

WORKERS OF ALL COUNTRIES, UNITE!



Joel Madison

SELECTED READINGS
FROM THE WORKS OF
JOSE MARIA SISON

FOREIGN LANGUAGES PRESS

FOREIGN LANGUAGES PRESS
Collection "Works of Maoism" #7

Contact - flpress@protonmail.com
<https://foreignlanguages.press>

Paris, 2021

First edition, Foreign Languages Press, Paris, 2021

ISBN: 978-2-491182-54-0



This book is under license Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 4.0 International
(CC BY-NC-SA 4.0)

<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/4.0/>

INTRODUCTION

Prof. Jose Ma. Sison's writings in this selection are what some young Filipino revolutionaries may refer to as "classics" having served as basic documents and texts in the study courses of all Party members and revolutionary activists for more than fifty years now. Several generations of Filipino revolutionaries have been stirred by these writings.

These continue to serve as basic reference and guide of the Communist Party of the Philippines as it leads the New People's Army (NPA) and the National Democratic Front of the Philippines (NDFP) in waging the people's democratic revolution in the country.

The selections are well chosen not only for their historical value but for their continuing relevance. The writings provide the Party and Filipino revolutionaries with foundational knowledge necessary for confronting the key issues and problems in the country and the crucial questions for leading the revolutionary struggle from start to its victorious end.

Reading and rereading *Philippine Society and Revolution* is particularly important to enable Filipino revolutionaries grasp the history and basic problems of the Filipino people. It is a practical application of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism on the concrete conditions of the Philippines. The key issues confronting the broad masses of workers and peasants today can only be fully understood by grasping the semi-colonial and semi-feudal nature of Philippine society as it is comprehensively discussed in PSR.

The PSR is so fundamental that it has been translated to the major languages in the Philippines to enable these to be more easily understood by the masses of workers and peasant across the country. It has also been popularized in a "Short Course" and through comic book form.

Of course, to understand the more recent facets of the ruling system and how it continues to fester and oppress the broad masses of workers and peasants, it is crucial to also read Ka Joma's other writings on the Philippine mode of production from the 1980s and up to recently, as well as by some progressive academicians and researchers.

The other long articles in this selection are fundamental references for the ideological, political and organizational building of the Party. *Rectify Errors and Rebuild the Party* is a Marxist-Leninist-Maoist summing-up and repudiation of the "Left" and Right subjectivist errors and revisionism of the old communist party which led to its practical demise starting in the late 1950s. *Anti-Marxism*

and Eclecticism is an assertion of the universal significance of Mao Zedong's theory of people's war to reject the revisionism of William Pomeroy and lay the theoretical framework for waging people's war and guerrilla warfare in the Philippines. The *Declaration* of the New People's Army and its *Basic Rules* serve as fundamental documents for building the people's army. They remain basic study material for all Red fighters of the people's army. *Our Urgent Tasks*, although written in 1976 under the US-Marcos dictatorship, continue to serve as valuable reference in defining the tasks of the Party in its successive 5-year programs of action.

These works of Ka Joma have galvanized the Filipino proletariat and militated them to perform their vanguard role in the people's democratic revolution. These have guided more than five decades revolutionary practice in the Philippines. Ka Joma's body of theoretical work have long become a material force in the form of a nationwide people's army that continues to wage guerrilla warfare with a mass base running to millions. Defended by the people's army, organs of political power have been established in the guerrilla base areas administering land reform and attending to the other needs of the masses. These writings serve as guide in efforts to build revolutionary mass organizations continue to be built among the oppressed classes both in the rural areas and cities, as well as overseas among the Filipino diaspora.

The publication of this selection of Ka Joma's writings by Foreign Languages Press is deeply appreciated by the Filipino revolutionary forces as it makes these Marxist-Leninist treasures available in new form. We urge all Filipino communists, revolutionaries and activists to avail of this book and earnestly read the choice selections.

We trust that communists and revolutionaries in other countries will also find these articles valuable not only in helping them understand the people's democratic revolution in the Philippines, but also in inspiring and helping them carry forward the class struggles and revolutionary movement in their own countries.

MARCO L. VALBUENA
INFORMATION OFFICER
COMMUNIST PARTY OF THE PHILIPPINES

Contents

PHILIPPINE SOCIETY AND REVOLUTION

October 1969

Preface to the Sixth Edition	1
Chapter I: A Review of Philippine History	5
I. The Philippines and the People	5
II. The People Upon the Coming of the Spanish Colonialists	7
III. Spanish Colonialism and Feudalism	10
IV. The Philippine Revolution of 1896	14
V. The Filipino-American War	20
VI. The Colonial Rule of US Imperialism	23
VII. The People's Struggle Against Japanese Imperialism	33
VIII. The Present Puppet Republic of the Philippines	36
1. The Roxas Puppet Regime, 1946-48	38
2. The Quirino Puppet Regime, 1948-53	21
3. The Magsaysay Puppet Regime, 1954-57	44
4. The Garcia Puppet Regime, 1957-61	47
5. The Macapagal Puppet Regime, 1962-65	51
6. The Marcos Puppet Regime, 1966-	56
IX. The Reestablishment of the Communist Party of the Philippines	64
Chapter II: Basic Problems of the Filipino People	67
I. A Semi-Colonial and Semi-Feudal Society	67
II. US Imperialism	69
1. The Meaning of Imperialism	69
2. Bogus Independence and the Unequal Treaties	72
3. US Monopoly Control of the Philippines	78
4. The Scheme to Prolong US Domination	83
III. Feudalism	93
1. The Meaning of Feudalism	93
2. The Hacienda System	96
3. Sham Land Reform	99

4. The Extent of Feudal and Semi-feudal Exploitation	107
5. The Political Power of the Landlord Class	117
IV. Bureaucrat Capitalism	119
1. The Meaning of Bureaucrat Capitalism	119
2. Sources of Graft and Corruption	122
3. Fascism	126
4. Reformism and Modern Revisionism	130
Chapter III: People's Democratic Revolution	133
I. Basic Character of the Philippine Revolution	133
II. Classes in Philippine Society	136
1. The Landlord Class	136
2. The Bourgeoisie	138
3. The Peasantry	144
4. The Proletariat	149
III. Class Basis of Strategy and Tactics	160
1. Class Leadership and the Party	161
2. The Main Force and the Armed Struggle	162
3. The Basic Alliance and the National United Front	164
IV. Basic Tasks of the People's Democratic Revolution	165
1. In the Political Field	166
2. In the Military Field	166
3. In the Economic Field	167
4. In the Cultural Field	168
5. In the Field of Foreign Relations	169
V. Perspective of the Philippine Revolution	170
Tables	173
RECTIFY ERRORS AND REBUILD THE PARTY	188
<i>December 26, 1968</i>	
I. Mao Zedong Thought is our Guide to Self-Criticism and Party Rebuilding	189
II. Summing Up our Experience and Drawing Revolutionary Lessons	191
III. Brief Historical Review	192
A. Founding of the Party and its Illegalization	192

B.	Merger of the Communist Party and the Socialist Party	192
C.	The Party during the Japanese Occupation	193
D.	The Party upon the Return of US Imperialism	195
E.	The Party in the Period of Military Adventurism	197
F.	The Party in the Period of Continued Military Defeat	199
IV.	Main Errors and Weaknesses	202
A.	Ideological Weaknesses	202
B.	Political Errors	207
C.	Military Errors	214
D.	Organizational Errors	220
V.	Three Main Tasks	226
A.	Party Building	226
B.	Armed Struggle	231
C.	The National United Front	237
	PROGRAM FOR A PEOPLE’S DEMOCRATIC REVOLUTION	242
	<i>December 26, 1968</i>	
I.	The Basic Condition of the Philippines Today	243
II.	Program for a People’s Democratic Revolution	249
III.	Our Specific Program	256
IV.	Conditions for Revolution Are Excellent	2661
	DECLARATION OF THE NEW PEOPLE’S ARMY	264
	<i>March 29, 1969</i>	
	The New People’s Army	266
	Crimes of the Taruc-Sumulong Clique	268
	Historical Roots of the Taruc-Sumulong Clique	272
1.	Period before the Establishment of the Hukbo ng Bayan Laban sa Hapon	275
2.	Period of the Hukbo ng Bayan Laban sa Hapon	275
3.	Period of the “Democratic Peace” Line	277
4.	Resumption of the Armed Struggle and Military Adventurism	277
5.	The Period of Continued Military Defeat	279
6.	The Reemergence of Right Opportunism and Flightism	280

7. The Ascendancy of Mao Zedong Thought in the Party and Army	281
The Main Tasks of the New People's Army	282
1. The New People's Army Must Engage in Party Rebuilding.	282
2. The New People's Army Must Carry Out Agrarian Revolution, Build Rural Bases and Advance the Armed Struggle.	284
3. The New People's Army Must Build the National United Front.	286
BASIC RULES OF THE NEW PEOPLE'S ARMY	288
<i>March 29, 1969</i>	
Preamble	289
I. The New People's Army and the Communist Party of the Philippines	292
II. The Tasks of the New People's Army	294
III. Membership in the New People's Army	296
IV. Discipline	298
V. Democracy	300
VI. Military Conferences	301
VII. The Military Command System	303
VIII. Formations of the People's Armed Forces	306
IX. Logistics	308
X. Amendments	309
ANTI-MARXISM AND ECLECTICISM	310
<i>June 15, 1971</i>	
I. Marxism-Leninism and the Question of Armed Struggle	313
II. The Universal Significance of Chairman Mao's Theory of People's War	319
III. Guerrilla Warfare Raised to the Level of Marxist-Leninist Theory and Strategy	327
IV. Once More on the Question of Armed Struggle in the Philippines	334

OUR URGENT TASKS	340
<i>July 30, 1976</i>	
1. Carry Forward the Anti-Fascist, Anti-Feudal and Anti-Imperialist Movement!	342
2. Further Strengthen the Party and Rectify our Errors!	352
3. Build the Revolutionary Mass Movement in the Countryside!	363
4. Further Strengthen the People's Army and Carry Forward the Revolutionary Armed Struggle!	370
5. Build the Revolutionary Mass Movement in the Cities!	377
6. Realize a Broad Anti-Fascist, Anti-Feudal and Anti-Imperialist United Front!	386
7. Relate the Philippine Revolution to the World Revolution!	391
TWO ARTICLES ON THE PEOPLE'S STRUGGLE FOR A JUST PEACE	396
1. History and Circumstances Relevant to the Question of Peace <i>May 10, 1991</i>	398
2. The NDFP Framework in Contrast with the GRP Framework <i>May 15, 1991</i>	435
THE PHILIPPINE REVOLUTION AND THE NATIONALITY QUESTION	456
<i>February 15, 1996</i>	
1. The Philippine Revolution of 1896 and Filipino Nationality	458
2. Filipino Nationality under US Imperialism	462
3. The New-Democratic Revolution and Filipino Nationality	466
4. The Right to Self-Determination Among the Minorities	471
5. The People's Democratic State	477

Philippine Society and Revolution

October 1969

Integrating Marxist-Leninist theory with Philippine practice is a two-way process. We do not merely take advantage of the victories achieved abroad so that we may succeed in our own revolution. But we also hope to add our own victory to those of others and make some worthwhile contribution to the advancement of Marxism-Leninism and the world proletarian revolution so that in the end mankind will be freed from the scourge of imperialism and enter the era of communism.

—Amado Guerrero

PREFACE TO THE SIXTH EDITION

Jose Maria Sison, KM Founding Chair

I am elated that the *Struggle for National Democracy* (SND) and *Philippine Society and Revolution* (PSR) are republished in both English and Pilipino in order to celebrate the 50th founding anniversary of Kabataang Makabayan (Patriotic Youth).

These two books are historical documents of the period when they were first published. At present and in years to come, they have continuing relevance and validity. They shed light on the persistent semi-colonial and semi-feudal ruling system of the big compradors and landlords under US hegemony. They confront the problems of foreign monopoly capitalism, domestic feudalism and bureaucrat capitalism, and they point to the people's revolutionary course of action.

SND is composed of articles and speeches that I wrote in the 1960s. Most of these were done in my capacity as the Chairman of the Kabataang Makabayan. Subsequently, the book became a basic reading material for all KM members. It became known figuratively as the bible of the KM and the youth movement for national liberation and democracy. To this day, it is read and studied avidly by the young men and women interested in fundamental social transformation through the national democratic revolution.

PSR, which I wrote in 1969, is a comprehensive and thorough presentation of the essential history of the Filipino people, the three basic problems that afflict them and the people's democratic revolution as the solution. The general line of people's democratic revolution through protracted people's war is clearly set against the semi-colonial and semi-feudal ruling system. The motive forces

and the enemies of the revolution are clearly defined. The socialist perspective of the revolution is made clear.

The motive forces of the Philippine revolution include the working class as the leading force, the peasantry as the main force, the urban petit bourgeoisie as the swing force and the middle bourgeoisie as an additional supplementary force in a national united front. They confront and struggle against the local reactionary classes of big compradors and landlords in a revolutionary civil war and are prepared to wage a war of national liberation against the escalation of US military intervention to the level of an aggressive war.

The basic alliance of the working class and the peasantry is at the foundation of the revolutionary united front. The urban petit bourgeoisie is one more progressive and revolutionary force and the middle bourgeoisie is one more patriotic and positive force in the united front. Under certain conditions, the united front may be further broadened to take advantage of the contradictions among political forces of the exploiting classes and hasten the isolation and defeat of the reactionary die-hards who are the enemy.

As the most progressive political and productive force in Philippine society, the working class leads the national democratic and socialist stages of the revolution. By winning the national democratic stage in combination with the peasantry through people's war, the working class acquires the strength to proceed to the socialist stage of the revolution.

Through the people's democratic revolution, under the leadership of the working class and the Communist Party as its advanced detachment, the people's democratic state system is built, economic development is propelled through land reform and national industrialization, a national, scientific and mass culture flourishes and international solidarity is promoted for the just cause of peace and development against imperialism and reaction.

Since the first editions of SND and PSR in 1966 and 1969 respectively, there have been great advances in the development of the people's democratic revolution and in the further production of revolutionary literature enriched by the actual life and death struggle between the self-reliant revolutionary forces and the reactionary forces that enjoy the fruit of oppression and exploitation and the support of US imperialism.

The new editions of SND and PSR must be read and studied in connection with the practical and theoretical development that has been achieved. This point cannot be missed if we keep in mind at the very start that many of the activists of Kabataang Makabayan that were guided by SND proceeded to

study PSR thoroughly and advanced to become proletarian revolutionaries. Guided by both SND and PSR, the KM expanded nationwide and took roots among the youth, including the students and the young workers, peasants and professionals.

The Communist Party of the Philippines (CPP) owes much to the KM for its role as assistant of the working class and as the training school for revolutionaries. Those who took the lead in reestablishing the CPP under the guidance of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought in 1968 came from the KM. And many of those responsible for expanding the CPP nationwide and taking deep roots among the toiling masses of workers and peasants came from the KM.

The KM has been enlightened and motivated by SND and PSR. Thus, it has become a major part of the revolutionary struggle of the people and has contributed greatly to its advance. The revolutionary victories achieved by the KM and its veterans have been paid for with hard work and sacrifices. The record of the KM is outstanding in fighting the Marcos fascist dictatorship, the succeeding pseudo-democratic regimes and the ruling system as a whole since the 1960s.

Despite the fall of the Marcos fascist regime, the KM has remained in the urban revolutionary underground and in the field of armed struggle. It continues to play the role of the Communist Youth League and make significant contributions to the development of the revolutionary struggle.

I am glad that in this foreword I have the opportunity to cite the historic role and brilliant achievements of Kabataang Makabayan in connection with the celebration of its 50th founding anniversary and the latest editions of the *Struggle for National Democracy* and *Philippine Society and Revolution*.

CHAPTER I

A REVIEW OF PHILIPPINE HISTORY

Changes in society, are due chiefly to the development of the internal contradictions in society, that is, the contradiction between the productive forces and the relations of production, the contradiction between classes and the contradiction between the old and new; it is the development of these contradictions that pushes society forward and gives the impetus for the supercession of the old society by the new.

—Mao Zedong

I. THE PHILIPPINES AND THE PEOPLE

The Philippines is an archipelago with a tropical climate and a mountainous terrain. It is located a little above the equator and bounded by the Pacific Ocean, the China Sea and the Celebes Sea. It lies some 600 miles southeast of the coast of mainland Asia and is strung on the north-south axis, bounded by China to the north and Indonesia and North Kalimantan to the south.

The geographic position of the Philippines makes the Filipino people literally close to the center of the world proletarian revolution and part of a gigantic wave of a powerful revolutionary movements in Southeast Asia. Though the Philippines seems surrounded by a moat and is at the outer rim of Asia directly facing US imperialism, the Number One enemy of the world's peoples, the Filipino people can rely on a great invincible political rear made up of the People's Republic of China and all revolutionary peoples of Asia.

The Philippines consists of 7,100 islands and islets with a total land area of 115,000 square miles. The two largest islands which are at the same time principal regions are Luzon and Mindanao. The former has a total land area of 54,000 square miles, and the latter has 37,000 square miles. The third principal region is the group of islands and islets called the Visayas in the central part of the archipelago. The irregular coastline of the whole country extends to a little less than 11,000 miles. All the islands are seasonally inundated by river systems flowing from mountains. The plains and valleys are well-populated.

The mountains, many of which are volcanic in origin, the extensive river systems and the tropical climate endow the Philippines with extremely fertile agricultural lands suitable for a wide variety of crops for food and industrial use. It has vast forest, mineral, marine and power resources. Its forests cover a little over one-third of the land. Its mineral resources include iron, gold, copper, nickel, oil, coal, chrome, and so many others. Its principal rivers can be controlled to irrigate fields continuously and also to provide electricity to every part of the country. It has rich inland and sea fishing grounds. Numerous fine harbors and landlocked straits are available for building up the maritime industry.

If the natural wealth of the Philippines were to be tapped and developed by the Filipino people themselves for their own benefit, it would be more than enough to sustain a population that is several times bigger than the present one. However, US imperialism, domestic feudalism and bureaucrat capitalism prevent the Filipino people from making use of their natural resources to their own advantage. As of now, US imperialism and all of its lackeys exploit these natural resources for their own selfish profit and according to their narrow schemes at the expense of the toiling masses.

Based on the 1970 Census, the Filipino people now number about 37 million and they are increasing at the annual rate of 3.5 percent. Seventy-five percent of them live in the countryside under backward and feudal conditions. If the population were not subjected to foreign and feudal exploitation, not only could it become self-reliant economically, but it could also excel in all fields of social endeavor. It could be a massive force for progress instead of being a “problem” interpreted in the Malthusian way by reactionaries who constantly prate about “overpopulation” to cover up the basic problems that are US imperialism, feudalism and bureaucrat capitalism.

The Filipino people have been generated by several racial stocks. The main racial stock is Malay, which accounts for more than 85 percent. Other significant factors in the racial composition of the people are Indonesian and Chinese. The Arab, Indian, Spanish, American and Negrito factors are present, but only to a marginal degree.

There are many theories on the peopling of the archipelago in prehistoric times. We can cite what are currently the most accepted ones.

The aboriginal inhabitants of the Philippines were the Aetas or Negritos, small black people, who first came to the Philippines on land bridges about 25,000 to 30,000 years ago in the Pleistocene era. They were followed by the

first Indonesian wave of immigrants who came bringing with them an early stone age culture from Southeast Asia about 5,000 to 6,000 years ago. The second Indonesian wave came about 1,500 B.C. from Indochina and south China bringing with them a late Neolithic or bronze-copper culture.

What would later compose the main racial stock of the Filipino people, the Malay, came in three major waves. The first wave of the Malays came from a southern direction between 300 and 200 B.C. bringing with them Indian cultural influences. The second wave came between the first century and the 13th century and became the main ancestors of the Tagalogs, Ilocanos, Pampangos, Visayans and Bicolanos. As they were equipped with a system of writing, they were the first to leave historical records. The third wave of Malays who came between the latter half of the 14th century and the 15th century came the Arab traders and religious teachers who laid the foundation of Islam in Sulu and in mainland Mindanao.

The national minorities of today comprise at least 10 percent of the population. They inhabited the greater part of the archipelago until a few decades ago when land grabbers started to dispossess and oppress them. They have been set apart from the rest of the people principally by Christian chauvinism employed by Spanish colonialism and US imperialism, as in the case of the Muslims in Mindanao and the non-Christian mountain tribes all over the country. There is also Malay racism bred by foreign and feudal exploiters of the people. This is often directed against the Chinese and the Aetas.

To this day, there are more than 100 languages and dialects. The nine most widely spoken are Tagalog, Ilocano, Hiligaynon, Sugbuhanon, Bicol, Pangasinan, Samarnon, and Maguindanao. Tagalog is the principal base of the national language, which can now be spoken by the majority of the people with varying degrees of fluency.

II. THE PEOPLE UPON THE COMING OF THE SPANISH COLONIALISTS

Before the coming of Spanish colonialists, the people of the Philippine archipelago had already attained a semi-communal and semi-slave social system in many parts and also a feudal system in certain parts, especially in Mindanao and Sulu, where such a feudal faith as Islam had already taken roots. The Aetas had the lowest form of social organization, which was primitive communal.

The barangay was the typical community in the whole archipelago. It was the basic political and economic unit independent of similar others. Each embraced a few hundreds of people and a small territory. Each was headed by a chieftain called the *rajah* or *datu*.

The social structure comprised a petty nobility, the ruling class which had started to accumulate land that it owned privately or administered in the name of the clan or community; an intermediate class of freemen called the *maharlikas* who had enough land for their livelihood or who rendered special service to the rulers and who did not have to work in the fields; and the ruled classes that included the *timawas*, the serfs who shared the crops with the petty nobility, and also the slaves and semi-slaves who worked without having any definite share in the harvest. There were two kinds of slaves then: those who had their own quarters, the *aliping namamahay*, and those who lived in their master's house, the *aliping sagigilid*. One acquired the status of a serf or a slave by inheritance, failure to pay debts and tribute, commission of crimes and captivity in wars between barangays.

The Islamic sultanates of Sulu and mainland Mindanao represented a higher stage of political and economic development than the barangay. These had a feudal form of social organization. Each of them encompassed more people and wider territory than the barangay. The sultan reigned supreme over several *datos* and was conscious of his privilege to rule as a matter of hereditary "divine right."

Though they presented themselves mainly as administrators of communal lands, apart from being direct owners of certain lands, the sultans, *datos* and the nobility extracted land rent in the form of religious tribute and lived off the toiling masses. They constituted a landlord class attended by a retinue of religious teachers, scribes and leading warriors.

The sultanates emerged in the two centuries prior to the coming of Spanish colonialists. They were built up among the so-called third wave of Malay migrants whose rulers either tried to convert to Islam, bought out, enslaved or drove away the original non-Muslim inhabitants of the areas that they chose to settle in. Serfs and slaves alike were used to till the fields and to make more clearings from the forest.

Throughout the archipelago, the scope of barangays could be enlarged either through the expansion of agriculture by the toil of the slaves or serfs, through conquests in war and through inter-barangay marriages of the nobil-

ity. The confederations of barangays was usually the result of a peace pact, a barter agreement or an alliance to fight common internal and external enemies.

As evident from the forms of social organization already attained, the pre-colonial inhabitants of the Philippine archipelago had an internal basis for further social development. In either barangay or sultanate, there was a certain mode of production which was bound to develop further until it would wear out and be replaced with a new one. There were definite classes whose struggle was bound to bring about social development. As a matter of fact, the class struggle within the barangay was already getting extended into inter-barangay wars. The barangay was akin to the Greek city-state in many respects and the sultanate to the feudal commonwealth of other countries.

The people had developed extensive agricultural fields. In the plains or in the mountains, the people had developed irrigation systems. The Ifugao rice terraces were the product of the engineering genius of the people; a marvel of 12,000 miles if strung end-to-end. There was livestock-raising, fishing and brewing of beverages. Also there was mining, the manufacture of metal implements, weapons and ornaments, lumbering, shipbuilding and weaving. The handicrafts were developing fast. Gunpowder had also come into use in warfare. As far north as Manila, when the Spaniards came, there was already a Muslim community which had cannons in its weaponry.

The ruling classes made use of arms to maintain the social system, to assert their independence from other barangays or to repel foreign invaders. Their jurisprudence would still be borne out today by the so-called Code of Kalantiyaw and the Muslim laws. These were touchstones of their culture. There was a written literature which included epics, ballads, riddles and verse-sayings; various forms and instruments of music and dances; and art works that included well-designed bells, drums, gongs, shields, weapons, tools, utensils, boats, combs, smoking pipes, lime tubes and baskets. The people sculpted images from wood, bone, ivory, horn or metals. In areas where *anito* worship and polytheism prevailed, the images of flora and fauna were imitated, and in the areas where the Muslim faith prevailed, geometric and arabesque designs were made. Morga's *Sucesos de las Islas Filipinas*, a record of what the Spanish conquistadores came upon, would later be used by Dr. Jose Rizal as testimony to the achievement of the *indios* in precolonial times.

There was interisland commerce ranging from Luzon to Mindanao and vice versa. There were extensive trade relations with neighboring countries like

China, Indochina, North Borneo, Indonesia, Malaya, Japan and Thailand.¹ Traders from as far as India and the Middle East vied for commerce with the precolonial inhabitants of the archipelago. As early as the 9th century, Sulu was an important trading emporium where trading ships from Cambodia, China and Indonesia converged. Arab traders brought goods from Sulu to the Chinese mainland through the port of Canton. In the 14th century, a large fleet of 60 vessels from China anchored at Manila Bay, Mindoro and Sulu. Previous to this, Chinese trading junks had been intermittently sailing into various points of the Philippine shoreline. The barter system was employed or gold and metal gongs were used as medium of exchange.

III. SPANISH COLONIALISM AND FEUDALISM

The absence of a political unity involving all or the majority of the people of the archipelago allowed the Spanish conquistadores to impose their will on the people step by step, even with a few hundreds of colonial troops at the start. Magellan employed the standard tactic of divide-and-rule when in 1521 he sided with Humabon against Lapu-lapu. He started a pattern of inveigling certain barangays to adopt the Christian faith and then employing them against other barangays which resisted colonial domination. However, it was Legazpi who in 1565 and thereafter succeeded in hoodwinking a large number of barangay chieftains typified by Sikatuna in quelling recalcitrant barangays with the sword and in establishing under the cross the first colonial settlements in Visayas and subsequently in Luzon.

The kind of society that developed in more than three centuries of Spanish rule was colonial and feudal. It was a society basically ruled by the landlord class, which included the Spanish colonial officials. The Catholic religious orders and the local puppet chiefs. The masses of the people were kept to the status of serfs, and even the freemen became dispossessed.

It was in 1570 that the Spanish colonialists started to integrate the barangays that they had subjugated into larger administrative and economic units called the *encomiendas*. Wide areas of land, the *encomiendas* were awarded as royal grants to the colonial officials and Catholic religious orders in exchange for their "meritorious services" in the conquest of the native people. The encomienda system of local administration would be phased out in the 17th century when the organization of regular provinces was already possible and

¹ Modern names of these countries are used for convenience.

after it had served to establish the large-scale private landownership of the colonialists.

Under the guise of looking after the spiritual welfare of the people, the *encomenderos* collected tribute, enforced corvee labor and conscripted native soldiers. They arbitrarily extended the territorial scope of their royal grants, usurped ownership over the lands previously developed by the people and put more land to cultivation by employing corvee labor. It was convenient for the colonialists to convert into agricultural lands the clearing made from the forests as a result of the timber-cutting necessitated by various construction projects.

Public building, private houses, churches, fortifications, roads, bridges and ships for the galleon trade and for military expeditions were built. These entailed the mass conscription of labor for quarrying, timber-cutting, hauling, lumbering, brickmaking and construction work in nearby or faraway places.

The central government was set up in Manila to run the affairs of the colony. Its head was the Spanish governor-general who saw to it that the Filipino people were compelled to pay taxes, render free labor and produce an agricultural surplus sufficient to feed the parasitic colonial officials, friars and soldiery. On the one hand, the governor-general had the soldiery to enforce the colonial order. On the other, he had the collaboration of the friars to keep the people in spiritual and economic enslavement. He enriched himself fast within his short stay in office by being the chief shipper on the Manila-Acapulco trade galleons and by being the dispenser of shipping permits to merchants.

The Manila-Acapulco trade in certain goods coming from China and other neighboring countries yielded high revenues for the central government and the business-minded religious orders from the late 16th century to the early 19th century. It eventually declined and was replaced by the more profitable export of sugar, hemp, copra, tobacco, indigo and others on various foreign ships after the first half of the 18th century and all throughout the 19th century. The large-scale cultivation of these export crops was imposed on the toiling masses to provide more profits for Spanish colonialism.

At the provincial level was the *alcalde-mayor* as the colonial chieftain. He exercised both executive and judicial powers, collected tributes from the town and enjoyed the privilege of monopolizing commerce in the province and engaged in usury. He manipulated government funds as well as drew loans from the *obras pias*, the friars' chest for "charities," to engage in nefarious commerce and usury.

At the town level was the *gobernadorcillo*, the top puppet official formally elected by the *principalia*. The *principalia* was composed of the incumbent and past *gobernadorcillos* and the barrio chieftains called the *cabezas de barangay*. It essentially reflected the assimilation of the old barangay leadership into the Spanish colonial system. Membership in the *principalia* was qualified by property, literacy, heredity and, of course, puppetry to the foreign tyrants.

The most important regular duties of the *gobernadorcillo* and the *cabezas de barangay* under him were the collection of tribute and the enforcement of corvee labor. Their property was answerable for any deficiency in their performance. However, the *gobernadorcillo* usually made the *cabezas de barangay* his scapegoat. To avoid bankruptcy and keep themselves in the good graces of their colonial masters, these puppet officials also made sure that the main burden of colonial oppression was borne by the peasant masses.

In the classic fashion of feudalism, the union of church and state suffused the entire colonial structure. All colonial subjects fell under friar control from birth until death. The pulpit and the confessional box were expertly used for colonial propaganda and espionage, respectively. The catechetical schools were used to poison the minds of the children against their own country. The Royal and Pontifical University of Santo Tomas was established as early as 1611 but its enrollment was limited to Spaniards and creoles until the second half of the 19th century. The colonial bureaucracy did not find any need for natives in the higher professions. Among the masses, the friars propagated a bigoted culture that was obsessed with novenas, prayer books, hagiographies, scapularies, the passion play, the anti-Muslim *moro-moro* and pompous religious feasts and processions. The friars had burned and destroyed the artifacts of precolonial culture as the handiwork of the devil and assimilated only those things of the indigenous culture which they could use to facilitate colonial and medieval indoctrination.

In the material base as well as in the superstructure, friar control was total and most oppressive in the towns situated in vast landed estates owned by the religious orders. In the colonial center as well as in every province, the friars exercised vast political powers. They supervised such diverse affairs as taxation, census, statistics, primary schools, health, public works and charities. They certified the correctness of residence certificates, the condition of men chosen for military service, the municipal budget, the election of municipal officials and police officers, and the examination of pupils in the parochial schools.

They intervened in the election of municipal officials. As a matter of fact, they were so powerful that they could instigate the transfer, suspension or removal from office of colonial officials, from the highest to the lowest, including the governor-general. In line with their feudal interests, they could even murder the governor-general with impunity, as they did to Salcedo in 1668 and Bustamante in 1719. As they could be that vicious within their own official ranks, they were more so in witch-hunting and suppressing native rebels whom they condemned as “heretics” and “subversives.”

Throughout the Spanish colonial regime, revolts broke out sporadically all over the archipelago against the tribute, corvee labor, commercial monopolies, excessive land rent, land grabbing, imposition of the Catholic faith, arbitrary rules and other cruel practices of the colonial rulers, both lay and clerical. There were at least 200 revolts of uneven scope and duration. These grew with cumulative strength to create a great revolutionary tradition among the Filipino people.

The most outstanding revolts in the first century of colonial rule were those led by Sulayman in 1564 and Magat Salamat in 1587-88 in Manila and by Magalat in 1596 in Cagayan. At the beginning of the 17th century, the Igorots in the central highlands of Northern Luzon rebelled against attempts to colonize them and used the favorable terrain of their homeland to maintain their independence. Almost simultaneously in 1621-22, Tamblot in Bohol and Bankaw in Leyte raised the flag of revolt. Revolts also broke out in Nueva Vizcaya and Cagayan in 1621 and 1625-27, respectively.

The most widespread revolts that occurred in the 17th century were those inspired by Sumuroy in the southern provinces and Maniago, Malong and Almazan in the northern provinces of the archipelago. The Sumuroy revolt started in Samar in 1649 and spread northward to Albay and Camarines Sur and southward to Masbate, Cebu, Camiguin, Zamboanga and Northern Mindanao. The parallel revolts of Maniago, Malong and Almazan started in 1660 in Pampanga, Pangasinan and Ilocos, respectively. Malong extended his revolt to Pampanga, Ilocos and Cagayan. A localized revolt also broke out in 1663 under Tapar in Oton, Panay.

All throughout the Spanish colonial rule, the Muslims of Mindanao as well as the mountain people in practically every island, especially the Igorots in Northern Luzon, kept up their resistance. Aside from these consistent anti-colonial fighters, the people of Bohol fought the foreign tyrants for 85 years from 1774 to 1829. They were first led by Dagohoy and subsequently by his succes-

sors. At the peak of their strength, they were 20,000 strong and had their own government in their mountain bases.

Despite previous defeats, the people of Pangasinan and the Ilocos provinces repeatedly rose up against the colonial rule. The revolt led by Palaris in 1762-64 spread throughout the large province of Pangasinan and the one led by Diego Silang in 1762-63 (and later by his wife, Gabriela, after his treacherous assassination) spread from the Ilocos to as far as Cagayan Valley northward and Pangasinan southward. These revolts tried to take advantage of the British seizure of Manila and the Spanish defeat in the Seven Years' War.

In the 18th century, the anti-colonial revolts of the people increasingly took the character of conscious opposition to feudalism. Previously, the hardships and torment of corvee labor were the frequent causes of revolt. The arbitrary expansion of friar estates through fraudulent surveys and also the arbitrary raising of land rent inflamed the people, especially in Central Luzon and Southern Luzon. Matienza led a revolt outrightly against the agrarian abuses of the Jesuits who had rampantly grabbed land from the people. This revolt spread from Lian and Nasugbu, Batangas to the neighboring provinces of Laguna, Cavite and Rizal. In other provinces of the archipelago outside of Central Luzon and Southern Luzon, revolt came to be more often sparked by the monopolistic and confiscatory practices of the colonial government towards the end of the 18th century and during the 19th century. In 1807, the Ilocanos revolted against the wine monopoly. Once more they rose up in 1814 in Sarrat, Ilocos Norte and killed several landlords.

In quelling all the revolts precedent to the Philippine Revolution of 1896, the Spanish colonialist conscripted large numbers of peasants to fight their own brothers. Military conscription thus became a major form of oppression as the development of revolts became rapid and widespread.

IV. THE PHILIPPINE REVOLUTION OF 1896

The 19th century saw the intensification and ripening of the colonial and feudal system of exploitation. The Spanish colonial government was compelled to draw more profits from its feudal base in the Philippines to make up for the decline of the galleon trade and to adjust to the increasing pressures and demands of capitalist countries. The British victory in the Seven Years' War, the Napoleonic wars and French occupation of Spain, the expansionist maneuvers of the United States and the rise of national independence movements in Latin

America, and the sharp struggle between the “liberal republicans” and “absolute monarchists” in Spain had the total effect of goading colonial Spain to exploit the Filipino people further.

Under the strain of increasing exploitation, the national and democratic aspirations of the broad masses of the people rose. As oppression was stepped up, the spirit of resistance among the ruled, especially the peasant masses, became heightened until the Philippine Revolution of 1896 broke out.

The fullest development of feudalism under Spanish colonial rule was made. The peasant masses were compelled not only to continue producing a surplus in staple crops to feed and keep the colonial and feudal parasites in comfort, but also produce an ever-increasing amount of raw material crops for export to various capitalist countries. The large-scale cultivation of sugar, hemp, tobacco, coconut and the like in some areas in turn required the production of a bigger surplus in staple food crops in other areas in order to sustain the large numbers of people concentrated in the production of export crops. Rice was imported whenever a general shortage occurred.

Thus, the expansion of foreign trade made by the Spanish colonialists entailed the acceleration of domestic trade and the wearing-out of a self-sufficient natural economy towards a commodity economy. The exchange of agricultural products within the archipelago, as well as the delivery of export crops to Manila and other trading ports and the provincial distribution of imported goods that served the wealthy, necessitated the improvement of transportation and communications.

The intensification of feudal exploitation included the adoption of the hated hacienda system, the rampant seizure of cultivated lands, the arbitrary raising of land rent and levies by both landlords and bureaucrats. The practice of monopoly, which meant dictated prices for the crops, further impoverished the peasants and enriched the bureaucrats. Landowning peasants either found themselves bankrupt or their lands arbitrarily included in the legal boundaries of large landlord estates. From 1803 to 1892, eighty-eight decrees were issued ostensibly to make landownership orderly but these merely legalized massive land grabbing by the feudalists.

The improvement of transportation and communications aggravated by feudal exploitation of the people. Exercising their colonial powers, the Spaniards ordered the people in increasing numbers to build roads, bridges and ports and paid them extremely low nominal wages. Big gangs of men were taken to distant places to work. At the same time, the improvement of trans-

portation and communications paved the way for wider contacts among the exploited and oppressed people despite the rulers' subjective wish to use these only for their own profit. Also the introduction of the steamship and the railroad in connection with foreign and domestic trade contribute a great deal to the formation of the Filipino proletariat.

It was in the 19th century that the embryo of the Filipino proletariat became distinct. It was composed of the workers at the railroad, ships, docks, sugar mills, tobacco and cigar and cigarette factories, printing shops, breweries, foundries, merchandising firms and the like. They emerged in the transition from a feudal to a semi-feudal economy.

The economic prosperity enjoyed mainly by the colonial rulers was shared to some extent by the *principalia*, especially the *gobernadorcillo*. The local puppet chieftains either had landholdings of their own or become big leaseholders on the landed estates of friars or lay Spanish officials. They engaged in trade and bought more lands with their profits in order to engage further in trade. In Manila and other principal trading ports, a local comprador class emerged correspondent to the shipping, commercial and banking houses put up by foreign capitalist firms including American, British, German and French ones.

A nascent Filipino bourgeoisie became more and more distinct as agricultural production rose and as the volume of exports likewise did. The port of Manila was formally opened to non-Spanish foreign ships in 1834, although foreign trade with capitalist countries was actually started much earlier. From 1855 to 1873, six other ports throughout the archipelago were opened. In 1869, the opening of the Suez Canal shortened the distance between the Philippines and Europe and thus accelerated economic and political contacts between the two.

In the second half of the 19th century, the entry of native students into the Royal and Pontifical University of Santo Tomas and other colonial-clerical colleges became conspicuously large. Though these natives could afford college education, they were still the object of racial discrimination by their Spanish classmates and friar mentors. They had to suffer the epithet of "monkey" as their parents were referred to as "beasts loaded with gold." The creoles or mestizos were caught in the middle of a situation charged with the racial antagonism between the *indios* and the Spaniards. This racial antagonism was nothing but a manifestation of the colonial relationship. Even among the Spaniards, there was the foolish distinction made between the Philippine-born Spaniards and

the Spanish-born Spaniards, with the former being derisively called Filipinos by the latter.

As more and more *indios* joined the ranks of the educated or the *ilustrados*, there came a point when the colonial authorities were alarmed and they entertained fears that they would be taken to task on the basis of the colonial laws whose idealist rhetoric they did not all practice. What appeared to the colonial rulers as the first systematized movement among the native *ilustrados* to attack the social and political supremacy of the Spaniards was the secularization movement within the clergy. The overwhelming majority of those who participated in this movement were *indios* and creoles and they demanded taking over the parishes held by the religious orders whose members were overwhelmingly Spanish.

When the Cavite Mutiny of 1872 occurred, Fathers Burgos, Gomez and Zamora who were the most outspoken leaders of the secularization movement were accused of conspiring to overthrow the Spanish colonial regime and were garroted. The mutiny was essentially an act of rebellion of the oppressed masses initiated by workers at the Cavite naval stockyard who were subjected to low wages and various forms of cruelty. Many of the rebellious workers and their genuine supporters were tortured and murdered. The three clerics who were condemned by the Spanish governor-general and the friars pleaded their innocence until their end. The style of pleading political innocence characterized the *ilustrados* from then on.

Nevertheless, even as the yoke of colonial oppression was carried mainly by the toiling masses, the *principalia* also suffered political and economic oppression at the hands of the colonial tyrants. The *principalia* joined in the exploitation of the toiling masses but in turn it was subjected to certain oppressive demands made by the governor-general, the provincial governor and the friars who increasingly reduced its share of exploitation. These colonial tyrants arbitrarily increased the quota in tribute collection, the taxes for the privilege of engaging in commerce, the land rent on lease holdings, the quota in agricultural production and interest on loans. Failure to keep up with ever-increasing levies resulted in bankruptcy especially among the *cabezas de barangay*. The employment of civil guards for the confiscation of property and the enforcement of colonial laws became a common sight. Towards the end of the 19th century, the *principalia* became most offended when it was forcibly ejected from its leaseholds on friar lands because the friars preferred to turn over the management of their lands to various foreign corporations.

The extremely frequent change of governors-general in the Philippines during the 19th century reflected the sharp struggle between the “liberal republicans” and the “absolute monarchists” in Spain. This had the general effect of aggravating the Filipino people’s suffering. Every governor-general had to make the most of his average short term of a little over a year to enlarge the official as well as his personal treasury.

The *ilustrados* became increasingly dissatisfied with the colonial regime and some of them fled to Spain where they hoped to get higher education and gain more sympathy from Spanish liberal circles for their limited cause of changing the colonial status of the Philippines to the status of a regular province of Spain. They were desirous of representation in the Spanish parliament and the enjoyment of civil rights under the Spanish Constitution. In carrying out their reform movement, they established the newspaper *La Solidaridad*. It was the focus of activity for what would be called the Propaganda Movement, of which the chief propagandists were Dr. Jose Rizal, M.H. del Pilar, Graciano Lopez Jaena and Antonio Luna.

The Propaganda Movement failed and was condemned as “subversive” and “heretical” by the colonial authorities. Trying to carry out propaganda work in the Philippines itself, Rizal organized the short-lived La Liga Filipina which called on the Filipino people to become a national community, and yet failed to state categorically the need for revolutionary armed struggle to effect separation from Spain. Putting his trust in the enemy, he was subsequently arrested and exiled to Dapitan in 1892. When the Philippine Revolution of 1896 broke out, he was held culpable for it by the colonial tyrants, and yet he betrayed it by calling on the people to lay down their arms a few days before his execution.

The clear revolutionary call for separation from Spain was made by the Kataastaasang Kagalang-galang na Katipunan ng mga Anak ng Bayan. It was secretly founded in the proletarian district of Tondo by its leader Andres Bonifacio immediately after Rizal’s arrest in 1892. In its first year, it was composed of only 200 members coming mainly from the toiling masses. In the next few years, it consciously recruited members who could start revolutionary struggle in various parts of the country so as to be able to wage a war of national liberation. At the same time, it recruited its members mainly from the ranks of the oppressed masses to ensure the democratic character of the revolution. After its Cry of Pugad Lawin on August 23, 1896, signaling the start of armed warfare against the colonialists, its ranks swelled to several tens of thousands and rallied the entire Filipino people to rise in revolt.

The Philippine Revolution of 1896 was a national-democratic revolution of the old type. Though Bonifacio came from the working class, he was not in possession of proletarian ideology. The guiding ideology of the revolution was that of the liberal bourgeoisie. Its classic model was the French Revolution and Bonifacio himself was inspired mainly by its ideas. At any rate, the revolution asserted the sovereignty of the Filipino people, the protection and promotion of civil liberties, the confiscation of the friar estates and the elimination of theocratic rule.

At the Tejeros Convention of 1897, the *ilustrados* who were mostly from Cavite decided to form the revolutionary government to replace the Katipunan and elected Emilio Aguinaldo president, thus replacing Bonifacio as the leader of the revolution. When an *ilustrado* strongly objected to Bonifacio's election as minister of interior on the ground that he was of lowly origin and had no education as a lawyer, the latter declared the convention null and void in accordance with a previous agreement requiring respect for every decision made by the convention. The convention manifested the class leadership of the liberal bourgeoisie and likewise the divisive effect of regionalism. The attempt of Bonifacio to form another revolutionary council led to his arrest and execution by the Aguinaldo leadership.

Within 1897, the revolutionary government suffered defeat after defeat. The *ilustrados* showed their inability to lead the revolution. The liberal-bourgeois leadership finally succumbed to the offers of general amnesty by the colonial government through the mediation of the scoundrel Pedro Paterno. The Pact of Biak-na-Bato was signed to consummate the surrender of Aguinaldo and the payment of P400,000 as the first installment to his council of leaders.

While Aguinaldo was in exile in Hong Kong, US agents approached him and proposed to him to take advantage of the imminent outbreak of the Spanish-American War. They pretended to help the Filipino people liberate themselves from the Spanish colonial rule. The US imperialists schemed to make use of Aguinaldo to facilitate their own seizure of the Philippines. Thus was Aguinaldo brought back to Cavite aboard an American cutter after Dewey's naval squadron had sailed to Manila Bay to destroy the Spanish fleet.

Taking advantage of the Spanish-American War, the Filipino people intensified their revolutionary armed struggle against the Spanish colonial rule. Spanish power collapsed throughout the archipelago except in Intramuros and a few negligible garrisons. Even the Filipino soldiers in the Spanish military service took the side of the Philippine Revolution. A situation in May 1898 emerged

in which the Filipino revolutionary forces encircled on land the colonial seat of power, Intramuros, and the US naval fleet stood guard in Manila Bay. The Filipino revolutionaries took the policy of laying siege to starve the enemy into surrender while the imperialist navy waited for troop reinforcements from the United States.

On June 12, 1898, Aguinaldo made the Kawit proclamation of independence which carried the unfortunate qualification, “under the protection of the Mighty and Humane North American nation.” Unwittingly, he declared the so-called First Philippine Republic to be a mere protectorate of US imperialism.

US troop reinforcements started to arrive at the end of June. They were landed to take over under various pretexts positions occupied by the Filipino revolutionary forces in the encirclement of Intramuros. Position after position was relinquished to the US imperialists by the weakling Aguinaldo until all the revolutionary forces were relegated to the background.

V. THE FILIPINO-AMERICAN WAR

When Intramuros was already completely surrounded by the US naval and land troops, diplomatic negotiations were secretly conducted by Admiral Dewey and the Spanish governor-general through the Belgian consul. These negotiations led to the agreement of staging a mock battle to justify the turnover of Manila to the US imperialists by the Spanish colonialists and were parallel to negotiations being held abroad towards the general settlement of the Spanish-American War through the mediation of the French government.

On August 13, 1898, the mock battle of Manila was staged by the US imperialists and the Spanish colonialists. After a few token shots were fired, the latter surrendered to the former. The US imperialists made it a point to prevent Filipino troops from entering Intramuros. It was thus that the Filipino revolutionary forces were conclusively deprived of the victory that was rightfully theirs. From then on, however, hatred of the US imperialism became more widespread among the Filipino masses and their patriotic troops.

The Philippine revolutionary government shifted its headquarters from Cavite to Malolos, Bulacan in September in anticipation of further US imperialist aggression. Here the Malolos Congress was held to put out a constitution that had for its models bourgeois-democratic constitutions. During the same period, the US imperialists kept insisting in diplomatic terms that Filipino

troops withdraw further from where they had been pushed. The US aggressors maneuvered to occupy more territory around Manila.

Attempts of the Aguinaldo government at diplomacy abroad to assert the sovereign rights of the Filipino people proved to be futile. On December 10, 1898, the Treaty of Paris was signed by the United States and Spain ceding the entire Philippines to the former at the price of \$20 million and guaranteeing the property and business rights of Spanish citizens in the archipelago. On December 21, US President McKinley issued the “Proclamation of Benevolent Assimilation” to declare in sugar-coated terms a war of aggression against the Filipino people.

On February 4, 1899, the US troops made a surprise attack on the Filipino revolutionary forces in the vicinity of Manila. In the ensuing battles in the city, at least 3,000 Filipino were butchered while only 250 US troops fell. Thus, armed hostilities between US imperialism and the Filipino people began. The Filipino people heroically stood up to wage a revolutionary war of national liberation.

Before the Filipino-American War was decisively won by US imperialism in 1902, 126,468 US troops had been unleashed against the 7,000,000 Filipino people. These foreign aggressors suffered a casualty of at least 4,000 killed and almost 3,000 wounded. Close to 200,000 Filipino combatants and noncombatants were slain. In short, for every US trooper killed, 50 Filipinos were in turn killed. More than a quarter of a million Filipinos died as a direct and indirect result of hostilities. However, an estimate of a US general would even put the Filipino death casualty to as high as 600,00 or one-sixth of the population in Luzon then.

The US imperialist aggressors practiced genocide of monstrous proportions. They committed various forms of atrocities such as the massacres of captured troops and innocent civilians; pillage of women, homes and property; and ruthless employment of torture, such as dismemberment, the water cure and rope torture. Zoning and concentration camps were resorted to in order to put civilians and combatants at their mercy.

As US imperialism forced the Aguinaldo government to retreat, it played on the weaknesses in the ranks of the *ilustrado* leadership of the revolution. The imperialist chieftain McKinley dispatched the Schurman Commission in 1899 and then the Taft Commission in 1900 and issued to them instructions for the “pacification” of the country and cajolement of capitulationist traitors.

The liberal-bourgeois leadership of the old democratic revolution once more proved to be inadequate, flabby and compromising. Aguinaldo failed to lead the revolution effectively. He turned against such anti-imperialists as Mabini and Luna and increasingly relied on such capitulationists as Paterno and Buencamino. These two traitors who in previous years were notorious for their puppetry to Spanish colonialism had sneaked into the revolutionary government and usurped authority therein. They headed a pack of traitors who were deeply attracted to the siren song of “peace,” “autonomy” and “benevolent assimilation” which the US imperialists sang as they butchered the people.

In every town occupied by the US imperialist troops, puppet municipal elections were held and dominated by the old *principalia*. These puppet elections excluded the masses who could not comply with the property and literacy requirements. These sham elections were used mainly to break off the *principalia* from the revolution and to attract its members into becoming running dogs in the same way that the Spanish colonialists had done.

As soon as traitors led by Paterno and Buencamino were in the hands of the US imperialists, they were used to serve imperialist propaganda, chiefly to call on the people to lay down their arms. Under the instigation of the aggressors, particularly the US army intelligence, Trinidad Pardo de Tavera organized the Partido Federal in 1900 to advocate the annexation of the Philippines by the United States. At the same time, the imperialists promulgated laws to punish those who would advocate independence.

The people and their revolutionary leaders who refused to take the oath of allegiance to the US flag were persecuted, imprisoned or banished to Guam. Mass organizations, especially among the workers and peasants, were suppressed every time they surfaced.

In 1901, Aguinaldo himself was captured by the imperialists with the help of Filipino mercenaries. From then on, the treacherous counterrevolutionary forefathers of the Armed Forces of the Philippines were systematically organized and employed to help complete the imperialist conquest of the Filipino people. The first puppet constabularymen were used extensively in “mopping up” operations against persistent revolutionary fighters in Luzon and Visayas, as well as in the subjugation of Mindanao.

Even when the main detachments of the Aguinaldo government had been defeated, armed resistance against US imperialism still persisted in practically every town of the entire archipelago. The people of Bicol continued to wage armed struggle until 1903, when their leader Simeon Ola betrayed them by

surrendering. In the Visayas, particularly Cebu, Samar, Leyte and Panay, the Pulahanes fought fierce battles against the US aggressor troops and the puppet constabulary. So did the masses of Cavite, Batangas, Laguna and Quezon even after a general amnesty was issued. In Central Luzon, a religious organization, the Santa Iglesia, also waged armed resistance. In the Ilocos, associations that proclaimed themselves as the New Katipunan conducted a guerrilla war for national independence against US imperialism. As late as 1907, puppet elections could not be held in Isabela because of the people's resistance. The most prominent of the final efforts to continue the revolutionary struggle in Luzon was led by Macario Sakay, from 1902 to 1906 in Bulacan, Pampanga, Laguna, Nueva Ecija and Rizal. It was only in 1911 that guerrilla war completely ceased in Luzon. However, the fiercest armed resistance after 1902 was waged by the people of Mindanao until as late as 1916.

For some time, US imperialists succeeded in deceiving the Sultan of Sulu that his feudal sovereignty would be respected under the Bates Treaty of 1899, which he signed. When the foreign aggressors began to put what they called the "Moro Province" under their administrative control, they had to contend with the Hassan uprising of 1903-1904; Usap rebellion of 1905; Pala revolt of 1905; Bud Dajo uprising of 1906; Bud Bagsak battle of 1913 and many others. This heroic resistance of the people was quelled with extreme atrocity.

The Sedition Law of 1901, the Brigandage Act of 1902 and the Reconciliation Act of 1903 were passed by US imperialism to sanction military operations against the people as mere police operations against "common criminals." Patriots were called bandits. People in extensive areas were herded into military camps in order to separate them from the patriotic guerrillas.

The war expenditures of US imperialism in the conquest of the Philippines were paid for by the Filipino people themselves. They were compelled to pay taxes to the US colonial regime to defray a major part of the expenditures and the interest on bonds floated in the name of the Philippine government through the Wall Street banking houses. Of course, the superprofits derived from the protracted exploitation of the Filipino people would constitute the basic gains of US imperialism.

VI. THE COLONIAL RULE OF US IMPERIALISM

The bestial conquest of the Filipino people by US imperialism meant the continued status of the Philippines as a colony. US imperialism came to frus-

trate the national and democratic aspirations of the Filipino people and to impose the will of the US monopoly-capitalist class by force of arms and double-talk. In the United States, the imperialist politicians and their capitalist masters boasted of their filthy work as a noble mission to “civilize” and “Christianize” the Filipino people.

US imperialism had been interested in the Philippines as a source of raw materials, a market for its surplus product and a field of investment for its surplus capital. Moreover, it needed the Philippines as a strategic foothold for carrying out its expansionist drive to convert the Pacific Ocean into an “American lake” and to increase its share of loot in the despoliation of China and Asia in general.

By the treaty of Paris in 1898, US imperialism took over the role of Spanish colonialism as the colonial ruler of the Filipino people. The victor in the Spanish-American War acted as the rising capitalist power, capable of paying off the old colonial government and accommodating those property and business rights established previous to the treaty. Thus, feudalism was assimilated and retained for the imperialist purposes of the United States.

After the Filipino revolutionary forces had been defeated, US imperialism drew from the country an increasing quantity of such commercial crops as sugar, coconut and hemp, aside from other raw materials such as logs and mineral ores. Sugar centrals, coconut oil refineries, rope factories and the like were built. The hacienda system of agriculture was further encouraged and reached its full development under the US colonial regime. The purchase of a mere portion of the friar lands by the US government in 1903 from the religious corporations was a token act which did not solve the land problem. Persons other than those who had little or no land, especially the top running dogs of the colonial government, were the ones who were able to take advantage of the land policy. Landlords in authority combined with American carpetbaggers in titling to themselves public lands of commercial, agricultural and speculative value.

As a result of the more rapid growth of a commodity economy under the US colonial regime, the peasantry became more impoverished and the owner-cultivators who became bankrupt sold off their lands to old-type and new-type landlord usurers, merchants and rich peasants. The evils of the Spanish colonial regime were carried over to the US colonial regime. A new feature of the economy was an increase in the number of proletarians. Soon enough a

huge reserve army of labor and a relative surplus of population, mainly emanating from the peasantry, arose.

In exchange for the Philippine raw materials, US finished goods were imported free of tariff duties under the Payne-Aldrich Act of 1909. In 1913, quota limitations on Philippine raw materials exported to the United States were completely lifted. The free trade between these two types of commodities perpetuated the colonial and agrarian economy. The increasing avalanche of finished goods into the country crushed local handicrafts and manufacturers and furthermore compelled the people to buy these finished goods and to produce raw materials mainly.

US surplus was invested in the Philippines both in the form of direct investments and loan capital. Direct investments went mainly into the production of raw materials and into trade in US finished products and local raw materials. Minor processing of raw materials was also introduced. Mineral ores were extracted for the first time on a commercial basis. On the other hand, loan capital served to support foreign trade and cover trade deficits, convert pesos into dollars for profit remittances, pay salaries of American bureaucrats and business personnel, and cover the needs of the colonial government for various equipment and the like. Every year, raw material production and, therefore, the exploitation of the people had to be intensified by the colonial regime in order to increase its rate of profit.

US imperialism improved the system of transportation and communications as a means to tighten its political, economic, cultural and military control of the Philippines. US corporations derived huge profits from public works contracts in the construction of more roads, bridges, ports and other transportation facilities. These public works in turn widened directly the market for US motor vehicles, machinery and oil products. The colonial exchange of raw materials and finished products was accelerated. Troop movement for the suppression of the people also became faster.

The establishment of an extensive public school system and the adoption of English as the medium of instruction served not only to enhance the political indoctrination of the Filipinos into subservience to US imperialism but also to encourage local taste for American commodities in general. It also opened the market directly for US educational materials. The mass media was developed not only to spread imperialist propaganda but also to advertise all kinds of US goods and, in particular, to sell various kinds of printing and communications equipment. Even the campaign for public sanitation and hygiene was

a means to speed up the monopoly sales of US drugs, chemicals and medical equipment. In the first place, the depredations of the US aggressors troops in the Filipino-American War had resulted in various kinds of pestilence and epidemics, especially cholera, which threatened the health of the imperialist conquerors themselves.

On the basis of the economic conditions bred by US imperialism, a certain social structure was built up in the Philippines. The US imperialists merely adopted as their principal puppets those exploiting classes which had collaborated most with the Spanish colonial rulers in the 19th century and retained them at the top of the Philippine society. These were the comprador big bourgeoisie and the landlord class. From the ranks of these exploiting classes, the US imperialists chose their top political agents and trained them to become bureaucrat capitalists sharing in the spoils of the colonial government. At the base of the society were the toiling masses, workers and peasants who comprised more than 90 percent of the people. During the US colonial rule, the proletariat increased in number to the extent that the semi-feudal society became reinforced with the quantitative increase of raw material production, trade, transport and communications facilities and minor manufacturing. But the peasantry remained the majority class in the entire society.

In the middle section of Philippine society were such strata as the national bourgeoisie and the petit bourgeoisie. The national bourgeoisie was an extremely tiny and hard-pressed stratum because of the enormous dumping of US finished products and the concentration of financial power in the hands of the comprador big bourgeoisie and the imperialist firms. The petit bourgeoisie which had maintained its status by sheer property ownership that made it self-reliant increasingly took interest in formal education. Of the many small landlords and rich peasants who became bankrupt, some held on to a petit-bourgeois status by acquiring a college education and getting into salaried service in the colonial bureaucracy and in private companies and others fell to the status of the proletariat or the semi-proletariat.

US imperialism built up an educational system as a major instrument of colonial control. Its main content was directed against the Philippine Revolution and was intended to cultivate political subservience to US imperialism. As soon as an area was conquered in the course of the Filipino-American War, the imperialist aggressor troops posed as teachers in order to spread the imperialist propaganda that they had come to bring “democracy” and to prepare the Filipinos for “self-government.” The first American teachers from the soldiery

were soon reinforced by the Thomasites, hundreds of civilian teachers from the United States. They systematized the colonial public schools and put up teacher-training schools and agricultural schools. In addition, American Catholic and Protestant missionaries came to help in the colonial indoctrination of the people, especially in the hinterlands.

To make their propaganda pervade every field of culture, the aggressors never hesitated to employ force to suppress any attempt to express the national-democratic aspirations of the people. As late as 1907, the Flag Law was enacted to suppress any patriotic attempt of Filipinos to advocate independence or display the Philippine flag. Such newspapers as *El Renacimiento* and *El Nuevo Dia*, despite their basically compromising liberal-democratic views, were harassed by the US colonial authorities. Patriotic literature and dramatic presentations were banned and their authors were severely punished.

Reflecting the subordination of feudalism to US imperialism at the material base of society, the new colonial culture and education were characterized by the superimposition of comprador ideology upon the feudal ideology within the superstructure. The Catholic Church shifted its loyalty from Spanish colonialism to US imperialism. The homilies of the priest were bent to the slant of the US press. The US colonial regime established the University of the Philippines in 1908 to attract mainly the petit bourgeoisie, even as the University of Santo Tomas, together with the convent schools, continued to prefer teaching an exclusive clientele of students from the exploiting classes who could afford to pay exorbitant matriculation fees. US imperialism was bent on recruiting a large number of intellectual agents from the ranks of the petit bourgeoisie in order to raise the level of scientific and technical competence for servitude in an expanding bureaucracy and in the proliferating imperialist corporations. To further establish its ideological hegemony in the Philippines, the US colonial government also recruited from 1903 to 1914 a large number of students for training in the United States. These *pensionados* subsequently functioned as the most reliable puppets of US imperialism inside and outside the colonial bureaucracy. They always mistook their indebtedness to US imperialism as that of the entire Filipino people and they were blind to the fact that through them US imperialism could oppress and exploit the broad masses of the Filipino people, especially the workers and peasants.

In establishing the colonial government in the Philippines, US imperialism first relied on the most notorious betrayers of the Philippines Revolution. They were afforded the spoils of bureaucrat capitalism, which enlarged their com-

prador and landlord interests. Their political party, the Partido Federal, served to endorse the new colonial rule. Their leading representatives were accommodated in the Philippine Commission, the leading legislative and executive organ of the regime. This was headed by the American governor-general and included other American officials.

When in 1907 they declared the first national elections for the puppet Philippine Assembly in accordance with the Philippine Bill of 1902, the US colonial officials allowed the Partido Nacionalista to compete with the Partido Federal in the elections. Realizing that the US colonial officials themselves actually scorned the idea of making the Philippines a US state and that the Filipino people were vigorously desirous of national independence and democracy, the barefaced traitors in the Partido Federal relabeled themselves as the Partido Progresista and advocated “eventual independence” after the people had supposedly shown their capacity for “self-government.” By adopting the slogan of “immediate, absolute and complete independence”, the Partido Nacionalista won overwhelmingly in the puppet elections over the Partido Progresista. Old puppets were replaced by new puppets led by Sergio Osmena and Manuel Quezon. Though their winning slogan sounded attractive, the new traitors were no different from the old ones in that they too accepted the treacherous notion that genuine independence could be peacefully and graciously granted by US imperialism.

Osmena prevailed as top puppet chieftain from 1907 to 1922, first as president of the Philippine Assembly and then as speaker of the House of Representatives. He took orders from the American governor-general. The Philippine Assembly was subject to the Philippine Commission and was mainly an instrument for facilitating the collection of taxes from the people and the appropriation of government revenues for colonial administration. It was a glorified *principalia* with pretensions larger in scale than those of its antecedent. It was composed of the political representatives of the landlord class and the comprador big bourgeoisie.

One glaring example of Osmena’s puppetry was his campaign for the suspension of any kind of agitation for Philippine independence in 1917 when US imperialism joined the first global inter-imperialist war. He also offered 25,000 Filipino mercenaries, a submarine and a destroyer to serve with the US armed forces in Europe and maneuvered for the subscription of \$20 million worth of Liberty Bonds and the contribution of \$500,000 to the American Red Cross by the impoverished Filipino people.

By the middle part of the second decade, the number of Filipino bureau chiefs had markedly increased. The US imperialists prated about “Filipinization” of the colonial government. They had already trained a big number of puppets to assume administrative responsibility on behalf of US monopoly capitalism in addition to the interest of the local exploiting classes. In 1916, the US imperialists issued the Philippine Autonomy Law, which dissolved the Philippine Commission and in its place created the Philippine Senate. The Philippine Assembly became the House of Representatives. The law further encouraged the US bureaucrats to retire so that they could be replaced with Filipinos.

By being elected to the presidency of the Philippine Senate, Quezon gained a position from which he was to catapult himself to the top of the puppet bureaucracy. He claimed responsibility for the enactment of the autonomy law and, therefore, for the “Filipinization” of the colonial government. To boost his political capital, he posed as a champion of Philippine independence in the manner approved by his imperialist masters. He led the first mission to beg for “independence” in Washington in 1918. He slowly undermined the prestige of Osmena who was speaker of the House of Representatives until 1921 when he attacked the latter on his method of leadership but not on the substance of leadership. In 1922, both ran for the Philippine Senate and were elected on two separate wings of the Nacionalista Party. It was Quezon who was once more elected president of the Senate. Osmena was elected president *protempore*. From then on, Quezon became the top puppet chieftain.

Consistently, Quezon played the game of orating for the Philippine independence while obsequiously acting as the top puppet politician in the country. Feigning dissatisfaction with the result of the independence mission to the United States, he formed in 1926 the Supreme National Council and launched a national prayer day for “independence” on Washington’s birthday. These he used as a mere device for getting “non-partisan” support for his puppet leadership.

Like all the bureaucrat capitalists whom he headed, Quezon enriched himself through graft and corruption and was able to amass wealth in agricultural land, urban real estate and corporate stocks. During the third decade, when the US capitalist crisis occurred and sharpened the suffering of the people all over the world, Quezon acted as an efficient instrument of colonial rule by raising the slogan of “social justice” while at the same time launching the most brutal attack against the people.

At the onset of the decade, the broad masses of the people were greatly agitated by the unremitting colonial and class oppression imposed on them by US imperialism and its local lackeys—the comprador big bourgeoisie, the landlord class and the big puppet bureaucrats. The Communist Party of the Philippines was established on November 7, 1930 by Crisanto Evangelista in response to the growing demand for national and social liberation. It strived to integrate the universal theory of Marxism-Leninism with the concrete conditions of Philippine society and raised the level of the Philippine Revolution to a new type of national-democratic revolution in the era of imperialism.

The ceaseless struggle of the proletarian and peasant masses against US imperialism and feudalism reached a new high with the founding of the Communist Party of the Philippines. Trade unions and peasant associations had emerged since the beginning of the century despite the efforts of the US colonial regime to suppress them with outright force and sabotage them with tactics of infiltration and misrepresentation of the people's interests. In the preceding decade, the discontent of the masses was frequently expressed by spontaneous violence, as in industrial strikes in Manila and peasant strikes in Central Luzon, Southern Luzon, Visayas, and Mindanao. The Colorums waged a revolt in two provinces in Mindanao in 1923-24. On a lesser scale, they also rebelled in Negros, Rizal, Batangas, Laguna, Pampanga and Tarlac. In all cases of mass protest, the US colonial government employed the most violent measures to attack the masses.

On May 1, 1931, a people's march organized and led by the Party was ruthlessly attacked and dispersed by the puppet constabulary under the orders of the US imperialists. Party leaders and members were arrested. In the following year, the puppet Supreme Court outlawed the Party and meted out sentences of imprisonment to Party leaders. Nevertheless, despite the banning of the Party, spontaneous peasant uprisings occurred like those of Tayug, Pangasinan in 1931, and the Sakdals in 1935 over certain areas in Central Luzon and Southern Luzon.

US imperialism was compelled by grave circumstances within the Philippines, in its own heartland and in the whole world to create the illusion that it was willing to grant "independence" to its Philippine colony. The crisis of imperialism heightened the national struggle for independence and the class struggle in the Philippines. In the United States, US farm capitalists made an outcry against Philippine sugar and coconut oil; and the yellow labor leaders of the AFL-CIO denounced the immigration of Filipino workers to the United

States. Under these circumstances, the US Congress passed the Hare-Hawes-Cutting Law in 1933 granting sham independence to the Philippines.

A mission led by Osmena and Roxas brought home this sham independence law. Afraid that the two puppet politicians would make political capital out of it, Quezon attacked it as inadequate and led another mission to Washington to ask for another sham independence law. In place of the Hare-Hawes-Cutting Law, the Tydings-McDuffie Law which was no different, except in minor rephrasing, was enacted in 1934 by the United States. This new colonial law would serve as Quezon's credentials for becoming the first president of the puppet commonwealth government.

The Tydings-McDuffie Law paved the way for the framing of a constitution that was subject to the approval of the US president and for the formation of the commonwealth government in 1935. It pledged to grant full "independence" to a bogus republic ten years after the ratification of this constitution. The law made sure that among so many imperialist privileges, US citizens and corporations would retain their property rights in the Philippines, that the US government would be able to station its troops and occupy large areas of Philippine territory as its military bases and that the United States and the Philippines would maintain free trade.

US imperialism rigged up the Constitutional Convention of 1935. Delegates came overwhelmingly from the comprador big bourgeoisie and the landlord class. Like all colonial documents, the constitution that they framed was adorned with high-sounding phrases to hide substantial provisions as well as meaningful omissions sustaining the political and economic power of US imperialism, feudalism and bureaucrat capitalism in the Philippines. The constitution placed no restrictions on US and other foreign investments, except in the areas of land ownership, natural resources and public utilities where the restrictions were nevertheless flimsy. It also contained special provisions (Art. XVII) in favor of US imperialism. In 1939, the first ordinance would be appended in order to ensure further the all-round dominance of US imperialism, even after the proclamation of sham independence.

The National Defense Act was the very first legislative act of the puppet commonwealth government. This act conceived the organization of the reactionary armed forces and adopted the Filipino mercenaries of US imperialism as the main component of the puppet state. The Philippine Constabulary became the First Regular Army under the US Army in 1936. Quezon, the first

president of the puppet commonwealth, designated Gen. Douglas Mac Arthur as “field marshal” of these mercenaries.

In the face of the rampaging fascism of Japan, Germany and Italy, Communists all over the world called for a popular front with all anti-fascist forces. Afraid of being isolated from the broad masses of the Filipino people, the US imperialists and the puppet commonwealth government saw the necessity of putting out of prison the leaders of the Communist Party whom they had persecuted. As soon as these leaders were out of prison in 1936, the Party intensified the anti-fascist movement among workers and peasants under the banner of the Popular Front.

In an attempt to increase its membership and mass support rapidly, the Communist Party of the Philippines merged in 1938 with the Socialist Party to form the Communist Party of the Philippines (Merger of Socialist and Communist Parties). In the congress that ratified the merger, agents of the bourgeoisie who had crept into the Party and usurped authority therein while Party leaders were in prison succeeded in having themselves formally elected to responsible positions, especially in the so-called second line of leadership. These unremolded petit-bourgeois elements represented by Vicente Lava conspired with some anti-communist elements in the Civil Liberties Union² and League for the Defense of Democracy in inserting into the 1938 constitution of the merger party counterrevolutionary provisions supporting the colonial constitution of the puppet commonwealth government.

These counterrevolutionaries who had crept into the Party consistently misrepresented the Popular Front policy as a policy of subservience to US imperialism and the puppet commonwealth government. These anti-communists disguised as communists maneuvered the Party leadership into submitting a shameless memorandum to US High Commissioner Sayre, Gen. MacArthur and Quezon in December 1941, pledging all-out support and loyalty to US imperialism and the puppet commonwealth government. The three colonial officials relished this beggarly act and firmly rebuffed the prayer for arms.

² The anti-communist Emmanuel Pelaez had a hand in polishing the constitution of the old merger party. Consultations with him were made through the instrumentality of Francisco Lava, Sr.

VII. THE PEOPLE'S STRUGGLE AGAINST JAPANESE IMPERIALISM

In the period following World War I, US and British imperialism assigned Japan the role of being their special sentry at the backdoor of the first socialist state and principal Asian collaborator in the colonization of the Asian peoples. Japan was accorded the privilege of holding on to its old colonies and acquiring new ones, so long as it did not challenge the Anglo-American hegemony. In the Philippines, Japanese enterprises were encouraged by US imperialism to participate in the exploitation of the Filipino people, especially in Mindanao. However, the world capitalist crisis of the thirties shook the balance of power among and within the imperialist countries, and fascism rose to power in a number of capitalist countries, including Japan, to threaten the peoples of the world.

Like all other fascist powers, Japanese imperialism decided to wage a war for redividing the world as a desperate means of saving itself from economic depression. It had the ambition of monopolizing Asia, even against the wishes of its erstwhile Anglo-American masters. It launched a massive invasion of China in the thirties before it took on other countries in the course of World War II.

On December 7 and 8, 1941, the Japanese made a sudden air attack on US military bases all over the Pacific Ocean and the China Sea, including those in Pearl Harbor and in the Philippines. The puppet commonwealth government immediately took orders from the US military authorities and Manila was declared an "open city" on December 26 and was occupied by the Japanese on January 2, 1942. At the very start, it was obvious that the US military strategy was to attend to Europe first and allow the Japanese to overstretch itself in Asia.

As the Japanese invaders had expected, MacArthur foolishly concentrated the USAFFE (US Armed Forces in the Far East), composed of US troops and Filipino volunteers, in Bataan and Corregidor. The Japanese imperialist troops freely invaded the Philippines from several points. Thus, they were able to encircle the USAFFE which surrendered in Bataan on April 9 and in Corregidor on May 7. The resistance put up in Bataan was of little value except to cover the flight of the US colonial officials and the puppet commonwealth government from Corregidor. The US generals surrendered their forces only to be forced into a death march from Bataan to the concentration camp in Capas, Tarlac.

The bureaucrat capitalists, puffed up by the US imperialists, chose between two alternatives: to maintain their allegiance to US imperialism or to shift it to Japanese imperialism. Such was also the choice to which the comprador big bourgeoisie and the big landlord class limited themselves. They did not consider at all that the fascist invasion, the result of inter-imperialist contradictions, was an occasion to assert the sovereignty of the Filipino people against both Japanese imperialism and US imperialism. The comprador-landlord Nacionalista Party, which had practically monopolized the puppet bureaucracy, split into two factions, with one serving US imperialism and the other serving Japanese imperialism. The bureaucrat capitalists who chose to side with US imperialism either fled to Washington or joined the USAFFE, which fought the people more than it did the Japanese fascists and their puppets.

Japanese imperialism came with the catchphrase “greater East Asia co-prosperity sphere” in the same fashion that US imperialism had come with “benevolent assimilation.” The fascist invaders turned the Philippines into a colony and put up their own puppet government under the big traitor Jose Laurel. This was supported by the comprador big bourgeoisie and the landlord class. On October 14, 1943, the Japanese imperialists granted “independence” to the Philippines and rigged up a puppet republic in an obvious attempt to outbid the US imperialists, who had already pledged to do the same sham on July 4, 1946.

As late as three weeks after the Japanese occupation of Manila, the leadership of the Communist Party of the Philippines was still in Manila. The Party leaders were arrested while they were meeting in the city. This event manifested in the clearest manner the lack of ample preparation against war. It showed the damaging influence of the agents of US imperialism led by the Lavas and Tarucs who had maneuvered to preoccupy the Party leadership with bourgeois parliamentarism, pacifism and civil liberties.

Nevertheless, the revolutionary cadres and members of the Party succeeded in holding the Central Luzon Bureau Conference on February 6, 1942 and decided to fight the Japanese aggressors with a people’s army. Thus, the Party acquired the honor of being the only party that decided to fight the fascist invaders and assert the sovereignty of the Filipino people. It created the Anti-Japanese People’s Army (Hukbo ng Bayan Laban sa Hapon-Hukbalahap) on March 29, 1942 and rallied the people to armed resistance. The patriotism of the Communists and the Red fighters was demonstrated in heroic feats of combat against the enemy. These patriots aroused and mobilized the people

and led them to gain a large measure of democratic power, particularly in Central Luzon and certain areas in Southern Luzon.

Within the Party, however, the bourgeois reactionary gang of the Lavas and Tarucs kept on sabotaging the people's war. It spread the line of limiting the people's struggle to one exclusively against the Japanese and hailing the return of US imperialism and its puppet commonwealth government. At the height of the anti-fascist war, it adopted the cowardly line of "retreat for defense" which was no different from the "lie-low" policy of the USAFFE. The bourgeois reactionary gang of the Lavas and Tarucs contravened the line of the Third International to conduct unity and struggle in the united front at all times and use the anti-fascist popular front to establish a people's democratic government.

The "retreat-for-defense" policy, the breaking up of Hukbalahap squadrons³ into miniscule units of three to five persons was exposed as erroneous by events. It hindered the growth and advance of the people's army. Under the pressure of the revolutionary cadres and masses, the Party Central Committee repudiated this policy only in September 1944. The repudiation of the policy was timely to the extent that it paved the way for the victorious advance of the Hukbalahap even only in Central Luzon and parts of Southern Luzon. In the succeeding month of October, the US imperialist forces were already trying to recapture the Philippines.

Despite the efforts of the agents of US imperialism to weaken them from within, the Party and the Hukbalahap distinguished themselves as the fiercest and most effective fighters against the Japanese fascists and their puppets. They made it difficult for the enemy to get their food, especially rice, from Central Luzon. They stood out as the strongest single guerrilla force with the greatest popular support and widest territory after the war.

In its ignoble scheme to recapture its colonies and seize new ones, US imperialism engaged in naval and air battles with Japan just when the latter's troops were already being wiped out in great numbers by every national liberation movement in Asia, especially in the great expanse of China. The most decisive defeats of Japanese imperialism in the entire anti-fascist war in Asia were inflicted by the Chinese Communist Party and the People's Liberation Army led by Comrade Mao Zedong. It was China which ate up the main bulk of Japanese aggressor troops that had been overextended in its immense territory since 1937. To the great Chinese people, the peoples of Asia owe the turning

³ The Hukbalahap squadron was roughly equivalent to a regular company formation.

of the tide of war against Japanese imperialism as 1945 approached. It was a stupid, gangster and racist act of US imperialism to use the atomic bomb on the Japanese people in an effort to claim victory over Japan.

The entire people of the world, especially the people of Europe, owe the Soviet Union under the great leadership of Comrade Stalin the turning of the tide of the entire world war against fascism. It was the battle of Stalingrad that weakened the Axis powers to the core. From then on, the Soviet Red Army advanced and the fascist forces were annihilated and disintegrated without let-up.

To themselves principally, the Filipino people owe their liberation from the Japanese imperialist invaders in their own country. It was the total effort of the Communist Party of the Philippines, the Hukbalahap and other patriotic guerrilla forces all over the country which broke the back of the Japanese invading and puppet forces. They were the ones who forced out the Japanese from garrisons in cities and towns and annihilated them in the flames of guerrilla warfare in the countryside. It was not US imperialism which liberated the Philippines. US imperialism merely returned to reimpose its colonial rule. In fact, it concentrated its air bombardment and artillery fire on the Filipino people and their homes in late 1944 and early 1945 to pave the way for their resubjugation. The Japanese imperialists competed with the US imperialists in inflicting mass slaughter on the Filipino people. As soon as it returned, US imperialism maneuvered to attack and disintegrate the Hukbalahap and other guerrilla forces that were independent of the USAFFE.

VIII. THE PRESENT PUPPET REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES

By waging a people's war and building a people's army against the Japanese fascists and their puppets, the Communist Party of the Philippines achieved the status of being a powerful instrument of the Filipino people and the position of being able to play a significant role in Philippine history. Before US imperialism landed its troops in Luzon, the Hukbalahap under the leadership of the Party had liberated almost the entire region of Central Luzon, had organized provincial and municipal governments and had dispatched armed units to Manila and Southern Luzon.

There was however no ideological and political preparation against the return of US imperialism and the reimposition of feudalism in the country-

side. Consistently acting as the instrument of US imperialism within the Party, the bourgeois reactionary gang of the Lavas and Tarucs harped on loyalty to the US government and the puppet commonwealth government and hoped to engage in parliamentary struggle under the dispensation of these monsters. Yet, US imperialism and the local exploiting classes were determined to attack the Party, the people's army and the people with real bullets as well as with sugar-coated ones.

Misled by the bourgeois reactionary gang of the Lavas and Tarucs, the Hukbalahap welcomed the US imperialist troops that marched through Central Luzon from Lingayen in 1945. Some units of the people's army fought together with the US imperialist troops in dislodging the Japanese troops from the Floridablanca Airfield, but were surprised when after the battle the US troops turned their guns on them and disarmed them. In Manila, the imperialist aggressors also disarmed and turned back units of the Hukbalahap that had preceded them. Squadron 77, a unit of the people's army, was massacred in Malolos, Bulacan while on its way from Manila after having been disarmed.

To suppress the Filipino people, US imperialism put together under its Military Police Command its USAFFE puppets and the erstwhile pro-Japanese Philippine Constabulary. It encouraged the traitor landlords to take back full control over the lands that they had left during the war, to demand rent arrears from the peasants and to organize private armed gangs, then known as the civilian guards, to enforce their class rule in coordination with the military police. In their attempt to dissolve the provincial and municipal governments established by the Party and people's army, the US imperialists and the landlords unleashed a campaign of white terror against the people. The general headquarters of the Hukbalahap in San Fernando, Pampanga was raided by the US Counter-Intelligence Corps. Mass arrests and imprisonment of Party cadres, Red fighters and common people were made all over Central Luzon. Massacres, assassinations, torture and other forms of atrocities were perpetrated by the military police and civilian guards.

So incensed were the people that they wanted to fight back and continue the people's war. But the bourgeois reactionary gang of the Lavas and Tarucs insisted on the line that the people were tired of war and that a campaign for "democratic peace" was called for. The hidden traitors within the Party hailed the fake independence promised by US imperialism in their desire to occupy high positions in the puppet reactionary government. So the headquarters of the Party was moved out of the countryside to the city. They organized

the Democratic Alliance so that it could help US imperialism put up a sham republic. They converted the Hukbalahap into the Huk Veterans' League and thus put the people at the mercy of the enemy. The people's committees, tempered by the anti-fascist war, were turned into mere chapters of a legal peasant association, and these were used to spread the false illusion that land reform could fall from the palms of the enemy.

The bourgeois reactionary gang of the Lavas and Tarucs regarded as the top item in its agenda of parliamentary struggle the question of turning the Communist Party through the Democratic alliance into a mere adjunct of either the Nacionalista Party or the Liberal Party in the 1946 elections. It chose to put the Democratic Alliance on the side of the Nacionalista Party against the Liberal Party, which had only been recently a mere faction of the Nacionalista Party. There was no basic difference between the Liberal Party and its mother party.

Osmena, the presidential candidate of the Nacionalista Party, had in his capacity as president of the puppet commonwealth government participated in absolving Roxas, the founder of the Liberal Party, of the charge of pro-Japanese collaboration. In accordance with the orders of his imperialist masters, Osmena convened the prewar Congress, the majority of whose members had become pro-Japanese collaborators during the war. This assemblage of traitors elected Roxas, the former top rice collector of the Japanese imperial army, to the position of Senate president, a position from which he could challenge the puppet leadership of Osmena. This puppet Congress even collected back pay services it had rendered to the Japanese fascists.

1. The Roxas Puppet Regime, 1946-48

As predetermined by the heavy financial and propaganda support extended by US imperialism to his electoral campaign, Manuel Roxas was elected as the last president of the puppet commonwealth government in April 1946. He became automatically the first president of the puppet republic of the Philippines upon the proclamation of nominal independence on July 4, 1946. His imperialist masters favored him because he could be threatened with prosecution for his pro-Japanese collaboration and he could therefore be bound to bat for the unequal treaties that they wanted to extort in return for a general amnesty exculpating him and others of the ruling classes from the charge of treason.

The newly established Liberal Party prevailed in the reactionary elections over the Nacionalista Party but, despite the fraud and terrorism perpetrated by

the military police and civilian guards, six congressional candidates in Central Luzon and three senatorial candidates who had run under the DA-NP alliance and who were known to be opposed to the unequal treaties being prepared by US imperialism won. Their number was enough to prevent a three-fourths majority necessary for ratifying treaties in Congress and so they were prevented from taking their seats in Congress on the first day of its session on the trumped-up charge of committing electoral fraud and terrorism in Central Luzon.

On the very day that the sham independence of the Philippines was granted and the puppet republic was inaugurated under a proclamation enacted by a foreign government, the puppet president Roxas had to sign the US-RP Treaty of General Relations nullifying Philippine independence. This treaty empowered the US government to retain its supreme authority over extensive military bases which it could expand at will, guaranteed the property rights of US corporations and citizens as being equal to those of Filipino corporations and citizens and put Philippine foreign relations under US government direction.

Under the Roxas puppet regime, other major treaties and agreements were made to elaborate on the basic colonial subservience of the Philippines to US imperialism. These were the Property Act, the Bell Trade Act, the US-RP Military Bases Treaty, and the US-RP Military Assistance Pact. The Property Act provided that all real estate and other property acquired by the US government or its agencies before and after July 4, 1946 would be respected. The Bell Trade Act explicitly required the Parity Amendment in the colonial constitution to enable the US monopolies to plunder at will Philippine natural resources and operate public utilities, prolonged free trade relations between the Philippines and the United States and placed Philippine tariff and peso currency under US dictation. The US-RP Military Bases Treaty gave to US imperialism extra-territorial rights for 99 years in US military bases at more than twenty strategic points in the Philippines. The US-RP Military Assistance Pact provided for continued US control over the local reactionary armed forces through the JUSMAG, which would advise and lend or sell weapons and other equipment to them.

The Tydings Rehabilitation Act required the ratification of the Bell Trade Act, with the Parity Amendment, before the US government would pay war damage claims exceeding \$500. Also, the Vogelback Treaty turning over US war surplus property to the Philippine puppet government made it an obligation for the latter to accept the Bell Trade Act and other unequal treaties.

When the war damage payments were made, these went mostly to the US monopolies, the comprador big bourgeoisie, the landlord class, the bureaucrat capitalists and religious organizations. In the disposition of the US war surplus property, there was rampant graft and corruption similar to that in the disposition of relief goods during the Osmena puppet regime.

Aside from being responsible for the imposition of unequal treaties upon the Filipino nation, the Roxas puppet regime was responsible for the extremely vicious attacks against the peasant masses which were intended to strengthen landlord power in the countryside. The Maliwalu massacre and the Masico massacre were some of these heinous crimes. And yet, the bourgeois reactionary gang of the Lavas and Tarucs persisted on the line of bourgeois parliamentarism. It caused the Pambansang Kaisahan ng mga Magbubukid to submit a memorandum to Roxas begging for land reform, the dissolution of the civilian guards, and the recognition of the right of peasants to bear arms for self-defense. The tricks of the shyster were being employed in a life-and-death struggle instead of implementing a firm policy of arousing and mobilizing the people for revolutionary armed struggle.

The most blatant act of obsequiousness perpetrated by the bourgeois gang of the Lavas and Tarucs was its support for the “pacification” campaign launched by the Roxas puppet regime against the Party, the army and the people. Party cadres were put under the custody of the military police and went around asking the people to lay down their arms. This act of sabotage of the Lavas and Tarucs cost the lives of so many people, cadres and Red fighters. The Lavas and Tarucs spread the lie among cadres that the “pacification” campaign was a mere speaking tour. It was in fact a campaign of terror against the people, the Party and the people’s army. Workers in the city and peasants in the countryside fell victims to this campaign.

The people could not be cowed. They were eager to defend themselves and as a matter of fact did so in a spontaneous way against the depredations of the enemy. But every time they raised a clamor for armed revolution, the bourgeois reactionary gang of the Lavas and Tarucs would seize the initiative within the Communist Party and pretend to respond to the clamor. In 1947, it removed Pedro Castro as general secretary on the grounds that he proposed to convert the Party into an open mass party on an equal footing with the Nacionalista Party and the Liberal Party. But in his place it put Jorge Frianeza who was even worse because he openly advocated all-round cooperation with the Roxas pup-

pet regime notwithstanding the brazen acts of fascist terror against the Party, the army and the people.

Knowing no bounds in its hatred of the people, Roxas' puppet regime outlawed the Hukbalahap and the Pambansang Kaisahan ng mga Magbubukid by presidential edict on March 6, 1948. On behalf of US imperialism and the local reactionary classes, the Roxas puppet regime never hesitated to attack the people.

2. The Quirino Puppet Regime, 1948-53

After the death of Roxas in April 1948, Elpidio Quirino who was then his vice-president served the rest of the presidential term. Fearing the onrush of the revolutionary mass movement, Quirino acted to inveigle the people with an offer of amnesty to the Hukbalahap and a pledge to reinstate and pay the back salaries of the Democratic Alliance congressmen who had been ousted in 1946. The principal condition set for the granting of such concessions was the surrender of arms and the registration of the Red fighters of the Hukbalahap.

Even as the Party leadership represented by Jorge Frianeza had been removed in May 1948 due to its rightist support for the Roxas puppet regime, the Party leadership now represented by Jose Lava allowed the traitor Luis Taruc in June 1948 to discuss the sell-out of the revolution to the Quirino puppet regime. The flimsy excuse peddled within the Party was that Taruc would merely make use of the negotiations to make propaganda. The surrender negotiations turned out to be propaganda in favor of the enemy. When an amnesty agreement was reached and Taruc reclaimed his seat in the reactionary Congress, the troops and secret agents of the Philippine Constabulary were allowed to mingle with the Red fighters of the Hukbalahap and enjoyed safe conduct in the barrios of Central Luzon. The most reliable cadres of the Party were exposed to the enemy who came to facilitate the surrender of arms and the registration of Red fighters.

The Taruc-Quirino amnesty agreement did not even last for two months. Even as the reactionary armed forces were once more ferociously attacking the people, the Jose Lava leadership again made a mockery of the revolutionary integrity of the Party in December 1948 when it prepared a memorandum for the Committee on Un-Filipino Activities (CUFA) which was read by Mariano Balgos, posing as the Party general secretary. The submission of the memorandum was another act of conceding to the authority of the reactionaries. Furthermore, the text of the memorandum contained such counterrevolutionary

views as that the Party would always continue to support the colonial constitution of the reactionary government and that the new-democratic revolution would have a capitalist basis.

In 1949, the Jose Lava leadership repeated the counterrevolutionary practice of directly participating in the puppet elections by campaigning for a particular reactionary faction and becoming a tail thereof. It supported Laurel against Quirino, that is to say, the Nacionalista Party against the Liberal Party. It obscured the dark record of Laurel as the top puppet of Japanese imperialism and ballyhooed him as a nationalist and a democrat. While Quirino campaigned on a platform of complete loyalty to US imperialism, Laurel declared lamely that like Roxas his puppetry to Japanese imperialism had also been a form of loyalty to US imperialism with the secret blessings of Quezon. At any rate, Quirino employed fraud and terrorism to ensure the electoral defeat of Laurel.

After the 1949 elections, the Jose Lava leadership took the line that it could seize power within two years and for this purpose prepared a timetable of military operations and rapid recruitment into the Party. Without relying mainly on the strength of the Party and the people's army and without rectifying a long period of unprincipled compromises with US imperialism and the local reactionaries, the Jose Lava leadership considered as basic factors for the victory of the Philippine Revolution such external conditions as the "certainty" of a third world war, the economic recession in the United States and the liberation of the Chinese people. Within the Philippines, it overestimated the struggle between Quirino and Laurel as a basic factor for the advance of the revolutionary mass movement. In January 1950, the adventurist line of quick military victory was formally put forward by the Jose Lava leadership through resolutions of the Party Political Bureau.

All units of the people's army were ordered to make simultaneous attacks on provincial capitals, cities and enemy camps on March 29, August 26 and November 7, 1950. The attacks of March 29 and August 26 were executed. But these overextended the strength of the people's army. On October 18, the enemy counterattacked by raiding all central offices of the Party in Manila, arresting among others the Politburo-In led by Jose Lava.⁴ Subsequently, campaigns of encirclement and suppression were launched in the countryside against the thinly spread people's army. Overextended lines of supply and communica-

⁴ For the Politburo-In and the Politburo-Out, see 'Rectify Errors and Rebuild the Party', pp. 197-216.—*Ed.*

tions of the People's Liberation Army became easy targets of the reactionary armed forces. Because of its putschist orientation, the Jose Lava leadership brought the most crushing defeats on the Party and the people's army.

The principal service rendered by the Quirino puppet regime to US imperialism and the local exploiting classes was the crushing blow it inflicted on the Party and the people's army. The writ of habeas corpus was formally suspended to enable the fascist military led by Ramon Magsaysay to make the most unbridled abuse of democratic rights. The objective conditions for waging a protracted people's war were extremely favorable, and yet the Jose Lava leadership chose to exhaust and overextend the revolutionary forces under an adventurist policy. It thwarted the advance of the people's democratic revolution by violating the fundamental principles of Marxism-Leninism.

Towards the end of the forties, the funds derived by the puppet republic from war damage and rehabilitation payments, relief goods, sale of war surplus materials, expenditures of US military personnel and veterans' payments were already being exhausted by the unrestricted importation of consumption and luxury goods, by public works, by the reconstruction of agricultural mills, offices and palaces of the comprador-landlords and by rampant graft and corruption. Import controls had to be imposed in 1949 to conserve the dollar reserves of the reactionary government. In 1953, an entire system of foreign exchange controls was applied to further put a brake on the depletion of the financial resources of the puppet government.

Taking advantage of the political and economic difficulties of the Philippines, the US government dispatched the Bell Mission to make an economic survey and make recommendations to the Quirino puppet regime. The Bell Mission paved the way for the imposition of the Economic and Technical Assistance Agreement of 1951 which required the placement of US advisers in the strategic offices of the puppet government to ensure the perpetuation of the colonial policy. The newly established Central Bank, desperately in need of dollars, became a ward of the US Export-Import Bank and other US banks.

In the guise of complying with resolutions of the US-controlled United Nations, the Quirino puppet regime sent expeditionary forces to the Korean War to help US imperialism in its war of aggression against the Korean people in 1950. The representative of the puppet president signed the San Francisco Treaty in 1951 in accordance with the wishes of US imperialism to revive Japanese militarism as its principal partner in Asia. At that time, Japanese monop-

oly capitalism was being rapidly revived with contracts directly related to the Korean War.

In 1951, the Quirino puppet regime had the US-RP Mutual Defense Treaty ratified, allowing the United States to intervene arbitrarily in Philippine affairs under the pretext of mutual protection. In 1953, Quirino signed the agreement extending indefinitely the effectivity of the US-RP Military Assistance Pact, which was first signed in 1947. Also in 1953 the Agreement Relating to Entry of US Traders and investors was signed, facilitating the entry of US capital and managerial personnel into the Philippines. To the end of his term, Quirino remained a rabid puppet of US imperialism despite the fact that the Central Intelligence Agency was particularly interested in replacing him with Magsaysay as puppet president.

3. The Magsaysay Puppet Regime, 1954-57

As secretary of national defense under the Quirino puppet regime, Magsaysay was credited by US imperialism and the local exploiting classes with the defeat of the revolutionary mass movement. The US propaganda mills misrepresented him as the “man of the masses” and “savior of democracy” and gave all-out support to his bid for presidency in exchange for his brutal suppression of the masses and trammeling of democratic rights. Quirino, on the other hand, became most blamed for the state of civil war, the imposition of martial law and the rampant graft and corruption in the reactionary government.

Magsaysay transferred from the Liberal Party to the Nacionalista Party to run against Quirino in the 1953 elections. By this act, US imperialism exposed the absence of any basic difference between the two reactionary parties. Magsaysay became the third president of the puppet republic despite the efforts of Quirino to manipulate government resources and facilities in his own favor. The US monopolies through the American Chamber of Commerce of the Philippines brought the full weight of their money behind Magsaysay in an unprecedentedly expensive and corrupt election. Using the authority of the JUSMAG as an excuse, US military officers went as far down as the company level in the reactionary armed forces to see to it that their pet running dog would be elected.

In his brief reign, Magsaysay completed the evil work of crushing the Party and the people’s army by taking advantage of the anti-Marxist and anti-Leninist policies of the Jesus Lava leadership which had automatically replaced the Jose Lava leadership in 1951. Refusing to learn from the errors of the previous

Party leadership, the Jesus Lava leadership continued to dispose of the people's armed forces in an adventurist way. It chose to describe the stage of armed struggle it was in as the stage of strategic "counteroffensive." Acting beyond the correct mass line in practically every place, units of the People's Liberation Army became isolated and resorted to grave abuses merely to get food for themselves. More political isolation only resulted in more disastrous military defeats.

The traitor Luis Taruc surrendered to Magsaysay in 1954. Consistently unable to conduct a protracted people's war correctly, the Jesus Lava leadership swung from adventurism to capitulationism. In 1955, the Jesus Lava leadership prepared to abandon the countryside by announcing that the main form of struggle was parliamentary struggle. It dissolved the units of the people's army it could influence and converted them into so-called organizational brigades.

In 1954, the Magsaysay puppet regime sabotaged the ceaseless popular demand for the abrogation of the Bell Trade Act by negotiating for its mere revision. Thus, the Laurel-Langley Agreement was made. This new treaty aggravated the economic subservience of the Philippines to US imperialism by allowing the US monopolies to enjoy parity rights in all kinds of businesses. Adjustments in the quota system and preferential treatment for Philippine raw materials were made only to deepen the colonial and agrarian character of the economy. The formal assertion of the independence of the peso currency did not remove it from the actual control of the US dollar.

The foreign exchange controls showed conspicuously the subservience of the Philippine peso to the US dollar. Having a semi-colonial and a semi-feudal economy, the Philippines had to make use of its dollar earnings from its raw material exports to get finished commodities from abroad, chiefly the United States. To circumvent the priorities set by the foreign exchange control regulations and the tariff laws for the importation of "essential" commodities, the US monopolies and the compradors disassembled US finished commodities before bringing them into the country and labeled them as raw materials for local processing. Reassembly and packaging plants were put up to create the illusion of local industrialization and import substitution.

The Magsaysay puppet regime signed the first Agricultural Commodities Agreement with the United States in 1957. This agreement was designed to make use of US agricultural surplus to help perpetuate a colonial pattern of economy in the Philippines, keep local agricultural production at the mercy of

US imperialism, control intermediate industries requiring imported agricultural raw materials and support US imperialist propaganda.

To cover up his puppetry to US imperialism, Magsaysay resorted to the old colonial and chauvinist trick of attacking Chinese retailers who merely ranked third (after American and British) among merchants of foreign nationality engaged in domestic trade. At the same time, he continued to make it difficult and expensive for foreign nationals of Chinese descent to become Filipino citizens. The Chiang bandit gang and the local bureaucrat capitalists extorted heavily from them. At any rate, Magsaysay allowed all foreign businessmen, especially the direct representatives of US monopolies and the big compradors, to bring capital out of the country at their whim.

To cover up the anti-national and anti-democratic character of his regime, Magsaysay reluctantly allowed the enactment of the Noli-Fili Law requiring the study of Rizal's writings. This law would after all propagate only the old type of national democracy, which had been valid only during the pre-imperialist era of bourgeois democracy. At the same time, he plotted with the CIA and the American Jesuits in preparing the Anti-Subversion Law, which was intended to whip up a counterrevolutionary atmosphere of anti-communism and to trammel the people's democratic right of assembly and expression.

Magsaysay had a law passed ostensibly to guarantee the tenure of poor tenants. Its actual purpose was to assure the landlords of their privilege to retain their vast landholdings and uphold the state policy of keeping the Philippines an agricultural appendage of US imperialism. Magsaysay continued the program of land settlement but this merely disguised land grabbing by the exploiting classes in frontier areas. The Agricultural Credit and Cooperative Financing Administration was created with the avowed purpose of helping the peasantry in general but it turned out to be a mere device for enabling the landlords, merchant-usurers, bureaucrats and rich peasants to control fake cooperatives and cheat the poor and middle peasants.

At one time during the Magsaysay puppet regime, the US government issued the Brownell opinion making a formal claim of ownership over the US military bases in the Philippines. The entire Filipino people were so enraged by this imperialist claim that the reactionary Supreme Court was compelled to make the pretense of denying the claim. However, the court left unquestioned the imperialist privilege of the United States to actually occupy the military bases, enjoy extraterritorial rights, and violate the territorial integrity of the Philippines.

In 1954, the Magsaysay puppet regime sponsored in Manila the conference which put out the treaty forming the imperialist-dominated Southeast Asia Treaty Organization (SEATO). The majority of the member-governments (United States, Britain, France, New Zealand, Australia and Pakistan) in the treaty organization do not even belong to Southeast Asia. The SEATO arrogated unto itself the privilege of attacking the sovereignty of the peoples of Southeast Asia and of defending reactionary governments. In this regard, the SEATO is another flimsy excuse for imperialism to intervene in Philippine affairs and manipulate the Philippine puppet government against other peoples of Southeast Asia. At the same time, the SEATO allows US imperialism to bring its allies into the Philippines and attack the people under the pretext of regional defense.

In line with the US policy of aggression in Vietnam, the Magsaysay puppet regime recognized the bogus Republic of South Vietnam in flagrant and direct violation of the Geneva Agreements. US military bases in the Philippines were used to launch the interventionist and aggressive activities of US imperialism all over Asia. Filipino agents of the CIA were fielded all over Indochina in the guise of technical personnel under such sinister outfits as the CIA-funded Operation Brotherhood and Eastern Construction Company.

US imperialism ordered the Magsaysay puppet regime in 1956 to make an agreement with Japan on war reparations and to ratify the San Francisco Treaty. The Ohno-Garcia reparations agreement was made, enabling Japan to penetrate the Philippine economy through the system of delivering reparations goods. While bowing its head to the US-Japan partnership, the Magsaysay puppet regime was fond of making bellicose statements against national liberation movements and socialist countries, particularly the People's Republic of China, and of endorsing every aggressive act of US imperialism throughout the world.

The Magsaysay puppet regime was shamelessly proud of the fact that its chieftain Magsaysay was a running dog of US imperialism. The regime tried futilely to label its slavishness as "positive nationalism" when faced with the anti-imperialist criticism made by Senator Claro Mayo Recto.

4. The Garcia Puppet Regime, 1957-61

Carlos P. Garcia as vice-president assumed the presidency of the puppet republic upon the death of Magsaysay in 1957 and was elected to the same position under the banner of the Nacionalista Party in that same year. He was

basically a puppet of US imperialism and the chief representative of the local exploiting classes. His regime never took any decisive step to break the colonial and feudal chains that bind the Filipino people. Instead, it allowed these to remain.

As a result of foreign exchange and import controls, the middle bourgeoisie became politically assertive in favor of what it called nationalist industrialization. Some Filipino manufacturers using local raw materials were enraged by the establishment of reassembly and packaging plants by the US monopolies and the compradors to circumvent the tariff wall that was supposed to restrict the importation of commodities already locally produced. Even those manufacturers reliant on imported raw materials in various degrees also recognized the advantages of protection and clamored for more.

The political aspirations of the national bourgeoisie were best articulated by Recto who was also able to attract to some extent the interest of the petit bourgeoisie in joining the anti-imperialist movement.

The Garcia puppet regime raised the slogan of “Filipino First” as an apparent concession to a growing anti-imperialist movement among the people. But it did so only in order to cover up its basic puppetry to US imperialism. The slogan meant nothing more than giving preference to Filipino businessmen in the allocation of US dollars for import-export operations over foreign businessmen of a nationality other than American. The basic assumption was still that Filipino businessmen should be subservient to the US dollar. Though there were laws and priority lists encouraging “new” and “necessary” industries and restricting the importation of certain goods that could be locally produced, these only served to encourage the establishment of a limited number of assembly and packaging plants by US subsidiaries which took to misrepresenting as raw materials the finished goods that they imported.

Though the Garcia puppet regime was conspicuously encouraging Filipino merchants to push out merchants of Chinese nationality from the retail business, especially in the rice and corn trade, it allowed the big Kuomintang compradors to have a big share in the import-export and wholesale business and to bring their capital to Taiwan. All Chinese residents in the Philippines were coerced to manifest their allegiance to the Chiang bandit gang or else face reprisal.

In line with the scheme of US imperialism to revive Japanese militarism, the Garcia puppet regime hurriedly negotiated and agreed with Japan on the Japan-R.P. Treaty of Amity, Commerce and Navigation. Though ratification of

the proposed treaty was held back because of great popular opposition, Japanese companies were already extensively using the reparations agreement as an excuse for setting up liaison offices, making surveys in the country and participating in the import-export business.

Towards the end of the fifties, US imperialism exerted pressure on the Garcia puppet regime to remove foreign exchange controls. Foreign exchange controls had been permitted by US imperialism as a mere tactical and temporary device for putting a brake to the rapid depletion of US dollars and for helping prevent the complete breakdown of the colonial economy at a time when the revolutionary mass movement was on the upsurge. Now, US imperialism wanted a more “favorable climate” for foreign investments in the Philippines and the unlimited remittance of its superprofits. It wanted to counteract its uneven balance-of-payments problem by intensifying the export of its surplus products, by extending usurious loans and making the type of direct investments that would rapidly fetch superprofits. Furthermore, the lifting of foreign exchange controls would pave the way for the prolongation of imperialist privileges in the colonial economy despite the 1974 termination of the Laurel-Langley Agreement.

US imperialism used the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund to make an economic survey and recommend the adoption of immediate and full decontrol as the cornerstone of “development.” Due to the resurgent anti-imperialist movement, Garcia could not immediately lift foreign exchange controls. US imperialism had to subject him to a virulent attack for perpetrating graft and corruption in dollar allocations and also to a coup d’état threat by the CIA gang closely associated with the late Magsaysay in order to pressure and compel him to adopt partial decontrol in December 1960. It was a step calculated by Garcia to appease US imperialism in anticipation of the 1961 presidential elections. However, US imperialism had already decided to depose him and to replace him with another puppet politician who would not hesitate to follow its orders to the letter.

The sly character of the Garcia puppet regime was also evident in the negotiations hoax concerning the reduction of the 99-year period of US control of the military bases in the Philippines. Though it was publicized that an agreement between the Philippine and US panels was reached reducing US tenure on such bases to 25 years, the US-RP Military Bases Treaty was never amended and in later years it would be reported that minutes of meetings pertaining to the reduction of US tenure could not be found in the files of the Department

of Foreign Affairs. The negotiations hoax had been put on as a mere tactic to meet the growing anti-imperialist demand for the complete withdrawal of US military bases. The demand had risen especially when US military personnel repeatedly committed the crime of murder on Filipinos in US military bases and base commanders prevented the prosecution of the culprits by asserting US jurisdiction.

During the Garcia puppet regime, the US military bases continued to be used in launching aggression against the peoples of Southeast Asia. In 1958, these were used to support the rightist rebellion against the Indonesian people and to step up US intervention in Indochina. Flaunting the slogan of “Asia for the Asians,” the Garcia puppet regime tried to establish the Association of Southeast Asia (ASA) under the pretext of fostering regional cooperation in the economic and cultural spheres. Actually, the ASA was a device for coordinating a free trade zone for US imperialism and for reinforcing the SEATO, which was already wracked by severe contradictions between US imperialism and Pakistan and also between US imperialism and France.

The resurgence of the anti-imperialist revolutionary mass movement became most conspicuous during the Garcia puppet regime when on March 14, 1961 a powerful demonstration led by young men and women broke into the halls of the puppet congress and literally scuttled the anti-communist hearings being conducted by the Committee on Anti-Filipino Activities (CAFA). This mass action marked the beginning of a cultural revolution of a national-democratic character after more than two decades, during which the bourgeois reactionary gang of the Lavas surrendered initiative to the reactionaries. The CAFA was thwarted in its attempt to employ the Anti-Subversion Law as a measure for cowing students, teachers, and the people in general from expressing their national-democratic aspirations.

As early as 1958, the Anti-Subversion Law had been enacted with the evil purpose of dealing a deathblow to the Communist Party of the Philippines. At about the same time, parallel to the anti-communist maneuver of the reactionary government, Jesus Lava abused his position as Party general secretary by deciding all by himself to liquidate the Party with his “single-file”-policy, a policy of destroying even the least semblance of democratic centralism within the Party. The reactionaries in the country so dominated the superstructure that they would immediately denounce as “communist” any intellectual trend opposed to the anachronistic “free enterprise” ideology most rabidly espoused

by the Grand Alliance led by such CIA agents and clerico-fascist diehards as Manahan and Manglapus.

All the cultural devices established by US imperialism and the Catholic Church at the beginning of the puppet republic persisted and expanded. The CIA kept on manipulating fanatics of this most numerous church through the Manahan-Manglapus clique and the American Jesuits. In 1961, the US Peace Corps was brought in by US imperialism as an additional device to aggravate the cultural and political subversion of the Philippines.

5. The Macapagal Puppet Regime, 1962-65

Enjoying the political and financial support of the US monopolies, Diosdado Macapagal defeated Garcia in the presidential elections of 1961 despite the latter's use of government resources and facilities in the campaign. In the era of modern imperialism, Macapagal inanely ran on a platform of "free enterprise" and "decentralization." The Liberal Party of which he was the principal candidate coalesced with the Grand Alliance to form the United Opposition. This coalition shamelessly echoed the US imperialist dictation made through the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund, besides the usual run of US advisors.

The first executive act performed by Macapagal when he assumed the puppet presidency in 1962 was to proclaim immediate and full decontrol. Local US firms were enabled to remit huge profits even without having to conceal them any more through overpricing of goods and services bought from their mother and sister companies in the United States or elsewhere abroad. The comprador big bourgeoisie and the big landlord class gobbled up their dollar income from the export of raw materials and freely converted their pesos into dollars for the import of finished commodities. Graft and corruption shifted from the Central Bank to the Bureau of Customs and the long seacoasts of the archipelago as the system of dollar allocations was replaced by a readjusted tariff system intended to draw government revenues.

Upon the exhaustion of the dollar reserves of the reactionary government, the peso was devalued from the previous fixed rate of P2.00 per dollar to P3.90 per dollar. To maintain this rate, the Macapagal puppet regime had to accept onerous "stabilization" loans from US banks. With the new peso-dollar rate, the broad masses of the people had to suffer high prices which cut down their real income. There was not a single commodity in the Philippines unaffected by the higher cost of importing finished goods, raw materials, spare parts, fuel

and the like from the United States. While the peso was devalued to the extent of almost 100 percent, the statutory minimum wage level was raised by only 50 percent and could be had by wage-earners only through mass struggle.

The Macapagal puppet regime used the very economic crisis caused by US imperialism as the excuse for advocating an “open door” policy for US investments. The volume of US investments increased but not any higher than the huge profits being remitted. US investments were made only to aggravate the unevenness of the semi-colonial and semi-feudal economy. US investors took over enterprises which could no longer pay their foreign debts and made new investments in plantations, fertilizer plants and the like. Conforming to their own policy of restraining the outflow of dollars from the United States, the US monopolies employed the tactic of sucking up Filipino savings and loan capital taken by the Philippine government from US-owned and US-controlled banks. Thus, even with the very little capital that they actually brought into the country, they could enlarge their capitalization through local borrowings. All these were facilitated by the puppet president through the Program Implementation Agency, an office created especially for this purpose. New lending agencies were also created to facilitate the rapid depletion of foreign loans.

Government corporations were made to borrow directly from the World Bank. Private corporations and banks were encouraged to get loans directly from US and other foreign banks and to use government banks to make the guarantees. During the time of Macapagal, it was extremely clear that burdening the reactionary government with foreign loans was deliberately being done to reduce to complete absurdity the illusion of the bourgeois nationalists that they could make use of the puppet state to help them take over US assets in the Philippines.

A program of public works projects which was mainly intended to exhaust foreign loans and abuse the local currency and the whole economy was initiated. It was launched despite the fact that the Macapagal puppet regime could not get from Congress the tax measures it wanted for raising government revenues so as to cover increased government expenditures. A nonsensical agency like the Emergency Employment Administration was put up to conduct sham public works and create the illusion of more employment at a time of mass layoffs.

In an attempt to dissimulate its brazen puppetry to US imperialism, the Macapagal puppet regime had “independence day” changed from July 4th to June 12th. The fable that the United States “granted” independence to the Fili-

pino people was supplanted by the equally arrogant fable that the United States “restored” it. It became a vogue among puppet politicians to pay lip service to the events and heroes of the old democratic revolution so as to give a superficial local color to their puppetry. Romulo, an old running dog of US imperialism, was put in the University of the Philippines to be always on hand for consultations with Macapagal in the embellishment of pro-imperialist policies and also to refurbish the state university as a tool of US imperialism and the local exploiting classes.

To further make itself appear progressive and to swindle the peasantry, the Macapagal puppet regime enacted the Agricultural Land Reform Code. This code piously declares share tenancy as “contrary to public policy” and makes the false promise to emancipate the tenant masses. Underneath all the bombast about emancipating the tenant masses is the full assurance to all landlords that if a piece of land is to be expropriated from them by the reactionary government, they shall be given “just compensation.” The tenant masses would not be able to afford the redistribution price and the reactionary government would not have enough funds to go beyond a few token instances of expropriation.

The code also provides that before there can be any expropriation of land from the landlords, the tenant masses should first become “leaseholders,” paying a fixed land rent amounting to 25 percent of the average annual net crop based on the three normal crop years preceding the landlord-tenant “leasehold” agreement. The tenant is obliged to shoulder all agricultural expenses and to deliver to the landlord the fixed rent whatever the outcome of the crop, come floods, drought or crop epidemics. “Leasehold” does not actually reduce the land rent; it is nothing but one more form of share tenancy. But the code makes it appear that merely adopting this form of share tenancy means the abolition of share tenancy.

The Philippine claim on Sabah and the Maphilindo (Malaysia, Philippines, Indonesia) plan were initiated by the Macapagal puppet regime ostensibly to carry out an irredentist policy but in reality to facilitate the recognition of the Philippines as an intervenor in and supporter of the Anglo-American concoction that is “Malaysia.” The Maphilindo was nothing but an imperialist trick to outwit the Sukarno government of Indonesia and to extort more privileges for US monopolies in Malaya and North Kalimantan. In pretending to take an independent course in Philippine foreign relations, Macapagal even had the US-RP Treaty of General Relations abrogated, but he allowed all other unequal treaties elaborating on this treaty to continue.

It was anomalous that, whereas the Macapagal puppet regime could not assert Philippine sovereignty and jurisdiction over the US military bases within the Philippines, it sought to acquire more territory outside. When the number of murder cases involving US military personnel and their Filipino victims increased, the Macapagal puppet regime conspired with the US ambassador in the old trick of negotiating the amendment of the US-RP Military Bases Agreement. The amendments agreed upon actually enlarged the jurisdiction of the US base commander. However, no serious step was ever taken to submit these to the Philippine Senate for ratification.

The Macapagal puppet regime thoroughly exposed to all the Asian peoples its puppetry to US imperialism when it rabidly campaigned for the sending of Filipino mercenary troops to participate in the US war of aggression against the Vietnamese people. Filipino CIA agents who had gained substantial business interests in the US war of aggression in Indochina were most vociferous in joining Macapagal's call for sending Filipino mercenary troops to Vietnam. The first mercenaries to be sent there under an act of the puppet Congress took the guise of engineering and medical teams.

To promote the imperialist partnership of the United States and Japan in exploiting the peoples of Asia and strengthen Japan's role as the regional puppet chieftain of US imperialism in Asia, the Macapagal puppet regime sponsored the conference which led to the formation of the US-Japan-controlled Asian Development Bank and offered to make Manila its headquarters. The Asian Development Bank is one more financial institution designed to manipulate the Philippine puppet government into perpetuating a semi-colonial and semi-feudal economy for supplying raw materials principally to both the United States and Japan. During the time of Macapagal, the share of Japan in Philippine foreign trade had already gone up to around 20 percent.

In opposition to the reactionary policies of the Macapagal puppet regime, the revolutionary mass movement in the city surged forward. Increasingly bigger protest demonstrations were staged by workers, peasants, students and other patriots. On October 2, 1964, workers and students demonstrated against US parity rights and the US military bases in front of the US Embassy and then in front of Malacanang Palace where they battled the presidential guards. The most militant demonstrators subsequently became charter members of the Kabataang Makabayan. The Kabataang Makabayan was founded on November 30, 1964 to become a consistent major factor in the struggle for national democracy.

On December 25, 1964, the people of Angeles City and adjoining towns held a big meeting to denounce the murder of Filipinos inside the US military bases and demand the withdrawal of these bases. On January 25, 1965, twenty thousand people composed of workers, peasants, students and the unemployed marched to the puppet Congress and then to the US embassy to expose in a comprehensive way the workings of US imperialism, feudalism and bureaucrat capitalism. Demonstrations were also repeatedly made against the Anglo-American concoction of “Malaysia” and the US war of aggression in Vietnam.

These demonstrations were preceded and followed by study meetings at several places in order to discuss the issues thoroughly. Altogether, the militant demonstrations and study meetings constituted a further development of the cultural revolution of a national-democratic type signaled by the anti-CA-FA demonstration of 1961. The youth played a vanguard role in these mass actions. The workers and peasants could have immediately played an even bigger role were it not for the more than one decade of sabotage perpetrated by the bourgeois reactionary gang of the Lavas and Tarucs in the revolutionary mass movement.

In the countryside, Red commanders and fighters who refused to heed the call of the Jesus Lava leadership for liquidating the armed struggle persisted in their revolutionary efforts. However, in the absence of a definite Marxist-Leninist leadership capable of striking down the counterrevolutionary leadership of the bourgeois reactionary gang of the Lavas and Tarucs, those who persisted in revolutionary armed struggle in the countryside were susceptible to the outlook of the roving rebel band and were prey to the usurpation of leadership by the Taruc-Sumulong gangster clique. Despite the usurpation of leadership by both the bourgeois reactionary gang of the Lavas and the Taruc-Sumulong gangster clique, the broad masses of people clamored for a correct proletarian revolutionary leadership.

The one-man Jesus Lava leadership exposed its completely bankrupt character when it forwarded letters of support to Macapagal for its policies, especially the Agricultural Land Reform Code, and when it subsequently arranged its surrender in May 1964. Before his surrender, Jesus Lava vainly tried to sow disorder in the ranks of the revolutionary mass movement by making arbitrary appointments that appeared to recognize the independent kingdom of the Taruc-Sumulong gangster clique and yet encouraged certain kinsmen of his

to claim Party leadership even as they were isolated from the masses and were actually accomplices in his surrender.

The independent kingdom of the Lavas based in Manila took to using a reformist peasant organization, the Masaka, to assert its fake authority in the revolutionary mass movement and also to comply with Jesus Lava's commitment of supporting the sham land reform program of the reactionary government.

Soon after the surrender of Jesus Lava to Macapagal, Marxist-Leninists emerging from the revolutionary mass movement rose up to criticize and repudiate the counterrevolutionary acts of the Lavas and Tarucs. At first, expressions of criticism and repudiation were spontaneous. Then these matured into a full-scale rectification movement. The rectification movement would still entail some years to develop towards the stage when the Revolutionary School of Mao Zedong Thought could be formed and the Communist Party of the Philippines could be reestablished under the great red banner of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought. The long dynastic rule of the Lavas and Tarucs in the Party could not be done away with overnight.

6. The Marcos Puppet Regime, 1966-

What Magsaysay had done in 1953, transfer from the Liberal Party to the Nacionalista Party to become no less than the presidential candidate, Ferdinand Marcos did in 1965 without having to account for any change of political principles, thus exposing once more the absence of any basic difference between the two puppet reactionary parties. Marcos had been no less than the president of the party he had left and the close associate of Macapagal .

Marcos defeated Macapagal in the election of 1965 to become the sixth president of the puppet republic. After one term, he ran for reelection in 1969 and won over Sergio Osmena, Jr. of the Liberal Party. Each time in the two presidential elections, he faced an opponent raucously claiming to be the more efficient running dog of US imperialism. On the other hand, US imperialism wanted a puppet of the Marcos type, one who could most effectively make use of counterrevolutionary dual tactics in a period marked by the rise of the revolutionary mass movement in both city and countryside.

While sounding "nationalist" interested in the economic emancipation of the Filipino nation and pledging to let the Laurel-Langley Agreement, particularly parity rights, lapse in 1974, the Marcos puppet regime enacted as early as 1967 the Investment Incentives Law which declares it the state policy to

encourage foreign investments and defines a corporation with a maximum foreign equity of 40 percent as a "Philippine national." By this definition, the US imperialists can create a system of interlocking corporations by which a "Philippine national" already bearing and camouflaging 40 percent equity invests in another corporation and actually increases foreign equity in the latter corporation beyond 40 percent. The law, however, clearly allows foreign equity to exceed 40 percent in an old or new corporation registered with the Board of Investments and to remain so indefinitely as long as "Philippine nationals" do not buy the shares of stock offered in the stock exchange on the eleventh year after registration. In guaranteeing the property rights of foreign investors, the Investment Incentives Law goes to the extent of guaranteeing the right of non-expropriation and exposes the primacy of foreign investments over any pretension of the present puppet state to sovereign rights. The "incentives" offered by the law are unprecedentedly abusive of the sovereign Filipino people and are geared to aggravating the colonial status of the Philippines.

An insidious propaganda drive supporting the perpetuation of the interests of the US monopolies in the Philippines has been unleashed by the counter-revolutionaries, especially by the CIA and the American Jesuits through the Manglapus-Manahan gang. Brandishing their slogans of "peaceful revolution," "constitutional reform" and "profit-sharing," the Christian Social Movement, the Movement for the Advancement of Nationalism, the Congressional Economic Planning Office and several other reformist groups spread the mendacious line that the nationalization of the economy could be advanced through legislation and through the stock market. The workers are told that they can become capitalists and can participate in joint ventures with foreign investors by going to the stock market to buy their own shares and putting a mortgage on their future wages. This is akin to the old lie repeatedly told to the landless peasants that they can become landowners by buying land from the landlords.

There has been so much ado about another colonial Constitutional Convention. It is publicized as a channel for changing the status quo. The actual purpose of the Constitutional Convention, however, is to adjust the wording of the colonial constitution to such a law as the Investment Incentives Law and the treaty of friendship, commerce and navigation between the US and the Philippines, which is now being prepared. The broad masses of the people are reminded at every turn that they have to attract and be hospitable to "dollar-bringing tourists," meaning, the US monopolies. Every town or barrio is

made to expect itself as a possible tourist spot in a clever campaign to counteract the growing sentiment of the people against US imperialism.

Rendering completely inutile the reformist view that the economic interests of US imperialism could be taken over by the reactionary government or Filipino businessmen in accordance with “due process” and “just compensation,” the Marcos puppet regime has faithfully followed the dictation of US imperialism to exhaust the financial resources of the reactionary government and to overburden the people with inflation and repeated devaluation. Despite the raising of taxes, the internal debt of the reactionary government has risen to the level of at least P6.0 billion because of the profligate spending on projects that merely deepen the semi-colonial and semi-feudal character of the economy. On top of this internal debt, an external debt of more than \$1.9 billion has been incurred mainly with US imperialism. Thus, the nation is severely afflicted with a financial crisis of unprecedented proportions.⁵ The broad masses of the people have to suffer steeply rising prices as a result of the rapid erosion of the purchasing value of the peso from within and from without.

Taking advantage of the financial plight of the Philippine puppet government, US imperialism through the International Monetary Fund has dictated the devaluation of the peso at the expense of the broad masses of the people. At the beginning of 1970, the value of the peso sank to the level of more than P6.00 per US dollar from the previous level of P3.90 per US dollar. This is the second time in only eight years that devaluation has been imposed on the people without any corresponding increases in their income. Since 1962, the prices of many basic commodities have gone up by more than 150 percent. There is not a single commodity in the Philippines that is not affected by the rising costs of imported fuel, equipment, spare parts, raw materials, and the like. The Filipino national bourgeoisie is daily facing bankruptcy because its products are being squeezed out of the local market and it cannot avail itself of adequate credit assistance from a bankrupt puppet government.

As a result of the peso devaluation, the value of US assets in the Philippines and also of Philippine foreign debt has automatically increased. It is idle and downright stupid to expect the reactionary government or private Filipino stock buyers to be able to buy out the US monopolies. On the other hand, the reactionary government has become worse as a beggar of usurious foreign loans and Filipino-owned enterprises have become more than ever subject to

⁵ As of February 1972, the internal debt of the reactionary government was P7.1 billion and the external debt was \$2.134 billion or P14.45 billion at the exchange rate of P6.77 to one US dollar.

takeover, assimilation or crushing by the US monopolies. Devaluation has only made the Philippines more dependent on the US dollar and has only served to aggravate the semi-colonial and semi-feudal character of the economy.

Though the Marcos puppet regime has flamboyantly declared many towns in the country, especially in Central Luzon, as land reform areas, the reactionary government is simply bereft of the financial resources to carry out what it hypocritically labels a land reform program. In the countryside of the Philippines, it has become too clear that only by waging a people's war can the peasantry achieve agrarian revolution. In the city, the proletariat is pressed hard by mass layoffs and by the inflation caused by the workings of imperialism within and without the country.

Only the reactionary classes in Philippine society have shared in the exploitative privileges and gains enjoyed by US imperialism. The comprador big bourgeoisie and the big landlord class have been extremely favored by the automatic increase of the peso equivalent of their dollar earnings on their raw material exports. They are the principal beneficiaries of the various public works projects facilitating the movement of raw material exports and finished manufacture imports. They have received various forms of "export incentives." They have been extended the biggest loans in constructing and reconstructing milling facilities. Playing up to the trick of US imperialism of using preferential trade for sugar as a lever for increasing its privileges in the Philippines, the Marcos puppet regime has extended the biggest loans for the construction of new sugar mills at so many points in the country. In the disposition of government funds and the granting of government approval for business projects, the bureaucrat capitalists led by Marcos have aggravated the economic crisis by exacting kick-backs on all sorts of government contracts.

As a rabid puppet of US imperialism, Marcos has outdone Macapagal in sending Filipino mercenary troops to participate in the US war of aggression in Vietnam and Indochina in general. Despite the worsening bankruptcy of the reactionary government, he dispatched the Philcag (Philippine Civic Action Group) to South Vietnam. Until now, there have been Filipino mercenaries there who merely carry other labels, the Philcon, Operation Brotherhood and engineering firms. US imperialism brazenly uses its military bases and Philippine skies and waters to conduct its wars of aggression in Asia. On US military bases here, US military personnel continue to murder, rape, and commit all kinds of abuses against the Filipino people and yet the Marcos puppet regime, like all previous puppet regimes, has conspired with the US imperialists in

holding “negotiations” that end in upholding the latter’s extraterritorial rights. Instead of fighting for the people’s sovereignty, the reactionary government unleashes its police and troops to attack the anti-imperialist protest actions of the people.

The Marcos puppet regime has echoed every “new” policy and followed every “new” step taken by US imperialism. It follows Nixon’s “new Asia policy” of “making Asians fight Asians.” It rabidly supports the US-Japanese partnership in the Pacific and the troublemaking activities of this partnership in Asia. It bows to the US imperialist policy of reviving Japanese militarism and making it play the role of fogleman for US imperialism in Asia. Resurgent Japanese militarism is being promoted as the “regional leader” of Asia through the Asian Development Bank, the Asian Pacific Council (ASPAC), the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN), the Southeast Asian Ministers Economic Council (SEAMEC), the “Asian Forum” and the like.

Even before the ratification of the unequal Japan-R.P. Treaty of Amity, Commerce and Navigation, the Marcos puppet regime has encouraged the Japanese monopolies to invade the Philippines. They now rank as the second biggest foreign investor. Japanese commodities are being dumped into the country and Japanese investments are penetrating every major field of business activity. Japan today is next only to the United States in getting Philippine raw materials and ranks first in getting copper concentrates, logs, molasses and iron ores. Japan’s share of Philippine foreign trade is now more than 30 percent. Its military vessels and fishing fleets do not respect the territorial waters of the Philippines. In a desperate attempt to hoodwink the Filipino people about Japan, the Marcos puppet regime is bandying about the lie that Japan is a benevolent aid-giver and actually begs for loans from it in exchange for the plunder of Philippine natural resources and exploitation of the people. Its war reparations payments which have been grabbed by the local reactionaries for themselves are even misrepresented as gracious aid to the people. The strategic Pan-Philippine highway is obsequiously called the Japanese Friendship Highway.

The Marcos puppet regime has also steadily opened the way for trade and diplomatic relations with Soviet social-imperialism and other revisionist countries in line with the US imperialist policy of maintaining a global alliance with the Soviet Union in opposing China, the people, revolution, and communism. In a futile attempt to deflect attention from itself, US imperialism is raising the joint oppression and exploitation of the Filipino people by the United States,

Japan and the Soviet Union. In this connection, there is an imperialist scheme to whip up the evil wind of modern revisionism inside the country. The local agents of modern revisionism, the bourgeois reactionary gang of the Lavas, are being accommodated in the arena of bourgeois parliamentarism in the imperialist scheme to sabotage the revolutionary mass movement.

In carrying out its reactionary policies, the Marcos puppet regime has inevitably laid out its fascist character. Unable to cope with the political and economic crisis into which it has pushed the nation and also unable to deceive the people with such hypocritical slogans as “this nation can be great again” or “new Filipinism,” it has ruthlessly employed the apparatuses of the state to suppress the broad masses of the people through selective and mass terrorism. In conducting its anti-democratic campaign, it cynically waves the banner of “liberal democracy”.

Through the JUSMAG, US imperialism is supplying more military equipment to the reactionary armed forces and is egging them on to launch counterinsurgency campaigns, that is to say, to attack the broad masses of the people. Through A.I.D., US imperialism is also providing communications and anti-riot equipment to attack mass organizations and disperse protest actions. US military personnel have even taken to the field of supervising police and military operations. The buildup of local fascism by U . S . imperialism is clearly intended to quell the growing revolutionary mass movement inflamed by the rapid deterioration of the ruling system.

As fascism is on the rise, private armies and official murder units, such as the “Monkees,” “BSDU,” “Home Defense Forces,” “Special Forces,” “provincial strike forces” and the like brazenly commit atrocities against the people. Even as the tyrannical character of the reactionary government has clearly emerged, the counterrevolutionaries rig up reformist groups to whip up confidence in the reactionary government and slander the revolutionary mass movement.

Massacres, mass arrests, kidnappings, assassinations, rape, arson, extortion and looting of homes have characterized the Marcos puppet regime. The Culatingan massacre, Corregidor massacre, Lapiang Malaya massacre, Capas massacre, the Mendiola massacre and the Tarlac massacre are blatant proofs of its fascist character and they typify the many more atrocities inflicted on the workers, peasants, students, intellectuals, and the national minorities.⁶ In the

⁶ Add to these massacres perpetrated by the Marcos puppet regime the Manila massacre, the Tacub massacre, the first Plaza Miranda massacre, the May Day 1971 massacre, the second Plaza Miranda massacre, the Cabugao massacre and several others, to the ever-growing list of massacres. The second Plaza Miranda massacre on August 21, 1971 was followed

last presidential elections, it made use of fraud and terrorism on an unprecedented scale to ensure its continuance in power. Government funds and facilities and both the reactionary government armed forces and the warlord gangs were employed on an unprecedented scale to keep the Marcos fascist clique in power.

Under the Marcos puppet regime, the revolutionary mass movement has risen to new heights. In 1966 repeated mass protests against Philippine involvement in the US war of aggression in Vietnam culminated on October 23 and 24 when the Manila summit attended by the US imperialist chieftain Johnson and the Asian puppet chieftains were dealt powerful blows by a multitude of workers, peasants and students. In 1967 powerful demonstrations condemned the economic enslavement of the people by the US monopolies; the US military bases and the atrocities being committed therein; and the US war of aggression in Vietnam. In 1968 militant demonstrations broke out all over the country against the US-RP negotiations preparing the extension of “national treatment” to US monopolies beyond 1974, against US military bases, against the further Americanization of the University of the Philippines and the entire educational system and against Anglo-American support for “Malaysia.”

The whole year of 1969 was spanned by student and teacher rebellions against the reactionary educational system, by peasant demonstrations in Manila against the landlords and the fascist rule in the countryside and by workers’ strikes supported by student activists. The coming of the US imperialist chieftains Nixon and Agnew on two separate occasions was met by fiercely militant demonstrations. While militant mass actions raged in Manila and other urban centers, revolutionary workers, students and intellectuals went in larger numbers than before to the countryside to conduct rural surveys and mass work among the peasants. The cultural revolution of a new-democratic type advanced rapidly under the leadership of the reestablished Communist Party of the Philippines.

From year to year, despite fascist brutality, the revolutionary mass movement has intensified, increasing in frequency, becoming larger, spreading throughout the province and delivering a clearer revolutionary message among the people. In 1970, unprecedented mass actions involving 50,000 to 100,000

within hours by a nationwide suspension of the writ of habeas corpus. The suspension order was lifted only after the US-Marcos clique was able to get from the reactionary supreme court a decision upholding it. With or without any formal suspension of the writ of habeas corpus, however, an actual state of martial law has been maintained by the US-Marcos clique and its armed minions in extensive areas of the country.

direct participants on each occasion unfolded as a great summation of revolutionary efforts in the past decade and as a striking storm signal for the entire current decade. These started with the January 26 and 30-31 demonstrations of workers, peasants, students and intellectuals. Efforts of the reactionaries to raise the counterrevolutionary slogan of “peaceful revolution” were drowned out by the revolutionary slogan of the masses of “protracted people’s war” in answer to the fascist brutality unleashed against them and also in answer to the repeated threats of the Marcos puppet regime to make a formal declaration of martial law. The First Quarter Storm of 1970⁷ marked the maturation of the cultural revolution spearheaded by the revolutionary youth oriented to Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought and conscious of the people’s democratic revolution. The essence of the cultural revolution clearly emerged as being the propaganda movement for the national-democratic struggle against US imperialism, feudalism, and bureaucrat capitalism.

Confronted with the increasingly fierce opposition of the revolutionary masses, the Marcos puppet regime has harped on formally declaring martial law notwithstanding the fact that it has wantonly practiced fascist terror in both city and countryside, especially so in the latter where uniformed troops and their goon assistants vent their ire on the peasant masses. By resorting to more counterrevolutionary violence, the Marcos puppet regime is enraging the people and is hastening the collapse of the semi-colonial and semi-feudal system.

The Marcos puppet regime can no longer attack the revolutionary masses without being counterattacked. The Communist Party of the Philippines has been reestablished under the powerful inspiration of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought and has taken the road of armed revolution in order to fight for national liberation and people’s democracy. The New People’s Army under the leadership of the Party is vigorously establishing revolutionary bases in the countryside and is advancing from victory to victory in a protracted people’s war. The Communist Party of the Philippines is today applying Chairman Mao’s strategic principle of encircling the cities from the countryside.

At the end of 1969, which marked only less than a year of its existence, the New People’s Army inflicted on the enemy a death casualty which was well more than 150 percent higher than the average annual death casualty of the enemy during the period of 1966-68 when the peasant guerrillas significant-

⁷ The First Quarter Storm of 1970 was a great historical event from which emerged a large number of mass organizations embracing the workers, peasant, youth, women and cultural activists.

ly raised the level of armed resistance from the level of immediately preceding years. From March 29, 1969 to March 29, 1970, the New People's Army wiped out at least 200 enemy troops, spies, local tyrants, and bad elements.⁸

Despite the fact that they have been singled out for attack by the enemy, the Party and the New People's Army have successfully withstood enemy-assaults and have gained greater strength. That is because they are waging a revolutionary armed struggle in defense of the broad masses of the people.

IX. THE REESTABLISHMENT OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF THE PHILIPPINES

The most significant development so far in the Philippine Revolution is the reestablishment of the Communist Party of the Philippines under the supreme guidance of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought. The Party was reestablished on December 26, 1968 after several years of criticism and self-criticism conducted by both old and young proletarian revolutionaries.

Resuming the people's democratic revolution on a new and higher level, the Communist Party of the Philippines was reestablished on the theoretical basis of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought, the acme of proletarian revolutionary ideology in the present era when imperialism is heading for total collapse and socialism is marching toward worldwide victory.

The counterrevolutionary revisionist line of the Lavas and Tarucs which had persisted for more than three decades within the old merger party of the Communist Party and the Socialist Party was thoroughly criticized and repudiated. The Party issued the document of rectification, "Rectify Errors and Rebuild the Party," and promulgated the Program for a People's Democratic Revolution and the new Party Constitution in its Congress of Reestablishment.

Under the leadership of the Communist Party of the Philippines, the people's guerrillas were transformed into the New People's Army on March 29, 1969. In the meeting of Red commanders and fighters, the Taruc-Sumulong gangster clique was repudiated as a counterrevolutionary remnant of the old

⁸ On March 3, 1972, the New People's Army had already wiped out some 800 enemy troops; some 900 informers, landlord despots, and bad elements; and 22 US military officers. It had raided several major enemy camps, including the headquarters of Task Force "Lawin" and the Philippine Military Academy. Also, it had destroyed or seriously damaged six enemy aircraft, including five helicopters, and various types of ground vehicles and communications equipment. In less than three years, the number of fulltime fighting squads had increased eightfold exclusive of the more numerous local part-time guerrillas and people's militia.

bourgeois reactionary gang of the Lavas and Tarucs. The Red commanders and fighters issued a document of rectification, “The New People’s Army,” and promulgated the Rules of the New People’s Army.

Since the reestablishment of the Party and the formation of the New People’s Army, the bourgeois reactionary gang of the Lavas in Manila and the Taruc-Sumulong gangster clique have plunged into new depths of treason. Aggravating its counterrevolutionary line of parliamentary struggle and subservience to US imperialism and the local exploiting classes, the bourgeois reactionary gang of the Lavas has formed the Monkees-Armeng Bayan-Masaka (Lava) gang in flagrant subservience to the fascist policies of the Marcos puppet regime and has committed a number of atrocities to carry out its old line of intrigue against the Communist Party of the Philippines and the New People’s Army.⁹ The Taruc-Sumulong gangster clique, on the other hand, has lost all its old pretensions and has offered to surrender to the Marcos puppet regime on the condition that it would retain its handful of goons and its ill-gotten wealth.¹⁰

The Communist Party of the Philippines today maintains its leadership in the revolutionary armed struggle and in the national united front.¹¹ Since its reestablishment, it has heroically and correctly upheld the great red banner of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought and the leadership of the Filipino proletariat in the Philippine Revolution. US imperialism, feudalism and bureaucrat capitalism can no longer ride roughshod over the Filipino people without being isolated and hit back by an invincible revolutionary mass movement of workers, peasants, students, intellectuals and all other patriots.

⁹ Refer to *Lavaite Propaganda for Revisionism and Fascism* (1971) for an extensive discussion of the erroneous ideas and criminal activities of the Lava revisionist renegades. This book can be treated as a continuation of the document of rectification, “Rectify Errors and Rebuild the Party.” In the *Guide for Cadres and Members of the Communist Party of the Philippines* (1969).

¹⁰ The Taruc-Sumulong gangster clique has disintegrated with the surrender of Faustino del Mundo (“Commander” Sumulong) and the assassination of Pedro Taruc. Taruc and several of his henchmen have been hunted down murdered upon the instigation of Sumulong.

¹¹ The Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Philippines now leads thousands of Party cadres and members and has regional committee leading revolutionary activity in Northern Luzon, Central Luzon, Manila-Rizal, Southern Luzon, Eastern Visayas, Western Visayas and Mindanao. The Party and the New People’s Army now rely on a direct mass base running into several hundreds of thousands of people after three years of hard struggle.

CHAPTER II

BASIC PROBLEMS OF THE FILIPINO PEOPLE

In approaching a problem a Marxist should see the whole as well as the parts. A frog in a well says, “The sky is no bigger than the mouth of the well.” That is untrue, for the sky is not just the size of the mouth of the well. If it said, “A part of the sky is the size of a well,” that would be true, for it tallies with the facts.

—Mao Zedong

I. A SEMI-COLONIAL AND SEMI-FEUDAL SOCIETY

Philippine society today is semi-colonial and semi-feudal. This status is determined by US imperialism, feudalism and bureaucrat capitalism which now ruthlessly exploit the broad masses of the Filipino people. These three historical evils are the basic problems that afflict Philippine society.

The semi-colonial character of Philippine society is principally determined by US imperialism. Though the reactionaries claim that the Philippines is already independent, it is not in fact completely so, as they themselves give contradictory testimony that Philippine independence was merely “granted” or “restored” by US imperialism. The truth is that US imperialism persists in violating the national sovereignty of the Filipino people and in strangulating Philippine independence. Before and after the grant of nominal independence, US imperialism made sure that it would continue to control the Philippine economy, politics, culture, military and foreign relations. It has extorted unequal treaties and one-sided privileges that transgress the national sovereignty, territorial integrity and national patrimony of the Filipino people. US imperialism continues to arrogate unto itself the privilege of giving armed protection to the local exploiting classes. Though there is now the illusion that the present government is self-determining, its basic policies and the election and appointment of its highest officials are mainly determined by US imperialism. The clearest evidence that the Philippines is still a colony of the United States consists of economic enclaves lorded over by US enterprises and also of

huge US military bases. These colonial enclaves can be removed only by means of an armed national revolution to assert Philippine independence.

The semi-feudal character of Philippine society is principally determined by the impingement of US monopoly capitalism on the old feudal mode of production and the subordination of the latter to the former. The concrete result of the intertwining of foreign monopoly capitalism and domestic feudalism is the erosion and dissolution of a natural economy of self-sufficiency in favor of a commodity economy. Being dictated by foreign monopoly capitalism, this commodity economy is used to restrict the growth of a national capitalism and force owner-cultivators and handicraftsmen into bankruptcy. It is used to keep large masses of people in feudal bondage and at the same time create a relative surplus of population, a huge reserve army of labor, that keeps the local labor market cheap. In Philippine agriculture, the old feudal mode of production persists side by side with capitalist farming chiefly for the production of a few export crops needed by the United States and other capitalist countries. As a matter of fact, the old feudal mode of production still covers more extensive areas than capitalist farms. Feudalism has been encouraged and retained by US imperialism to perpetuate the poverty of the broad masses of the people, subjugate the most numerous class, which is the peasantry and manipulate local backwardness for the purpose of having cheap labor and cheap raw materials from the country. It is in this sense that domestic feudalism is the social base of US imperialism. The persistence of landlord exploitation is in turn under the counterrevolutionary protection of US imperialism. An agrarian revolution is needed to destroy the links between US imperialism and feudalism and deprive the former of its social base.

The interactive and symbiotic relationship between US imperialism and feudalism has made Philippine society semi-colonial and semi-feudal. US imperialism has no genuine interest in developing the colonial and agrarian economy to one that is truly independent and self-reliant. It is in the nature of modern imperialism to make possible only uneven and spasmodic development. The US monopoly capitalists are merely interested in making superprofits from the colonial exchange of raw materials from the Philippines and fully processed commodities from the United States, from direct investments that rake in a higher rate of profit from colonies and semi-colonies and from the practice of international usury.

The present reactionary state cannot be expected to solve the basic problems of the Filipino people because it is in the first place a creation and puppet

instrument of US imperialism and feudalism. At every level of the present reactionary state, from the national to the municipal level, are the bureaucrat capitalists who serve as the running dogs of US imperialism and feudalism. Bureaucrat capitalism itself is a distinct evil that afflicts the entire nation. It plays the special role of linking up the interests of the foreign and domestic exploiters and suppressing the determined opposition of the revolutionary masses. It has been built up by US imperialism under its policy of “tutelage for self-government” precisely to function as its puppet administrator.

The bureaucrat capitalists would rather pocket the spoils from their government offices and seek concessions from their foreign and feudal masters than fight for the national and democratic interests of the Filipino people. It is futile and wrong to expect them to change the basic semi-colonial and semi-feudal policies of the reactionary puppet government. What these corrupt government officials usually do is to use counterrevolutionary dual tactics in order to deceive the people and serve the ruling classes better. They will proclaim themselves as “populists,” “nationalists,” “democrats” or even “socialists” and they are even capable of stealing phrases from the revolutionary mass movement. They will even misrepresent their amicable relations with the local revisionist renegades and the Soviet social-imperialists as their credentials for patriotism and progressivism. But they will never hesitate to turn to outright fascists and employ military force to quell the revolutionary masses. They are the caretakers of a reactionary state, an instrument of coercion against the broad masses of the people. Bureaucrat capitalism is the social basis of fascism.

II. US IMPERIALISM

1. The Meaning of Imperialism

The United States decided to seize the Philippines together with other colonial possessions of Spain towards the beginning of the 20th century. American capitalism had already reached what Lenin called the final stage of capitalism, which is monopoly capitalism or imperialism. Free competition had given rise to the concentration of production and capital in the hands of a few. Unless it engaged in imperialist expansion, the American ruling class of monopoly capitalists would not be able to cope even temporarily with the crisis of overproduction. Imperialism is the last way out for the monopoly capitalists to postpone their revolutionary overthrow. It means the extension of the class

oppression and exploitation within the United States into the oppression and exploitation of other nations and peoples abroad through the export of surplus products and surplus capital.

Lenin gave the most precise definition of modern imperialism when he described it as the monopoly stage of capitalism and pointed out five of its basic features: namely, 1) the concentration of production and capital has developed to such a high stage that it has created monopolies which play a decisive role in economic life; 2) the merging of bank capital with industrial capital, and the creation on the basis of this “finance capital,” of a financial oligarchy; 3) the export of capital as distinguished from the export of commodities acquires exceptional importance; 4) the formation of international monopoly capitalist combines which share the world among themselves; and 5) the territorial division of the whole world among the biggest capitalist powers is completed.

The Spanish-American War of 1898 was inevitable as colonial Spain stood in the path of US imperialist expansion. US imperialism had already spread its hegemony over the northern part of South America and all of Central America. It was determined to grab Puerto Rico and Cuba from colonial Spain and monopolize the whole of Latin America as its backyard. US imperialism found it convenient to declare war on a decadent colonial power so as to get the excuse for seizing the Philippines and getting an important stronghold for long-term aggression against China and the whole of Asia. As a newly-risen imperialist power then, the United States found its enemy an easy pushover.

Imperialism means war. Wars of expansion are in themselves profitable big business for the US monopoly capitalists, although in the end these are disastrous for them upon failure. These unjust wars constitute the worst kind of oppression and exploitation for the American people and also for other peoples abroad. The imperialist state pretending to pursue a “manifest destiny” or, in later parlance, defend the “free world,” forces millions of American workers to intensify monopoly production and conscripts them to fight in foreign lands. The imperialist objective is to widen the field for monopoly investments abroad, make possible the disposal of huge amounts of manufactured commodities and seize sources of raw materials. It is to exact a higher rate of profit abroad in colonies and semi-colonies.

Contrary to the idealist view that the United States became a reluctant guardian of the Philippines by some “quirk of fate,” such as the explosion of the Maine that supposedly ignited the Spanish-American War, the American conquest of the Philippines—directed not only against the Spanish colonialists

but also against the Filipino revolutionaries—had long been determined by the internal laws of motion of US capitalism. The imperialist appetite for superprofits brought the US aggressors to the Philippines and to Asia. The expansion of US imperialism was a policy cold-bloodedly decided by the monopoly capitalist interest behind the American state.

It was principally with the use of counterrevolutionary violence and secondarily with deception that US imperialism managed to impose its power on the Filipino people. At first, it insinuated itself into Philippine affairs by pretending to assist the Filipino liberal-bourgeois leadership in fighting Spain. At the next turn, it suppressed the Philippine revolutionary government and the revolutionary masses by military force. Never abandoning its counterrevolutionary dual tactics, it offered negotiations, peace, wealth and a share of power to the bourgeois leadership of the old democratic revolution even while unleashing the full force of its imperialist might to attack the revolutionary masses.

Only after succeeding in its war of aggression was imperialism able to hold the Philippines under its direct colonial rule. During the period of its direct colonial rule, US imperialism took a firm hold of the material base of Philippine society. It saw to it that sugar mills, coconut refineries, cordage shops and mines were established to tie down the country to raw material production for US monopoly firms. It did not develop local manufacturing extensively because it was already able to draw superprofits from direct investments in colonial trade and in a few factories engaged in slight processing of local raw materials and also from the disposition of loan capital and local taxes mainly for public works to facilitate the colonial exchange of raw materials from the Philippines and finished products from the United States. The free trade formalized by the Payne-Aldrich Act of 1909 and the Underwood Tariff Act of 1913 thoroughly made the Philippines dependent on raw material exports and manufactured imports.

US imperialism took a firm hold of the superstructure correspondent to its control of the material mode of production in Philippine society. The political activity of its Filipino puppets was governed by a series of laws it enacted abroad, like the Philippine Bill of 1902, the Jones Law of 1916 and the Tydings-McDuffie Law of 1934. It extended administrative responsibilities to its local underlings in the colonial government only insofar as it had succeeded in training them under its cultural and educational system. It was always alert with its guns to quell any movement genuinely fighting for national indepen-

dence and democracy. In the whole society, it relied on the collaboration of the comprador big bourgeoisie, the landlord class and the bureaucrat capitalists.

By the time that US imperialism considered granting bogus independence to the Philippines during the 1930s, it anticipated the resurgence of the revolutionary mass movement for national independence and democracy in the Philippines. The crisis of imperialism that eventually led to a global war and the rapid spread of Marxism-Leninism as the beacon light for the liberation of all oppressed peoples clearly imperiled the very existence of US imperialism. Thus, it had to make a pretentious pledge of granting independence that only the sovereign Filipino people could actually fight for.

After World War II, it was even more clear to US imperialism to make no delay in granting sham independence to the Philippines. Otherwise, it would risk being buried under the tidal wave of a national liberation movement as was already the case with other colonial powers in other countries. At any rate, though the world capitalist system had weakened as a whole due to the inter-imperialist war, the growing strength of the first socialist state and the prairie fire of national liberation movements, US imperialism emerged as relatively the strongest power among the imperialist powers which had fallen into shambles in the course of World War II. In dealing with the people's demand for independence in the Philippines, therefore, US imperialism could still cleverly employ dual tactics of coercion and chicanery. Besides, it had long gotten the commitment of the bourgeois reactionary gang of the Lavas and Tarucs to support the sham independence it was willing to grant. In that case, it had its saboteurs in the revolutionary mass movement.

2. Bogus Independence and the Unequal Treaties

US imperialism did grant "independence" to the Philippines. But the Philippine Constitution came into full operation without any expressed prohibition against imperialism, colonialism and neocolonialism. On the very day that this bogus independence was granted, the puppet president signed the US-RP Treaty of General Relations which recognized the perpetuation of US property rights and the US military bases in the Philippines. A furious struggle concerning the Bell Trade Act and the Parity Amendment ensued and exploded into a civil war. Not satisfied with what is already a colonial provision in the Philippine puppet constitution allowing 40 percent foreign equity in corporations exploiting natural resources and operating public utilities in the Philippines, US imperialism dictated on the Philippine puppet government the

amendment of the colonial constitution so as to allow US investors to continue controlling such corporations without any restriction of equity. This amendment, known as the Parity Amendment, aggravated what had already been an iniquitous situation where the constitution allows US investors, including other foreigners, to control local businesses and corporations to whatever extent as they please in extensive fields outside the flimsy restrictions made by Article XIII and Section 8 of Article XIV. The constitution thus became a senseless scrap of paper, completely contradicting the principle of national sovereignty and national patrimony it so hypocritically avows. The Parity Amendment was dictated by the Bell Trade Act, which comprehensively laid down the continuance of the economic enslavement of the Filipino people by US imperialism. Aside from imposing the Parity Amendment, the Bell Trade Act extended the period of free trade and spelled out the subordination of the Philippine peso to the US dollar. Until today, there is a set of unequal treaties and arrangements reflecting the undiminished control of the Philippines by US imperialism. These are the shackles on the nation which are known as “special relations.” Let us make a review of them.

a. The Laurel-Langley Agreement (Revised Bell Trade Act), 1954.

This reflects the economic vassalage of the Philippines to US imperialism. It does not only reiterate the Parity Amendment, but it also unconstitutionally extends its meaning to include “parity rights” in all kinds of businesses, including the acquisition and utilization of private agricultural lands. The revised tariff schedule and the quota system still basically encourage the export of raw materials to the United States and the import of finished products from the United States. While in this agreement the United States formally relinquishes control over the Philippine monetary system, the entire Philippine economic reality is such that it is extremely dependent on foreign loans, that the US firms in the Philippines can convert their huge peso earnings into US dollars and that all export-import transactions are in terms of US dollars. Because of the actual colonial control of the economy by US imperialism, the peso sinks the moment that the Central Bank does not have enough US dollars. A mere euphemism in legal verbiage does not change a material fact to its opposite.

b. The US-RP Military Bases Agreement, 1947

Under this agreement, US imperialism retains its control over the entire Philippine territory. The Filipino people are literally in a large prison surround-

ed by strategically located US land, air and naval bases. The US Air Force hovers above them. The US Navy patrols Philippine waters as it pleases. As of 1969, apart from those in transit to or from the Vietnam War, at least 50,000 US troops were reported to be stationed on US military bases. As of now, US imperialism has more than 20 military bases occupying close to 200,000 hectares.¹² On these bases, US military personnel enjoy extraterritorial rights. Off these bases, they are also beyond the jurisdiction of the puppet government by simply claiming to be “on a specific military duty.” The US military can commit crimes against the people and ignore any subpoena from the puppet government. Under the US-RP Military Bases Agreement, the US military bases could even be expanded as US imperialism may deem necessary. At any rate, the present US military bases are large enough and contain enough troops to prove that US imperialism holds the Philippines by armed force. These US military bases are launching grounds for aggression against the Asian peoples. These bases contain nuclear, chemical and bacteriological weapons of genocide.

c. The US-RP Military Assistance Pact, 1947

This unequal treaty further ensures US imperialist control over the Armed Forces of the Philippines (AFP). Through the Joint US Military Advisory Group (JUSMAG), US imperialism extends strategic and staff direction, logistics, training and intelligence coordination to the reactionary Armed Forces of the Philippines. US military advisers exercise direct control over the A.F.P. Most of the military equipment and facilities of the A.F.P. are granted on a loan basis by the JUSMAG. Within the reactionary armed forces, puppetry to US imperialism is thoroughly built in. Under a counterinsurgency program, the reactionary armed forces are continually goaded to attack and abuse the revolutionary masses on behalf of US imperialism and the local exploiting classes. The JUSMAG is actually the mastermind behind the creation of such murder units as the “Monkees,” BSDU, Home Defense Forces, “special forces,” and the like. US military personnel in the JUSMAG are conspicuously present in campaigns of “encirclement and suppression” against the people, the Party and the people’s army.

¹² These are apart from extensive areas occupied by the Voice of America. Radar stations, satellite tracking stations and airfields which are outside of US military bases but are under direct US control.

d. Economic and Technical Cooperation Agreement, 1951

Under this agreement, the US government makes the pretext of extending economic and technical programs of assistance to the Philippine puppet government. US advisers are planted in every strategic branch of the puppet government to direct and influence policies, conduct imperialist propaganda, gather economic and political intelligence and see to it that “aid” results in quick profits for private US firms on foreign loans, grants and peso counterpart funds through huge purchases of US commodities and through excessive payments for US contractors and experts. Agents of the A.I.D. (and its predecessor agencies) have been characteristically agents of US monopolies and even of the US Central Intelligence Agency. Under the A.I.D. Office of Public Safety and its direct local agent, the Police Commission, local police forces are equipped and trained to attack and disperse patriotic mass actions against US imperialism, feudalism and bureaucrat capitalism. The A.I.D. is actually the mastermind behind the creation of “anti-riot squads,” “*rondas*,” and “provincial strike forces” and the like.

e. The US-RP Mutual Defense Pact, 1951

This unequal treaty allows the United States to use its aggressor troops to interfere in the internal affairs of the Philippines under the pretext of securing “peace” and “mutual security.” It is a redundant piece of imperialist document because there are already ample provisions in the basic military treaties on US military bases and military assistance allowing US imperialism to conduct aggression against the Filipino people at its whim. It is nonsensical for some reactionaries to beg US imperialism to include an “automatic retaliation” clause in this treaty. Whenever its own selfish interests face extinction, US imperialism never hesitates to launch aggression against the people as in Vietnam, Laos, Cambodia, Palestine, Thailand, Dominican Republic, Cuba and so many others.

f. The Manila Pact, 1954

This treaty created in Manila the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization (SEATO) for the “regional defense” of Southeast Asia. It includes two puppet governments of US imperialism in Southeast Asia: namely, the Philippines and Thailand. It is dominated by imperialist powers headed by the United States. Under this treaty, US imperialism can bring along the Philippines to its wars

of aggression in Southeast Asia. Conversely, US imperialism can bring along other puppet governments to conduct subversion and aggression against the Filipino people. It has been proven in the Korean War and in the Vietnam War that with or without direct reference to a specific regional defense treaty, US imperialism can easily command the Philippine reactionary to dispatch Filipino mercenary troops abroad.

g. The Agricultural Commodities Agreements

These are governed by US Public Law 480, otherwise known as Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act. Through these agreements, the United States disposes of its surplus agricultural products by dumping them on the Philippines. These are utilized to keep under control certain “intermediate” industries like flour and textile mills which depend on imported raw materials. These are also used to manipulate local agricultural production to serve the policies of US imperialism. The proceeds from the sale of these agricultural products have been used to support propaganda campaigns and educational exchange programs administered by the US Embassy in Manila. Previously, the sale of US war surplus materials had in the main supported these programs to poison the thinking of key elements among the Filipino intelligentsia .

h. Agreements Pertaining to Culture and Education

US governmental agencies like the A.I.D., the US Educational Board, the Peace Corps and foundations like Asia Foundation, Rockefeller Foundation and Ford Foundation have a decisive say in the cultural and educational system. Exchange programs for various sectors and travel, study and research grants are used to glorify the “American way of life” and propagate anti-national and anti-democratic ideas. The special educational fund drawn from the remaining war damage payments has been set aside to reinforce US imperialist control over the Philippine educational system. In extending certain loans to the University of the Philippines, the World Bank has been used by US imperialism to help keep pro-imperialist educational policies.¹³ Such a sinister agency as the CIA directly or through “cover” institutions recruits Filipino agents in

¹³ The World Bank is bent on aggravating foreign indebtedness of the Philippines through “educational loans” and using these loans to ensure US control of the Philippine educational system. Together with US foundations and agencies, it has masterminded the Presidential Commission to Survey Philippine Education (PCSPE) in order to reorganize state universities and colleges and make Philippine educational policies, programs and projects conform to imperialist demands.

the educational system and mass media. Cultural and educational institutions are being increasingly used for intelligence and counterinsurgency research. Since US monopoly firms are the biggest advertisers, they are in a position to dictate on the local mass media and to influence the political thinking of a great number of people. Reading materials, the radio and such audio-visual entertainment as Hollywood and TV films are systematically used to corrode the patriotic and progressive spirit of the people. Certain reformist and religious organizations are also subsidized by various imperialist institutions to spread ideological confusion. New and old sinister arrangements are too many and diverse for us to exhaustively relate here.

All US expenditures in connection with the above unequal treaties and arrangements are categorized as “aid” to the Philippine puppet government. In one accounting, it is claimed that US imperialism extended “aid” to the tune of \$1.9 billion during the period of 1946-67. This “aid” is supposed to comprise military assistance, non-military loans, war damage rehabilitation, and such loans and grants that include US expenditures for the Peace Corps and fellowship grants.

Military assistance amounted to \$512.4 million and it included the proceeds in the disposal of World War II and Korean War military surplus, the cost in the lease of military equipment, compensation for US military advisers and Filipino mercenaries in the Korean War and the Vietnam War, support for the suppression of the revolutionary mass movement and further training of the A.F.P. in defending US imperialist, comprador, feudal and bureaucrat interests. The non-military loans amounted to \$375.5 million and were used mainly for US propaganda activities under the “Food for Peace” program and the A.I.D. (and its predecessor agencies) and for supporting the dollar reserves of the Central Bank under the Export-Import Bank. War damage rehabilitation amounted to \$473 million and was extended mainly to US firms, religious organizations, the bureaucrat capitalists and the local exploiting classes. The other loans and grants amounted to \$352.2 million and were used mainly for supporting US advisers and missions, for training a few Filipinos in puppetry through fellowship grants, for conducting a wide range of counterinsurgency activities under the guise of economic and technical assistance and services for agricultural development, for supporting the Peace Corps and for purchasing US commodities at an overprice through the A.I.D. and other US organizations. Even the propaganda activities of the US Information Agency and the Voice of America are considered “aid.”

The operations of the A.I.D. and its predecessor agencies expose the utter chicanery in American “aid.” During the period of 1951-68, the A.I.D. and its predecessor agencies made a grant of \$54.1 million to the Philippine reactionary government. The latter was required to put up a peso counterpart fund amounting to almost P500 million during the same period. The American advisers and experts dictated the use not only of their meager dollar grant but also of the huge peso counterpart fund. They overpriced the commodities that they ordered exclusively from the United States, overcompensated themselves for their services as US propagandists and sales agents, gathered important data from the country, influenced further the local bureaucracy to stick to its puppetry, trained key police officers and agencies in counterinsurgency¹⁴ and publicized the lie that the US government is altruistic.

In the Philippines, Spanish colony or semi-colony dominated by US imperialism, there is the “country team” that coordinates and oversees the various agencies of US imperialism. It is composed of the US ambassador as head and the CIA chief of station, USIA director, USAID director and the JUSMAG chief as members.

In addition to its direct agencies, US imperialism manipulates various agencies of the United Nations, regional arrangements and Philippine bilateral arrangements with third countries. These supplement the direct agencies of US imperialism in subverting the national-democratic interests of the Filipino people.

3. US Monopoly Control of the Philippines

In an uneven and spasmodic way, US surplus capital has been invested in the Philippine economy. At present the US monopolies and their local subsidiaries own or control such businesses involving petroleum,¹⁵ tire and rubber, drugs, fertilizers, chemicals, mining, heavy equipment, marketing, transport facilities and others. The majority of the biggest corporations in the Philippines today are American. They control at least 50 percent of the total business assets in the country. The book value of these US private assets is at least \$2.0 bil-

¹⁴ All police agencies, including the Philippine Constabulary, have been made to follow the 1967 Walton Report of the AID Office of Public Safety.

¹⁵ This refers to refining and marketing of petroleum products. After several decades of claiming that there are no oil deposits in the Philippines, US oil companies now dominate the field of oil exploration and plan to open the oil deposits for their own benefit.

lion, according to available sources in 1969.¹⁶ The market value is several times higher. These assets represent at least 60 percent of the total US private investments in Southeast Asia. Of the total foreign private investments in the Philippines, US investments constitute 80 percent. The volume and value of US investments in the Philippines are even greater today than during the period of direct US colonial rule when US private investments reached the level of P537 million or \$268.5 million (based on Bureau of Census and Statistics figures).

The magnitude of US investments is not the only thing that weighs down heavily on the Filipino people. It is also their strategic position. For instance, petroleum (supplied by Esso, Caltex, Mobil, Filoil and Getty Oil)¹⁷ is overwhelmingly under the control of the US oil monopolies. By this commodity alone, US monopoly capitalism controls every other commodity transported or processed in the Philippines. The US oil monopolies supply more than 90 percent of the country's energy requirements. Tire production, trade in construction materials, import-export, and the wholesale trade are also controlled by foreign firms, chiefly American. They control bulk sales to end-consumers like big utility plants. Though US capitalists appear to have withdrawn from the field of public utilities, they sold a great portion of their shares in the Meralco (electricity) and P.L.D.T. (telephone) only after burdening these firms with US loans and after securing guarantees from government financing institutions. These enterprises remain as sources of huge interest payments and are increasingly subject to being retaken over through bonds floated in Wall Street.

The US imperialists own the largest commercial banks, insurance companies and other financing institutions. They therefore control the Philippine banking system. They grab the domestic savings of the people and utilize these to support US enterprises here. In this regard, an oft-cited case of Yankee cleverness is the original capitalization of the Philippine-American Life Insurance Company at less than a million pesos and its rapid growth into a billion-peso corporation in a matter of two decades after the last war. US firms secure credit

¹⁶ According to a study made under the National Economic Council, the book value of US assets in 1965 was at least \$1.15 billion with the top 108 US firms owning \$807 million. Self-serving estimates of the US embassy placed US assets at \$1.0 billion in 1968. Only 170 firms with US equity of 40 percent or more and with investments of \$1.0 million or more were considered. These firms supposedly accounted for an estimate of over \$900 million. The estimates were grossly inadequate because the basis for estimating the value of land and other real estate properties may be the price at the time of acquisition a number of decades ago. The repeated devaluation of the peso was not also uniformly or fully taken into account.

¹⁷ Shell is British-owned.

not only from local US banks but also from Philippine-owned banks. Another flagrant case of Yankee rapaciousness can be seen in gold production. For a long period of time under the Gold Subsidy Law, the Central Bank bought gold from Benguet Consolidated and other US mining companies at \$57 to \$67 per ounce, that is to say, \$22 to \$32 above what was then the world price of \$35 per ounce.

During the period of 1960 to the middle of 1969, foreign investors (principally American) borrowed P13.5 billion from local credit sources. For the period of 1962-68, US firms alone were able to borrow P8.0 billion in clear pursuit of old imperialist practice and also in clear application of the US policy of exhausting local credit sources in colonies and semi-colonies so as to help ease the US balance of payments crisis. A study of 108 US firms supposedly accounting for 70 percent of US investments in the Philippines, reveals that 84 percent of their capital and operational funds came from Philippine sources and only 16 percent (including reinvested profits made in the Philippines) came from the United States in the period of 1956-65. During the same period, these 108 US firms remitted home more than \$386 million, close to seven times the actual total of new investments (\$58.5million) that they brought into the Philippines. The increase in paid-up capital of these firms was only \$28 million from a base of \$74 million in 1956 to a new level of \$102.5 million in 1965 while their remitted superprofits was more than 1,300 percent of such measly increase in paid-up capital.

Central Bank statistics show that during the period of 1960-69, foreign investors, mostly American, brought in \$160 million in the form of new capital investments and brought out at least \$482 million in the form of capital withdrawals and profit remittances. Huge profit remittances by US firms are not a new development. When in the fifties there were foreign exchange controls and US firms were encouraged to plow back their profits into the local economy, they invested the paltry amount of \$19.2 million only to remit \$215.1 million. US statistics easily admit that the rate of profit from US investments in the Philippines is more than 25 percent higher than the average rate of profit from US overseas investments in general.¹⁸

The profit remittances of US firms were officially reported by the Philippine reactionary government as reaching tens of millions of dollars annually during the sixties, specifically an average annual rate of a little over \$40

¹⁸ The US embassy has admitted recently that US investors take out three dollars from the Philippines for every dollar that they put in. This is, of course, a deflated figure.

million. Nevertheless, there were unidentifiable transactions in Central Bank records amounting to several hundreds of millions of dollars every year, ostensibly for the payment of imports, travel abroad, and several other transactions involving the disbursement of foreign exchange. According to estimates made by the Economic Monitor, the US firms holding \$500 million investments in the Philippines made remittances amounting to \$2.2 billion from 1962 to 1969 or an annual average of \$316 million. On top of this, dollar payments for miscellaneous invisibles totaled \$2.7 billion or an annual average of \$304 million. The Americans for Peace in Indochina, an association of Americans in the Philippines opposed to the US war of aggression, claims that in 1969 alone, US investors remitted \$3.0 billion from the Philippines.

A clever method of profit remittance by overseas US firms is the purchase of commodities and services from their mother or sister companies in the United States at an overprice. US firms engaged in export and re-export business in the Philippines underprice their goods only to get the real prices and the real profits abroad. A variation of this involves the export by US mining companies of copper concentrates and iron ores with substantial gold, silver, nickel and other components which are not fully accounted for in the country.

Because of the colonial and agrarian character of its economy the Philippines is highly dependent on a colonial pattern of trade that is to say, the exchange of local raw materials and foreign finished products, especially American. In a vicious cycle, the colonial pattern of trade which has been developed for a long period of time by US imperialism through preferential trade and the quota system has in turn served to perpetuate the colonial and agrarian character of the Philippine economy. At first glance, it looks as if free trade has been favorable to the Philippines, but on an examination of the accounts it is clear that only the US imperialists and the comprador-landlord cliques in the Philippines have been favored. At the height of free trade under the Bell Trade Act from 1946 to 1954, the United States exported to the Philippines \$2.0 billion worth of goods duty-free and the latter exported to the former only \$889 million worth of goods duty-free.

By the nature of its exports the bulk of which comprises sugar, logs, lumber, coconut products, abaca, tobacco and unprocessed minerals, the Philippines cannot earn enough US dollars to pay for the importation of foreign manufactures coming principally from the United States which command higher prices. As of 1968, only 8.3 percent of Philippine exports could be categorized as manufactured goods. The Philippine economy is so uneven and lopsided that

it has to import even such agricultural products as poultry and dairy products, cereals and cereal preparations, which are still in the bracket of the ten top imports. In the world capitalist market, the foreign monopolies consistently jack up the price of their manufactures and other products and force down the price of raw materials that they purchase from the colonies and semi-colonies like the Philippines. The result is chronic deficit in the foreign trade of the Philippines. The annual foreign trade deficit rose from \$147.1 million in 1955 to \$249.7 million in 1967 and to \$301.9 million in 1968. The rapid rate of increase in deficit is due to the effects of US imperialism and all other imperialist powers to squeeze out more profits from their foreign trade as a measure of facing up to their own balance-of-payments problem. They are now viciously trying to pass on the burden of their general crisis to their colonies and semi-colonies by stepping up their own exports, by exporting inflation, by forcing weaker countries to devalue their currencies and by practicing usury.

The economy has no capital-goods industry and the structure of local manufacturing has not changed at all.¹⁹ As of 1968, 75.5 percent of manufacturing output went into non-durables like food, beverages, cigarettes and cigars, textiles, footwear, paper, rubber, chemicals and the like. 24 3/10 percent went into the manufacture of such durables as furniture and fixtures and mere reassembly of machinery, metal products, appliances, motor vehicles and the like.

It is bandied about that during the last two years, the Philippine reactionary government made heavy dollar expenditures because it imported mainly machinery, transport equipment, fuel and raw materials for domestic processing. What is falsely implied is that the Philippines is rapidly industrializing. This is a big lie because these imports have been mainly for public works projects, construction of office buildings and sugar mills, mineral extraction, spare parts, motor vehicle and home appliance reassembly and other such so-called intermediate industries as textile, flour and steel mills that rely on imported yarn, wheat and steel sheets.

Maintaining the colonial economy in an artificial way, the Philippine reactionary government has incurred an internal debt of at least P6.0 billion and an

¹⁹ In recent years, the Iligan Integrated Steel Mills, Inc. (IISMI) has been referred to by the reactionaries as proof that US imperialism does not prevent industrialization. The clamor for steel mills was made for decades. But when the IISMI was finally put up, the imperialists overloaded it with loans (more than \$200 million) and turned it into a milking cow for huge interest payments; charged high fees for consultantships, engineering services and management contracts; and overpriced the equipment installed. Before IISMI could produce steel of any kind, limits on production and marketing were imposed on it by its creditors.

external debt of \$1.9 billion (as of June 1970)²⁰ mostly from US banks at high interest and on a short-term basis. These debts have resulted in a steep inflation and devaluation. As a semi-colony, the Philippines cannot continue to operate without an adequate supply of US dollars. And yet, as it tries to acquire such, it is bogged deeper in colonial exploitation and crisis. Because of the chronically inadequate dollar earnings of Philippine raw materials, the reactionary government has to beg the US monopoly banks and the international financial institutions under US control for more loans at increasingly onerous terms. The Philippines is mortgaged and auctioned off so easily. The critical point has been reached in foreign borrowings so much so that devaluation has been repeatedly imposed on the peso currency and the reactionary government has already become hysterical even only on the matter of “restructuring” its old debts. But it must still get new loans on more onerous terms in order to be able to import the finished goods which its colonial economy does not produce. The Marcos puppet clique is bent on increasing the foreign debts of the Philippines by asking for the authority to borrow another \$1.5 billion within the next four years.

4. The Scheme to Prolong US Domination

In the last 10 years, the crisis in the Philippine economy has rapidly worsened. This has been the result of the vicious maneuvers of US imperialism to shift the burden of its economic crisis at home to its colonies and semi-colonies and also to prepare for the termination of the Laurel-Langley Agreement and the Parity Amendment. The scheme of US imperialism is to put the Philippines into such a desperate financial situation as to ensure the prolongation of imperialist privileges. At the same time, all-out military and police preparations and actual operations are conducted to counteract the revolutionary mass movement inflamed by the economic crisis. Counterrevolutionary reformist campaigns are also waged to sow confusion in the ranks of the revolutionary masses.

As a result of the full and immediate decontrol of foreign exchange at the start of the Macapagal puppet regime, US business firms remitted profits heavily and the comprador-landlords used their dollar earnings as they pleased. The

²⁰ Of the total foreign debt of \$2.134 billion as of February 1972, borrowings from the United States and Japan accounted for about 66 percent, with the former accounting for about 45 percent and the latter for 21 percent. In addition, US-controlled banks like the World Bank, International Monetary Fund and the Asian Development Bank also accounted for a total of 12.5 percent, with the World Bank alone accounting for a little over one half of this.

dollar reserves of the reactionary government were depleted and the peso sank in value from P2.00 to P3.90 per US dollar in the absence of sufficient dollars to support it. To maintain the peso at its new level, the Philippine reactionary government was extended “stabilization” loans at onerous terms. But these loans were mainly sucked up by US firms and their comprador-landlord and bureaucrat allies. The puppet chieftain Macapagal promoted the “open-door” policy on foreign investments and the idea of “joint ventures” and allowed US subsidiaries to grab the foreign loans in remitting profits, building up their local assets, taking over Filipino enterprises or overloading them with foreign loans in preparation for being taken over and the like.

During the first four years of the Marcos puppet regime, US imperialism went high on aggravating the puppet policies of the Macapagal regime. The Marcos puppet regime was even more efficient in implementing the recommendations made by the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank as early as 1960. It was able to increase taxes, ostensibly of those with the ability to pay, who in turn shifted the tax burden to the broad masses of the people in the form of steeply rising prices. The Marcos puppet regime profligately made expenditures on public works and other inflationary projects. The US subsidiaries and the comprador-landlords were extended the biggest government loans and guarantees. There was a splurge on luxuries, a buildup of sugar mills, mining projects and mining speculation. The bureaucrat capitalists exacted the most stupendous amounts of kickbacks on import-export contracts, especially in contracts with foreign machinery and construction firms.

At the beginning of 1970, it was clear that the Marcos puppet regime had succeeded in making the Philippines more bankrupt than ever before, with a big internal and external debt. The peso sank to another low level, at more than P6.00 per US dollar. In only eight years, the peso suffered a devaluation of more than 200 percent in relation to the US dollar. The International Monetary Fund, functioning as the agency of US imperialism, dictated the devaluation of the peso as a precondition for the rescheduling of loan payments and also for the granting of new loans by US imperialism. The automatic result of the peso devaluation was the increase in the price of all commodities and the increase in value of all foreign debts.

In February 1970, the peso value of the \$1.5 billion foreign debt rose from P5.85 billion to at least P9.3 billion (at the unsettled rate of P6.20 per US dollar) excluding interest, which also rose. In June, only five months after, the foreign debts reached \$1.9 billion or at least P11.78 billion excluding interest.

Annual interest payments alone on these debts consumed half of the dollar earnings on Philippine raw material exports. In this process, US imperialism is the worst usurer in the whole world. The Philippines does not stop begging for foreign loans from US imperialism because it has to import many vital commodities which its colonial economy does not produce and because it has to service previous foreign debts. The rapid increase in the value of such foreign loans can only concretely mean ever cheaper raw materials and cheaper local labor for US imperialism and an ever higher cost of importing finished products from the United States and other imperialist countries. The working people are today suffering from the higher prices of commodities; their real income has gone down and no adequate adjustment has been made by the puppet government. The daily minimum wage has been re-fixed at P8.00 for industrial workers, a mere increase of 33 percent, yet the devaluation is at least 60 percent and continues to cut down real wages in a rapid way.

A puppet government that is bankrupt cannot be expected to undertake the expropriation of US assets with US dollars. It is both politically and economically impossible for that puppet government to do so. The repeated devaluation of the peso has increased the value of these alien assets and has favored their buildup in so many related ways. As a matter of fact, the US monopolies have deliberately increased their assets in the Philippines from \$440 million in 1962²¹ to at least \$2.0 billion (book value) in 1969. They did so by bringing in only a small amount of direct investments and by borrowing heavily from local credit sources. They sucked up the very same laws that they had extended to the Philippine puppet government at onerous terms. The rapid buildup of US interests, inside and outside the areas of “parity rights” is obviously calculated to effect a firmer internal US political and economic control of the Philippines. It is to prepare for the termination of the Laurel-Langley Agreement and the Parity Amendment and to nullify any notion that US assets could be bought out within the framework of reactionary laws.

In the light of the financial bankruptcy of the reactionary government and the severe impoverishment of the Filipino people, it is clearly counterrevolutionary to advocate the “peaceful nationalization” of the economy or to hope that the mere formal termination of the Laurel-Langley Agreement and the Parity Amendment would automatically inaugurate economic independence. Besides, the majority of US investments (more than 50 percent are now out-

²¹ The figure [a guesstimate] comes from the Foreign Information Service, First National City Bank of New York, “The Philippines: Return to a Free Market Economy” [Pamphlet, January 1963] pp. 5-6.

side the areas of “parity rights” and are therefore legally allowed to stick in business entities where US investors can own and control more than 40 percent.

In order to promote the acceptance of US investments in the Philippines, US imperialism is actually subsidizing counterrevolutionary organizations and movements spouting such nonsense as “peaceful revolution,” “constitutional reform,” “due process,” “just compensation,” “profit-sharing,” “joint ventures,” “hospitality to foreign guests” and other such hogwash. These counterrevolutionary slogans are all intended to slur over the viciousness of US monopoly capital and to head off the revolutionary mass movement clamoring for people’s war against US imperialism and all its local lackeys.

Not even the national bourgeoisie can hope to increase its share in the exploitation of the Filipino people. This social stratum is daily facing bankruptcy. The few commodities that it produces locally cannot escape the rising cost of importing fuel, equipment, spare parts, raw materials and the like. The local sources of credit have practically dried up for the national bourgeoisie. More than this local stratum, the Japanese militarists and the Soviet social-imperialists have the better chance of joining up or competing with US imperialism in the exploitation of the people.

The Investment Incentives Law was enacted to pave the way for the continuance and aggravation of US economic control over the Philippines after the termination of the Laurel-Langley Agreement and the Parity Amendment. The Constitutional Convention now being played up by the counterrevolutionaries as a channel for “change” in Philippine society is actually a step towards allowing the US monopolies to own more than 40 percent equity beyond 1974, even in the utilization of public lands, exploitation of natural resources and the operation of public utilities. As certain as dominance of comprador and landlord delegates in the Constitutional Convention, the accommodation of the Investment Incentives Law and an unequal treaty of friendship, commerce and navigation with the United States will be carried out by the most significant amendments in the colonial constitution.

The Investment Incentives Law empowers the Board of Investments, a mere agency of the puppet president, to allow US-dominated enterprises to persist or be set up in the Philippines even without limiting their equity capital to a maximum of 40 percent in corporations as per requirements of the present constitution. Section 19, Paragraph 3 of the investments law allows foreign investors to own even 100 percent equity in local corporations provided that they merely signify their intention of selling shares of stock to Filipinos or

“Philippine nationals” within 10 years from the date of registration of such corporations. On the eleventh year, these corporations are supposed to actually offer for sale shares of stock in the stock exchange. But if Filipinos and “Philippine nationals” fail to buy enough shares to reduce direct foreign equity to 40 percent, so much the better for the foreign investors because they would be permitted to continue owning equity beyond 40 percent for 20 years from the date of registration of the corporations. After one period of 20 years, these corporations may again be permitted to stay under unlimited US ownership and control for another period of 20 years.

The Investment Incentives Law sanctifies the “Philippine national,” a corporation with a maximum of 40 percent foreign equity in its capital structure. Thus, there is so much talk nowadays about giving “national treatment” to US investments among the puppet politicians. The outlandish definition of “Philippine national” is calculated to allow the US monopolies to hold more than 40 percent equity even in local corporations where they are restricted to a maximum limit of 40 percent equity. For an illustration, let us have corporations A and B. If corporation A bears 40 percent foreign equity and qualifies as a “Philippine national,” it can acquire and hold 60 percent equity in corporation B side by side with 40 percent equity directly headed by foreign investors. In such an interlocking relationship, corporation A actually effects 64 percent foreign equity in corporation B, if one were to do away with legal blinders. In turn, corporation B will certainly have an impact on corporation A in favor of foreign control.

It is already sufficient for the US monopolies to own and control 40 percent equity in order to control an entire corporation internally. This is easily effected by keeping solid 40 percent equity in the hands of foreign investors and keeping diffused through the stock market the 60 percent among Filipino petty shareholders. It is an old trick of monopoly capitalists to use a small but solid block of shares to control a big mass of small shareholders. It is in line with this imperialist trick that there is a huge campaign for “profit-sharing” (an obscurantist term for stock manipulation) to mislead some wage-earners and petit-bourgeois elements to surrender their meager savings and future earnings to the exploiters or allow the US monopolies and the local reactionaries to rob the Social Security System (SSS), the Government Service Insurance System (GSIS), the Development Bank of the Philippines (DBP) and the Philippine National Bank (PNB). The US imperialists, rapacious as they are, wish to have

more levers for retaining their political and economic power over the Philippines.

There are other ways by which the US monopolies could continue controlling and enjoying ownership of more than 40 percent of the capital in a corporation and also more than 40 percent of the profits even after the termination of the Laurel-Langley Agreement and the Parity Amendment. These were obsequiously explained by the Philippine panel to the American panel in the negotiations on the Laurel-Langley Agreement. The US monopolies could hold non-voting shares and bonds in corporations, exercise credit control, impose management contracts, manipulate purchase agreements and technical assistance contracts and so many others that reactionary power permits. Moreover, the Braderman-Virata negotiations have sought to perpetuate “parity rights” by simply replacing the term with a new one, “national treatment,” in the treaty of friendship, commerce and navigation now being cooked up. In the communique issued by the negotiators, it is evident that the US imperialists and their local running dogs are willing to remove US “parity rights” only from the field of retail trade.

The Investment Incentives Law worsens the economic enslavement of the Filipino people and sells off every semblance of Philippine sovereignty to US imperialism. The puppet state is bound by this law never to expropriate or requisition foreign assets. It is also bound to provide US dollars to foreign investors for the repatriation of investment, remittance of earnings and payment of all foreign loans and contractual obligations. In addition to these basic privileges, the US investors through their corporations registered with the Board of Investments enjoy such “incentives” as capital-gains tax exemption, tax allowance, tax exemption on sale of stock dividends, deduction of organizational and pre-operating expenses, accelerated depreciation, net operating loss carryover, tax credit, tax exemption on imported capital equipment, employment of foreign nationals, deduction for expansion reinvestment, protection from government competition, preference in grant of government loans, absorption of G.S.I.S. and S.S.S. funds and special export incentives.

The Investment Incentives Law has set a pattern of legislation intended to perpetuate US ownership and control of local firms to the extent of 100 percent. The Export Incentives Law allows foreign equity up to 55 percent in export industries and up to 100 percent in pioneer industries engaged in export.

Following the dictates of their US imperialist masters, the reactionaries have also taken to creating free trade zones, like the Mariveles Free Trade Zone, to let the US monopolies have permanent economic enclaves where they are beyond the tax laws of the Philippine puppet government.

US imperialism is using both peaceful and violent methods of suppressing the Filipino people's clamor for national liberation and democracy. The CIA and other subversive agencies of US imperialism are subsidizing and manipulating various branches of the puppet government, "civic" and "reform" organizations, educational and cultural institutions and the reactionary mass media to wage a propaganda campaign designed to whip up a "climate for foreign investments" and an atmosphere of anti-communist hysteria. At the same time, all-out violent efforts are being exerted to "nip in the bud" the Communist Party of the Philippines and the New People's Army, meaning to say, the broad masses of the people who have risen to shake off their colonial shackles. Increased military supplies and training in counterinsurgency techniques are being extended to local police forces through the A.I.D. Office of Public Safety and to the reactionary armed forces through the JUSMAG. So many fascist crimes are being committed in the name of anticommunism against the people. The Marcos fascist puppet regime daily promotes the rise of fascism in an attempt to cow the people.

Whenever a dastardly crime is committed by US military personnel and there are widespread demands for justice which find their way even into the reactionary press, the puppet government goes through the motion of asking the US Embassy for renegotiations on the US-RP Military Bases Agreement. When the din dies down, talk of having renegotiations also dies down. What is made to prevail is the treacherous idea that the foreign military bases provide a dollar income for the puppet government. A measly annual income of about \$130 million to \$150 million from the US military bases for the puppet government and vice lords is clearly not enough to pay for the transgression of Philippine sovereignty and territorial integrity and also the actual economic deprivation and sabotage resulting from the occupation of potential agricultural and mineral lands and the wanton smuggling of US goods through the US military bases.

Whenever US imperialism wages a war of aggression against another country, the Philippine puppet government never hesitates to call for or join a war council under the direction of US imperialism. The necessity for US imperialism to hold on to its military bases in the Philippines becomes more clear.

These military bases are the ultimate guarantee for the protection of its foreign investments in the Philippines and also for launching wars of aggression in Asia. Despite all talks of US “withdrawal” from Asia, US imperialism repeatedly insists that it will remain a “Pacific power”. Sham talk of “withdrawal” is only intended to give Filipino running dogs an occasion to beg US imperialism to stay. Whenever the demand for US withdrawal is raised by the broad masses of the people, the local diehard reactionaries say that it is untimely to “renegotiate” treaties when the Philippines is suffering from an economic crisis and is begging for foreign loans.

Being fast isolated as the Number One enemy of the world’s peoples and the Filipino people, US imperialism is desperately trying to dissimulate its role as the principal oppressor and exploiter. As before, it wants to make the Philippine government appear to be begging of its own volition for investments not only from the United States but also from so-called international financial institutions and consortiums²² and such imperialist countries as Japan and the Soviet Union, among others. In imposing its imperialist policies on the Philippine puppet government, the United States does not only make use of the A.I.D. and its other direct agencies but also the International Monetary Fund, the World Bank, the Asian Development Bank, international consortiums, various agencies of the United Nations and “regional” organizations. But when an internal analysis is made of the accounts, it is US imperialism that inevitably comes out as the principal bloodsucker.

Aggravating the old bilateral and multilateral treaties and agreements shackling the Philippines, US imperialism encourages the Philippine puppet government to promote such new “regional” arrangements as the Asian Pacific Council (ASPAC), the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN), Southeast Asian Ministers’ Economic Council (SEAMEC) and others. These are ballyhooed as regional organizations independent of US imperialism, but are clearly composed of the puppet government bound to US imperialism in so many ways. Efforts of US imperialism to hide behind such farcical organizations are being intensified under the “Nixon Doctrine” of “making Asians fight Asians.” But US imperialism can never conceal its aggressive nature; it will always keep and use its military personnel abroad as much as it can.

At any rate, US imperialism is rapidly reviving Japanese militarism to serve as its principal Asian instrument and is accommodating it in the Philippines. It

²² The World Bank sponsored in October 1970 the establishment of an international “consultative group” to further bind the Philippines financially.

has the pipe dream of retaining Japan as its fugleman in Asia. In line with the wishes of US imperialism, the Marcos puppet regime has been maneuvering to have the unequal Japan-R.P. Treaty of Amity, Commerce and Navigation ratified. Even without this treaty, Japan is being allowed to participate in the plunder of Philippine mineral, marine, forest and agricultural resources. It is being allowed to make investments and dump its goods in the Philippine market. It now ranks second only to the United States in investments and control of Philippine foreign trade.²³ The reactionaries wish to give Japan the special privilege of moving as it pleases its fishing fleets as well as its naval vessels in Philippine territorial waters.

US imperialism is also calculatingly compelling the Philippines to open diplomatic and trade relations with Soviet social-imperialism. Under the guise of being able to extend loans, especially in the form of capital goods, Soviet social-imperialism is trying to get a share of raw material products from the Philippines, dispose of its shoddy commodities in the Philippine market and impose usury. Like Japan, Soviet social-imperialism is being maneuvered by US imperialism to overextend itself in the defense of the world capitalist system and share in the responsibility of maintaining reactionary governments that are basically puppets to US imperialism.

US imperialism is specifically interested in allowing Soviet social-imperialism to help the local revisionist renegades sabotage the revolutionary mass movement and help the reactionary government foster the illusion that there is democracy. Eager to benefit from the accommodation being granted by US imperialism, the Lava revisionist renegades, the Philippine agents of Soviet social-imperialism, have on many occasions fed to the reactionary armed forces information against the Communist Party of the Philippines, the New People's Army and the broad masses of the people. They have conducted slander campaigns and bloody forms of intrigue against the people.

The strategic alliance of US imperialism, Japanese militarism and Soviet social-imperialism into which the Philippine puppet government has been

²³ Japanese direct investments have risen by leaps and bounds, especially since 1970. Though Philippine official records show that Japanese have invested a mere \$15 million, Japanese publications claim that Japanese direct investments have already reached \$450 million. Japan has also loaned out a total of \$438 million to the private sector and to the Philippine government as of September 1971. The large extent of the Japanese economic invasion is exceedingly conspicuous in the field of foreign trade. In 1970, Japan even dislodged the United States as the "No. 1 trade partner" of the Philippines. In 1971, the latter regained the No. 1 position with the former running a close second. Together, they control at least 75 percent of Philippine foreign trade.

drawn is basically directed against the people, revolution, communism and China. In this arrangement, US imperialism makes use of Japanese militarism to keep in check Soviet social-imperialism and Soviet social-imperialism to keep in check Japanese militarism. While they ally themselves against their common enemies, they cannot but contend among themselves as imperialist powers for the re-division of the world. This is a self-defeating arrangement.

Though US imperialism is relatively strong in the Philippines, it has actually become weak on a world scale. It can no longer postpone its collapse. This is now the era of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought, when imperialism is heading for total collapse and socialism is marching toward world victory.

Unlike in the last two world wars when it could take advantage of the disaster of other imperialist powers, US imperialism now finds itself being pushed to its own total disaster by the worldwide anti-imperialist struggle. By overextending itself throughout the world in order to oppress the people, US imperialism is now being struck hard by more and more people and in more and more places than it can cope with. People's wars are raging all over the world, especially in Asia, Africa and Latin America. At this stage, when so many oppressed peoples have risen up to make revolution the main trend, US imperialism is rapidly heading for total collapse. If it were to launch a world war, it would only hasten its own destruction. If it did not, it still would have no chance of winning its wars of aggression as those against the peoples of Vietnam, Cambodia, Laos and other countries. In the homeland of US imperialism, the white and black proletariat are intensifying their revolutionary struggle against the bellicose impositions of the big bourgeoisie. US imperialism makes alliances with other imperialist powers but the latter never fails to take advantage of its plight. Though it appears to be a huge monster, US imperialism is in essence a paper tiger in the throes of its deathbed struggle.

While US imperialism and its allies are heading for disaster, the Chinese and Albanian peoples are consolidating socialism and ensuring a powerful rear base for the worldwide anti-imperialist struggle. The international united front is ever expanding to isolate counterrevolutionary diehards. All oppressed peoples can look forward to a bright future as they arm themselves with the same basic weapons with which the Chinese and Albanian peoples have achieved their glorious victories. The Philippine Revolution is today illumined by the great universal truth of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought. The Communist Party of the Philippines, the revolutionary party of the Filipino prole-

tariat, has become reestablished on a correct theoretical basis to lead the people to victory.

III. FEUDALISM

1. The Meaning of Feudalism

On reaching the stage of imperialism, capitalism as a world historical phenomenon has become moribund, parasitic and decadent. US imperialism exports its surplus capital to its colonies and semi-colonies not to raise the economy of these to the level of capitalist development but merely to extract superprofits by exploiting cheap local labor and drawing out cheap raw materials. Only to some very limited extent will US enterprises be set up to process on the spot certain raw materials available locally. The extent and quality of US monopoly capital injected into the Philippine economy since the beginning of the 20th century has merely caused the subordination of domestic feudalism to US imperialism. It is in the nature of US imperialism to cause uneven and spasmodic development, to maintain a few cities ruled by the comprador class and preserve a vast countryside ruled by the landlord class.

Feudalism still persists in the Philippines, although US imperialism has introduced a certain degree of capitalist development. US monopoly capital has assimilated the seed of capitalism that is within the womb of domestic feudalism, but at the same time it has prevented the full growth of this seed into a national capitalism. The persistence of feudalism and the growth of a limited degree of capitalism can be understood only by delving into history. Feudalism is a mode of production in which the principal forces of production are the peasants and the land which they till and the relations of production are basically characterized by landlord oppression and exploitation of the peasantry. The most immediate manifestation of feudalism is the possession of vast areas of cultivable land by a few landlords who themselves do not till the land and who compel a big number of tenants to do the tilling. Feudal relations between the parasitic landlord class and the productive peasantry essentially involve the extortion of exorbitant land rent in cash or kind from the latter by the former. Such basic relations leave the tenant-peasants impoverished as their share of the crop is just enough or even often inadequate for their subsistence. They are further subjected to such feudal practices as usury, compulsory menial service and various forms of tribute. The old landlord class which utilizes land

rent essentially for its private pleasure and luxury is satisfied with the backward method of agriculture because it gets more than enough for its needs from the sheer exertion of physical labor with simple agricultural implements by a big mass of tenants. On the other hand, the tenant who has only his own assigned plot to till is further impoverished by the low level of technology.

It was not the Spanish colonialists who first laid the foundation of feudalism in the country. The sultanates of Mindanao, especially those of Sulu and Maguindanao, preceded the Spanish conquistadores by at least a century in doing so. These were the first to create a feudal mode of production producing an agricultural surplus to support a landed nobility of considerable membership, fighters, religious teachers and traders. The growth of feudalism under the Islamic faith was stimulated by the brisk trade that was centered in Sulu. Later on, the feudal society became further consolidated by its determined resistance to Spanish colonialism. Representing a form of social organization higher than that which obtained in other parts of the archipelago, the sultanates of Mindanao could more effectively resist the Spanish colonialists who did not represent any higher form of social organization and who were easily identified as an external enemy due to the long-standing conflict of Islam and Christianity then.

It was Spanish colonialism, however, which compelled the institution of feudalism on the widest scale in the archipelago. Under its administration, it developed the feudal mode of production to the fullest extent. In their rule of more than three centuries, the colonial authorities took two major steps to entrench feudalism in the Philippines. These were 1) the assignment of *encomiendas* as a royal grant, a reward for service or loyalty to the Spanish crown and 2) the compulsory cultivation of certain crops for export starting during the latter part of the 18th century.

The *encomienda* was a royal grant to religious orders, charitable institutions and individuals. It encompassed a large area and brought together several barangays into one economic and administrative unit. The chiefs of barangays were converted to become the chief running dogs in every locality in their capacity as tribute collectors, enforcers of corvee labor and principal devotees of the alien faith. The essential purpose of the *encomienda*, was indeed to facilitate the collection of tribute in cash or agricultural commodity, the enforcement of corvee labor and the indoctrination of the people in such a feudal ideology as Roman Catholicism. The colonialists used Christianity to foster docility and servility.

A surplus in agricultural production was created but only to support and feed the Spanish administrators, clergy, soldiery and the indigenous nobility. The tribute was collected as a means of supporting the foreign rulers, especially for providing them with food and luxuries. Corvee labor was employed to expand the agricultural fields, build government and church buildings, and improve communications between the villages and the town settlement where the curate set up his quarters.

Within the *encomienda*, Spanish laws on private property in land began to be applied arbitrarily by both the clerical and lay *encomenderos*. Communalism was abolished in fully colonized areas. The Spanish *encomenderos* claimed vast tracts of land as their private property. The indigenous nobility was also allowed to lay private claims on agricultural lands, and at the same time it was cajoled into making direct donations of land to the Catholic Church. In cases where the people resisted, the colonialists cruelly grabbed the lands from them by force of arms. All conquered lands were considered property of the royal crown, subject to arbitrary disposal by the colonial authorities. Corvee labor was used systematically to clear new lands or in cases where the people on their own volition would create new agricultural fields for their own needs, they would only be subsequently told that these did not belong to them but to the royal crown or to some *encomendero* who had gained title over these.

When the friars later advocated the abolition of the *encomienda* system, it was not really with the view of having feudal abuses eliminated. Their intention was mainly to demand the rigorous application of Spanish laws within a more orderly administrative system so that clerical and lay landlords would not collide with each other too often in their common land grabbing activities. Friar criticism of the *encomienda* system merely led to the creation of provinces under the central administration of Manila. The *encomienda* system had already taken deep roots. The religious orders had already accumulated vast lands.

Spanish lay *encomenderos* chose either to stay in the archipelago to breed successive generations of *insulares* and mestizos or to sell out to merchants and other landlords, bring gold back to Spain and retain their status as *peninsulares*. The native landlords had their own stratum within the landowning class. Some of them became landlords only at the expense of their fellow *indios* who were dispossessed through sheer land grabbing or who fell into bankruptcy through the due processes of feudalism. Chinese merchants who chose to stay in the country to conduct trade between the town center and the villages and between

the provinces and Manila intermarried with the native women in order to be able to buy lands legally with the money that they earned from their trade and money-lending activities. This would explain why the family names of many landlords today still sound Chinese aside from sounding Spanish.

2. The Hacienda System

The Spanish colonialists decided to intensify feudal exploitation of the people when the galleon trade was already on the decline during the latter part of the 18th Century. The galleon trade had been the principal source of income for the central administration in Manila. With this source of income yielding less and less as a result of international developments caused primarily by the pressures of capitalism, the colonial authorities turned to large-scale cultivation of commercial crops for export. “Economic reforms” were adopted ostensibly to make the Philippines “self-sufficient”, that is to say, allow the colonialists to have an alternative source of income.

The Economic Society of Friends of the Country was founded by the Spanish governor-general in 1871 to encourage the planting of certain commercial crops for export. The Royal Company of Spain was subsequently enfranchised to monopolize trade in these agricultural crops. The cultivation of tobacco, indigo, sugar, abaca and other crops was imposed. Spain was trying to adjust to the pressures of capitalism, especially British capitalism and French capitalism, during the late part of the 18th century and the early part of the 19th century. Before the formal opening of the ports of Manila to non-Spanish ships, these had already started to call on Manila during the latter part of the 18th century.

The large-scale cultivation of commercial crops started the hacienda system that still exists today. This resulted in the more vicious exploitation of the Filipino people. The colonial government dictated confiscatory prices for the commercial crops. Also, the people who planted these crops had to get their staple food, rice or corn, from other areas. Thus, specialization in agriculture was introduced and commodity production began to disturb the natural economy existing in a feudal society.

While the Spanish colonialists, particularly the friars, intensified their feudal exploitation of the people, 51 non-Spanish foreign shipping and commercial houses became established in Manila in the middle part of the 19th century. Twelve of these were American and non-Spanish European houses, which virtually monopolized the import-export trade. These would subsequently open

branches at different points in the archipelago such as Sual, Cebu, Zamboanga, Legaspi and Tacloban where ports were opened to foreign trade.

The financial operations of these foreign establishments strengthened the production of export crops. The total value of agricultural exports rose from P500,000 in 1810 to P108 million in 1870. This rose even more rapidly towards the outbreak of the Philippine Revolution of 1898. The cultivation of abaca and sugar was encouraged, and these crops became the principal exports of the country. In the mid-19th century, the level of sugar production was 3,000 piculs and four decades later it reached 2,000,000 piculs. American refineries (controlled by the mammoth American Sugar Refining Company) were especially interested in sugar so that in 1885, they were already getting two-thirds of this crop or 225,000 short tons. In 1898, the American consul in Manila could boast that the value of trade under his supervision equaled that of 21 competitors combined.

The acceleration of foreign trade in agricultural crops resulted in the acceleration of domestic trade. The local mercantile bourgeoisie emerged more significantly in domestic trade. Nevertheless, it found its economic opportunities limited to investing its profits in the acquisition of lands or in the leasing of friar estates. Part of its profits went into supporting more university students who studied locally or abroad. Thus, the mercantile bourgeoisie served as the social base of the native intelligentsia.

When the United States in its imperialist greed seized the Philippines for itself, it was very conscious of the necessity of retaining feudalism so as to provide itself continuously with such raw materials as sugar, hemp, coconut and other agricultural products. In using counterrevolutionary dual tactics to deceive the *ilustrado* leadership of the Philippine Revolution, it was aware of the landlord and mercantile character of the right wing of such a leadership and moved to assimilate its interests. It adopted the tactics to isolate the left wing represented by Mabini which was ideologically closer to the revolutionary peasant masses and which advocated the restitution to the people of the lands taken away from them by the Spanish colonial government and the friars.

US imperialism, therefore, did not hesitate to guarantee in the Treaty of Paris of 1898 the property rights of the landlord class under the Spanish colonial regime and returned even to the most despotic Spanish ecclesiastical and lay landlords the lands that had been confiscated from them by the revolutionary masses. The continuance of feudal rights assured the US colonial government of political support by the betrayers of the revolution and of continued supply

of raw materials for US industries. The Payne-Aldrich Act of 1909 admitted Philippine products, chiefly agricultural, duty-free into the United States. In 1910, the US imperialists set up a sugar mill as a signal act for the type of investments they were most interested in making. In 1913, the Underwood Tariff Act removed all quota limitations on Philippine agricultural products exported to the United States. All these steps had the single effect of tying down the Philippines to a colonial and agrarian economy highly dependent on a few export crops. During the first three decades of US imperialist rule, agricultural production for export was expanded more rapidly than ever before. By 1932, more than 99 percent of sugar exports was going to the United States.

By conquering the Philippines, US imperialism was able to create the conditions which it was less in a position to create through sheer commercial financing operations by its export-import and shipping firms under the Spanish colonial rule. It enhanced semi-feudalism in the countryside by further encouraging capitalist farming, corporate ownership of land and merchant usury. It put up sugar mills, abaca mills and coconut mills under corporate ownership and around which the landlords were organized. Aside from these measures which were effected directly in the countryside, US imperialism dumped finished products in order to tie down the economy to the production of a few export crops and to the commodity market.

The pattern of the economy and of agricultural production encouraged by US imperialism during its direct colonial rule has remained basically unchanged. As of 1957, large-scale cultivation of export crops prevailed over about 20 percent (1.5 million hectares) of the total agricultural land. Land devoted to food crops comprised about 80 percent (5.5 million hectares).

As of 1970, despite conspicuous attempts in the sixties to expand it, large-scale cultivation of export crops prevailed over about 28 percent (2.5 million hectares) of the total agricultural land. Land devoted to food crops comprised about 72 percent (6.4 million hectares). Capitalist methods of exploitation are strikingly evident in lands where export crops are cultivated, except in some few areas where mechanization has been introduced by the landlords.

Not all bankrupt owner-peasants and tenant-peasants displaced from lands converted into capitalist farms can be accommodated as workers in the industrial areas or as regular farm workers. The enterprises set up by the US monopolies and national capitalists are insufficient to absorb them. Because of extremely limited opportunities in industry and agriculture, there is excessive

competition for a few industrial jobs which press down wage conditions as well as overcrowding on land.

3. Sham Land Reform

In the period of direct and indirect US imperialist rule, there has been a long list of sham land reform measures. These include laws involving land titles, disposition of public lands, resettlement, “expropriation” of large estates, “fair” crop distribution credit and “anti-usury” and “just wage” for farm workers. These laws have been adopted only at certain times when the reactionaries fear most the avalanche of peasant armed struggle and they wish to deceive the rural masses. The reactionary measures taken on the land problem from the time of the Taft Commission to that of the present puppet regime have always been expressed in high-sounding and “benevolent” terms but they have only resulted in more vicious dispossession and exploitation of the rural masses. To relate the story of reactionary land reform in the country is to relate a story of chicanery and deception in which the name of the peasantry is invoked to aggrandize the landlord class.

a. Resettlement and Land grabbing

The earliest law pertaining to land that the US imperialists adopted in the Philippines was the Land Registration Act of 1905, which took the pretext of facilitating the issuance of land titles. The act recognized only three titles to properties that could be registered under it; i.e., the Informacion Possesseria, registration under the Spanish Mortgage Law and imperfect title or possession since 1894. The handful of top renegades of the Philippine Revolution, Yankee land speculators, landlords and bureaucrats from the municipal level and up rushed to register untitled lands as their property, including those belonging to the peasants and national minorities who were kept ignorant of the procedure for land registration during the Spanish colonial regime as well as during US colonial rule.

To the US imperialists the main purpose of the act was to determine the limits of private lands and to classify those beyond them as public lands under their arbitrary disposition and control. The Cadastral Act of 1907 was passed to carry out further the US imperialist seizure of land and not to rectify previous errors in land titles. Until now, cadastral surveys are being used as a major device for land grabbing.

A series of public land laws was passed in 1903, 1919 and 1929 under the pretext of encouraging the dispossessed peasantry to acquire public lands through homestead, purchase or lease of limited areas. The call for resettlement in so-called frontier areas was actually the fig-leaf for the large-scale acquisition of public lands by US citizens, US agricultural corporations and Filipino landlords and bureaucrats. The dispossessed peasants were attracted to these areas so as to provide labor power for clearing the land and to serve as the buffer between the dispossessed local inhabitants who usually belonged to non-Christian nationalities on one hand and the US imperialists and landlords on the other.

In an attempt to counteract the peasant movement in Central Luzon and other parts of the country, the landlord Quezon had the National Land Resettlement Administration organized in 1939 in order to operate two settlement projects in Southwestern Mindanao and one in Cagayan Valley that were designed as exile areas for rebellious peasants.

At the height of the peasant war of 1950, the Land Settlement Development Corporation (Lasedeco) was organized to resettle landless peasants. In its three years of existence, the Lasedeco resettled no more than 400 peasant families. Subsequently the reactionary military under the CIA agent and big landlord Ramon Magsaysay put up resettlement projects under the Economic Development Corps (Edcor). No more than 1,000 peasant families were resettled. The last resettlement projects were conducted under the National Resettlement and Rehabilitation Administration (NARRA) established in 1954. All these resettlement projects did not improve the status of even one-tenth of one percent of the landless peasantry in the country. The settlers were merely thrown into forest areas only to suffer government neglect and be susceptible to the old evils of feudalism. The main purpose of the reactionaries was merely to have a token of "land reform" to serve their mendacious propaganda. US military advisers and the reactionary armed forces utilized the resettlement projects only as a counterinsurgency measure.

Following their own calls for resettlement during the last seven decades, the landlords together with the compradors and the bureaucrat capitalists have extended feudalism and capitalist farming to the mountains and hills. They use their surplus in agricultural production and comprador profits to acquire more lands or use their lands to get big loans to acquire more lands. They get titles to vast areas of public lands, trap settlers into clearing and cultivating them, and then eject these settlers or retain them as tenants. To comply with Article XIII,

Section 2 of the Philippine Constitution, they lease vast areas of cultivable land from the public domain, each as large as two thousand hectares and misrepresent these as grazing lands or ranches. Subsequently, they acquire these lands as their own private agricultural lands. They grab even the mountains, hills and rivers. They also become logging concessionaires and subsequently acquire the land from which the timber has been cut. They not only widen their area for capitalist and feudal exploitation, but they also cause floods and soil erosion to the detriment of the toiling masses in low-lying areas.

The US monopolies have participated in the seizure of land from the people by establishing their own plantations like those of Del Monte, Dole, Stanfilco, Firestone Rubber and several others and by opening mines like those of Benguet Consolidated, Lepanto, Atlas Consolidated and so many others. These mines involve the direct seizure of land from the peasants and national minorities, and also the destruction of wide expanses of agricultural fields as a result of the flow of mineral and chemical wastes in rivers. More mines are now feverishly being opened all over the country by both the US and Japanese imperialists.

As land-extensive enterprises like mines, plantations and ranches are being set up more rapidly than before by both the US imperialists and their local lackeys, the broad masses of the people are bound to wage a fierce resistance to the end. The dispossessed peasantry and the national minorities who are now being pushed out from resettlement and reservation areas have started to fight vigorously against US imperialism, feudalism and bureaucrat capitalism.

b. Land Retention Limits and Bogus Expropriation

In all laws of expropriation that they have passed, the reactionaries invariably require “due process” (i.e., bureaucratic run-around and expensive litigation that the poor peasants cannot afford) and “just compensation” (i.e., high prices for barren lands that landlords are willing to part with). Only for token purposes have some lands been actually bought by the reactionary government from the landlords. The higher the price of the land paid to the landlord, the higher is the redistribution price for the peasants. Thus, only landlords and big bureaucrats have been able to acquire expropriated lands or these remain under state administration indefinitely.

The reactionary government helps the landlord class engage in land speculation. With so much given to them in payment, if they are willing to sell their lands, the landlords can always buy lands elsewhere or get public lands in

exchange. After a short while, the reactionary government fails to appropriate funds for its “reform” program.

In an attempt to hoodwink the broad masses of the people enraged by the persistence of large friar estates, a major issue in the Philippine Revolution of 1896, the Taft Commission purchased from the religious corporations some of these estates. The exorbitant amount of over \$7.0 million were paid for some 400,000 acres. Small plots were subsequently resold to 60,000 tenants and bigger portions were allocated to leading renegades of the Philippine Revolution as their bribe for collaborating with US imperialism. Within a short period of time, the recipients of these small plots sold out as they were weighed down by the heavy redistribution price and got deeper and deeper in debt.

Quezon used the slogan of “social justice” as his mouthwash at a time when the peasant masses manifested strongly their aspiration to be liberated from imperialist and feudal rule during the thirties. But, he agreed with the landlord delegates in the 1935 Constitutional Convention in putting into the colonial constitution the requirement of “just compensation” for lands that may be expropriated from the landlords and also in implying that feudal exploitation had a right to exist so long as the reactionary government could not buy out the landlords. It never came to pass under the auspices of Quezon that, as indicated in the constitution, a limit to retention of private agricultural lands would be set by law and be enforced.

The colonial constitution directly sets limits for the holding of public agricultural lands. A private corporation or association is not allowed to acquire, lease, or hold public agricultural lands in excess of 1,024 hectares. No individual is allowed to acquire such lands by purchase in excess of 144 hectares, or by lease in excess of 1,024 hectares, or by homestead in excess of 24 hectares. A maximum of 2,000 hectares of grazing lands may, however, be leased to an individual, private corporation, or association. These retention limits are high enough to allow the landlords to expand their landholdings tremendously. But these retention limits have never been strictly required by the reactionary government. Public lands in general have always been an open field for the expansion of the landholdings of Filipino comprador-landlords and big bureaucrats as well as US agro-corporations.

Commonwealth Act No. 21 was passed in 1936 authorizing Quezon to purchase homesites on large landed estates for resale to occupants and it called for the appropriation of the measly amount of P1.0 million. It was, however, only in 1939 that he created the Rural Progress Administration to acquire and

administer properties under the foregoing legislation. When this administrative body was dissolved in 1950, it had acquired a total of only 37,746 hectares equal to a mere particle of one percent of the total land area owned by the landlords in 1948.

The Land Reform Act of 1955 was another piece of deception brought out by the landlord-CIA agent Ramon Magsaysay, who misrepresented himself as a “land reformer” in his attempt to seize political initiative from the armed peasant struggle. The act created the Land Tenure Administration with the avowed purpose of expropriating landed estates whose size exceeded the maximum retention limit of 300 and 600 hectares of contiguous area for private individuals and corporations, respectively; and to make it a formal state policy for the Philippines to remain an agricultural appendage of the United States. Under the puppet regimes of Magsaysay, Garcia and partially of Macapagal, no more than 30 landed estates (including urban real estates) were expropriated. The expropriation of the few estates became an occasion for the corrupt collusion between the government negotiator and the landlord who overpriced his estate.

The Agricultural Land Reform Code passed in 1963 under the Macapagal regime is the latest of sham land reform measures.²⁴ It is touted by the reactionaries as the legal instrument that would finally emancipate the tenant masses in rice and corn lands. But like all previous sham land reform laws, it declares that the reactionary government shall expropriate lands from the landlords only by giving “just compensation” and that the tenant masses shall have to pay the redistribution price of the parcels allotted to them from the expropriated lands. No poor peasant, farm worker or lower-middle peasant can afford to pay the redistribution price even on a deferred-payment basis. The redistribution price is exorbitant because it embodies the overpricing that usually goes into land purchases made by the reactionary government. Furthermore, there are administration costs, interest payments and taxes charged on the tenant who tries to pay the redistribution price.

²⁴ In 1971, the Marcos puppet regime amended the *Agricultural Land Reform Code* and relabeled it as the *Code of Agrarian Reforms*. The amendatory act, Rep. Act No. 6389, conclusively defines “just compensation” for landlords as the payment of the “fair market value” of lands in cases expropriation and in a roundabout way requires the tenant-peasant to join a “cooperative” before he can petition for the purchase of the land he is tilling from the landlord. Rep. Act No. 6390, creating an agrarian reform special account, puts emphasis on the setting up of “cooperatives” that are underlings of the landlords’ rural banks and the Agricultural Credit Administration.

The Agricultural Land Reform Code sets an order of priority in expropriating lands, which is as follows: 1) idle or abandoned lands; 2) those whose area exceeds 1,024 hectares; 3) those whose area exceeds 500 hectares but is not more than 1,024 hectares; 4) those whose area exceeds 144 hectares but is not more than 500 hectares; and 5) those whose area exceeds 75 hectares but is not more than 144 hectares. Giving priority to the expropriation of idle or abandoned lands is downright silly, because these lands can easily be confiscated or reverted to the public domain. Idle and abandoned lands are usually of poor quality and difficult to cultivate. The landlords themselves consider these lands uneconomic and are just too willing to part with them at an overprice they can always collude on with the reactionary government. Buying this type of land would tie down and deplete the finances of the Land Bank; and the tenant masses would not be able to afford the redistribution price and the cost of developing the land.

It will never come to the point that the reactionary government will be able to enforce a maximum retention limit of 75 hectares, which the Agricultural Land Reform Code merely suggests by its order of priority in expropriation. Even if this limit is enforced, it would still be high enough to give free rein to the landlord class. A landlord can simply distribute the excess areas to immediate members of his family or sell them in order to acquire lands elsewhere. As a matter of fact, the code encourages the landlord class to sell out where there is peasant unrest and get public lands elsewhere or buy lands elsewhere.

The landlord does not have to move out from any area. The code allows him so many brusque tricks to evade expropriation, aside from the simple act of distributing excess land areas to immediate relatives. He may coerce or deceive his tenants into signing or attesting to a declaration that he himself is the tiller. He can adopt some semblance of mechanization or actually adopt mechanization. He can adopt the wage system instead of the tenancy system. He can shift from the production of rice or corn to the production of some other crops. He can cheat his tenants on accounts and pile up debts on them so that they will be prevented from becoming “amortizing-owners.” He can simply pass off his land as an educational, residential or commercial area. The code categorically exempts from expropriation lands that are already or about to be operated on a mechanized basis, or that are planted to crops outside of rice and corn. Thus, lands planted to sugar cane, coconut, citrus and others are exempted. Lands categorized as religious, educational, residential or industrial sites are also exempted.

The most important factor in the persistence of landlordism in this country is the political power behind the sham and token operation of the seven “land reform” agencies created by the code. It is impossible for the reactionary government to go against its feudal masters. The National Land Reform Council and the Land Authority, the principal policy-making agencies, are under the thumb of the landlord class. Their landlord officials have as a matter of fact grabbed more public lands for themselves than they have been able to distribute to the landless.

There was not a single landed estate purchased by the Macapagal puppet regime from the landlord class for redistribution under the Agricultural Land Reform Code. It took three years from the enactment of the code before the Land Bank, responsible for financing the expropriation of landed estates, could be organized. During the period of 1966-69, the Land Bank actually received the measly amount of P13.6 million out of the P400 million that was supposed to have been appropriated to it. During the same period, the reactionary government released several hundred times more funds (half a billion pesos annually) for the reactionary armed forces to keep the people in feudal bondage. A year of Philcag adventure in Vietnam was worth P35 million.

Under the code, the capital of the Land Bank is supposed to be P1.5 billion, with P900 million subscribed by the government and issued as preferred shares. Now that the reactionary government is more bankrupt than ever, it will find it more difficult to release funds for its bogus program of expropriation.

From 1966 to 1969, the Land Bank was able to purchase 10 agricultural estates comprising 997.6 hectares for P3.4 million. The lands were to be resold to 363 tenants. It is clear by this record that the reactionary government will never be able to buy off even one percent of landlord property.

And yet in the few areas where actual token purchases of landlord property were made by the reactionary government, the poor peasants as in previous times would never be able to afford the redistribution price. The average cost per hectare of land acquired so far by the Land Bank is P3,408. If the lands were to be redistributed to the tenant peasants, each would actually be entitled to three hectares. Computations can immediately show that the tenant will never be able to save enough to pay the principal of P10,224 and the administration costs, interest charges and taxes, even on an installment plan of 25

years. We know too well that a poor peasant cannot save P409 annually just to pay 1/25 of the principal cost of the land allotted to him.²⁵

In the six years following the enactment of the Agricultural Land Reform Code, the US imperialists were able to take over public agricultural lands at the expense of homesteaders. Even before a single agricultural estate could be expropriated, the reactionary government turned over to such US agro-corporations as the Philippine Packing Corporation, United Fruit, Dole and Standard (Philippines) Fruit Corporation tens of thousands of hectares with the option to widen them some more for planting pineapple, banana and others. Such government corporations as the National Development Corporation and the Mindanao Development Authority made up “growers’ agreements” with these US agro-corporations, despite the constitutional rule that only Philippine corporations with at least 60 percent Filipino equity can hold public agricultural lands and that even these cannot hold any such land in excess of 1,024 hectares. Fifty thousand hectares of the Mt. Apo National Park Reservation was also offered to these US agro-corporations, especially the notorious United Fruit Corporation.

The landlord class has never stopped grabbing lands that are already being cultivated by the national minorities and small settlers. As a matter of fact, the reactionary government encourages the landlords to exchange their lands in more populated areas for wider fields from the public domain, especially in Mindanao. But the most striking development in the land situation since the enactment of the Agricultural Land Reform Code has been the rapid conversion of rice and corn lands into sugar lands and the considerable increase of large-scale capitalist farming and farm-mechanization. Peasants have been driven out of their farms by bulldozers, guns and court orders.

As a result of the decontrol policy and the repeated devaluation of the peso, the comprador-landlords have been in a position to acquire more lands and build up their milling facilities. The sugar landlords have been specially favored

²⁵ From 1965 to 1971, the entire period during which the *Agricultural Land Reform Code* was in effect before being relabeled as the *Code of Agrarian Reforms*, the various “land reform” agencies actually received a total of P399.24 million out of a total appropriation of P1.3 billion. Only the measly amount of P36.32 million was released specifically to the Land Bank, which in turn spent P16,002,900 to purchase 32 landed estates having the total size of 3,876 hectares and involving 2,268 tenants. The magnitude of the land expropriated is not even a drop in the vast ocean of landlord holdings. Yet no poor tenant can afford to pay even by installment to the end of redistribution price of a single hectare. The average purchase price paid by the reactionary government so far is P4,149 per hectare. On top of this, the reactionary government demands payment for administration costs and interest charges.

by the puppet government with the biggest financial support to expand their sugarcane fields. The puppet government has extended all the necessary dollar support for the construction of eighteen new sugar mills at various points of the country. The construction of forty more sugar mills is being considered. This is in line with the US imperialist policy of preempting the formal termination of the Laurel-Langley Agreement by exhausting the financial resources of the puppet government on projects that will reinforce the colonial character of the economy.

4. The Extent of Feudal and Semi-feudal Exploitation

a. The Magnitude of the Land Problem²⁶

The peasantry has become more impoverished during the last seven decades of both direct and indirect US imperialist rule in the Philippines. The reactionary government admits that the rate of tenancy increased from 18 percent in 1903 to 22 percent in 1918, to 35 percent in 1933, to 37.4 percent in 1948 and then to 48 percent in 1956 and to 50 percent in 1961. According to the 1960 agricultural census, 63 percent of rice cultivators are share-croppers, tilling an average of 2.6 hectares each. In 1963, eight million of the 27 million Filipino people were sharecroppers. All these figures coming from the statistical agencies of the reactionary government require verification through actual rural surveys. But they indicate the extreme plight of the great majority of the Filipino peasantry.

In 1903, only 0.8 percent of the population owned 35 percent of the total farm area. Fifty years after, a lesser percentage of people owned more lands. In 1953, only 0.36 percent owned 41.5 percent of the total farm area.

As of 1954, there were about 13,859 landlords (their names are often repeated in the list) owning 50 hectares to more than 1,000 hectares of agricultural lands. Landlords owning 50 to 200 hectares numbered 11,770; 201 to 500 hectares, 1,455; 501 to 1,000 hectares, 423; and above 1,000 hectares, 221. This handful of exploiters owned 2.4 million hectares of the 5.7 million hectares total farm area. The 221 biggest landowners owned more than half-a-million hectares or close to 10 percent of the total farm area in the country.

²⁶ There is no substitute for actual barrio-to-barrio investigation though the figures stated under this section are based on the most considerable records available from the reactionary government. The author has discovered glaring discrepancies between these records and the reality in a number of provinces. Reality reveals a bigger problem of land concentration in the hands of a few.

As of 1968, there were about 10,764 landlords (their names are again often repeated in the list) listed by provincial assessors as owning from 50 hectares to more than 1,000 hectares of agricultural lands. Landlords owning 50 to 199 hectares numbered 8,914; 200 to 499 hectares, 1,228; 500 to 1,000 hectares, 417; and above 1,000 hectares 204. The total area of their landholdings could easily come to 3,000,000 hectares or a little below 50 percent of the total agricultural area of the country today.

The number of big landlords owning 50 hectares to more than 1,000 hectares in Northern Luzon is 717; Central Luzon, 1,899; Southern Luzon, 2,827; Visayas, 3,150 and Mindanao, 2,171. These figures are still based on the listing made by provincial assessors of the reactionary government. Rural investigation in various parts of the country have revealed that there were omissions in the listing. At any rate, the listing amply shows the magnitude of big landlord property in the country.

The 25 provinces with the biggest number of big landlords are the following in their order:

1. Iloilo
2. Negros Occidental
3. Quezon
4. Camarines Sur
5. Nueva Ecija
6. Cagayan
7. Capiz
8. Negros Oriental
9. Masbate
10. Pampanga
11. Zamboanga del Norte
12. Tarlac
13. North Cotabato
14. Bulacan
15. Mindoro Oriental

16. Bataan
17. Bukidnon
18. Zambales
19. Albay
20. Romblon
21. Batangas
22. Agusan
23. Davao del Norte
24. Aklan
25. Pangasinan

Every Philippine province is afflicted with feudalism and has its own share of landlords and, therefore, poor peasants and farm workers. Batanes, Camiguin and Surigao del Norte, the smallest provinces in terms of population and territory have 11, 12 and 11 big landlords owning 50 hectares and above, respectively. The mountainous provinces of Kalinga-Apayao, Mountain Province, Ifugao and Eastern Samar have 11, 15, 8 and 7 big landlords, respectively. Romblon and Sulu are provinces with a small land area but which have 161 and 118 big landlords, respectively.

On a national scale, we may readily classify the owners of 50 hectares and above as big landlords. On the basis of closer knowledge of the land problem, that is to say, the concrete relations on landholdings, we can determine who are the big, middle and small landlords in areas where landlord property is generally less than 50 hectares. There is a significant number of landlords owning 10 to 49 hectares. The magnitude of landlord property is not the sole factor that makes feudalism. More important are the relations of production to be considered. This should be well remembered in analyzing the land situation in provinces where population density is high and there is relative land scarcity. Here the value of land is so high that the poor peasants and other semi-proletarians have absolutely no hope of attaining the status of owner-cultivators.

Feudal and semi-feudal exploitation in such land-scarce areas as Ilocos Norte, Ilocos Sur, La Union, the mountain provinces, Cebu and Eastern Samar is even worse than, say, in certain areas of Central Luzon where the armed peasant movement has to a certain degree seized democratic gains. The land-scarce

areas are generally the source of farm workers for haciendas in other areas and of settlers in the frontier areas of the last seven decades. Farm workers in the haciendas of Central Luzon and even Laguna come in great numbers from the Ilocos provinces and in the haciendas of the Negros and Mindanao provinces, from Cebu and provinces of Panay, Samar and Leyte. In Mindanao, the land-starved Visayans and Ilocanos are also found in great numbers as homesteaders and tenants.

b. Basic Forms of Exploitation in the Countryside

The basic forms of landlord exploitation in the countryside today include the exaction of high land rent from the poor peasants and semi-owner peasants and the imposition of the extremist wage slavery on farm workers. Aggravating these basic forms of exploitation are the practice of usury, price manipulation, menial service and tribute-making. Political oppression is also necessarily the concomitant of economic exploitation. Only a concrete social investigation by the proletarian revolutionary cadres can fully expose the evils of feudalism and semi-feudalism from place to place. However, we can cite some widespread practices as the starting point for understanding the problem.

1) Land Rent, Usury and Other Feudal Evils

Land rent to the landlord is still as high as 80, 70, 60 and 50 percent of the crop, although it is commonly said by the less knowledgeable that the "50-50" sharecropping arrangement is the prevalent system of rent payment all over the country. In many areas, 60 percent rent is still the open rule dictated by the landlord who takes advantage of the already impoverished condition of the-poor peasant and of the absence of any other economic opportunity for the latter.

Ordinarily, the landlord boasts of having a "50-50" sharecropping arrangement with his tenants. But in fact he makes them shoulder all the agricultural expenses. It is very common that mainly or only the tenants shoulder the expenses incurred in preparing the seedlings, plowing and harrowing, planting, irrigation, fertilization, pest control, harvesting and threshing. Even if the landlord were to share in such expenses "50-50," it would still be unfair and unjust to lose sight of the actual work expended by the tenants and to give the landlord a 50 percent rent on the crop. Besides, whenever he provides

seedlings, fertilizers, pesticides and other such materials, he overprices and charges payment for these and thereby sucks blood from the tenants at this very instance. He also demands a high price for the use of his work animals or simply makes his tenants absorb the expenses for renting the rich peasants' work animals. Whenever he introduces some machinery to take over a part in the process of cultivation, he always manages to increase his share and reduces his tenants' share. He can unilaterally decide to "improve" the land, say the irrigation or dike system, and then require the tenants to pay back to him in the form of higher land rent the expenses which he alone had accounted. The tenants are obliged to deliver to the landlord his crop share and to stock this up in his granary without any compensation and often times even without being given a meal by him.

On sugar lands that have been converted from rice and corn lands, the tenants face such possibilities as complete displacement, conversion into farm workers or accepting a special kind of sharecropping arrangement. The sharecropping arrangement is supposed to be "50-50" between the landlord and the tenant on the net amount after the sugar central has deducted 40 to 50 percent of the milled sugar and after the landlord has also deducted for himself his supposed expenses for seedlings, harrowing, fertilizer, weeding, cutting and delivery to the sugar central. The landlord alone does all the computations for the agricultural expenses and he alone knows the quantity and the value of the sugar and molasses that come off the milling process. Oftentimes, the landlord mendaciously tells the tenant that both of them have had bad luck, while in fact the landlord has made a killing.

Usury is a major feudal device that many landlords use to increase their crop share and also to acquire more lands. They may agree to any sharecropping arrangement but in lending money to the tenants either for the cultivation of the land or for the upkeep of the tenant's family, an interest rate ranging from 100 percent in three months to 50 percent per month is demanded. The landlords take the option of demanding cash or so much of the tenant's crop share, whichever yields the higher profit at the time of the debt payment. Together with the landlords, merchants and a number of rich peasants impose usury on the poor peasants long before the next harvest. Usury results mainly from the fact that poor peasants can hardly subsist on their crop share and can offer no collateral except their crop share in the next harvest.

Crop distribution laws involving tenants only in rice and sugar lands and credit laws have been passed by the reactionary government. But these have

been of no avail to the peasantry. In practice, the landlord class holds the tenants in its vice with feudal common law. Contracts between the landlords and the tenants are not even in written-form and the terms can be arbitrarily fixed or changed by the former. The tenants are under the constant threat of being ejected or shifted to inferior and smaller plots. They cannot afford to get involved in a long-drawn litigation in which they are sure to lose inside and outside the courts. The landlord's hatchetmen and the reactionary troops and police are always on hand to oust them from their tenancy in the most brutal manner possible.

It is not surprising if in many cases the tenants are made to pay wholly or partially for the share of the overseer. Oftentimes, the overseer calls them to do construction work or menial service for the landlord or for himself or for the local reactionary government without pay. Overseers and hacienda guards play the oppressive role of running dogs.

The Rice Share Tenancy Act of 1933 declared as contrary to "public policy" tenancy arrangements in which the tenant received less than 50 percent of the net crop. At the same time it provided that the law could take effect within a province only if the majority of the landlord-controlled municipal councils in the province would file a petition for implementation against their very class interests. Because of the obvious loopholes in the law, the landlord Quezon pretended to play hero by having the law amended in 1936 to empower himself to proclaim the effectivity of the law piecemeal. The result was that he made flamboyant proclamations only in ten provinces where he considered it necessary to mislead the peasants. Long after Quezon, the landlord class would still continue to exploit the peasant masses at the same rate as before.

Commonwealth Act 4113 of 1933 requires the landlords in sugar lands to show receipts from the sugar central on the amount of sugar cane harvested and on the quantity and value of sugar and molasses that come off the milling process. This has never been observed. Besides, the landlords who are often stockholders in the milling corporation can easily collude with the sugar central in cheating the tenants. The widest area for deception is allowed by this act which gives the landlord the privilege of determining the expenses incurred for planting, cultivating and harvesting.

In an attempt to deceive the peasants into accepting their feudal servitude, especially in areas where the people's army was strong, the landlord Roxas resorted to proclaiming the effectivity of the Rice Share Tenancy Act of 1933 all over the country in 1946. He even had another law passed, Republic Act

No. 31, which he allowed to be inaccurately called the “70-30” law in order to give the false impression that the tenants would get the bigger share. This law provided that 55 percent of the crop would go to the tenant only if he furnished the work animals and implements and landlord and tenant shared all other expenses equally. Seventy percent would go to the tenant only if he defrayed all the expenses for planting and cultivation of the land. The high land rent of more than 50 percent still stares us in the face.

Resorting to redundancy, the landlord Magsaysay had the Agrarian Relations Act of 1954 passed. The law merely fixed the land rent at 30 percent of the net crop after deducting the costs of fertilizer, pest and weed control, reaping and threshing. He who provides the work animals is entitled to five percent; farm implements, five percent; transplanting, 25 percent; and final harrowing, five percent of the net crop. This “70-30” law has been followed only in a few places. Here, the landlords manage to actually raise the land rent by overpricing their share of agricultural costs and engaging in usury and other unscrupulous activities.

The latest law involving tenancy, the Agricultural Land Reform Code, provides that share tenancy shall be “abolished” by bringing the tenant masses into the “leasehold” system in “land reform” districts proclaimed piecemeal by the National Land Reform Council. Under the “leasehold” system, the tenants enter into a “leasehold” contract with their landlord to pay in cash or crop a fixed annual land rent equivalent to 25 percent of the annual net crop computed on the basis of the three normal crop years preceding the contract. While it appears that rent reduction has been effected by the code, the truth is that there is nothing of the sort because in the “leasehold” contract the tenants commit themselves to shouldering all agricultural expenses and, worse, to paying the fixed annual rent even when the crop is bad or some calamity, like flood, drought or infestation, destroys the entire crop. It is for this reason that the peasant masses detest the Agricultural Land Reform Code like the plague. The “leasehold” system is nothing but a new form of share tenancy and is in many respects worse than the older forms of tenancy.

Several years have passed since the enactment of the Agricultural Land Reform Code, and yet the sharecropping arrangement substantially remains the same in the various parts of the country. The Land Authority has reported that from 1966 to 1969 only 13,377 tenants out of millions went into “leasehold.” The National Land Reform Council itself has been extremely slow in proclaiming “land reform districts” because the reactionary government as a

whole has priorities over and above its sham land reform program. The proclamation of “land reform districts” entails bigger financing for the various “land reform” agencies. Even in areas where these agencies have been well-financed, there is no letup in the feudal and semi-feudal oppression and exploitation of the peasant masses.

A long time ago, an anti-usury law was passed limiting the maximum annual interest rate to 12 percent for secured loans and 14 percent for unsecured loans. Credit institutions like the Agricultural Credit and Cooperative Financing Administration (ACCFA) and private rural banks were also established. But these credit institutions have become mere sources of capital that merchants, landlords and bureaucrats use in their commercial and land-buying operations. Victimized by usury and manipulation of the prices of commodities, owner-peasants become bankrupt and lose their lands. The rural banks often serve as instruments for rendering many owner-cultivators bankrupt. Their lands are underassessed when used as collateral. Because they can offer no collateral aside from their future crop share the poor peasants easily fall prey to the most vicious usurers.

The Agricultural Credit Administration (ACA) has taken over the functions of the ACCFA under the Agricultural Land Reform Code. There is no fundamental change; there is only a change of name. Like its predecessor, the ACA is still basically a source of capital for merchant and usury activities and for fake cooperatives controlled by the landlords, bureaucrats and rich peasants. The limited capital of the ACA basically serves the landlord class. Even assuming that this capital is actually used to serve poor peasants, it is so limited that it cannot serve even only one percent of the vast number of poor peasants. The ACA is nothing but a fig-leaf for the entire exploitative banking system, both government and private, which is controlled and manipulated by the landlord class for maintaining its class rule in the countryside.

2) Wage Slavery on Farms

Because farm workers generally come from land-scarce and one-crop areas, they are even more exploited than the poor peasants who can still subsist on the land that they tenant. Farm workers are a great part of the relative surplus of manpower in the countryside. The *hacenderos* and labor contractors recognize their desperate economic condition. On this basis both the *hacenderos* and the labor contractors engage them in the worst exploitative relations despite

the fact that agricultural production for export is extremely profitable for the *hacenderos*.

In sugar cane haciendas, the landlord distinguishes regular from seasonal farm workers. This is his way of getting himself responsible only for the year-round employment of a relatively small number of regular farm workers. In classifying a bigger number of farm workers as seasonal or temporary workers, he can give to them the heaviest workload and pay them the lowest wages only during the few months of the cutting season. Some of these “temporary” farm workers actually reside in the vicinity of the hacienda even off-season, while others come only during the cutting season. In different areas, they get average daily wages ranging from P1.00 to P3.00. They live in subhuman quarters and buy or take on credit at high interest rates their necessities from the hacienda stores at marked-up prices.

Even at the time that U.S. demand for Philippine sugar rose and the price of this commodity rose several times over as a result of the Cuban Revolution, the farm workers were not accorded corresponding wage increases and were pressed down to their old starvation wages. Yet an ongoing inflation and the 1962 devaluation cut down their old wages.

The Agricultural Land Reform Code assured the farm workers of the minimum daily wage of P3.50 in 1963. This has not been complied with by the *hacenderos*. And yet the value of the peso has been rapidly eroded since then. After the latest devaluation of the currency, Congress made another formal increase of the minimum farm wage to P4.75. This increase of 35 percent is not adequate to meet the more than 60 percent devaluation of the currency. This devaluation continues unabated. And yet it is certain that the *hacenderos* as before will not comply with their own law unless the farm workers wage fierce and bitter political and economic struggle.

The “bill of rights” listed in one whole chapter of the Agricultural Land Reform Code assures the farm workers of the right to self-organization, to go on strike, to work for not more than eight hours daily unless they agree and unless they are given overtime pay at the regular rate plus 25 percent, to claim damages for death or injuries sustained while at work, to claim compensation for personal injuries, death or illness, and to enjoy permanent tenure. All of these have been violated with utter brutality by the *hacenderos*.

Without unity and revolutionary consciousness, the farm workers are easily rendered helpless by the landlords because the latter can withhold the former’s wages for the first month and the labor contractor is usually a person in author-

ity (mayor, chief of police, councilor or barrio captain) in the place where the farm workers are recruited. Furthermore, the labor contractor binds the farm workers to himself by lending money to their families and by arbitrarily accounting expenses for transportation, food and other miscellaneous things as debt to him at usurious rates as high as 300 percent while the farm workers are still in transit to the haciendas.

The labor contractor basically participates in landlord exploitation by getting a commission for every ton or day that the farm workers complete. While already in the hacienda, the farm workers are often forced to live in unsanitary quarters and are cheated of their food rations and in the weighing or counting of the sugar cane that they cut, haul or load. When they get sick, their fate is worse than a carabao's. They are merely sent away. A carabao is at least taken care of.

The condition of farm workers toiling in various areas where sugarcane, coconut, abaca, tobacco, rubber, banana, pineapple and vegetables are produced on a large scale and on the basis of capitalist farming should be closely investigated by the cadres inasmuch as the forms of exploitative relations differ from area to area. Ordinarily, however, the farm workers receive only a few tens of pesos monthly during the harvest season, whether they are paid on wage or piecework (*pakyaw*) basis.

Because farm workers employed by rich peasants are also a significant lot, close attention has also to be paid to them. Their wage condition can still be improved even as their employers need to be neutralized instead of attacked as the enemy.

The preservation of feudalism in the Philippines is a matter of prime necessity for US imperialism. If landlord power were to be overthrown in the countryside, US imperialism would have nothing to stand on and it would have to face a colossal force that can drive it out of the country. So, US imperialism resorts to all kinds of measures preventing an agrarian revolution. It has a program of counterinsurgency to suppress the revolutionary mass movement of the peasantry in the countryside. Components of this program of counterinsurgency are the sham land reform measures, "civic action," reformist organizations and murder gangs like the "Monkees," the Barrio Self-Defense Units (BSDU), the "provincial strike forces" and "special forces." US imperialism keeps on adopting old tactics of counterrevolution and calling them by new names. It will certainly bring out its own aggressor troops from its military bas-

es to attack the people the moment the reactionary puppet troops and police become weakened or fail to suppress the people.

US imperialism has recently increased its direct interests in Philippine agriculture. US agro-corporations have opened large plantations, especially in Mindanao. The Rockefeller monopoly group has put up the biggest fertilizer plant, the Esso Standard Fertilizer and Agricultural Chemical Co., Inc. (ESFAC),²⁷ and has put up the International Rice Research Institute to undertake the culture of new rice varieties which require heavy doses of fertilizers. The ESFAC today can directly determine the price of all agricultural commodities by its control of fertilizers, pesticides and all chemicals for agricultural use. The Agricultural Land Reform Code was pushed through by US imperialism as a maneuver to compel landlords to buy more farm equipment from US companies and also to convert their rice and corn lands into sugar land inasmuch as mechanization and sugar cultivation are major excuses for them to get exempted from expropriation. Dow Chemicals, the notorious manufacturer of defoliants and other chemical-biological weapons (CBW) for the US war of aggression in Indochina, is already in business in the Philippines and is frenziedly conducting research to destroy vegetation in the Philippines in the event that revolutionary base areas emerge.

The Japanese monopolies are collaborating with the US monopolies in turning the Philippines into a market for farm equipment and in investing in plantations. US imperialism today is accommodating the needs of Japan for Philippine agricultural commodities. To make sure that Japan will play second fiddle to it in Philippine agriculture, US imperialism has accelerated its own direct investments in this field. The Japanese monopolies have long prepared to operate plantations once more in the Philippines as before in World War II.

5. The Political Power of the Landlord Class

The landlord class will never surrender its ownership of vast lands voluntarily. Neither will it allow exploitative relations in the countryside to cease. It will always make use of its political power to serve its interests. At the first sign of resistance by the peasants to its authority, it never hesitates to use armed force to quell them. Woe unto the fool who relies exclusively on the Office of the Agrarian Counsel and the Court of Agrarian Relations! In all “land reform” laws adopted by the reactionary government, the landlord class has never failed

²⁷ The controlling stocks of ESFAC, now called Planters Products, have been taken over by Marcos and his clique.

to put provisions that benefit itself and worsen the plight of the peasantry. The army, police, courts and prisons are at its service. It has put up for its immediate purposes private armies not only for carrying out factional strife within the class but also for attacking the growing revolutionary mass movement. Warlordism in the provinces has steadily risen. The landlord class has its direct representatives at every level of the reactionary government, from the barrio level to the national. The landlords themselves are officials of the reactionary government. Their power extends into every agency of the reactionary government, especially the coercive apparatuses of the state. Being the big and widespread financiers of electoral campaigns, they are found in decisive positions in all the reactionary political parties.

Every time the reactionary government speaks of increasing agricultural productivity or of making export incentives, it merely wants to bring the benefits to the landlord class. So long as the landlords continue to own large estates and so long as they continue to control the relations of production in the countryside, all the improved roads, bridges, ports, irrigation systems, river control systems and even the agricultural extension services that the reactionary government may build with onerous foreign loans and high taxes can only redound to the benefit of the landlord class and the big comprador bourgeoisie.

The landlord class has various types of organizations which it can directly and indirectly use to look after its interests in every possible way within the present system. It has the millers' and producers' associations and the chambers of commerce. It has the so-called civic and charitable organizations which are used to publicize its "thoughtfulness" and "kindheartedness" and to conceal the ruthlessness and violence of its rule. It puts up fake cooperatives to manipulate the various strata of the peasantry. It has the banks serving as the centers of landlord-comprador alliances.

Among all types of organizations, the Catholic Church serves as the oldest and most reliable defender of the landlord class. It has been the most decisive and most virulent factor in the development and preservation of feudalism for over four centuries. This Church is itself a big landlord, enjoying undiminished the feudal privileges that it enjoyed in the Spanish colonial system. It is a parasitic institution enjoying the material support of the landlord class. It is an ideological and political weapon, using all kinds of tactics to advocate the "sacredness" of the right of landlords to keep their property. It has put up a big number of lay organizations dedicated to the preservation of landlordism and yet pretending to work for land reform. Even its bishops and priests and the

landlords' children in sectarian schools have joined in the fun of reformism only to proscribe violently those who advocate agrarian revolution and to prescribe to the oppressed peasant masses the old recipe of faith and confidence in the reactionary government and in the landlord class.

In the countryside today, there is quite a number of peasant associations, farm workers' unions, "rural development" agencies and "cooperative" projects which are reformist and counterrevolutionary. These are organized either by the US counterinsurgency agencies, bureaucrat capitalists, religious organizations, counterrevolutionary revisionist renegades, plain crooks or the landlords themselves directly. To mention a few, these are the Philippine Rural Reconstruction Movement (PRRM), the Presidential Arm on Community Development (PACD), the Free Farmers' Federation (FFF), the Federated Movement for Social Justice and Reform (FMSJR), Malayang Samahang Magsasaka (Lava faction), Kaisahang Magsasaka (Kasaka) and the like. They share the counterrevolutionary objective of swindling the poor peasants and farm workers into believing that they can rise up from their oppression and exploitation by trusting the "land reform" program of the reactionary comprador-landlord state. They hope vainly to draw away the poor peasants and farm workers from the agrarian revolution for which the Communist Party of the Philippines is indefatigably and courageously fighting.

IV. BUREAUCRAT CAPITALISM

1. The Meaning of Bureaucrat Capitalism

In dominating the Philippines, US imperialism, like its colonial predecessors, found it expedient at the outset to secure the assistance of local traitors. Since it had to accommodate and assimilate the comprador big bourgeoisie and the landlord class to pursue its selfish interests, it considered as its most reliable assistants in colonial administration the political representatives of these exploiting classes. US imperialism sought its first puppet bureaucrats from the ranks of the *principalia*. It took a special preference for renegades of the Philippine Revolution because these were very useful for scuttling the revolutionary efforts of the people and were too eager to prove their new colonial allegiance and take advantage of the bureaucratic and economic opportunities offered to them.

The pack of counterrevolutionary speculators that had crept into the leadership of the Aguinaldo government was the first group of local politicians to be permitted by US imperialism to organize a political party in the Philippines. Their Partido Federal campaigned for the annexation of the Philippines to the United States. Membership in this traitor party was proof of loyalty to the alien flag and served as a guarantee for gaining appointment to the colonial bureaucracy established by US imperialism.

When the Partido Federal became too discredited and isolated, the US imperialists procured the bureaucratic assistance of the Nacionalista Party and assigned to it the special role of lulling the people with patriotic slogans while servilely performing colonial chores. The class leadership of this new traitor party was no different from that of its predecessor.

The Nacionalista Party was so efficient in its special role of pretending to be for independence and preventing the people from asserting their sovereign rights that it was allowed to dominate puppet politics for quite a long time. After World War II, however, US imperialism saw to it that what was then the most reactionary wing within the Nacionalista Party be converted into another party so as to maintain a two-party system in which one party checks the other to stay within the bounds of a semi-colonial and semi-feudal society.

In this last quarter of a century, the Nacionalista Party and the Liberal Party have never expressed any basic difference in program with regard to the problems of US imperialism, feudalism and bureaucrat capitalism. The stalwarts of both parties at every level can shift from one party to the other without having much to account for except in the most superficial terms. These puppet political parties have always been alike as the democratic Party and the Republican Party or Coca-Cola and Pepsi-Cola are alike.

There is so much muckraking between these two reactionary parties, especially on the issue of graft and corruption. But mutually they avoid bringing up the fundamental issues involving the foreign and feudal domination over the country. What bounds them above all is their servitude to US imperialism and to the local exploiting classes and their pursuit of private wealth. Their differences are at the most factional and cliquish. They are preoccupied with quarrelling over the spoils of colonial office.

The big bureaucrats are characteristically big compradors and big landlords themselves. Contrary to the liberal lie that a "poor boy can become president," no one has ever reached the rank of even a congressman without representing the exploiting classes and without in the process joining them. By the time that

someone has become president in the present system, he shall have become not only the chief political representative of the exploiters but also one of the biggest among them.

With US imperialism enlarging its interests at the expense of the broad masses of the people, the colonial bureaucrats have become bureaucrat capitalists. They are capitalists by keeping the entire government as a large private enterprise from which they draw enormous private profits. They act like the local managers of the US monopolies. They serve the comprador big bourgeoisie and the landlord class, which are their internal material basis. Nevertheless, as distinguished from these two exploiting classes, the bureaucrat capitalists build up or expand their wealth through the exercise of political power. Classic statements to describe their distinctive character have come from their own mouths: "What are we in power for?", "We must provide for the future of our families!" and "We are all giant octopuses here!"

Through their political parties, the bureaucrat capitalists try to give the masses the false illusion of democratic choice. But these political parties are nothing but the external trappings of comprador-landlord dynasties perpetuating themselves in power. So far, elections have been regularly held in the Philippines but US imperialism and the local exploiting classes have always seen to it that only the political parties and the candidates subservient to their interests are politically permitted and financially capable of running for elective positions in the bureaucracy.

These exploiting interests contribute financially to both sides of an electoral contest to make sure that whichever wins, the forces of counterrevolution win and the broad masses of the people who are misled into the motion of voting lose. Oftentimes, these exploiters give vent to their preferences only by giving more funds to their favorite candidates. The general result is that the reactionary government continues to be their instrument and that the bureaucrat capitalists continue to draw their own profits from the preservation of a semi-colonial and semi-feudal order.

A party which is in control of government funds and facilities has a great advantage over an opposition party. In addition, it can also dispose at least a clique in the reactionary armed forces for fraud and terrorism. Despite all these, however, such a party that is ostensibly in power can either retain its majority position or be shoved into a minority position in the reactionary government only as US imperialism and the local exploiting classes wish. These superior powers behind the entire puppet state have more disposable funds for

electioneering. They are controllers of the most powerful mass media. They can manipulate the levers of their economic and political power to unleash propaganda in favor of their own policies and interests. To put the ruling party in a ridiculous position, all that the US imperialists have to do is to withhold loan capital from the reactionary government or all that the local exploiting classes have to do is to manipulate the prices of prime commodities. Besides all these tricks, the puppet politicians have to watch out in whose favor the reactionary armed forces are being swung by US imperialism.

During the last 25 years, so-called third parties have been put up. These parties like the Democratic Party led by Carlos P. Romulo and the Progressive Party of the Philippines led by the Manahan-Manglapus gang have served mainly to firm up the puppet and exploitative class character of the two-party system and have merely ensured the granting of concessions to their chieftains. These “third parties” have been used only to tilt the balance in favor of the most reactionary candidates at a given time in the puppet elections. Romulo’s Democratic Party was used to support the Magsaysay candidacy. The Manahan-Manglapus gang has continuously adapted its party to the needs of the CIA and the reactionary diehards in the Catholic Church whose support it enjoys. The Progressive Party of the Philippines became the Grand Alliance in 1959 and launched a campaign for the decontrol policy and went to the extent of threatening the incumbent regime with a coup d’état. In 1961, the Manglapus-Manahan gang formed the United Opposition with the Liberal Party to ensure the electoral success of the latter with its colonial platform of “free enterprise.” Now the Manglapus-Manahan gang is running the Christian Social Movement. This latest contraption of the CIA and the reactionary diehards in the oldest colonial and feudal institution in the country is intended as before to mislead those who are disgusted with the present political system into counterrevolutionary reformism and clerico-fascism. Its comprador and landlord leaders echo the catchphrases of the discredited Christian Democratic parties of Europe and Latin America.

So far, the only “third party” with some positive aspects emerged in 1957 when the Nationalist-Citizens’ Party was led by Sen. Claro Mayo Recto. It was at best, however, an anti-imperialist mouthpiece of the national bourgeoisie for a short while. It had a dual character. Its failure resulted from its adherence to bourgeois constitutionalism and parliamentarism. In the end, it served only to strengthen the present political system. Now it remains a mere name

with which individual opportunists qualify themselves for concessions from the present ruling party.²⁸

2. Sources of Graft and Corruption

Graft and corruption is an integral part of a semi-colonial and semi-feudal society. The bureaucracy is nothing but an instrument for facilitating the exploitation of the broad masses of the people by foreign and feudal interests. The bureaucrat capitalists merely exact their share in the profits of comprador and landlord exploitation. It is their reward. In dishing out the anachronistic jargon of “liberal democracy” or “free enterprise,” they simply mean to say that private interest (individual freedom of the exploiters) is paramount to public interest.

The entire hierarchy of the Philippine bureaucracy, including the executive, legislative and judicial branches, from the time of Quezon and Osmena to that of Macapagal and Marcos, has always been ridden with graft and corruption. One has only to take note of how much property a certain bureaucrat capitalist has at the start of his treacherous career and compare it with his visible assets that accumulate from year to year to be convinced of the enormity of graft and corruption and how detestably rotten the present system is.

In the guise of collecting support for their political parties, the bureaucrat capitalists get funds and facilities from their imperialist, comprador and landlord masters. Even before winning the elections or even in losing out to their opponents, they become wealthy on account of the large campaign contributions that they get. In return for the largesse that they collect, they become bound to the class interests of their supporters.

The bureaucrat capitalists get bribe money on the adoption of laws, executive orders and court decisions. In every contract, concession, franchise or license there is a certain amount of money that is used to line the pockets of the bureaucrat capitalists. Oftentimes, they themselves are parties in private transactions directly or through trusted dummies or relatives. It is characteristic of bureaucrat capitalists today to flaunt their status as chairmen, consultants or legal counsel of private business enterprises.

Public lands, including those actually cultivated by the poor homesteaders and the national minorities, are grabbed by the bureaucrat capitalists and their collaborators. These are taken over as logging, mining or pasture areas

²⁸ The National-Citizens' Party completely went out of existence when its president, Sen. Lorenzo Tanada, retired from the Senate in 1971.

at first under a lease or some other kind of contract with the government and subsequently converted into their private property. And public works are so designed as to raise the value of these lands.

In export-import operations peculiar to a semi-colonial and semi-feudal country, the bureaucrat capitalists draw their own share of comprador profits by putting their own outfits and the bribe-givers' on the priority list in foreign exchange accommodation. In the misdeclaration of imports and exports and consequent tax evasion, they cheat their own reactionary government of revenues.

Every year enormous amounts of funds are appropriated for public works. Most of these actually go into the pockets of the bureaucrat capitalists. Public bidding for the purchase of equipment and construction materials or for the hiring of a construction firm is manipulated. The payroll is also padded to pay idle proteges and also to yield more graft for the bureaucrat capitalists.

The government banking and insurance systems have been used to build up the landholdings and capital holdings of the bureaucrat capitalists and their close collaborators. Even when loans are granted to other borrowers, large percentages of the loans grease the palms of the bureaucrat capitalists. Using funds collected from workers and government employees through the Social Security System and the Government Service Insurance System, the reactionary government makes direct investments in private corporations. In the process, the bureaucrat capitalists get various concessions aside from gaining positions of authority in these private corporations.

All government corporations become milking cows in the hands of the bureaucrat capitalists. They are the sources of huge salaries and allowances. Purchase bids provide still bigger income for them. At so large an expense by the reactionary government, so-called pioneering enterprises are put up only to be sold at a losing price to private entities. Before being sold, these government corporations are subjected to all kinds of financial manipulation. Their bankruptcy becomes the rationale for their sale, that is, for another bureaucrat-capitalist killing. The bankruptcy of a government corporation is ridiculously used as an argument by the bureaucrat parasites themselves, not against state capitalism but against socialism.

In the accounting of private assets, there is a double standard: one is the book value for tax purposes and the other is the market value. Tax exemptions and all kinds of incentives are further granted to imperialist, comprador and landlord interests. Corporate bodies and fake cooperatives controlled by the

imperialists, compradors and landlords are created to cheat the petit bourgeoisie and the masses in general. In all these arrangements, there is so wide an area for graft and corruption for the bureaucrat capitalists. Oftentimes, bureaucrat capitalists are directly retained by corporations and haciendas in order to insure immediate suppression of the working people.

At every turn in the history of Philippine bureaucracy, there are special sources of graft and corruption. These could be crop loans, relief goods, war surplus goods, reconstruction funds, Chinese immigration quota, import controls, price controls, dollar allocations, rural banks, fake cooperatives, Japanese war reparations, deportation threats, alien naturalization, logging and mining concessions, pasture leases, stock exchange manipulations, government loans and subscriptions to private corporations, congressional allowances, calamity and contingency funds, barrio improvement funds, subsidies and so on and so forth.

The bureaucrat capitalists also venture directly into the most starkly illegitimate activities. They are involved in smuggling, usury, plain extortion, gambling, cattle-rustling and prostitution. These are conspicuously perpetrated at the lower levels of the bureaucracy though the top bureaucrats operate their political parties as crime syndicates. In this connection, the reactionary troops and police and the private goons of local officials also grow fat on the most anti-social activities.

The sources of graft and corruption enumerated above do not yet complete the list. A particular bureaucrat capitalist may not take advantage of all these at one particular time. But he is certainly taking advantage of some. It is extremely clear that his nominal salary is not adequate to maintain the kind of living that he leads. He would pretend to dole out his monthly salary to his proteges, but in fact he gets a huge income from one stroke of the pen or one telephone call. The arch-hypocrite Magsaysay made a big show of refusing petty gifts but was in fact engaged in grand extortion. Marcos announced that he would give up his worldly goods in self-abnegation, but he actually meant to create a foundation to keep in display his USAFFE medals and “glorify” himself. The most self-aggrandizing purpose of that foundation, however, is the collection of financial “contributions.”

Big bureaucrat capitalists have developed standard tricks for keeping their loot. They keep “petty cash” (in millions of pesos) in their house vaults for immediate use, deposits under numbered accounts in Swiss banks, strings of palatial houses and buildings, jewelry and all kinds of luxuries, securities in

profitable corporations and land titles. To make a big joke of the Anti-Graft Law, the bureaucrat capitalists temporarily put their assets under the names of close relatives or well-known businessmen until such time that the bureaucrat capitalists can freely cite “legitimate” business ventures.

The center of fire is properly directed at the big bureaucrat capitalists who rapaciously betray the national-democratic interests of the Filipino people. No matter how they conceal their ill-gotten wealth, it will still show in so many pompous assets that they never fail to flaunt. Characteristically, they spend their money in the most wasteful and unproductive ways.

The corruption of the big bureaucrat capitalists extends downward to the lower levels of the reactionary government and the local ward leaders. But by and large, within the reactionary government, the big bureaucrat capitalists oppress and exploit lower officials and ordinary employees.

3. Fascism

The bureaucrat capitalists perform the special function of deceiving the people with incantations of national chauvinism and bourgeois populism. They use parliamentarism to dissipate and disrupt any revolutionary movement for national liberation and people’s democracy against the evils of US imperialism, feudalism and bureaucrat capitalism. When they become desperate, they resort inevitably to the use of the state as a coercive instrument of class dictatorship. They call for “national discipline” to suppress the people’s democratic rights. They hypocritically invoke the glittering generalities of the constitution and the name of the people to suppress the people and justify their most heinous fascist crimes.

Bureaucrat capitalism is the basis of local fascism. The bureaucrat capitalists are too well compensated by US imperialism and the local exploiting classes to change their oppressive character in favor of the people. They will go to every length in protecting the interests of their own clique and in keeping the sources of their graft and corruption. In the face of an opposition coming even from another clique of their own class, the bureaucrat capitalists never hesitate to make use of armed force one way or another to preserve their power.

In the face of a revolutionary mass movement, the bureaucrat capitalists are even more vicious in using their armed power. They are in the first line of defense on behalf of their imperialist and feudal masters. The reactionary Armed Forces of the Philippines and the local police forces are ever at their disposal for counterrevolutionary purposes. If they themselves cannot subdue

the revolutionary mass movement, US aggressor troops are expected to come out of the US military bases and press them further into the front lines against the people.

The bureaucrat capitalists who turn into barefaced fascists take after their imperialist masters in brutality. For seven decades, US imperialism has taught them how to launch counterrevolutionary violence and has improved their weapons and techniques. Japanese imperialism has also given them three years of training in fascist rule and is again ready to give them some more. There has not been a single decade in Philippine history that is not stained by the blood of the people spilled by imperialism and its running dogs since the beginning of the century.

The present puppet republic is founded on counterrevolutionary violence, that of US imperialism and the local exploiting classes. For the US imperialists and the bureaucrat capitalists of the commonwealth government to return to power, they had to wage a ruthless war of aggression against the Filipino people. This was a repetition of the first US war of aggression at the turn of the century.

Fascism emerged in the Philippines and ravaged the motherland as the bureaucrat-capitalist clique led by Roxas took the main responsibility in combating the revolutionary mass movement. Those who refused resubjugation to US imperialism and the local exploiting classes became the target of fascist attacks. The Counterintelligence Corps, the Military Police Command and the Civilian Guards were unleashed against them.

The military suppression of the broad masses of the people raged on through the puppet regimes of Quirino and Magsaysay. The Philippine Constabulary and tens of battalion combat teams of the Philippine Army conducted the most sanguinary campaigns to uphold the supremacy of their foreign and feudal masters. The counterrevolution was capped by the formal suspension of the writ of habeas corpus (in fact a declaration of martial law) in 1950 which gave the fascist brutes more license to abuse the least semblance of civil liberty. The working class and the peasantry received the hardest blows, and even the petit bourgeoisie was subjected to the most despicable white terror. Fascism was inflicted on the people under the direction of US imperialism through such agencies as the Joint US Military Advisory Group and the Central Intelligence Agency.

Once more fascism is conspicuously on the rise under the Marcos puppet regime. Massacres, assassinations, kidnappings and arrests on trumped-

up charges are being flagrantly committed by the reactionary armed forces and police. Patriotic mass actions are brutally dispersed and demonstrators are murdered, maimed and arrested en masse. Brutal steps are taken to dissolve patriotic mass organizations. Even when the writ of habeas corpus is not formally suspended, an actual state of martial law is enforced. People are detained indefinitely, tortured and killed and homes are searched, looted or even burned without the niceties of reactionary laws. All of these abuses are being perpetrated on an increasingly larger scale.

All the fascist acts of the Marcos puppet regime fall under the US program of counterinsurgency. Day and night, the CIA, the JUSMAG and the A.I.D. Office of Public Safety goad the Armed Forces of the Philippines, the Police Commission, the National Bureau of Investigation and the local police forces to launch the most dastardly campaign of suppression against the people. Not satisfied with the regular army, constabulary and police formations, special murder gangs like the “Monkees,” “special forces,” BSDU’s and “provincial strike forces” have been organized to intensify the oppression of the people. Even the Reserve Officers Training Corps (R.O.T.C.) and Preparatory Military Training (P.M.T.) are now being geared for counterinsurgency, even as large student masses are attacked in mass demonstrations. More and more youths are being compelled to report to military camps for fascist training. Trainees in “home defense” centers are being used in military operations against the people in Central Luzon and elsewhere.

Marcos himself as the chief bureaucrat capitalist in the country exercises his role as commander-in-chief in the most callous manner. Day in and day out, he shouts threats of formally declaring martial law and in fact directly plots with his minions not only the perpetration of selective terror against patriots and democrats but also of large-scale military abuses on the people. He encourages the chieftains of the armed forces to threaten the imposition of martial law even while the US imperialists never fail to motivate them with the ambition to replace even their commander-in-chief in case he fails to keep the situation in tow. The butcher officers of the reactionary armed forces have the National Defense College, the Philippine Military Academy, and their fort training in the United States to fall back on for inspiration in fascist leadership.

Under the Pentagon slogan of “civic action,” the military appropriations are rapidly increasing and the reactionary armed forces are taking over functions formerly reserved for civilians. Funds appropriated for other branches of the government are being shifted to maintain the fascist machinery. For “human-

itarian” purposes, the reactionary armed forces have been involved in US wars of aggression abroad.

The bureaucrat-capitalist cliques and dynasties all over the country have gained more license to kill, burn and loot as a result of Marcos’ declaration of war against the Communist Party of the Philippines, patriotic mass organizations and the people in general. The formation of BSDU’s and “provincial strike forces” all over the country gives them more power than ever to attack the people. Armed gangs which bureaucrat capitalists formerly camouflaged as authorized bodyguards and security agencies for their haciendas and companies have acquired more authority to extort and make depredations. The bureaucrat capitalists have been given the widest latitude for combining reactionary troops and police with their own private killers and extortionists in order to perpetuate themselves in power. The growth of warlordism is accelerated.

The rise of fascism is not actually a sign of strength. It is in essence a show of despair and weakness by the diehard reactionaries. It shows that they have ceased to fool the people with words. The increased depredations of the reactionary armed forces and the fascist armed gangs will hasten the doom of the present system. Fascism is on the rise precisely because the revolutionary mass movement is surging forward and the split among the reactionaries is becoming more violent. It is to be expected that the puppet elections in the Philippines will become more fraudulent and terroristic.²⁹ The exposure of the violent character of the reactionaries will only teach the masses to defend themselves and assert their own power.

As part of the rise of fascism, the diehard reactionaries in the Catholic Church are helping the present tyrannical government misrepresent and slander the Communist Party and other organizations of a national-democratic character. The Christian Social Movement and its allied organizations are actually more concerned about stopping the people’s democratic revolution led by the Communist Party than even about begging for concessions from the tyrants. They are more interested in making the people helpless before the onslaught of US imperialism, feudalism and bureaucrat capitalism. The Opus Dei, the clerical instrument of Franco the Spanish fascist, has been import-

²⁹ The second Plaza Miranda massacre, which almost wiped out the entire national leadership of the Liberal Party, brought to a new high the ever-growing violence in the contradictions of the reactionaries. Nine people were instantly killed and hundreds of people were seriously injured by the blasts of two fragmentation grenades obviously thrown by goons of the US-Marcos clique. In a matter of three hours, Marcos made an official proclamation suspending the writ of habeas corpus and launched white terror not only against Communists but also against leaders of the Liberal Party and various democratic organizations.

ed into the country and has organized the Cursillo movement which means to arouse old clerical organizations into an anti-communist fanaticism and convert the cross into a dagger for killing people in an anti-communist crusade. Clerico-fascism is definitely an ingredient in the rise of fascism. Fascism, though it may take a priestly garb, is sure to be resisted by the masses of Catholic believers themselves and by the broad masses of the people whose historical experience has taught them the evils of friar domination.

In their moment of despair, the diehard reactionaries turn to the most backward institutions and methods for retaining their oppressive power over the people. But the internal and external conditions for armed opposition to the puppet republic have never been better. The political and economic bankruptcy of the present system is undeniable. Those who seek to defend it can only be the object of popular opprobrium. The main protector of the present rotten system, US imperialism, is increasingly being isolated inside the country and abroad and is the object of the most resolute people's wars.

4. Reformism and Modern Revisionism

The intensification of reformist and revisionist activity is complementary to the intensification of fascist activity. The diehard reactionaries will never cease to employ reformist tricks even while they commit heinous counterrevolutionary deeds. They will go to the extent of consorting with the modern revisionists. Reformism and modern revisionism are the brittle shields of fascism.

It is an absolutely foolish hope that legal possibilities can be exhausted before waging an armed revolution. There can be no end to law-making and parliamentary hocus-pocus if the reactionaries are not opposed by an armed revolution. They can even rewrite their constitution, but merely to put more embellishments on it. At this critical stage of Philippine history, the reactionaries find it convenient to rig up another Constitutional Convention³⁰ and float talks of "peaceful revolution."

Certain laws of the reactionaries can be taken advantage of only for tactical purposes. He is a fool who believes that the reactionary laws could be turned all the time against their own makers, especially when the dividing line between the broad masses of the people and the oppressor minority has been clearly drawn. Any review of history will yield not a single instance when the reactionaries peacefully allowed their class privileges to be written off.

³⁰ The delegates of the comprador big bourgeoisie and the big landlord class are in the overwhelming majority in this convention.

At a time when the people are clamoring for people's war to oppose the daily violence of foreign and feudal exploitation, there is an increasing use of "revolutionary" phrases even among diehard counterrevolutionaries. The spokesmen of comprador and landlord organizations and the bureaucrat capitalists in the executive, legislative and judicial branches of the reactionary government talk of making "structural reforms" in every conceivable forum. All of a sudden, it seems that everyone is becoming revolutionary, including the counterrevolutionaries. But by a mere analysis of the words of the reactionaries, we can clearly see that they will permit a "revolution" only "from the top" or merely "in the heart of the individual." They reserve the bitterest words of damnation for the real revolutionaries among the broad masses of the people. They talk of "revolution" mainly to justify or slur over the fascist barbarities inflicted on the people. To prove this point, one has only to examine the pronouncements of such counterrevolutionary entities as Marcos and his minions, the Christian Social Movement and other clerical organizations, and so on and so forth.

When the most violent means are already being employed against the revolutionary masses, the reactionaries resort to the sweetest words of concern. There is more talk of "civic work," "community development," "philanthropy," "social action," "welfare state," "constitutional reform" and "profit-sharing." At the moment, there is clearly a proliferation of organizations spouting so many lies. The CIA and the American Jesuits are today extremely active in putting up and running reformist organizations.³¹ What needs only to be done is to expose the class character of the organizers and supporters behind them.

The Marcos "nationalists" and the Lava revisionist renegades are also busy nowadays trying to soften up the harsh fascist picture of the Marcos puppet regime and are collaborating to facilitate the aggravation of imperialist domination. They are working hand-in-glove in the Movement for the Advancement of Nationalism, the Congressional Economic Planning Office, the U.P. Law Center and so many other organizations pretending to be anti-imperialist but always insisting that only concessions can be asked from US imperialism and the local exploiting classes and that the struggle be limited to parliamentary struggle.

The Lava revisionist renegades are being given all the liberty that they need to sabotage the revolutionary mass movement. They are at their old game, with the support of US imperialism, the Marcos puppet regime and Soviet

³¹ The US imperialists still continue to put up out-and-out traitor organization. For instance, as late as 1972, the CIA has put up the "Philippine Statehood-USA Movement" which calls for annexation of the Philippines to the United States.

social-imperialism. They specialize in spreading slander through the Movement for the Advancement of Nationalism and committing bloody acts of intrigue through the Monkees-Armeng Bayan-Masaka (Lava) gang against the revolutionary masses. Like its social-imperialist masters, the bourgeois reactionary gang of the Lavas is shifting from the “peaceful” talk of Khrushchev to the undisguised deeds of violence of Brezhnev against the proletarian revolutionaries and the people.

The Marcos puppet regime and the Lava revisionist renegades are steadily moving towards diplomatic and trade relations with Soviet social-imperialism under the guarantees provided by US imperialism and Japanese militarism. The false hope is being dangled before the national bourgeoisie and before those who take the viewpoint of the national bourgeoisie that Soviet social-imperialism can provide anti-imperialist assistance to them.

It is all a lie that Soviet social-imperialism can extend support to the nation or even only to the national bourgeoisie. More than it can assist any section of the Philippine Revolution, Soviet social-imperialism will only be able to reinforce to some extent the presently tottering puppet state and connive with the comprador big bourgeoisie in cheating the Filipino people in the exchange of overpriced and shoddy Soviet commodities and Philippine raw materials. US imperialism is interested in allowing Soviet social-imperialism some share in the exploitation of the Philippines only because they are allied in opposing the people, revolution, communism and China.

Diplomatic and trade relations with Soviet social-imperialism is very attractive to the Marcos puppet regime. It is because Soviet social-imperialism and the Marcos puppet regime have one thing in common: they both have a bureaucrat-capitalist character. The only difference between them is that one is monopoly bureaucrat-capitalist and the other is puppet bureaucrat-capitalist. Bureaucrat capitalists can always come into relations with each other so long as there are people for them to exploit.

Bureaucrat capitalism today is trying to prolong its existence with the assistance of US imperialism, Japanese militarism and Soviet social-imperialism. It is also trying to cover up its evil deeds with the reformist endorsement of the most reactionary feudal institution in the country. But the Filipino people have learned enough of their own history and problems to be deceived.

CHAPTER III

PEOPLE'S DEMOCRATIC REVOLUTION

Whoever sides with the revolutionary people is a revolutionary. Whoever sides with imperialism, feudalism and bureaucrat capitalism is a counterrevolutionary. Whoever sides with the revolutionary people in words only but acts otherwise is a revolutionary in speech. Whoever sides with the revolutionary people in deed as well as in word is a revolutionary in the full sense.

—Mao Zedong

I. BASIC CHARACTER OF THE PHILIPPINE REVOLUTION

Because of the semi-colonial and semi-feudal nature of Philippine society, the present stage of the Philippine Revolution cannot but take a national-democratic character. It is a national-democratic revolution, a revolution seeking the liberation of the Filipino people from foreign and feudal oppression and exploitation.

It is a national revolution principally because it seeks to assert national sovereignty against US imperialism and its local running dogs. It is a democratic revolution principally because it seeks to fulfill the peasant struggle for land against domestic feudalism, and furthermore it seeks to uphold the democratic rights of the broad masses of the people against fascism. The basic contradictions in Philippine society are those between the Filipino nation and imperialism, and those between the great masses of the people and feudalism. The fascism that is now on the rise is basically the military suppression of the people by the present counterrevolutionary state on behalf of its imperialist and feudal masters.

Because the principal objective of the present stage of the Philippine Revolution is to liberate the Filipino people from foreign and feudal oppression and exploitation, it can be said that it is a continuation and resumption of the Philippine Revolution of 1896 and the Filipino-American War, both of which end-

ed in failure under the leadership of the local bourgeoisie, particularly under the liberal-bourgeois leadership of the Aguinaldo government.

There is however a basic difference between the present national-democratic revolution and the one that suffered defeat at the hands of US imperialism. The present national-democratic revolution is of a new type. It is so by virtue of the fact that since the October Revolution and the emergence of the first socialist state from the ruins of an inter-imperialist war (World War I), the national-democratic struggles against imperialism, feudalism and bureaucrat capitalism in colonies and semi-colonies have inevitably become part of the world proletarian revolution. Since then, the objective conditions for the national-democratic struggles against imperialism, feudalism and bureaucrat capitalism in colonies and semi-colonies have inevitably become part of the world proletarian revolution. Since then, the objective conditions for the national-democratic revolution of the old type in the Philippines have ceased. The world bourgeois revolution has ceased to provide the correct orientation for the national-democratic revolution. More than ever, the old *ilustrado* leadership has sharply divided into the three strata of the comprador big bourgeoisie, national bourgeoisie and petit bourgeoisie with clearly different political attitudes. We are now in the stage of the new type of national-democratic revolution, the people's democratic revolution.

The effective class leadership in the Philippine Revolution is now in the hands of the proletariat and no longer in the hands of the bourgeoisie or any of its strata as was previously the case in the old type of national-democratic revolution. US imperialism, feudalism and bureaucrat capitalism cannot be overthrown unless the broad masses of the people are led by the revolutionary party of the proletariat, the Communist Party of the Philippines, under the supreme guidance of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought. The revolutionary demands and aspirations of the working class, the peasantry, the petit bourgeoisie and the national bourgeoisie can be correctly brought forward and can be realized only under the class leadership of the proletariat and its party.

The Communist Party of the Philippines was established as early as 1930. But because it was seriously afflicted by bourgeois subjectivism in ideology, opportunism in politics and violations of democratic centralism in its organizational life, it did not only fail to carry out its revolutionary tasks despite extremely favorable objective conditions at certain periods, especially during the period of the anti-fascist struggle and thereafter, but it also failed to preserve itself substantially for the almost two decades that immediately preced-

ed its reestablishment on December 26, 1968. That was mainly because the counterrevolutionary line of the Lavas and Tarucs prevailed within the Party until it was repudiated by a rectification movement inspired by Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought.

We are now in the era when imperialism is heading for total collapse and socialism is advancing to worldwide victory. The Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution has lofted high Marxism-Leninism of the present era, Mao Zedong Thought, and has transformed the People's Republic of China into an iron bastion of the world proletarian revolution. The oppressed peoples of the world now have an invincible ideological weapon to defeat imperialism, revisionism and all reaction and can look forward to a socialist future that has become a reality in a significant part of the world. The universal truth of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought is the invincible weapon directly wielded by the proletarian revolutionary parties leading the oppressed peoples of the world. There is now the Communist Party of the Philippines which is arduously striving to apply the universal truth of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought to the concrete conditions of the Philippines.

There is now the New People's Army under the command of the Party to deal deadly blows against armed counterrevolution and build the iron bastions of the revolution in the countryside before the seizure of power in the cities. There is now a united front for waging people's war and isolating the enemy diehards. It is based on the alliance of the proletariat and the peasantry, comprising more than 90 percent of the people, and furthermore it embraces the petit bourgeoisie, national bourgeoisie and other patriots. The local allies of US imperialism—the big bourgeoisie, the landlord class and the bureaucrat capitalists—are coming fast to their doom.

Under the present concrete conditions of Philippine society, which are semi-colonial and semi-feudal, the Communist Party has to wage a national democratic revolution of a new type, a people's democratic revolution. Though its leadership is proletarian, the Philippine Revolution is not yet a proletarian-socialist revolution. We should not confuse the national-democratic stage and the socialist stage of the Philippine Revolution. Only after the national-democratic stage has been completed can the proletarian revolutionary leadership carry out the socialist revolution as the transitional stage towards communism.

II. CLASSES IN PHILIPPINE SOCIETY

In carrying out the people's democratic revolution, it is absolutely necessary to make a general analysis of the various classes in Philippine society. In order to know comprehensively and profoundly the internal laws and course of historical development in the Philippines, we must recognize these various classes. We have to know their political attitudes to the revolution by recognizing their respective economic status. In knowing their economic status and political attitudes, we can determine who are our real friends and who are our real enemies in the revolutionary struggle against US imperialism, feudalism and bureaucrat capitalism.

We can define the classes and strata in Philippine society by considering them as large groups of people differing from each other by the place that they occupy in a historically determined system of social production, by their relation to (ownership or non-ownership of) the means of production, by their role in the social organization of labor, and, consequently, by the dimensions of the share of social wealth of which they dispose and the mode of acquiring it. In effect, the basis for class analysis is the relationship between the exploiters and the exploited. The various classes and strata become even more defined in the course of political struggle, when revolution and counterrevolution intensify and unfold the irreconcilable conflict between the exploiters and the exploited. The question of political standpoint consequently rises in importance as a criterion in class analysis.

Philippine society is made up of the following classes and strata:

1. The Landlord Class

The landlords are owners of vast tracts of agricultural lands. They do not engage in essential labor and they exploit the peasant masses principally through the exaction of land rent. They also lend money at usurious rates, hire labor or demand menial service as a form of tribute and cheat their tenants in the accounting of expenses for seedlings, fertilizers, pesticides, irrigation and the use of machine implements in order to increase land rent arbitrarily. They buy out impoverished peasants and grab lands already cultivated by small settlers and national minorities.

Those who assist the landlords in collecting rent or managing land estates and who are better off than the average middle peasant on the basis of their

share in feudal exploitation can be put in the category of landlords. Such is the standing of the general run of overseers and land administrators.

Usurers who rely on usury as their main source of income and are better off than the average middle peasant are to be considered landlords. Millers and agricultural machine owners who charge excessive rates either in grain or cash from the peasants also partake of the character of landlords.

Leaseholders or concessionaires of vast tracts of agricultural lands either from the reactionary government, banks, churches, schools, or absentee landlords are also in the category of landlords since they engage in the feudal exploitation of peasants. Managers and promoters of fake farm cooperatives may be included in the category of landlords because they derive their income from feudal exploitation.

The landlord class represents the most backward and reactionary relations of production and hinders the development of the productive forces. It is the main obstacle in the political, economic and cultural development of the Philippines. It is the main social base of imperialist rule and exploits the greatest number of people in the country today. At the same time it is a mere appendage of the international bourgeoisie depending on imperialism for its survival and protection. It resists the people's democratic revolution violently and is, therefore, a target of the revolution. It supports and uses the Catholic Church as a feudal institution to protect its interests and it has political representatives in the Nacionalista Party, Liberal Party, the Christian Social Movement and other reactionary political organizations from the national level to the barrio level.

Whenever the peasants organize themselves to claim their just rights, the landlord class never hesitates to use the police, armed forces, courts and prisons of the reactionary state to suppress them. It also organizes its own armed gangs to secure its property. It can never surrender its economic and political power voluntarily. All "land reform" laws that have been made by the reactionary government have served only to aggrandize the landlord class. The "land reform" agencies of the reactionary government allow the landlords and bureaucrats to exploit the peasants further in so many ways.

For tactical purposes, we may classify the landlords in several ways. They can either be big, medium or small, largely on the basis of the amount of land that they own or control. Some wield political authority while others relatively do not. It is often the case that cliques of landlords are antagonistic to each other. Some landlords are despotic while others are relatively not. Although

the landlord class as a whole is a target of the Philippine Revolution, landlords who are big, who are in authority and who are despotic, are the chief targets. These landlords lead in the suppression of the revolutionary mass movement and often incur blood debts.

The landlords who are closest to the imperialists and who are most powerful in the national center of the reactionary government are involved in the export of such agricultural products as sugar, coconut, hemp, tobacco, banana and the like. They are tied up with the imperialists through loan agreements on their mills or machine equipment and also through marketing agreements. They are a decisive force in the outcome of reactionary electoral contests because they are big campaign financiers and they themselves vie for seats in the reactionary government. Because they earn US dollars, they easily assume the role of the comprador big bourgeoisie engaging in both export and import of commodities.

The landlords in the line of crop exports are either wholly or partially engaged in capitalist farming. But, invariably, they exploit poor peasants who are rounded up seasonally by labor contractors to serve as farm workers on a temporary basis. Labor contractors and overseers aggravate the exploitation of these poor peasants and farm workers in various ways, especially usury and cheating on accounts.

2. The Bourgeoisie

The bourgeoisie in Philippine society is composed of three strata: the comprador big bourgeoisie, the middle bourgeoisie or national bourgeoisie and the petit bourgeoisie.

a. The Comprador Big Bourgeoisie

The comprador big bourgeoisie links the international bourgeoisie with the feudal forces in the countryside and has profited most from trade relations with the United States and other imperialist countries, especially Japan at the present moment. It has accumulated the biggest capital locally in its role as the principal trading and financial agent of US imperialism. Together with the big landlords to whom it is closely linked, the comprador big bourgeoisie restricts Philippine economic development because its interests lie in the persistence of imperialist and feudal domination. Its wealth is derived principally from the export of local raw materials (such as sugar, coconut products, logs, mineral ores, and the like) and the import of finished products.

In a semi-colonial and semi-feudal Philippines, the comprador big bourgeoisie inevitably has big landlord interests because its original economic base is feudal ownership of land and its persistent interest lies in the production of raw materials, the great bulk of which is agricultural. Wealth in the Philippines today is concentrated in the hands of only fifty big comprador-landlord families. Among the biggest representatives of the comprador big bourgeoisie are the Sorianos, Ayalas, Zobels, Elizaldes, Aranetas, Lopezes, Ortigas, Yutivos, Roxas-Chuas, Cojuangcos, Montelibanos, etc.

The wealthiest comprador group in the Philippines is that of the Sorianos, Ayalas, Zobels, and Roxases. It has its direct interests even as it serves as the agent of US imperialism and clerical organizations in such corporations as the Bancom, Ayala House of Investments, San Miguel Corporation, Atlas Consolidated Mining, Bislig Bay Lumber, Paper Industries Corporation of the Philippines, Nutritional Products, Coca-Cola Export Corporation, Atlas Fertilizers, Phelps Dodge, Central Azucarera de Don Pedro, Soriamont, F.G.U. Insurance Group, Bank of the Philippine Islands, People's Bank and Trust Company, Industrial Textiles Manufacturing, International Engineering, Rheem of the Philippines, Herald-Mabuhay, Interisland Broadcasting Corporation, Radio Mindanao Network, STAATS, and a host of other corporations .

The comprador big bourgeoisie controls the present political system as it serves as the biggest financier in political campaigns conducted by reactionary parties like the Nacionalista Party, Liberal Party and such political organizations as business chambers, civic organizations and clerical movements. The comprador big bourgeoisie is a target of the Philippine Revolution and its political attitude is violently opposed to the national and democratic aspirations of the Filipino people. It is the class that is most virulent in promoting every political, economic, cultural, and military measure for the perpetuation and aggravation of imperialist dominance in Philippine society.

The bureaucrat capitalists are closely bound up with the compradors and landlords. These corrupt government officials provide immediate armed security to comprador rule in the cities and landlord rule in the countryside. Under such kind of rule, they can perpetrate graft and corruption and at the same time protect their own comprador and landlord interests. The reactionary state in the Philippines is essentially the joint dictatorship of the compradors, landlords and bureaucrat capitalists.

Managers, big corporate lawyers, big accountants, labor dealers and highly paid reactionary publicists and intellectuals in the direct service of the interna-

tional and local big bourgeoisie are in the category of the comprador bourgeoisie. Their political attitude towards the people's democratic revolution is as vile and vicious as that of their masters.

b. The Middle Bourgeoisie

The middle bourgeoisie is otherwise called the national bourgeoisie. It is the middle stratum between the comprador big bourgeoisie and the petit bourgeoisie. It is composed of businessmen in town and country who are interested in "nationalist industrialization." Its economic interests range from cottage industries, fishing and light manufacturing to medium marketing and transportation businesses, and "intermediate" industries highly dependent on imported raw materials. Manufactures of the national bourgeoisie include alcohol, shoes and leather, cigars and cigarettes, simple agricultural implements, fishing nets, ropes, coconut oil, flour, textiles, cement and concrete products, educational materials, lumber, scrap metal products and so many others.

The national bourgeoisie represents the capitalist relations of production in the country. It is oppressed to a great extent by imperialism which has its own direct investments in a big and strategic way, dumps its manufactures locally and manipulates the basic policies of the reactionary government regarding the whole economy, currency, fiscal policy, foreign loans, domestic credit, tariff rules and regulations, taxation and local marketing. At the same time, those who belong to the national bourgeoisie are linked in varying ways and degrees with imperialism through contracts involving credit, raw materials, fuel, patents and the like.

The national bourgeoisie is generally fettered by feudalism, but at the same time many of its members belong to the landlord class. That is because they depend on their land as collateral in getting loans from banks for their investment projects. In their relations with the reactionary government, they often complain about graft and corruption, but at the same time they are eager to join the ranks of the bureaucrat capitalists.

The national bourgeoisie has a dual character in the Philippine economy. For this reason, it has an inconsistent attitude towards the people's democratic revolution. It has a weak economic base and therefore, its political standpoint is flabby. At certain times, it joins the working people in revolution against US imperialism and feudalism to some extent. At other times, it joins the big bourgeoisie in counterrevolution.

The national bourgeoisie has the ambition of becoming the big bourgeoisie and of building a capitalist state under its class dictatorship. Its leading representatives are fond of citing the capitalist transformation of feudal Japan in Asia as an example, and they frequently talk of merging independent enterprises into giant industries.

Nevertheless, the middle bourgeoisie can still join the forces of the Philippine Revolution at certain times and to a limited extent. In the era when imperialism is heading for total collapse and socialism is marching toward worldwide victory, the middle bourgeoisie cannot escape nor remain independent of the intensification of imperialist and feudal oppression on one hand and the intensification of resistance by the revolutionary masses on the other. It is compelled to choose between revolution and counterrevolution. It has no more chance to develop capitalism to the full or to dominate the present state.

In having a dual character, the national bourgeoisie has a left wing and a right wing. The left wing is most oppressed by imperialist rule and is always in danger of bankruptcy due to the increasing combinations of the foreign monopolists, comprador big bourgeoisie and upper section or right wing of the national bourgeoisie. Because of its plight, it is sympathetic to the revolutionary cause of the masses. It can also win over the middle wing and prevail over the right wing when imperialism and antidemocratic forces are bearing down heavily on their class interests. But the right wing can easily swing over to the side of counterrevolution because of its fear of the masses and its close attachment to the big bourgeoisie. The Party should always take a prudent policy with regards to the dual character of the national bourgeoisie.

c. The Petit Bourgeoisie

The petit bourgeoisie is the lowest and most sizable stratum of the local bourgeoisie. It includes the vast majority of the intelligentsia like teachers, student youth, low-income professionals, office clerks and lower government officials; middle peasants; small businessmen; master handicraftsmen; carpenter contractors; fishermen with their own small motorized boats and implements; and relatively well-paid skilled workers.

Of the three strata of the local bourgeoisie, it possesses the smallest amount of property. It is mainly characterized by relative economic self-sufficiency accruing either from the ownership of a small amount of productive means or the possession of some special training or skills. In comparison with the national bourgeoisie, it has a more limited and generally fixed income and is

definitely more oppressed by imperialism, feudalism and bureaucrat capitalism and is, therefore, far more progressive. It is an important motive force of the Philippine Revolution in being a reliable ally of the working class.

The petit bourgeoisie deserves our close attention because its support for and participation in the people's democratic revolution is decisive in shifting the balance of forces against the national and class enemies of the Filipino people. This stratum has three levels—upper, middle, and lower—distinguishable on the general basis of income. The petit bourgeoisie at each level has a corresponding political tendency toward the Philippine Revolution .

The upper level includes those who manage to have some cash savings or grain surplus each year. They are the most affluent in the ranks of the petit bourgeoisie, and they aspire to join the middle bourgeoisie. They are, however, a small minority in the petit-bourgeois stratum. Their political tendency is markedly influenced by the bourgeoisie. Thus, they constitute the right wing of the petit bourgeoisie. They tend to be influenced by the political views of the bourgeoisie in the reactionary schools and mass media, and they echo these views as if these were their own. From their ranks are often recruited the local leaders of the reactionary parties and also the provincial members of various US-style clubs like the Jaycees, Rotary, Lions and YMCA and also such clerical groups as the Christian Social Movement, Knights of Columbus, Daughters of Isabella, Catholic Women's League, Catholic Action and the Cursillo.

The middle level of the petit bourgeoisie includes those who are in the main economically self-supporting and who earn just enough to make both ends meet. They are extremely concerned about their source of income lest they fall into difficulties. They are subject to the political influence of the upper level, but at the same time they are subject to the influence of the restless lower level of the petit bourgeoisie. They are verbally abusive of the imperialists and the local exploiters in a very personal way, but at the same time they express doubts about the effectiveness of the revolutionary mass movement. They have a strong tendency to stay "neutral" but they do not oppose revolution. Because of their great number, being at least one half of the petit bourgeoisie, they have to be won over to the fold of the revolution in order to shift the balance of forces not only within the petit bourgeoisie but also within the whole nation.

The lower level of the petit bourgeoisie includes those whose standard of living is definitely falling and are annually harassed by the deficit in their accounts. To cover their financial difficulties, they incur debts from their relatives and friends or mortgage their property to usurers. The misery of their lives

is sharpened by the fact that they have seen better days. They are in great mental distress as they watch their means dwindle. This part of the petit bourgeoisie is great in number and tends to welcome and accept the wisdom of joining the revolution. It is the left wing of the petit bourgeoisie. In times of crisis or war, it becomes a distinct and a considerable force rapidly participating in the revolutionary mass movement. In its forward movement, it brings along the middle level and even the upper level of the petit bourgeoisie. Even at the initial stage, it is important to conduct political work among the semi-owner peasants who comprise the lower level and left wing of the rural petit bourgeoisie or who to an increasing degree are falling to the status of the semi-proletariat or poor peasants.

At this stage, it is already clear how important it is to arouse and mobilize the low-income intelligentsia and student youth who comprise the overwhelming majority of the urban petit bourgeoisie. In both city and countryside, the petit bourgeoisie have the common peculiar character of being economically hard-pressed because they have to send their children to high school and college as an expected means of maintaining or raising their status.

Among the various sectors of the petit bourgeoisie, the intelligentsia (student youth, teachers, low-income professionals and intellectuals) is the most important and decisive in preparing public opinion in favor of the Philippine Revolution on a nationwide scale. The student youth and teachers can join the vanguard of the cultural revolution in shattering the superstructure that stifles the nation and preserves the exploitative system. They are in a good position to undertake this task because they have a keen political sense; they are the most numerous part of the intelligentsia; they are the most widespread, and yet they are concentrated in schools at particular points in both urban and rural areas. They can easily relay revolutionary propaganda and reach the masses throughout the archipelago beyond the capability of the reactionaries to curtail the truth of the people's democratic revolution. That is why it is very important to conduct revolutionary propaganda and revolutionary work among them.

Most of those who belong to the intelligentsia have extremely limited fixed income and, thus, they are extremely oppressed by imperialism, feudalism and bureaucrat capitalism. Most teachers receive salaries that are barely adequate and many of them live in fear of being disemployed due to the vagaries of the system. Most students also live in fear of having to discontinue their studies or having no employment after graduation. They depend on their families, which are mainly petit-bourgeois and have nothing much to bequeath to them. There

are quite a number of students in cities who labor at the same time as office clerks, menials, drivers or factory workers to earn their living and their matriculation fees; these either come from proletarian or peasant families. Low-income intellectuals and professionals have the same economic difficulties as most of those who belong to the intelligentsia. In general, the intelligentsia is extremely receptive to revolutionary propaganda.

As in the old democratic revolution when student youth were among those in the forefront of the propaganda movement, the student youth are again among those in the forefront of the propaganda movement of today's struggle for people's democracy. The previous decade of the sixties was marked by a revolutionary activism among the student youth that is now unfolding even more vigorously in the current decade of the seventies in the form of increasingly bigger militant mass demonstrations combining the intelligentsia with the workers and peasants and in the form of student propaganda and investigation teams going to factories, farms and other schools to conduct mass work on a wider scale. The student youth are an important force assisting the proletariat in the spread of revolutionary propaganda on a nationwide scale.

The people's democratic revolution cannot be advanced without the participation of revolutionary intellectuals. Nevertheless, it must be recognized that intellectuals are characteristically subjective, individualistic, impetuous or easily cowed because of their petit-bourgeois origin, living conditions and political outlook. They are susceptible to counterrevolutionary ideas, including modern revisionism centered in the Soviet Union and pseudo-revolutionary ideas as those of Che Guevara, Herbert Marcuse and Regis Debray, to say the least. They can overcome their weaknesses and shortcomings only by deeply involving themselves in mass struggles over a long period of time. Some will drop out and a few will even become enemies of the revolution, but others will revolutionize and remold their thinking and persist in the ranks of the revolutionaries. At all times, the proletariat should be alert to their weaknesses.

3. The Peasantry

The peasantry is distinguished from all other classes by the fact that all its members cultivate the land. It is the main force of the national economy. It is 75 percent of the entire Philippine population. It has three strata; namely, the rich peasants, the middle peasants and the poor peasants.

a. The Rich Peasants

The rich peasants are otherwise called the rural bourgeoisie and comprise about five percent of the rural population. They as a rule own the land that they till and have surplus land besides. Otherwise, they own only part of the land and rent the remainder or they do not own the land at all but rent a sizable amount of land. By tilling the land themselves and by exploiting others on the surplus portion of the land that they either own or rent, they derive a surplus in grain or in cash above their yearly expenses.

Although they themselves work, they engage in exploitation either by hiring farm labor or letting part of their land to poor peasants. They have more and better farm implements and also more work animals. They have more capital to improve their crops with fertilizers and pesticides and also their fields with irrigation facilities. Aside from hiring farm labor or collecting land rent, they engage in such other forms of exploitation as usury, renting out work animals and farm implements, running a local store and the like. They represent semi-feudalism in the barrios and are susceptible to echoing the views of the small landlords or the small merchants.

Rich peasants attain the status of landlords when they begin to depend wholly or mainly on their income from hiring the labor power of others, retaining tenants, engaging in usury, renting out work animals and farm implements or serving as overseers or administrators of landed estates or communal lands. When reaction is on the rise in particular areas, a handful of rich peasants also take to the style of local tyrants and become rabid running dogs of despotic landlords. The landlord class always tries to make use of rich peasants as instruments for turning the "barrio councils" as well as organizing armed gangs against the revolutionary peasants. Our policy is to frustrate the landlords' efforts and win at least the neutrality of the rich peasants in the revolution.

It must be recognized as a general rule that the rich-peasant form of production is useful for a definite period. A premature policy of liquidating it should be strictly avoided. The rich peasants can be of help to the anti-imperialist struggle of the peasant masses, and they can remain neutral in the agrarian revolution against the landlords. Rich peasants should not be indiscriminately treated as landlords or as filthy rich. On the other hand, a general policy should be adopted to encourage them to make grain or cash contributions to the revolution. At the same time, definite steps must be taken to replace their political dominance in the barrio with that of the proletariat through the Party, the semi-proletariat, and the leading activists from the middle peasants. Steps must

also be taken to guard against the possibility that they turn against the revolution. However, the opportunism of the rich peasants in the face of the enemy should not be regarded automatically as treason. Those who have willfully done serious damage or incurred blood debts against the revolutionary masses must be dealt with on a case-to-case basis.

b. The Middle Peasants

The middle peasants may be called the rural petit bourgeoisie, and they comprise about fifteen to twenty percent of the rural population. They as a rule own land that more or less allows them to be self-sufficient. Otherwise, they own only part of the land and rent the remainder or they do not own land at all and rent all of it. But in any case, they rely mainly on their own labor to earn an income that allows them to be self-sufficient. They may occasionally practice exploitation, but it is only to a small extent and is not their regular or main source of income. They have adequate farm implements, cash for agricultural expenses and at least one work animal. Because of their characteristic self-sufficiency, the middle peasants do not have to sell their labor power. Some members of their families may have certain special skills, but they will earn the extra money only to be able to improve their homes or to send someone to school.

There are three levels of the middle peasants. Those who belong to the upper level have a little more than enough land or make a harvest or get a share of the harvest a little more than sufficient for their families. They aspire to the status of the rich peasants and they therefore tend to take the political attitude of the latter. Those who belong to the middle level of the middle peasants have just enough land or earn just enough to make them self-sufficient. They strive to earn a little more in an attempt to attain the status of the upper-middle peasants and to keep themselves from falling into indebtedness. They get indebted sometimes, but they manage to stay on an even keel. They tend to follow the opinion of the upper-middle peasants and rich peasants in placid times. But they easily follow the opinion of the lower-middle peasants and poor peasants in an increasingly difficult situation or when the tide of the revolutionary movement is high. Those who belong to the lower level of the middle peasants are ever troubled by the inadequacy and poor quality of their land, their shortage of cash and increasing pile of debts. The usurers are knocking at their doors to declare them in default of their mortgage and inform them of their new status as poor peasants.

The middle peasants live austerely to make both ends meet. But their lives are often upset by a poor harvest or by a serious illness in the family. As the crisis in Philippine society is rapidly worsening, however, the whole lot of the upper, middle and lower-middle peasants are going down rapidly into bankruptcy. They are being mercilessly pressed down by the rising costs of agricultural production and prices of basic commodities.

The middle peasants are willing to join the anti-imperialist struggle and the agrarian revolution because of their immediate oppressed and exploited condition. It is of great importance to conduct revolutionary propaganda among them. Their positive or negative attitude is one of the factors determining victory or defeat not only in the countryside but in the whole country. Their enthusiastic support is especially needed in carrying out the agrarian revolution, and we must remember that after the agrarian revolution, the middle peasants become the majority of the rural population. The middle peasants welcome and can accept agricultural cooperation and socialism. They are, therefore, a reliable ally of the proletariat and an important motive force of the Philippine Revolution.

c. The Poor Peasants

Together with the farm workers, the poor peasants are about 75 to 80 percent of the rural population. Together with the semi-owner peasants, the poor peasants are included in the category of semi-proletariat. They as a rule own no land and serve as tenants of feudal lords. Some of them may own a piece of land but this is utterly negligible as they depend for their livelihood mainly on their tenant status. They own a few odd farm implements and many of them merely borrow or rent work animals. The main form of exploitation suffered by the poor peasants is the regular payment of land rent that is equivalent to half their harvest or even more. It is this peasant stratum that is most subjected to usury and other forms of feudal abuses. In many cases, they are cheated by the landlords in the accounting of agricultural expenses. The poor peasants more than any other peasant stratum have to supplement their meager crop share by planting side crops, raising poultry or pigs, fishing, handicrafts, peddling, or selling their labor power as construction workers or seasonal farm workers. The poor peasants are often obliged to sell their labor power for a definite and considerable period of time unlike the middle peasants who sell their labor power only occasionally or partly. The poor peasants generally have insufficient funds for both their subsistence and agricultural expenses. They often seek the help

of relatives and friends or use their crop to guarantee debts from the landlords and money lenders.

The poor peasants and the overwhelming majority of semi-owner peasants constitute the biggest motive force of the Philippine Revolution. The land problem is their essential problem. It is, therefore, the main problem of the people's democratic revolution. In the process of making the revolutionary solution to this problem, the most gigantic force in Philippine society is aroused and mobilized to smash not only the landlords but also the imperialists, the comprador big bourgeoisie and the bureaucrat capitalists. All of them have long conspired to keep the peasantry in bondage. All "land reform" laws passed by these counterrevolutionaries have been calculated to entrench the exploiters of the peasant masses in this semi-colonial and semi-feudal society.

The peasantry, i.e., the poor and middle peasants, is the natural and most reliable ally of the proletariat, and it is the main force of the Philippine Revolution. Only under the leadership of the proletariat can the peasantry achieve liberation from its oppressors, and only by forging the firmest alliance with it can the proletariat lead the Philippine Revolution to victory. Powerful armed contingents can be drawn in large numbers by the revolutionary party of the proletariat only from the ranks of the peasantry. The people's democratic revolution is essentially a peasant war because its main political force is the peasantry, its main problem is the land problem and its main source of Red fighters is the peasantry.

With the support of the peasantry, the revolutionary party of the proletariat and the people's army can take full advantage of the uneven development of Philippine society. The countryside where the peasantry toils can be turned into a vast ocean to drown the enemies of the Philippine Revolution. It is here where the revolutionary forces first defeat the counterrevolutionaries before the final seizure of power in the cities. The countryside offers the widest area possible for maneuver for the revolutionaries because the counterrevolutionaries have no choice but to concentrate their forces for the defense of their urban centers of economic and political power and also for guarding their main lines of communication and transport. Furthermore, as the revolutionary movement intensifies, factions within the counterrevolutionary ranks struggle more bitterly and more violently, thus forcing whichever faction is in power to retain its crack forces in the city or in reserve camps to defend itself from coup d'états.

The proletariat should pursue a revolutionary anti-feudal united front in order to mobilize to the fullest possible extent the revolutionary forces in the

countryside. It should unite with the poor peasants, lower-middle peasants and farm workers as its most reliable allies. These in turn can win over the entire middle peasantry to neutralize the rich peasants and isolate the landlord class and other local tyrants.

4. The Proletariat

The proletariat refers principally to the industrial workers and secondarily to other wage-earners. It is a class that is dispossessed of any means of production and has to sell its labor power to the capitalist owners of the means of production. It is exploited by being forced to create surplus value while receiving in return a measly subsistence wage, far smaller than that surplus value which its capitalist employers appropriate.

Because of the semi-colonial and semi-feudal nature of Philippine society today, the Filipino industrial proletariat is small in size in comparison with the peasantry. It includes about 15 percent of the total manpower in the country. It ranges in number from 1.8 million to 2.0 million.

The industrial workers are in land, water and rail transport; mines and quarries; logging areas and lumber yards; sugar, coconut and abaca-stripping mills; public utility plants; food processing; beverage plants and breweries; tannery and shoe manufacturing; textile factories; printing presses; merchandising firms; chemical and drug factories; soap and cosmetic factories; oil refineries; flour mills; cement plants; pulp and paper manufacturing; scrap metal and steel processing plants; and several other enterprises and industrial lines. The most strategic and the biggest enterprises are owned and controlled by US monopoly firms. Otherwise, they are owned by the local big bourgeoisie and the middle bourgeoisie, with the latter playing a secondary role in the economy as a whole.

The industrial workers are extremely oppressed and exploited by US imperialism, local capitalism and feudalism. The so-called Magna Carta of Labor has not really been of help to them. It has been a mere concessionary and deceptive scrap of paper issued by the counterrevolutionaries after the brutal suppression of the Communist Party of the Philippines and the Congress of Labor Organizations. The workers receive low wages which are further cut down by continuous inflation and are deprived in practice of such minimum rights as unionization, job security, compensation for death and injury, overtime pay, maternity and sick leave with pay, regular medical and dental care, retirement pension and the like. The army, police, courts and prisons are ruth-

lessly poised and used against them whenever they rise up to assert their rights. The excessive number of unemployed and underemployed due to the general backwardness of the economy is always used by the exploiters to threaten or cause dismissals and replacements and to press down wage and living conditions of workers.

Before the reactionary employers give any concession, they subject the workers to the most vicious deception and, when this proves futile, the brutal force of the counterrevolutionary state. The officials of the reactionary government are given retainers' fees, bribes and other special privileges to suppress the workers' strikes. Labor dealers also come into the bargain to mislead the workers either by making a straight sellout or by limiting the economic struggle to merely getting the watered-down terms of a "collective bargaining agreement" and preventing the workers from raising their class consciousness. The exploiters make concessions to a certain segment of workers only when there is no way out in the face of a powerful workers' unity. But they never stop seeking ways of taking back what they have conceded and of intensifying the exploitation of the proletariat and other working people.

In addition to the industrial workers, there are the farm workers mainly in large sugar, coconut, fiber-growing, citrus, pineapple, banana and vegetable farms. They work the longest hours, receive the lowest wages and suffer the worst conditions. They are exploited by the imperialists, landlords, labor contractors and usurers. Like the industrial workers, the farm workers are wage-earners, and own no means of production. They are the rural proletariat.

The industrial proletariat is the most advanced force of production in the country today. It is internationally associated with the most advanced force of production in the imperialist countries and the world in general. It is associated with the most advanced form of economy, socialism. In the whole history of mankind, the proletariat has emerged as the most advanced force of production by creating the modern means of large-scale production. On the basis of its economic status and political experience, the proletariat has become the most advanced political force internationally and nationally. This truth has become unmistakably clear in the era of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought, when imperialism is heading for total collapse and socialism is marching toward worldwide victory.

The Filipino proletariat is not only a basic motive force of the Philippine Revolution, but it is also the leading force. It is the standard-bearer of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought, the proletarian revolutionary ideology

that guides the people's democratic revolution now and the socialist revolution subsequently. Among the toiling masses, the proletariat has the Communist Party of the Philippines to represent its class leadership. It is the class that can have a comprehensive grasp of materialist philosophy, dialectical and historical materialism, political economy, social science, people's war, party-building and the great proletarian cultural revolution.

The workers are today the most concentrated class in Philippine society; in big numbers, they work together daily. They have a strong sense of organization and discipline. They can use their strikes to temper their class leadership and prepare themselves for the seizure of political power in concert with the peasantry and other exploited sections of the people. By waging general strikes in coordination with the people's army, they can paralyze or overthrow their class enemies.

Owning no private means of production and being subjected to the most brutal oppression and exploitation, they are always willing to exercise their class leadership and strike down the oppressors and exploiters of the Filipino people.

Being young in comparison with the proletariat of the imperialist countries, the Filipino proletariat has natural ties with the peasantry, which are close and strong. Most Filipino workers come from peasant families. They can make full use of their home barrios and blood relations at various points of the whole country to launch people's war. At present, there is an increasing number of workers going to the countryside to conjoin with the peasantry in the revolutionary armed struggle. The workers in such enterprises as those found in the countryside, mines and quarries, transport lines, logging and lumbering, plantations, cement plants and others are tightly bound up with the peasant masses and are easily drawn to the revolutionary cause.

The Filipino proletariat has a splendid record of revolutionary struggle. Though still unconscious of their revolutionary ideology, Marxism, the Filipino workers led by Andres Bonifacio initiated and participated vigorously in the old national-democratic revolution. In the course of the Filipino-American War, the printing workers of the official newspaper of the revolutionary government established the first union. After the defeat of the Aguinaldo government by US imperialism, they fearlessly continued to establish trade unions despite the brutal attacks launched by the imperialists and their local lackeys to suppress them.

Unable to stop them, the US imperialists attempted to split the ranks of the proletariat by propagating locally the reactionary trade unionism of the American Federation of Labor (A.F.L.) and, after the triumph of the October Revolution, by promoting anti-Bolshevik hysteria. Despite the combined use of force and deception, the Communist Party of the Philippines was established in 1930, marking the formal beginning of the integration of the theory and practice of Marxism-Leninism with the concrete practice of the Philippine Revolution. Since then, US imperialism and its local lackeys have become even fiercer in attacking the revolutionary workers and in using all kinds of subterfuge to attack them and also to make use of internal weaknesses of the Party.

Only a few months after its establishment, the Party was brutally attacked by the US imperialists with the use of the Quezon puppet clique and the puppet constabulary. In the period of 1935 to 1941, political representatives of the bourgeoisie led by Vicente Lava crept into the Party to lay the foundation of the counterrevolutionary revisionist line of the Lavas and Tarucs. This line became more distinct in 1938 when the Communist Party and the Socialist Party merged wholesale.

During the war of anti-Japanese resistance, the proletariat and the Communist Party of the Philippines achieved considerable strength by leading the peasantry in revolutionary armed struggle. But upon the return of the US imperialists in 1945, counterrevolutionary revisionist agents of the bourgeoisie, the Lavas and Tarucs, maneuvered the Party into taking the erroneous path of parliamentary struggle and allowed US imperialism and feudalism to reclaim the areas where the workers and peasants had made substantial democratic gains.

Despite the veiled opposition of the Lavas and Tarucs, the armed struggle was resumed upon the insistence of the revolutionary masses. Under the guise of trying to achieve a rapid military victory in two years' time, the counterrevolutionary agents of the bourgeoisie led by Jose Lava within the Party abandoned the principle of building the people's fighting strength step by step within a protracted period of time and thereby sabotaged the revolution in concert with the US imperialists, the comprador big bourgeoisie, the landlord class and the bureaucrat capitalists, who launched vicious campaigns of "encirclement and suppression" against the people and the Party. In 1951, the puppet state destroyed the biggest and strongest trade union movement, the Congress of Labor Organizations, by committing all kinds of terrorist abuses against its officers and rank-and-file. Only after destroying this democratic organization

did the reactionaries put out the so-called Magna Carta of Labor to allow its agents to mislead those who could be misled among the workers.

After suffering disastrous military defeats, the counterrevolutionary agents of the bourgeoisie within the Party, the Lavas and Tarucs, took a series of steps towards surrender. Luis Taruc surrendered in 1954 and Jesus Lava did the same in 1964. The revolutionary mass movement became sabotaged because of the long period during which the counterrevolutionary revisionist line of the Lavas and Tarucs prevailed within the old Communist Party. The old Communist Party not only failed to seize power but it also failed to preserve itself for further waging revolutionary armed struggle.

The proletariat has been preyed upon by reactionary union bosses and other sorts of swindlers. The US labor attaché, CIA, AID, representatives of the AFL-CIO, ICFTU and ILO, US foundations (Asia, Rockefeller, Ford and the like), the Asian Labor Education Center, Institute of Social Order, Philippine Trade Union Center, Federation of Free Workers, Philippine Transport and General Workers Organization and so many reactionary outfits³² have for quite a long time tried to mislead the proletariat. Yet the crooks trained, fielded and subsidized by these anti-communist and anti-proletarian entities hardly control ten percent of the Filipino working class in all their fake trade unions. It is obvious that the workers can be organized and mobilized only under the theoretical guidance of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought and under the practical leadership of the proletarian revolutionary party, the Communist Party of the Philippines.

a. The Semi-Proletariat

A high rate of unemployment is a basic characteristic of a semi-colonial and semi-feudal country. With a population of 37 million, the Philippines has a reserve army of labor that is three million unemployed and seven million underemployed. The reactionary government mendaciously conceals this fact by releasing false figures concerning the state of unemployment. Artificially, it considers the millions of people who belong to the semi-proletariat as fully employed.

³² Even such a trade union outfit as the National Association of Trade Unions previously reputed to be progressive has long suffered the corruption and anti-communist misdirection of the labor aristocrat Ignacio F. Lacsina, its president. Lacsina has been discovered as an infiltrator and saboteur of the revolutionary mass movement in all years that he pretended to veer away from his past connections with CIA Jesuit "labor organizer," Fr. Hogan; the late puppet chieftain Magsaysay; and the Philippine Trade Union Council (PTUC).

The huge multitude of poor and semi-owner peasants who belong to the semi-proletariat has been presented. Aside from this, there are still other sections of the semi-proletariat which comprise a sizable part of the population. The most numerous of these are poor fishermen on the sea coasts and lake shores. The rest of the semi proletarians are found mostly in towns and urban areas.

The semi proletarians suffer from dispossession, under-compensation, irregularity and insufficiency of income and insecurity. There are those who have only their simple implements like the small handicraftsmen, carpenters and masons, small photographers, ambulant repairmen and poor fishermen. There are those who have only a small amount of funds to carry on their lives as peddlers and small stall keepers. There are those who have nothing at all but their labor power to sell like provincial dock porters, market *cargadores*, shop assistants, apprentices in sweatshops, pedicab drivers, some jeepney drivers, house servants, restaurant helpers and the like. These are people who cannot be accommodated as regular wage-earners in industrial enterprises nor as regular tenants in the countryside because of the semi-colonial and semi-feudal conditions.

These semi proletarians are a motive force of the people's democratic revolution. They can be formed into local associations although they are not as concentrated as the industrial proletariat. They are eager to fight the national and class enemies of the Filipino people.

b. The Lumpen Proletariat

On the basis of the high degree of unemployment in both city and countryside, the ranks of the lumpen proletariat keep on increasing. This stratum is composed of the dregs of Philippine society. It has emerged as a result of forced idleness. It is composed of thieves, robbers, gangsters, beggars, pimps and prostitutes, fakirs, vagrants and all other elements who resort to anti-social acts to make a living. They appear conspicuously in city slums. Many of them come from the provinces to look for jobs that are not available in the city. They are organized into such gangs as the OXO, Sigue-Sigue, Bahala Na and the like.

They often act as strikebreakers, disrupters of democratic actions, informers or goons for hire. Many of them go to the countryside to engage in banditry, extortion, cattle rustling, piracy and the like. Most of those being recruited by the reactionary armed forces into the "Monkees," BSDU's and other killer groups come from the lumpen proletariat. Lately, the reactionary government

has adopted the malicious practice of sending into the ranks of demonstrators combined forces of secret agents and hired lumpen proletarians to attack petit-bourgeois establishments and to disrupt and prevent demonstrations from reaching the vicinity of Malacanang Palace and the US embassy.

The lumpen proletarians are an extremely unstable lot. They are easily bought off by the enemy and are given to senseless destruction. But some of them can be remolded. Their courage in combat and their hatred of the puppet state and exploitation can be put in the service of the revolutionary struggle provided safeguards are taken. When they join the revolution, they become the source of roving rebel and anarchist ideology. The Taruc-Sumulong gangster clique and the Monkees-Diwa gang typify the unremolded lumpen proletarians who try to misrepresent the people's army.

All the classes and strata presented above comprehensively cover Philippine society. It is impossible for any person in the Philippines today to claim that he does not belong to any class or to any stratum within a class. Every person belongs to a definite class and carries the brand of that class.

If the basic structure of Philippine society is to be presented graphically, a pyramid would have to be drawn with the big bourgeoisie and the landlord class, together with their biggest political agents—the big bureaucrat capitalists—at the smallest tip representing not even one percent of the national population. Immediately below this tip is an extremely thin slice representing the national bourgeoisie. This is followed by another relatively thicker slice representing what amounts to about seven percent—the share of the petit bourgeoisie (excluding the middle peasants) in the population. In the parlance of bourgeois sociology, both the national bourgeoisie and the petit bourgeoisie, including the middle peasants, are called the middle class. More than 90 percent of the pyramid from the base up represents the toiling masses—the proletariat and the peasantry.

According to the Philippine Joint Legislative-Executive Tax Commission in 1960, 88.3 percent of Philippine families earned below P2,500; 8.0 percent earned P2,500 to P4,999; 2.6 percent earned P5,000 to P9,999 and 1.1 percent earned P10,000 and over. Those who earned P100,000 and above were estimated to comprise one-tenth of one percent of Philippine families and they were known to hold the lion's share of the national income and assets. By its own figures, the reactionary government cannot cover up the great disparity of income between the exploiting and exploited classes. This disparity means the emptiness of reactionary claims to democracy. Since 1960, considering

the ongoing inflation and two abrupt devaluations, the people's livelihood has worsened a great deal. The people's income has fallen far behind the rise in the prices of basic commodities.

It might occur that a certain person can be classified under two class categories or more. Because of the semi-colonial and semi-feudal character of the economy, one who belongs to the landlord class may belong at the same time to the big bourgeoisie or middle bourgeoisie. The principal class character of this person can be determined on the basis of his principal source of income. When it occurs that a landlord is at the same time a national bourgeois, his landlord interests and industrial or commercial interests are dealt with separately and properly. A member of the intelligentsia may come from a landlord, national bourgeois or rich peasant family, and yet he may in fact earn his livelihood as an urban petit bourgeois. He is essentially recognized as a member of the urban petit bourgeoisie.

However, it is not only the economic criterion that must be used in classifying individuals. The revolutionary or counterrevolutionary character of an individual is developed in the course of struggle, especially when it comes to the question of becoming a proletarian revolutionary. No one is born Red, even among the toiling people. Among the oppressed and exploited, there can be a handful of scabs whose counterrevolutionary attitude puts them on the side of the people's enemies. Among the members of the petit bourgeoisie, there may be those who can become advanced elements in the revolutionary struggle. Even among members of the exploiting classes, there may be exceptional cases of individuals who become remolded and join the ranks of the revolutionaries. Due importance must therefore be given to the criterion of political standpoint and the process of ideological remolding.

We must have a comprehensive view of the dialectical relationship between the economic base and the superstructure. In terms of classes and strata, we also need repeated class analysis in order to have a correct grasp of changes in political attitudes due to new material conditions, and vice versa. Concrete analysis of concrete conditions is the soul of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought.

c. Special Social Groups

There is no social group in the Philippines that can be excluded from class analysis. When the Party gives special attention to such social groups as the fishermen, national minorities, settlers, women and youth, it is not to obscure

or discount the class content but to give due attention to certain common conditions that each social group peculiarly has or is in need of.

1. *The fishermen* are a peculiarly large social group because of the archipelagic character of the Philippines. Aside from sea fishermen, there are also inland fishermen along big rivers and lakes. Fishing is not only a supplementary means of livelihood for the peasantry. There are full-time fishermen and these can be divided into three sections: namely, the rich, middle and poor fishermen.

The rich fishermen fish with their own motorized boats, big nets and fishing gears, buy the labor power of poor fishermen and earn more than what is enough for their respective families. The middle fishermen fish with their own non-motorized boats, medium-sized nets and fishing gears of poorer quality than those of the rich fishermen, engage solely in municipal fishing and earn just enough for their respective families. The poor fishermen either fish with their own inferior boats and fishing gears, engage mainly in shore-fishing and do not earn enough for their respective families but have to resort to other means of livelihood, most often by tilling the land as a side occupation, or they sell their labor power to rich fishermen and fishing capitalists.

The fishermen are directly exploited by US and Japanese deep-sea fishing capitalists with their large fishing trawlers and fleets (including storage and factory ships) which deplete fishing grounds, by landlords who fence them off from fishing grounds, by local fishing capitalists and merchants who dictate prices, and by abusive government officials who arbitrarily tax them in kind or in cash. The fishermen, especially the poor and middle fishermen, can support the anti-imperialist and anti-feudal struggle. They are very important in linking up and defending the islands and in providing food for the people. They can enrich the theory and practice of people's war by developing sea warfare and warfare in rivers, lakes and estuaries.

2. *Special recognition must be given to the need for autonomous government among the national minorities* numbering about five million or about 14 percent of the population. The so-called Muslim tribes (it is more accurate to speak of them as Maguindanaos, Maranaos, Tausogs, etc.) compose the largest minority, numbering 3.5 million. They are followed by the Igorot tribes numbering half a million.

The vast majority of the national minorities live in the hinterlands and in areas most neglected and abused by the reactionary government. The national minorities have long been subjected to Christian chauvinism and oppression by the reactionaries. It will never do to impose or give the impression of imposing

something beyond their autonomous needs. The Party recognizes their right to self-determination. They can be united with the rest of the Filipino people only on the basis of equality and respect for their culture or race.

The national minorities in the Philippines carry a heavier burden than the rest of the Filipino people. Until now, most of the Negritos have lived a primitive communal life and are the victims of racial discrimination. The Christian and Malay chauvinists have grabbed their lands in the plains and valleys and even the mountains to which they have been pushed. These aborigines are abused and killed at will. Even the national minorities in Mindanao who have attained a stage of social development which is not at all inferior to that attained by the rest of the Filipino people have been subjected to the most criminal abuses by the Christian chauvinists and the reactionary government. Ancestral minority lands have been taken away by the imperialists, compradors, landlords and bureaucrat capitalists by sheer manipulation of land titles and with utter disregard for indigenous customs and laws. Land grabbing is the evil that has been viciously inflicted on all indigenous cultural minorities in the Philippines by big land speculators, loggers, ranchers, mining companies and landlords. Invariably, they have been forced out of their lands with armed power. Many of them have been pushed to the remotest areas and these can be turned into powerful bases for revolutionary warfare.

The Chinese minority is also subject to Malay chauvinism in the Philippines. Compared to the Chinese minority in other Southeast Asian countries, that in the Philippines is the smallest with barely 120 thousand.³³ The reactionary government deliberately makes it difficult for Chinese nationals to be naturalized so that the Chiang bandit gang and Filipino bureaucrat capitalists can extort heavily from them and use them as a ready target for chauvinist attacks to divert attention from US imperialism and Japanese militarism. This is underscored by the fact that the reactionary government suppresses the people's clamor for the nationalization of all foreign enterprises, American and otherwise. The US imperialists, the Filipino reactionaries, the big bourgeois agents of the Chiang bandit gang and the modern revisionists are in cahoots with each other in the fascist plot to serve up the majority of Chinese nationals who belong to the middle and petit bourgeoisie, semi-proletariat and prole-

³³ This figure is taken from the records of the Bureau of Immigration and other records of the reactionary government. To magnify the so-called Chinese problem, chauvinists usually claim the number of Chinese nationals in the Philippines to be 600,000 or even as high as three million. They try to count the children of Filipino-Chinese intermarriages as Chinese nationals, though most of these have elected Filipino citizenship in accordance with Philippine laws.

tariat to the chauvinist hatred of hooligans who will take up the war cry of "nationalism" to cover up their puppetry to US imperialism.

The correct policy toward all the national minorities is always to take a proletarian standpoint and make the necessary class analysis. This is the only way by which the Party can most profoundly integrate with them. By developing Party cadres and Red fighters among the national minorities, the Party can overthrow not only the entire puppet state but also the local tyrants in the territories of the national minorities.

3. *Settlers on the hilly regions and forest zones* of the country are a major phenomenon due to the semi-colonial and semi-feudal character of Philippine society. They are important because they are oppressed, are of large number and occupy terrain favorable for armed struggle. It is safe to estimate that those who have resided in their new settlements for not more than twenty years are no less than ten percent of the peasant population in the entire country. In several provinces, settlers in general compose the majority of the local population. The settlers on hilly regions and forest zones are dispossessed peasants who find neither agricultural nor industrial employment in places from which they have migrated. Though they at first hold small pieces of land which they till and call their own, they ordinarily live as poor peasants or as lower-middle peasants and are prevented from gaining formal title over their land by the reactionary government and various local exploiters. They are often victims of land grabbing, government neglect, usury, merchant manipulation, special levies by local bureaucrats and bullies, and banditry. For their own benefit, landlords and officials of the reactionary government often foment communal conflicts between the settlers and the original inhabitants.

4. *Women* compose about one-half of the Philippine population and they cut through classes. The vast majority of Filipino women, therefore, belong to the oppressed and exploited classes. But in addition to class oppression, they suffer male oppression. The revolutionaries of the opposite sex should exert extra efforts to make possible the widest participation of women in the people's democratic revolution. They should not take the attitude that it is enough for the men in the family to be in the revolutionary movement. This attitude is actually feudal, and it would be to aggravate the old clan and clerical influence on women if they were to be kept out of the revolutionary movement. Women can perform general as well as special tasks in the revolution. This is an effective method for liberating them from the clutches of feudal conservatism and also

from the decadent bourgeois misrepresentation of women as mere objects of pleasure.

5. *Youth* compose the majority of the Philippine population. We have already discussed at length the student youth as in the main belonging to the petit bourgeoisie. We must keep in mind that the majority of the youth belong to the working class and the peasantry. The majority of the Party cadres and regular fighters in the people's army are as a matter of course youth.

Elder people should not be arrogant to the youth, and the latter should not be insolent to the former. The revolutionary experience of the elder people should be combined with revolutionary vitality and keenness of the youth. It is important to rely on the youth in a protracted revolutionary struggle. The mobilization of the youth ensures the continuous flow of successors in the revolutionary movement.

III. CLASS BASIS OF STRATEGY AND TACTICS

Class analysis of Philippine society determines the strategy and tactics of the Philippine Revolution. Without a comprehensive view of the various classes from a proletarian revolutionary viewpoint, we cannot at all determine our real friends and our real enemies. It is of decisive importance in the revolution to distinguish real friends from real enemies. Otherwise, we are bound to commit serious mistakes and lead the revolution astray. Based on our class analysis of Philippine society, the motive forces or friends of the Philippine Revolution are the proletariat, the peasantry, the petit bourgeoisie and, at certain times and to a limited extent, the national bourgeoisie. They compose the overwhelming majority of the Filipino people who are oppressed and exploited by US imperialism, feudalism and bureaucrat capitalism. On the other hand, the targets or enemies of the Philippine Revolution are US imperialism and its local lackeys, which are the comprador big bourgeoisie, the landlord class and the bureaucrat capitalists. They compose an extremely small minority of the population. They need to be overthrown in order to achieve national freedom and democracy.

By correctly pursuing a revolutionary class line, we can arouse and mobilize the most gigantic force to encircle or bear upon, isolate and destroy the enemies of the Philippine Revolution. We call upon the entire Filipino nation to wage a national war of liberation against US imperialism. We call upon the great masses of the people to wage a democratic revolution, which is mainly a peasant war, to destroy the feudal social base of imperialist rule.

1. Class Leadership and the Party

There can be no successful revolution without the correct leadership of a definite class. The leading class in the Philippine Revolution today is the proletariat. It is the most advanced productive and political force in the Philippines and in the whole world. It is the standard-bearer of the universal theory of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought, without which no genuine revolutionary movement can arise in the Philippines in the present era.

Since World War I and the October Revolution, when the course of world history departed from the path of capitalism to the path of socialism, only the Filipino proletariat has become capable of fully comprehending and embracing the patriotic and progressive aspirations of the entire Filipino people. After World War II, the national liberation of the Chinese people and other peoples and the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution, the historic role of the Filipino proletariat as the leading class of the Philippine Revolution has become ever more clear.

In these last three decades, it is the class in Philippine society that has dared to lead the people onto the road of revolutionary armed struggle against their foreign and local oppressors and exploiters. It is the class that has gained the profoundest experience and lessons in the concrete practice of the Philippine Revolution.

By its class nature, the proletariat is capable of giving revolutionary leadership not only in the short run but also in the long run until the stage of communism is reached. It now leads the present stage of people's democratic revolution and it will also lead the subsequent stage of socialist revolution.

The Communist Party of the Philippines is the most advanced embodiment and the principal instrument of the revolutionary leadership of the Filipino proletariat in fulfilling its historic mission. It is composed of the most advanced elements of the proletariat and therefore, it is the concentrated expression of the ideological, political and organizational strength of the proletariat as a leading class.

Without this revolutionary party, there can be no revolutionary movement. It is responsible for applying correctly the universal theory of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought on the concrete conditions of Philippine society. Its practical leadership and policies determine the course of the revolutionary movement. Acting as the general staff of the Philippine Revolution, the Party sees to it that correct strategy and tactics bring the revolutionary cause forward.

Although the proletariat is relatively small in a semi-colonial and semi-feudal society like that of the Philippines, the Communist Party of the Philippines as its most advanced detachment goes deep among the broad masses of the people and builds itself up as the invincible force at the core of the entire revolutionary mass movement. The Party links firmly the proletariat with the peasantry and also with other revolutionary classes and groups in the Philippines. By providing proletarian leadership to the peasantry, the Party can wield a strong people's army as its principal weapon and can develop the basis for wielding another powerful weapon, the national united front of all revolutionary classes and strata.

Keenly concerned about the danger of modern revisionism and the persistent counterrevolutionary revisionist line of the Lavas and Tarucs, the Party is indefatigably waging a rectification movement to cleanse itself of past errors as well as current ones.

2. The Main Force and the Armed Struggle

The main force of the Philippine Revolution is the peasantry. It is the largest mass force in a semi-colonial and semi-feudal country. Without its powerful support, the people's democratic revolution can never succeed. Its problem cannot but be the main problem of the people's democratic revolution. It is only by acting upon this problem that the proletariat and its Party can arouse and mobilize the peasant masses.

There is no solution to the peasant problem but to wage armed struggle, conduct agrarian revolution and build revolutionary base areas. In the course of carrying out the revolutionary struggle for land as a way of fulfilling the main democratic content of the Philippine Revolution, the central task of the entire national revolutionary movement which is to seize political power and consolidate it is also carried out. The main armed contingents of the Philippine Revolution can be raised only by waging a peasant war. Thus, it is inevitable that the vast majority of the Red fighters of the New People's Army can only come from the peasantry.

It would be erroneous for a Communist Party in a semi-colonial and semi-feudal country to put the principal stress of its mass work in the cities instead of in the countryside. To do so is to mislead itself into either committing the "Left" opportunist error of trying to seize power mainly on the basis of the mass strength of the proletariat in cities without adequate support from the peasantry or the Right opportunist error of relying indefinitely on parlia-

mentary struggle and unprincipled compromises with the imperialists and the ruling classes as the local revisionist renegades are now trying to do.

It is with due respect to the uneven development of Philippine society that the principal stress should be put on revolutionary struggle in the countryside and the secondary stress on revolutionary struggle in the cities. At all times, the revolutionary struggle in the city and countryside should be well-coordinated. But we should never miss the central fact that it is in the countryside where the weakest links of the political power of the enemy are to be found and where the people's armed forces have the widest area for maneuver in eating up the counterrevolutionary armed forces piece by piece and destroying them step-by-step.

Chairman Mao's strategic line of encircling the cities from the countryside should be assiduously implemented. It is in the countryside where the enemy can be compelled to spread his forces thinly and lured into areas where the initiative is completely in our hands. Though in the beginning the enemy encircles us strategically ten to one, we can in turn encircle him tactically ten to one. In the long run, the tide of the war will be surely turned against him as his actual forces dwindle and it becomes politically difficult to replenish them. At all times, he will be compelled to deploy an exceedingly large military force even only in the static defense of his cities, major camps and main lines of communication and transport. In the long run, his parasitic and passive military forces will also become hopelessly involved in the factional struggles of the reactionary classes.

In the countryside, we can develop several fighting fronts, ranging in quality from guerrilla zones to base areas. In doing so, we should always trust and rely on the masses because revolution is a mass undertaking. We should always rely mainly on the poor peasants, the lower-middle peasants and all sections of the proletariat and semi-proletariat found in the countryside. Furthermore, we should win over the middle peasants and neutralize the rich peasants to isolate and destroy the main pillars of feudalism and all other local tyrants.

In creating our base areas, we depend on a sound mass base, a sound Party organization, a fairly strong Red army, a terrain favorable to military operations and economic resources sufficient for sustenance.

We can turn the most backward areas in the countryside into the most advanced political, military, economic and cultural bastions of the revolution. We can create the armed independent regime in the countryside even before defeating the enemy in the cities. Only on the basis of solid democratic gains in the countryside can the revolution advance. Because of the uneven devel-

opment of Philippine society, the people's democratic revolution can develop only in an uneven way.

Thus, it would take a protracted people's war to bring about a thoroughgoing revolution all over the country.

3. The Basic Alliance and the National United Front

It is the basic alliance of the working class and the peasantry that serves as the stable foundation of the national united front. Only by building up such an alliance can such middle forces as the petit bourgeoisie and the national bourgeoisie be attracted into a national united front to isolate enemy diehards. The national united front serves the Party's political line that the Philippine Revolution is basically a revolution of the toiling masses against US imperialism, feudalism and bureaucrat capitalism.

Through the national united front, the Party extends widely its political influence and gains the widest support of the masses and other progressive classes and strata. At the base of this broad undertaking are the efforts of the proletariat to build up its independent strength through armed struggle supported mainly by the peasantry. The real united front for the people's democratic revolution is one for waging armed struggle.

There is the old poisonous idea still being circulated by the counterrevolutionary revisionists that the united front is mainly for parliamentary struggle. They wish to propagate the old error that befell the Popular Front, the Democratic Alliance and the Movement for the Advancement of Nationalism. The Popular Front was limited to being a city-based campaign for the boycott of Japanese goods and a medium for the reactionary elections before the war and in the long run became a mere instrument of US imperialism and the puppet commonwealth government. The Democratic Alliance was organized mainly to support the parliamentary struggle of a Party leadership that disarmed the Hukbalahap after the war and converted it into a veterans' league and a legal peasant organization. The Movement for the Advancement of Nationalism is today an instrument of the Lava revisionist renegades and other opportunists who wish to get positions in the reactionary government on account of their "nationalist" reputation.

The counterrevolutionary revisionists are speaking demagogically of the need for "absolute" unity within a definite formal organization of the national united front. This is a wrong idea because within the real united front there is always both unity and struggle on the basis of varying class interests, and the

united front does not always have to have a definite formal organization. The proletariat and the Party must always maintain their leadership, independence and initiative within the united front even as they recognize the independence and initiative of their allies and give concessions to them on condition that there is agreement on a general program which corresponds with the general line and program of the people's democratic revolution and that such concessions do not undermine the basic interests of the toiling masses.

It is with special reference to the national bourgeoisie that the Party is sharply aware of the need for unity and struggle in the united front. This class has a dual character, one aspect being revolutionary and the other aspect reactionary. It is "Left" opportunism to dismiss this class as completely counterrevolutionary, and it is Right opportunism to embrace it as completely revolutionary. The correct policy is to unite with it only to the extent that it supports the revolution at a given time and at the same time to criticize it appropriately for its vacillations or tendency to betray the revolution. This policy will always keep us vigilant.

In the course of discussing the role of the various motive forces of the Philippine Revolution, it has been made clear that the three magic weapons of the Philippine Revolution are the Communist Party of the Philippines, the New People's Army and the national united front. In another manner of speaking, the Communist Party of the Philippines, representing the proletariat, wields the two powerful weapons of armed struggle and united front.

IV. BASIC TASKS OF THE PEOPLE'S DEMOCRATIC REVOLUTION

The Program for a People's Democratic Revolution in the Philippines, which is the program of the Communist Party of the Philippines, comprehensively lays down the general and specific tasks not only of the proletarian revolutionary party but also of the entire revolutionary mass movement. In another summary form, let us state the basic tasks of the people's democratic revolution.

The central task of the Philippine Revolution in the present stage is the overthrow of US imperialism, feudalism and bureaucrat capitalism, the seizure of political power and its consolidation. Our purpose is to liberate the Filipino nation from foreign oppression and also the great masses of the Filipino people, especially the peasantry, from feudal oppression.

1. In the Political Field

All efforts must be exerted to achieve both a national revolution, mainly against US imperialism and a democratic revolution against feudalism and fascist puppetry. The joint reactionary dictatorship of the comprador big bourgeoisie, the landlord class and the bureaucrat capitalists must be overthrown and replaced with the people's democratic state system which is the united front dictatorship of the proletariat, peasantry, petit bourgeoisie, national bourgeoisie and all other patriots.

A new-democratic republic which is under the leadership of the proletariat and which harmonizes the interests of all revolutionary classes and strata shall replace the present bogus republic which is nothing but a puppet creation of US imperialism and a coercive instrument of the exploiting classes. It shall neither be a bourgeois dictatorship nor a dictatorship of the proletariat, but a joint dictatorship of all revolutionary classes and strata under the leadership of the proletariat.

From the national level of government to the provincial or district level, there shall be people's congresses or conferences. At the lower levels, there shall also be representative governing bodies. At every level, the people's representatives shall be elected under a system of universal and equal suffrage. The principle of democratic centralism shall be the main organizational principle of the People's Democratic Republic of the Philippines.

In advancing towards the people's democratic state system, revolutionary bases must be developed in order to establish the independent regime, even while the comprador-landlord-bureaucrat state has not yet been completely overthrown in the country. The people's democratic government can be established where the people have won under proletarian revolutionary leadership. Here can be established the united front dictatorship or people's democracy. Revolutionary committees can be set up in barrios, factories, schools and other areas as the embryo or actual organs of political power all over the country.

2. In the Military Field

Political power grows out of the barrel of a gun. Not until the counterrevolutionary armed forces, including foreign aggressor troops, puppet troops and all kinds of murder gangs, have been destroyed can the independent regime in the countryside or the people's democratic state system throughout the country be established.

The New People's Army shall be the mainstay of the people's democratic state system. It has now the principal task of seizing political power and consolidating it. It must always serve the people and defend them from their enemies.

All forms of the people's armed forces must have a mass character, and they must be led by the proletariat and its Party. The principal forms are the regular mobile forces, the people's guerrillas and the people's militia. They are drawn mainly from the ranks of the peasantry.

Revolutionary base areas and guerrilla zones must be created in the countryside first. It is here where the enemy has to be defeated before the final seizure of power in the cities. The New People's Army shall advance wave upon wave over a protracted period of time to destroy the enemy in the whole country.

3. In the Economic Field

The principle of self-reliance must be implemented in economic affairs even while our revolutionary forces are still creating the rural base areas and guerrilla zones. We must engage in production and not limit ourselves to the cash income and expense account based on contributions, confiscations or war bonds. We must use our resources wisely by following strictly the style of simple living and hard work.

We must confiscate the property of the imperialists, the exploiting classes and traitors to benefit the proletariat and semi-proletarian masses. The state shall run all nationalized enterprises and all sources of raw materials and power. All enterprises which have a monopolistic character shall be taken over. The state sector of the economy shall have a socialist character and shall constitute the leading force of the whole national economy. The national bourgeoisie shall be allowed to develop capitalist production, but only to the extent that it does not dominate or hamper the livelihood of the Filipino people.

The lands of the landlords shall be distributed at no cost to the peasants who have little or no land. The principle of equalizing land ownership shall be implemented. Cooperative enterprises shall be initiated among owner-cultivators and other petty producers as the first step towards socialism. A rich peasant economy will be allowed within a reasonable period of time. Even landlords who have not committed public crimes shall be afforded the opportunity of earning a living although they shall not be put in any position to make or influence decisions.

Before the nationwide victory of the revolutionary movement, the leading organs of the Party and the base government shall make the appropriate eco-

conomic policies in the base areas and in adjoining guerrilla zones on the basis of the concrete situation. They will see to it that before an economic reform is undertaken in a certain area, there are enough cadres and revolutionary organizations to ensure the proper adjustments of interests among the people.

4. In the Cultural Field

The Philippine Revolution cannot advance at all without the general awakening of the broad masses of the people. The concept of people's democracy or national democracy of a new type must pervade the cultural activities of the revolutionary mass movement. A national, scientific and mass culture must overwhelm and overthrow the imperialist, feudal and anti-people culture that now prevails. The educational system from the lowest to the highest levels shall be so democratic that it shall charge no fees whatsoever from students.

A revolutionary national culture must be propagated in order to oppose imperialist oppression and uphold the dignity and independence of the Filipino nation. It must repudiate the decadent culture of colonialism, imperialism and neocolonialism. It must adopt certain traditional and modern cultural forms and infuse these with content that enhances the national-democratic revolution. It must link up with the socialist and new-democratic cultures of other nations. What is progressive in foreign cultures should be assimilated and adapted to national conditions. At the same time, due respect must be accorded to the culture and customs of national minorities. The universal truth of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought can take life in the Philippines only if it is integrated with local conditions and acquires a definite national form. The use of the national language must be promoted to accelerate the propagation of a revolutionary national culture.

A scientific culture must be propagated in order to oppose the reactionary idealism dished out by imperialism and feudalism and also the superstitions that still persist. A united front of the scientific thought of the proletariat and the progressive aspects of bourgeois materialism and the natural sciences can be made. But at all times, the theory of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought must be the leading core of this scientific culture. It should serve as the guide for the practical movement of the revolutionary masses as well as for the ideological remolding of intellectuals. In the field of political action, we can have an anti-imperialist and anti-feudal united front with some idealist and even religious people, although we cannot approve of their idealism or

religious doctrines. We should not allow religious controversies to hamper the advance of the revolution.

A culture that truly belongs to the broad masses of people, because it is anti-imperialist and anti-feudal, should be propagated. It should be a revolutionary and democratic culture, expressive of the heroic struggles and aspirations of the toiling masses. Cadres in the cultural field should be like commanders waging a cultural revolution with the masses as their cultural battalions. They should continually link up the higher knowledge imparted to them with the general knowledge that they impart to the masses. They should always strive to raise cultural standards, even as their basic concern is popularization. They must derive from the experience of the masses typical examples and infuse them with a higher ideological content. The revolutionary workers, peasants and fighters should be the heroes of this mass culture. Modern revisionism has no place in the revolutionary ranks and should be thoroughly combated.

5. In the Field of Foreign Relations

In waging the revolutionary struggle, the Communist Party of the Philippines is highly conscious of fighting US imperialism, Soviet social-imperialism and all reaction under the great principle of proletarian internationalism and under the great policy of the international united front. Whenever possible, direct relations with fraternal parties, with revolutionary movements and with socialist countries like the People's Republic of China and the People's Republic of Albania must be established.

When the People's Democratic Republic of the Philippines has been established, it shall open and maintain diplomatic and trade relations with all countries which respect the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the Filipino people and which engage in such relations for mutual benefit. It shall abide by the Five Principles of Peaceful Coexistence. All unequal treaties and arrangements with the international bourgeoisie led by US imperialism must be immediately abrogated.

The closest and warmest relations shall be fostered with fraternal socialist states, parties and all revolutionary movements fighting imperialism, modern revisionism and all reaction.

V. PERSPECTIVE OF THE PHILIPPINE REVOLUTION

It has already been made clear that the Philippine Revolution has two stages. The first stage is that of the people's democratic revolution. The second stage is that of the socialist revolution. The Philippine Revolution, therefore, has a socialist perspective.

The most important political factor in the transition from people's democracy to socialism is the proletarian class leadership based on the worker-peasant alliance. The proletariat through its most advanced detachment, the Communist Party of the Philippines, is responsible for creating the conditions for socialism or for transforming the people's democratic dictatorship into the proletarian dictatorship. As in the struggle for the seizure of power, the working class relies mainly on the great masses of the poor and lower-middle peasants and farm workers in the consolidation of the proletarian dictatorship and the socialist transformation of the economic base.

Under people's democracy, there shall already exist the economic factors for the construction of socialism. Such factors are the state and cooperative sectors in both industry and agriculture. They shall be promoted and advanced by the proletariat in order to create the economic base for socialism. National capitalism and the rich peasant economy will develop but only to some limited extent and will constitute only a part of the whole economy. Increasingly, the proletariat and its revolutionary party shall see to it that the workers, peasants and soldiers shall revolutionize the superstructure in order to make it correspond to the material base. We shall employ the great proletarian cultural revolution repeatedly to keep the political color of the Philippines Red.

At all times, the people's army shall be maintained as the main pillar of the people's democratic state system and subsequently of the socialist state. It shall safeguard the people and the state from external and internal enemies and it shall always give support to the proletarian revolutionaries and the masses in their struggles. It shall always remain the great school for the Filipino youth as successors to the Philippine Revolution.

We are in the era when imperialism is heading for total collapse and socialism is marching toward world victory. All peoples fighting imperialism, modern revisionism and all reaction are creating the conditions for the advent of socialism in more countries. The world proletarian revolution is vigorously advancing. This international factor is hastening the advance of the people's democratic revolution and thereafter the advent of socialism in the Philip-

pines. At this stage, the universal theory of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought and the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution have already had an incalculable impact on the concrete practice of the Philippine Revolution. The revolutionization of the 700 million Chinese people has transformed the People's Republic of China into an iron bastion of socialism. We are very fortunate to be so close to the center of the world proletarian revolution and also to the main anti-imperialist battlefield that is Indochina.

TABLES

(Proofreader's notes added as seen on www.philippinerevolution.net/documents/philippine-society-and-revolution)

TABULATION OF LANDLORDS OWNING 50 HECTARES AND ABOVE (1968)

Region / Province	50-99	100-199	200-499	500-999	1,000+	Total
Northern Luzon						
Abra	17	2	2	0	0	21
Batanes	7	4	0	0	0	11
Benguet	49	20 ³⁴	8	7	1	85
Cagayan	263	90	56	13 ³⁵	15	437
Ifugao	1	6	1	0	0	8
Ilocos Norte	19	6	4	1	0	30
Ilocos Sur	5	5	2	1	0	13
Isabela	18	16	7	2	2	45
Kalinga-Apayao	3	4	0	0	4	11
La Union	18	7	2	2	0	29
Mt. Province		3	0	0	1	15
Nueva Vizcaya	6	3	0	2	1	12
Regional Total	417³⁶	166	82	28	24	717
Central Luzon						
Bataan	113	42	29	4	3	191
Bulacan	125	62	23	4	3	217
Nueva Ecija	273	119	44	11	15	462
Pampanga	201	120	40	9	6	376
Pangasinan	79	36	13	11	0	139

³⁴ Original entry was 10 but it does not satisfy vertical & horizontal totals.

³⁵ Original entry was 14 but it does not satisfy vertical & horizontal totals.

³⁶ Original entry was 147, most probably a typing error.

Tarlac	195 ³⁷	75	48	4	5	327
Zambales	101	41	29	12	4	187
Regional Total	1,087	495	226	55	36	1,899

Southern Luzon

Albay	98	59	16	2	1	176
Batangas	87	44	15	6	2	154
Camarines Norte	66	22	10	2	2	102
Camarines Sur	283	143	86	29	43	584 ³⁸
Catanduanes	12	2	2	0	0	16
Cavite	64	21	7	3	0	95
Laguna	40	19	3	4	3	69
Marinduque	16	11	2	2	0	31
Masbate	232	76	49	23	16	396
Mindoro Occidental	29	29	16	7	4	85
Mindoro Oriental	134	42	13	2	1	192
Quezon	339	171	116	26	9	661
Rizal	67	29	25	6	7	134
Sorsogon	70	46	12	4	0	132
Regional Total	1,537	714	372	116	88	2,827

Visayas

Aklan	87	42	13	0	0	142
Antique	77	22	6	5	0	110
Bohol	63	33	14	7	3	120
Capiz	235 ³⁹	125	50	14	2	426
Cebu	30	17	7	1	0	55
Iloilo	433	196	90	22	4	745
Leyte	34	3	10	1	1	59
Leyte del Sur	18	5	1	0	1	25

³⁷ Original entry was 495 but it does not satisfy vertical & horizontal totals.

³⁸ Original entry was 548, most probably a typing error.

³⁹ Original entry was 135 but it does not satisfy vertical & horizontal totals.

Negros Occidental	343	240	111	33	5	732 ⁴⁰
Negros Oriental	207	166	40	11	2	426
Romblon	84	49	21	6	1	161
Samar East	7	0	0	0	0	7
Samar North	32	21	3	2	0	58
Samar West	65	18	1	0	0	84
Regional Total	1,715	947	367	102	19	3,150
Mindanao						
Agusan	106	33	7	5	3	154
Bukidnon	125	36	15	7	5	188
Camiguin	6	5	1	0	0	12
Cotabato N.	116	73	37	19	10	255
Cotabato S.	59	42	14	16	4	135
Davao del Norte	81	37	13	9	11	151
Davao del Sur	46	25	9	6	2	88
Davao Oriental	78	33	15	7	1	134
Lanao del Norte	30	21	2	3	0	56
Misamis Occidental	35	13	4	2	0	54
Misamis Oriental	68	19	5	3	1	96
Palawan	53	27	18	9	3	110
Sulu	86	19	8	4	1	118
Surigao del Norte	7	4	0	0	0	11
Surigao del Sur	81	17	3	0	0	101
Zamboanga N.	242	88	18	7	1	356
Zamboanga S.	80	19	5	7	2	123
Regional Total	1,307	529	181	108	45	2,171
National total						10,764

Source: *Provincial Assessors*

Proofreader's Note: All regional totals do not tally with calculated vertical totals; there might be a missing row/province.

⁴⁰ Original entry was 723, most probably a typing error.

COMPARATIVE STATUS OF FOREIGN INVESTORS IN THE PHILIPPINES (IN P MILLION)

	Sales	%	Assets	%	Net worth	%	Net profit
American	5,699.72	71.83	7,767.18	73.33	3,134.06	77.62	613.22
Japanese	595.84	7.51	1,215.09	11.47	250.97	6.22	(36.58)
British	657.26	8.28	833.31	7.87	300.32	7.44	42.52
Chinese	457.06	5.76	316.29	2.99	166.30	4.12	16.64
Swiss	353.82	4.47 ⁴¹	231.67 ⁴²	2.09	79.10	1.96	20.10
Spanish	117.40	1.48	171.25	1.62	88.19	2.18	10.25
German	17.00	0.21	21.18	0.20	1.98	.05	(1.00)
Dutch	10.77	0.14	15.80	0.15	3.66	.09	0.16
Others	25.43	0.32	29.09	0.27	12.83	.27	12.83
Total	7,934.30	100.00	10,590.86	100.00	4,037.41	100.00	667.88⁴³

Source: *Chronicle Research*

Out of more than 3,000 Philippine firms carrying US investments, only the top 168 US firms are actually accounted for here.

⁴¹ The original entry of 353.82 is impossible! The value 4.47 was obtained by deduction: 100 less the total of all other values.

⁴² The original entry of 4.46 seems improbable—too small compared with the others, considering the mentioned percentages. Moreover, the totals do not add up to the total value above. The more probable value of 231.67 was obtained from the formula [above total less the sum of the other column values.]

⁴³ Total value does not tally with the calculated column values: 715.72 excluding values in parentheses; 753.30 including values in parentheses.

**1970 INDUSTRY TOTALS OF TOP 168 US FIRMS IN THE
PHILIPPINES (IN P MILLION)**

	Sales	Assets	Net worth	Net profit
Export industries				
Mining	591.40	1,088.57	679.14	243.56
Coconut Products	421.78	198.00	23.98	10.32
Logs and Lumber	187.78	195.37	108.27	30.20
Sugar	57.20	74.00	54.40	15.15
Tobacco	17.30	10.32	2.46	0.44
Manufacturing				
Petroleum Refinery	857.07	966.81	482.73	36.42
Food Processing	439.28	598.48	166.75	21.83
Heavy Equipment	256.52	365.63	188.60	37.81
Drugs and Pharmaceutical	303.73 ⁴⁴	266.99	101.88	27.68
Chemicals & Allied Prod.	232.95	231.76	109.60	21.70
Rubber Products	216.07	222.50	161.86	47.51
Beverages	200.08	171.79	53.84	6.95
Basic Metals	150.45	146.85	86.78	19.06
Automotive	126.19	126.35	(0.67)	(8.76)
Cosmetics	247.46	115.65	66.02	26.25
Paper & Paper Products	62.35	89.45	21.65	1.47
Textile & Wearing App	72.25	63.89	40.64	5.24
Trading				
Petroleum Products	701.32	604.02	250.51	17.94

⁴⁴ The original entry (3.73) does not satisfy the vert total; it seems to be a printing error. The value 303.73 was obtained by the formula: total less the sum of all the other entries.

Selected Readings from the Works of Jose Maria Sison

Appliances & Office Eqpt.	219.55	269.65	89.39	16.69
General Merchandise	198.35	131.68	61.53	19.12
Books, Periodicals	21.60	32.69	16.42	0.26
Construction				
Total	7.32	3.44	(0.04)	(0.019)
Services				
Banking		969.80	152.61	
Insurance	26.33	546.54	82.81	11.31
Investment & Management	22.51	169.41	87.60	(0.09)
Transportation	18.54	23.33	9.02	0.76
Advertising	4.25	10.86	0.94	(0.10)
Others				
Total Others	40.09	93.35	35.34	5.18
<hr/>				
Total	5,699.72	7,767.18	3,134.06	613.22⁴⁵
<hr/>				

Source: *Chronicle Research*

⁴⁵ The totals do not tally with calculations.

TOP US FIRMS IN THE PHILIPPINES (1970)

Firms (Mother firm in parenthesis)	Assets	US Ownership in %
1. First National City Bank (First National City Corporation, N.Y.)	712,754,952	100.0
2. The Philippine American Life Insurance	527,331,000	N.A.
3. Caltex Philippines, Incorporated (Caltex Petroleum Corporation)	502,547,219	100.0
4. Atlas Consolidated Mining and Development Corporation	469,292,118	54.0
5. Benguet Consolidated, Incorporated	319,891,228	68.7
6. ESSO Philippines, Incorporated (Esso Eastern, Incorporated)	301,109,521	100.0
7. Marcopper Mining Corporation	299,394,279	41.0
8. Bataan Refining Corporation (Esso Philippines, Mobil Petroleum)	270,997,377	100.0
9. Mobil Oil Philippines, Incorporated (Mobile Petroleum Company)	269,050,825	100.0
10. Bank of America (Bank of America, San Francisco)	257,013,200	100.0
11. Dole Philippines, Incorporated (Castle & Cook, Incorporated)	240,037,273	100.0
12. Filoil Refinery Corporation (Gulf Oil Corporation)	193,262,077	67.0
13. A. Soriano y Compania	142,487,513	100.0
14. USIPHIL, Incorporated	1 19,007,857	100.0
15. Granexport Corporation	1 16,199,090	100.0
16. Philippine Packing Corporation (Del Monte Corporation)	107,030,747	100.0
17. International Harvester MacLeon, Inc. (International Harvester Company)	103,232,041	100.0
18. BF Goodrich Philippines, Incorporated (The BF Goodrich Company)	97,569,000	100.0
19. Standard (Philippines) Fruit Corporation (Standard Fruit and Steamship Company)	85,701,142	66.0

20. Pepsi-Cola Bottling Company of the Philippines, Inc. (Pepsi Co. N.Y.)	85,680,153	100.0
21. Bislig Bay Lumber Company, Incorporated	81,682,161	56.0
22. Ford Philippines, Incorporated (Ford Motor Company)	80,000,949	100.0
23. Union Carbide Philippines (Union Carbide Corporation, NY)	79,972,183	100.0
24. Procter & Gamble, PMC (The Procter & Gamble Company)	75,957,104	100.0
25. Honiron Philippines, Incorporated (Honolulu Iron Works)	73,872,656	100.0
26. Legaspi Oil, Incorporated	71,029,761	83.0
27. Firestone Tire & Rubber Company (Firestone Tire & Rubber Company)	60,245,528	75.0
28. The Goodyear Tire & Rubber Company of the Philippines (Goodyear International Corporation)	60,045,425	100.0
29. General Milk Company (Philippines), Inc. (General Milk Company California USA)	58,428,756	74.0
30. Theo H. Davies & Company Far East, Limited (Theo Davies & Company Far East Limited)	57,729,757	90.0
31. Pepsi-Cola Far East Trade Development Company, Incorporated	56,669,988	100.0
32. Kimberly-Clark Philippines, Incorporated (Kimberly-Clark Corporation)	53,521,708	95.8
33. Republic Glass Corporation (Castle & Cooke, Incorporated)	52,505,634	55.0
34. Singer Sewing Machine Company (Singer Sewing Machine Company)	49,661,858	100.0
35. California Manufacturing Company, Inc. (CPC International, Incorporated)	44,647,581	100.0
36. Reynolds Philippines Corporation (Reynolds International Corporation)	43,729,359	51.0
37. Phelps Dodge Philippines, Incorporated (Phelps Dodge Corporation)	42,770,511	61.0
38. General Telephone & Electronics Industries, Inc. (General Telephone & Electronics International Inc.)	42,099,981	100.0
39. IBM Philippines, Incorporated (IBM World Trade Corporation)	41,614,319	100.0

40. Mead Johnson, Philippines, Incorporated (Bristol-Myers Company, N.Y.)	40,794,651	100.0
41. Colgate-Palmolive Philippines Incorporated (Colgate-Palmolive Peet Company)	39,693,860	100.0
42. Chrysler Philippines, Incorporated (Chrysler International)	38,253,870	100.0
43. Zamboanga Wood Products, Incorporated (Boise Cascade Corporation)	37,725,588	86.0
44. Getty Oil (Philippines), Incorporated (Getty Oil Company)	33,864,946	100.0
45. Weyerhaeuser Philippines, Incorporated (Weyerhaeuser, Incorporated)	30,079,907	100.0
46. Hawaiian-Philippine Company	29,090,015	98.0
47. Engineering Equipment, Incorporated (Benguet Consolidated, Incorporation)	29,001,100	93.0
48. Coca-Cola Export Corporation (Coca-Cola Export Corporation)	27,965,942	100.0
49. Scott Paper Philippines, Incorporated (Scott Paper Company)	27,404,580	100.0
50. San Carlos Milling	26,999,564	66.0
51. Boise Cascade Philippines, Incorporated (Boise Cascade Corporation)	26,821,136	100.0
52. American Wire & Cable Company, Inc.	25,845,087	-
53. Columbian Carbon Philippines, Inc. (Cities Service Company)	24,291,304	79.0
54. General Electric Philippines, Incorporated (General Electric)	24,064,310	100.0
55. Philippine Appliance Corporation (Westinghouse Electric)	23,916,000	56.0
56. Gelmart Industries Philippines, Inc. (Gelmart Knitting Mills, Incorporated)	23,575,947	99.0
57. Connell Brothers Company (Philippines) (Wilbur-Ellis)	23,341,962	100.0
58. The Edward J. Nell Company	23,047,597	60.0
59. Aircon, Incorporated	22,535,531	90.0
60. Consolidated Philippines, Incorporated (Consolidated Dairy Products Company)	22,070,393	51.0

61. Insular Lumber Company (Philippines), Incorporated	20,439,300	97.0
62. Borden Chemicals Company (Philippines), Inc. (Borden International)	20,220,213	98.0
63. Pfizer, Incorporated N.Y. (Pfizer, Incorporated N.Y.)	19,118,979	100.0
64. Erlanger & Galinger (The National Cash Register Company)	19,114,764	70.0
65. Winthrop-Stearns, Incorporated (Winthrop-Stearns, Incorporated)	19,057,144	100.0
66. Minnesota (3M) Philippines, Incorporated (Minnesota Mining & Manufacturing)	18,211,912	100.0
67. Philippine Electrical Manufacturing Company	18,205,009	60.6.0
68. Bogo-Medellin Milling Company, Incorporated	17,913,039	92.0
69. Kodak Philippines, Limited (Eastman Kodak)	17,909,281	100.0
70. E.R. Squibb & Sons Philippines, Corporation (E.R. Squibb & Sons Incorporated)	16,376,832	100.0
71. Johnson & Johnson (Philippines) Incorporated (Johnson & Johnson International)	16,132,171	99.0
72. Franklin Baker Company of the Philippines (General Foods Corporation)	15,940,162	96.0
73. Groiler International, Incorporated (Groiler Incorporated)	15,871,870	100.0
74. Warner Barnes & Company Limited	15,452,528	-
75. Bristol Laboratories (Philippines, Incorporated) (Bristol Laboratories, International)	15,214,289	100.0
76. Macondray & Company, Incorporated	15,162,241	99.9
77. American International Underwriters (Philippines), Incorporated	15,088,065	100.0
78. Philippine Remnants Company, Inc.	15,073,098	100.0
79. Muller & Philipps (Manila) Limited (Muller & Philipps, New York)	14,572,589	100.0
80 Findlay-Millar Timber Company	14,344,035	100.0
81. Wrigley Philippines Incorporated (William Wrigley Company)	14,283,864	100.0
82. Ault & Wiborg Company (Far East) (Inmon Corporation)	14,115,807	100.0

83. Burroughs Limited (Philippine Branch) (Burroughs Limited)	13,580,687	99.0
84. Abbott Laboratories (Philippines) (Abbott Universal, Limited)	13,521,124	100.0
85. Richardson-Merrell (Philippines), Inc. (Richardson-Merrell, Incorporated)	12,886,225	100.0
86. Singer Industries Philippines, Incorporated (Singer Sewing Machine Company)	12,758,711	99.0
87. Inhelder-Don Baxter Laboratories, Incorporated (American Supply Corporation)	12,530,967	99.9
88. Everett Steamship Corporation	12,254,355	63.0
89. National Lead Company (Philippines) Inc. (National Lead Company)	11,806,904	51.0
90. Manila Cordage Company (Tubbs Cordage Company)	1 1,730,168	95.0
91. Edward R. Bacon Company, (Philippines) Inc.	11,263,694	100.0
92. Warner-Chilcott Laboratories Incorporated (Warner-Lambert Pharmaceutical)	1 1,097,651	99.0
93. Wyeth-Suaco Laboratories Incorporated (Wyeth Laboratories, Corporation)	10,868,277	90.0
94. San Pablo Manufacturing Corporation	10,766,475	100.0
95. Parke Davis & Company, Incorporated (Parke Davis & Company)	10,003,283	100.0
96. Inhelder Corporation	9,988,281	99.9
97. Merck, Sharp & Dohme (Philippines), Inc. (Merck & Company, Incorporated)	9,460,582	100.0
98. Philippine Acetylene Company Incorporated	8,907,284	98.0
99. Air Mac Philippines, Incorporated (Air Mac International Corporation)	8,760,743	100.0
100. Lancaster Philippines, Incorporated (Lancaster Leaf Tobacco, Incorporated)	8,307,475	65.0
101. Luneta Motor Company	8,103,326	N.A.
102. Sterling Products, International, Inc. (Sterling Products International, Incorporated, N.Y.)	7,709,929	100.0
103. P.F. Collier, Incorporated (P.F. Collier, Incorporated)	7,695,775	100.0

104. J. Walter Thompson Company (Philippines) (J. Walter Thompson Company)	7,665,204	100.0
105. Oceanic Commercial, Incorporated	7,173,817	95.0
106. ITT Philippines, Incorporated (International Telephone & Telegraph Corporation)	6,927,057	99.0
107. Cyanamid Philippines, Incorporated (American Cyanamid Company)	6,888,835	70.0
108. S.C. Johnson & Son, Incorporated (S.C. Johnson & Son, Incorporated)	6,853,829	100.0
109. Atkins, Kroll & Company, Incorporated (Atkins Kroll Company)	6,720,091	100.0
110. Loreto F. de Henudes, Incorporated (RBS)	6,597,605	-
111. J.P. Heilbronn, Company	6,113,257	52.9
112. Conrad & Company, Incorporated	6,113,257 ⁴⁶	100.0
113. Rexall (Philippines) Incorporated (Rexall Drug Company)	6,074,129	100.0
114. Sherwin-Williams Philippines Incorporated (The Sherwin-Williams Company)	5,965,292	60.0
115. Shurdut Industrial Distributors, Inc.	5,609,809	80.0
116. Rheem of the Philippines, Incorporated (Rheem International Incorporated)	5,500,738	55.0
117. Eli Lilly (Philippines), Incorporated (Eli Lilly International)	5,485,590	100.0
118. Philippine Education Company, Inc.	5,427,863	94.0
119. Sanitary Steam Laundry, Incorporated	5,427,863 ⁴⁷	96.0
120. Liberty Aviation Corporation (Philippine American Insurance)	5,393,927	67.0
121. Matalin Coconut Company, Incorporated	5,168,210	100.0
122. Novelty Philippines, Incorporated	5,099,188	99.0
123. Williams Equipment Company, Limited (Williams Equipment Company)	4,955,418	92.0
124. Goulds Pumps (Philippines), Incorporated (GPI, N.Y.)	4,748,795	100.0
125. Amfil Chemical Corporation (Rohm & Haas Company)	4,635,151	100.0

⁴⁶ Values need to be rechecked for accuracy.

⁴⁷ Values need to be rechecked for accuracy.

126. Philippine Rubber Project Company, Inc.	4,634,203	100.0
127. Schering Corporation (Philippines), Inc. (Schering Corporation [Panama] USA.)	4,611,623	100.0
128. American Machinery & Parts Manufacturing Incorporated	4,568,180	67.0
129. Mahogany Products (Philippines), Inc.	4,503,762	88.0
130. Upjohn, Incorporated (The Upjohn Company)	4,123,644	100.0
131. Estraco Pharmaceutical Corporation (USV Pharmaceutical Corporation)	3,839,484	99.9
132. Mastodon Equipment Company, Inc.	3,654,145	50.0
133. Smith, Kline & French Overseas Company (Smith, Kline & French Overseas)	3,425,695	100.0
134. McCann-Erikson (Philippines), Inc.	3,189,654	99.0
135. C.F. Sharp & Company, Incorporated	3,179,122	50.0
136. Lawyers Cooperative Publishing Company	3,078,025	100.0
137. Fuller Paint Manufacturing Company (Philippines) Incorporated	3,015,019	40.0
138. Philippine American Timber Company, Inc.	2,939,222	59.0
139. Far East Corn Refining Company, Inc.	2,938,222 ⁴⁸	50.0
140. Ayerst Laboratories (Philippines), Inc. (American Home Products Corporation)	2,872,800	100.0
141. Royal Undergarment Corporation of the Philippines (Exquisite Form Industries)	2,582,012	99.0
142. Philippine Paper Products Company	2,396,340	95.0
143. E.E Elser, Incorporated	2,255,760	94.0
144. Standard Brands of the Philippines, Inc. (Standard Brands, Delaware, USA)	2,233,976	100.0
145. A.H. Robins (Philippines) Company, Inc. (A.H. Robins Company Incorporated)	2,226,772	100.0
146. Heald Lumber Company (Benguet Consolidated Incorporated)	2,128,835	100.0
147. Taylor Pacific (Philippines), Incorporated	2,103,426	100.0
148. Orion Manila, Incorporated	2,102,886	100.0
149. Pacific Airways Corporation	2,055,430	90.0

⁴⁸ Values need to be rechecked for accuracy.

Selected Readings from the Works of Jose Maria Sison

150. Bunning & Company, Incorporated (Associated Tobacco Importer)	2,008,431	99.0
151. Insurance Specialists, Incorporated	1,889,797	99.7
152. B.B. Fisher	1,861,676	88.0
153. Chicago Bridge (Philippines), Incorporated	1,797,012	100.0
154. Ingersoll-Rand, Philippines, Incorporated (Ingersoll-Rand Company)	1,723,431	100.0
155. Inter-Island Construction Corporation (E.E. Black Limited)	1,637,906	100.0
156. Solex Tool Corporation	1,548,799	100.0
157. Johnston Lumber Company, Incorporated	1,531,732	100.0
158. Philippine Handicraft, Incorporated (Cradle Toys Incorporated)	1,515,732	98.0
159. SPT Extract Corporation (Seven-Up Export Corporation)	1,470,558	98.0
160. Judy Philippines	1,208,912	98.0
161. Otis Elevator Company (Manila branch) (Otis Elevator Company, Delaware)	1,190,839	100.0
162. Philippine Chemical Laboratories, Inc.	1,118,500	99.0
163. Rachele Laboratories (Philippines) Inc.	1,063,704	100.0
164. Newsweek, Incorporated (Philippine branch)	588,324	100.0
165. Philippine Gloves, Incorporated	559,390	100.0
166. Dean International, Incorporated	450,487	100.0
167. Supreme Baby Wear, Incorporated	436,870	99.0
168. South Seas Trading Corporation	334,446	100.0

Total

7,767,180.334

Source: *Chronicle Research*

Rectify Errors and Rebuild the Party

December 26, 1968

I. MAO ZEDONG THOUGHT IS OUR GUIDE TO SELF-CRITICISM AND PARTY REBUILDING

Mao Zedong Thought is the highest development of Marxism-Leninism in the present world era. A genuine proletarian revolutionary party must, in the present era, constantly strive for the integration of Mao Zedong Thought and revolutionary practice in order to achieve thoroughgoing victory.

Mao Zedong Thought is the supreme guide in analyzing and summing up the experience of the Communist Party of the Philippines. Our Party has been committed from the very beginning to Marxist-Leninist theory and its creative application to the concrete conditions in the Philippines in fighting US imperialism, feudalism and bureaucrat capitalism. Availing itself of the constant advance of the theory and practice of the international communist movement, our Party is consequently committed to the theory and practice of Mao Zedong Thought which is now the highest development of Marxism-Leninism.

We are at the stage of world history and of the international communist movement when all parties and cadres of Marxist-Leninist standpoint are reexamining their experience in accordance with Mao Zedong Thought. Communist parties like the Communist Party of the Philippines, which so far have not established proletarian revolutionary power, are confronted with the question of pursuing Mao Zedong Thought or otherwise. This urgent question is sharpened by the emergence and worldwide campaign of modern revisionism.

Mao Zedong Thought sets the demarcation line dividing the proletarian revolutionaries from the false pretenders to the title of revolutionaries in this period of great upheaval, great division and great reorganization of political forces. Mao Zedong Thought now guides all proletarian revolutionary movements that are inflicting mortal blows on US imperialism, modern revisionism and all reaction. The continuing failures of old parties that are not guided by Mao Zedong Thought only prove that without its guidance and faithful application the revolution cannot be won and consolidated. The experience of revisionist parties the world over provides more than sufficient proof. The history of our own Party is marked by failures on account of serious errors and weaknesses that need to be rectified now in accordance with Mao Zedong Thought.

This document was initially drafted by Jose Maria Sison in 1966. It went through revisions on the basis of further research and discussions until it was finalized and ratified by the Congress of Reestablishment. It is extracted from *Foundation for Resuming the Philippine Revolution*, the first volume of the Sison's selected works, pp. 5-58.

As modern revisionism is being fostered and spread by the modern revisionist clique with its headquarters in the Soviet Union, all proletarian revolutionaries are impelled to express themselves and act in accordance with Mao Zedong Thought which is the acme of Marxism-Leninism in this world era. Two steps forward are now being made with Mao Zedong Thought. Under the direct leadership of Chairman Mao, the People's Republic of China has become the central base of the world revolution. It is the center of gravity of the world's countryside encircling the cities of the world.

In a Philippines that is not yet liberated from US imperialism and feudalism, revisionist currents are bound to develop as they have. Currents of opportunism, with the local petit bourgeoisie and big bourgeoisie as their sources, serve as the basis for the superimposition of modern revisionism from its world center in Moscow. If modern revisionism is not effectively combatted with correct theory and practice, then US imperialism, domestic feudalism and bureaucrat capitalism can persist in Philippine society.

II. SUMMING UP OUR EXPERIENCE AND DRAWING REVOLUTIONARY LESSONS

It is our urgent task to analyze and sum up our experience as a Party. The sole reason for this analysis and summing-up is to draw revolutionary lessons, to identify errors and weaknesses, in order to enable us to rectify them, strengthen ourselves and rebuild a proletarian revolutionary party that is guided by Mao Zedong Thought.

When we criticize errors and weaknesses, it is “to learn from past mistakes to avoid future ones” and “to cure sickness to save the patient.” In the scientific spirit of Marxism-Leninism, we make our criticism in order to rebuild the Party on stronger foundations and build revolutionary power. As the nucleus of proletarian dictatorship, the Communist Party of the Philippines must consolidate itself through the process of rectification.

Only the broad outlines of Party history can be herein presented with the end in view of showing its dialectical development. This summing-up cannot possibly incorporate all the details that may be available. It is for Party cadres to do this in further discussions. However, our trusted comrades, old and new, have already engaged during the last three years in thorough discussions concerning the problems of the Party.

At the outset, let it be stated that in our summing-up, the handling of the three main weapons of the Philippine revolution assumes prime consideration. These are: the building up of a Marxist-Leninist party, armed struggle, and the national united front.

Also in our summing-up, we shall cover the fields of ideology, politics, military and organization. As a matter of fact, the main body of this discussion is divided into these four aspects. However, before dealing with these, let us trace briefly the history of the Communist Party of the Philippines.

III. BRIEF HISTORICAL REVIEW

A. Founding of the Party and its Illegalization

The national democratic movement in the Philippines entered a new stage when on November 7, 1930, the Communist Party of the Philippines was founded in Manila. The founding of the Party served to signify that the Filipino working class had advanced ideologically, politically and organizationally, and had started to seek class leadership in the Philippine revolution. Thus, the era of the new-democratic movement was ushered in with the emergence of a working class party committed to the integration of Marxist-Leninist theory and Philippine revolutionary practice.

As a newly founded working class party, the Communist Party of the Philippines was immediately based in the city among the most advanced workers represented by Crisanto Evangelista. Without sufficient consideration of and safeguard against the oppressive and coercive character of the US imperialist regime and the domestic ruling classes, the Party was publicly launched on the 13th anniversary of the October Revolution.

Within a short period, on May 1, 1931 and subsequently, the reactionary authorities took punitive actions against the Party. Cadres and members of the Party were arrested and imprisoned. Mass organizations under the leadership of the Party were banned. In 1932, the Supreme Court formally outlawed the Party and its mass organizations and meted out prison sentences to their leading members.

At the time that the first line of Party leaders was incapacitated, no reliable second line of Party leaders had yet been developed to carry on Party work. Nevertheless, by 1935, there were some elements who had established Marxist study groups among the petit bourgeoisie in Manila.

In the period that the Communist Party of the Philippines was outlawed, the Socialist Party headed by Pedro Abad Santos was building up strength on the basis of a loose mass organization of peasants and agricultural workers in Central Luzon.

B. Merger of the Communist Party and the Socialist Party

A merger was made between the Communist Party of the Philippines and the Socialist Party on November 7, 1938 after the leadership of the former was given conditional pardon by the Commonwealth government in accordance

with the anti-fascist Popular Front policy. This merger came about with the assistance of James Allen, representative of the Communist Party of the USA.

The open leadership elected by the merger congress was represented by Crisanto Evangelista as chairman, Pedro Abad Santos as vice-chairman and Guillermo Capadocia as general secretary.

The secret second line of leadership was represented by Vicente Lava whose time was mostly devoted to his full-time government employment at the Bureau of Science and whose political work was limited to leading a small progressive petit-bourgeois organization, the League for the Defense of Democracy. Other members of the secret second line of leadership were those who had had limited success in urban Party work, especially among petit-bourgeois elements, during the period that the Party was outlawed.

The Communist Party (merger of the Communist Party and Socialist Party) under the Evangelista leadership worked hard for a city-based anti-fascist movement, which advocated the boycott of Japanese goods and the creation of “labor battalions” under the auspices of a united labor front, the Collective Labor Movement, and with the cooperation of the Commonwealth government. Political work among the urban petit bourgeoisie was carried on by Vicente Lava.

With the aid of Communist cadres, the erstwhile Socialist leaders tried to raise the political consciousness of peasants in Central Luzon, but this was given only secondary importance. The main bulk of Party work was done in the city by a city-based and city-oriented Party.

C. The Party during the Japanese Occupation

When the Japanese invaders occupied Manila in January 1942, the Party leadership took no steps to leave the city in an organized way so that soon after, the first line of leadership was easily arrested by the Japanese fascists. The second line of leadership and the mass of Party members who had also been concentrated in the city spontaneously fled to the countryside in various directions. Nevertheless, the majority of Party members fled to various towns in Central Luzon but without coordination.

The Central Luzon Bureau Conference was held on February 6, 1942 to discuss Party policies in the face of the grave situation. It was at this conference that the decision to organize a guerrilla army was taken and the ascendance of the second line of leadership to the central leadership was formalized. Vicente Lava, who became general secretary, was elected *in absentia* as he had fled to

Rizal province. Over a month later on March 29, the Hukbalahap (Hukbo ng Bayan Laban sa Hapon) or the People's Anti-Japanese Army was established in Barrio San Lorenzo in Cabiao, Nueva Ecija.

Meanwhile, two principal leaders of the Party who had been arrested, Abad Santos and Capadocia, agreed to cooperate with the Japanese in convincing Party members to desist from resistance. However, the former was incapacitated by illness and the latter was arrested by the Party when he attempted to implement his compromise. Later on, however, Capadocia was reeducated by the Party.

The Party and the army was based in the Mount Arayat area. It did not take long for the Japanese to pinpoint the area as the seat of the Party and in 1943 the Japanese launched the so-called March Raid which resulted in the capture of many leading Party cadres and members.

During the encircling raid, the people in the vicinity of Mount Arayat dispersed and tried to slip through in small groups; in the process, many leading cadres and members were captured. In an attempt to minimize losses from the enemy offensive, the Vicente Lava leadership adopted the "retreat for defense" policy.

The "retreat for defense" policy meant the breaking up of all Hukbalahap "squadrons" (of company strength) and other units of platoon strength into minuscule units of three to five fighters. It promoted tactical passivity and helplessness in the face of the enemy. It fell in line with the "lie-low" policy of the USAFFE.

It was only as late as the Bagumbali Conference of late September 1944, when the Party declared the "retreat for defense" policy incorrect, that the Hukbalahap "squadrons" were regrouped to take the offensive against the enemy. After a policy of active resistance was taken and implemented, the strength of the people's armed forces increased by leaps and bounds. But while this policy was adopted, the US air force had already started to bombard the Philippines, preparing for massive landing by the US imperialist military forces.

While the "retreat for defense" policy in particular was corrected and Vicente Lava was demoted from the general secretaryship, he retained his membership in the Central Committee to promote together with others a Right opportunist line. The Bagumbali Conference decided to prepare the establishment of the Democratic Alliance for parliamentary struggle upon the return of US imperialism and the Commonwealth government.

D. The Party upon the Return of US Imperialism

It was in the course of conducting a people's war during the Japanese occupation that the Communist Party of the Philippines gained real political power in certain areas, thus proving the great thesis of Comrade Mao Zedong that "political power grows out of the barrel of a gun."

Nevertheless, an erroneous position was taken with regard to the central question of keeping the people's armed power in the face of the return of US imperialism and the concomitant reinstatement of landlordism in those areas where the people had asserted their own armed power.

Among Party members and their mass following, the aggressive nature of US imperialism was not thoroughly exposed. Neither was the armed peasantry under the leadership of the Party mobilized on the basis of the new democratic stage of the Philippine revolution of which the peasantry is the main force. In areas where the leadership of the Party had been established, the anti-national and anti-democratic links between US imperialism and feudalism were not exposed and denounced for the guidance of the people.

Aside from deficiency in ideological mobilization and in grasping the mass line with regard to US imperialism and the agrarian revolution, the Communist Party of the Philippines did not succeed in developing a Party organization and armed force of a national scale even while developing its main force in Central Luzon. To a much lesser extent, it was only in the Southern Tagalog region where Party units and armed units outside of Central Luzon were established towards the end of the anti-Japanese war.

At the end of World War II, the Party leadership decided to shift its headquarters and the center of its political activity from the countryside to the city. Relying on the word of US military agents, Party leaders took the Rightist line that the main form of struggle had changed into the parliamentary form, that the people were tired of war, that they could participate in bourgeois elections under conditions of "democratic peace," the line echoed from the Browderite leadership of the CPUSA. Thus, the central organs and newspapers of the Communist Party of Philippines were shifted to the city.

In the countryside, the Huk Veterans League and the Pambansang Kaisahan ng Magbubukid (National Peasant Union) were set up as legal mass organizations to supplant the Hukbalahap and the BUDC (Barrio United Defense Corps). In the city, the Congress of Labor Organizations and other urban organizations were established. The Party and these mass organizations were to engage in legal and parliamentary struggle through the Democratic Alliance.

Within the Democratic Alliance, the Party itself was merely one of the organizations subordinate to the bourgeois personalities leading the alliance.

The policy of disarming and disbanding armed units of the people's army was adopted and implemented. The political power that had been gained by the people's armed forces was, therefore, broken when arms became separated from the men who had wielded them. The Party leadership, however, nurtured the illusion that whereas the "democratic peace" line of making a token surrender of arms to the Military Police was merely a "propaganda line," the "true line" was that the Party was actually keeping caches of arms.

Little was it realized that the enemy would not be fooled by a token surrender of arms and that the gap between the "propaganda line" and the "true line" merely confused the masses more than it misled the enemy. The basic fact was that armed units had been disarmed and disbanded even as the enemy massacred entire "squadrons" of the Hukbalahap (like "Squadrons 77 and 99") and took other forms of repressive measures against the masses and the Hukbalahap.

Under the direction of US imperialism, the Military Police and civilian guards gave armed protection to the landlords to enable them to recover control over their lands in Central Luzon and even to exact excessive demands, such as the collection of arrears on land rent, on the past years of the Japanese occupation. These subsequent developments proved the bankruptcy of the counterrevolutionary line of welcoming the US imperialists and abandoning the armed struggle.

During the period that the Chinese Communist Party under the leadership of Comrade Mao Zedong was setting the example of heightening its armed struggle and capability at a time that the US imperialists were maneuvering a Kuomintang-controlled "coalition" government, the leadership of the Communist Party of the Philippines nurtured the illusion that it could engage in bourgeois parliamentary struggle through the Democratic Alliance and it did field its own candidates in the few areas where it held great political influence.

Soon after the Party had taken the legal forefront in fighting against the Bell Trade Act and Parity Amendment and other imperialist-landlord measures, Party-supported members of Congress who had been elected in the 1946 elections were unjustly ousted from Congress, thus exposing once more the bankruptcy of the policy of relying mainly on bourgeois parliamentarism.

During the early postwar period, the Right opportunist trend dominated the Party. Vicente Lava was most articulate and active in providing ideological

support to this trend within the Party Central Committee. However, the Party general secretaryship was left to Pedro Castro who wanted to develop an open mass party for purposes of bourgeois parliamentary struggle, and then to Jorge Frianeza who advocated a united front with the reactionary Roxas administration.

The 1946 Constitution of the Party, like the 1938 merger Constitution, advocated parliamentary struggle as the main form of struggle. The counter-revolutionary revisionist line within the Party was aggravated by petit-bourgeois careerism, regionalism and by individual acts of flightism which seriously undermined the Party.

E. The Party in the Period of Military Adventurism

It was in 1948 that the question of armed struggle was firmly raised by revolutionary Party cadres and the revolutionary masses in the face of fascist abuses perpetrated by the puppet government of Roxas against the Communist Party, Hukbalahap, democratic mass organizations and their leaders and the broad masses of the people. The question of armed struggle was, however, interpreted by the Jose Lava leadership mainly on the basis of external conditions.

There was the one-sided expectation by the Party leadership that the near-violent split in the ruling classes due to the election frauds of 1949, the revolutionary victory of the Chinese people, the Korean War and the economic recession in the United States would absolutely open the way for the victory of the people's army in the Philippines, notwithstanding the internal weakness of the Party and the people's army due to previous Right opportunist errors. External conditions were interpreted as the very reasons for a quick military victory.

The Party leadership represented by Jose Lava failed to provide the most essential reasons for engaging in armed struggle, like a program of armed struggle against US imperialism and its local running dogs and for agrarian revolution among others, and equally it failed to recognize that armed struggle under the conditions existing in the Philippines would have to be protracted.

Against the superficial reasons provided by the Lava leadership to justify the policy of striving for a quick military victory, the Right opportunists took the line of converting the Communist Party of the Philippines into a big open mass party for purposes of the parliamentary form of struggle and took the narrow view that the trade unionists should automatically prevail in the Party leadership.

Both opposing sides failed to consider extensively whether the Party's headquarters and center of political gravity should be the city or the countryside. Both Right opportunists and "Left" opportunists agreed that the Communist Party of the Philippines remain an urban Party.

Despite its advocacy of armed struggle, the Jose Lava leadership decided to command the People's Liberation Army (Hukbong Mapagpalaya ng Bayan) from the city.

Although it assumed the policy of armed struggle, the Jose Lava leadership did not lay down the correct theoretical and political basis for its organizational and military efforts. For this reason, it inconsistently allowed Luis Taruc as commander-in-chief of the people's army to negotiate for amnesty with the Quirino government.

The Politburo conference of January 1950 assumed a purely military viewpoint and drew up the "PB Resolutions" which maintained a line of rapid military victory. The Jose Lava leadership adopted a two-year timetable for seizing political power in the cities, without an all-sided and dialectical appreciation of the strength of the Party and the people's army on the one hand and the strength of the enemy on the other.

An adventurist military policy was initiated by a city-based Party leadership which was called the Secretariat or the Politburo-In. Instead of advancing in a series of waves within a protracted period of time, the people's army in the countryside was ordered to make simultaneous overextended attacks on the enemy at widely separated points in Central Luzon and Southern Luzon as part of the plan to prepare for the seizure of Manila. The military objectives were big military camps, cities and provincial capitals.

The attacks were done in a spirit of haste on March 29 and then on August 26, 1950 in accordance with the "PB Resolutions" of January 1950, without any thought of the forthcoming counterattack by the enemy with massive campaigns of "encirclement and suppression" and also without any serious thought of the necessity of being able to concentrate the forces of the people's army in order to deal with the subsequent enemy counterattack.

Overextended and inadequately armed units were also adventuristically disposed on the "gates" of Manila to bolster the illusion that the seat of reactionary rule was "soon" to fall. On the other hand, the headquarters of the Politburo-Out was snuggled in the unpopulated vastness of the Laguna portion of the Sierra Madre, isolated from the main force of the people's army.

As the Secretariat or the Politburo-In (the main Party leadership) was separated physically from the Politburo-Out, so was the latter from the people's armed forces that it was supposed to command upon orders of the Politburo-In. Military operations and the supply and communication lines were excessively stretched out over unreliable areas.

In October 1950, the Politburo-In was totally smashed in the city, with other Party members, sympathizers and couriers apprehended. A big harvest of Party documents, which included lists of members and tactical plans, was made by the enemy and this helped the enemy destroy the Party organization in the city and smash the people's armed forces in the countryside.

F. The Party in the Period of Continued Military Defeat

After the capture of the Secretariat or the Politburo-In in Manila, the Politburo-Out organized a Central Committee conference in February and March of 1951 in order to discuss the new situation. As clear proof of the increasingly desperate situation of the Party, the conference itself was under heavy military pressure by a massive enemy encirclement. With only a negligible armed force for protection, the conference could only depend on mere physical concealment within the encirclement.

The Central Committee conference failed to pose and criticize the adventurist errors of the Jose Lava leadership organizationally, politically and ideologically. The Jesus Lava leadership elected by the conference was essentially a part of the previous leadership; the Politburo-Out merely replaced the apprehended Politburo-In as the main leading body. At the most, the capture of the entire Politburo-In was narrowly adduced to tactical errors like negligence of security particularly in the city. The Central Committee failed to make a profound and systematic self-criticism as basis for a rectification movement.

The CC Resolutions of 1951 merely reiterated mechanically with the same overconfidence as that of the Jose Lava leadership the PB Resolutions of 1950. Grossly ignorant of the strategy and tactics of people's war, the Jesus Lava leadership could not state categorically that the people's army was on the strategic defensive; instead it muddleheadedly considered the incumbent stage of armed struggle as strategic "counteroffensive."

As in previous stages of the Party history, a new situation within the Party developed due to grave errors of a previous Party leadership and yet no rectification movement was launched to correct the basic mistakes and weaknesses in ideology, politics, organization and armed struggle.

The errors of the Jose Lava leadership were obscured by the inner-Party struggle which arose between Jesus Lava and the Taruc brothers on fragmented issues. In this regard, the Jesus Lava leadership resorted mainly to organizational maneuvers to cover up for the adventurist errors of the Party leadership and to combat the capitulationist ideas of the Taruc brothers.

As a result of the unrectified ideological and political weaknesses, and as a result of the disastrous military adventurism of the Jose Lava leadership, capitulationism started to set in the ranks of the Party leadership and was represented by the disgruntled and traitorous Luis Taruc who surrendered to the reactionary puppet government of Ramon Magsaysay in 1954. The outright capitulationist trend was aggravated to become the principal current by successive military defeats and by the chronic incorrect handling of cadres and the sectarian and liberal manipulation of cadres to perpetuate the clannish chain of Lava leadership.

Upon its assumption of office, the Jesus Lava leadership was buffeted from one military defeat to another. After the 1951 Central Committee conference, the Party headquarters, with its complement of staff members and security force, divided itself into several smaller groups and these were in blind flight within the massive enemy encirclement that enveloped the Sierra Madre from Laguna to Nueva Ecija and on both sides of Quezon. At a time that the Party leadership needed to concentrate its armed forces and smash or break through the weak points of the enemy encirclement, there was no sufficient number of men it could command.

From this time on, the Jesus Lava leadership was never in effective control of any sizeable armed force because the strongest regional command (Reco 2) closely associated with Luis Taruc became disaffected with the Lava leadership and all other forces had been fragmented because of the overextended dispersal of armed units during the adventurist leadership of Jose Lava.

During the period of 1951-1954, many principal leaders of the armed struggle fell under the massive encirclement campaigns in Southern Tagalog, Central Luzon, Bicol and Panay. It was during this period that roving rebel tendencies developed in the HMB because of ineffective central command and the slicing-off tactics of the enemy.

Under the impact and conditions of military defeat, the Jesus Lava leadership decided to adopt parliamentary struggle as the main form of struggle in 1955, thus falling into the same capitulationist line of Luis Taruc. The policy of armed struggle was abandoned and those who had opposed this policy before

became gleeful, wrongly feeling vindicated by the adventurist error of the Jose Lava leadership and by the Right opportunist about-face of the Jesus Lava leadership.

The Jesus Lava leadership went as far as deactivating armed units that were accessible to its command, and these were converted into so-called organizational brigades. Under the impact of the world revisionist campaign that was being waged by the Khrushchev revisionists, the Jesus Lava leadership in succeeding years felt more justified in its wrong policy.

Around 1958, he disbanded his own security men and fled from the countryside to the city to start the life of a city fugitive, isolated from the masses. This pattern of flight from the countryside to the city resulted in the capture of the principal leaders of the Party in the Greater Manila area. It signified the utter failure of the series of Lava leaderships in the Communist Party of the Philippines.

Living the life of a city fugitive, Lava wrote political transmissions and directives and made appointments without the benefit of collective Party discussions. It was during this period that Jesus Lava acting alone decided to adopt the liquidationist "single-file" policy. This policy required one Party member to be in contact with only one other Party member. The whole Party organization was, at first, reduced to a few one-way files until the loss of only one member in a single file would result in the automatic disconnection of several others from the Party or the complete dissolution of the entire file. This process led to the grave disorganization of the Party. After a few more years, Jesus Lava was to lose contact with both legal and armed cadres of the Party.

It was during this liquidationist period that the Party fell behind, even behind the national bourgeoisie and urban petit bourgeoisie which were raising the banner of nationalism of the Recto brand as early as 1957 and more strongly in 1961. Until new Party cadres emerged and some Party members were reactivated, the Party fell too far behind the events of the day. Meanwhile, Jesus Lava made decisions for the Party all by himself as Party discussions would now reveal.

In May 1964, Jesus Lava was finally arrested in Sampaloc, Manila under circumstances which clearly showed that he surrendered himself. In the first place, he had deliberately, by his own Right opportunism, one-man flightism and liquidationism, placed himself into the urban mouth of the reactionary whale.

IV. MAIN ERRORS AND WEAKNESSES

A. Ideological Weaknesses

The main ideological weakness of all previous leaderships of the Communist Party of the Philippines has been subjectivism, appearing in the form of dogmatism and empiricism, and resulting in Right and “Left” opportunist lines. The Philippines, being a semi-colonial and semi-feudal country, has a large petit bourgeoisie which serves as the historical and social basis for subjectivism. Since the Party exists in this kind of society, it is liable to reflect subjectivist trends from without and from within if it is not alert and careful in its Marxist-Leninist ideological building which is the first requirement in Party building.

The Party could be penetrated by a considerable number of Party members of petit-bourgeois orientation (intellectuals, middle peasants, handicraftsmen and other petit producers) who fail to remold their world outlook and methods of thinking in accordance with Marxism-Leninism and who fail to integrate revolutionary practice with dialectical materialism and historical materialism.

Although the first Party members were mainly from the working class represented by Comrade Crisanto Evangelista, the Party leadership erroneously put much reliance on open, legal, parliamentary and urban political activity which resulted in the paralyzation of the Communist Party of the Philippines once it was outlawed by the US imperialists and their running dogs. A revolutionary and thoroughgoing proletarian world outlook would have made the Party recognize the dialectics of the whole Philippine situation and would have enabled it to adopt the correct methods of legal and illegal struggle.

It was around 1935, however, while the Party was still outlawed by its class enemies when a considerable number of Party members of petit-bourgeois class status crept into a fluid underground Party that was deprived of a definite central leadership and tried to carry on political work, bringing with them their un-remolded petit bourgeois and bourgeois ideas.

At the helm of this petit bourgeois element within the Party were those who were greatly influenced by the empiricist and Right opportunist current spread by Browder of the Communist Party of the USA. At this time, the Communist Party of the Philippines, under the auspices of the Communist International, was assisted by the CPUSA by seeing to it that cadres like Vicente Lava who became its leading representative would carry on Party work.

Subjectivism of the empiricist type was manifested by major political policies and developments such as the principal importance given to urban Party work before the outbreak of the Pacific war; the merger of the Socialist Party and the Party which artificially increased the membership of the latter; the Rightist preamble in the merger constitution; capitulationism towards US imperialism and the Commonwealth government; the absence of any plan to shift the Party headquarters from the city to the countryside; the adoption of the “retreat for defense” policy of 1943 and the belief of Vicente Lava that there could be no proletarian leadership in the countryside; the purely anti-Japanese line during the war period and the shift of the Party central organs to the city after the anti-Japanese war and the blatantly Right opportunist policies of Vicente Lava, Jorge Frianeza and Pedro Castro during the period of 1945-1948.

Empiricism grows on a static underestimation of the people’s democratic forces and on a static overestimation of the enemy strength. Party work becomes dictated by the actions of the enemy instead of by a dialectical comprehension of the situation and the balance of forces. Revolutionary initiative becomes lost because of a static, one-sided, fragmented and narrow view of the requirements of the anti-imperialist, anti-feudal and anti-fascist struggle.

Thus, there is the overconcentration on urban political work because of the subjectivist and opportunist desire to compete or collaborate with bourgeois parties and groups, and beg for “democratic peace” from the US imperialists and local reactionaries in their own urban citadel. The countryside is grossly underestimated and thus, revolutionary initiative, the indispensable mass support of the peasantry, and a wide area for maneuver are ignored. There is also the personal desire of the petit bourgeois to enjoy the comforts and prestige of city life.

There is, however, the other side of the coin of subjectivism. Between 1948 and 1955, subjectivism of the dogmatist type prevailed during the first two years of the Jose Lava leadership and the first five years of the Jesus Lava leadership. This dogmatism grew on an overestimation of the people’s democratic forces and an underestimation of the enemy strength, without taking into full account the painstaking process of a protracted people’s war.

Under the Jose Lava leadership, the strategic view was adopted that, in a brief period of two years, the Party was certain to seize power. The Jose Lava leadership did not take into full account the necessity of a concrete and extended process of Party building, building of a people’s army and the building of a revolutionary national united front.

The Jose Lava leadership was fond of “Left” jargon so unrelated to the whole basic situation, a manifestation of subjectivism of the dogmatist type. This leadership took the style of confounding comrades with book knowledge and some supposedly special knowledge about the world situation and about the inner circles of the enemy. On the basis of such knowledge it took decisions that overstrained the Party and the masses beyond their capability and understanding. It did not care for painstaking work among the masses in the development of a protracted people’s war.

On the other hand, subjectivism of the empiricist type manifested by the Vicente Lava leadership and the Jesus Lava leadership was the cowardly reaction to the incumbent military superiority of the enemy. These leaderships took the line of passivity both strategically and tactically. They lost sight of the possible development of revolutionary principles and policies correctly adopted and applied on the basis of the internal laws of development of Philippine history and society. They simply went with the tide of defeat, without trying to seize revolutionary initiative.

Empiricism and dogmatism are two sides of the same petit-bourgeois coin. A twirl of the coin of subjectivism will abruptly show this or that side. The subjectivist errors of the Vicente and Jose Lava leaderships were mainly empiricism and dogmatism, respectively. These errors spring from the same petit-bourgeois disease of subjectivism that has afflicted the Party and that has wrought havoc on the revolutionary movement.

Reversals from empiricism to dogmatism and from dogmatism to empiricism are peculiarly common to those who still retain the petit-bourgeois world outlook. Nevertheless, when one is the principal aspect of a subjectivist stand, the other is bound to be the secondary aspect and the secondary aspect becomes the principal aspect at another moment. That is the dialectical relationship of empiricism and dogmatism.

Comrades should not wonder why under a dogmatist leadership there should be cases of empiricism; what is common between dogmatism and empiricism is the use of narrow and limited experience as the basis for overall subjectivist decisions. Also, comrades should not wonder why a leadership with the same petit-bourgeois orientation should swing from empiricism to dogmatism and back to empiricism, and so on and so forth. All subjectivists fail to grasp the laws of dialectical development and so they are volatile and erratic.

In 1951, the Jesus Lava leadership continued to carry the dogmatist line of the Jose Lava leadership. But after a few years, subjectivism of the empiricist

type started to dominate because of military defeats. The Jesus Lava leadership started to overestimate the strength of the enemy and it adopted parliamentary struggle as the main form of struggle, took flight from the countryside and then took up the so-called “single-file” policy based on its narrow individual experience.

In summing up the series of subjectivist leaderships, we can state that Vicente Lava, Jose Lava and Jesus Lava were responsible for the petit-bourgeois disease that has long afflicted the Communist Party of the Philippines. The bourgeois reactionary line of the Lavas continues to promote revisionism in the Philippines. It is essentially the inability to grasp proletarian revolutionary ideology and apply this on the concrete conditions of Philippine society.

The usurpation of the Party leadership by the Lavas during the last more than 30 years accounts for the fact that the Communist Party of the Philippines is still weak. Although the political errors of each Lava leadership became exposed in the wake of far-reaching damage, no thoroughgoing rectification movement had ever been conducted to expose and correct the basic errors in ideology.

Despite the fact that Vicente Lava’s subjectivism as expressed by his “retreat for defense” policy had resulted in great damage to the Party, there was no subsequent rectification movement that could have prevented the Right opportunist errors of the subsequent early postwar years. Also, despite the serious errors of the Lava leadership, the subsequent leadership did not engage in any serious rectification movement.

Until now, despite the grave errors of the Jesus Lava leadership and those of other previous leaderships, there has been strong resistance to ideological, political, and organizational rectification. The Party flounders from error to error when there is no systematic and objective evaluation of each error ideologically, politically and organizationally.

The fact that Party leadership was passed from one blood brother to another, a singular phenomenon in the entire international communist movement, could be taken as a magniloquent symptom of the subjectivism that had predominated within the Party.

The bourgeois reactionary line of the Lavas is careerism on a grand scale within the Party. A dangerous pattern has been established wherein Party responsibilities are apportioned to blood relatives on the basis of personal trust rather than on the basis of ideological and genuine Party trust. In this manner

a mechanical and slavish artificial majority could always be depended upon to elect the Lava brothers as general secretaries of the Party in a series.

The evil of subjectivism is still persistent within the Party and must be eradicated. It still appears in the form of sentimentalism on the part of elder cadres who had received their ideological training from the previous leaderships. Sentimentally, they recognize the personal sacrifices of the Lava brothers but at the same time they do not see how many lives of people and cadres have been sacrificed at the altar of subjectivist errors and failures and they do not see that the so-called personal sacrifices of the Lava brothers were the very product of their subjectivist errors and failures.

This sentimentalism has become a hindrance to the rectification of ideological, political and organizational errors. It is combined with a subjectivist awe for high bourgeois academic degrees that some cadres have. It also appears in the form of personal trust for those who have had ideological training from and those who enjoy the sanction of the series of Lava leaderships.

The bourgeois reactionary line of the Lavas, as it has developed on the basis of subjectivism, now nourishes the growth of modern revisionism in the Philippines. Since we are determined to rebuild the Party, the bourgeois reactionary line of the Lavas and all errors of subjectivism must be resolutely opposed and weeded out by a thoroughgoing rectification movement.

In conducting such a movement it is not so much the persons of the Lava "dynasty" that we are after; what we are after is the rectification of subjectivist errors. If no rectification movement is to be undertaken, if no ideological consolidation of the Party is to be made, then modern revisionism would flourish to disarm and undermine the people's democratic revolution.

Lava revisionism has been persistent for decades within the Party only because rectification, as demonstrated by Comrade Mao Zedong in the Chinese Communist Party, has never before been conducted as we have decided to do. A rectification movement within the Communist Party of the Philippines, the nucleus of the proletarian dictatorship, should be conducted in the Marxist-Leninist way that a cultural revolution is conducted under the proletarian state in order to combat Right opportunism and modern revisionism.

The preponderant form of subjectivism that has characterized the Lava leadership is empiricism. The dogmatist leadership of Jose Lava and, partially, of Jesus Lava was approximately a seven-year "Left" interregnum in what is more than 30 years of empiricism carried out mainly by the Vicente Lava and Jesus Lava leaderships.

Empiricism in philosophy results in Right opportunism in politics. Empiricism and Right opportunism in turn provide the basis for modern revisionism which is persistently advocated by the neo-bourgeois and revisionist renegade clique in Moscow. At present, modern revisionism is futilely trying to gain ground. The Communist Party of the Philippines must combat it thoroughly and seriously, especially now that Party rebuilding is being undertaken.

B. Political Errors

Right opportunism and “Left” opportunism have been committed in the history of the Communist Party of the Philippines. These political errors have emanated from the subjectivist world outlook. They have restricted the building of a Marxist-Leninist party that is firmly and closely linked with the masses on a national scale, that has a correct style of work and conducts criticism and self-criticism, that implements a program of agrarian revolution and that makes use of the national united front to broaden its influence and support in its struggle against US imperialism, feudalism and bureaucrat capitalism.

The urban, parliamentary and open character of the Communist Party of the Philippines during the early months of its existence in 1930 and 1931 was mainly responsible for the political disaster and difficulties that it soon suffered. During this early period, the Party leadership was given to the use of “Left” language in public against the entire bourgeoisie, and illegal work was not effectively carried out together with legal work.

The Party did not arouse and mobilize the peasantry as the main force of the revolution. Even when the principal leaders of the Party and its mass organizations were banished to different provinces, they were not conscious of the significance of planting the seeds of the new democratic revolution in the countryside. The idea of the national united front was also not immediately taken up and adopted. Even the urban petit bourgeoisie was not given serious attention as a class ally and as a source of cadres.

However, during the period that the Party was outlawed, cadres of petit-bourgeois origin crept into the Party and by 1935 their presence therein became marked. Because of their continued petit-bourgeois social status and their failure to remold their outlook, these cadres restrained the putting of emphasis on Party work among the toiling masses, especially in the countryside. In the trade unions, Party cadres working illegally could be counted on one’s fingers. As late as 1937, only a few cadres were working among the peasants in a few towns of Central Luzon. It was the Socialist Party of Pedro Abad Santos, however, which

had a large but loose mass following in the countryside. A few activists of this reformist party actually read Marxist literature but were lacking the discipline of Communist cadres.

It was through the merger of the Communist Party of the Philippines and the Socialist Party in 1938 that the bourgeois reactionary line of revisionism became formalized. The constitution of the merger party contained in its preamble the clause that it “defends the Constitution (of the US-puppet Commonwealth government) and the rights proclaimed therein...” and in Section I of Article III, the statement it “opposes with all its power any clique, group, circle, faction or party which conspires or acts to subvert, undermine, weaken or overthrow any or all institutions of Philippine democracy whereby the majority of the Filipino people have obtained power to determine their own destiny in any degree.” Getting the good wishes of Quezon in the Popular Front preoccupied most of the Party leaders then.

The necessity of preparing and developing rural bases in the face of the growing threat of fascism was not fully grasped by the Party leaders; and even if it were so surmised, no adequate preparations for armed struggle were made. The international situation that was already clearly pointing to the imminence of World War II was not fully related to the Philippine situation. From 1938 to 1942, the first and second lines of leadership agreed on the principal importance of urban Party work and overconcentrated on defending “civil liberties” while minimizing the importance of Party building and army building among the peasants.

It was simply assumed that the merger of the Communist Party and the Socialist Party would bring the peasantry en masse to the side of the Party. Under the banner of the Popular Front and under the auspices of the Commonwealth government, leading Party cadres ran for electoral offices in the reactionary government, especially in Greater Manila and in a few provinces, and they did not pursue what was principal revolutionary work in the countryside.

At the outbreak of World War II, the Party submitted a memorandum to Commonwealth president Manuel L. Quezon for arms support from the bourgeois government; but the latter, sure of his class interests, refused despite the Popular Front. Instead of putting the main stress on the revolutionary work of arousing and mobilizing the peasant masses, the Party leadership chose to put the main stress on the secondary, which consisted of legal and urban work

under the banner of the Popular Front. It was misled by the false prospect of arms support from a puppet government under US imperialist control.

When the Japanese imperialists invaded Manila, the first line of leadership was apprehended in the city and the rest of the city cadres did not exactly know where to retreat. At this point, we can see the error of Right opportunism as having grown within the Party without having been the object of critical exposure and thoroughgoing rectification.

Focusing Party work on parliamentary struggle, the merger party failed to make the most essential preparations for the anti-fascist armed struggle. The city cadres who fled to the countryside at the time of the Japanese invasion were unable to withdraw in an organized way, thus exposing the failure of the Crisanto Evangelista leadership to build the Party with deep foundations among the peasant masses on the basis of their struggle for land which is the main content of the people's democratic revolution. There was no rural base prepared for waging a people's war against the Japanese fascists.

Taught nevertheless by the immediate situation, the Party leadership held the Central Luzon Bureau Conference and soon after organized the People's Army Against the Japanese (Hukbalahap) to lead the popular resistance against the Japanese invaders and the puppet government. With the Hukbalahap under its command, the Party began to build political power in the countryside.

But the Right opportunist political line persisted and when the Party and the Army met their first serious setback in the anti-Japanese struggle during the "March raid," the Vicente Lava leadership promoted Right opportunism by adopting the "retreat for defense" policy. It was a policy that contravened the Marxist-Leninist principle that Red political power could be built only by waging armed struggle. This policy was nothing but a variation of the USAFFE "lie-low" policy of avoiding armed struggle with the Japanese invaders. This Right opportunist line restricted the rise of people's democratic power not only in the short run but even long after it was declared an erroneous policy.

The spontaneous resistance of the masses exposed the bankruptcy of the "retreat for defense" policy and the Bagumbali Conference declared this policy erroneous. Although the conference resulted in the demotion of some Right opportunists and in the regrouping of Hukbalahap "squadrons" for intensified resistance, the Right opportunist error was not thoroughly rectified and the Right opportunists still retained a big say in the Central Committee. Furthermore, the "Socialists" who had automatically become "Communists" by virtue of the 1938 merger were not provided by the Party leadership with the correct

Marxist-Leninist education and were always susceptible to Right opportunism. The capitulationist and renegade Luis Taruc would remain to be the general representative of a great many of them who failed to advance to the level of Marxist-Leninists.

The abandonment of the “retreat for defense” policy resulted in some limited successes for the Party and the army. In a few months’ time, the area and the population covered by both increased to the extent that the greater part of Central Luzon came under the effective leadership of the Party and that the people’s army could send out sizeable units to establish or reinforce armed bases in the Southern Tagalog area.

However, at the end of the anti-Japanese struggle when the US imperialists landed to reconquer the Philippines, the Right opportunist line would again strikingly emerge as the main line. There arose the illusion that the people were tired of war and that the Party could strive for the realization of its principles under conditions of “democratic peace” granted by US imperialism and the landlords. Against this illusion were the brutalities committed by the military police, the civilian guards and all kinds of American agents against the people and the unjust arrest and incarceration of the principal leaders and fighters of the Hukbalahap.

Thus, a strategic dual line was adopted with the so-called “propaganda” line differing from the so-called “true” line. The “propaganda” line was that the Party was publicly desirous of “democratic peace,” of participating in bourgeois politics through the Democratic Alliance; and the “true” line was that it was actually keeping its armed power in the form of concealed arms caches. The Party leadership ordered the disbanding of the majority of Hukbalahap “squadrons” and token arms surrender were made. It shifted back the center of its political activity to the city under the banner of bourgeois parliamentarism.

With the adoption of this strategic dual line, deception was idealistically intended as an essential component of the strategic line. But while the enemy was not fooled by the token surrender of weapons by the Hukbalahap, confusion was introduced into the ranks of the cadres and masses. The Party leadership failed to establish the correct mass line as it adopted a strategic dual line and lost its grip on the gun.

The 1946 constitution of the Party continued to carry the bourgeois reactionary line of revisionism by stating in its Article VIII, Section 2, “Affiliation with or participation in the activities of any group, class, faction or party which

aims or acts to destroy, weaken or overthrow the democratic Constitution of the Philippines shall be punished with immediate ouster from the Party.”

Until May 1948, when the Jose Lava leadership assumed central responsibility, the Party experienced the blatant reign of Right opportunism or revisionism. During the early postwar period, the Right opportunist influence of Vicente Lava, Pedro Castro and Jorge Frianeza prevailed. The Pedro Castro leadership was denounced and replaced for Right opportunism and tailism and for advocating the development of a mass and open Party that was supposed to engage solely in bourgeois elections.

But the errors of this leadership were never consistently rectified ideologically and politically all throughout the Party although drastic organizational measures were taken against those who took sides with Pedro Castro without so much as an explanation to the masses of Party members. Jorge Frianeza replaced him and was soon removed from the secretaryship and expelled for Rightism but again no thoroughgoing rectification movement was conducted to weed out the persistent roots of the errors.

Without clarifying the ideological, political and organizational grounds for a protracted people’s war, the Jose Lava leadership merely took advantage of the Party’s and the people’s clamor that armed struggle was necessary on account of the fascist attacks against them and a number of duly-elected representatives in Congress who opposed the Bell Trade Act and the Parity Amendment. This leadership automatically expected revolutionary triumph on the basis of external conditions.

Because of the absence of a thoroughgoing rectification movement against the previous Rightist leadership being conducted aside from organizational and administrative measures, Right opportunism could still persist as a strong undercurrent or secondary aspect of opportunism even under the “Left” opportunist leadership of Jose Lava.

Soon after its assumption of office and adoption of the line of armed struggle, it actually permitted Luis Taruc to negotiate the terms of surrender and amnesty for the people’s armed forces with the Quirino government. This was another instance of an opportunist line that undermined the revolutionary will of the masses more than it deceived the enemy. No genuine Marxist-Leninist party leadership would ever consider surrendering to or seeking amnesty from the enemy. To do so would be to betray the fighting masses, promote capitulationism and serve the enemy.

The Jose Lava leadership committed mainly the error of “Left” opportunism by dogmatically assuming that the class enemies of the proletariat were weakening and splitting up all the way on a straight line and that the Party could seize power within a very short period. There was a failure to recognize that in a semi-colonial and semi-feudal country, a protracted people’s war would have to be waged with due regard to the strength of the enemy.

The Party could depend only on the people in areas covered by the Hukbalahap and the Barrio United Defense Corps during the anti-Japanese struggle. Because of previous failure to distribute cadres to important parts of the country other than Central Luzon, Manila, Rizal and Southern Tagalog and because of the Right opportunism of previous years, the Party and the people’s army were not able to build up on a national scale and, therefore, were not able to unite with the people on a national scale. It would require a protracted period of time for the Party to convert into a revolutionary advantage the initial disadvantage of fighting for people’s democratic power in an archipelago like the Philippines.

The “Left” opportunist leadership of Jose Lava failed to understand comprehensively the requirements of a people’s democratic revolution. It failed to see the necessity of solid party building, the development of armed rural bases on the basis of an agrarian revolution and the national united front. If it recognized the necessary combination and correct use of these weapons, then it could have easily taken the view that people’s war is protracted and painstaking.

During this period, the notion became prevalent that the establishment of rural bases was a strange and utopian idea “because the Philippines is a small country and an archipelago having no rear adjacent to and contiguous with a big friendly country.” Jose Lava as general secretary dismissed arrogantly the concept of rural bases as a grandiose idea. Little was it realized that the rural base was itself the center of gravity or great rear of guerrilla zones. The camp of the Politburo-Out in the Laguna portion of the Sierra Madre depended merely on a hidden physical base instead of a rural base where the people’s support is strong by virtue of armed struggle and agrarian revolution.

A protracted revolutionary armed struggle should have been waged in combination with an agrarian revolution and the development of rural bases. The people’s army should have advanced in a series of waves from stable base areas but a petit-bourgeois leadership was too much in a hurry, too impetuous to capture within so short a period the bourgeois state power centered in Manila.

This petit-bourgeois leadership never realized that the Party could fight the bourgeois state by establishing the people's democratic power in the countryside.

At the height of the adventurist folly, Party leaders would bid each other goodbye in public with: "See you in Malacañang!" This infantile talk reflected the adventurist desire of the Jose Lava leadership to move the people's army to the city gates within a short period of time without first developing the armed power of the masses and then advancing in a series of waves from well-consolidated rural bases.

The Central Committee plenary session which was held by the Politburo-Out under the Jesus Lava leadership in February-March of 1951 after the capture of the Politburo-In failed to clarify fully the building and wielding of the three weapons of the Philippine revolution; namely, party building, armed struggle and the national united front.

It obscured the basic errors of the Jose Lava leadership by superficial rationalization such as "carelessness" of the captured Party leaders and the tactical errors of lower cadres and commanders and the rank and file. A rectification movement would have unfolded the ideological and political basis of the failure of the Jose Lava leadership and thus removed the danger of opportunism continuing in its Right or "Left" form.

Jesus Lava's assumption of the Party leadership did not mean an immediate reversal of Jose Lava's "Left" opportunist political line. It was when the Jesus Lava leadership lost effective central command over all units of the people's army and was further burdened by the series of military defeats and difficulties inflicted by the enemy and by the capitulationism and splittism of Luis Taruc and his Titoite cohorts that it swung to the Right opportunist line.

Its Right opportunism became most evident in the formal adoption of parliamentary struggle as the main form of struggle in 1955 and in the disbandment of armed units under its command. This Right opportunism would continuously be further borne out by the subsequent one-man flights of principal leaders of the Party from the countryside to the city.

This one-man flightism resulted in the worst policy of the Jesus Lava leadership, the "single file" policy, which meant the liquidation of the collective life of the Party and the dissolution of practically all Party units and armed units, thus defeating even the Right opportunist objective of engaging mainly in parliamentary struggle.

The militant resurgence of the Communist Party of the Philippines has been on account of the emergence of new Party cadres and reactivated Party cadres who are now guided by today's highest development of Marxism-Leninism, Mao Zedong Thought.

At the present moment, however, the bourgeois reactionary line of the Lavas remains a pernicious influence within the Party. Afflicting the Party for an exceedingly long period, without having been profoundly criticized before this present stage of the development of our Party, this bourgeois reactionary line cannot be defeated within a few weeks, months or years. It cannot be removed from the Party even if its direct representatives are overthrown from their positions of Party authority unless we combat the ideological and political roots of their errors.

Considering the present circumstances, the dangers of Right or "Left" opportunism will always confront us. But those who hold on to the living study and application of Mao Zedong Thought and to the correct mass line of the Party will always maintain and heighten their revolutionary strength and courage in order to prevail.

It should be kept in mind, though, that the bourgeois reactionary line of the Lavas is mainly Right opportunism and secondarily "Left" opportunism. Today, some Party members overestimate the value of legal urban-based "nationalist" mass organizations like the Movement for the Advancement of Nationalism and such government measures as the Magna Carta of Labor, the Agricultural Land Reform Code and others.

On the other hand, there is a minor undercurrent of infantile "Left" opportunism of excessively underestimating the value of legal mass organizations and of resorting to "Left" phrase mongering without actually engaging in thoroughgoing mass work and struggle against the exploiters of the people.

Modern revisionism has gained a small foothold in Philippine society through the Lava revisionist renegades and other Right opportunists. It is necessary to combat modern revisionism with the revolutionary theory and practice of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought. Otherwise, the Communist Party of the Philippines will continue to suffer stagnation and reverses in the struggle for people's democratic power.

C. Military Errors

Errors in ideology and politics always lead to errors in the armed struggle. A party that does not seriously pay attention to this relationship is bound to

fail in performing its central revolutionary task of seizing political power and consolidating it.

Armed struggle is the main weapon of the Communist Party of the Philippines in carrying out the people's democratic revolution. Without a people's army under the command of the Party, the people have nothing as Comrade Mao Zedong has taught us in his theory and practice of the Chinese revolution. Being in a semi-colonial and semi-feudal country, our Party must integrate three necessary and inseparable components in waging a people's war in the countryside; namely, armed struggle, agrarian revolution and rural base building.

During the first 12 years of the existence of the Party, from 1930 to 1942, the Party did not immediately develop these three components. In 1931, it met its first concrete experience of suppression by US imperialism and its running dogs. The reactionary state with all the weapons of coercion at its command succeeded in creating grave difficulties for the Party for so many years.

When the Party finally organized the guerrilla forces of the Hukbalahap on the basis of the popular anti-Japanese resistance, the Party leadership did not have a clear understanding of what it took to wage a people's war. When the Party and the army had their first serious setback at the hands of the Japanese fascists, the Party leadership adopted the "retreat for defense" policy. This policy involved the dissolution of the Hukbalahap "squadrons" and the formation of minuscule units composed of only three to five men at a time that the people's army needed to concentrate larger forces to deal punishing blows on isolated parts of the Japanese invasion forces and their mercenaries. The dissolution of the Hukbalahap "squadrons" had far-reaching debilitating effects on the people's army.

The Party leadership had to abandon the "retreat for defense" policy and re-muster the Huk "squadrons" in the face of persistent popular demand to annihilate the enemy. However, when US imperialism returned to reoccupy the Philippines, the Party and the Hukbalahap leadership again surrendered the military initiative to the USAFFE forces. Hukbalahap "squadrons" were too ready in welcoming and in merely assisting the US reoccupation forces when what was needed was for them to keep their forces distinct in fighting the retreating Japanese fascists.

The Party leadership was too ready to abandon the military initiative to US imperialism for it was bent on returning to the city and conducting peaceful parliamentary struggle. Even when US imperialism attacked the people and the

people's army in a campaign to restore landlord power in areas that the Party and army controlled, the Party leadership ordered the disbandment of armed units of the people's army under the erroneous banner of "democratic peace" unlike in China where the vanguard Party held on to its arms and fought.

Under the Jose Lava leadership, the error of military adventurism and purely military viewpoint was perpetuated as an extreme reaction to Right opportunism. The petit bourgeois world outlook was at the root of the "Left" subjectivist error of military adventurism. This outlook prevented the Party leadership from understanding the laws of development of a people's war in Philippine society and thus from adopting the correct strategy and tactics.

The Jose Lava leadership was marked by military impetuosity and petit-bourgeois vindictiveness manifested inside and outside of the Party. What was, however, in common between the "Left" opportunism and the Right opportunism it opposed was the petit-bourgeois illusion that the people's forces could be commanded from the city and that the city of Manila, the strongest base of the bourgeois state power, could be easily seized without building rural bases.

The selfish desire to seize power in the city in so short a time as two years without having laid down an extensive ground work among the people showed lack of understanding of protracted people's war. As "Left" opportunism emerged as the principal aspect of the Jose Lava leadership, Right opportunism persisted as a secondary aspect or as an undercurrent represented by Luis Taruc. As the power of the reactionary ruling classes was estimated to be weak because it was wracked by an internal split, the Jose Lava leadership gave orders to direct fire only against Filipino puppet troops and to strictly avoid attacks against US military personnel.

The underestimation of US military support for the local reactionaries was primarily "Left" opportunism. At the same time, there was the false belief that avoiding military engagement with US military personnel would make the fight for the Red army easier. This was Right opportunism lurking behind "Left" opportunism and was still a carryover of the counterrevolutionary Rightist line during the anti-Japanese war that the United States would return to the Philippines in order to restore "democratic peace" after overcoming the Japanese fascists.

It was "Left" opportunism to hope for rapid military victory on such an illusion as that the bourgeois politicians, Laurel and Rodriguez, would lead revolts against the Quirino government from Batangas and Rizal in concert with the People's Liberation Army. And yet the element of Right opportunism

is to be found in giving bourgeois politicians a decisive role in so central a question as the actual seizure of power. At this time the HMB had not yet gained enough strength to capture Manila: no more than 3,000 Red troops could be massed for the purpose, with the sure difficulties of overstraining the people's armed strength in all other places.

The predominating "Left" opportunist line of the Jose Lava leadership was evident in the issuance of military orders to the people's forces in the countryside from the city-based Secretariat or Politburo-In. Even in the countryside the Politburo-Out was distant from the main military forces and relied on camouflage rather than on developing a stable rural base on which it should have relied. There was still a great gap between the Party leadership and the masses consisting of unstable areas in Central Luzon and blatantly White areas in Southern Luzon.

While the Party headquarters in the city was distantly separated from the Politburo-Out and the latter was in turn distantly separated from the main forces of the people's army, orders were brought down making the people's armed forces leap over unstable and unreliable areas to simultaneously attack widely separated targets such as military camps, cities and provincial capitals. This kind of armed movement overextended the strength of the people's army and further strained what had already been the overstretched lines of communications and supplies.

The raids of March 29 and August 26, 1950 conducted by the people's army in accordance with the "PB Resolutions" of January 1950 demonstrated fully the adventurist impetuosity of the Jose Lava leadership. In essence, it failed to recognize dialectically the ability of the enemy to make a counterattack that could break the overextended lines linking the Politburo-Out to the regional commands and so on and so forth. The enemy did counterattack after the March and August raids by pitting 25,000 troops against the people's army of a lesser number dispersed all over Central Luzon, Manila, Rizal, Bicol and Panay.

A short while after the raids of August 26, the Party headquarters in the city was smashed systematically by the enemy in October 1950. Considering the extent of enemy success in this crackdown, the policy of rapid recruitment of Party members in the city was demonstrated to be a folly and a violation of the defensive and underground requirements of urban party work. No less than the highest organs of the Party were infiltrated by the enemy.

The failures of the military policy vis-a-vis the enemy were aggravated by the incorrect handling of Red cadres and fighters. Under the guise of “Bolshevization,” the Jose Lava leadership adopted harsh methods on those who were found committing even minor errors. The death penalty was imposed on cadres and fighters even where a lighter punishment would have sufficed.

In meting out punishments, the life history of erring cadres and fighters was not considered seriously and oftentimes the immediate error was isolated from the circumstances. What was mistaken for “Bolshevization” were the rules of war from bourgeois military books. This mishandling of cadres and fighters worsened as the people’s army suffered an increasing number of setbacks and a tendency towards disintegration occurred.

In its petit-bourgeois eagerness to seize power, the Jose Lava leadership instructed Party organs to put the military viewpoint in command, to make military-technical articles dominant in the HMB Bulletin and to study and adopt as a basic training guide the 90-week “Master Training Schedule”—a manual used by the US Army and the reactionary armed forces of the Philippines. These specific instances showed the utter lack of understanding of the nature of people’s war.

As the armed struggle started to ebb during the latter part of 1951, the relationship between the people’s army and the people was mishandled in a serious way. Distinctions were made between friendly and hostile barrios. The distinctions were made not for purposes of waging the correct propaganda campaign to win over the people from a hostile attitude to a friendly attitude but for purposes of making retaliatory and vindictive foraging attacks even against ordinary peasants some of whose work animals were confiscated to provide food for the beleaguered fighters of the people’s army. It was not fully realized that aside from being a fighting force, the people’s army was a propaganda and productive force.

It was as a result of the serious mistakes of the Jose Lava leadership and the effective counterattacks of the enemy that a tendency towards roving rebel bands and a degeneration of these bands became more pronounced. The absence of genuine proletarian discipline, the wanton dispersal of the people’s army and the concomitant loss of effective central command led the Party from one disaster to another.

After the Jose Lava leadership assumed command, “Left” opportunism continued in the form of roving rebel tendencies on the basis of forced dispersal of armed units. With the central command lacking a main armed force,

the dispersed armed units subjected to massive “encirclement and suppression” operations by the reactionary army committed in the name of “struggle for survival” or “economic struggle” many abuses and excesses that the enemy used to its “psywar” advantage.

Taking advantage of real abuses and excesses of the “people’s army,” the reactionary army systematically used reactionary troops in civilian clothes to make their own abuses and excesses and blamed them on the people’s army. A deep line of sectarianism within the Party leadership of Jose and Jesus Lava was taken advantage of by the enemy.

The Jesus Lava leadership could not correct the military adventurism of the Jose Lava leadership because it did not have any comprehensive understanding of the nature and requirements of a people’s war. It was completely ignorant of how to conduct a people’s war at its stage of strategic defensive and tactical offensives.

As before, it was completely ignorant of how to smash an enemy campaign of encirclement and suppression. Because of its failure to grasp Marxism-Leninism, it was never able to regroup the dispersed armed units of the people’s army which were attacked in a massive way by the reactionary army continuously from 1951 to 1955.

In 1955, under conditions of military defeat, the Jesus Lava leadership took a Rightist line and adopted parliamentary struggle as the main form of struggle. Jesus Lava became guilty of liquidationism when he actually disbanded armed units, including his own armed security, and chose to live the life of a city fugitive. The individual flights of the commander-in-chief of the people’s army, Casto Alejandrino, and the general secretary of the Party, Jesus Lava, from the countryside to the city and their subsequent capture in the city proved conclusively the erroneous military line of the Party leadership.

It is only in the area of Regional Command No. 2, particularly in the province of Pampanga and partially in Tarlac, Bataan and Nueva Ecija where remnants of the People’s Liberation Army have persisted. It is not those who have slavishly followed the leadership of the Lavas who are now waging the armed struggle. Nevertheless, a thoroughgoing rectification of the bourgeois reactionary line of the Lavas and the capitulationism of Luis Taruc must be waged particularly in this area.

Roving rebel tendencies and practices must also be corrected here. What is to be generated is a genuine people’s army that is under the effective command

of a Marxist-Leninist party guided by Mao Zedong Thought, that is a weapon for agrarian revolution and that builds up stable base areas.

It has been a disadvantage for the Party to have established its strength only in the areas of Greater Manila, Central Luzon and partially in Southern Tagalog although these areas have strategic value because it is here where bourgeois state power is most concentrated throughout the archipelago.

However, new military strategy and tactics in line with Mao Zedong Thought must be adopted taking into full account the weak links of the bourgeois state power on the basis of class analysis and turning the archipelago from a short-run disadvantage into a long-run advantage for the Party and the People's Liberation Army.

The development of the people's main military forces and rural bases in Luzon other than in Central Luzon should be well-considered; and the other islands of the Visayas and Mindanao should be utilized to disperse and dissipate the main forces of the enemy concentrated in Luzon.

D. Organizational Errors

Organizationally, the main disability of the Communist Party of the Philippines has been its failure to build an organization that has a broad mass character and that is national in scale. Where the Party has been built, the principle of democratic centralism has not been applied correctly in the organizational life of the Party, resulting in errors of sectarianism and liberalism, and commandism and tailism, because of subjectivism and opportunism.

Building a party of a broad mass character requires a national system of party cadres who build up a great mass following. Under the difficult conditions existing in Philippine society, it is a wise policy to build the Party carefully. Recruitment and development of cadres must always conform to the standards of a proletarian revolutionary party.

A party with a broad mass character means that party cadres have a big mass following due to the adoption of the correct ideology, political line, and principles and methods of organization. The Communist Party of the Philippines can have a broad mass character only if its cadres could truly lead masses of workers and peasants in revolutionary struggle. The Party guides the revolutionary struggle of the masses and in turn the struggle produces the best and most advanced fighters of the revolution who become party members.

Closed-doorism was a marked tendency of the Crisanto Evangelista leadership. Party work was concentrated in the trade union movement. The Party

gained strength during the anti-Japanese war only by waging revolutionary armed struggle and leading the peasant masses. In 1948, the Party regained revolutionary strength for some time until the errors of adventurism of the Jose Lava leadership undermined the revolutionary resurgence.

It was shown that the Party could gain real mass strength only to the extent that it merged with and led the peasant masses. In a semi-colonial and semi-feudal country like the Philippines, the Party can gain strength only by arousing, organizing and mobilizing the peasant masses in line with the agrarian revolution as the main content of the people's democratic struggle. In the final analysis, the proletarian revolutionary party in the Philippines can have a broad mass character only if it gains the mass support of the peasantry, particularly the poor peasants and farm workers.

Until now, Party members are relatively overconcentrated in Central Luzon and in the Manila-Rizal areas. Even in the previous high tides of the revolutionary movement in the Philippines, the Party did not succeed in broadcasting sufficiently on a national scale the people's democratic revolution through the systematic deployment of cadres.

In the course of his long period of being a trade union leader, Crisanto Evangelista developed a small amount of relations with other trade union leaders in the Visayas. But he himself, even as late as the later part of the thirties, had the illusion that if the Party could gain control over Central Luzon, then the whole of Luzon would easily follow; and if the Party could gain control over Luzon, then the whole archipelago would follow.

At the beginning of the anti-Japanese war, there was an attempt to send a team of cadres to the Visayas but it was called off. During the war, the Party and the Hukbalahap were built up mainly in the single region of Central Luzon. Even in the accessible region of Southern Tagalog, the Party was not able to seize leadership and initiative in the anti-Japanese war from pro-US guerrilla units. After the war, the question of sending cadres out to other islands was not immediately taken up seriously.

It was only at the height of the armed struggle under the Jose Lava leadership that Party cadres were sent out to Cagayan Valley, Bicol, Panay, Ilocos and Mindanao to build the Party and army. But these pioneering comrades were clearly not able to build the Party and army on strong foundations. They did not have sufficient time to do so because of the failure of the Party leadership to adopt a correct political line. The main policy of rapid military victory did not allow the cadres sufficient time to build the Party, the army and the united

front on a more massive and nationwide scale and to develop all requisites for people's democratic power.

During the entire period of the Jesus Lava leadership, the failure to build a national organization persisted. This leadership merely presided over and hastened the destruction of old Party units as well as new ones established outside of Central Luzon. Even during the later part of the 1950s when legal mass organizations under the leadership of the Party could be established, there was no serious attempt made by the Party to build legal mass organizations as the medium for Party expansion.

It would only be after 1960 that, through the initiative mainly of new and reactivated old Party members, the Party would dare to push forward the resurgence of the revolutionary mass movement. Now the Party has started to make modest gains in building a Party that has a broad mass character and that is national in scale.

Through a national united front, the proletarian revolutionary party which is carrying out agrarian revolution, with the full support of the oppressed peasantry, can still broaden its support by allying itself with such supplementary revolutionary forces as the urban petit bourgeoisie and the national bourgeoisie.

In the Philippines, the Party first experienced a united front policy when it opposed fascism during the days of the Popular Front. But during this period, the powerful influence of the petit bourgeoisie within the Party started to corrode the revolutionary will of the Party in a subtle way.

After the war, the Democratic Alliance was put up as a formal unified front organization. But this alliance served only to support Right opportunism and allowed some bourgeois personalities to assume the leadership. The Party practically carried the sedan chair for them for some time until they scurried away when the armed struggle became intensified.

During the Jesus Lava leadership, no genuine united front could be built because of the failure to build a strong Party, people's army and legal mass organizations under the leadership of the Party. At the time that the urban petit bourgeoisie and the national bourgeoisie were being agitated by Claro Mayo Recto to join the anti-imperialist movement, the Party failed to take advantage of the situation fully because of the liquidationist policy that gravely hampered and threatened the very organizational existence of the Party.

The Party failed in many instances to combine legal and illegal struggle in its organizational work. At the time that the Party was outlawed for the first

time soon after its founding, there was no secret second line of leadership that could carry out Party tasks legally and illegally. At the beginning of the war, a second line of leadership replaced an incapacitated first line but the former had in the main been detached from mass work previously, having only engaged in limited political work among urban petit bourgeois elements.

As a result of erroneous political lines, grievous organizational errors were committed. Democratic centralism did not come into full play in order to arrive at the correct decisions. The development of the bourgeois reactionary line of the Lavas is the result of gross violations of democratic centralism. The astounding series of Lava leaderships has been the result of bourgeois maneuvers chronically causing falling-off and demoralization among Party cadres through a period of more than 30 years.

Liberalism in the most vulgar forms like nepotism and favoritism was practiced in the making of assignments and appointment or election to leading positions. Liberalism marked the merger of the Communist Party of the Philippines and the Socialist Party. Members of the Socialist Party were taken wholesale into the Communist Party notwithstanding the ideological requirement of a Marxist-Leninist. The first and second lines of leadership adopted a liberal attitude to Party organization as they concentrated on urban and legal political work before the outbreak of the anti-Japanese war.

The big upsurge of liberalism and legalism represented by Vicente Lava, Jorge Frianeza and Pedro Castro after the anti-Japanese war had dialectical connections with an unrectified Right opportunist trend starting before the war. Jorge Frianeza advocated the complete dissolution of the people's army and a "united front" with the reactionary Roxas government; and Pedro Castro advocated the organization of a "mass party" for parliamentary struggle and the liquidation of illegal Party work. Within the Democratic Alliance, a liberal policy of allowing the predominance of bourgeois personalities occurred. It was itself an act of liberalism to allow the Democratic Alliance to play the central role in the political struggle of the masses.

Sectarianism was the principal organizational error of the Jose Lava leadership while liberalism was its secondary error. Isolated from the concrete conditions of the armed struggle in the countryside, this leadership was commandist in bringing down its orders. Among the fighting forces in the countryside, sectarian excesses occurred under the cover of the slogan of "Bolshevization." Contradictions among the people and minor infractions within the Party were considered as contradictions between the people and the enemy.

Whereas a policy of persuasion and leniency was required in many cases, the harshest penalties were imposed on erring Party members and Red fighters. In the city, sectarianism was also practiced in relation to the national united front. As a result of the failure of the Democratic Alliance, the importance of a consistent united front policy towards the middle forces was immediately discounted by the Jose Lava leadership.

Although the main organizational error of the Jose Lava leadership was sectarianism, it perpetuated liberalism in appointing to high Party positions and recruiting into the Party persons who happened to be relatives, personal friends and townspeople of the Lava family, without benefit of undergoing the tests of revolutionary mass struggle.

Certainly, liberalism was essentially involved in the rapid recruitment policy in the city of Manila, a policy which allowed the penetration of the Party by enemy agents. The cornerstone of this policy was personal trust. The ludicrous example of liberalism was the appointment of Paciano Rizal to a decisively important position on the narrow consideration that he bore the name of the bourgeois national hero, Jose Rizal.

The Jesus Lava leadership carried substantially for some time the sectarianism of the Jose Lava leadership. For a number of years, the Party leadership represented by Jesus Lava resorted to the sectarian method of intimidation to put Party members into line and there were many cases of cadres executed for flimsy reasons. On the basis of mere suspicion, Party members suffered the death penalty.

When Right opportunism prevailed, the Jesus Lava leadership practiced liberalism by coddling Party members whom it dissuaded from joining the revolutionary mass struggle. The main line of parliamentary struggle inevitably degenerated into liquidationism. The flight of the Party leaders from the countryside to the city resulted in the neglect of Party organizations in the countryside and in the disastrous liquidationist "single file" policy which destroyed in a big way the collective life of Party organizations, cut off lines of responsibility between higher organs and lower organs and isolated the Party from the people.

The Jesus Lava leadership became reduced to the general secretary alone, made one-man decisions, issued political transmissions from some secluded room and made appointments to high Party positions on the basis of blood and personal relations. During the late fifties, opportunities for regrouping Party and armed units in the countryside were completely disregarded and

parliamentary struggle itself was not properly conducted. It would only be during the early sixties that party rebuilding and the establishment of mass organizations were affected by the Party members independent of the isolated Party leadership.

In the main, the bourgeois reactionary line of the Lavas is organizationally the disease of liberalism, liquidationism and the consistent violation of democratic centralism. A thoroughgoing rectification movement to remove the ideological, political and organizational roots of the bourgeois reactionary line of the Lavas must be conducted in order to rebuild the Party in accordance with Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought. The bourgeois reactionary line of the Lavas can still persist if no serious efforts are taken to repudiate organizationally its ideological and political agents within the Party.

V. THREE MAIN TASKS

A. Party Building

Without a revolutionary theory, there can be no revolutionary movement. The revolutionary movement must be guided by today's highest development of Marxism-Leninism, Mao Zedong Thought. In rebuilding the Communist Party of the Philippines, we must apply the universal truth of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought on the concrete practice of the Philippine revolution, in party rebuilding, in developing the armed struggle and in utilizing the national united front to achieve the people's democratic revolution.

What we need to rebuild in the Philippines today is a proletarian revolutionary party that is armed with Mao Zedong Thought. The Philippine revolutionary movement cannot possibly advance without moving ahead with the theory and practice of the world proletarian revolution. The proletarian revolution has been continuously advancing, passing three major stages: the first stage was led by Marx and Engels by developing the theory of scientific socialism; the second stage was led by Lenin and Stalin by developing the theory and practice of proletarian dictatorship in the era of imperialism; and the third stage is now guided by Comrade Mao Zedong. Even in the second stage, Comrade Mao Zedong was already in the vanguard of the international communist movement by outstandingly developing the theory of people's war in a semi-colonial and semi-feudal country.

In this era of Mao Zedong Thought, the Communist Party of the Philippines cannot achieve its immediate goal of people's democracy and its ultimate goal of socialism without applying Mao Zedong Thought on the concrete conditions of the Philippines and without grasping the six components of today's Marxism-Leninism: philosophy, political economy, social science, people's war, party building and the proletarian cultural revolution. The Communist Party of the Philippines can be a proletarian revolutionary party only if it grasps the advances in philosophy, political economy and social science contributed by Comrade Mao Zedong and his theory and practice of people's war, party building and the great proletarian cultural revolution.

As a proletarian revolutionary party, the Communist Party of the Philippines comprehensively differentiates itself from bogus and revisionist parties and groups by adopting Mao Zedong Thought as its supreme guide and by applying it in revolutionary practice. The Party sets itself free from subjectivism, Right and "Left" opportunism and other manifestations of the bourgeois

reactionary line by adhering to Mao Zedong Thought in theory and in practice. Only with the guidance of Mao Zedong Thought can the Party cleanse itself of the bourgeois reactionary line of the Lavas and all other ideological, political and organizational errors that have hampered and hindered the victorious advance of the people's democratic revolution in the Philippines.

Mao Zedong Thought draws the demarcation line between the true proletarian revolutionaries on the one side and the bourgeois pseudo-revolutionaries and revisionists on the other. In an international revolutionary movement that is beset with modern revisionism directed and led by the revisionist renegade clique in Moscow, Mao Zedong Thought stands out to illumine the whole world including the Philippines and to push to the darkest corners the treasonous modern revisionist concoctions of the three "peacefuls" and two "wholes."

Adhering to Mao Zedong Thought and holding firmly that the central task of a revolutionary movement is the seizure and consolidation of political power, the Communist Party of the Philippines cannot be confused by the false revisionist theory of peaceful coexistence, peaceful transition, peaceful competition, party of the whole people and state of the whole people being peddled by the Soviet revisionist ruling clique internationally and by the Lava revisionist renegades locally. Modern revisionism is the main danger today in the international communist movement and likewise in the Philippine revolutionary movement.

The Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution in the People's Republic of China, however, has consolidated a great base area— an iron bastion—of the world proletarian revolution under the leadership of Comrade Mao Zedong and has arisen as the epoch-making weapon against modern revisionism in the whole world and against the restoration of capitalism within socialist society.

The People's Republic of China serves today as a stable base area of all revolutionary peoples now surrounding the cities of the world from the world's countryside of Asia, Africa and Latin America. Mao Zedong Thought has taken deep roots among 700 million Chinese people and in the whole world through genuine Marxist-Leninist parties that uphold Mao Zedong Thought as the Marxism-Leninism of this era.

In the Philippines today, Mao Zedong Thought is guiding a rectification movement within the nucleus of the proletarian dictatorship, the Communist Party of the Philippines. A thoroughgoing rectification movement, which is a widespread movement of education in Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought, is being waged to rid the Party and its mass organizations of the

failures and errors of the Lavas that are persisting ideologically, politically and organizationally. The bourgeois reactionary line of the Lavas is in the main Right opportunism which is the bourgeois soil for modern revisionism in the Philippines.

The treasonous current of modern revisionism has taken roots in the subjectivist and Right opportunist line that the Lavas have perpetuated for the last more than three decades and that the semi-colonial and semi-feudal condition of Philippine society has encouraged. Under the banner of modern revisionism, the political agents of the Lavas are striving hard to cut off the armed struggle from the legal struggle by spreading slanders and lies against those engaged in developing armed struggle and against the most militant cadres of the Party.

A thoroughgoing rectification movement chiefly directed against the bourgeois reactionary line of the Lavas and modern revisionism should be carried out through to the end among cadres, following the pattern of unity-criticism-repudiation-unity. This rectification movement is a test of the ability of the Communist Party of the Philippines to make self-criticism and to rid itself of longstanding and major errors and shortcomings that have too long undermined the Philippine revolutionary movement and deprived the people of revolutionary triumph. Without this rectification movement, party rebuilding cannot be achieved.

Ideological building with Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought is the first requisite in rebuilding the Communist Party of the Philippines. The Revolutionary School of Mao Zedong Thought within the Communist Party of the Philippines is doing great service to the cause of the Philippine revolution by propagating Mao Zedong Thought and by playing a decisive role in the present rectification movement.

This rectification movement has to be done, especially at a time that we need to rebuild the Party on the solid foundation of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought and the activities of the local revisionist renegades are being intensified with the aid of the Soviet revisionist ruling clique and US imperialism to spread modern revisionism, develop a city-based and city-oriented Party that is afraid of armed struggle, foster relations between the reactionary Philippine government and the revisionist renegade ruling cliques and disarm the peasants politically by relying mainly on the reactionary government's "land reform" program.

Comrade Mao Zedong has said: “A well-disciplined Party armed with the theory of Marxism-Leninism, using the method of self-criticism and linked with the masses of the people; an army under the leadership of such a Party; a united front of all revolutionary classes and all revolutionary groups under the leadership of such a Party—these are the three main weapons with which we have defeated the enemy.” These are the three main weapons that the Party and all its cadres and members must strive to develop in order to achieve the present main task of seizing political power.

The Communist Party of the Philippines must be rebuilt as the highest form of organization of the leading class, the proletariat. To be such, it must be armed with Mao Zedong Thought, the acme of Marxism-Leninism in this era. By grasping the proletarian revolutionary ideology, our Party affirms its class nature in a clear-cut way but the ultimate test lies in revolutionary practice and further revolutionary practice. It is not enough to lay down a nicely drafted program.

It is necessary to sustain it with consistent and arduous mass struggle, transforming Mao Zedong Thought into a powerful material force by arousing and mobilizing the broad masses of the people to take revolutionary action. In other words, our Party as a proletarian revolutionary party must integrate theory and practice.

Our cadres must go deep among the masses of workers and peasants. They must be well distributed on a national scale in order to build up a nationwide party. The Party must concentrate on arousing and mobilizing the peasant masses, including the farm workers, as the main ally of the proletariat and as the main force of the people’s democratic revolution.

The Party must implement the great strategic principle of making the countryside surround the cities and put principal stress on party work in the countryside instead of in the city, but without neglecting party work in the latter. Our cadres must conduct their political work with the style of hard work and frugality and in the creative spirit of self-reliance and must always be ready to make self-criticism in order to improve their political work constantly. They must trust and rely on the masses, arousing and mobilizing them against the exploiters.

In the countryside, the people’s army should be constantly built up from among the exploited peasantry under the leadership of the proletariat and the Party. A program of agrarian revolution should be implemented in order to fulfill the main content of the people’s democratic revolution. To make possi-

ble and protect the gains of the agrarian revolution, the Party should develop rural bases and direct a wide range of fighting areas, from stable base areas to guerrilla zones.

The Communist Party of the Philippines makes class analysis and distinguishes its friends from its enemies. The Party recognizes the poor peasants and farm workers as the most reliable allies of the working class. To succeed in the people's democratic revolution, an alliance of the working class and the peasantry must be developed as the basis for a national united front which includes the urban petit bourgeoisie and the patriotic sections of the national bourgeoisie as supplementary allies. At the same time, the Party is ever alert to the dual vacillating class character of the national bourgeoisie as an ally in the people's democratic revolution.

The Party, in keeping and utilizing the national united front, realizes that it should maintain its class leadership, independence and initiative. Proletarian class leadership, independence and initiative are best maintained as our cadres constantly build our Party and our people's army. The national united front should be lined up primarily against the class forces of counterrevolution: the US imperialists, the compradors, landlords and bureaucrat capitalists; and serve the establishment and advance of Red political power. In the concrete conditions of the Philippines today, the Party should employ armed struggle and the national united front skillfully and likewise, legal and illegal methods and secret and open work.

Imbued with proletarian internationalism, the Communist Party of the Philippines is determined to fulfill its international obligation to fight US imperialism and all its local reactionary agents, the compradors, the landlords and bureaucrat capitalists through to the end. The Party assumes it as an international obligation to combat modern revisionism and a resurgent Japanese militarism now increasingly in alliance with US imperialism to keep the Philippines in colonial bondage.

The struggle of the Filipino people against these enemies of national independence, social liberation and progress is a contribution to the worldwide struggle now being waged by all oppressed nations and peoples. In Asia, especially in Southeast Asia, the Philippines has too long served as the bastion of US imperialism, feudalism and bureaucrat capitalism. If the Filipino people are to deal powerful blows against these, then they shall have assisted other oppressed nations and peoples through common struggle.

The Communist Party of the Philippines is aware that all other nations and people fighting US imperialism and its reactionary allies are reciprocally assisting the Filipino nation and people through common struggle. The Filipino proletariat is bound by the spirit of proletarian internationalism with all workers and peoples of the world.

B. Armed Struggle

It is the fundamental task of the Communist Party of the Philippines to give proletarian revolutionary leadership to the peasantry. The people's democratic revolution which our Party is waging is essentially a peasant war. The struggle for land among the vast majority of our people is the main content of the people's democratic revolution that we are trying to achieve in our semi-colonial and semi-feudal country. The liberation of the peasantry from feudal exploitation and its mobilization as the main force of the people's democratic revolution are of decisive significance to the revolutionary triumph of the proletariat as the leading class.

Since industry is not well developed in our semi-colonial and semi-feudal country, the number of industrial workers is small. The proletariat through its party must therefore develop its alliance with the peasantry and lead the peasantry as the main force of the people's democratic revolution. Because of its exploited condition, the peasantry is the most reliable ally of the proletariat. Its massive strength provides the overwhelming popular support for the proletarian revolutionary party.

By giving this support, the peasantry ensures the victory of the proletarian class leadership. As a proletarian revolutionary party, the Communist Party of the Philippines must rely mainly on the peasantry to conduct armed struggle and seize power. The people's democratic revolution is basically a peasant war under the leadership of the proletariat and its party guided by Mao Zedong Thought.

In going to the countryside, the Party must make the correct class analysis and take the correct class line. In our semi-colonial and semi-feudal society, the peasant problem constitutes the main problem both politically and economically. It is therefore necessary for the Communist Party of the Philippines to conduct thoroughgoing class analysis to be able to understand the problem in the countryside so that in giving leadership to the class struggle in the countryside it will be able to distinguish between its real friends and its real class ene-

mies; so that it can mobilize the correct class forces to train their guns against their class enemies.

The basis for class analysis is the relationship between the exploited and the exploiter and the ownership of the means of production. By knowing the relations of exploitation we determine the economic position of each class or stratum and their corresponding political attitudes.

Through their ownership of the means of production, the exploiting classes maintain a system of exploitation. In the countryside, they maintain a feudal and semi-feudal system of exploitation.

In waging the people's democratic revolution, the Party aims at overthrowing this system of exploitation by launching a peasant war against the feudal and semi-feudal exploiters. In the countryside, the main exploiter is the landlord class. This class relies mainly on feudal exploitation. The landlord owns lands tilled by poor peasants who pay rent to him and who are further exploited in several other ways, such as usury, menial service and tributes.

The rich peasant stratum also engages in exploitation; a considerable part of his living depends on exploitation but the rich peasant is distinguished from the landlord in that although he owns lands more than sufficient for his household, he still tills the soil. The rich peasant participates in exploitation by hiring farm workers, renting out surplus land, surplus work animals and implements, by practicing usury and other forms of exploitation.

The middle peasant owns a piece of land sufficient for his family; but his status ranges from being on the edge of bankruptcy to having a piece of land a little more than sufficient for his household needs and having other sources of income.

The poor peasants and farm workers are those who have to work mainly for the landlords and be exploited by them. They are the most oppressed stratum of the peasantry and they are, therefore, the most interested in the people's democratic revolution and the most reliable allies of the proletariat. They compose the majority of the rural population in the Philippines.

The correct line in the countryside can be implemented by arousing and mobilizing the poor peasants and farm workers mainly and by winning over and uniting with the middle peasants, especially the lower-middle and middle-middle peasants, into an anti-feudal revolutionary united front. The rich peasants, including those who have traditionally taken leading positions in the barrios, can be neutralized with the growing might of the poor peasants and farm workers.

The Party must do painstaking work to arouse and mobilize the poor peasants and farm workers and raise their prestige so that they can assume responsibility for the revolution. The Party must see to it that a revolutionary anti-feudal barrio committee, controlled by the poor peasants and farm workers must ultimately replace or take over the “barrio councils” controlled by the landlords, corrupt government official and rich peasants.

The implementation of the class line in the countryside would depend on painstaking remolding of the attitudes of Party cadres towards the poor peasants, lower-middle peasants and farm workers. The Party must educate its cadres through revolutionary practice to make them understand that once the poor peasants, lower-middle peasants and farm workers have been aroused and mobilized they are the staunchest supporters of the revolution.

The social base of the revolution in the countryside are the poor peasants, lower-middle peasants and farm workers. It is important to keep this in mind in our mass work in the countryside among the peasantry. It is not only in the national democratic revolution that we must rely mainly on the poor peasants, lower-middle peasants and farm workers; after the seizure of state power by the proletariat and during the period of transition to communism, these strata will continue to be the social base for the consolidation of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

The Communist Party of the Philippines must rely on peasant revolutionary bases to defeat the reactionary state power in the countryside before capturing the cities. Comrade Mao Zedong has extensively shown with genius in theory and in practice how the countryside can encircle the cities in the course of armed struggle in a semi-colonial and semi-feudal country. The universal truth of the theory of using the countryside to encircle the city has been proven invincible.

There are, however, the local revisionists who reject the universal truth of this revolutionary theory and who overstress the fact that the Philippines is an archipelago, unlike China with a vast contiguous land area and population, with the view of obscuring and denying the basic class analysis and dialectics involved in the theory of using the countryside to encircle the city.

The theory of people’s war applies to Philippine conditions. Because of the uneven development of politics and economy in the era of imperialism, the weak links of bourgeois state power are to be found in the countryside. The counterrevolutionary army is spread thinly over the country in maintaining control over main communication and transportation lines. This disposition

of counterrevolutionary forces would leave the widest areas of the countryside for the development of the peasant war under the leadership of the proletariat.

In the countryside, the Party must go deep among the peasant masses in order to develop the main force of the people's democratic revolution. The people's democratic forces should develop and accumulate their armed strength in the backward areas in the countryside and turn them into the most advanced political, economic, military and cultural bastions from which a protracted struggle can be waged by the people's army in order to win overall victory over the counterrevolutionary army. The countryside certainly provides so many times vaster an area for maneuver than the cities.

In the Philippines, the area for maneuver in the city is extremely limited for armed struggle. The cities are actually the bastions of bourgeois state power before the people's democratic forces develop the capability of capturing them. The counterrevolutionary army must first be defeated in the countryside. What also makes bourgeois state power weak in the countryside is that contradictions within the counterrevolutionary front keep on arising. By its own laws of motion, whichever group in the counterrevolutionary front is ascendant would keep a big armed force in the city to maintain its city-based political power.

In line with Mao Zedong Thought, the Communist Party of the Philippines must consciously shift its center of gravity to the countryside. All previous Party leaderships in the Philippines have suffered failures that were singularly characterized by political activity that had its center of gravity in the city of Manila. The shift from the city to the countryside means that the headquarters of the people's democratic revolution should be shifted from the city to the countryside where the main forces of the revolution are to be found.

This shift does not mean the neglect of the urban struggle but it is a matter of determining which is the principal and which is secondary. The principal form of struggle is waged in the countryside; the secondary one, in the city. It is in the countryside that the people's armed forces can take the offensive against the enemy, while in the city the revolutionary forces must take the defensive until such time that the people's armed forces in the countryside can seize the city.

Developing the people's war in the countryside entails three inseparable components; namely, armed struggle, agrarian revolution and rural bases. By engaging in armed struggle and winning more battles, conditions are created for enlarging base areas. The base areas are utilized by the people's armed forces

to entrap the enemy forces, whether they are in the form of “special forces,” big operations or what else the enemy can launch.

By having more base areas, there are more areas where to wage the agrarian revolution. By waging the agrarian revolution, the base areas become more consolidated because the feudal forces and their political power are wiped out. The political power of the revolutionary forces is developed as the peasants become enthusiastic and join the advancing Red army.

Armed struggle, agrarian revolution and rural bases promote each other. The people’s democratic power is developed in the countryside through warfare. As rural bases become consolidated politically and economically, a state within a state is created. An armed independent regime, a base government of the people, is created in the countryside.

The agrarian revolution that the Party should strive for in waging people’s war should entail essentially the confiscation of lands from the landlords and distribution of these lands to the peasants without cost. Feudal land ownership is to be eliminated within the base area. Pursuing the correct class line in the countryside, the Party and the people’s armed forces should rely on the poor peasants and farm workers, unite with the middle peasants, neutralize the rich peasants and wipe out landlordism and promote production.

In waging the agrarian revolution, the Party and the people’s armed forces should be aware of two basic stages of development. At a stage when an area is unstable, they should make constant preparations for converting it into a base area by exercising armed power in wiping out the local tyrants, enemy detachments and spies, bandits and cattle rustlers and in compelling lower rent and lower interest rates in order to weaken the enemy and mobilize the masses.

As the masses are fully mobilized organizationally, politically and ideologically and a well-consolidated base area has emerged from the struggles of the masses themselves, confiscation of lands from the landlords and equal distribution of these lands to the peasants can take place.

The Party and the people’s armed forces should trust and rely on the masses in raising their political consciousness. They should let the masses educate themselves. Initially, they should recognize the roots of suffering among the masses; and subsequently, through reason and struggle meetings, grievances against the exploiting classes can be poured out by the peasants to educate themselves.

As the Party and the people’s armed forces direct the peasant war against the three pillars of feudal power, the big landlords, the despotic landlords and

the landlords in authority, the peasants gain experience in class dictatorship over the exploiting classes. Through reason and struggle meetings and through the people's courts and the rendering of sentences commensurate to the crimes of the feudal exploiters and other criminals, the peasant masses become more deeply committed to the people's democratic revolution and they willingly let their best sons and daughters join the Communist Party of the Philippines and the people's army.

Comrade Mao Zedong has said: "The seizure of power by armed force, the settlement of the issue by war, is the central task and the highest form of revolution. This Marxist-Leninist principle of revolution holds good universally for China and for all other countries. But while the principle remains the same, its application by the party of the proletariat finds expression in various ways according to varying conditions."

The central task of the Communist Party of the Philippines is to seize political power. In waging armed struggle to achieve the people's democratic revolution, the Party must grasp Comrade Mao Zedong's theory of using the countryside to encircle and capture the cities and likewise his analysis of a semi-colonial and semi-feudal country. In the Philippines, however, there is the special condition of being an archipelago that requires particular attention.

While it is necessary to build the people's military forces in the main island of Luzon to overthrow the bourgeois state power that is centrally seated in the city of Manila, the other islands of the Visayas and Mindanao can be converted from an initial disadvantage to a long-run advantage by establishing there armed fronts and rural bases that can disperse and dissipate the counterrevolutionary armed power now concentrated in Luzon, particularly in Central Luzon and Greater Manila.

At any rate, taking into consideration all special conditions, Comrade Mao Zedong's theory of using the countryside to encircle the city and his class analysis holds true universally, for the Philippines and for every significant island of the Philippines. In the stage of strategic defensive, the development of guerrilla warfare on a national scale will surely dissipate and prepare the total destruction of the strength of the enemy.

Aside from being applicable in specific agrarian countries, Comrade Mao Zedong's theory of people's war may be described as applicable to the countryside of the world, the combination of agrarian countries in Asia, Africa and Latin America, which veritably encircle the cities of the world. US imperialism, the main enemy of the peoples of the world and principal guardian of

reaction, is overextended throughout the countryside of the world. It is in this countryside of the world that the oppressed peoples, like the Filipino people, can have plenty of area for maneuver and deal deadly blows on every weakened link of the overextended imperialist chain.

US imperialism is confronted by the oppressed peoples and nations, by the working class in its own borders and on an international scale, by socialist states and by its imperialist rivals. The manpower and material resources of US imperialism are not limitless. What is most essential is that its aggressive class character is hated by all peoples of the world and is met by just and progressive revolutionary people's wars.

In Vietnam alone, US imperialism and its allied troops cannot win over the valiant and patriotic Vietnamese people. In many more places, it will continue to be defeated resoundingly by revolutionary armed struggles. Armed with invincible Mao Zedong Thought, the peoples of the world are waging people's wars.

C. The National United Front

The national united front is an integral part of the political line of the Communist Party of the Philippines. The Philippine revolution is a revolution of the toiling masses against US imperialism, feudalism and bureaucrat capitalism. The national united front must serve this political line.

The highest task of the people's democratic revolution is the seizure of state power by armed force and the consolidation of people's democratic power as the transitional stage toward socialism. The national united front must serve this central task. The Communist Party of the Philippines stands firmly wielding and utilizing both weapons of armed struggle and the national united front against the enemy. Through the national united front, the Party extends widely its political influence and gains the widest support of the masses and other progressive classes and strata as it establishes the independent strength of the leading class, the proletariat, through a national war or an agrarian revolution supported mainly by the peasantry.

For failure to clarify and use correctly the national united front as a weapon of the people's democratic revolution, previous Party leaderships have been responsible for several revisionist misconceptions regarding it. There are those who regard the national united front as the opposite of armed struggle. Violating the Marxist-Leninist theory of state and revolution, they also consider the national united front as the main weapon and parliamentary struggle as the

main form of struggle. The Lavas are mainly responsible for this revisionism, this treason to Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought.

Before the outbreak of the anti-Japanese war, the Popular Front was considered by the Party leadership as merely the license for engaging mainly in parliamentary struggle; no preparations for anti-fascist armed struggle were seriously made. During the war, the Right opportunists ludicrously maintained the anti-fascist united front against Japan as a “united front” mainly with US imperialism and the Commonwealth government so that the line of opposing the return of US imperialism and its puppet Commonwealth government was obscured.

After the anti-Japanese war, the Democratic Alliance, as a formal united front organization, assumed leadership over all progressive forces; and bourgeois personalities close to the Lava brothers assumed the leadership and initiative therein. The Party lost strength, initiative and independence when its leadership decided to lay down its arms and to engage mainly in parliamentary struggle through the Democratic Alliance.

Until now, there is the false notion fostered by Right opportunists and revisionists that a national united front must always have a definite organizational form like the Democratic Alliance or the Movement for the Advancement of Nationalism whose unity, for the purpose of parliamentary struggle, must be preserved by all means and above all. In the broad experience of successful revolutionary movements, the national united front does not necessarily have a formal organization. Neither is its function limited to parliamentary struggle.

As a matter of fact, the best form of united front is one in which the Party has an independent and strong people’s army to command. If the Party is involved in any formal united front organization in the course of either armed struggle or legal struggle, it must always be prepared by having its own independent strength and initiative to meet any betrayal or compromise with the enemy that the national bourgeoisie might make due to its dual class character.

The key question in the national united front is whether a proletarian revolutionary class leadership is at the helm of all other progressive forces fighting in common against the enemy in the armed and legal fronts. Whether there is a formal united front organization or not, the Communist Party of the Philippines must maintain its revolutionary vanguard role, its independence and initiative.

The Communist Party of the Philippines must engage in the national united front in order to tap all positive forces in the armed and legal fronts against

the enemy. The national united front policy is pursued in order to expand the influence of the revolutionary armed forces, isolate the enemy and its diehard elements and recruit the broad masses of the people to the side of the people's democratic revolution.

The special task of the national united front is to win over the middle forces and elements in order to isolate enemy diehards. To be able to do this, the Party must make clear and repeated class analysis which can distinguish the middle forces and elements from the diehard reactionaries, the principal enemies from the secondary enemies, the enemies of today from the enemies of tomorrow; and among friends, the reliable from the unreliable.

The Party's policy of the national united front is a proletarian policy concerning classes in Philippine society. In developing the national united front, we must distinguish our enemies from our friends and vice versa.

Chairman Mao has said: "Who are our enemies? Who are our friends? This is a question of first importance for the revolution.... A revolutionary party is the guide of the masses, and no revolution ever succeeds when the revolutionary party leads them astray. To ensure that we will definitely achieve success in our revolution and will not lead the masses astray, we must pay attention to uniting with our real friends in order to attack our real enemies. To distinguish real friends from real enemies, we must make a general analysis of the economic status of the various classes in Chinese society and of their respective attitude towards the revolution." The national united front should be based on the alliance of the working class and the peasantry under the leadership of the working class and the Communist Party of the Philippines. The national united front should include other progressive classes and strata in Philippine society which unite with the masses on the basis of a common political program. This political program, accepted in common by the working class, the peasantry, the petit bourgeoisie and the national bourgeoisie, should correspond to the general line and program of the Communist Party of the Philippines. This political program must serve to weld together the broadest unity of progressive forces and groups to isolate US imperialism and the diehard reactionaries, composed of the comprador big bourgeoisie, the landlord class and the bureaucrat capitalists.

The program of the Party and the national united front should include mainly the liquidation of feudalism and the free distribution of land to the poor peasants, lower-middle peasants and farm workers, and the nationalization of industries and enterprises owned and controlled by the foreign monopoly cap-

italists and the comprador big bourgeoisie. This program can be achieved fully only with the seizure of state power through armed force by the people under the leadership of the proletariat. The state sector in the present economy and “land reform” under the reactionary state should not be confused with the real nationalization of the economy and agrarian revolution in the liberated areas or in the people’s democratic state.

In adhering to the national united front, the Communist Party of the Philippines must maintain its independence, ideologically, politically and organizationally. It must unite with the progressive forces within the national united front but it should not surrender its fundamental class interests and those of the proletariat and the peasantry to the bourgeoisie. It must always conduct independent mass work, mainly among the peasants, so that it has its own political strength to rely on in any event. The national united front is essentially an instrument to win over the middle forces and elements and to isolate enemy diehards.

It is the relationship of the Party with the national bourgeoisie within the national united front that requires special attention. This is primarily because the national bourgeoisie has a dual class character, one aspect of which is progressive and the other reactionary. In dealing with the national bourgeoisie, we must avoid two dangerous pitfalls; namely, “Left” opportunism and Right opportunism. To dismiss the national bourgeoisie as completely reactionary is “Left” opportunist and sectarian; and to regard the national bourgeoisie as completely revolutionary is to be Right opportunist and capitulationist.

It is necessary at all times for the Party to adopt a revolutionary dual tactic towards the national bourgeoisie, combining unity and struggle. If the Party loses sight of the reactionary aspect of the national bourgeoisie, it would be unprepared for any betrayal of the revolution by this class. Revolutionary vigilance is required in our relations with the national bourgeoisie. If the Party loses sight of the progressive character of this class and does not recognize it as an ally within a certain period of time and to a certain limited extent, it would fail to take advantage of actual contradictions between this class on the one hand and foreign monopoly capitalism and feudalism on the other.

In order to develop the cooperation of the national bourgeoisie, the Party must have its own strength; otherwise, this class and its representatives would be reluctant to cooperate. The Party must respect the legitimate interests of all middle forces, with concessions actually granted to them without undermining the interests of the people and the leadership of the proletariat. At all times,

resolute struggle must be waged against the enemies of the national united front so that trust in the Party would grow among the people and all middle forces.

In its relations with revolutionary forces throughout the world, the Party pursues the policy of the international united front. All revolutionary and progressive forces that can be united against the main enemy of the peoples of the world, US imperialism, should be united. Modern revisionism with its slogan of “united action” should be rejected as the ideology of the international scabs who are serving and seeking peace and détente with US imperialism.

In the international communist movement, the biggest danger today is modern revisionism. Likewise in the Philippines the main danger is modern revisionism in the form of the Lava revisionist renegade line and all other forms of Right opportunism. The collaboration between US imperialism, modern revisionism and all forms of reaction should be continuously exposed and attacked by the international united front and the national united front.

US imperialism and all other reactionaries are paper tigers. All the nuclear weapons and all the military technology of US imperialism cannot frighten us. Although our fraternal people, the Chinese people, have the atom bomb for the defense of the revolutionary peoples, what is more important for all fighting peoples is the human factor, the surging forces of the masses under the inspiration of Mao Zedong Thought and under the leadership of the proletariat and the Communist Party. Mao Zedong Thought is their spiritual atom bomb. They are bound by the spirit of proletarian internationalism in the world proletarian revolution and in the international united front against US imperialism, modern revisionism and all reaction.

Although our Party and people welcome political and material support from fraternal parties and peoples, under the spirit of proletarian internationalism and within the framework of the international united front, we must rely mainly on ourselves first of all and wage the people’s democratic revolution as part of the world proletarian revolution.

Armed with invincible Mao Zedong Thought, the Communist Party of the Philippines will surely triumph and the Filipino people under the leadership of the revolutionary proletariat will achieve people’s democracy first and socialism next.

*Ratified by the Congress of Reestablishment
of the Communist Party of the Philippines
December 26, 1968*

Program for a People's Democratic Revolution

December 26, 1968

I. THE BASIC CONDITION OF THE PHILIPPINES TODAY

The basic condition of the Philippines today is that of a semi-colonial and semi-feudal country dominated by the US imperialists, the comprador big bourgeoisie, the landlords and the bureaucrat capitalists. These vested interests mercilessly exploit the broad masses of the people. US imperialism and domestic feudalism are the main problems afflicting the whole nation and from which the masses of the people aspire to be liberated.

The Philippine revolution against Spanish colonialism failed to achieve the goals of national liberation and the elimination of feudalism. The flabby leadership of the *ilustrados* (liberal bourgeoisie) failed to win the revolution by playing into the hands of US imperialism which brutally massacred the Filipino people and deprived them of their national independence and democratic rights in the course of the Filipino-American war and thereafter.

Since the beginning of this century, US imperialism has made use of feudalism as its social base in the Philippines. With the defeat of the old type of national democratic revolution, which was imbued mainly with the ideas of liberalism, US imperialism has succeeded in employing domestic puppet forces to frustrate the revolutionary aspirations of the Filipino people and deprive them of their national freedom, class freedom and individual rights.

US imperialism has bred and made use of the comprador big bourgeoisie as its principal agent in perpetuating a semi-colonial and semi-feudal type of economy, culture and political system. The landlord class has persisted as the most important ally of US imperialism and the comprador big bourgeoisie in the perpetuation of feudal and semi-feudal relations in the vast countryside. The bureaucrat capitalists have also emerged under the imperialist tutelage for "self-government and democracy" to perpetuate the dominance of US imperialism, the local comprador bourgeoisie and the landlord class in the present reactionary puppet state.

The combined oppression by US imperialism and feudalism involves the inequitable colonial exchange of cheap local raw materials (sugar, coconut, abaca, logs and mineral ores) on the one hand and finished products imported chiefly from the United States on the other and also the investment of US surplus capital in the Philippines chiefly to foster the semi-colonial and semi-feudal type of economy that exploits the toiling masses of workers and peasants.

The "Program for a People's Democratic Revolution" was the program of the CPP from 1968 to the 2nd Congress in 2016. It is extracted from *Foundation for Resuming the Philippine Revolution*, the first volume of the Sison's selected works, pp. 59-77.

During the direct and indirect rule of US imperialism in the Philippines, the Filipino toiling masses have been exploited to serve the excessive hunger for profits of the US monopoly capitalists and the local reactionaries. The acute exploitation of the masses of workers and peasants, a general state of backwardness in society and the corruption and brutality of the bourgeois reactionary state characterize the Philippines today.

The Filipino working class has significantly grown in number and experience since the later period of Spanish colonial rule. But its further growth has been stunted because of the limitations on local industrialization and emphasis on raw-material production for export and, lately, on mere reassembly plants, new plantations, mines and businesses in the grip of foreign monopoly capitalism. The Filipino working class has suffered extremely low wages and the whole nation has suffered lack of opportunity and the remittance of super-profits from the Philippines by foreign monopolies and heavy indebtedness to imperialist banks.

Despite the emphasis on raw-material production, there is the stagnation of Philippine agriculture and the exploitation of poor peasants and farm workers in areas where feudalism persists; and in areas where modern plantations are in operation both regular and seasonal agricultural workers also suffer low wages and sub-human levels of working and living conditions.

The rural poor, composed mainly of poor peasants, farm workers and poor fishermen; and the urban poor, composed mainly of workers, peddlers, poor handicraftsmen and the unemployed living in city slums, comprise together more than 90 percent of the population. Though they are the overwhelming majority in the Philippines, they are now the most deprived and oppressed politically, economically, socially and culturally. They are the vast source of revolutionary power against foreign and feudal exploitation.

The urban petit bourgeoisie also suffers from the state of foreign and feudal exploitation. Though it lives in relatively better comfort than the urban and rural poor, its very limited and usually fixed income is subject to the pressure of foreign and feudal exploitation. It can easily be won over to the side of the revolution because it is not free from the abuses of the state on its livelihood and democratic rights.

The national bourgeoisie is the most wealthy of the forces that may be won over to the side of the revolution. It is restricted by foreign and feudal domination in its goal of nationalist industrialization. Though it wishes to lead the patriotic and progressive classes through its entrepreneurship and its political

actions, its kind of class leadership has already been surpassed historically by the revolutionary class leadership of the working class. The vacillating dual character of the national bourgeoisie should be recognized by the working class while working for a national united front of all patriotic and progressive classes, groups and individuals under the leadership of the working class.

At this stage of Philippine history and world history, it no longer suffices to have the old type of national democratic revolution. The era of modern imperialism has long invalidated the leadership of the bourgeoisie. An exceedingly high stage of the world proletarian revolution has been achieved with the ascendance of Mao Zedong Thought, the acme of Marxism-Leninism in this era. The Communist Party of the Philippines itself can never hope to lead the Filipino people if it does not rid itself of modern revisionism or the bourgeois reactionary line, particularly of the Lavas and the Tarucs, that has marked its history.

The national bourgeoisie and the urban petit bourgeoisie, especially the latter, are allies of the working class within the national united front but they have long become inadequate at leading the Philippine revolution in the era of imperialism as demonstrated as early as the start of the armed conquest of the Philippines by US imperialism when the liberal bourgeois leadership capitulated.

The class leadership in the Philippine revolution is now in the hands of the working class. A proletarian revolutionary leadership, guided by Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought, is what makes the people's democratic revolution a new type of national democratic revolution. By adopting Mao Zedong Thought as the supreme guide for our revolutionary actions, we cleanse the vanguard Party of its weaknesses (as presented by the document of rectification, "Rectify Errors and Rebuild the Party") and strengthen it to become the invincible force at the core of the revolutionary mass movement.

The Communist Party of the Philippines is now reestablished and rebuilt as a Party of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought. It is the most advanced detachment of the Filipino working class leading the Philippine revolution forward. It strives to be a well-disciplined Party armed with the theory of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought, using the method of criticism and self-criticism and closely linked with the masses of the people. It wields the two weapons of armed struggle and the national united front to deal death blows to US imperialism and feudalism.

There is only one road which the working class under the leadership of the Communist Party of the Philippines must take. It is the road of armed revolution to smash the armed counterrevolution that preserves foreign and feudal oppression in the Philippines. In waging armed revolution, the working class must rely mainly on the mass support of its closest ally, the peasantry.

The peasantry is the main force of the people's democratic revolution. Without the peasantry's support, without waging an agrarian revolution that responds to the peasantry's struggle for land, no genuine and formidable people's army can be built and no revolutionary base area can be established. The peasant struggle for land is the main democratic content of the present stage of the Philippine revolution.

From the countryside, the people's democratic forces encircle the cities. It is in the countryside that the enemy forces are first lured in and defeated before the capture of the cities from the hands of the exploiting classes. It is in the countryside that the weakest links of the reactionary state are to be found and the people's democratic forces can surround them tactically before defeating them strategically.

It is in the countryside that the people's army can accumulate strength among the peasants by combining armed struggle, agrarian revolution and the building of revolutionary base areas. The Party and the people's army must turn the backward villages into advanced military, political and economic and cultural bastions of the people's democratic revolution.

A true national united front exists only when it is founded on the alliance of the working class and the peasantry and such alliance has been strongly welded by armed struggle, by the creation of a people's army mainly among the peasants by the working class party, the Communist Party of the Philippines. A true united front is one for carrying out armed struggle.

The urban petit bourgeoisie can join such a united front. The national bourgeoisie can also lend direct and indirect support to it although it always carries its dual character, its contradictory progressive and reactionary aspects. In a national united front of workers, peasants, urban petit bourgeoisie and the national bourgeoisie, the proletarian revolutionary party can best guarantee its leadership, independence and initiative only by having the people's army firmly at its command.

In the countryside, a revolutionary anti-feudal united front must also be created. The working class must rely mainly on the poor peasants and farm workers, then win over and unite with the middle peasants and neutralize the

rich peasants. In its close alliance with the masses of poor peasants and farm workers, the working class undertakes armed struggle, agrarian revolution and the building of revolutionary base areas to build the strong foundations of people's democracy.

While the old democratic leadership of the bourgeoisie no longer applies to the Philippine revolution at this historical stage, the working class and the Communist Party of the Philippines cannot accomplish both democracy and socialism at one blow. The Party must first achieve a new type of national democratic revolution, a people's democratic revolution in the concrete semi-colonial and semi-feudal conditions of the Philippines, before reaching the stage of socialist revolution. Socialism cannot be immediately achieved when the Filipino people under the leadership of the working class still have to liberate themselves from foreign and feudal oppression.

The people's democratic revolution rejects the old liberal leadership of the bourgeoisie. US imperialism has long made use of the jargon of liberal democracy to deceive the people. In upholding proletarian revolutionary leadership, the Party does not mean that socialism shall be achieved without passing through the stage of national democracy.

Neither does it mean that such progressive strata of local bourgeoisie as the petit bourgeoisie and the national bourgeoisie have no more place in the revolution. They do have a role to play as national democratic allies of the working class.

Indeed, people's democracy is a new type of democracy because of its proletarian, instead of bourgeois, leadership. But this proletarian revolutionary leadership assumes the present democratic task of waging protracted people's war, an agrarian revolution, and organizing a national united front of workers in alliance with the peasantry, the urban petit bourgeoisie, the intelligentsia and the national bourgeoisie. The proletarian revolutionary leadership and the worker-peasant alliance are the most important links between the stage of the people's democratic revolution and the stage of socialist revolution.

The immediate and general program of the Filipino people and the Communist Party of the Philippines is a people's democratic revolution and the long-term maximum program is socialism. It is dishonest, demagogic and utopian to insist that socialism is the immediate goal under conditions that the people are still dominated and exploited by US imperialism and domestic feudalism.

In the political field, the Communist Party of the Philippines advances the revolutionary leadership of the working class, fights to overthrow the reactionary bourgeois regime and all reactionary classes supporting it and, in its stead, establishes a people's democratic state system, a coalition or united front government of the working class, peasantry, the urban petit bourgeoisie and national bourgeoisie.

In the economic field, the Party fights for a self-reliant economy, a just and prosperous people's livelihood and a national industry and trade emancipated from foreign monopoly capitalism and feudalism which have restricted and exploited the productive efforts of the people including patriotic businessmen, industrialists and petit producers.

In the field of culture and education, the Party fights for the development of a national, scientific and mass culture and education.

In the military field, the Party commands and builds up a people's army that serves as the mainstay of the national and social liberation movement and, consequently, of the people's democratic state system.

II. PROGRAM FOR A PEOPLE'S DEMOCRATIC REVOLUTION

The Communist Party of the Philippines is determined to implement its general program for a people's democratic revolution. All Filipino Communists are ready to sacrifice their lives for the worthy cause of achieving the new type of democracy, of building a new Philippines that is genuinely and completely independent, democratic, united, just and prosperous. We are all keenly aware that the present bourgeois state and the reactionary classes that it serves will never surrender their political and economic power without a fight.

The Party is highly conscious that in rebuilding itself as the principal instrument of the leading class and in building a united front of all patriotic and progressive forces, it must build a strong people's army that can weld together the workers and peasants and destroy the local reactionary state and the interventionist forces of US imperialism.

The Communist Party of the Philippines is the core of the revolutionary mass movement against foreign and feudal oppression and for the establishment and consolidation of a people's democratic state. In the exercise of its leadership, the Party hereunder states ten guidelines for its general program:

1. Destroy the Forces of US Imperialist and Feudal Oppression in the Philippines.

National sovereignty and democracy can never be obtained without the destruction of the forces of US imperialism and domestic feudalism whose basic interests lie in the continued national and class enslavement and exploitation of the Filipino people. The overriding interest of the Filipino people now is to fight for national liberation and people's democracy.

They must take the road of armed revolution to defeat the armed counter-revolution; and all patriotic and progressive classes, parties, groups and individuals must be aroused and mobilized to isolate and then destroy the power and influence of the US imperialists, the comprador bourgeoisie, the evil gentry, the bureaucrat capitalists and all their political and armed agents. The political power and influence of these exploiters can be isolated, destroyed and replaced by both waging the armed struggle and building the national united front.

As a proletarian revolutionary party, the Communist Party of the Philippines should not be tied down by legalist and parliamentary struggle. The Party should concentrate on building up the people's democratic power in the

countryside before seizing the cities and, simultaneously, on discrediting the monopolization of political power by the bourgeois political parties, like the Nacionalista Party, the Liberal Party and others, which actually perpetuate the same single party of class interests.

2. Establish a People's Democratic State and a Coalition or United Front Government.

The ultimate goal of the people's democratic revolution is the establishment of a people's democratic state and a coalition or united front government. The people's democratic state is under the leadership of the working class and it includes the participation of all democratic classes, i.e., the workers, the peasants, the petit bourgeoisie and the national bourgeoisie.

Its government is a coalition or united front of all democratic classes. In the course of the protracted people's war, a national liberation front may be created to combine all available forces and elements to isolate and destroy the enemy and prepare for a democratic coalition government.

In the meantime, while a nationwide coalition government cannot yet be established, the masses of workers and peasants under the proletarian revolutionary leadership can establish an armed independent regime in the countryside where they shall learn to govern themselves, defend and advance their independence and democratic gains and manage well their relations with all friends and sympathizers. The armed independent regime is the nucleus of the People's Democratic Republic of the Philippines.

3. Fight for National Unity and Democratic Rights.

The firmest national unity founded mainly on the basis of the class interest of the workers and peasants must be created. On this popular basis, all patriotic and progressive classes, groups and individuals shall enjoy political and economic rights that US imperialism and feudalism have deprived them of.

Individual initiative and enterprise on the part of fishermen, handicraftsmen, intellectuals, the urban petit bourgeoisie and the national bourgeoisie shall be respected, encouraged and assisted. All efforts shall be exerted by the state, cooperative and private sectors to provide every citizen a decent livelihood.

All democratic classes, groups and their members shall enjoy all such democratic rights as freedom of domicile, person, thought, belief, religion, speech and assembly in a democratic bill of rights. The interests and rights of overseas

Filipinos shall be protected; they shall be allowed to have the amplest contact with their kith and kin in the Philippines or to return from the United States or elsewhere.

4. Follow the Principle of Democratic Centralism.

The national government shall have central authority over the local government at various levels. The government, however, shall base its decisions on the needs and aspirations of the broad masses of the people and the lower levels of government. This is centralized leadership based on democracy guided by centralized leadership.

At every level of the government (barrio, municipality, city or district, provincial, regional), there shall be elected representative bodies where decisions are taken democratically for every corresponding area. A lower representative body shall be subordinate to a higher representative body.

Any part of the government shall be subordinate to the people's revolutionary congress which represents nationally the sovereign Filipino people. In all elections or voting on any question, the rule of the majority shall be followed.

5. The People's Liberation Army

There can be no people's democratic state without a people's army whose principal and most essential function is to defend and secure it. The people's army, composed mainly of fighters from the peasantry, must be under the leadership of the working class and the Communist Party of the Philippines.

The most pressing task of the people's army now is to defeat and destroy the reactionary imperialist-created and imperialist-supported Armed Forces of the Philippines and all other kinds of armed power in the hands of the exploiting classes and the reactionary state at all levels.

The people's democratic government can be established only with the triumphant advance of the people's army. The people's army shall be a fighting force, a propaganda force and a productive force closely linked with the masses of the people. It constantly strengthens itself ideologically, politically and organizationally with Mao Zedong Thought.

The armed strength of the people's army includes its regular mobile troops, the guerrilla units, and the militia and self-defense corps and armed city partisans. The Party should see to it that troops are well-provisioned and the welfare of the families of fighters are well-taken care of.

6. The Land Problem

The main content of the people's democratic revolution is the struggle of the peasants for land. The people's democratic revolution must satisfy the basic demand of the poor peasants and farm workers for land. The agrarian revolution is the necessary requirement for the vigorous conduct of the armed struggle and the creation and consolidation of revolutionary base areas.

Land shall be distributed free to the landless. Usury and all other feudal evils shall be wiped out. Plantations and estates already efficiently operated on a mechanized basis shall be converted into state farms where agricultural workers shall establish proletarian power and provide themselves with better working and living conditions. In the whole countryside, mutual aid teams and mutual labor exchange systems shall be created as the initial steps towards higher forms of agricultural cooperation.

Through agricultural cooperation, production shall be raised and well planned, the sale of produce shall be assured at the best price possible and welfare services guaranteed. The higher purchasing power of the peasantry shall enable the ceaseless expansion of industrial production. The basis of the national economy shall be agriculture because it fulfills the food and raw material requirements of expanding industrialization and because it is mainly the peasantry that absorbs the products of industrialization.

7. The Problem of Industry

Foreign monopoly capitalism and feudalism which have hindered the growth of national industry are firmly opposed by the people's democratic revolution. All efforts towards the growth of national industry as the leading factor of the economy shall be mustered by the people's democratic government. There shall be three sectors in the national economy: the state sector, the cooperative sector and the private sector.

All major sources of raw materials and energy, all heavy and basic industries and all nationalized enterprises shall be run by the state sector. The private sector run by patriotic entrepreneurs and merchants shall be given assistance and support by the people's democratic government. All peasants, fishermen and handicraftsmen shall be encouraged to organize themselves into cooperatives so as to increase their productivity and assure themselves of a ready market.

While building up the state and cooperative sectors of the economy as factors of proletarian leadership and socialism, the people's democratic government shall encourage and support all private initiative in industry so long as

this does not monopolize or adversely affect the people's livelihood. The people's democratic government shall exercise regulation of capital only to protect the people's livelihood and guarantee a people's democracy.

8. The Problem of Culture, Education and the Intellectuals

A people's democratic cultural revolution is necessary to rid the nation of the stultifying dominance of imperialist and feudal culture and education. It must advance instead a national, scientific and mass culture truly serving the interests of the people. It shall see to it that the educational system and the mass media are securely in the hands of the people's democratic forces.

Education at all levels shall be free, irrespective of class, religion, creed, sex or color. It shall promote the national language as the principal medium of communication in Philippine society. It shall give full encouragement and support to scientific experiment and technological progress. It shall see to it that the national language, art and literature shall be given revolutionary content and relate the revolutionary struggles of workers, peasants, soldiers and other participants of the revolution. Old forms as well as foreign forms of art and literature may be adopted so long as these can be given revolutionary content and suit the national aspirations of the people.

The working class assumes leadership in the field of culture and education in line with its leading revolutionary role. But it welcomes the wholehearted support of intellectuals for the revolution. All democratic intellectuals are given all the opportunity to serve the people and remold their own thinking. While freedom of thought and religion shall be accorded respect, proper safeguards shall be taken to keep this freedom from being systematically employed to resist the people's democratic revolution or hurt the people's interests. In the course of the protracted people's war, the Party shall transform backward villages into cultural bastions of the Philippine revolution. Illiteracy and superstition among the masses shall be wiped out and the scientific spirit of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought shall prevail.

9. The Problem of National Minorities

National minorities in the Philippines have been abused and grossly neglected. US imperialism, the local reactionary government and the Christian churches have too long regarded the national minorities as mere objects of bourgeois charity and Christian proselytization. The people belonging to the national minorities, especially those of Mindanao and the mountain provinces,

can be powerful participants in the revolutionary overthrow of US imperialism and feudalism.

The bourgeois government, reactionary scholars and Christian chauvinists talk loud about national integration but they stand in reality for the exploiting classes that are the main sources of abuse and oppression. The main concern of the national minorities is land; the abuses of landlords, loggers and landgrabbers; and exploitation in mines and plantations. A new type of leadership, a revolutionary one, must be encouraged to rise among them so as to supplant the traditional leadership that has failed to protect them and has merely contributed to and participated in their exploitation.

With regard to naturalized Filipinos and foreign nationals, the class approach must be firmly taken so as to do away with “Malay” racism and chauvinism. Residents or citizens of Chinese ancestry are very often the target of racist and chauvinist attacks launched by the US imperialists, modern revisionists and other local reactionaries in line with their anti-China, anti-communist and anti-people policy. The Kuomintang comprador big bourgeoisie should be thoroughly exposed and attacked for its class position and for the fact that it is an accomplice of US imperialism, modern revisionism and all reaction.

10. The Problem of Foreign Policy

The foreign policy of the Philippine bourgeois government is dictated by US imperialism and the internal reactionary classes. The diplomatic relations and foreign trade of the Philippines is dictated upon by the United States, together with its reactionary allies like resurgent militarist Japan. Relations with the revisionist states have been initiated only because of the permission granted by the United States which recognizes modern revisionism as its chief accomplice in maintaining neocolonialism throughout the world, including the Philippines. The imperialists and the modern revisionists are maintaining all-round cooperation to save puppet states like the reactionary puppet state in the Philippines.

The only true basis for an independent and active foreign policy is the overthrow of the internal power of US imperialism and its local lackeys in the Philippines, and the abrogation of all treaties, executive agreements and statutes that define “special relations” with the US government and its imperialist allies. The people’s democratic government shall truly broaden its foreign policy by opening diplomatic and trade relations with its powerful neighbor and friend, the People’s Republic of China, and all other countries willing to have relations

in the spirit of mutual respect for national sovereignty and on the basis of equality and mutual benefit.

The people's democratic government shall give moral and material support to the revolutionary movements of oppressed peoples abroad and shall maintain the firmest alliance with genuine socialist states like the People's Republic of China and the People's Republic of Albania. It shall be inspired by the principle of proletarian internationalism and guided by the policy of the international united front. It regards the People's Republic of China as an iron bastion of the world proletarian revolution and as a reliable friend of all oppressed peoples, including the Filipino people.

III. OUR SPECIFIC PROGRAM

Our general program will fundamentally remain unchanged during the entire stage of the people's democratic revolution. But from phase to phase during this general stage, our specific and immediate demands shall change.

Hereunder are our specific and immediate demands:

In the Political Field

1. Attack, isolate and destroy the bourgeois reactionary state, the US imperialists, the landlords and all local tyrants in our country until their doom;
2. Establish the armed independent regime and develop the people's ability in the conduct of the government in the course of armed struggle;
3. Purge our ranks of modern revisionists and all other opportunists who sabotage our revolutionary efforts and expose the bankruptcy of bourgeois legalism and parliamentarism;
4. Campaign for a people's democratic constitution and demand the revocation of the bourgeois constitution and all counterrevolutionary laws, executive agreements and treaties;
5. Expose the curtailment of the political rights of workers, peasants, intellectuals and patriotic citizens who fight against foreign and feudal oppression, and allow the free operation of or support every democratic party or mass organization;
6. Fight the rise of fascism and the use of murder and all other forms of intimidation against the people and their revolutionary and democratic leaders and organizations;
7. Punish the evil gentry and corrupt government officials and subject them to public trial by the people's court whenever possible;
8. Replace or reorganize the barrio councils and promote the leadership of the poor peasants and farm workers through revolutionary barrio committees;
9. Cooperate with all organizations and groups that help build up the national united front and isolate the diehard enemies of the people's democratic revolution; and

10. Assure low-ranking officials and rank-and-file employees in the reactionary government that they shall be reintegrated into the people's democratic government so long as they do not participate directly in the commission of public crimes and so long as they secretly cooperate with the revolutionary movement.

In the Economic Field

1. Render ineffective the Parity Amendment, the Laurel-Langley Agreement, the Economic and Technical Cooperation Agreement, the Agreement Relating to Entry Rights of American Traders and Investors, Agricultural Commodities Agreements and the Investment Incentives Law and all such legal instruments that bind our country economically to US imperialism and all its local lackeys, and reject the old and new loan agreements made by the bourgeois reactionary government, including the "aid" agreements;
2. Encourage the people and the national bourgeoisie to build a self-reliant economy and at the same time confiscate foreign goods that depress or eliminate the local production of goods by patriotic Filipino citizens while urging the broad masses of the people to boycott imperialist businesses and consumer goods;
3. Outlaw bureaucrat capital and all property gained through corrupt and criminal means;
4. Help improve the livelihood of workers, peasants, farm workers, fishermen and handicraftsmen by exercising price control in base areas and providing work for the unemployed; and organize the peasants, fishermen and handicraftsmen into elementary cooperative units (mutual aid teams and labor exchange systems) and support every movement for the economic emancipation of the people;
5. Compel the reduction of rent and interest rates in guerrilla zones and abolish rent in the liberated areas, abolish exorbitant taxes and miscellaneous levies and establish a consolidated progressive tax, collecting a fair agricultural tax and also a fair business tax from the petit and the national bourgeoisie;
6. Help the workers in the factories, mines, plantations, transportation lines and offices to conduct strikes successfully;

7. Expose the deceptive and reactionary character of the Magna Carta of Labor, the Agricultural Land Reform Code and such other bourgeois measures pretending to support the economic and social struggle of the exploited masses;
8. Protect and encourage Filipino-owned commerce and industry by providing market guarantees, protection, credit and tax relief;
9. Support the national minorities in their fight against landlords, land-grabbers, mining companies, logging concessionaires and plantations; and
10. Safeguard the people's health and expand medical services.

In the Military Field

1. Organize and train units of the people's army: armed propaganda teams, guerrilla units, regular mobile troops, militia and armed city partisans;
2. Campaign against the US military bases and US military assistance and all treaties (US-RP Military Bases Treaty, Military Assistance Pact and Mutual Defense Treaty, the SEATO, etc.) that bind the reactionary government and army to the US imperialists, and also against the anti-democratic intent of "civic action," the "Peace Corps" and other counterinsurgency projects of the US imperialists;
3. Destroy the military units of the reactionary government and of the US imperialists and capture useful military equipment;
4. Punish the spies and all subversive agents (especially members of the CIA and DIA) of US imperialism and their local reactionary cohorts;
5. Campaign against the drafting of youth, workers and peasants by the reactionaries for military camp training and service and also against the PMT, ROTC and Philippine Military Academy because of their reactionary orientation;
6. Eliminate cattle rustling and piracy, banditry and all other activities that prey on the poor;
7. Destroy the terror squads like the Home Defense Corps and the "Monkees," and disarm and disband the bodyguards of bureaucrat capitalists, civilian guards of landlords and strikebreakers;

8. Organize the oppressed national minorities to take up arms against imperialist and feudal oppression;
9. Wage a war of annihilation but exercise leniency on captured combatants so as to demoralize the enemy; and
10. Cooperate with all other armed movements or groups fighting against imperialist and feudal oppression.

In the Cultural Field

1. Develop a national, scientific and mass culture responsive to the needs and aspirations of the Filipino people;
2. Campaign against imperialist and feudal or Church control and influence over the educational system and mass media;
3. Propagate the national language as the principal medium of instruction and communication;
4. Develop a people's democratic culture and put revolutionary content in art and literature while combatting the decadent literature of "universal humanism," pessimism, escapism, class reconciliation and all other pernicious bourgeois trends;
5. Combat Christian chauvinism against the national minorities;
6. Support the progressive movements and actions among students, teachers and all intellectuals;
7. Guarantee the better livelihood of teachers and other staff members of educational institutions and guarantee academic freedom;
8. Respect the freedom of thought and religious belief and use patient persuasion in gathering support for the people's democratic revolution;
9. Denounce imperialist study and travel grants; and
10. Fight for free education at all levels and wipe out illiteracy and superstition among the masses and rouse them to a revolutionary and scientific spirit.

In the Field of Foreign Policy

1. Base Philippine foreign policy on the Filipino people's sovereignty and self-reliance, and cooperate with all friendly revolutionary people's governments and movements on the basis of mutual respect and mutual benefit;
2. Fight against all unjust treaties and agreements imposed by US imperialism;
3. Develop the firmest relations with the People's Republic of China, the People's Republic of Albania and all revolutionary governments and peoples;
4. Support the revolutionary struggles of all oppressed peoples in Asia, Africa and Latin America; and all the neighboring oppressed peoples of Vietnam, Laos, Indonesia, Thailand, Kalimantan Utara, Malaya, Burma, Korea and others;
5. Expose the United Nations as a tool of US imperialism and its revisionist renegade accomplices in the crime of neocolonialism;
6. Oppose every treacherous maneuver of all revisionist states and parties in their collaboration with US imperialism;
7. Resist the attempts of US imperialism to make use of Japan and the revisionist renegade cliques led by the Soviet Union as tools in the exploitation of the Philippines;
8. Oppose such "regional" arrangements as the Asian Development Bank, Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN), Asian Pacific Council (ASPAC) and the like that reinforce the SEATO and other long-standing instruments of US imperialism in the region;
9. Campaign against the imperialist advisers and survey missions in the bourgeois reactionary government; and
10. Uphold the spirit of proletarian internationalism and the policy of the international united front.

IV. CONDITIONS FOR REVOLUTION ARE EXCELLENT

The objective conditions for the implementation of our general and specific programs are excellent. US imperialism, modern revisionism and all reactionary forces are receiving crushing blows from the oppressed peoples of the world and are in a state of disintegration.

Increasingly, armed struggles in the countryside of the world, Asia, Africa and Latin America, are ever intensifying and expanding to tear apart and destroy the overextended power of US imperialism and all its reactionary allies. In the close vicinity of the Philippines, the tide of people's war is ever rising under the powerful inspiration of Mao Zedong Thought. The heroic peoples of Vietnam, Laos, Thailand, Indonesia, Burma, Malaya and others are fighting US imperialism and feudalism. The Filipino people and the Communist Party of the Philippines are fortunate to be within the storm center of the world proletarian revolution.

Because of its losses in the Vietnam war, because of its expensive but futile aid to its puppet governments and because of its failure to further expand its foreign trade, US imperialism is rocked in its very heartland by a serious crisis that is now agitating the American workers and youth, both Afro-American and White, who refuse to be carried away into imperialist wars of expansion and to be abused economically and politically at home. The deepening internal and external crisis of US imperialism is clearly depriving the Filipino reactionaries of a significantly great amount of imperialist protection and support.

The crisis of overproduction severely afflicts the entire world capitalist system today and is profoundly agitating its own working class and youth that it viciously exploits. All capitalist countries are now engaged in cutthroat competition because each is trying to save itself from economic and political crises at the expense of the other. Although all capitalist countries are united in manipulating the revisionist renegade states and parties and shifting the burden of their financial crisis on the backs of their colonies and semi-colonies, they only aggravate the hopeless situation of their puppets and intensify the aspirations of the oppressed peoples to be freed of their imperialist yoke.

Modern revisionism spearheaded by the Soviet revisionist clique is failing to be an effective accomplice of US imperialism in their mutual crime of neocolonialism. The Soviet revisionist renegade bloc is fast disintegrating. The Soviet aggression against the Czechoslovak people has demonstrated the treacherous character of modern revisionism. While US imperialism and Soviet social-im-

perialism collude in claiming their respective spheres of influence, they also struggle to re-divide the same.

While US imperialism and modern revisionism are in deep crisis, the People's Republic of China has consolidated itself as an iron bastion of socialism and the world proletarian revolution by carrying out the epochal Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution and by holding aloft Mao Zedong Thought to illumine the road of armed revolution throughout the world.

Also, in the Eastern European heartland of modern revisionism, the People's Republic of Albania stands forth as an advance post of the world proletarian revolution and Mao Zedong Thought and is encouraging all the oppressed peoples and Marxist-Leninists there to rebel against the ruling revisionist renegade cliques.

The most significant development in the entire history of the Filipino people so far is the reestablishment and rebuilding of the Communist Party of the Philippines as a party of Mao Zedong Thought. This occurs at a time when world and national conditions are extremely favorable for revolution under the leadership of the proletariat.

The Philippine reactionary state can no longer rely on the "unlimited" support of the crisis-stricken US and world capitalist system. What the United States and other capitalist powers are vainly trying to do is to shift the burden of their economic and financial crisis on the backs of colonies and semi-colonies like the Philippines. This will only aggravate the foreign and feudal oppression of the Filipino people and will only goad them to take up arms.

The Philippine reactionary state is increasingly unable to rule in the old way. Armed opposition to it by the Filipino people under the leadership of the Communist Party of the Philippines is sure to doom foreign and feudal oppression. It is both a patriotic and internationalist duty to fight US imperialism and all its reactionary allies. The defeat of US imperialism and modern revisionism and all domestic reactionaries in the Philippines is bound to have far-reaching world significance because our country has long served as a bastion of all these evils in this part of the world.

*Ratified by the Congress of Reestablishment
of the Communist Party of the Philippines
December 26, 1968*

Declaration of the New People's Army

March 29, 1969

As surely as the Communist Party of the Philippines is being regenerated, reoriented and reestablished under the supreme guidance of Mao Zedong Thought, the acme of Marxism-Leninism in the present era, the people's liberation army which the Party commands as its principal instrument in the Philippine revolution is likewise being regenerated, reoriented and reestablished under the supreme guidance of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought.

In the same way that the Party is undertaking a rectification movement in the spirit of "learning from past mistakes to avoid future ones" and of "curing the sickness to save the patient," so does the people's army in order to regenerate itself correctly, cast away degenerates and take in new blood to carry out more firmly and vigorously the tasks of the people's democratic revolution against US imperialism, domestic feudalism and bureaucrat capitalism.

The New People's Army is definitely emergent after twenty-seven years of hard struggle and sacrifices in the people's democratic interests by those who have persisted in revolutionary armed struggle. This army can take pride in its splendid achievements and in the glorious martyrdom of its heroic martyrs. It can also learn bitter lessons from the failure of previous leaderships to win the revolution or to preserve a single base area during the last more than two decades. It is now arduously striving to intensify the armed struggle in a number of guerrilla zones and girding for the realization of agrarian revolution as the condition for establishing a base area and an armed independent regime.

The universal truth of Mao Zedong Thought is now being consciously and thoroughly integrated with the concrete practice of the Philippine revolution. After an extended process of rectification and self-criticism lasting for a number of years reflected in the historic document of rectification, *Rectify Errors and Rebuild the Party*, the Communist Party of the Philippines ratified in its Congress of Reestablishment on December 26, 1968, a new *Constitution* and a new *Program for a People's Democratic Revolution* in order to give new guidance, the guidance of Mao Zedong Thought, to the people's army and to the conduct of our revolutionary armed struggle.

The Party Constitution and Program make it clear that the road of armed revolution is the only road for the Filipino people to take in order to liberate themselves from the exploitative and oppressive rule of US imperialism, feudalism and bureaucrat capitalism. This basic stand of our Party recognizes the great role of the people's army in the Philippine revolution. Since armed

The "Declaration of the New People's Army" was ratified at its founding on March 29, 1969. It is extracted from *Foundation for Resuming the Philippine Revolution*, the first volume of the Sison's selected works, pp. 95-118.

struggle is the main form of struggle, the people's army is the main form of organization in the people's democratic revolution.

As Comrade Mao Zedong has long pointed out, "Without a people's army, the people have nothing." The Communist Party of the Philippines or the Filipino working class can neither lead the revolution nor fight for the people's interest without the people's army. Neither can a true united front be formed without armed struggle and the people's army welding together the workers and the peasants. The people and the Party can have political power only by taking up arms and only by having a genuine people's army as the mainstay of all efforts to overthrow the reactionaries and consolidate revolutionary power. As Comrade Mao Zedong has said, "Political power grows out of the barrel of a gun."

THE NEW PEOPLE'S ARMY

Today, March 29, 1969, on the occasion of the twenty-seventh anniversary of the founding of the people's army, we have the best and happiest reasons for celebration. In line with the rectification, reestablishment and reinvigoration of the Communist Party of the Philippines under the powerful inspiration of the invincible Mao Zedong Thought, we the overwhelming majority of Red commanders and fighters are convened to formalize the adoption of the proletarian revolutionary line of the Party and Mao Zedong Thought, announce the creation of the New People's Army and approve the draft of the Basic Rules for submission to the Party Central Committee, proclaim our irrevocable repudiation of and triumph over the bourgeois headquarters in the army which is lorded over by the Taruc-Sumulong renegade clique and express our resolute determination to combat and remove all vestiges of modern revisionism and Right opportunism, particularly the bourgeois reactionary line of the Lavas and the Tarucs which have besmirched the integrity and prestige of the Party and the army and have hindered for so long the advance of the people's democratic revolution against US imperialism, feudalism and bureaucrat capitalism.

Today, we speak of the New People's Army because it is under the unified command of Mao Zedong Thought and the Communist Party of the Philippines, because it truly serves the fundamental interests of the people by being the principal instrument in the agrarian revolution that we are to launch to mobilize the masses of peasants and farm workers and also in the united front against US imperialism, feudalism and bureaucrat capitalism, and because it

has a style of being closely linked with the masses of the people by helping them in every possible way.

Our army is new in two senses. It is new in the sense that it is fundamentally different from the reactionary puppet Armed Forces of the Philippines (and all its supplementary forces) that wages armed suppression of the people and defends the exploiting classes. It is also new in the sense that it has repudiated the bourgeois reactionary line that has persisted in the people's army from the period of the Hukbalahap to that of the Taruc-Sumulong clique and sabotaged the revolutionary armed struggle for quite a long time.

That the New People's Army is resplendently new is beyond all doubt inasmuch as it has emerged as the fruit of inner-Party struggle, the concrete result of the triumph of Mao Zedong Thought and the overthrow of the bourgeois headquarters in the Party and army. Following the Marxist-Leninist leadership of the Communist Party of the Philippines, the New People's Army has arisen as the fresh formation of Red commanders and fighters who have rejected the bourgeois headquarters of "Commander" Sumulong and who have upheld Mao Zedong Thought against the pernicious bourgeois reactionary line of the Lavas and the Tarucs.

Within the Party, we the Red commanders and fighters following the lead of the proletarian revolutionary cadres and inspired by Mao Zedong Thought have set ourselves free from the two main sources of modern revisionism and Right opportunism in the Party and army.

One main source is the city-based Lava revisionist clique which engages mainly in legalist and parliamentary struggle and whose principal leaders are in the payroll of the bourgeois reactionary government. This clique conceives of the national united front as something detached from the armed struggle. It is sponsoring a reformist peasant organization that limits its activities to arbitration within the narrow channels of the bourgeois reactionary government and systematically sabotages the revolutionary work of the people's army and harbors surrenderees, swindlers, cattle rustlers and other bad elements.

The other source of modern revisionism and Right opportunism is lorded over by the Pedro Taruc-Sumulong clique that usurps the name of the Communist Party of the Philippines and the people's liberation army (Hukbong Mapagpalaya ng Bayan) to advance selfish counterrevolutionary bourgeois and feudal ends that are essentially no different from those of the Lava revisionist clique.

In dealing with the present situation in the army, we have to deal at length with the Taruc-Sumulong clique which has since 1964 formally usurped the leadership over all those units of the people's liberation army that had heroically persisted in armed struggle against the enemy. Though we, the overwhelming majority of Red commanders and fighters, have already overthrown this revisionist renegade clique in the countryside, we must expose clearly its anti-Party and counterrevolutionary crimes so as to make them serve as negative examples and to show to all comrades and to the people that the Communist Party of the Philippines and the New People's Army are capable of rectifying errors and rebuilding themselves as genuine instruments of the people's democratic revolution against US imperialism, feudalism and bureaucrat capitalism.

CRIMES OF THE TARUC-SUMULONG CLIQUE

The Taruc-Sumulong clique has deliberately encouraged the persistence of the ideology and activities of roving rebel bands for selfish, counterrevolutionary bourgeois and feudal ends. Though it has usurped the name of the Party and army and even usurped high titles therein through a system of false appointments, it has outrightly taken the counterrevolutionary standpoint on many problems and issues of basic importance and has done so in open violation of the basic norms of a Marxist-Leninist party and people's army.

Like the heirs and advocates of the Lava revisionist line, the Taruc-Sumulong clique has never found it necessary during the period 1964-1969 to put forward a new party program and constitution and other kinds of guide to replace the outmoded ones put out during the 1946-1951 period and also those put out arbitrarily by Jesus Lava until his surrender. There has never been any attempt on the part of the heirs of the Lavas and the Tarucs to study the universal truth of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought and apply it on the concrete practice of the Philippine revolution. On the other hand, they have consistently violated it.

Despite its presumptions of leadership, the Taruc-Sumulong clique has willfully failed to give the correct revolutionary direction to the armed struggle. It has completely shunned the principle of agrarian revolution and has never made any significant step to advance towards it. Instead, this clique has merely made use of the armed units of the people's liberation army to compel mediation between the landlords and the peasants. Mediation has been used mainly to favor the landlords who get what they want by making financial or

grain contributions to the “revolutionary” fund. In this manner, the Taruc-Sumulong clique has criminally tried to cut off the Red army from the peasant masses. This clique has promoted the outlook of the roving rebel band by its criminal refusal to base the growth and development of the people’s army on the peasant struggle for land and on the mobilization of the masses.

This clique has systematically made use of the units of the people’s army to apply coercion more on the peasant masses than on landlords whose friendship it would rather cultivate. It uses the flimsy reasoning that the landlords are needed in a “united front” solely against US imperialism. But, when confronted with the specific case of poor peasants being ejected by the US imperialists and their running dogs as in Concepcion, Tarlac to make way for the gigantic radio installation of the Voice of America, this clique ordered the people’s army and the peasant masses to desist from fighting the ejection. In many instances, the Taruc-Sumulong clique has acted to discourage mass protest actions and labor strikes against the US military bases on the counterrevolutionary ground that Angeles City would lose plenty of business if the US imperialists were denounced and antagonized.

Shamelessly, this clique has on a big scale dictated the use of some units of the Red army as security guards for the landlords’ fields and granaries again on the flimsy excuse of “actually helping out the peasants to cheat the landlords.” This is a completely wrong orientation in the revolution because the peasants do not have to limit themselves merely to “cheating” the landlords. The overriding goal of the Party and the army is to arouse and mobilize the peasants into a revolutionary mass force capable of destroying the pillars of feudalism.

The peasants still voluntarily give support to the people’s army. This is because we the majority of Red commanders and fighters have always tried to do our best beyond the bureaucratic control of the Taruc-Sumulong clique in helping the peasant masses. We the majority of Red commanders and fighters have always maintained the closest links with the peasant masses by constantly siding with them against the landlords, the armed agents and troops of the bourgeois reactionary government and such bad elements as cattle rustlers, swindlers and bandits.

In many areas we have succeeded in reducing land rent and interest rates beyond the promises of the bourgeois Agricultural Land Reform Code. We have used our weapons to reduce the bullying and abuses of the landlord class and the bourgeois reactionary government by wiping out their big representatives and running dogs in many areas where, as a result, the people now live in

conditions better than elsewhere. We have also managed to help the peasants in their daily work and life.

But, whenever the Taruc-Sumulong clique is approached by landlords regarding agrarian disputes with peasants, the interests of the latter are sold out and, thereby, the good work of the people's army is sabotaged. Thus, peasants in particular areas become resentful over the fact that they have to give contributions to an army whose leadership takes the side of the landlords. Also in this manner are the reactionaries and counterrevolutionary reformists given the chance to malign the people's army and to prepare the betrayal and murder of Red fighters in the field, especially in those areas where we are trying to expand for the first time.

In labor and student strikes in Central Luzon, the Taruc-Sumulong clique has not only stood aside while the exploiting classes and their armed agents, the Philippine Constabulary and the local police, wreak their vengeance on the strikers but it has also used its armed units to coerce the strikers and their organizations into submitting to the wishes of the exploiters. This has been done in exchange for a paltry sum of money.

Class capitulation, class collaboration and class betrayal have been carried to the extremest point by the Taruc-Sumulong clique in several ways. Politically, it has kowtowed to the biggest representatives of the exploiting classes such as Marcos, Nepomuceno and Cojuangco. Its ringleaders have made themselves "compadres" of these reactionary politicians and made agreements of "cease-fire" and "political support" with them. This folly of embracing the enemy, of collaborating with reactionary politicians resulted in the exposure and murder of so many comrades after the elections of 1965.

This class betrayal is nothing but a political reflection of the counterrevolutionary bourgeois and feudal character of the Taruc-Sumulong clique. In that regard, this clique has been blatantly spreading the philosophy of survival among the Red fighters. It has recently ordered the stopping of campaigns launched by revolutionary commanders to wipe out enemy detachments and agents in their field commands. To please the big reactionary politicians this clique has for monetary reasons even ordered the surrender of a comrade to the reactionary government. Fortunately, this counterrevolutionary order to surrender a comrade has been frustrated.

The obvious reason for the counterrevolutionary revisionist policy of "peaceful coexistence" is that the enemy has promised to tolerate the landholdings, the investments in Angeles City and elsewhere and also the gang-style

collections of the Taruc-Sumulong clique from businessmen, landlords and the peasant masses, all of which are under the one-man control and disposition of "Commander" Sumulong in the name of the Party and army. This unprincipled compromise has always been falsely justified in terms of economism. Yet the financial resources and property accumulated by this clique have been privately appropriated by the clique-masters in the most rapacious manner and have been mainly kept away from the Party and army.

The Taruc-Sumulong clique has deliberately limited the growth of the people's army and also smothered Party life therein so as to maintain its selfish capitalist and feudal rule. There is no democratic centralism; there is only the "centralism" of one big shot, "Commander" Sumulong. Abusing his private rule of centralism without democracy, "Commander" Sumulong has criminally made one-man decisions involving the execution of "erring" comrades and other people, the disposition of huge amounts of funds and the like. Without due process and on the flimsiest grounds that usually have something to do with finance collection or some business enterprise, he has judged many comrades as deserving of the death penalty and mass murders have actually been committed on his orders.

The Taruc-Sumulong clique has been directly responsible more for the killing of comrades and other people in connection with some shady business enterprise than in connection with the revolutionary armed struggle against the enemy. Following the old sectarian style of the Jose and Jesus Lava leaderships, cases of "finance opportunism" involving the smallest amounts have been concocted to discredit and justify the mass execution of comrades who dare to criticize or oppose the Taruc-Sumulong clique.

Since there is absolutely no democracy practiced by the Taruc-Sumulong clique, no committee system, no system of political commissars, no report system and no accounting of funds, the clique-masters have been in a position to make arbitrary decisions, abuse the mechanical discipline of some comrades and armed units and to commit finance opportunism on a grand scale as scandalously manifested by their luxurious and corrupt living, by their having several wives and spending Party funds in such a manner, by their lavish parties for their reactionary friends and "compadres" and also by having close relatives gain private titles over some sizable property that properly belong to the Party and the people.

Consistently importing the style of the vagabond and the lumpenproletariat into the Party and army and assuming a fascist gangster or petty warlord

attitude, “Commander” Sumulong appoints goons and police characters to high positions in his staff, mixes them with dedicated comrades, personally administers beatings to them alike and orders their execution whenever they fail to satisfy his financial demands.

“Commander” Sumulong has also made use of the name of the Party and army in practicing usury among comrades and among the people at the average rate of 50 percent a month, in forcing the sale of properties to him at the price he dictates and in extorting money and grain from the masses. He has actually manipulated units of the people’s army to conduct his evil business practices in the style of a protection gang. This man who has assumed the functions of commander-in-chief and national finance officer of the people’s army is one of the worst scoundrels that has ever infiltrated into the Party and army. Pedro Taruc has to assume full responsibility as the principal accomplice of Sumulong.

Because of its selfish counterrevolutionary interests, the Taruc-Sumulong clique is afraid to see the building of a Marxist-Leninist Party within the people’s liberation army. It is afraid of democracy and the use of criticism and self-criticism. It is afraid of seeing Party cadres and Red fighters raise their quality and the Party and army expand under the guidance of Mao Zedong Thought. It is afraid of being exposed, criticized and repudiated. Thus, it would rather operate as a crime syndicate.

It is now clear beyond doubt why the Taruc-Sumulong clique has consistently practiced sectarianism and closed-doorism. It wishes mainly to prevent the expansion of the Party and army and the emergence of revolutionary mass organizations in order to keep out the good and keep in the bad and maintain its counterrevolutionary renegade command and its system of privately appropriating wealth. This clique wishes to lord over the Party and army in Central Luzon as if it were its “independent kingdom.” It does this at a time that the urgent need is to rebuild the Party and army as the intimate and conscientious servants of the people on a nationwide scale.

HISTORICAL ROOTS OF THE TARUC-SUMULONG CLIQUE

The bourgeois reactionary line carried out by the Pedro Taruc-Sumulong clique in Central Luzon has its historical roots. It has the same root cause as the counterrevolutionary revisionism and Right opportunism of the Lava clique. It is merely a branch of the long line of Right opportunism that has run through

the history of the Party and that has retarded the growth of the Party and army and prejudiced the consistent advance of the revolution.

It is directly related to the Right opportunist line of the Lavas within the Communist Party of the Philippines for the last thirty-four years. It is immediately related to that bourgeois reactionary line carried forward by Jesus Lava who, when already isolated from the masses of the people, the masses of Party members and the masses of Red fighters, and already preparing to surrender himself to the enemy after failing to get the help of fraternal parties for him to escape from the country, made one-man decisions and appointments that favored his close relatives and also his accomplice in counterrevolution, Pedro Taruc, who in turn appointed his close relative, "Commander" Sumulong, as the commander-in-chief and national finance officer of the people's liberation army.

Just before he surrendered himself to Macapagal through the Social Security System medical officer, Jesus Lava gave himself the title of Party chairman and appointed a number of secretaries to form the Party secretariat. Independent of the other secretaries all of whom were in Manila, Pedro Taruc made his own one-man decisions and appointments, among which was keeping "Commander" Sumulong as military and finance chieftain of the Taruc-Sumulong clique. Sumulong was appointed to his position despite the fact that the Party's case against him in 1963 for malversation and rape had never been properly litigated.

It is possible to make an exposure and rectification of errors in the Party and in the people's liberation army because we, the majority of the Party members and Red fighters, have remained steadfastly true to the Party and to the Philippine revolution. The Party and the army have persisted under the most difficult conditions because among the masses of Party members and Red fighters the majority have remained faithful to the interests of the toiling masses and have consistently taken the mass line.

The Taruc-Sumulong clique which has usurped Party and army leadership in Central Luzon has long acted as a hindrance to the advance of the revolution and as a heavy burden on the masses of the people. Its crimes have been utilized by the enemy to discredit the Party and the people's army. This clique has perpetrated the most grievous crimes inside and outside the Party and army. It is best, therefore, that the Party and army should wage a rectification movement, ideological, political and organizational, in order to cleanse the Party and army and make them ever stronger servants of the masses.

Comrades who are passive to or who refuse the call for rectification will only endanger themselves because if the evil practices of the Taruc-Sumulong clique are not repudiated now, then the reactionaries can use them to isolate the Party and army from the people. The Communist Party of the Philippines and New People's Army cannot carry out the tasks of the revolution without engaging in criticism and self-criticism, without engaging in a rectification movement and clarifying their revolutionary tasks, without arousing the people to feel free to say what they think and what they expect to be done. Certainly not all the particular crimes of the Taruc-Sumulong clique can be included in this document. Only the full play of a rectification campaign among Party members and Red fighters can unfold them most amply and clear the way for the proletarian revolutionary line of Mao Zedong Thought.

However, to be most profound and to be of the greatest benefit to the Party and to the New People's Army, the rectification movement should encompass not only the wrongs committed by the Taruc-Sumulong clique but also the whole history of the Communist Party of the Philippines. With such a scope of criticism, comrades will fully understand why the phenomenon of a Taruc-Sumulong clique has come to pass and why, for instance, many of those who entered the Party and army at various stages have become passive, afraid and reluctant to carry out the tasks of the revolution or have turned the other way only to strike back at the Party and army as counterrevolutionaries.

To understand the present as something that develops into the future, with the true proletarian revolutionaries advancing and the degenerate capitalist roaders being thrown into the dustbin of history, we must know the past that has brought about certain wrongs and weaknesses and also that has brought about what is good and strong about us today. An understanding of the whole history of the Party is necessary, especially because most of the Party members and Red fighters who are now actively working for the success of the Philippine revolution are literally a new generation. It is most important that we take advantage of the lessons of the past and of the positive and negative experiences of old comrades who compose a minority within the Party and army at the moment.

Hereunder we outline briefly the major stages in the development of the Party and army, with special interest in the latter and with special emphasis on the causes of failure. For an ample view of Party history, it is indispensable for comrades to adopt this document together with the more extensive document, "Rectify Errors and Rebuild the Party," issued previously by the Party.

1. Period before the Establishment of the Hukbo ng Bayan Laban sa Hapon

For twelve long years after its formal establishment on November 7, 1930, the Communist Party of the Philippines failed to create a people's army to combat the US colonial regime and later the puppet comprador-landlord government of Quezon and its US imperialist masters. Without a people's army, the Party was defenseless.

A few months after its public founding, repressive measures were taken by the US imperialists and the puppet officials against the Party. In 1932, the Party and all the mass organizations associated with it were formally declared illegal by the reactionary government and all principal Party leaders were sentenced, imprisoned and banished to various parts of the country.

Even as the Party had been declared completely illegal, the Party leadership still failed to recognize the importance of Party and army building among the peasants in the countryside. Throughout the decade of the thirties, widespread agitation for independence and land reform was conducted more vigorously by other organizations.

In 1937, the Party was again allowed to operate legally in line with the anti-fascist Popular Front and in 1938, a merger of the Communist Party of the Philippines and the Socialist Party was made under the influence of the Right opportunist leadership of Earl Browder in the Communist Party of the USA. The Party leadership continued to concentrate on legal work in the city and no armed preparations were undertaken in the countryside against the impending Japanese invasion.

Only campaigns for the voluntary boycott of Japanese goods were made mainly by the trade union movement under the leadership of the CPP chairman Crisanto Evangelista. The cadres of the Socialist Party continued to engage in purely legal and reformist agitation. At this time, Party members of petit-bourgeois orientation who stood out in advocating civil liberties and whose chief representative was Dr. Vicente Lava started to gain principal influence in the Party.

2. Period of the Hukbo ng Bayan Laban sa Hapon

The people's army in the form of the Hukbalahap was established under the leadership of the Party on March 29, 1942 in Central Luzon. Since then, confirming what Comrade Mao Zedong has said that political power grows out of

the barrel of a gun, the Party and the people gained a certain amount of power and prestige in Central Luzon that they had never held before.

Within one year of waging guerrilla warfare, the people's army grew from a small force to a big one. Its strength grew rapidly as the peasants rallied around it under such favorable conditions as the evacuation of the US imperialists and the Commonwealth government from the Philippines, the disintegration of landlord power in the countryside and the clear need among the people to take up arms against the Japanese fascists.

But after the Japanese raid on the Mt. Arayat base of the people's army in the early part of March 1943, the Party leadership of the Right opportunist Vicente Lava was overcome with pessimism and adopted the wrong policy of "retreat for defense" which was a passive military line involving the dissolution of armed units and prevention of tactical offensives against the enemy.

The Lava leadership also entertained serious doubts about the working class being able to lead under conditions that the trade union movement in the city was in chaos. It did not recognize that the Communist Party of the Philippines as the most advanced detachment of the working class was already in the countryside to lead the peasant masses.

The "retreat for defense" policy was rectified only sometime in September 1944 when the US military forces and their puppet forces were already starting to make their own offensive. Because of this Right opportunist policy, which covered more than half of the three-year Japanese occupation, the Red army lost the opportunity of building up more massive fighting forces and of expanding as fast as it should have even beyond Central Luzon. On a national scale, the Party and army failed to seize the leadership in the anti-fascist armed struggle.

The plan to send out cadres to other parts of the archipelago to develop armed struggle had been called off even as early as 1942. Thus, the development of armed struggle under the leadership of the Party became limited to Central Luzon and to a small part of Southern Tagalog. Furthermore, the Party leadership failed to use agrarian revolution as the basis of its strength in areas securely held by the people's army. It also glaringly failed to expose US imperialism as an enemy. It utterly failed to implement the policy of the Communist International of using the anti-fascist struggle as an occasion to establish a people's democratic government.

3. Period of the “Democratic Peace” Line

As the US imperialist and puppet forces were advancing, the Party leadership still mainly influenced by the Right opportunism of Vicente Lava and Luis Taruc relied on the word of US agents who contacted them that they could participate in the parliamentary life and economic reconstruction of the country.

The Party leadership passed on to more outright Right opportunists like Pedro Castro and Jorge Frianeza who advocated an open and legal mass party in the style of bourgeois parties and who carried out further the line of separating the gun from the Red fighters. The Party leadership failed to recognize that US imperialists and the landlords were systematically disorganizing the people's army to strengthen armed counterrevolution and reimpose their control over the entire countryside and over the whole country.

Atrocious crimes had been committed by the US imperialists and their puppets against the Hukbalahap and the masses. Entire “squadrons” of the Hukbalahap were massacred or, as in the case of the Banal Regiment, were bought off with US backup. Hukbalahap leaders were soon arrested and assassinated or imprisoned by the US imperialists and their puppets. Despite these evil deeds of the enemy, the Right opportunists set up the Huk Veterans' League and the Pambansang Kaisahan ng mga Magbubukid to supplant the Hukbalahap and the Barrio United Defense Corps (BUDC).

True to its Right opportunist line, the Party leadership shifted its headquarters from the countryside to the city, launched the Democratic Alliance which was dominated by bourgeois personalities and engaged in the bourgeois electoral game only to discover when it was too late that the US imperialists, the comprador bourgeoisie, the landlords and bureaucrat capitalists would violate their own parliamentary rules to get what they wanted, such as the Bell Trade Act, Parity Amendment and other imperialist and landlord measures.

During the period of the “democratic peace” line the reactionaries were able to reinstall themselves in positions of power all over the country by unhesitatingly using their guns to suppress the people as in the regions of Central Luzon and Southern Tagalog.

4. Resumption of the Armed Struggle and Military Adventurism

As a result of the ouster of the Party-supported members of Congress from their parliamentary seats, the murder of revolutionary leaders, Red fighters and common people, and the just clamor of the people for resuming armed

struggle, the Right opportunist leadership in the Party was overthrown and the Party decided to launch armed struggle in 1948.

But as no sufficient rectification movement was waged aside from organizational repudiation of the Right opportunists, the Jose Lava leadership that tried to resume the armed struggle was not able to formulate correctly the ideological, political and organizational basis for a protracted people's war. Even as the Party was already bent on waging armed struggle, the Right opportunist Luis Taruc, who was commander-in-chief of the people's liberation army, was allowed to negotiate the surrender and disarming of the people's army in the same year of 1948.

Taking a dogmatic and sectarian attitude as clearly manifested by its PB Resolutions of 1950, the Jose Lava leadership adopted the impetuous petit-bourgeois line of quick military victory within two years, which underestimated the enemy and overestimated the revolutionary forces. It was a complete violation of Mao Zedong's strategic principle of a protracted people's war. It was merely a subjective conclusion reached by relying heavily on such external possibilities as a third world war, the absolute breakdown of the US economy and the violent split among the local political factions in the country which were foretold to occur within two years.

The putschist line of military victory in two years overstrained the limited revolutionary forces, made them leap over unstable areas instead of advancing wave upon wave, and impelled the imposition of bourgeois rules of war and sectarian punishments on the overstrained cadres, fighters and masses. The more the Party and army leadership waved the obnoxious flag of commandism, the more the Party and army became isolated from the masses on whom sectarian abuses were committed. Those sectarian abuses were repeated in a big way by reactionary soldiers in civilian disguise and were blamed on the Party and army, thus isolating the Party and army further from the masses.

The "Left" opportunist leadership of Jose Lava (PB-In and Secretariat) was isolated in the city from which it dictated its adventurist orders. It had a sub-command under Jesus Lava (the so-called PB-Out) which was likewise isolated in a physical base, not a political base, in the Sierra Madre fastnesses of Laguna, far away from the main military forces in the plains of Central Luzon.

After the March and August 1950 raids conducted by the people's army, the Jose Lava leadership was quickly smashed by only a few enemy counterattacks such as the total capture of the central Party headquarters in the city, the massive encirclement of the Sierra Madre, the slicing off of overextended supply

and communication lines, large-scale enemy imitation of the roguish sectarian activities of a big number of Red army units and heavy enemy infiltration of the Party headquarters because of a liberal policy of recruitment in the city.

The Jose Lava leadership was criminally responsible for the almost total obliteration of the people's army within the short period of two years and for the most wanton sacrifice of the lives of Party cadres and Red fighters in the entire history of the Communist Party of the Philippines.

5. The Period of Continued Military Defeat

After the enemy had smashed the Jose Lava leadership, Jesus Lava assumed the Party leadership and together with Casto Alejandrino as commander-in-chief, continued the "Left" opportunist and sectarian line of his brother. Adducing the failure of the Jose Lava leadership to mere negligence and tactical errors of some comrades and to mere accident, Jesus Lava carried further the line of his brother and failed to launch a much-needed rectification movement.

Revealing its utter ignorance of the theory of people's war, the Jesus Lava leadership asserted that the strategic stage that the people's liberation army had been in since 1949 was neither the strategic defensive nor the strategic offensive but what it muddleheadedly called the "strategic counteroffensive."

The Central Committee conference of February-March 1951 which elevated Jesus Lava to the general secretaryship did not find any substantial ideological, political and organizational errors in the previous leadership. Jesus Lava was more concerned then with outwitting and outmaneuvering the equally careerist renegade Luis Taruc to assume the Party leadership.

Taking advantage of the defeats suffered by the people's army, Luis Taruc and his clique pushed forward the Right opportunist line of seeking peace negotiations with the enemy. This capitulationist line had disastrous results inasmuch as it encouraged the mood of many soldiers to surrender even in areas where the people's army was still strong. In 1954, the renegade, traitor and scab Luis Taruc surrendered to the enemy under the auspices of the US Central Intelligence Agency.

While the enemy launched a series of massive campaigns of encirclement and suppression during the period of 1951, the Party and army were severely split between two factions and the Jesus Lava leadership failed to give the unifying ideological, political and organizational leadership for a protracted people's war.

The relationship between the Party and army on the one hand and the people on the other, between Party officials and army officers on the one hand and soldiers on the other, and among soldiers worsened without letup. The Jesus Lava leadership failed to grasp the mass line, failed to overcome, but even increased the harsh sectarian activities of the previous leadership and continued to propagate a purely military viewpoint.

6. The Reemergence of Right Opportunism and Flightism

In 1955, the Jesus Lava leadership was overcome with pessimism about the armed struggle as a result of its ceaseless military defeats and its isolation from the masses. Its dogmatism, “Left” opportunism and sectarianism easily reversed into empiricism and Right opportunism.

As a result of continuous military defeats, this leadership subsequently adopted the line of parliamentary struggle, and it went out of its way to dissolve those armed units of the people’s army that it had access to and convert them into “organizational brigades.” As Jesus Lava himself prepared to abandon the armed struggle and the countryside, he dissolved his own security unit.

During this period, the Khrushchev revisionist renegades of the Soviet Union were already waging a worldwide campaign for the “parliamentary road” and “peaceful transition.” In 1958, Lava took flight from the countryside and began his career of “general secretary” in his secluded city room from which he issued political transmissions and directives without the benefit of collective discussions and concrete experience. This flightism was imitated by other principal Party leaders, particularly by the commander-in-chief of the people’s army, Casto Alejandrino.

But even the efforts of the Party in the parliamentary struggle did not directly bear fruit. In political agitation, the Jesus Lava leadership tailed behind the leaders of the national bourgeoisie and the urban petit bourgeoisie through whose independent efforts the line of anti-imperialism was advanced. What crippled the Party most during this period was the one-man decision taken by Jesus Lava that the Party must pursue the “single file” policy in organization.

This is liquidationism pure and simple, destroying the collective life of the Party. The vast majority of Party members became disconnected and became passive as they were easily cut off from their “single file” due to the arrest of a single Party member, the increasing passivity and opportunism of others, or the infrequency of contacts. It would only be in 1960 that new Party members

in both legal and illegal fronts of the struggle emerged to reinvigorate the Party and army.

Further carrying out his flightist policy, Jesus Lava sought vainly to leave the country. After failing to do so, he tried to cajole President Macapagal with several letters of support for his bourgeois policies and finally wrote him a treasonous letter offering his surrender. Before his “capture” by the enemy in 1964, he alone made appointments to the Party leadership.

These appointments were characterized by nepotism, thinly camouflaged by the nominal appointment of Pedro Taruc as the “secretary for peasants.” Other appointees to the Party secretariat were close Lava kinsmen who had never before excelled in Party work or mass work.

7. The Ascendancy of Mao Zedong Thought in the Party and Army

The Right opportunist line of the Jesus Lava leadership resulted in two degenerate and counterrevolutionary trends. Feigning loss of contact with the people’s army and Party cadres therein led by Pedro Taruc, the heirs in the leadership of the Lava revisionist renegade clique took the blessings of the Soviet revisionist renegade clique, held a conference of their own in April 1968 to perpetuate the “noble lineage” of the Lavas and put forward formally the line of opposing those engaged in armed struggle, of accepting the leadership of the reactionary government in land reform, of contraposing the united front with the armed struggle and of repeating the error of letting bourgeois personalities assume the leadership in what they conceive to be a formal united front organization.

On the other hand, also feigning loss of contact with the barefaced city-based local revisionist renegades, the Taruc-Sumulong clique defined a limited area in Central Luzon as its own independent “kingdom” and put forward its own line of Right opportunism and revisionist treachery in the countryside as explained previously. Pedro Taruc, acting alone, committed the serious crime of appointing Sumulong as commander-in-chief of the people’s army and also as national finance officer despite the fact that the latter was still facing the serious charges of malversation and corruption made in 1963.

If there is a bourgeois headquarters within the Party and army and also factions within the same bourgeois headquarters, the counterrevolutionary line it puts forward is bound to be opposed by a revolutionary line put forward by the proletarian revolutionary headquarters within the same Party and army. During the years from 1964 to the present, when the one-man decisions and

appointments made by the renegade Jesus Lava were creating confusion within the Party, those upholding Mao Zedong Thought led by Comrade Amado Guerrero rose up to criticize and repudiate modern revisionism and the bourgeois reactionary line of the Lavas and the Tarucs and thus prepared the way for the reestablishment and rebuilding of the Communist Party of the Philippines under the supreme guidance of Mao Zedong Thought.

At the same time, within the people's army, Comrade Dante with the late Comrade Delio, struggled hard to put other Red commanders and fighters on the revolutionary path, continued to wage armed struggle most militantly and fostered the revolutionary spirit of serving the people and making the Red fighter merge with the people like fish with water.

Today, the efforts of the overwhelming majority of the Red commanders and fighters led by Comrade Dante who remain ever faithful to the people's democratic revolution and to Mao Zedong Thought are crowned with the transformation of the old Hukbong Mapagpalaya ng Bayan (People's Liberation Army) into the New People's Army under the supreme command of Mao Zedong Thought and the Communist Party of the Philippines.

THE MAIN TASKS OF THE NEW PEOPLE'S ARMY

Under the Marxist-Leninist principle that the Party commands the gun, the New People's Army follows the absolute leadership of the Communist Party of the Philippines and the supreme command of Mao Zedong Thought.

The New People's Army is an instrument for implementing the Party Program for a People's Democratic Revolution. It is, as a matter of fact, the principal organization under the command of the Communist Party of the Philippines, an organization for waging the main form of struggle, armed struggle, in the people's democratic revolution.

The tasks of the New People's Army are comprehensively outlined in the Party Program for a People's Democratic Revolution. Both the general and specific programs are therein stated. But, in another comprehensive manner, we outline hereunder its urgent tasks:

1. The New People's Army Must Engage in Party Rebuilding.

It is by propagating Mao Zedong Thought in the people's army and among the masses, applying it in revolutionary practice and organizing Party branches and committees inside and outside the army that the New People's Army

engages in Party rebuilding. The New People's Army is not only a fighting force, it is also a propaganda and organizing force.

It must propagate and apply Mao Zedong Thought as the highest development of Marxism-Leninism in the present era. Its cadres, commanders and fighters must all imbue themselves with Mao Zedong Thought by undertaking study classes under the direction of the Revolutionary School of Mao Zedong Thought, under the army political department and under the political officer appointed by the Party to supervise Party life and political education in every Red armed unit.

All Party cadres in the army, commanders and fighters should in turn effect an ideological mobilization of the masses under the guidance of Mao Zedong Thought and they should see to it that the most advanced elements among the masses, as among the Red fighters, are taken in as members of the Communist Party of the Philippines in the course of mass struggle. All daily problems of the Party, army and the masses in politics, armed struggle, culture and economic work should be solved by applying the universal truth of Mao Zedong Thought.

As an organized force, the New People's Army must see to it that Party branches at company level, Party groups in every squad and Party committees at every level from the company upwards are established. As an organizing force, it must establish Party branches and local Party committees among the people. The New People's Army must always be conscious that the Communist Party of the Philippines is at the core of the revolutionary mass movement.

In instilling itself with Mao Zedong Thought, the New People's Army instills itself with the spirit of serving the people and repudiating selfishness. It rejects modern revisionism and subjectivism in its dogmatist or empiricist form, Right and "Left" opportunism, sectarianism and liberalism, commandism and tailism and all other weaknesses and mistakes that have obstructed the advance of the people's democratic revolution. Mao Zedong Thought is the most precise instrument for rectifying and weeding out all the weaknesses and the bourgeois reactionary line of the Lavas and the Tarucs and all other evil sources of errors in the Philippine revolutionary movement.

The New People's Army has a conscious iron discipline. It follows the principle of democratic centralism. Centralism is essentially the supreme command of Mao Zedong Thought. At its core is the subordination of the minority to the majority, the lower organ to the higher organ and the individual to the Party. Inner democracy shall be fully enjoyed by all Red fighters and shall serve as

the means for the practical and concrete application of Mao Zedong Thought. Criticism and self-criticism shall be given full play in order to raise the political and combat effectiveness of the New People's Army.

There shall be political democracy in the New People's Army, with the soldiers having the right to hold meetings and speak out freely on any worthwhile subject or problem that confronts them.

There shall be economic democracy, with all officers and men enjoying equal material conditions, such as allowances and rations, with the men having the right to elect representatives to assist the company leadership in managing their material conditions and with all officers and men having the right to look into the books of accounts at any time.

There shall also be military democracy, with the officers teaching the soldiers, the soldiers teaching the officers and soldiers learning from each other with regard to military plans, methods and techniques of fighting. As much as possible, meetings shall be held before and after battles in order to raise fighting knowledge and effectiveness.

Bourgeois and feudal practices between officers and men, such as bullying, shall be absolutely prohibited. The best of relations shall therefore be developed between officers and men within the army so that the army as a whole shall always be oriented towards the maintenance and development of the best relations with the masses.

The officers and men of the New People's Army shall be strictly bound by Comrade Mao Zedong's Three Main Rules of Discipline and Eight Points of Attention and shall always go out of their way to serve the people, aside from performing well their fighting tasks.

2. The New People's Army Must Carry Out Agrarian Revolution, Build Rural Bases and Advance the Armed Struggle.

Since the people's democratic revolution is essentially a peasant war under the leadership of the working class and the Communist Party of the Philippines, and since the peasant struggle for land is the main content of the people's democratic revolution, the New People's Army must launch an agrarian revolution and mobilize the peasant masses, the vast majority of the Filipino people, for the people's democratic revolution.

A revolution is a mass undertaking and so the New People's Army as a revolutionary army must rely on the masses for increasing its fighting strength,

preserving itself, winning battles, winning the whole war and consolidating the power won.

It is only through agrarian revolution that rural bases can be created as great rears for the emergence of more rural bases and more guerrilla zones and that the great masses of the people are mobilized against US imperialism, the comprador big bourgeoisie, the landlord class and the bureaucrat capitalist. Only by destroying the feudal base of US imperialism in the Philippines can the people's democratic revolution be won against US imperialism, feudalism and bureaucrat capitalism.

It is only by having stable base areas that the New People's Army can wage a protracted people's war. From these stable base areas, it can advance wave upon wave against the enemy. By building stable base areas to encircle the city, the biggest graveyard of the enemy forces is created. It is here in the countryside that the enemy is compelled to spread out thinly, lured in and destroyed piece by piece over a long period of time. It is here in the countryside that the enemy becomes exhausted and defeated before the main forces of the New People's Army march in on the cities to seize power finally with the help of workers in a general strike or in a general uprising together with the urban petit bourgeoisie.

It is now the urgent task of the New People's Army to establish the armed independent regime in the countryside on the basis of agrarian revolution. The armed independent regime shall become the focus of an ever-expanding wave of guerrilla zones throughout the country. All commanders and fighters must study with Party cadres how to raise the guerrilla zone to the level of a base area.

The New People's Army must establish its main fighting forces in Luzon to defeat the enemy forces concentrated in Luzon and in the Greater Manila Area, and also big forces at certain points of the Visayas and Mindanao to compel the enemy to disperse its forces at great cost across the archipelago. We must disperse the enemy in two ways: first, throughout the countryside and second, throughout the archipelago. Then we can destroy it piece by piece. For this purpose great rural bases must be created in Luzon, the Visayas and Mindanao. The nationwide expansion of the Party and army should be made in the light of this consideration.

To carry out the armed struggle, the New People's Army should develop four types of armed units: the regular mobile forces, the guerrilla units, the militia or self-defense corps and the armed city partisans. The New People's Army must learn from the experiences of the Chinese and the Vietnamese in

conducting people's war and must be trained to employ new and old fighting methods and military techniques.

Aside from developing marksmanship with various types of guns, the New People's Army must train in night operations, bayoneting, using land mines, mortar fire, tunnel warfare and the like. It must also be able to master all the indigenous methods of fighting that the workers, fishermen, peasants and national minorities know.

In building itself, the New People's Army must be guided by the principle of self-reliance. So long as it is closely linked with the masses of the people and enjoys their support, the New People's Army shall find its efforts adequate for a protracted armed struggle. The Party committees in the army and in local areas must closely unite to carry out the tasks of the people's democratic revolution.

3. The New People's Army Must Build the National United Front.

The New People's Army must build the national united front by upholding and following the leadership of the Communist Party of the Philippines, by welding together through armed struggle the workers and peasants whose alliance serves as the basis of the national united front and by attracting the urban petit bourgeoisie and the national bourgeoisie into the fold of the people's democratic revolution.

Because of the anti-national, anti-democratic and corrupt character of the state that it seeks to destroy and replace, the New People's Army can easily attract the urban petit bourgeoisie which inevitably joins the ranks of the exploited in sentiment and material condition as the crisis aggravates. Because the New People's Army shall confiscate imperialist goods and deprive the imperialists of markets in the provinces, the national bourgeoisie and all small patriotic businessmen shall be encouraged to produce goods locally and to support the revolutionary forces.

In the countryside, the New People's Army must forge an anti-feudal united front to unite the poor peasants and farm workers as an invincible political base, win over the middle peasants and neutralize the rich peasants.

The New People's Army shall be willing to establish a national liberation front as an armed united front of all patriotic and progressive classes, groups and individuals. It welcomes the formation of other armed groups that wage armed struggle against the enemy. The New People's Army shall extend to them as much support and cooperation as it can.

In every instance of cooperative unity, the New People's Army must take firm hold of the revolutionary class line. So long as the goal of any class or group is the destruction of the power of US imperialism, feudalism and bureaucrat capitalism, the New People's Army shall always be willing to extend its cooperation and helping hand. But it shall always be alert to enemy infiltrators and revisionist saboteurs of the armed struggle.

In performing its revolutionary duty of fighting US imperialism, modern revisionism and local reaction, the New People's Army is highly conscious that it is contributing to the development of the international united front and that it is upholding the principle of proletarian internationalism.

Revolutionary armed struggle in the Philippines is certainly an effective part of the worldwide struggle of all oppressed peoples against US imperialism, modern revisionism and all reaction. The overthrow of US imperialism and domestic reaction in the Philippines will be a great contribution towards the total collapse of imperialism and the worldwide triumph of socialism.

Long live Mao Zedong Thought!
Long live the Philippine Revolution!
Long live the Communist Party of the Philippines!
Long live the New People's Army!

*Issued by Meeting of the Red Commanders and Fighters, under the Leadership
of the Central Committee and Military Commission of the
Communist Party of the Philippines
March 29, 1969*

Basic Rules of the New People's Army

March 29, 1969

PREAMBLE

The New People's Army is under the supreme guidance of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought and the Communist Party of the Philippines. It is the revolutionary army of the broad masses of the Filipino people against US imperialism, the comprador big bourgeoisie, the landlord class and the bureaucrat capitalists.

The New People's Army is the principal organization of the Communist Party of the Philippines which takes the path of armed revolution according to Mao Zedong Thought. It is the main weapon to carry out the central task of the Party which is to seize and consolidate political power. It is the instrument which shall overthrow the present bourgeois reactionary puppet government and bring forth the victory of the people's democratic revolution. It is an important tool which significantly contributes to the implementation of the Program for a People's Democratic Revolution of the Communist Party of the Philippines.

The New People's Army wholeheartedly serves the national and democratic interests of the people and is the main backbone of the people's democratic dictatorship. It protects the people from the demonic forces of imperialist and feudal oppression and exploitation. It constantly tries to help the masses in their daily lives. It detests the smallest damage committed against the masses instilling in its officers and men the strict discipline that will prevent them from inflicting any damage to the people.

The New People's Army which is armed with Mao Zedong Thought emerged after it repudiated the counterrevolutionary revisionist errors of the Lavas and Taruc as well as those others who advocate modern revisionism and opportunism whether "Left" or right. Within its ranks, it struggles against the purely military outlook, ultra-democracy, disobedience to organizational discipline, absolute equality, subjectivism, individualism, putschism and the ideology of the roving rebels.

The New People's Army at present is composed of the best fighters who persevere in pursuing armed struggle and popularize the teachings of Mao Zedong. It continues to apply the universal truth of Mao Zedong Thought to the practice of the protracted people's war in the Philippines.

The "Basic Rules of the New People's Army" is extracted from *Foundation for Resuming the Philippine Revolution*, the first volume of the Sison's selected works, pp. 119-132.

While it adheres to the leadership of the working class and the Communist Party of the Philippines, the New People's Army primarily integrates within itself the armed peasants waging agrarian revolution which is the main content of the people's democratic revolution. In this context, the people's democratic revolution is essentially a peasant war which is led by the proletariat.

In the countryside, the New People's Army vigorously struggles to change the backward villages and transform them to become the most developed political, military, economic and cultural bastions of the people's democratic revolution. In order to accomplish this heroic task, the New People's Army primarily relies on the masses of poor peasants and agricultural workers, while encouraging the middle peasants so as to neutralize the rich peasants. This is the revolutionary anti-feudal class line in the countryside.

The New People's Army ensures independence, initiative and leadership of the Communist Party of the Philippines and the proletariat over the national united front. This is achieved by waging armed struggle which tightly unites the peasantry and working class, as the genuine foundation of a broad national democratic unity.

All throughout the protracted people's war, the New People's Army shall rely mainly on the alliance of the proletariat and the peasantry, though it is always ready to work with other patriotic and progressive classes, organizations and individuals that sympathize with the armed struggle against US imperialism, feudalism and bureaucrat capitalism.

The main strategic principle of the New People's Army is a protracted people's war in which its armed units continuously gather strength from the countryside based on people's war, agrarian revolution and building its bases. This includes the strategy of encircling the cities from the countryside, defeating the enemy by portions until its strength wears out.

The people's army has the determination to build bases and stable local government organs and advance in waves until it has effectively crushed the remnants of the enemy's forces which are concentrated in big cities and military camps. It shall systematically create and develop consolidated guerrilla zones capable of running the local people's government. The consolidated bases shall serve as a wide rear for expansion and creating new guerrilla zones and for the development of other democratic revolutionary forces.

The New People's Army will pass through three strategic stages in waging the protracted people's war. The first stage is the strategic defensive, wherein it maintains the initiative in tactical offensives against the strategic military

advantage of the enemy. The second stage is the strategic stalemate, wherein its fighting capacity is more or less equal to that of the enemy. The third and the last stage is the strategic offensive, wherein the forces of the New People's Army have developed their strength capable of assaulting the enemy forces in their very own fortifications within the cities and in big camps.

In the whole period of protracted people's war, the New People's Army has the political initiative because it unites revolutionary theory with revolutionary practice; because it is closely linked with the masses; and because it practices self-criticism for every mistake or weakness it commits.

The New People's Army creates and uses different types of fighting units in conducting the protracted people's war. The guerrilla forces defend the guerrilla bases and zones, pave the way for the formation and development of regular mobile forces. The self-defense units and the militia defend the masses in the localities but are not detached from their daily economic activities. The armed partisans in the cities perform special roles in sabotaging the enemy and punishing traitors in the cities and urban centers. All these fighting units of the New People's Army are coordinated and make use of all methods of warfare brought about by the development of the masses and the objective conditions.

The New People's Army fully understands that in performing its revolutionary task of crushing US imperialism, the comprador big bourgeoisie, the landlord class and the bureaucrat capitalists in the Philippines, it performs a heroic and honorable task for the broad masses of workers and peasants, as well as for the oppressed peoples of the world.

The struggle for the people's democratic revolution as a stage towards socialism is both a national task and a proletarian internationalist act of the New People's Army. The Philippine armed struggle weakens and contributes to the crushing of US imperialism, modern revisionism and all reaction all over the world. Likewise, the armed struggles waged by all other oppressed peoples weaken and help in crushing the enemy in the Philippines.

The New People's Army has an internationalist responsibility to struggle towards the final annihilation of imperialism led by US imperialism, and for the worldwide victory of socialism.

I. THE NEW PEOPLE'S ARMY AND THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF THE PHILIPPINES

Point 1

The New People's Army shall always adhere to the leadership of the Communist Party of the Philippines and thus, it must abide with all decisions, orders and directives of the National Congress, Central Committee, Political Bureau and the Military Commission of the Party.

Point 2

The Military Commission is the highest special organ of the Central Committee that receives regular and special reports from the lowest to the highest military command, and it shall issue appropriate policies, orders and directives.

Point 3

The Military Commission ensures that the Party leadership, organization and life is alive within the New People's Army. The Party branch is based on the company level and the Party group shall work within each squad. All nonregular armed units are directly under the local Party committee.

Point 4

Party committees shall be created from branch level up to the succeeding higher levels and shall be responsible in maintaining the leadership of the Communist Party of the Philippines. These committees also see to it that good relations are developed between the army and the masses, between officers and men, among fighters and between the army as a whole and the local Party committees.

Point 5

The New People's Army shall have its own Political Department which shall be responsible for the proletarian revolutionary education of all officers and men, for raising up proletarian revolutionary cadres from the army, for Party building, and mobilizing the masses especially in new areas of military work.

Point 6

A political officer shall be deployed in each regular mobile force unit, as well as in guerrilla forces in order to teach the fighters, and maintain Party organization and life.

Point 7

Territorial and unit commanders are responsible for internal military administration and operation in their respective areas and units while being guided by the Party at their corresponding levels. The number and special tasks of the deputy commanders shall be determined by the Military Commission.

Point 8

All district commanders, platoon leaders, and all succeeding higher officials must have studied in the Revolutionary School of Mao Zedong Thought.

Point 9

All nonregular fighting units like the guerrilla, militia, self-defense and armed city partisans are directly under the local Party committee. Nevertheless, they shall receive direct orders from the Military Commission or from the military command to link them with the regular mobile forces.

II. THE TASKS OF THE NEW PEOPLE'S ARMY

Point 1

The primary task of the New People's Army at present is to wage a protracted people's war in order to crush the reactionary state power and the interventionist forces of US imperialism, mobilize and defend the masses and advance their national and democratic interests.

Point 2

The New People's Army shall help in organizing the barrio revolutionary committees and other local government organs.

Point 3

The New People's Army shall serve the people in all possible means other than its military tasks.

Point 4

The New People's Army shall conduct revolutionary propaganda work and mobilize the masses.

Point 5

The New People's Army shall assist in organizing the local Party branches, local Party committees and revolutionary mass organizations.

Point 6

The New People's Army shall participate in construction, production and economic work for its own needs, as well as for the needs of the Party and the masses.

Point 7

The New People's Army shall help maintain public order. It shall arrest bad elements and take them to people's courts for trial.

Point 8

Within the New People's Army, different work sections shall be created for office work, training, internal peace and order, intelligence and surveillance, logistics, ordnance and maintenance, medical service, communication and transportation, construction, production and others.

Point 9

The guerrilla forces and regular mobile forces shall be allowed to rest from combat work for a short period of time especially if this shall serve for ideological, political and combat training; consolidation, recuperation and recovery; and the conduct of local political work.

III. MEMBERSHIP IN THE NEW PEOPLE'S ARMY

Point 1

Anyone who is physically fit, regardless of age, sex, race, nationality or religion and has the capacity to fight and ready to participate in a protracted armed struggle against the reactionary state power, may be a member of a fighting unit of the New People's Army.

Point 2

Those who are interested to join the New People's Army must express their intention to any army unit or headquarters, Party committee, Party member or revolutionary mass organization.

Point 3

The local Party committees, armed units of the New People's Army, and the revolutionary mass organizations may initiate to accept individual and collective requests for membership in the people's army or may directly recruit fighters and build new fighting units of the New People's Army.

Point 4

The military command and the local Party committees which are directly responsible in the area shall supervise and administer the recruitment of Red fighters.

Point 5

A higher military command or Party committee has the right to dissolve or rebuild any armed unit based on reasonable grounds.

Point 6

Individuals or groups who escaped from the enemy ranks or captured enemy troops may join the NPA, provided that they undergo reorganization and reeducation. Their membership in the army will be confirmed after a thorough investigation done by the military command and the Party committee not lower than the provincial level.

Point 7

The New People's Army shall conduct regular analysis of class origin, performance in work and readiness to fight of all its fighters in order to continue to upgrade their proletarian revolutionary qualities.

Point 8

The broad majority of members of the New People's Army are armed fighters at all times, although some may be assigned to noncombat work but related to the fighting capacity of the army.

IV. DISCIPLINE

Point 1

The discipline of all officers and men of the New People's Army is a conscious discipline guided by Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought, the Communist Party of the Philippines and the organizational principle of democratic centralism. The Party committees in the army shall see to it that the line, policies and decisions of the Party are implemented by the military command at all levels.

Point 2

The New People's Army adheres to the following discipline:

- a. *An individual is subordinate to the whole army;*
- b. *The minority is subordinate to the majority;*
- c. *The lower level is subordinate to the higher level; and*
- d. *All members are subordinate to the Military Commission and the Central Committee.*

Point 3

All officers and men are prohibited from committing the slightest damage against the interest of the masses and they are always subject to the Three Main Rules of Discipline and the Eight Points of Attention of Comrade Mao Zedong so as to always advance their revolutionary integrity.

- a. *The Three Main Rules of Discipline are:*
 1. Obey orders in all your actions.
 2. Do not take even a single needle or thread from the masses.
 3. Turn over everything confiscated to the proper body.
- b. *The Eight Points of Attention are:*
 1. Be polite in speech.
 2. Pay all purchases with the appropriate amount.
 3. Return everything borrowed.
 4. Compensate all damages.
 5. Do not hurt or curse anybody.
 6. Do not destroy the people's crops.
 7. Do not take liberties with women.
 8. Do not be cruel to captives.

Point 4

All officers are strictly prohibited to use bourgeois and feudal ways in dealing with the fighters and the masses.

Point 5

All officers and men are strictly prohibited from gambling and drunkenness.

Point 6

The Party committee in the army in the appropriate level or the military court that can be created by it, shall conduct the trial and shall decide on the cases filed against officers and men at the level where the error or crime was committed. The following penalties shall be meted out based on the gravity of the crime:

- a. *Strong warning*
- b. *Strong warning and transfer to another area of work*
- c. *Demotion*
- d. *Suspension*
- e. *Expulsion*
- f. *Expulsion and death*

Point 7

In all types of penalties, except for expulsion, and expulsion and death, the erring individual or group shall be reeducated for a definite period of time and shall also apologize to the aggrieved party in public.

Point 8

The most severe punishment of expulsion and death shall be imposed to those proven to have committed treachery, capitulation, abandonment of post, espionage, sabotage, mutiny, inciting for rebellion, murder, theft, rape, arson and severe malversation of people's funds.

Point 9

All cases shall be thoroughly investigated and all accused shall be given a just trial.

V. DEMOCRACY

Point 1

In order to enjoy democracy while maintaining discipline, and in order to avoid ultra-democracy within the New People's Army, all officers, fighters and Party cadres will conduct discussions and studies among themselves on Mao Zedong Thought, the program, policies and decisions of the Communist Party of the Philippines.

Point 2

All officers and men shall conduct together regular and special meetings of criticism and self-criticism in order to ensure their effectiveness in politics and warfare. Ideological, political and organizational errors and weaknesses shall be rectified through criticism and self-criticism.

Point 3

There shall be political democracy. This means that both officers and men shall have the freedom to hold meetings and speak freely on how they can advance their proletarian revolutionary consciousness; how to develop a closer relationship with the masses; how to improve their fighting capacity; how to attend to their non-military work; and how to upgrade their material conditions.

Point 4

There shall be economic democracy within the ranks. This means that both officers and men shall share in times of austerity and prosperity, enjoy equal material conditions such as equal rations and budget. They have the right to collectively manage their food and finances whereby the soldiers shall elect their representative to assist the company leadership. Anyone has the right to check the accounting and logistics records anytime.

Point 5

There shall be democracy in the military field. This means that both officers and men together shall hold meetings before and after military operations and campaigns. The officers teach the fighters, the fighters teach the officers, and the fighters teach one another regarding operational plans, methods and techniques in warfare and how to win battles.

VI. MILITARY CONFERENCES

Point 1

The Military Commission shall convene a national conference at least once a year to discuss the political and military conditions and the corresponding tasks of the New People's Army. The conference shall be attended by the Military Commission, the National Operations Command and the Regional Operations Commands. The chairman of the Military Commission shall head the conference.

Point 2

The Military Commission shall convene a regional military conference at least once in six months to discuss the political and military conditions and the corresponding tasks of the New People's Army in the region. This shall be attended by the representatives of the Military Commission, the Regional Operations Command, the operations commands of the provinces and the regional Party committee. The chief representative of the Military Commission shall head the conference.

Point 3

The Regional Command shall convene a provincial military conference, at least once every four months to discuss the political and military conditions and the corresponding tasks of the New People's Army in the province. This shall be attended by the representatives of the Regional Operations Command, the Provincial Operations Command, operations commands of the districts and the provincial Party Committee. The chief representative of the Regional Operations Command shall head the conference.

Point 4

The Provincial Operations Command shall convene a district military conference at least once in three months to discuss the political and military conditions and the corresponding tasks of the New People's Army in the districts. This shall be attended by the representatives of the Provincial Operations Command, the District Operations Command, district Party committee, secretaries of sections of the Party, all the commanders of the units, and all the Party secretaries of the Army. The chief representative of the Provincial Operations Command shall head the conference.

Point 5

All the conferences mentioned may submit recommendations for the Military Commission of the Central Committee to act upon.

VII. THE MILITARY COMMAND SYSTEM

Point 1

The National Operations Command shall be responsible for the implementation of the national and interregional policies and military plans approved by the Military Commission. The Political Bureau and/or the Central Committee shall direct all formations of the armed units of the New People's Army, and shall make regular and special reports and put forward military recommendations to the Military Commission. The National Operations Command shall be composed of the Commander-in-Chief, his deputies, the regional commanders and their deputies.

Point 2

The Regional Operations Command shall be responsible for the implementation of the regional and interprovincial policies and military plans, direct all formations of armed units of the New People's Army in the region, and make regular and special reports, and put forward military recommendations to the Military Commission and the National Operations Command. The Regional Operations Command shall be composed of the regional commander, his deputies, the provincial commanders and their deputies.

Point 3

The Provincial Operations Command shall be responsible for the implementation of the provincial and inter-district policies and military plans, direct all formations of the armed units in the province, and make regular and special reports, and put forward military recommendations to the Regional Operations Command and provincial Party committee. The Provincial Operations Command shall be composed of the provincial commander, his deputies, the district commanders and their deputies.

Point 4

The District Operations Command shall be responsible for the implementation of the district policies and military plans, direct all formations of the armed units in the district, and make regular and special reports, and put forward military recommendations to the Provincial Operations Command and the district Party committee. The District Operations Command shall be composed of the district commander, his deputies and the commanders of the regular mobile force units, guerrilla units and militia units.

Point 5

The National Operations Command shall be created by the Military Commission. All regional, provincial and district commanders and their respective deputies shall be appointed by the Military Commission, with or without the recommendation of the National Operations Command. All commanders for strategic companies and special operations with national significance shall be appointed by the Military Commission or the Central Committee.

Point 6

Appointment of military commanders shall be determined on the basis of proletarian revolutionary outlook and fighting capacity. However, the commanders of the nonregular units may be developed from the localities in the process of armed struggle.

Point 7

Territorial commanders are superior to the unit commanders and their respective regular territorial command is usually determined by the higher military command.

Point 8

The size and formations of the people's armed forces under any territorial operations command at any level shall be determined by the development of the people's war in general. Its corresponding deployment shall be decided based on the need to ensure success in battles and campaigns and the people's war as a whole.

Point 9

The commanders of the battalion units and succeeding higher levels shall be appointed by the Military Commission upon the recommendation of the National Operations Command. All company commanders shall be appointed by the National Operations Command upon the recommendation of the Party committee. All platoon and squad leaders shall be appointed by their company commander upon the recommendation of the Party group in the squad.

Point 10

In any coordinated operation of all armed unit formations, the regular mobile force shall perform the central task of crushing the enemy.

Point 11

The system of command should not hinder the execution of any immediate military action of any armed unit in a particular area, unless proven that it can affect a bigger military operation against the enemy.

Point 12

The headquarters of the National Operations Command shall be decided upon by the Central Committee or the Military Commission, while the headquarters of the lower command shall be decided upon by the higher command.

VIII. FORMATIONS OF THE PEOPLE'S ARMED FORCES

Point 1

The New People's Army shall have the following combat units:

- a. Regular mobile forces
- b. Guerrilla units
- c. Militia and self-defense units
- d. Armed city partisans

Point 2

The regular mobile force shall be formed in the following manner:

- a. Squad: five to ten fighters and the squad leader.
- b. Platoon: two to three squads and the platoon leader.
- c. Company: two to three platoons with a company commander and his deputies.
- d. Battalion: two to three companies with the battalion commander and his deputies.
- e. Regiment: two to three battalions with the regiment commander and his deputies.
- f. Division: two to three regiments with the division commander and his deputies.
- g. Corps: two to three divisions with the corps commander and his deputies.
- h. Army: two to three corps with the army commander and his deputies.
All territorial and unit commanders shall always endeavor to expand the regular units to their full size.

Point 3

The creation of guerrilla units shall be based on the political situation and the available arms in the area. Merging of one guerrilla unit or parts of it to the regular mobile force shall be decided by the Regional Operations Command, National Operations Command or the Military Commission. Nevertheless,

guerrilla units shall be formed continuously as support forces of the regular mobile forces.

Point 4

The militia and self-defense units shall be composed of individuals who maintain their daily economic activities. They shall perform the primary role of defense while serving as vast reserve and support forces to the regular mobile force and guerrilla units.

Point 5

Each unit of armed city partisans shall be composed of not less than three members. They shall develop their skills, tactics and techniques in city operations, intelligence and surveillance, sabotaging the enemy and the reactionary government; heighten the morale of the workers and the urban petit bourgeoisie; and prepare in a protracted manner for a general insurrection in the city as directed by the Military Commission.

Point 6

The unit commanders and their deputies shall compose the unit operations command.

Point 7

The regular mobile force shall distribute arms and ammunitions to guerrilla fighters, militia and self-defense units, and partisan units to increase their fighting capacity; to include them in the regular troops, or to form new fighting units of the same type. Likewise, the guerrilla units shall distribute arms and ammunitions to the militia and self-defense units to increase their fighting capacity, and to create new fighting units of the same type or to develop them into a higher level of combat formation.

Point 8

Party cadres, officers and men of the New People's Army can be deployed in nonregular armed units as mentioned above in Points 3, 4 and 5.

IX. LOGISTICS

Point 1

The regular mobile force and the guerrilla units of the New People's Army shall have a special allotment from the regular budget of the local people's government, local Party organizations, and/or revolutionary mass organizations.

Point 2

The New People's Army shall take initiative in forming production units such as units for agriculture, transportation, repair and maintenance, and other enterprises which may be of service to the people and the army and provide for its financial and production requirements.

Point 3

The central government of the people shall sell war bonds or allot a reasonable percentage from the money that it shall print to support the New People's Army.

Point 4

The New People's Army shall help the people's government in collecting taxes from business and agriculture, from which it shall directly receive compensation.

Point 5

The units of the New People's Army shall help the masses in their work in exchange for material support.

Point 6

Financial and material contributions given by allies and sympathizers particularly for the New People's Army shall be accepted.

Point 7

A definite percentage from the earnings coming from the confiscated businesses, capital and properties of US imperialism, comprador big bourgeoisie, feudal lords, bureaucrat capitalists and traitors shall be allotted for the use of the New People's Army.

Point 8

A committee shall be created to keep accounts of logistics.

X. AMENDMENTS

Point 1

The Central Committee, Political Bureau or the Military Commission of the Communist Party of the Philippines may initiate to make amendments in the Basic Principles and Rules of the New People's Army.

Point 2

The National Operations Command or any regional operations command may recommend any amendment it deems necessary.

Point 3

The Military Commission and the National Operations Command may issue guidelines and regulations in addition to this Basic Principles and Rules.

Anti-Marxism and Eclecticism

June 15, 1971

Guerrilla Warfare and Marxism is mainly a collection of excerpts from diverse authors. It is edited by William J. Pomeroy who avows as the central aim of the book:

to make clear Marxist-Leninist principles and attitudes in regard to armed struggle, showing how they have emerged in the course of over a century of extremely varied circumstances, and showing how, in the light of new experiences, they may be used to define the issues of controversy that have arisen out of contemporary armed struggles.

A quick look at the table of contents, at the authors' names and the number of pages endowed upon each would immediately show that the book title and the avowed central aim of the editor are misleading and that the editor is utterly dishonest, without any sense of proportion and antagonistic to Marxism and revolutionary guerrilla warfare. By the eclectic choice and arrangement of excerpts, which include so many outrightly anticommunist ones, Pomeroy presents a distorted picture of Marxism and all revolutionary armed struggle.

Decking himself out as some kind of a Marxist arbiter and a revolutionary veteran, Pomeroy endows himself with an unduly great amount of space in the book. He gives a long general introduction and some section introductions, all of which spell out his anti-Marxist standpoint and principal interest of attacking Comrade Mao Zedong and his Marxist-Leninist theory of people's war. Having no regret for serving once as the hack of the anticommunist traitor Luis Taruc, he includes in his collection an excerpt from the counterrevolutionary and egocentric *Born of the People* and boastfully acknowledges authorship of it. He also includes an excerpt from Jorge Maravilla (Pomeroy himself) on the Philippine revolutionary struggle, particularly on the 1950 debacle of the Jose-Jesus Lava leadership.

Marx, Engels, Lenin and Mao Zedong combined have less space than Pomeroy's ramblings. Pomeroy and his fellow writers for the revisionist *World Marxist Review* (like Enrique Lister of Spain, Zizis Zografos of Greece, Bashir Hadj Ali of Algeria, Juan Rodriguez of Venezuela, Alberto Gonzalez of Colombia, Jose Manuel Fortuny of Guatemala, Jose Guello and Asdrubal Dominguez of the Dominican Republic and Luis Corvalan of Chile) hog the way and have more to say than all of Marx, Engels, Lenin, Mao Zedong and Ho Chi Minh

First published in *Ang Bayan*, Special Release, June 15, 1971. The text here is extracted from *Defeating Revisionism, Reformism & Opportunism*, the second volume of the Sison's selected works, pp. 117-144.

combined. To Pomeroy, Stalin has absolutely nothing to say about the Civil War and the anti-fascist Great Patriotic War although Tito and some lesser personalities like I. Minz and A. Fyodorov are allowed some say on armed struggle in the Soviet Union.

Definitely, the revisionist Pomeroy is an ideological swindler who would use a few pages from the great communist leaders only as wrappings for rotten goods. All throughout his compilation, he preoccupies himself with the central aim of brazenly or slyly impugning the universal value of Comrade Mao Zedong's theory and practice of people's war. Unlike his other counterrevolutionary revisionist book, *Guerrilla and Counter-Guerrilla Warfare*, Pomeroy frequently mentions Comrade Mao Zedong, the Lenin of the present era, but only to picture him as merely one among a motley of personalities, which include Kwame Nkrumah, Regis Debray, Ernesto "Che" Guevara, Pomeroy himself and his revisionist confrères.

Guerrilla Warfare and Marxism is a piece of ersatz. It suffices for the time being to have this critique concentrate on Pomeroy's counterrevolutionary revisionist statements to expose the general character of the book and the counterrevolutionary purpose of Pomeroy in making the compilation. However, all comrades are enjoined to study critically every excerpt incorporated and also to get into its theoretical and historical context.

I. MARXISM-LENINISM AND THE QUESTION OF ARMED STRUGGLE

To deny the revolutionary essence of Marxism-Leninism, which is to say the armed overthrow of the reactionary state and the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat, the counterrevolutionary revisionist Pomeroy declares that it would be a “grotesque distortion” if Marxism-Leninism is “equated” with violence and armed methods.

To develop his thesis that Marxism-Leninism is essentially a peaceful effort to change society, he sets up and quarrels with his own straw figures as those “few people” who would take to arms without mass support and without a “revolutionary situation.” It would seem that he insists on mass support for armed revolution. Indeed, every revolutionary undertaking has to be a mass undertaking in order to win; we oppose adventurism as much as we oppose capitulationism. But what Pomeroy actually calls for throughout the world is a protracted legal struggle that avoids armed struggle inasmuch as the reactionaries are “willing” to tolerate that legal struggle. At the core of this revisionist line is the stand that the transition from capitalism to socialism is peaceful, which repeatedly rubs in the treacherous point that to wage armed struggle in any country is to negate and abandon political work that brings about mass support.

We must tell him that in the concrete semi-colonial and semi-feudal conditions of the Philippines, mass mobilization and mass support in extensive areas in the countryside have been brought about in the course of armed struggle. On an unprecedented scale, political work which encompasses the building of the Party, people’s army, local organs of political power and mass organizations is being carried out. It is impossible for the Filipino proletariat to lead the peasantry and win it over as its main force for overthrowing the reactionary state without engaging in armed struggle, agrarian revolution and base building.¹

The central aim of Pomeroy in his general introduction and section introductions and in the manner by which he has edited and arranged his compilation of excerpts is to obscure the revolutionary essence of Marxism-Leninism; deny the advance of Marxism-Leninism to the new and higher stage of Mao

¹ In spite of imperialist-backed “base denial” government operations against it, the New People’s Army has been successful in expanding itself in all regions of the Philippines, developing people’s political power and improving the people’s conditions in many respects. The anti-feudal campaign to reduce land rent and eliminate usury has been given the highest priority.

Zedong Thought; muddle the basic characteristics of the present era; oppose outrightly the theory of people's war when he can no longer obscure it; refuse to give a living definition of revolutionary situation in the period following World War II, especially with regard to countries in the world's countryside; and always in consonance with his revisionist line condemn in overt and covert ways every armed undertaking of the oppressed masses.

In misrepresenting Marxism-Leninism as some kind of bourgeois pacifism, Pomeroy goes to the extent of claiming that Marx and Engels had no definite understanding of the word "force" when they said in 1847 in the *Communist Manifesto* that the ends of Communists "can be attained only by the forcible overthrow of all existing social conditions." Pomeroy states:

Force... in their view—as in the view of outstanding Marxists who have followed them—encompassed the great variety of forms that working class struggles take: mass demonstrations, general strikes, and even the relatively passive boycott, as well as armed uprisings (and in particular, combinations of all these).

Bogged down in bourgeois idealism, this revisionist renegade is incapable of Marxist analysis and is always given to "combining two into one" by babbling mysteriously about "great variety of forms" and "combinations of all these."

Like all revisionist renegades, Pomeroy deliberately avoids laying out and considering fully the two basic aspects of revolutionary struggle, armed struggle and parliamentary or peaceful struggle. These two aspects of revolutionary struggle must be employed at the same time and can be correctly coordinated only by being able to distinguish the principal form from the secondary form in the Philippine revolution, for instance. It is characteristic of Pomeroy to dissolve the importance of armed struggle (which has its own variety of particular forms) by mechanistically mentioning so many forms of parliamentary struggle or by attacking straw figures whom he would arbitrarily picture as waging armed struggle exclusive of the various forms of parliamentary struggle.

We must tell Pomeroy that in the Philippines we are waging armed struggle as the main form of struggle and we are at the same time employing the parliamentary form of struggle as the secondary. The Communist Party of the Philippines is today's vanguard in the waging of both forms of revolutionary struggle whereas the Lava revisionist renegades for whom Pomeroy speaks abroad are far behind the revolutionary movement in the cities or in the countryside

and are always gesticulating and cursing the masses in words echoing those of the US imperialists and the reactionaries.

We Filipino Communists recognize, as genuine Marxists have always done, that among oppressed peoples armed struggle is in the final analysis the most important form of revolutionary struggle and certainly more important than parliamentary struggle. We need to remind Pomeroy that Marx and Engels saw even more clearly in the experience of the Paris Commune of 1871 the necessity of smashing and breaking the bourgeois state machinery and establishing the dictatorship of the proletariat.

What sets scientific socialism apart from utopian socialism and sham socialism of every kind is Marx's theory of the dictatorship of the proletariat. Marx and Engels devoted their lives to the clarification of this theory and to painstaking efforts towards the realization of this theory. In 1852, Marx said:

Long before me, bourgeois historians had described the historical development of this class struggle and bourgeois economists the economic anatomy of the classes. What I did that was new was to prove: 1) that the existence of classes is only bound up with particular historical phases in the development of production, 2) that class struggle leads to the dictatorship of the proletariat, and 3) that this dictatorship itself only constitutes the transition to the abolition of all classes and to a classless society.

After Marx and Engels, the great Lenin brought Marxism to a new and higher stage by developing further the theory and practice of proletarian revolution and proletarian dictatorship in the era of imperialism. He triumphantly led the armed seizure of political power by the Bolsheviks in the October Revolution in 1917 and established the first socialist state. Because of his clear grasp of the revolutionary essence of Marxism, Lenin was able to take full advantage of the favorable conditions for armed revolution created by the first inter-imperialist war. Leninism emerged clearly in the bitter defense of Marxism against the revisionism of Pomeroy's forefathers in the Second International who turned more rotten as imperialism became aggressive.

The October Revolution marked the triumph and correctness of Leninism as a definite stage in the development of Marxism. It changed the world revolution completely by giving it a proletarian character and it made clear and feasible the socialist future of the armed revolutions of all oppressed peoples led by the proletariat. A great breach was made on the imperialist front in the West. The proletarian dictatorship in the Soviet Union immediately stood the

acid test of the Civil War or War Against Intervention and subsequently the anti-fascist Great Patriotic War led by Comrade Stalin. In these great wars, the Soviet people under the great leadership of the party of Lenin defended the socialist fatherland by waging armed resistance against imperialist aggression.

Taking the road opened by the Paris Commune and further extended by the October Revolution, the Chinese proletariat and people led by Comrade Mao Zedong launched a protracted people's war, defeated their enemies and made a great breach on the imperialist front in the East. Comrade Mao's correct theory and victorious practice of people's war constituted another great contribution to the treasury of Marxism-Leninism. By this contribution, the Marxist-Leninist theory of proletarian dictatorship has been tremendously enriched and raised to a new and higher level. To all oppressed nations, big and small, in the world's countryside, Comrade Mao Zedong showed how people's war can be conducted against big imperialist powers.

The Chinese revolution changed further the character of the world revolution by making fuller its proletarian character. As Lenin linked the socialist revolution in the West to the national democratic revolution in the East, Mao Zedong linked the national democratic revolution in the East to the socialist revolution in the West. In the conduct of seizing political power in their respective countries, the methods employed by Lenin and Mao Zedong complemented each other. In smashing the enemy, one moved from the cities to the countryside and the other moved from the countryside to the cities.

As a result of World War II, the world situation changed drastically. As a result of the disaster suffered by world capitalism and the emergence of a series of socialist countries, it has been possible for small and weak countries to take their destinies into their own hands by taking up arms, especially in the world's countryside of Asia, Africa and Latin America. The imperialist countries headed by US imperialism have had to face an ever-increasing number of oppressed peoples daring to fight them. The oppressed peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America have steadily advanced in their revolutionary struggles as their leaderships have increasingly adhered to Chairman Mao's theory of people's war and strategic line of encircling the cities from the countryside.

Even as more and more oppressed peoples in Asia, Africa and Latin America are grasping Chairman Mao's theory of people's war so that the world's countryside now surrounds the cities of the world, the evil wind of modern revisionism blows and tries to sway the oppressed peoples of the world from armed revolution. In the guise of attacking one person, that of the great Marx-

ist-Leninist Stalin, Khrushchev betrayed and attacked the Party of Lenin, put the Soviet Union on the capitalist road, disrupted the international communist movement, changed the red color of some other countries and bargained away principles to US imperialism. After Khrushchev, the Brezhnev gang has gone on to promote modern revisionism and to perpetrate the most barbarous acts of social-fascism and social-imperialism.

Confronted with the problem of preventing the restoration of capitalism in a socialist society, Comrade Mao Zedong put forward the theory of continuing revolution under the dictatorship of the proletariat and personally initiated and led the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution. In the course of the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution, it became clear to Marxist-Leninists the world over that Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought is the clear demarcation line between genuine Marxist-Leninists and sham Marxist-Leninists. Mao Zedong Thought has been lofted as the Marxism-Leninism of the present era when imperialism is heading for total collapse and socialism is marching toward world victory.

The Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution is a bitter mass struggle waged by the proletariat against the bourgeoisie in a socialist society. It has resulted in the consolidation of the dictatorship of the proletariat and the overthrow of the incorrigible capitalist-roaders headed by China's Khrushchev, Liu Shaoqi. China has become the strongest bulwark of socialism, ensuring the total collapse of imperialism and the worldwide victory of socialism. It provides powerful support to all the armed revolutions being waged by the oppressed nations and peoples. It serves the main trend of the world today which is revolution. The consolidation of socialism in China is of immense benefit not only to the Chinese people but also to the people of the whole world. The hundreds of millions of Chinese people are now more than ever prepared for any eventuality even as they can give ever more powerful support to the armed revolution of oppressed peoples.

Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought firmly stands for revolutionary violence. In the more than one hundred years of Marx to Mao Zedong, revolutionary violence has remained the essence of Marxism in both theory and practice.

Chairman Mao teaches us:

The seizure of power by armed force, the settlement of the issue by war, is the central task and the highest form of revolution. This Marxist-Le-

ninist principle of revolution holds good universally, for China and for all other countries.

II. THE UNIVERSAL SIGNIFICANCE OF CHAIRMAN MAO'S THEORY OF PEOPLE'S WAR

Chairman Mao's theory of people's war is summed up from twenty-two continuous years of people's war in a vast country like China. It was a war passing through the Agrarian Revolutionary War, the War of Resistance Against Japan, and the People's War of Liberation against the US-Chiang clique. The protraction in time and the vastness of scale of this people's war, contending with the most powerful imperialist and puppet armies and encompassing the widest yet the most particular circumstances, are unprecedented in the entire history of mankind and of the international communist movement. The laws summed up from this war cannot be belittled. The whole range of strategy and tactics of people's war formulated by Chairman Mao fulfills Engels' profound prediction that: "The emancipation of the proletariat, in its turn, will have its specific expression in military affairs and create its specific, new military method."²

Only a counterrevolutionary idealist will fail to see the universal significance of the victory of people's war in China and the fact that it has profoundly acted upon world reality. The vastness of China cannot be considered a particularity that separates or isolates the Chinese revolution from other revolutionary struggles in terms of theory and practice. There are those who superficially think that Chairman Mao's theory of people's war applied only in a vast country like China and who also talk as if this country were not composed of many parts, from which the most complex problems arose and were solved by Chairman Mao. We must recognize the universal truth of Chairman Mao's theory of people's war and the rich practical experience on which it is based. Genuine Marxist-Leninists the world over have accepted it as an important component of today's Marxism-Leninism and are accordingly being guided by it in making revolution.

After World War II, oppressed nations and peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America have continued to take the road of armed revolution on a long-term basis. Most of those waging armed struggle in the world's countryside are applying Chairman Mao's strategic line of encircling the cities from the countryside. Taken together, the peoples fighting for national liberation and democracy in

² Frederick Engels, "Possibilities and Perspectives of the War of the Holy Alliance Against France in 1852", *Collected Works of Marx and Engels*, Russ. ed., Moscow, 1956, Vol. VII, p. 509.—*Ed.*

colonies and semi-colonies help the proletariat in the cities of the world in its revolutionary struggle. From the main battlefield of the world anti-imperialist struggle, the Vietnamese, Cambodian and Laotian peoples have helped bring about a situation in the United States and other capitalist countries in which increasingly large masses of people rise up to fight the evil of US imperialism. The crisis of imperialism, particularly of its main pillar the United States, has been caused in a big and fundamental way by the victories of people's war.

That the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America can wage armed struggle without having to wait for the "revolutionary situation" suited for a city insurrection in capitalist countries is a confirmation of Lenin's theory of imperialism's uneven development which has been amplified correctly in theory and in practice by Chairman Mao. The weakest links of imperialist power are found in the countryside of the world just as they are also to be found in the countryside of a semi-colonial and semi-feudal country. This countryside provides the people with a vastly greater area for maneuver and it cannot be occupied by the enemy as thoroughly as it would the cities, especially in the stage of its strategic offensive. Until the situation is ripe for their seizure, the cities are the well-secured centers of the political and economic power of the enemy.

Chairman Mao teaches us:

Since China's key cities have long been occupied by the powerful imperialists and their reactionary Chinese allies, it is imperative for the revolutionary ranks to turn the backward villages into advanced, consolidated base areas, into great military, political, economic and cultural bastions of the revolution from which to fight their vicious enemies who are using the cities for attacks on the rural districts, and in this way gradually to achieve the complete victory of the revolution through protracted fighting; it is imperative for them to do so if they do not wish to compromise with imperialism and its lackeys but are determined to fight on, and if they intend to build up and temper their forces, and avoid decisive battles with a powerful enemy while their own strength is inadequate.³

The revisionist pipsqueak Pomeroy has the temerity to claim that Chairman Mao's theory of people's war lacks universal significance and that the Chinese revolution does not even qualify as an "Asian model." He says outright:

³ Mao Zedong, "The Chinese Revolution and the Chinese Communist Party", *Selected Works*, Eng. ed., Foreign Languages Press, Beijing, 1965, Vol. II, pp. 316-17.—*Ed.*

In fact, successfully conducted guerrilla war has rarely pursued such a pattern (of setting up liberated areas and surrounding the cities from the countryside), contrary to the belief widely held, and to the claim of Chinese leaders themselves that it constitutes a model.

He also attacks Chairman Mao's theory of people's war as being "in conflict" with the fundamental concept of internationalism in Marxist-Leninist theory because, according to him, it dismisses the "alliance of the socialist countries and of the working class" and revolutionary forces in the capitalist countries with the national liberation movements in the colonial and neocolonial countries. Becoming more vicious in his vituperation, he babbles that the "un-Marxist generalizations" of Chairman Mao's theory and strategic line become more "emphasized" when expanded into an international principle. He boasts mendaciously that Chairman Mao's theory of people's war has been "dissipated" in Vietnam by the "three-way unity of liberation movements, the socialist countries, and the revolutionary and progressive movements in the capitalist countries."

In contending that the Chinese revolution has no universal significance, Pomeroy dogmatizes that the October Revolution is the only universal model of armed revolution. He goes so far as to oppose in an absolute way the October Revolution to the Chinese revolution, Lenin to Mao Zedong and Leninism to Mao Zedong Thought instead of recognizing the continuity and distinction between stages of development. The great Lenin should be turning in his grave; his name is being used against Marxism-Leninism by a revisionist scoundrel.

The anti-Marxist and anti-Leninist Pomeroy wants to kill the vitality of Marxism-Leninism, its continuous theoretical and practical development. In reducing the meaning of "revolutionary situation" to conditions like those attending the October Revolution, conditions that permitted the immediate seizure of cities in an imperialist country after a period of protracted legal struggle, he completely negates the fact that the world proletarian revolution has been fought in varying conditions, has undergone distinct stages of development and has wrought changes in the world such that a revolutionary situation now exists in the whole continents of Asia, Africa and Latin America after World War II and that the world revolutionary situation has never been better. Favorable conditions for revolution have so arisen in the world's countryside that small and weak countries here can wage and persist in protracted people's war so long as they adhere to Chairman Mao's theory and strategic line.

There is one basic difference to recognize in considering the revolutionary forces. Here protraction in legal struggle as the principal form of struggle is necessary and all right so long as forces decide to launch armed struggle; failure to seize the cities within the shortest possible time can be disastrous for the revolutionary forces. Here protraction in legal struggle as the principal form of struggle is necessary and alright so long as ideological and political work is conducted to prepare the proletariat for the armed seizure of power. However, in the world's countryside where the people undergo multiple oppression by imperialism and local reaction, revolutionary forces have the advantage of being able to engage in protracted people's war in the wide expanses of the countryside. This is in keeping with Lenin's theory of imperialism's uneven development and the Marxist-Leninist method of attacking the enemy at his weakest points. The national democratic revolution in the world's countryside certainly helps to hasten the ripening of the revolutionary situation in the cities of the world.

Pomeroy is so insanely against the universal significance of the Chinese revolution that he denies its significance even to the Asian peoples. He argues that the Chinese revolution is not even an "Asian model" (a fancy term of the bourgeois academicians) by discussing the "particular conditions" and "variegated forms" of armed struggles in Asia only to break these off from each other and from the Chinese revolution absolutely. By trying to isolate the Chinese revolution, Pomeroy also tries to isolate the revolutionary movement in every country and raises the black banner of chauvinism rather than advocate the integration of Marxist-Leninist theory and the concrete conditions of a country. Any criticism of dogmatism is sham when it is used as a camouflage for pushing empiricism forward. The empiricism of Pomeroy easily leads to attempts to deprive even the October Revolution of its universal significance though at certain times he poses to be dogmatic in insisting that city insurrections be the principal form of armed struggle in Asia, Africa and Latin America.

Consistent with his counterrevolutionary revisionist standpoint, Pomeroy distorts Vietnamese history. He dishes up the tale that the Vietnamese national liberation forces led by comrade Ho Chi Minh suddenly dropped from the skies and descended upon Hanoi to establish the Democratic Republic of Vietnam by city uprising. The truth is that these revolutionary forces had to gather strength among the people in the countryside before they could launch any insurrection in cities held by the Japanese fascists. Such strength developed mainly among the peasant masses still had to undergo the test of armed aggress-

sion by the French colonialists and their allies after the seizure of Hanoi. Even now the Vietnamese people and the entire Indochinese people rely mainly on their strength in the countryside to resist US imperialism, the biggest and fiercest imperialist aggressor.

The influence of Chairman Mao is very evident in the following words of Vo Nguyen Giap:

While the working class is the class leading the revolution, the peasantry is the main force of the revolution, full of anti-imperialist and anti-feudal spirit. Moreover, in waging the Resistance War, we relied on the countryside to build our basis from which to launch guerrilla warfare in order to encircle the enemy in the towns and eventually arrive at liberating the towns.

In trying to dismiss Chairman Mao's theory and strategic line as being only "one of those things" and having no worthwhile significance in the whole of Asia, Africa and Latin America, Pomeroy takes pride in a lot of wrong things, makes the most outright anticommunist statements and in the style of an intriguer considers as superior to a victorious and well-consolidated revolution those armed struggles still in progress and in fact guided by Chairman Mao's strategic line of encircling the cities from the countryside.

Pomeroy expresses satisfaction that the Jose-Jesus Lava leadership did not use in 1950 the teachings of Chairman Mao on people's war even as he admits (what else can he do but admit) that this "Left" opportunist leadership failed. But, fool that he is, he expresses belief that there should have been more violations of Chairman Mao's theory of people's war for that particular armed struggle to have been won. He even contends that the Jose-Jesus Lava leadership would have been successful had the Communist Party not taken a prominent role in the armed struggle. He considers as exemplary the fact that Marxism-Leninism and the Communist party were not in command of the armed struggles in Algeria and Cuba.

With regard to Africa, Pomeroy states:

Historically-evolved conditions in most African countries do not permit the rise of a working-class party, with an absence of a proletariat and worker-peasant alliances or radicalized petit-bourgeois groups from the leadership that does come out of such conditions.

Pomeroy wishes to create an image of an Africa completely isolated from modern civilization, notwithstanding the long period that this continent has been subjected to imperialist domination. Another thing that he does to negate the Chinese revolution and Chairman Mao is to imply that the African peoples have nothing to learn from them. As a matter of fact, he would even at the present stage rather rate higher Amilcar Cabral of the Partido Africano da Indendencia da Guine e Cabo Verde and Eduardo Mondlane of FRELIMO than the leaders of revolutions already triumphant under clear Marxist-Leninist leadership and already on the path of socialist revolution.

Pomeroy tries to impugn the correct ideas of Chairman Mao that guided the Chinese revolution from victory to victory as being “unMarxist.” Only a counterrevolutionary idealist would deny the victories of the national democratic revolution and socialist revolution in China under the leadership of Chairman Mao. Let us examine a bit of thinking that this revisionist fool makes on Chinese history. Wishing to reverse what is already a verdict of Chinese history, Pomeroy states in reference to the urban uprisings of 1927 in China:

These were failures not because the principles of a revolution with urban insurrection playing a key role were not applicable to China, but because of the uneven development of the Chinese revolution and of its worker-peasant alliance and because of departures from insurrectionary principles (the Guangdong Commune, for example, had a closer affinity to the Paris Commune than to the October insurrections in Petrograd and Moscow).

This revisionist fool absolutely disregards the semi-colonial and semi-feudal conditions of China even though he pretends to recognize the law of uneven development at work on the side of the revolutionary forces. He insists that city insurrections were alright in China then, had the October Revolution, not the Paris Commune, been dogmatically imitated. However, he does not bother to explain what were those differences between the Paris Commune and the October insurrections, which differences are presumed by him to be more important than those between capitalist countries and semi-feudal countries. The error of the urban uprisings in China in 1927 was in fighting to the end in the cities and in relying on foreign support. They were correct only insofar as they signaled armed resistance to the Kuomintang reactionaries. The road to the countryside and the Jinggang mountains were correctly shown by Chairman Mao.

To belittle the self-reliant revolutionary efforts of the Chinese people in defeating Japanese imperialism and then the Kuomintang reactionaries, he considers as “a significant factor” in the final victorious offensives launched by the Chinese Red Army the military equipment supposedly turned over by the Soviet Red Army from the Japanese imperialists in Manchuria. Yet he completely discounts the fact that, though there was coordination between the Chinese Red Army and the Soviet Red Army in Manchuria, the main support for military victories was the painstaking mass work and long-term armed struggle waged by the Chinese Communist Party and the Chinese people in the area. It needs also to be pointed out that armaments captured from the Japanese imperialists were largely turned over to the Kuomintang. Under the correct leadership of Chairman Mao, the Chinese people on their own self-reliant efforts, independence and initiative were able to liberate both the north and south of their country.

Because he expects that every people fighting for national liberation should be dependent mainly on foreign material assistance, Pomeroy makes the contention that Chairman Mao’s theory of people’s war is lacking in internationalism. The propagation of a correct theory and the taking of anti-imperialist policies and actions by a socialist country like China constitutes an important support for the oppressed peoples of the world. Also, China has performed well its duty of extending material support to various revolutionary movements and anti-imperialist countries. But China has always stood firm on the principle that the people can liberate themselves by relying mainly on themselves. With regard to the Vietnamese revolutionary struggle against the US war of aggression, China is a reliable rear base and is consistently providing tremendous amounts of necessary support for the Vietnamese people. On the other hand, the Soviet revisionist renegades give mere token support to Vietnam only to use it as a basis for making bargains with US imperialism over the heads of the Vietnamese people, for sabotaging the Vietnamese revolution and for sowing intrigues in revolutionary ranks. China has no use for what Pomeroy calls an “alliance of socialist countries,” an expression for mixing up genuine socialist countries and sham socialist countries, to support the Vietnamese struggle. The bilateral relations between China and Vietnam are good enough for each one to perform its internationalist duty.

Now that the US war of aggression in Vietnam has expanded into one covering the whole of Indochina, we find the pretensions of Soviet social-imperialism totally dissipated, not Chairman Mao’s theory of people’s war and strategic

line of encircling the cities from the countryside. Soviet social-imperialism brazenly supports the US-Lon Nol reactionary clique in Cambodia, condones US aggression against the Laotian people, and continues to give mere token and sham support for the Democratic Republic of Vietnam. As previously pointed out, Soviet social-imperialism wishes to make use of the Indochinese war of resistance against US aggression and for national salvation basically for striking bargains with US imperialism. But the Indochinese people are ever more firmly united to fight for their own liberation against the US imperialist aggressors and their reactionary stooges.

III. GUERRILLA WARFARE RAISED TO THE LEVEL OF MARXIST-LENINIST THEORY AND STRATEGY

In the early period of the Agrarian Revolutionary War or the Second Revolutionary Civil War, Chairman Mao laid the basic tactics of guerrilla warfare as follows: “The enemy advances, we retreat; the enemy camps, we harass; the enemy tires, we attack; the enemy retreats, we pursue.” Guerrilla war tactics were further developed during the War of Resistance Against Japan. As a matter of fact, guerrilla warfare as a whole was raised to the level of strategy. In the extended stage of strategic stalemate in the war of resistance, guerrilla warfare played the primary role in arousing the broad masses of the people on a nationwide scale and in fighting the militarily superior enemy. It played the decisive role in the multiplication, tempering and maturation of the fighting units that could subsequently be raised to the level of regular mobile forces in the later period of the war of resistance and during the Third Revolutionary Civil War. In the rich experience of people’s war in China, we draw the universal lesson that guerrilla warfare does not only prepare for but also serves as constant auxiliary for regular mobile warfare.

Having been raised to the level of Marxist-Leninist theory and strategy by Chairman Mao, guerrilla warfare has become a powerful revolutionary weapon in the hands of oppressed peoples who have to contend with far stronger and better equipped modern armies of imperialism and the reactionaries. By and large, guerrilla warfare has ceased to be something that can be used with success by revolutionaries and reactionaries “alike.”

What now determines the basic character of guerrilla warfare in this epoch is its employment by revolutionary forces in the world’s countryside. US counter-guerrilla tactics, banditry or any attempt at guerrilla warfare without its integration with the building of the revolutionary party, united front, rural base areas, mass organizations, and organs of democratic political power is bound to fail in the face of genuine revolutionary guerrilla warfare in line with Chairman Mao’s theory of people’s war.

Guerrilla warfare became on an unprecedented world scale the weapon of the oppressed nations and downtrodden masses during and after World War II. In the Philippines, however, the Jose-Jesus Lava leadership of the old merger party failed to use it well. Failing to recognize and master the Marxist-Leninist character given to guerrilla warfare by Comrade Mao Zedong, this opportunist leadership adopted in 1950 the “Left” opportunist line of “quick military vic-

tory” and ordered small guerrilla units, with a total troop strength of no more than five thousand, to take the “strategic offensive” against the enemy. Under the slogan of “all-out armed struggle,” this leadership did not pay attention to the step-by-step building of the Party, people’s army and the united front; and to the step-by-step raising of the level of armed struggle on the basis of the agrarian revolution and the building of revolutionary bases.

Going by his brief and narrow experience with the Jose-Jesus Lava leadership, Pomeroy always strains to express disdain for guerrilla warfare. He goes so far as to invoke the names of Marx and Engels in an attempt to preclude guerrilla warfare from the range of strategy and tactics available to the proletariat and its revolutionary party, especially in the world’s countryside. He writes:

Although Marx and Engels approved of guerrilla warfare as a form of popular struggle, neither of them tended to link it with working class tactics of gaining power, which were thought of in terms of insurrection in which the organized masses of the people would be brought into play in decisive action at decisive moments.

Pomeroy presents himself in a dogmatic posture as one being for the use of urban insurrection alone in revolutionary armed struggle. But behind this posture is his calculation that since urban insurrection is not immediately possible for the people in colonies and semi-colonies then he can insist that they should not at all engage in armed struggle but should engage in parliamentary struggle as the sole or main form of struggle for a protracted and indefinite period of time. This is what we call “Left” in form but Right in substance. Completely unmasking himself, he contends:

The prominence of armed struggle in liberation movements in many countries should not obscure the fact that independence from imperialist rule has been gained in a large number of cases by other means, including general strikes, mass demonstrations and political organization and agitation that has made popular sentiment undeniably clear.

He goes so far as to consider as having peacefully and truly become independent those countries whose “independence” has been “granted” by the imperialists or is the result of compromise between the imperialist countries and the local bourgeoisie, especially those elements that are or that are to become big comprador-bureaucrats. Pomeroy puts himself into ridicule by engaging in this mendacity and also by resorting to some futile juggling of terms: “In

these independent states the revolutionary or liberation process may not have been completed by the act of independence alone..." (underscoring ours). He also considers of "great satisfaction of Marxists" for countries to have no Marxist-Leninist leadership and to take "non-capitalist paths" ruled by US imperialism, Soviet social-imperialism and local comprador-bureaucrat capitalism.

Pomeroy wants to paint a large picture of defeat for the oppressed peoples of the world. By sheer verbiage, he wishes to convince everyone that the temporary defeats in some countries far outweigh the large and solid victories of people's war in China and other countries. He also disregards the fact that where temporary defeats are suffered the revolutionary forces can always strive to recover and persist in revolutionary armed struggle until victory is won. He babbles:

The spectacular success of guerrilla warfare in a number of liberation struggles—especially in China, Vietnam, Algeria and Cuba—has tended to gloss over the fact that several major guerrilla struggles were defeated in the same period, the most important being Malaya, Philippines, Greece, Burma and Kenya, while serious setbacks, at the least, have been given to guerrilla attempts launched in the Congo, Peru, Bolivia and elsewhere. It is quite evident from this that broad and universal generalizations about the efficacy of armed struggle or guerrilla tactics cannot safely be made.

The safe generalization that Pomeroy obviously wants to make is that armed counterrevolution and bourgeois pacifism are efficacious.

Pomeroy pictures the revolutionary forces as being passive, lacking in initiative and merely waiting to be compelled to wage armed struggle. He prates:

Every liberation movement has preferred to use peaceful, legal means to win freedom. These popular movements, denied such means of expressing themselves and met by an increasing use of violence by a desperate and crumbling imperialist system, have literally been compelled to adopt violent methods to gain popular ends.

He wants "preparations for armed struggle" to be done only when "all other doors to legal, peaceful ways of effecting change have been slammed shut"—when "warranted by the behavior of the reactionary class forces."

To further support his revisionist stand, Pomeroy takes advantage of the patent failure of Ernesto "Che" Guevara and Regis Debray to serve up the

“Cuban model” as the “universal model” for armed revolution surpassing the Chinese revolution. He gloats over the failure of the Latin American Organization of Solidarity (OLAS) to promote the “Cuban model” and also that of Guevara and Debray in their Bolivian adventure which did not attend correctly to the tasks of party building, united front building and mass work as the necessary support for armed struggle. Ostensibly to overwhelm the excerpts from Castro, Guevara and Debray, those excerpts from the counterrevolutionary revisionist Juan Rodriguez, Alberto Gonzalez, Jose Manuel Fortuny, Jose Cuello and Asdrubal Dominguez and Luis Corvalan are made to hog the entire section of Latin America.

These Latin American revisionists and Right opportunists give support to Pomeroy’s idealist and opportunist line of “combining all forms of struggle” without giving attention to the principal form of struggle and to the strategic aim of seizing political power; beating up the straw figure that is “all-out armed struggle” or “guerrilla movement alone;” supporting the “lesser evil,” oftentimes the puppet clique in power which is rapidly being isolated; and laying the principal stress on urban peaceful struggle for the sake of urban uprisings in the future and of concessions from the reactionaries in the meantime.

In attacking guerrilla warfare as revolutionary method, Pomeroy wants the revolutionary forces in the world’s countryside to vacillate between hoping indefinitely for city insurrections based on imagined conditions similar to the revolutionary situation in the October Revolution and starting guerrilla warfare only on the basis of a “revolutionary situation” that Pomeroy wants to sound mysterious about. At any rate, his consistent view is to have mass movements engage in protracted peaceful and legal struggle as the only or main form of struggle. In this regard, he has excessive praise for such revisionist parties and revisionist writers as those represented in the section on Latin America in his compilation. He pictures them as being for armed struggle but anyhow as being still in the stage of preparing indefinitely for it peacefully or in the stage of withdrawing from previous armed struggles. He evaluates his revisionist colleagues as of higher worth than the great revolutionary leaders of, say, China and Indochina.

Why does Pomeroy advocate protracted peaceful struggle in opposition to Chairman Mao’s theory of protracted people’s war in the world’s countryside? He makes the conclusion that since US imperialism is capable of recognizing “realities” (particularly the superpower maneuvers of the Soviet Union and

peaceful mass movements) its aggressive nature will eventually change. He chatters:

Popular armed struggles of today have been shaped largely by the imperialist tactics of violence, and the forms of struggle in the coming period will be affected to a considerable extent by the degree to which imperialism is forced to recognize the realities in the changed balance of power. Some revolutionaries would contend that American imperialism is rigidly incapable of acknowledging such a fact or of doing anything to meet it other than what it is doing today. However, a Marxist-Leninist, while ready for any form of struggle, must also be prepared for the complexity of change.

By that “complexity of change” (a mystifying phrase denoting the incapability of “dividing one into two,”) Pomeroy contends that US imperialism will change its nature.

Pomeroy completely exposes himself as an agent of US imperialism. He mocks what he calls the “apocalyptic vision” that imperialism and capitalism are being besieged and smothered in a mounting crescendo of guerrilla wars. He insinuates that those who hold the view that the world revolutionary situation is excellent are not Marxist-Leninist and are swayed by “emotion and temperament.” He claims as having a “static essence” the general formulation that imperialism and the capitalist system as a whole are in a state of crisis and that the present epoch is a revolutionary one. He grants to US imperialism all the positive vitality that he can imagine and wishes to render the revolutionary forces to become static before such a moribund and decadent monster. He disagrees with the view that now is the era of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought, when imperialism is heading for total collapse and socialism is marching toward worldwide victory. He consistently refers to the particularity of certain countries as an empiricist would with the mechanistic end of separating the particular from the general or universal.

Crudely taking sides with US imperialism, Pomeroy argues that the revolutionaries have only themselves to blame for waging armed struggle whenever US imperialism attempts to crush them militarily. He rails threateningly that “those who become overly committed to ideas of armed struggle” will surely become destroyed or forced to difficult retreats. He boasts of the power of US imperialism in the following manner: “Imperialist counterinsurgency opera-

tions have been designed especially to take advantage of this type of error.” Sweepingly, he calls armed struggle “this type of error.”

He boasts of the advanced military technology of imperialism and tries to blackmail the people with its supposed efficacy in suppressing revolutionary movements. He quacks:

Attempts by imperialism in the contemporary period to suppress revolutionary movements by using the most advanced military technology—helicopters, napalm, chemical warfare, electronic devices—bear comparison with the use of then-new military developments to drive revolutionary movements off the streets in the time of Marx and Engels, over 100 years ago.

Resorting to nuclear blackmail in an oblique manner, Pomeroy also poses as one extremely concerned about US imperialism being forced by revolutionary armed struggles to start an atomic war. He jabbers:

The changes could bring an atomic conflict between socialism and imperialism—a type of armed struggle that the socialist countries and the communist movement internationally seek to prevent because of the catastrophic effect it would have on mankind in general.

While Pomeroy would like to frighten the people with the military technology and nuclear weapons of US imperialism, he would also like them to believe that the world capitalist system would soon be left undefended by any capitalist power and that US imperialism itself, the chief defender of such a system, is just about to abandon its role of gendarme out of sheer pity for the American taxpayers and also out of sheer sympathy for mass struggles that find no more use for armed struggle, particularly guerrilla warfare. He prates:

French and British imperialism have already been forced in this direction and American imperialism, with divisions in its ranks over the cost of wars of suppression, is not immune from it.

He prates further:

It is unreal... to contend that it (police role of US imperialism) cannot be altered by mass struggle against it, and it is obvious that in each of the possibilities of changes in the world situation a diversity of forms

of struggle would present themselves to revolutionary movements, of which guerrilla warfare would only be one.

Next to Pomeroy as a brazen supporter of US imperialism in the compilation is Henry Winston of the revisionist renegade Communist Party of the United States of America who preaches to the Afro-American people to douse their militancy, love the Uncle Toms and peacefully demand additional black representation on all levels of the imperialist state. Like Pomeroy, Winston warns the Afro-American people to stop their “terrorism” and “provocations” lest the white supremacists crush them. To him Pomeroy gives the privilege of putting the final touch on this book.

IV. ONCE MORE ON THE QUESTION OF ARMED STRUGGLE IN THE PHILIPPINES

Pomeroy admits that during World War II the old merger party of the Communist Party and Socialist Party acquired arms and experience in guerilla warfare and that at the close of the war the leadership abandoned armed struggle in order to engage in peaceful forms of organization and struggle. The armed struggle continued in a spontaneous way; it developed during the 1946-48 period without the planning and initiative of the leadership of the old merger party. The people used the arms which they had retained in the spirit of self-defense because even before the end of the war of resistance against Japanese fascism, US army personnel and their local cohorts had already subjected them to persecution and armed attacks.

The Lavas and the Tarucs formally adopted the policy of armed struggle in May 1948 only after finding themselves rebuffed in their bid to gain official seats in the bourgeois reactionary government. Even when this policy was already supposed to be implemented, the Lavas and Tarucs continuously maneuvered for accommodation in the reactionary government and were willing to end the armed struggle in return. We can easily cite events which prove this point. These were the amnesty agreement with the Quirino puppet regime in June 1948; the presentation of an obsequious memorandum by the old merger party to an anticommunist committee in the reactionary congress in December 1948; and the support given to the presidential bid of Laurel in 1949 in the vain hope that the Nacionalista Party would give concessions to the Lavas and Tarucs. All of these were consistent with the policy of the Lavas and Tarucs that had been adopted as early as September 1944 and implemented thereafter to welcome the return of US imperialism and the Osmeña puppet regime and have the old merger party engage in parliamentary struggle under the Democratic Alliance.

Pomeroy proudly states that the leadership of the old merger party followed "its own path," departing from the road of the Chinese revolution. He admits though that Chinese comrades "introduced Chinese Red Army ideas into the Huk organization" during the Japanese occupation. But, according to him, the Lavas and Tarucs followed their own path, "governed by the Filipino peasant social structure, by Philippine terrain and geographical conditions." Sounding righteous about this path, Pomeroy boasts that the Lavas and Tarucs never found use even in 1950 for "the Chinese pattern" of setting up base areas and

encircling the cities from the countryside. He puts in the gratuitous opinion that “in fact, successfully conducted guerrilla war has rarely pursued such a pattern, contrary to the belief widely held, and to the claim of the Chinese leaders themselves that it constitutes a model.” He considers as correct and positive the guerrillaism, the roving rebel tactics, and in 1950 the impetuous desire of the Lavas and Tarucs to seize power in the cities within two years.

Only a fool takes pride in failure. Only an anti-Marxist counterrevolutionary can regard the violation of correct Marxist-Leninist teachings, particularly Chairman Mao’s theory of people’s war and strategic line, as the very proof for the “incorrectness” and “untruth” of what is correct and truthful. Have the Lavas and Tarucs won victory or persisted in revolutionary struggle by deliberately refusing to establish base areas and to take the line of encircling the cities from the countryside? No! Whereas Pomeroy admits that the Lavas and Tarucs violated the theory of people’s war and failed to win victory or even persist in armed struggle, Pomeroy insists like the anti-Marxist counterrevolutionary fool that he is that there should have been more violations of the theory. What he obviously hankers for is more failure.

The defeat of the 1950 “all-out armed struggle” policy of the Jose Lava leadership is explained by Pomeroy in terms that completely disregard Chairman Mao’s theory of people’s war and that violate fundamental principles of Marxism-Leninism. He gives four reasons for the defeat: 1) The Party was incorrect in concluding that the imperialist and their allies were in an irrecoverable situation and that they could “no longer rule in the old way.” 2) The Party put almost all emphasis and cadres into the armed struggle, to the neglect of allies unprepared for armed struggle; proclaimed the principal of “the hegemony of the party over the revolution;” failed to project and build a united front against US imperialism; and failed to side with the Liberal Party against Magsaysay. 3) The Party became careless in its security measures. 4) The Philippine national liberation struggle was physically isolated from international allies.

Let us analyze these reasons one by one.

1) Pomeroy still shares the same opinion as that held by the Jose-Jesus Lava leadership in 1950 that the “left” opportunist line of quick military victory in two years’ time is suitable in a semi-colonial and semi-feudal country like the Philippines. He faults the Lavas only for choosing the wrong moment for adopting and implementing such a policy. What would appear to constitute the correct moment for Pomeroy is when the imperialist crisis reaches such an extent that the imperialists and their allies are in an “irrecoverable situation”

and “could no longer rule in the old way.” Thus, he faults the Lavas for overestimating the “extent of imperialist crisis.” According to Pomeroy, the imperialists had a wide range of maneuver, as it was not necessary for them to use American troops in the Philippines, and the people were susceptible to promises of “reform.” In other words, Pomeroy wishes the Lavaite opportunists to have waited indefinitely for the imminent, if not total, collapse of imperialism in its home grounds before setting out on armed struggle.

Ideologically, Pomeroy is a Lavaite revisionist through and through. He harps on the same subjectivism that led the Jose-Jesus Lava leadership to rely mainly on external conditions in conducting armed struggle in a “Left” opportunist way. The difference is that whereas in 1950 the external conditions were expected to cause a “quick military victory” in the Philippines, nowadays, these are expected by the Pomeroyes and the Lavas to justify a protracted peaceful struggle. This revisionist line is being harped on at a time when US imperialism is in a crisis worse than before and the world revolutionary situation has never been more excellent. In recalling 1950, Pomeroy states categorically that it was a “vain hope” that the “impact of guerrilla struggle” would help to drive the imperialists and their allies into crisis.

2) It was, indeed, wrong and adventurist that “all-out armed struggle” was waged in a manner that almost all cadres were taken away from legal struggle and that the united front was not well taken care of. Though Pomeroy seems capable of mentioning facts, he always tries to make misrepresentations and wrong prescriptions. At the core of these is his notion that to engage in armed struggle is necessarily to forego political work, legal struggle and the united front. The effort of “Left” opportunism committed by the Jose-Jesus Lava leadership, including Pomeroy, is clearly explained in the light of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought in the basic documents of the reestablished Communist Party of the Philippines.

Not satisfied with his outright opposition to Chairman Mao’s theory of people’s war and strategic line of encircling the cities from the countryside, Pomeroy brazenly goes against the general line that the Philippine revolution is a new-democratic revolution led by the proletariat and its revolutionary party. He identifies the mere use of the phrase “new democratic revolution” (which was not actually carried out) and the proclamation of the principle of the “hegemony of the party over the revolution” as the cause of the Lavaite failure to build a united front and to find the forms of struggle by which broader masses of the people could be drawn into action. According to him,

these frightened and antagonized the “nationalist bourgeoisie” and forced it to ally itself with the rabid imperialist agent Magsaysay. He suggests that some mysterious kind of peaceful maneuver instead of armed struggle should have been undertaken to fight Magsaysay in 1951 and 1953. Even now he would rather imagine that the reactionaries were not at all bent on carrying through to the end their own strategic offensive against the Lava “Left” opportunists.

3) Pomeroy can really bring down a house in laughter by identifying “careless security measures” as one of the four major reasons for the defeat of the entire revolutionary movement. Effects should not be considered the causes. The disintegration of the highest leading organ of the old merger party caused by the enemy raids of October 1950 in Manila cannot be fully explained without reference to serious violations of Marxist-Leninist theory and strategy.

4) The “physical isolation” of the Philippine national liberation struggle cannot be a major reason for the failure of the Lavas. The geographic condition of the Philippines did not change during World War II and yet the people managed to wage a war of resistance successfully for several years against the Japanese fascists and their puppet troops.

The anti-Marxist and anti-Leninist line of Lavas, Tarucs and Pomeroy in ideology, politics, organization and armed struggle caused the defeat of the revolutionary mass movement in the early 1950s. In this regard, it is always important to analyze and sum up our revolutionary experience in the light of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought. If the Lavas, Tarucs and Pomeroy ignored Chairman Mao’s theory of people’s war and suffered disastrous defeat, it becomes more necessary for us to make a living study and application of this proven theory instead of continuing to oppose it as the Lavaites do in empty arrogance.

Even now Pomeroy continues to be a publicist of the Lava revisionist renegades abroad. Resorting to the most malicious falsehood, he tries to misrepresent abroad the Provisional Political Bureau that prepared the reestablishment of the Communist Party of the Philippines on the theoretical foundation of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought as “trying to put out calls for a return” by the national liberation movement to “all-out armed struggle” in the style of the Jose-Jesus Lava leadership in 1950.

Pomeroy openly supports the Lava revisionist renegades. As acknowledged by him, the bogus communist party of these renegades put out a statement in the *Information Bulletin* of the Czechoslovak revisionist party in 1967 attacking the May Day 1967 Statement of the Provisional Political Bureau of the

Communist Party of the Philippines and seeking in a futile manner to refute the line that the outlawed situation of the Party is the result of counterrevolution and the armed struggle is the only method by which the reactionary state can be overthrown.

Pomeroy must be told that the Communist Party of the Philippines is today indefatigably making a living study and application of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought in accordance with Philippine conditions, rebuilding itself in the process, waging armed struggle in the countryside and creating revolutionary bases among the peasant masses and rapidly developing a united front based on the worker-peasant alliance, which basic alliance is linked with such progressive strata of the local bourgeoisie as the urban petit bourgeoisie and the national bourgeoisie.

The Communist Party of the Philippines is today leading the New People's Army and fighting a tit-for-tat struggle against the enemy. On the other hand, the Lava revisionist renegades have made themselves notorious by becoming cheap enemy informers and fascist gangsters in operating the notorious Briones-Diwa-Pasion bandit gang. Put to shame and deprived of initiative in the countryside by the New People's Army led by the Party, the Lava revisionist renegades have gone to the extent of colluding with the Task Force Lawin⁴ and with special terrorist squads of the Marcos fascist puppet clique in pursuing their extortionist, swindling and other criminal activities in Central Luzon.

Though Pomeroy has always boasted that the Lava revisionist renegades have conducted parliamentary struggle as the main form of struggle since 1956, in conjunction with the worldwide campaign of modern revisionism, they are isolated from and shunned by the revolutionary mass movement raging in Greater Manila and other urban areas, provincial capitals and towns. They have made themselves notorious as the most filthy-mouthed slanderers of the Communist Party of the Philippines, the New People's Army, the revolutionary leaders and the broad masses of the people.

They are always trying to be the most clever by word and deed in giving support to US imperialism, Soviet social-imperialism, the Marcos fascist puppet clique and the landlord class.

⁴ The anti-dissident task force in Central Luzon province of the Philippine reactionary armed forces. Its operations are concentrated in what are referred to as "traditional hotbeds" of Pampanga and Tarlac provinces.

This essay was drafted in May 1976, under the title "Our Urgent Tasks", and subsequently published as a final Central Committee document of Communist Party of the Philippines in Rebolusyon, Vol. I, No.1, July 30, 1976.

The Lava renegades have busied themselves using the Movement for the Advancement of Nationalism, the Malayang Samahang Magsasaka, the Congress of Trade Unions of the Philippines, the Kilusan, the Bertrand Russell Peace foundation (Phil.), Inc., and the Malayang Pagkakaisang Kabataang Pilipino in attacking the Communist Party of the Philippines and the New People's Army and trying to mislead the people. These Lavaite outfits are mere paper organizations whose small membership is redundant. These have been useful for the Lava revisionist renegades in begging for concessions from the reactionaries and in maintaining their bureaucratic interest within their own clique and within the reactionary government.

Just as Soviet modern revisionism is a passing phase of imperialism, the revisionism of the Lavaites is likewise a passing phase of foreign and feudal domination in the Philippines. The Lava revisionist renegades have done much service to the Philippine revolution in acting as negative examples for the proletarian revolutionaries of today. Though they now talk more and more brazenly in the style of the Marcoses, Tarucs, Lacsinas, Manglapuses and other reactionaries, the Lavaites have for quite some time now served to sharpen the revolutionaries' understanding of the most clever form of ideology and activity that seeks to sabotage and subvert the revolutionary mass movement. With the Lavaites around, the Party and the people have deepened their understanding that to oppose imperialism it is necessary to oppose opportunism and revisionism.

Our Urgent Tasks

July 30, 1976

This is a statement of the urgent tasks of the Communist Party of the Philippines in the light of the Third plenum of the Central Committee and the most recent circumstances. Here included are the conditions, forces, methods, trends and reasons involved in carrying out such tasks.

We must united wholeheartedly and firmly to carry out these tasks for the single purpose of winning the life-and-death struggle against the fascist dictatorial regime of the US-Marcos clique and in the process carry forward the people's democratic revolution in a comprehensive way.

Each one of us in the Party must take as much assignment and responsibility as possible, fearing neither hardship nor sacrifice and always devoting ourselves to serving the people. All of us must exert the utmost effort to lead our people towards national liberation and social emancipation.

First published in *Rebolusyon*, Vol. I, No. 1, July 30, 1976. The text here was extracted from *Building Strength Through Struggle*, the third volume of the Sison's selected works, pp. 325-382.

1. CARRY FORWARD THE ANTI-FASCIST, ANTI-FEUDAL AND ANTI-IMPERIALIST MOVEMENT!

We must resolutely carry forward the antifascist, antifeudal and anti-imperialist movement. This is the current combative expression of our general line of people's democratic revolution against US imperialism, feudalism and bureaucrat capitalism.

The Marcos fascist dictatorship is the main force of armed counterrevolution and is ruthlessly conducting a civil war. Thus, we must give first place to the antifascist movement. We must do everything we can to push forward the democratic armed revolution against the fascist armed counterrevolution.

Everywhere in the country we must focus on the abuses of the Marcos fascist dictatorship. In the entire semi-colonial and semi-feudal history of the Philippines, there is no regime more infamous than this for the political tyranny and economic crisis it has unleashed against the broad masses of the people.

The "new society" (variably calling itself "constitutional authoritarianism", "crisis government" and now lately "new democracy") is but the old society gone far worse and far more intolerable. The reactionary state has shorn itself of all its bourgeois democratic embellishments and is nakedly acting as the coercive instrument of the big comprador-landlord-bureaucrat clique of Marcos and US imperialism.

We have the Marcos fascist dictatorship as the narrowest and weakest target on which to concentrate the broadest and strongest possible attack by the people. But to achieve the most profound, most wide-ranging and most forward results in the antifascist movement, we must deliberately and clearly link it to the antifeudal and anti-imperialist movements. It is only thus that we can effectively strike at the very essence and main body of the reactionary state.

Otherwise, we would be merely calling for the restoration of formal democratic rights and worn-out processes of the ruling system. Like bourgeois democrats, and not proletarian revolutionaries, we would be going after forms and we would be missing the content of a people's democratic revolution.

To deepen the antifascist movement, we must vigorously wage the antifeudal movement. By doing so, we develop the main force for overthrowing or causing the overthrow of the fascist dictatorship. We respond no less to the main demand of the people's democratic revolution and win the abiding interest of the most numerous class, the peasantry, in the armed revolution.

To raise the level of the antifascist movement, we must vigorously undertake the anti-imperialist movement. We must make US imperialism pay the ultimate price for having masterminded the Marcos fascist dictatorship and having been the most aggrandized by it. The longer Marcos stays in power, the stronger the anti-imperialist movement should become.

So long as we pay comprehensive attention to the antifascist, antifeudal and anti-imperialist movement, there is no chance for US imperialism and the local reactionaries to confuse the people and derail the revolution one day by simply replacing the current fascist dictatorship with another.

The Marcos fascist dictatorship is a measure of the weakening and desperation of the entire ruling system, rather than of strengthening and stability. This open terrorist rule is the absolute proof that the ruling classes can no longer rule in the old way.

The political crisis continues to worsen. The split among the reactionaries has continued to widen and become more virulent. The revolutionary mass movement, under the leadership of the revolutionary proletariat, has proven to be resilient and has expanded and intensified, instead of being crushed by the fascist counterrevolution.

Though at first taken by surprise by the ultra-rightist coup, Marcos' political rivals have gone on to disseminate anti-Marcos propaganda in their so-called bailiwicks and maneuver for influence in the very same reactionary armed forces manipulated and used by Marcos for his fascist autocratic purposes. In the years to come, the gun will become more important than ever in the conflicts of the reactionaries.

The alliance of the Macapagal, Aquino, Lopez and Manglapus groups is not idle. Though US imperialism continues to get what it wants from the Marcos fascist dictatorship, it has already assured this alliance that it should do what it can to stand in reserve in the face of Marcos' gross unpopularity. US public opinion and certain US business interests recognize the fact that even as the Marcos fascist dictatorship is a short-term asset for US imperialism, it is a long-term liability.

The Marcos fascist dictatorship has given no quarters to its political rivals. The ultra-rightist coup of the executive against co-equal branches of the reactionary government, against the constitutional convention and against all kinds of opposition carried extremely vindictive measures. Properties have been extorted for the personal gain of Marcos and his henchmen. The Marcos

press monopoly and other Marcos assets in far larger enterprises consist mainly of robbed property.

The series of fake referendums have in progression served to merely endorse the arbitrary martial law proclamation and the autocratic rule of Marcos. The “new” constitution, the indefinite non-convening of the interim national assembly, the supplantation of national and local elections by presidential appointment and the projection of Imelda as second-in-command and successor of the fascist dictator close every peaceful avenue to political power for Marcos’ political rivals.

The broad masses of the people have suffered most from the fascist counter-revolution. More than 95% of victims of illegal mass arrests and mass detention, massacres, assassination, torture, forced mass evacuation, illegal searches and looting, sexual molestation, bombardment, extortion and the like come from the ranks of ordinary people. Hundreds of thousands have become victims of direct physical abuse by the fascists.

At least three million people have been displaced, especially in the countryside, through fascist intimidation. People have been forced to abandon their homes, crops and small landholdings due to enemy “counterinsurgency” campaigns, expansion of corporate farming, “infrastructure” projects and real estate speculation.

The elimination or drastic diminution of political and economic rights and opportunities is causing incalculable suffering to the broad masses of the people. In such a situation, more people are liable to suffer oppression of the most direct and brutal kind.

The mass organizations of national-democratic character and the critical press are banned. The workers are deprived of their right to strike and the effective exercise of their trade union rights. The right of the peasants to self-organization is sabotaged by military operations and by the imposition of the *samahang nayon*. The students, together with their teachers, are under close guard and even student governments and publications are prohibited.

Every means of democratic expression is shut off. All forms of mass action opposing fascist, feudal and imperialist abuses are expressly prohibited. Even private conversations are liable to be considered “rumor-mongering.” Ownership and operation of even mimeographing machines and other minor printing equipment are also severely restricted. There are not only the written penalties but also the far more severe penalties imposed by the fascist torturers, murderers and extortionists.

Under the suffocating fascist martial rule, the broad masses of the people have no course but to fight back. They learn daily to resist their enemy. The Marcos fascist dictatorship has stood out as the best teacher by negative example. The learning process is so deep-going that the people increasingly detest not only the Marcos fascist dictatorship but also the entire ruling system.

The Marcos fascist dictatorship has, instead of effecting “peace and order,” fanned the flames of armed resistance. The New People’s Army, led by the Party, has only strengthened itself and expanded in the face of fascist abuses and barbarities. There are now tested guerrilla forces of the people’s army in all regions outside Manila-Rizal.

The armed resistance for self-determination among the people of southwestern Mindanao has been ignited and fueled by the abuses of the Marcos fascist dictatorship. This has constituted a great though indirect support to the revolutionary armed struggle of the New People’s Army.

A revolutionary underground is thriving all over the country. This is composed mainly of basic revolutionary forces led by the Party. Allied forces and other antifascist forces also have their own underground activities. In time to come, a powerful groundswell will overthrow the Marcos fascist dictatorship.

The Marcos fascist dictatorship is extremely isolated and under fire from all directions. Contrary to its wishes, it cannot be at the center of a “balancing act” between left and right. It is the ultra-right. It has made itself the target of a broad antifascist movement.

The economic crisis has rapidly worsened, making the core of the political tyranny more rotten every day. This crisis is generated by the Marcos fascist dictatorship through its own profligacy and corruption, and its subservience to US imperialism which is shifting the burden of its crisis to a semi-colonial dependent like the Philippines.

All our Party cadres and members must be well acquainted with the fast changing economic data in the country as a whole and in the local areas where they are, so that they can give clear substance to their propaganda and agitation.

Prices have been soaring since 1970, but these have been soaring even more rapidly since the imposition of fascist martial rule. Price increases have been by several hundreds of percent since 1972. Imported commodities lead the way. The repeated oil price increases obtained by the US oil companies alone have been a major factor in pushing up prices in the country.

Severe scarcities of locally produced commodities have been occurring and have been pushing up prices because the main focus of the fascist regime is to encourage production of raw materials for export and build up the “infrastructure” for it. Domestic prices of exportable commodities have risen so fast because exports are being made without prior attention to local needs. Food production is also grossly inadequate, and food requirements are dependent on imports.

The income of the toiling masses are forced down to yield high profits to the US and other foreign monopolies and the local exploiting classes. Wage levels have sunk too far below the price of basic commodities. The wage increases recently announced by the fascist regime do not correspond to the inflation since 1970 and can be completely circumvented due to the loopholes provided by the antilabor fascist regime.

It is openly admitted in watered-down statistics of the reactionary government that the purchasing power of the peso has gone down from 1965 to 1970 to 74 centavos and more rapidly from 1970 to 1975 to 33 centavos. This is bad enough. But the fact is that the purchasing power of the peso has certainly gone down to far less than 20 centavos.

According to no less than the National Economic Development Authority, the top economic agency of the fascist regime, a worker must earn P45.00 daily for his family to subsist. Another agency, the Private Development Corporation of the Philippines, has also arrived at the slightly higher figure of P46.00. Even when applied faithfully, the new minimum wage of P10.00, P9.00 and P7.00 for nonagricultural workers in Greater Manila, nonagricultural workers in the provinces and regular agricultural workers, respectively, are far below the level of subsistence.

Unemployment is more rampant than ever. 40% of the employable population is without employment. This exceeds the chronic level of 25% noted in 1970. Most of the unemployed are in the countryside, under the guise of being irregular farm workers. Many of the unemployed continue to flock into the cities to look for jobs that are not available.

There is no land reform whatsoever. It is a big hoax, obvious from the very start. The tenant masses have been merely offered to buy land from their landlords at prohibitive prices. The bogus land reform has been used as cover for divesting the tenant masses of their tenancy rights, for arranging high fixed land rent and promoting usury, for expanding corporate farming and for

enriching the Marcos-controlled corporations on fertilizer, pesticide and farm equipment sales contracts with the reactionary government.

US and other foreign investors are encouraged to extract super-profits on their direct investments, loans and trade. Restrictions that should have fallen on US investments upon the termination of the Parity Amendment and the Laurel-Langley Agreement have been overridden by obnoxious antinational provisions of the Marcos constitution and presidential decrees enlarging those privileges already available to foreign investors in those foreign investments incentives laws before fascist martial rule.

US investments and assets amount to far more than the well-known figure of \$3.0 to \$4.0 billion and comprise 85% of all foreign investments. Ownership is often camouflaged by the various nationalities of US multinational firms.

The US monopoly capitalists, followed by the Japanese, have increased their direct investments, especially in banking, investment houses, mining, oil exploration, foreign and local trading, plantations, repackaging and reassembly, real estate and the like in accordance with their schemes of quick profit and misshaping the economy. The basic character of the economy remains as semi-feudal as ever, restricted to being a producer of raw material and consumer of finished products from abroad.

Foreign loans with usurious rates of interest and other onerous conditions are being rapidly unloaded on the Philippines by the imperialists. Whereas the foreign debt of the Philippines stood at \$2.2 billion at the end of 1972, accumulated through seven years of Marcos misrule, it now stands at more than \$5.0 billion after only three years of fascist rule.

This is already far beyond the critical point. New and bigger loans have been incurred to pay old debts, thus, there is no end to the enlargement of the debts. What is most silly is that those who take most advantage of these loans are the foreign investors and the Marcos clique of big compradors and big landlords.

The deficit in the balance of trade has gone beyond the \$1.0 billion level in comparison to the few hundreds of millions of US dollars three years ago. It is still mounting. A greater volume of exports at lower prices is being made, while a greater volume of imports at higher prices is being made. With their tighter stranglehold on the local financial system, the foreign monopoly capitalists are using foreign trading more rapaciously than ever before to camouflage the remittance of super-profits.

The deficit on the balance of payments keeps on rising. It went beyond the level of \$500 million at the end of 1975 and is now approaching the level of \$1.0 billion. As usual, bigger foreign loans are resorted in order to cover the deficit. Taking aside the private foreign exchange deposits in commercial banks, the international reserve fund of the Philippines is composed almost entirely of foreign loans in the process of being rapidly spent and replenished by new borrowing.

A great deal of foreign loans incurred by the Marcos fascist dictatorship has been used to put up ill-planned and inflationary “infrastructure” projects beneficial essentially to the foreign investors and the local exploiting classes. The purpose is not only to make propaganda out of showy public works but also to enrich the fascist dictator and his henchmen through contract-pulling, kickbacks and real estate speculation. Marcos has controlled interests now in the major local construction firms and related companies.

The manipulation of public works is an old bureaucrat-capitalist method of self-enrichment which Marcos has indulged in an unprecedentedly colossal manner. “Infrastructure” projects are always priced high above the actual inflationary trend. A major part of the “cost” of every construction project represents the corruption of the fascist dictator and his top henchmen. The burden that is the fascist dictatorship’s profligacy and corruption is always passed on to the people in the form of higher taxes and higher toll charges or service fees.

The tax burden has increased abruptly so many times. This increased from P6.6 billion in 1972 to P14.3 billion in 1974 and has continued to rise. And yet revenues of the reactionary government fall far short of expenditures. The budgetary deficit for fiscal year 1974-75 is P5.0 billion, almost equivalent to the total budget of only a few years ago. Aside from foreign borrowing, the fascist dictatorship has had to resort to heavy local borrowing. At P20.7 billion in fiscal year 1974-75, the local public debt is now rapidly approaching P30 billion, skyrocketing from the 1972 figure of P9.7 billion.

The new development in the budgeting of the reactionary government under fascism is the rapid increase of appropriations for the military and the number one position of military expenditures. Before fascist martial rule, expenditures for public education and public works always vied for the top position, with those for the military running a poor third. Out of the total 1974-75 expenditures of P18.5 billion, the share of the military is more than P4.0 billion, including some P1.0 billion for intelligence.

On the whole, the expenditures of the reactionary government has been mainly for beefing up the personnel and equipment of the reactionary armed forces, increasing salaries and privileges of military officers, purchasing office materials and vehicles, acquiring public works equipment, paying private contractors, maintaining the general payroll, servicing public debts and the like. In every money transaction involving the fascist dictatorship, there is the inevitable cost that goes for graft and corruption.

There is no economic development whatsoever. Deterioration is the precise word for it. The gross national product is no gauge for economic growth. The transactions of the reactionary government, the foreign monopoly capitalists and the local exploiting classes compose the bulk of this gross national product. Also, this can be no basis for per capita income. More than 90% of the people live the lives of the exploited workers and peasants.

The broad masses of the people are suffering the worst kind of life since the end of World War II. They demand their democratic rights and the improvement of their livelihood. With the Marcos fascist dictatorship resorting to brutal methods to escape responsibility, the broad masses of the people have no choice but to engage in various forms of resistance.

The workers are clamoring for higher wages and their right to strike. They must lift themselves from the miserable life of extremely low wages and the rapidly rising prices of basic commodities. Benefits hard-earned through several decades of workers' struggle have been eliminated or drastically reduced. While opposing the workers' interests, the fascist regime subjects the workers' paychecks to withholding taxes and various kinds of special levies. There is no way out but to undertake the strike movement.

Despite the fascist prohibitions, the masses of workers have gone on to make strikes, slow-downs, sit-down, delegations, trooping the offices, demonstrations and other forms of mass protest. The more than seventy worker strikes and four street demonstrations between October last year and June this year is a signal for far bigger storms to come in Manila-Rizal and other areas. The workers have proven that they can stand firm against fascist intimidation and in many cases have actually won some of their demands.

The peasant masses are opposed to the rapidly rising costs of their subsistence and production, the military operations against them and the people's army, the higher land rent and loss of tenancy rights under the bogus land reform, the onerous conditions of the supervised credit system (Masagana

99¹), the heavy levies exacted under the *samahang nayon* and the *barangay*, the depression of their real income, the loss of homestead rights and the expansion of corporate farming.

The soil for the revolutionary antifeudal movement and armed struggle in the countryside is more fertile than ever before. Everywhere the peasant masses welcome the people's army. Without this condition, the small and weak people's army would not have grown in strength and would have been crushed by the enemy. Even in cases where the Red fighters were forced out from an area by extremely large enemy forces, they immediately come upon a favorable situation in the area to which they shift.

The urban petit bourgeoisie are also hard pressed by the economic crisis and feel abused by the antidemocratic policies of the fascist dictatorship. Their limited and often fixed incomes are ravaged by inflation. Those who own some small enterprises or practice some profession resent the ever-increasing taxes. The intelligentsia resent the Marcos press monopoly and are steadily gaining courage to speak out their minds and act accordingly.

The student masses and some of their teachers are stirring. Being the most concentrated section of the intelligentsia, apart from those in the government service who have to act more cautiously, they are steadily manifesting their service against not only the repressive conditions in campuses but also the rampant evils of the fascist puppet dictatorship in society as a whole. They are an effective link of the urban petit bourgeoisie to the toiling masses.

The national bourgeoisie are discriminated against in favor of the foreign monopoly capitalists. They are being forced into bankruptcy or absorption by the foreign monopolies to which even retail trading has been given back. The fascist dictatorship keeps on increasing the tax burden on them. They resent the fact that while taxes are collected from them, there is no effective representation of their interests.

There are groups and groups among the national bourgeoisie opposed to the Marcos fascist dictatorship. They are steadily speaking their minds in legal organizations, forums and pamphlets. Some of these groups are secret in nature and hanker for some solution like the assassination of Marcos and the convening of the interim national assembly and lay themselves open to manipulation by another set of puppets of US imperialism.

¹ Masagana (literally translated as bountiful) 99 was an agricultural program under the Marcos regime initiated under the premise of increasing rice production.

Though the Marcos fascist dictatorship has been put up avowedly in the interest of the comprador big bourgeoisie and the landlord class, the economic crisis has become so serious that spoils are becoming more and more limited for division among them. There is a growing split between those who are satisfied with the Marcos fascist dictatorship and those who are not. This is fertile soil for the maneuvers of Marcos' political rivals. A case in point is the disenchantment of the bloc of sugar landlords after being deprived of a direct hold on exports and dollar earnings.

The objective conditions for making revolution are excellent more than ever before. The basic contradictions in Philippine society are intensifying. Instead of saving the ruling system, the Marcos fascist dictatorship has further jeopardized its very existence. All that is needed is to resolutely strengthen such subjective forces of the revolution as the Party, the New People's Army, the mass organizations and the local organs of political power.

2. FURTHER STRENGTHEN THE PARTY AND RECTIFY OUR ERRORS!

We must further strengthen the Party ideologically, politically and organizationally. We have made some modest achievements on the basis of which we can advance further. But we have also had certain errors and weaknesses which we must rectify so that we will not be weighed down and dragged down by these and so that we will win more and greater victories.

The reestablishment of the Communist Party of the Philippines on the theoretical foundation of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought constitutes a victory of profound and far-reaching significance in the Philippine revolution. We have set down and clarified the correct ideological and political line of the Party.

To set the Philippine revolution on the correct course, we have studied and researched into the history and circumstances of the Filipino people and the Party and put out the necessary documents and writings for the edification of all Filipino revolutionaries. In the process, we have successfully criticized and repudiated the long-standing revisionist lines of the Lavas and Tarucs which polluted and suffocated the old merger party.

We have disseminated the works and propagated the scientific revolutionary teachings of Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin and Mao and we have successfully criticized and repudiated Soviet modern revisionism and social-imperialism. Chairman Mao's works have been widely circulated, because they not only deal correctly and elaborately with problems of a people's democratic revolution in a semi-colonial and semi-feudal country but also because they contain the latest and most comprehensive summing-up of the experience of the world proletariat and people.

To propagate the Marxist-Leninist stand, viewpoint and method, we have undertaken study courses, put out analyses of current national and international events, promoted further researches of national and regional scopes and required social investigations and criticism and self-criticism as methods for raising our ideological level and improving our practical work.

In our ideological rebuilding, we have had to lay stress on studying basic Marxist-Leninist principles and combating the modern revisionism of the Soviet and local renegades. We have had to rely considerably on books dealing with successful revolutions led by fraternal parties abroad. We ourselves have had to go through more revolutionary experience than what we started with in

order to deepen our grasp of Marxism-Leninism. And quite a number of our Party cadres are of petit bourgeois background who definitely have more book learning than experience.

Under these circumstances, the dogmatist tendency more than the empiricist has been most prominent among those ideologically in error. Instead of making concrete investigations and analyses in linking with the masses, there are some of us who would rather rest content with parallelisms, analogies, quotations and phrase mongering. There is even the notion that we do not deserve to be called revolutionaries if we cannot copy a successful revolution abroad.

There are also those who seem to grasp the basic principles and lessons derived from our criticism and repudiation of the Lavas and Tarucs but fail to grasp our own course of development and the different concrete circumstances that we are in. They fail to understand that we can advance only step by step and that we cannot apply on ourselves completely the same course of thinking and action demanded of the Lavas and Tarucs on the basis of forces available to them and circumstances obtaining at the end of World War II.

While the dogmatist tendency prevails among those in error, there are also those who remain immersed in their own narrow and limited experience either because they are given no chance of developing ideologically or are merely browbeaten or they systematically react to the dogmatist tendency with their own avoidance of theoretical study.

After more than seven years, our reestablished Party has gained enough experience to be in a new stage of knowing clearly the specific characteristics and specific requirements of our revolutionary struggle in the whole country and in the various localities. It is in this spirit that we call for rectification of ideological errors.

Those who have an advantage in book learning must link themselves closely to and learn from the toiling masses of workers and peasants and from our comrades who have an advantage in experience. At the same time, comrades who are of worker and peasant status must not shirk the responsibility of relating their experience to theory and asking that theory must be disclosed in a language easy to understand.

There is paucity of exchanges of worthwhile experiences within the Party, especially between our several regional Party organizations. To promote these, the Central Committee is putting out *Rebolusyon* as an internal and theoretical bulletin, exclusively for Party members. We intend to publish here, apart from statements and directives from the Central Committee, mainly documents

emanating from regional Party conferences and articles that are the result of the application of Marxist theory in the course of concrete revolutionary practice, social investigations, study courses and criticism and self-criticism sessions.

We also intend to undertake conferences among representatives of various regional Party organizations and encourage the attendance in regional Party conferences of representatives of other regional Party organizations. In this way, the most detailed yet discreet exchanges of experience are made possible.

We urge all Party members to contribute to the general effort of giving Marxism a national form. We should disabuse ourselves of the idea that only a few theoreticians know theory and know how to apply it. We can triumph only if the entire Party consistently applies Marxist-Leninist theory on the concrete conditions of the Philippines revolution.

The Party has established its political leadership of the proletariat in the revolution by laying down, clarifying and carrying out the general line of people's democratic revolution. This is a great victory. We have made clear the character, the motive forces, targets and perspective of this revolution.

The character of the revolution is determined by its essential task, which is to liberate the people from foreign and feudal domination and establish an independent and democratic Philippines. Such a task can be accomplished only by waging armed struggle as the main form among the motive forces to isolate and destroy the target or enemy.

At the helm of the motive forces is the proletariat. It takes as its main ally, the peasantry whose demand for land is the main content of the people's democratic revolution and from which the main contingents of the people's army can be drawn. The basic alliance of the toiling masses of workers and peasants is the solid foundation for the united front which must win over the urban petit bourgeoisie firstly and the national bourgeoisie secondly.

The targets of the revolution are the comprador big bourgeoisie and the landlord class. Our current revolutionary struggle against the Marcos fascist dictatorship is more than a struggle against the ruling clique. In the course of fighting this clique, we must develop the strength to weaken the entire ruling system and then topple it in the end.

The perspective of the people's democratic revolution is socialism. The socialist revolution must be won upon the completion of the people's democratic revolution. Though we are ready to give concessions to the petit bourgeoisie and national bourgeoisie in a period of transition, we shall no longer

pass through a full stage of capitalist development as in the case of the old democratic revolutions before the era of imperialism and proletarian revolution.

In line with the people's democratic revolution, we have established the New People's Army and launched the revolutionary armed struggle. Our strategic line is to encircle the cities from the countryside and through a protracted period of time develop rural bases from which to advance to seize political power.

Like the Party, the people's army started from scratch and immediately launched revolutionary armed struggle. The people's army has grown in strength step by step, won military victories against powerful odds and won the hearts and minds of millions by its heroic deeds.

The people's army has been the main instrument of the Party in organizing the peasant masses. Hundreds of thousands of people in the barrios have come directly under the barrio organizing committees organized by our guerrilla squads and armed propaganda teams. We have established small guerrilla bases and far more extensive guerrilla zones, carried out mass movements and initiated land reform.

In the face of the fascist enemy, we have continued to organize and lead large masses of people. Even when our barrio organizing committees collapse in one area due to a massive and prolonged enemy campaign, those in other areas increase to more than make up for the losses and even these losses are temporary, still open to recovery.

In support of the mass movement and armed struggle in the countryside, great mass movements have also been raised by the Party in the cities. The first quarter storm of 1970 and succeeding mass actions in Manila-Rizal and other urban areas have broadcast our revolutionary propaganda all over the country and have yielded to us a considerable number of Party and non-Party activists who have been shifted to the countryside or who continue to develop the revolutionary mass movement in the cities.

It is a matter of necessity in the countryside to expand at a rate fast enough to have a wide area for maneuver for our guerrilla forces. For the purpose, we have been setting up the barrio organizing committees. While we have required the organization of these committees to follow the policy of the anti-feudal united front, many of these are so haphazardly organized that unreliable elements creep in, prevail over the poor and middle peasants and flaunt their functions while the enemy is not yet around.

The error of haphazard organizing oftentimes characterized by lack or insufficiency of social investigation and by yielding membership in the barrio organizing committee to whoever are the initial contacts in a barrio, leads on to another error. The work of consolidation is not attended to. The basic mass organizations for peasants, workers, women, youth, children and cultural activists are not organized and mobilized to ensure sustained all-round mass support for the revolution. Thus, the surrounding waters may be wide but shallow.

When we cannot apply the principle of combining a few cadres from the outside with many local activists, it is even very likely that the scope of our political work is narrow. Thus, we must handle well the relationship of expansion and consolidation, of making the guerrilla zone and the guerrilla base a good fighting front for us.

In cases of errors with disastrous results, the principal tendency has been adventurism or “Left” opportunism. With mass support wide or narrow but shallow there are those who engage in military actions against enemy troops and then when enemy reaction rises, they do not know where to go or the enemy catches up with them. They fail to recognize that to support and ensure the success of any important action, military or otherwise, requires painstaking mass work.

There are petit-bourgeois elements who are still unremolded and who think that it suffices to beat the drum; make sweeping propaganda but forget to do solid organizational work among the masses; and who also think that the military action of a few courageous men must precede solid organizational work among the masses.

Relying on a mere committee dominated by unreliable but prestigious personalities has also spawned commandism. The chairman and the chief of defense of the barrio organizing committee often neglect to have any collective life within the committee. And in the absence of militant mass organizations, the trend is to order people around and make them do what is beyond their level of consciousness and organization.

While we oppose “Left” opportunism as the principal tendency among those of us in error, we must also be on guard against Right opportunism. Our insistence on taking the mass line, establishing the basic mass organizations and laying the foundation for a truly people’s war should not be twisted to mean the indefinite postponement of tactical military offensives even when conditions for them are already ripe.

There have been manifestations of the Right opportunist tendency in the countryside. To consciously let in unreliable elements in barrio organizing committees and relax with the transitory advantages that they provide is one. To enjoy the conveniences of one barrio and fail to venture out and do mass work in another barrio is another. To remain fixed on going after local bad elements and fail to push forward the land reform and the armed struggle is still another.

In the cities, there is the “Left” opportunist notion prevalent among those of us in error that there can be no revolutionary struggle when there are no strikes, demonstrations and other conspicuous mass protest actions. They fail to recognize that it is perfectly revolutionary struggle to lay down the foundation for these higher forms of political action by doing solid organizational work among the masses.

There is also the notion among those of us in error that sweeping propaganda work suffices to mobilize the people. There is still another notion that the economic struggle of the workers can be slurred over, whereas we must grasp it at its own level and steadily raise it to the level of the political struggle.

There have also been instances of Right opportunism in a certain region. One is the proposal to superimpose the slogan demanding general election in the country on other slogans asserting the democratic rights and interests of the basic masses. Another is making flimsy demands to avoid even only basic trade union demands and the necessary preparations for pushing them forward.

While we have pointed out that sweeping propaganda does not suffice by itself in revolutionary work, we recognize that it is of great importance and that without it mass organizing is without an advance notice and also without direction. We need to step up our propaganda work if we are to enhance our all-round revolutionary work. Our capacity for propaganda and agitation will certainly rise as the basic masses are well organized and activists from their ranks increase.

The corrective measures that we need to undertake in our political work will be dealt with more thoroughly in succeeding sections of this statement.

The membership of the Party is drawn generally from the ranks of activists of the revolutionary mass organizations and Red fighters of the New People’s Army. It is clear that our membership is closely linked with the masses and embedded in the revolutionary mass movement. But up to now, our Party is mainly a cadre party. We have thus remained a small Party.

The Party started with less than a score of Party members coming from the old merger party and 75 prospective members in late 1968. The membership increased to several scores in 1969, to a few hundred in 1970 and close to a thousand in 1971. Since 1972, we have had a few thousand members. But since 1973, we have had a slower rate of growth.

Our Party has become nationwide. Directly under the Central Committee, there were groups of Party members in Manila-Rizal, Central Luzon, Cagayan Valley and Southern Luzon in 1969 and 1970 with most members in the first two regions mentioned. Following the Second Plenum of the Central Committee in 1971, we started to build the regional Party committees and organizations. Now, we have nine regional Party organizations covering the whole country.

The majority of Party members are now under the regional Party organizations outside Manila-Rizal. In turn, the majority of these are in the countryside developing the revolutionary armed struggle. But the Manila-Rizal Party organization still remains the single largest Party organization. Though this regional Party organization has been giving cadres to the other regions, it has continued to grow.

We realize that the growth of the Party is quite slow if we relate it to the large numbers of masses being led by the Party. At first it looks flattering that so few could lead so many and that strict standards are being applied on recruitment. But there are unflattering reasons for the slow growth.

Sectarianism, poor tasking and check-ups, irregular and ponderous study courses and lack of recruitment planning are problems both in the cities and in the countryside which have restricted the organizational growth of the Party. We must solve these.

The outstanding reason for the failure of regional Party organizations outside Manila-Rizal to outstrip the membership of the Manila-Rizal Party organization is the failure to build the mass organizations and the mass movement in the localities. Without these, there can be no sound basis for establishing local Party branches. The mass organizations, aside from the people's army, should be the vast reservoir of revolutionary activists and Party members.

The Manila-Rizal Party organization should not be flattered and should not remain complacent about being the biggest single regional Party organization. In the last two years, there has been a tendency here for the membership to stagnate and even decrease. Just as we demand that local Party branches be set

up among the peasants in the countryside, we demand that local Party branches be set up among the workers.

The fascist martial rule cannot be used as the main reason for the slow growth of the Party. The strictures of this tyrannical rule has been more than compensated for by the deep-going hatred and growing resistance of the broad masses of the people. In no year has the enemy struck down more than five percent of the membership of the Party. The Party should be able to achieve a high rate of growth because it is small but composed mostly of cadres, if only to grasp the necessity and importance of mass members of the Party from the ranks of the workers and peasants.

The Manila-Rizal based national bureaus served positively from 1971 to 1973, not only as administrators of the city based national mass organizations but also as schools for a considerable number of new party recruits. In the first year of martial rule, it also served positively to direct the orderly retreat of the mass organizations suddenly forced to go underground. But in 1974, it became very clear that the national bureaus had outlived their purposes.

It is admitted that the period of one year after the first year of martial rule and before their dissolution in July 1974 constituted a big delay which unduly restricted the disposition of good cadres for various regional Party organizations eager and ready to get them.

It remains our policy to expand the Party boldly on the basis of the revolutionary mass movement and without letting in a single undesirable. We must follow the reasonable standards set by the Party constitution and we must increase the number of Party members who are of worker and peasant status. In this regard, we must keep in mind that we do not wish to be an exclusively cadre party.

We want a large mass of Party members who are of worker and peasant status because these is a measure of the effectiveness of our revolutionary work, because we want to accomplish gigantic tasks that mainly concern and involve them and because we want to counteract and dilute the negative influences that Party members coming from other classes are liable to bring into the Party.

The Party upholds democratic centralism as its basic organizational principle. This is centralized leadership based on democracy and democracy guided by centralized leadership. By this principle, we can stand and act united and well informed on any important matter. We must apply this principle consistently.

The committee system at every level of leadership, from the Central Committee down to the branch executive committee, is the most important tool of the principle of democratic centralism. The leading committee at a certain level is the point of concentration for an entire Party organization on that level and for lower organs and lower organizations; and within the collectivity of the committee democracy, is carried over from the lower ranks.

With so few Party members taking on large tasks, there is a tendency for a far fewer Party leaders to take on large tasks. When the Party leaders are often attending to large tasks in different places and have difficulties in often coming together, there is always the danger that single Party leaders decide matters that should be taken up in a committee.

Thus, there are conditions for the phenomenon of one-man monopoly of affairs to arise. Indeed it has arisen in the Party and we have been combating this for a long time. Until now, it persists because the conditions for it to keep on arising persist.

The standard organizational solution to this problem is to have a smaller standing committee more easily convened than the full and large committee to act and decide on matters under the guidance of standing policies. For instance, there is the Political Bureau of our Central Committee, then there is the Executive Committee and still there is the General Secretariat. There is the executive committee of the regional committee and then there is the secretariat.

It takes good judgment based on experience and full grasp of policies for a Party leader to make a prompt decision on an urgent matter. He could be like an army commander in an emergency military situation. But always as soon as possible he must submit his decision or action to a collective body.

Any Party leader can initiate or propose a draft or anything, though it is the chairman or the secretary who is expected to perform this leading role. But there must be some preparatory meeting in a smaller committee before presentation of matters before the plenary meeting of a larger committee. In this way, there is thoroughness in preparation and in the entire process of decision-making.

Bureaucratism is also an error contravening the spirit of democratic centralism. Our cadres should not limit themselves to merely receiving reports but they should go down for worthwhile periods of time to lower levels and to the grassroots to investigate for themselves the basis for policies, verify reports and study the correctness or incorrectness of policies.

Going down to the grassroots is good for the remolding of high and middle level Party cadres. We do not mean to say that they abandon their functions in the leading organs but for them to perform these better. And we do not mean that they dissipate their efforts in going around to many places. But they must go down to investigate typical or critical situations (whatever is the main problem that needs close attention) and link themselves closely with the masses.

The central leadership no less has undertaken certain special projects requiring special detachment of personnel, heavy fixed investments and special methods of work that are not assured of effective or sufficient support by the masses in the vicinity of operation. These should no longer be undertaken because these easily meet failure and unduly preoccupy the leadership with matters of secondary importance to a self-reliant revolutionary movement.

At lower levels of the Party, there have also been instances of business and other projects that tend to distract Party leaders from their fundamental tasks. If these projects are beneficial to the revolution, they should be undertaken by trustworthy personnel without wasting the time of Party leaders and without risking the resources of the Party which are much needed for other purposes.

All leaders and members of the Party must be diligent and thrifty. Every moment must be seized to advance the revolution. Every centavo must be sent wisely. Upon our diligence and thrift, we can fruitfully carry out the policy of self-reliance.

In this period of fascist martial rule, the Party must not only be vigilant but extra-vigilant. We must have contempt for the enemy strategically, but we must take serious, meticulous account of him tactically. The fact that the Party has always been underground and involved in armed struggle since the very beginning shows that it has always been prepared and equipped to face the worst of eventualities. But there are vulnerabilities that we must be aware of so that we can guard against them.

In the cities, we must be aware that the open activists of legal progressive organizations before fascist martial rule have been used by the enemy as unwitting tracers of the Party underground. Many of these activists have been apprehended and some of them are proven or merely suspected Party members. We must apply the policy of shifting or reassigning those Party members who can no longer effectively work in their present urban assignment.

In the countryside, the Party members on the manhunt list of the enemy should adapt to the fluidity of our guerrilla activity. The risks are also high in the countryside because we have mere guerrilla squads and at the most guerrilla

platoons. But certainly, here we can rely on mass support that is bigger over wider contiguous areas than in the cities. Party members who cannot work freely in the cities can work here far more freely.

In both cities and countryside, a number of comrades have sacrificed their lives and limbs or have fallen into the hands of the enemy and have suffered the most excruciating torture and the torment of incarceration. These include some members of the Central Committee and various regional Party committees.

We honor and emulate our martyrs and heroes. And we convey to our comrades in prison to steel themselves further while in prison and turn the prison into a school. We should learn from their experience. So long as our regional Party organizations keep on growing through revolutionary struggle, there is always a basis for cadres to come forward and replenish as well as reinforce the Central Committee and the regional Party committees.

Only so few among those who have fallen into the hands of the enemy have become traitors or betrayers. There are also those few who cannot stand the difficulties of the struggle and drop out or surrender themselves to the enemy. All these renegades are only a handful and do not make even two percent of those who have fallen into the hands of the enemy. We should learn from their negative examples.

The Party reflects the iniquitous society outside. Thus, there are errors and weaknesses. And there are the few who go overboard completely, and become traitors. It is clear that within the Party the law of contradiction and the law of class struggle operate. But our Party members in general are certainly good. The Party stands united to further strengthen itself.

3. BUILD THE REVOLUTIONARY MASS MOVEMENT IN THE COUNTRYSIDE!

We must build the revolutionary mass movement in the countryside, and we must build the basic mass organizations for the peasants, youth, women, children and cultural activists to be able to generate it. Not much can be accomplished in mobilizing the great masses if our propaganda teams and guerrilla squads limit their organizing to the barrio organizing committees and small local armed groups.

The key point in our rural mass work is to arouse and organize the peasant masses in the shortest possible time and carry out the land reform movement step by step. In the course of focusing attention on the organization of the peasant association in a typical farming barrio, to other basic mass organizations can also be organized. The peasant activists can easily move the youth, women, children and cultural activists of their own class to accomplish their self-organization.

The farm workers' association, the union of nonagricultural workers and fishermen's association are also basic mass organizations that should be organized wherever there is a basis. In cases where there are already mass organizations positively working for the people's interests, all that we do is to adopt them and transform them further into revolutionary organizations.

There is really no point in feeling sorry that there is a paucity of party cadres to attend to rural mass work. A propaganda team or a guerrilla squad can rely on the local mass activists and can cover so many barrios, even as many as twenty within six months. It is even possible for one, two or three experienced cadres from the outside to work initially with the local mass activists and cover several barrios within a relatively short period.

The local mass activists emerging at every stage of the process of developing the revolutionary mass movement are themselves prospects for recruitment into the Party. Through this process, new Party members keep on arising and local Party branches can be established.

We must rely on and trust the masses. So long as we grasp their interests, needs and demands through social investigation and close contact with them, we can arouse and guide them to set themselves into motion. They can very well organize and mobilize themselves along the correct path. There are always enough activists arising from their own ranks to firm up the revolutionary direction of their movement.

There must be a series of careful steps in organizing the people in a barrio, especially under the present harsh conditions of fascist martial rule. There are four of these steps which culminate in the full organization of the basic mass organizations.

The first step is to get reliable contact men or liaison men in a barrio that we wish to organize. The number of these can range from three to ten. Within the shortest possible time, we should form them into what we may call the barrio liaison group. This has been called the “barrio organizing group” in Central Luzon and the “organized group of contacts” in Southern Tagalog.

Usually, we can get the contact men in a barrio because of our preceding mass work in an adjoining barrio. This is advancing wave upon wave. It is inevitable that the people in one barrio have relatives and friends in the next barrio. Sometimes too, we can reach a barrio where work must be done and get the contact men or liaison men because a Party member, a Red fighter or activist or any reliable person has relatives or friends in that barrio.

Preliminary social investigation can be done on a barrio in a day or a few days, depending on the reliability and knowledgeability of our initial contact men. The shortcomings of some of these contact men can be made up for by further contacts. We must gather all the general and specific information we need to start political work in the barrio.

There is expediency in forming the barrio liaison group from out of the contact men that we initially come to know through reliable intermediaries. Although we try immediately to put the best available men in the group, it may not be possible all the time to get the best representatives of the people in the barrio. After all, it takes time to develop revolutionary activists. Sometimes, the contact men may all come from only one part of *sitio* of a barrio or from only one section of the barrio population.

But we must make sure that the members of the barrio liaison group are desirous of revolution, are elements of the exploited classes, are known to be honest and good people, have extensive relations in the barrio, are intelligent and resourceful and are conscientious in performing the tasks that we give them.

The functions of the barrio liaison group include assisting us in social investigation, conducting initial propaganda among the people, putting us in touch with the positive forces and elements in the barrio gradually and secretly, and making sure that we are secure in our entry into, stay in and exit from the bar-

rio. All these functions involve the smoothing of our initial relations with the people in the barrio.

The barrio liaison group replaces the barrio organizing committee. Some similarities between the two are apparent. But there are basic differences between them.

The barrio liaison group is no longer empowered nor expected to act as an embryo of people's government in the barrio. Its members do not have the unwritten vested privilege to become automatically the chief moving force behind the mass organizations to be established. We depart from the old pernicious practice of giving initial contact men this privilege and therefore we remove or drastically reduce the condition for unreliable elements to creep into the mass organizations.

The group is also under strict advice not to expose themselves as the organizers of mass meetings. At the same time, we take care that it does not know more than it should about the actual widening and deepening of organizational and political work being done in the barrio. Of course, the members of the group receive political education from us and are tested through work and at least some of them can advance from being mere contact men. But the group as a whole does not enjoy any automatic privilege of knowing details beyond its liaison work.

The second step is for our guerrilla squad, propaganda team or cadres to move from one part of the barrio to another or fan out to several parts at one time to conduct deeper social investigation and carry out study meetings among the people, especially the poor peasants, farm workers and lower-middle peasants. We should do everything possible to link ourselves closely with the exploited masses.

Our mass work should bear fruit initially in the form of the people's organizing groups. These include the peasant organizing groups for the poor and lower-middle peasants, the youth organizing group, the women's organizing group and such organizing groups that have a basis. These are based on a division of territory (*sitios* and parts of the barrio center if much larger than the *sitio*).

The organizing groups should be able to win the majority of people in their respective fields and initiate activists to arouse and mobilize them. At this point, local activists should start to arise inside and outside the organizing groups. The cadres of the Party should make sure through propaganda and

study meetings on the national democratic revolution that politics takes command of all activities.

We must grasp the antifeudal class struggle as the key link of our rural mass work and we must uphold the poor peasants, farm workers and lower-middle peasants as the most reliable and resolute revolutionary force in a typical farming barrio. But we cannot go far in the antifeudal struggle if we fail to link it well with the antifascist and anti-imperialist struggle not only by way of providing the basic antifeudal forces with the most comprehensive political view but also by way of bringing into active play all other positive forces in the countryside for the revolutionary cause.

The third step can be taken soon after the establishment of the people's organizing group in all or most of the parts of the barrio. There is already a wide and deep basis for establishing the people's organizing committees on a barrio-wide scale.

We have already found out who is fit for what function within each committee. The basic functions to be apportioned are those that pertain to organization, education, economy, defense and health. The apportioning of functions should be settled well within the committee by the members upon our guidance. The committees should be capable of raising the enthusiasm of the majority of the people in their respective fields for the revolution and coming into coordination with struggles launched over areas that include several barrios.

Like the organizing groups based on the parts of the barrio, which must be retained as their support, the people's organizing committees should be an underground force. They must know how to cover their activities with whatever legal and traditional organizations there are in the barrio and must know how to dissemble, use revolutionary dual tactics, before the enemy or unreliable elements.

As early as the successful establishment of the peasant organizing committees over a large area in the countryside, even only some scores of barrios, it is possible to take such a simple and easy first step towards land reform as the reduction of land rent through the systematic withholding of a certain part of the crop without the landlords' knowledge. The campaign to reduce interest rates and eliminate usury; arrange fair prices with the merchants; promote savings, mutual aid and simple exchange of labor and nonpayment of debts under Masagana 99; raise production and productivity; and the like can be pushed.

In cases where the landlords have cunningly abandoned the old practice of sharecropping of the bases of the actual crop and resorted to "leasehold" system (the system of high fixed land rent) promoted by the Marcos fascist dictatorship and by the Lava revisionist renegades, the tenant masses should deliver only a part of the rent and claim bad crop or some plausible reason for the non-payment of the full rent. If all the peasants claim the same reason, the landlords will be at a loss; they cannot threaten so many with eviction and they might as well simply write into their records the undelivered part of the rent as "debts."

Harvest after harvest, the process of peaceably outmaneuvering the landlords can be done until they come to terms with the peasants. The landlords' threat to deprive the tenants of credit for subsistence or production will be rendered naught by the peasants' gains from land reform their thrift, mutual aid and simple exchange of labor and alliance with the well-to-do peasants who come under persuasion not to engage in usury.

Any despotic landlord who abuses his tenants is liable to be punished by the people's army or secret groups of peasants. It would not pay for him to refuse to come to terms with the peasants. It would be difficult for his overseers and for scabs to show their faces before the peasant masses.

Depriving the landlord of a part of the land rent and demanding fair terms from merchants and moneylenders can be achieved only if the peasant masses are well organized, united and have a high level of political consciousness.

In a typical farming barrio, the majority of the population are poor and lower-middle peasants (most tenants belong to these strata). On this basis, the peasant organizing committee plus the other people's organizing committees can have their way through the barrio councils of the reactionary government. Using the tactics of the united front, peasant organizing committees can enhance their strength.

The peasant organizing committees can actually control the *barangay* councils or any legal organization for purposes of holding public meetings favorable to the peasant masses and for revolutionary dual tactics in the face of the enemy. In effect, they can function as the embryo of the people's governmental authority on their own strength, supplemented with cooperation of their allies who are often very much their own relatives and personal friends.

The fourth step in organizing the barrio people is to fully organize the basic mass organizations. It would seem as if the people's organizing committees and groups are a skeleton taking full flesh. All members are enlisted and they

elect the leading committees of their respective mass organizations, The peasant association includes mainly the poor and middle peasants.

Of course, like the antecedent organizing committees, the basic mass organizations cannot be fully organized all at the same time, say in one day or one night. There is the law of uneven development and differences of conditions. But we must strive that in one definite period in a barrio or group of barrios, all the basic mass organizations are fully organized. This requires planning and consistent work.

The fascist enemy has been more alert to peasant associations and far more intolerant towards them than the other mass organizations. We must be flexible in adopting legal forms for the peasant associations. We must use different names for them in different barrios. In handling them for the revolutionary cause, we must be good at combining illegal and legal methods. There must be open legal activities and clandestine illegal activities.

We should be fully aware of our strength and we should not overstep it. It is understandable if, for a considerable period of time in a given group of barrios, the antifeudal movement is capable only of effecting rent reduction and other agrarian reforms in the manner that we have described in discussing the third step.

While experience has shown that mass organizations other than the peasant association are less suspected and less subjected to evil measures by the enemy, we must take the same precautions that we take in having the peasant association. Whenever the enemy comes to know that a mass organization is led by the Party, it is liable to be subjected to the most vicious attacks.

Even when we are still at the second step of organizing the people in a barrio, we should start to carry out Marxist ideological instruction and recruit into the Party the most advanced elements among the mass activists so that by the time we reach the third or fourth step, we shall have been able to establish the local party branch in the barrio, with a group in every *sitio* and major part of the barrio center. At the fourth step, we shall also have Party groups within the basic mass organizations.

Upon the establishment of the basic mass organizations and the local Party branch, it becomes possible to establish the barrio revolutionary committee as the organ of democratic political power. It shall simply be a matter of putting together the representatives of the Party, the basic masses and allied forces.

In our old areas where the barrio organizing committees are reliable and are of sound character, we should work as fast as possible for their dissolution by

establishing the basic mass organizations, the local Party branch and the organ of democratic political power. We can speak of working fast here, at least faster than in new areas, because we have known the people and worked with them long enough.

When the basic mass organizations flourish, the revolutionary mass movement can make great strides. Revolutionary studies and propaganda become more widespread and vigorous than before. Land reform becomes firm. The able-bodied volunteers from every mass organization can be formed into the local militia and given military training and duties. The campaign for higher production becomes effective. Every mass organization has a special agricultural plot or cottage enterprise to support the revolution. Cultural activities blossom and raise the people's fighting spirit against the enemy. Health work is also attended to on a mass scale.

Under these circumstances, the foundation for greater military victories by the New People's Army is laid. The people's fighting spirit is ever rising. There is abundant material support for the revolutionary armed struggle because of land reform, higher production and special production. The local militia are a powerful reserve and auxiliary force of the people's army. The Party becomes will-rooted in the localities by taking into its ranks the most advanced local activists.

4. FURTHER STRENGTHEN THE PEOPLE'S ARMY AND CARRY FORWARD THE REVOLUTIONARY ARMED STRUGGLE!

We must further strengthen the New People's Army as the main form of organization under the leadership of the Party and carry forward the revolutionary armed struggle as the main form of our people's struggle. We have established a good basis for the further strengthening of the New People's Army.

Our Red fighters have a high level of political consciousness and are closely linked with the masses. Every squad has a party group within it, and oftentimes the majority of the Red fighters are Party members. The Party branch is at present based on the platoon.

The people's army has grown in rifle strength from early 1969 to the eve of fascist martial rule and from the latter time to the present. What it is now in armed strength is a far cry from the 35 rifles and handguns that it started with. The people's army now has guerrilla forces in all regions outside Manila-Rizal and has a total of twenty guerrilla fronts.

Each regional army organization is led by a regional Party committee. The nationwide expansion of the people's army under the direction of the Central Committee is a far cry from its beginnings in the second district of Tarlac.

Our army has gained invaluable experience and has become tempered. It has undergone the acid test of massive and prolonged enemy campaigns. We recall Tarlac of 1969-71, Isabela of 1972-73, Sorsogon of 1974-75 and Aurora of 1975. At the peak of his campaigns, the enemy always employs a number of troops more than a hundred times bigger than ours, with the support of paramilitary forces, heavy weapons and the most modern means of communications and air and land transport.

Our heroic Red fighters and party cadres together with the masses have overcome tremendous odds. Despite all the enemy campaigns, marked by the most wicked forms of "population control," the people's army has on the whole grown in armed strength. We have suffered some setbacks. There is not a single regional army organization which has not suffered serious setbacks at varying times. But the expansion, shifting and recoveries by our guerrilla forces have more than compensated for the losses.

Because of the nationwide expansion of the people's army, the enemy cannot concentrate his combat troops on one region without risking the advance of our forces in other regions. So far, it has not had the pleasure of inflicting a

total or strategically decisive defeat on all our forces in any single region. Within a region, the existence of several guerrilla fronts tend to weaken the enemy campaign whether directed against all or any of these.

Despite all our achievements in building the people's army, our overall armed strength is still so small in comparison to that of the enemy who is several hundreds of times stronger. The course of historical development and the current balance of forces, particularly our level of armed strength, determine the mode of our warfare, which is guerrilla warfare.

There is no course for us but to grow in strength step by step. Our revolutionary armed struggle is just and enjoys abundant support from the people. So long as we adhere to a correct strategy and tactics, we shall grow from small and weak to big and strong. To repeat, we shall do so step by step.

Our people's war is protracted. It shall take a long period of time to change the balance of forces between us and the enemy. We must recognize further that at the back of the local reactionaries is US imperialism is at the moment hardening its position in the Philippines precisely as a result of its defeats elsewhere and, for a long time to come, only a deep-going people's war can strike effectively at its foothold.

Friendly forces abroad cannot extend military assistance to us as much as we may need or wish. We must reconcile ourselves to the irony that when we need such assistance most it is most difficult for us to get it. The single imperialist power dominating the country is not yet an easy pushover in terms of the next few years, and his prior hold on our small archipelagic country is a serious factor to contend with.

We have to maintain a high degree of self-reliance in our people's war. We must rely on ourselves most certainly to a degree higher than many revolutionary armed movements abroad. There is no course for us but to always raise our determination to get all that we need for the armed struggle from our people and from the enemy himself in the battlefield.

Our strategic line in our people's war is to encircle the cities from the countryside until such time that we become capable of moving on the cities from stable revolutionary bases in the countryside. For a long time, we have to develop guerrilla warfare on a nationwide scale so as to convert into our advantage the disadvantage of fighting in a small archipelagic country, whose countryside is so vast in relation to the cities but fragmented into so many islands.

We are at the stage of the strategic defensive and we are precisely at its early substage of developing guerrilla warfare from almost nothing. From almost

nothing because of the revisionist line of the Lavas and Tarucs that threw away all previous revolutionary gains of the people.

We have only to look at how much armed strength we have in each of the eight regions outside Manila-Rizal to know the magnitude of hard work that we have to do to further increase our squads and platoons. Again it shall take another magnitude of hard work to advance from the present phase of squads and platoons.

In the whole country or in an entire region, we are on the strategic defensive in the face of the large enemy forces encircling us. But we are capable of tactical offensives. In parts and parts of the countryside, we can achieve local superiority. At a given moment and in a limited area, we can put a small enemy unit in the tightest bag and crush it.

We must launch tactical offensives as the most essential content of our strategic defense. We simply refuse to engage our small forces in any strategically decisive engagement with the far larger forces of the enemy. Not in any region or guerrilla front should this happen. Knowing that large forces of the enemy is divisible, as everything is from a Marxist viewpoint, we must take the initiative of maneuvering the enemy to divide his forces and then concentrating our small forces at only that part of the enemy which we are sure of wiping out at a given place and time.

We should accumulate the small victories from our ambushes and raids. Over a period of time, such victories should give birth to more guerrilla squads and platoons. Then our capacity to destroy the enemy will increase. The highest mark of initiative in our guerrilla warfare is annihilating the enemy and capturing his weapons. We should not waste our precious limited ammunition and we should plan well the disposition and intensity of our lines of fire on a given target. There is no point in killing enemy troops if it is not in the course of depriving them of the weapons which they would refuse to yield.

We must learn well the rudimentary tactics of guerrilla warfare. We disperse to do propaganda and organizational work among the masses. We concentrate a superior force to destroy the enemy. We shift or circle round to avoid a superior enemy force, learn more about it through the masses and through our own reconnaissance and move to an advantageous position politically and militarily.

We can apply our guerrilla tactics well only if we have the wide and deep organized support of the people and we have eliminated the enemy informers and bad elements who are incorrigible. With organized masses screening out the enemy, rendering him blind and deaf, we can foil his attempt to concen-

trate his forces on our small forces. Even when he is still preparing to attack us, we can learn through the masses his strength and movements and as a result we can act appropriately.

When the enemy is on some short-term offensive and wants to move in on us in superior force, we must deprive him of a target and we let him punch the air and thereby exhaust himself. We can remain on the active side either by laying an ambush on a weak part of the enemy disposition, attacking the enemy in an entirely different area or simply going elsewhere to do mass work. We should never accept or undertake any battle that we are not sure of winning. We may not be able to smash an enemy offensive but certainly we can frustrate it.

In all our experience, it is the massive and prolonged army campaigns, marked by forced mass evacuation and all kinds of barbarities, that have been our most outstanding problem in the battlefield. The enemy has launched such campaigns in areas where we are relatively strong over a wide area. At the early stage of such enemy campaigns, when enemy control is not yet tight, we must make him pay as much of a heavy price as we can exact from him, without prejudice to the prompt shifting of our main guerrilla forces to an alternative guerrilla front or area.

Enemy campaigns, whether short-term or protracted, are very costly to the enemy. That is why the military budget of the fascist dictatorship keeps on rising. Repeatedly frustrating them and depriving them of a target will undermine the resources of the reactionary government and also undermine the morale of enemy troops who also suffer some deprivations for nothing.

There is nothing wrong about shifting when faced with enemy forces ten or a hundred times stronger. This is neither accepting defeat nor flightism. This is preserving our forces to destroy the enemy another day. The areas that adjoin or are a short leap from the area being encircled by the enemy and under his heavy concentration are also fertile soil for revolution. Besides, we can always recover any "lost" area after some time.

So as not to be merely forced to shift to an uncertain destination by an enemy campaign, we should be prepared long beforehand for such an enemy campaign by developing alternate guerrilla fronts and by deploying propaganda teams in areas where guerrilla warfare is to be developed from scratch or is to arise upon the shifting of guerrilla forces from elsewhere.

The unpopulated forest areas are good passageways and offer good points for schooling and temporary retreats. But to simply wait out a massive and

prolonged enemy campaign of about one year to two years in the forests is to fall for the siege tactics of the enemy. It is also artificial to bring a considerable number of unarmed masses with you in this kind of retreat. Movement will be hampered. Food will soon run out and isolated *kaingings* are easily detected by the enemy.

When the masses are being forced to evacuate, legal mass struggle should be launched to oppose and stop the evacuation. Even when the forced mass evacuation is already done, these legal mass struggles can go on for the restitution of damage to their crops and homes, for better treatment and rationing at evacuation centers and for their early return to their evacuated homes.

Some of the masses or selected families can also be directed by us to shift mainly on their own and by different ways to the area where we are shifting. There are many of those who might have relatives and friends there. Or there are public lands there which they can open like other people do.

Whenever the time comes for us to recover an area previously abandoned by us and then abandoned by the enemy, we must disarm the “home defense units” left by the enemy and increase the weaponry of the people’s army. We must clean up those who have blood debts. And we must be alert for spies planted in the midst of the masses.

We have insisted that for a start in every region we must develop our guerrilla fronts on favorable terrain, that is to say, forested, mountainous and hilly terrain with population. It is in this kind of terrain where enemy rule and influence are usually weak and where we can establish our guerrilla bases within the shortest possible time at this stage. Here we not only have a wide area for maneuver but also easily achieve depth in our maneuvers. Here we can best apply the tactics of “luring in” the enemy. He cannot come in without first exposing himself and alerting us. It would be easy for us to be on the look-out and prepare for his coming.

We have also directed that for a start in a region, two or three guerrilla fronts on such a terrain should be established. We have been concerned with the possible dissipation of our limited Party cadres and resources by a previous current that we should have a guerrilla force in every province. But any regional Party organization can have more than two or three guerrilla front, whenever development and conditions permit.

While we must take advantage of the most favorable terrain for our guerrilla warfare, we must strive to move forward from the mountain to the plains and coordinate the revolutionary forces in the mountains and the plains as well as

those in the barrios and in the towns. In dealing with the islands, we should attend to the major islands first and then the minor ones.

This early, we must also pay attention to the coastal areas. This is important inasmuch as we are an archipelagic country.

Conditions are not yet ripe for having a well-known central revolutionary base, where the Central Committee of the Party and the general headquarter of the New People's Army are seated. We should keep the enemy guessing and ignorant where our principal leaders are in the countryside. But certainly at this stage, we should be firmly taking the steps towards creating such a base in the best possible location.

The emergence of the central revolutionary base presupposes the achievement of a higher stage in our people's war and takes into consideration the development of nationwide guerrilla warfare and international developments involving US imperialism. We still have a long road to traverse in this regard. Of all the regional Party and army organizations, the most directly concerned in bringing about the conditions for the emergence of the central revolutionary base are Northwest Luzon, Northeast Luzon and Central Luzon.

It remains the long-term strategic task of the revolutionary forces of Luzon to destroy the main forces of the enemy. The day is certain to come when the forces from the north and south of Luzon will converge on Manila-Rizal in a general offensive. It also remains the long-term strategic task of the revolutionary forces of Mindanao and the Visayas to draw the forces of the enemy and disperse them. At certain times, the bulk of enemy forces can be drawn to Mindanao. The area for maneuver for us here is as wide as that in the three regions north of Manila-Rizal; and the people's army can either take advantage of or coordinate its efforts with the resistance of Bangsa Moro Army, if integration of the latter is not possible.

We have repeatedly pointed to the present low level of armed strength of the New People's Army. To amplify this strength, we must give full play to the participation of the people in the revolutionary armed struggle. We should not limit this participation to merely providing for the material needs of the full-time Red fighters and watching out for the enemy.

We must give political-military training to as many able-bodied men and women from the mass organizations and from time to time get the required number of volunteers from them to participate in well-planned military actions where their inferior weapons can blend with more advanced weapons of the full-time Red fighters. In the hands of some many people, inferior weapons can

prove to be superior and yet we make sure that at the core of such weapons, such as bolos, spears, bows and arrows and homemade explosives, are good guns.

When the people's combative spirit is kept high by continuous political education and military training, they will make do with any weapon and will use every trick and ruse to disarm the enemy even with bare hands. The most important thing is the people's revolutionary determination and wisdom. In the future, popular uprising or insurrections will arise over extensive areas.

5. BUILD THE REVOLUTIONARY MASS MOVEMENT IN THE CITIES!

We must build the revolutionary mass movement in the cities by developing the trade unions, the community organizations, school organizations and others and engaging them in a broad democratic movement that is distinctly antifascist and anti-imperialist, a movement sympathetic to and supportive of the distinctly antifeudal movement in the countryside.

We must pay principal attention to the masses of workers and other urban poor. We must get the workers mainly through their workplaces and trade unions and also through the communities, where they are linked with other urban poor. We must also pay attention to the urban petit bourgeoisie, especially the student masses and their teachers.

In undertaking an open democratic movement in the cities, we can invoke the very laws of the reactionary state which contain hypocritical terms and reform concessions just to enable us to go into the midst of the masses. Among the masses, we can create a revolutionary underground and transform legal organizations or build new ones that can militantly yet legally carry forward the national-democratic line step by step.

Combining legal and illegal methods, we can develop the revolutionary mass movement in the cities. Our main tactic is to turn the table against the enemy, or to use another metaphor, to take the enemy's fortress from within by stratagem (but preparations for this are protracted and cannot be separated from the progress of the revolutionary armed struggle in the countryside).

The open and legal democratic mass movement cannot be firm, vigorous and well directed without the illegal party at the core. The Party as an underground force must be the backbone of this movement. It must be the guide, nurturing the movement at every step and seeing to it that the next step is taken upon the ripening of conditions for it.

As in the countryside, there is nothing discouraging about the smallness of the party amidst the large masses in the cities. So long as the mass movement develops, activists emerge and make themselves available for recruitment into the Party. Thus, the Party is strengthened to achieve more and assume greater tasks.

It is only through a reinvigorated mass movement that we can raise the new forces to tackle the new situation created by fascist martial rule. There is no other way to solve such problems as the constrictions and unhealthy conspira-

torial tendencies of a narrow underground and the enemy's cunning in looking out for the Party by merely tailing known activists of days before martial rule.

In this time of severe economic crisis, the masses of workers are stirring and pushing forward their economic struggle. We must get into this economic struggle and raise it to the level of the political struggle so that the entire working class will not only be able to fight most effectively for its own interests but also link itself fully with the rest of the people in the powerful flow of the of the people's democratic revolution.

There are immediate conditions and issues which make easy the transformation of the economic struggle into a political struggle. As previously pointed out, the wage and living conditions of the workers are extremely pushed down and benefits put into law by virtue of several decades of workers' struggle have been drastically reduced by the fascist dictator. And to top these all, the workers are prohibited from exercising their right to strike in most enterprises just because they are categorized as "vital industries" and "export industries" by the fascist dictatorship. In the main, these are enterprises owned by US and other monopoly capitalists and by the big comprador bourgeoisie and big landlords.

Whenever the employer gets wind of a plan among the workers to make a mass petition for the improvement of their conditions, the easiest thing for him to do is to make "preventive suspensions" and to call on the troops and police to show up and bully the workers. Of course, when the strike, slow-down, sit-down or any mass protest action is already on, the armed minions of fascism show up to make arrests and make all sound and fury about "subversives," "economic sabotage" and "national discipline."

The masses of workers have experienced the right to strike in times far better than the present. Their present experience of intensified oppression and exploitation is extremely intolerable to them. Thus, no amount of fascist intimidation has deterred them from mass protest actions. These have already developed into concerted strikes and street demonstrations.

We must promote the strike movement and must make it so widespread and so intense to demonstrate to the entire nation and people that the fascist ruling clique and big bourgeoisie are so puny and weak and so rotten to the core. We must promote the economic strikes and transform them into political strikes and political demonstrations. We must hit the big bourgeoisie (and foreign monopoly capitalists and the comprador big bourgeoisie) the hardest. The rate of exploitation is highest in their enterprises.

We are presently at the stage of making the economic strikes more widespread. Even at this stage, the political dimension of such strikes is already coming to the force. We must make solid preparations to bring great multitudes of workers to the streets and plazas for political demonstrations.

In the face of fascist martial rule, yellow labor leaders have become more discredited than ever. The top labor aristocrats of the country have blatantly placed themselves in the payroll of the fascist dictatorship under the so-called Trade Union Congress of the Philippines. Others have been so cowed and discouraged by antiunion restrictions that they have turned to other occupations.

The trade union movement has become more than ever a fertile ground for the revolutionary work of the Party. The masses of workers are already aware that when the Party is in their midst their economic struggle becomes resolute and militant and they become equipped with a profound political understanding of their situation and with a wide range of tactics.

Our propaganda has had some effects. Normally, it should outstrip our organizational work. But our propaganda and prestige have too far outstripped what solid results there should be for our organizational work. We should solve the problem not by reducing our propaganda. On the other hand, we should ceaselessly increase and amplify it. We should intensify not only our written propaganda of a general character but also all forms of verbal and nonverbal agitation suited to the most specific conditions. But we must harvest the crop of propaganda and agitation.

We must conduct organizational work among the workers more vigorously than ever before, in conjunction with our propaganda and agitation. Since long before the fascist rule, the Party has devised the workers' organizing committee as an underground force for organizational expansion among the workers. But learning from experience in the countryside, specifically in connection with organizing a trade union where there is none yet, we do not immediately form this committee from out of those workers whom we meet at the beginning.

We can go through a process akin to that in organizing the present masses. The first step is to organize as a matter of expediency the workers' liaison group from out of those workers with whom we can have relations at the beginning. The second step is for members of this secret group to introduce to us more workers, coming from every major part of an enterprise, so that we can form a secret organizing group in every major part of the enterprise.

The third step is for us to draw representatives or the best elements from the organizing group to form the workers' organizing committee. At every step,

we must deepen our social investigation and provide political education and appropriate instructions to the workers that we come into contact with and organize.

The workers' organizing committee retains the organizing groups as its subsidiaries and improves their composition whenever necessary. By the time that the committee is established, it shall have been ready to draw up the list of workers' demands to which the majority of the workers are to be won ever before the employers and his agents get wind of it. It takes only one, two or three capable party cadres to work with the committee.

The workers' organizing committee can be formed ahead of the workers' organizing group only in cases where we are certain right away that reliable and capable members are on hand at the beginning at least for honest trade union work. Such cases occur whether the objective is to form a trade union where there is none, to transform an already existing one or to put up one trade union against a thoroughly discredited one.

In any case, the workers' organizing committee and its organizing groups are a good means for giving way to the emergence of worker activists within them and outside them. The process of winning over the majority of workers to a list of union demands, creating the militant unity necessary to pursue such demands and developing the political consciousness of the worker masses are conditions for the emergence of a considerable number of worker activists.

Even only at the stage of the workers' organizing committee and organizing groups, our Party cadres should draw into the Party the advanced elements from the ranks of worker activists. Those who are through with the mass course on the trade union work and the national-democratic revolution can be immediately introduced to Marxism, their very own class ideology to which they are very receptive.

The ideological, political and organizational work of the Party branch and the groups under it in the enterprise is the best guarantee that revolutionary politics is in command of trade union work. The Party branch forms and directs the party groups embedded in the leadership of the trade union.

The workers' organizing committee and its organizing groups are dissolvable upon the establishment of the party branch and groups within the enterprise and the absorption of all the workers activists into the structure of the trade union. The organizing groups can be converted into group stewards and certainly a number of their members can qualify to be members of the Party

groups. More and more workers can be put into study circles organized by the Party.

It is necessary for some of our Party cadres to draw salaries and allowances from trade unions so as to devote their full time to trade union and political work. But party members should not monopolize the high posts in the trade union; and the members of the secretariat of the Party branch should not necessarily become the highest leaders of the trade union. We must allow the democratic broadness of the trade union; there can be good union leaders who cannot yet comply with the requirements of Party membership. And moreover, we do not want to let the enemy cripple the Party branch by simply clamping down on the trade union or its open leadership.

In further consideration of tactics in the face of the fascist enemy, trade unions under the effective leadership of the Party should not be replaced under only one chose legal labor federation. This is to prevent the enemy from singling out one nest for attack. Our trade unions can variably be independent or members of various labor federations. We must determine the best possible status of each trade union.

The Party secretly links and coordinates all our trade unions. Our “independent” unions can retain more income from membership dues and are somewhat saved from control by the reactionary trade union leaders. But when members of different labor federations, our unions have the advantage of enjoying close relations with other unions which the party can gradually get into.

The Party branch in an enterprise should see to it that Party members and other worker activists, with the help of the mass of their workers, do systematic revolutionary work in the communities. We must expand the workers’ revolutionary movement by promoting contracts among workers of various enterprises not only within labor federations, along industrial lines or through factory areas but also through the communities.

In communities, workers from all kinds of enterprises reside. The workers already organized and politicized by us can form secret study circles and work closely in community work with other workers. The result is that the latter will bring us to so many more enterprises. Our Party cadres should take firm hold of this possibility for expansion.

In community work, we must rely mainly on the masses of workers and other urban poor. They compose the majority of the people in most communities in the cities. If we place the focus on them in establishing the community organizing committees and either transforming the previously established mass

organizations where they predominate or building new mass organizations, especially where there are none yet, it becomes relatively easy to strike roots in the community and reach the youth, women and other sections of the community.

We must consign to a secondary position the old pattern of sending youth activists, mainly student activists, into urban poor communities and then letting them deal mainly with the youth in the community. We must advance from that situation before fascist martial rule in which there were more youth and student youth organizations than workers' organizations under our direction. We do not wish to diminish youth organizing and discourage activists from schools from participating in local community work. But we wish to give full play to the workers' role not only in trade union affairs but also in community affairs.

The community organizing committee can be immediately formed when we rely on workers or a combination of workers and youth who are themselves residents of the community and have proven to be good activists elsewhere. Of course, we assume that they are led by Party cadres. Then, community organizing groups can be formed to cover the various parts of the community.

The community organizing committee should continuously conduct social investigation and expand its contacts to be able to do well its work at every step. Since there are mass organizations existing prior to our organizational work, the community organizing committee can draw activists from these to form the community organizing groups. These organizations usually include the neighborhood associations, youth clubs, women's associations, squatters' organizations, athletic clubs, groups of professionals, civic clubs, regional or provincial groups and the like.

The advantage in drawing activists from already existing organizations is that they are closely related to the people in the community and that we can cover effectively not only the parts of the community but also the already existing mass organizations. Though we can form new mass organizations with different names in different communities, there is a decided advantage, especially under conditions of fascist martial rule, to make use of the legality of already existing mass organizations and engage the soonest in activities by which we can go deep among the masses and gradually raise their political consciousness.

Because we rely mainly on the masses of workers and other urban poor and we take up their majority interests, it is not too difficult to transform certain already existing mass organizations. We develop a Party group within each of

them and make political advances step by step. On this basis, we can maneuver or overwhelm even the *barangay* councils or *kabataang barangay* and other reactionary organs or institutions into becoming fora or channels for our revolutionary propaganda.

At every stage of the work of the community organizing committee and its organizing groups, we can draw into the Party the most advanced elements from the ranks of the revolutionary activists. In due time, the community organizing committee and its organizing groups can be dissolved because a Party branch has been established in the community and in the legal mass organizations. Mass work and party work can so advance in the communities that the Party branch will be based eventually on the street.

It is a matter of course that the party should be vigilant and look after its security all the time and everywhere, especially in the cities where enemy control and surveillance are tighter than in the countryside. But the Party should pay special attention to securing itself from infiltration by antisocial lumpen-proletarian elements though this be covered by our political work.

The urban petit bourgeoisie is a social stratum whose members are usually self-centered and dispersed. But their children are concentrated in universities and high schools and here they are receptive to revolutionary propaganda. The schools therefore merit the conscientious attention of the Party. These are next in importance to the factories and the urban poor communities.

The student masses and their teachers are an important force in bringing the intelligentsia and the entire urban petit bourgeoisie to the side of the revolution. They are the section of the urban petit bourgeoisie which has the most revolutionary potential. This fact has been proven repeatedly in our history; and the first quarter storm of 1970 and succeeding developments prove it. Students continue to join today's workers' struggles.

Quite a number of students and their teachers have gone so far as to strive remolding their outlook, engage deeply in revolutionary work and join the Party. Other students do not go as far, but they accept the general line of the Party and spread this to the ranks of the petit producers and the professionals. The revolutionary fervor of the student masses could be such that even some children of the exploiting classes who are their schoolmates become attracted to the revolutionary movement.

In the course of community work, the owners of small stores and shops, professionals and white-collar employees are reached by our propaganda. Though they can render some service to the revolutionary movement, they

are not as important as the student masses and teachers who are concentrated in great numbers in schools, are very capable of propaganda work and mass actions and are willing to coordinate their activities with the masses of workers.

The national-democratic organizations of the youth before fascist martial rule have done a great service to the revolutionary cause. Their work has been so fruitful in some schools and communities that there are now Party branches continuing revolutionary underground work here.

In schools where there are yet no party branch and no Party-led mass organization, Party cadres should establish school organizing committees and organizing groups to develop the initial activists from among the students, teachers and other school personnel, push for the establishment of genuine student governments and publications, promote revolutionary ideas in old student organizations or build new ones as means of promoting such ideas and help unions among teachers and other school personnel.

Student activists developed by the school organizing committee and organizing groups should be directed to create as many secret study circles as they can among friends and classmates; and teacher activists should do likewise among co-employees, students and friends. The efficacy of their ideological and propaganda work should in due time result in political mass actions.

The student masses, teachers and other school personnel should link the issues on the campus with the deteriorating conditions of society in general. The progressive students of the University of the Philippines are showing the way to fight the Marcos fascist dictatorship, how to oppose antinational, anti-democratic policies and actions. They have started to make mass protests of their own and join those of the workers.

Even only at the stage of the school organizing committee and organizing groups, we can start to draw into the Party the most advanced elements from the ranks of the school activists. Eventually the Party branch should emerge in the school, and party groups in the various parts of the school as well as in the mass organizations there. In large universities, it is possible for a section committee of the Party to lead so many party branches that are based on the colleges.

We should continue carrying out the policy of deploying student activists for social investigation and mass work in factories and communities accessible to them. We should promote the closest links between the worker and student activists in the cities so that concerted mass actions of the worker masses and student masses will become possible.

The development of the democratic movement in Manila-Rizal and other urban areas constitutes powerful political support to the revolutionary struggle in the countryside. The people in the entire country become aroused and the enemy is shaken within his fortress.

The people in the cities should realize that the long-term development of the underground there and the steady growth of political mass actions and a preparation for the final day of reckoning for the ruling system, when their general uprising will come into coordination with the general offensive of the people's army. The Party should promote this revolutionary thinking and dispel notions that the people's army should now send its small but growing forces to the cities for some spectacular actions.

There are other kinds of support from the cities for the revolutionary struggle in the countryside. The Party organization in the cities can systematically dispatch cadres who still have legal status or who no longer have this to the countryside. Cadres of worker status or of student background can be sent to their native areas or where they are most needed. Funds, medicine, military equipment, medical equipment, communications equipment, clothes, revolutionary publications and other useful materials can also be collected and sent.

It is inevitable at the moment for our communication to pass through certain cities. For instance, communications between the Visayas and Mindanao on the one hand and the central leadership of the Party cannot bypass Manila-Rizal. There should be a reliable corps of couriers who can travel legally between the cities and the countryside and from one region to another.

There should be coordination between the revolutionary struggle in the cities and that in the countryside on so many things. The Party is the coordinator and should have special organs to attend to the requirements of coordination.

6. REALIZE A BROAD ANTI-FASCIST, ANTI-FEUDAL AND ANTI-IMPERIALIST UNITED FRONT!

We must realize a broad antifascist, antifeudal and anti-imperialist united front under the leadership of the working class through its political party. As earlier pointed out, the foundation of this united front policy is the basic alliance of the working class and the peasantry.

Upon this foundation, we win over the urban petit bourgeoisie principally and the national bourgeoisie secondarily as additional allies. At the same time, we note well and take advantage of the splits among the reactionaries—the comprador big bourgeoisie and landlords who are now divided between the pro-Marcos and anti-Marcos sides.

The toiling masses of workers and peasants compose the overwhelming majority of the national population and, being the most oppressed and exploited, they are the most interested in a comprehensive antifascist, antifeudal and anti-imperialist movement. They constitute the main force of the united front. Only with such a force can we implement the policy of uniting the many to oppose the few and isolate and destroy the enemy.

Going deep among the workers and also among the peasants, the party links and coordinates both classes for a united revolutionary struggle. At the stage of the national-democratic revolution, when armed struggle is the main form of struggle, it is of the highest importance that the party in representation of the working class must do painstaking mass work among the peasants and build a peasant army.

It does not suffice to say that the peasantry is the closest and most reliable ally of the working class. Further analysis is required for the concrete application of the united front in the countryside. The peasantry is divided into three strata with various political attitudes on the basis of their economic status.

We must develop the antifeudal united front in the countryside. We must rely mainly on the poor peasants, win over the middle peasants and neutralize the rich peasants to oppose the evil landlord gentry. When we speak of the peasantry as the closest ally of the working class, we refer essentially to the poor peasants and middle peasants.

The barrio organizing committee was originally conceived as an organ of expansion and as the embryo of local people's government along the line of the united front. Now that we are laying it aside, it does not mean that we are dispensing with united front work in the barrios. We simply want to strength-

en the poor peasants and lower-middle peasants together in their own mass organization and not simply mix them up with the rich peasants and other unstable elements in a committee.

Carrying out the united front policy and employing its tactics, we must deal properly with all those entities outside the peasant movement. We must step by step win over the entirety of the middle peasants into the association, we must deal with them properly as individuals or groups and still try to gain some support and cooperation from them.

The rich peasants are not so much interested in the antifeudal movement. But they resent the economic crisis, the arbitrariness of the fascist dictatorship and the increasing taxes and have some patriotic feelings. When the revolutionary peasant movement is strong and the people's army is around, they are quite a hospitable lot and may even offer to join the peasant association. It is upon the rise of reaction that their reactionary aspect comes to the fore.

There are usually traditional and legal organizations where peasants of all strata are mixed up. We cannot summarily ban or ignore these. We must study these carefully and apply the united front policy to make them truly beneficial to the poor and lower-middle peasants or helpful to the revolutionary struggle.

There are such associations or groupings as the elders' councils, the usually informal mutual aid and labor exchange groups, irrigation associations, farm workers' groups cooperatives, youth clubs, athletic teams, carpenters' groups, the parents-teachers association, 4-H club, women's club, religious sects and so on and so forth.

Even such tools of the reactionary government as the barrio or *barangay* council, *kabataang barangay*, *samahang nayon* and at certain times the rural police, *ronda* or "home defense" unit may be neutralized, transformed or broken up, depending on the circumstances. The names of these associations can often be used for revolutionary dual tactics, specifically for covering up what is revolutionary.

In the countryside, there are many other kinds of possible allies. There are the teachers and other professionals, the small and middle merchants and entrepreneurs, certain relatively big businessmen and some enlightened landlords. The teachers and professionals are a good medium for spreading propaganda in the towns. Doctors and nurses can give much-needed medical services and medicine. The businessman and enlightened landlords pay taxes or give contributions and sometimes provide facilities to us.

When conditions are ripe, we must establish the organ of democratic political power along the line of the united front. We have already pointed out that the full establishment of the basic mass organizations in the barrio is the precondition for the establishment of the barrio revolutionary committee. In the period before the establishment of the barrio revolutionary committee, the functions of local self-government can be performed with the peasant organizing committee or the leading committee of the fully organized peasant association hewing to the party's united front policy. In the cities, we must continue the policy of winning the support of the student masses and their teachers by way of reaching and winning over the entire urban petit bourgeoisie. Upon the success of this policy, we can also win over the national bourgeoisie as they become aware that a strong anti-imperialist movement is advocating independence and national industrialization.

Elements of the national bourgeoisie in areas within the jurisdiction of the people's army have extended support to us. In the cities, there are also members of the national bourgeoisie who have extended support to us, especially through the student and youth movement.

In the principal conservative and reactionary organizations in the country, best exemplified by the political parties like the now dormant Nacionalista and Liberal parties, the urban petit bourgeoisie and the national bourgeoisie have been mere tails of the ruling classes—the comprador big bourgeoisie and the landlord class.

This is true even in professional and civic organizations at the municipal, provincial and national levels. In the chambers of commerce and industry, the national bourgeoisie are also reduced to being mere tails of the big bourgeoisie and big landlords. We must form groups within these associations to consolidate the ranks of the national bourgeoisie are also reduced to being mere tails of the big bourgeoisie and big landlords. We must form groups within these associations to consolidate the ranks of the national bourgeoisie and promote the national and democratic line.

The Preparatory Commission of the National Democratic Front and the regional united front commissions have projected and broadcast our united front policy; they have succeeded in winning over groups and personalities who take the stand of the urban petit bourgeoisie and the national bourgeoisie and have established progressive underground groups, called national-democratic cells, within the most reactionary institutions and organizations. Some

of these groups have helped us reach the basic masses that would otherwise be difficult to reach.

The aforesaid commissions have the special task of winning over the middle forces of the revolutionary cause and bringing to the main organization of the party concrete assistance in reaching the basic forces of the revolution. Legal mass organizations and mass activities of a national-democratic character should be well undertaken. Close attention must be paid to this urgent task.

The door continues to be open widely for cooperation with those who are against the Marcos fascist dictatorship who may vary in degree of anti-imperialism and anti-feudalism. We must unite with them but we must maintain our independence and initiative and we struggle with them on just grounds and with restraint all for the purpose of winning the hearts and minds of the people and advancing the revolutionary struggle.

The Lava revisionist renegades have long excluded themselves from the united front. By surrendering to the Marcos fascist dictatorship and actively participating in vicious counterrevolutionary actions, this handful of revisionist fascist criminals have become totally discredited even in the few small areas of which they once boasted as their bailiwicks. The Manglapus group, fancying itself as the “social democratic party,” has also excluded itself from the united front by being no more than a tool of the Central Intelligence Agency.

As it is now taking shape, the main split among the reactionaries is between the Marcos fascist gang and an alliance ostensibly led by Macapagal. Though Marcos has a sizable number of agents within the interim national assembly and has limited its authority, especially under fascist martial rule, he refuses to convene it and intends to explicitly abolish it because he is afraid that it would become a forum for popular opposition.

Aware of Marcos’ scheme, especially with Imelda already emerging as second-in-command and successor, Macapagal has called on the officers of the reactionary armed forces to make a counter coup and rule for a short period to pave the way for the convening of the interim national assembly. Obviously, he has already gotten the assurance of US imperialism that he can openly lead the opposition loyal to the ruling system. The pushing out of certain inside men of the CIA from Marcos ranks bears watching.

US imperialism intends to be aggrandized, whichever direction events may take in the struggle between the Marcos and Macapagal factions. This single dominant power in the country wants two dogs to compete for the same reactionary purposes. The only difference there is from reactionary competi-

tions before martial rule is the increasingly conspicuous role of the reactionary armed forces.

Under the circumstances, with both reactionary factions competing for the good graces of US imperialism, it is clear that we become more determined to carry forward the national-democratic line against fascism, feudalism and imperialism and carry out the armed struggle relentlessly. As revolutionaries, we do not want to get bogged down in debates whether the Marcos constitution or the 1935 constitution is to be promoted. The point is to fight well the Marcos fascist dictatorship and the forces behind it and in the process carry the revolution forward.

A coup d'état led by reactionary military officers can be as bad as or worse than the present Marcos fascist dictatorship even if it promises to pave the way for the interim national assembly. However, there is also the possibility that the coup d'état will bring to power a civilian faction and really allows it to reverse Marcos' fascist excesses. We must be prepared for every possibility.

We must always remember that our united front work is in support of the revolutionary armed struggle. We must have reliable and long-term allies and we must also have unreliable and short-term allies. The most important thing is that we have allies to be able to reach, arouse, organize and mobilize the millions upon millions of people who are under various influences for the revolutionary cause.

7. RELATE THE PHILIPPINE REVOLUTION TO THE WORLD REVOLUTION!

We must relate the Philippine revolution to the world revolution. We are proletarian internationalists. We are carrying out the Philippine revolution to contribute our own share in the struggle of the world proletariat and the entire mankind to defeat imperialism and bring about the dawn of communism.

We recognize at the same time all anti-imperialist struggles and advances of the revolution in other countries redound to the benefit of the Philippines revolution and favor its advance. These bring about conditions favorable to our revolutionary efforts. We receive powerful political support and boundless inspiration. We learn invaluable lessons. We see in the victorious national-democratic revolutions and socialist revolutions abroad our bright future.

The astounding revolutionary victories of the Indochinese peoples of Vietnam, Cambodia and Laos have signaled the irreversible decline of US imperialism in Southeast Asia, in the whole of Asia, in the whole world and in its very home ground. We are enthusiastic that the Peoples of small countries can deal so stunning a blow to US imperialism and make so great a contribution to the world revolution.

The stable outposts of anti-imperialism in Southeast Asia have arisen and have raised the banner of socialist revolution and socialist construction. In all unliberated countries in the region, the people are more than ever determined to carry out revolutionary armed struggle against US imperialism and its lackeys.

We are witnessing today the abandonment of the ignominious Southeast Asia Treaty Organization, an outrightly US military instrument, and a retreat into the Association of Southeast Asian Nation. This latter organization no longer flaunt the aggressive power of US imperialism and even denies being an instrument of this superpower. But it admits openly that the three main concerns of its reactionary member governments are to suppress “insurgencies”; promote “peace, freedom and neutrality” and develop “regional economic cooperation. We must not fail to recognize that the main and essential character of the ASEAN is counterrevolutionary even as we observe that this organization reflects a certain trend that is merely the result of the crisis of the world capitalist system, the US imperialist debacle in Indochina and the crisis plaguing each unliberated Southeast Asian country. Such a trend should remind us the more of our responsibilities as revolutionaries.

In our vicinity are the people of China surging forward in their socialist revolution and socialist construction and standing firmly against the two superpowers. The Korean people are engaged also in socialist revolution and socialist construction in the north and are facing up to US imperialism and its lackeys in the south.

Far and wide, the revolution is rapidly advancing. The people of Asia, Africa and Latin American continue to wage powerful revolutionary movements against imperialism, colonialism and hegemonism. In all other continents, including the home grounds of US imperialism and Soviet social-imperialism, the people are engaged in revolutionary struggles. Revolution is still the main trend in the world today and Marxist-Leninist parties are steadily forging ahead.

The world revolution is advancing under conditions of intensifying superpower contention, grave crisis of the world capitalist system and the rise of the third world people and countries as the main force of the world anti-imperialist struggle. All basic contradictions are sharpening and all the ingredients of both revolution and war are exhuming.

Despite their off-and-on “peace” and “detente” duets to lull the people of the world, the two superpowers are engaged in an ever-intensifying rivalry for world hegemony and are feverishly making arms expansion and war preparations. They are trying to push each other out and gain an advantage everywhere. It is clear that their imperialist rivalry is the source of the danger of war.

Though the two superpowers are overextending themselves all over the world, Europe is their main bone of contention. Their clashing interests are most concentrated here. War is likely to start here. Troubles are now increasingly erupting here and in its vicinity. Should war break out in that part of the world, the beasts can finish off or weaken each other while we push forward the revolution in our country and in our region.

But while war does not yet break out in Europe, Soviet social-imperialism is trying to penetrate even such a country like the Philippines which US imperialism considers a permanent preserve in this part of the world. Soviet social-imperialism calculates that it must make diplomatic and trade inroads to weaken US imperialism in as many places as possible and push hard its new tsarist ambitions of world hegemony.

US imperialist domination in the Philippines can be removed only by a powerful revolutionary movement. But the Soviet social-imperialists nurture the illusion that someday their long-discredited local agents, the Lava revision-

ist renegades, will be able to do turns for them and commit far more treachery and mischief than they presently can as shameless tools of the Marcos fascist dictatorship. Even now, within their narrow circles, the Lava revisionist renegades do not tire of talking about getting more help from their imperialist master to do more mischief.

The reason is clear why Soviet social-imperialism even as enemy of US imperialism cannot be our friend in any way. While we must oppose US imperialism, we must be alert to Soviet social-imperialism and frustrate its scheme. We are well past the early 60's when Soviet modern revisionism could still deceive well-intentioned people.

The present crisis of the world capitalist system has been the worst since the end of World War II and continues to deepen and worsen. The inherent law of motion of capitalism, bringing about a crisis of overproduction; the monopolistic competition among capitalist countries, especially the leading imperialist powers; and the reduction of economic territory by revolutions and by the assertion of independence by hard-pressed countries have spelled the present world capitalist crisis.

The imperialists shift the burden of crisis to those whom they can. They do so through accelerated rates of profits on direct investments, usurious loans and unequal trade. The people resist. Even a reactionary government like that of the Philippines, while determined to remain a puppet of US imperialism, has to maneuver for its own sake.

The third world countries have increasingly asserted their independence and demanded a new international economic order in the face of the world capitalist crisis and superpower machinations. Underlying the phenomenon of even reactionary governments posing to assert the independence of their countries is the growth of the revolutionary movement and at the same time the concern of the reactionary leaders that they must lessen or palliate the crisis that threatens them.

It must be made clear to the people that the Marcos fascist dictatorship has broadened the diplomatic and trade relations of the Philippines out of desperation and weakness even as it still clings to US imperialism as its imperialist master. The circumstances in the emergence of better Philippine relations with the Middle East countries and China are clear.

As the fascist dictator claims credit for promoting the US line of "interdependence" in the third world, we must criticize and condemn him for acting as an inveterate agent of US imperialism within the third world and for putting a

brake on the most meaningful participation of the Philippines in the anti-imperialist struggle of the third world. We must make our own projection of the demands of the third world in the terms especially of its revolutionary people.

The facts show that under the Marcos fascist dictatorship the economic stranglehold of US imperialism on the Philippines has become tighter. Because of the Marcos constitution and the fascist decrees giving more privileges to foreign investors, there is practically no more need for any new economic treaty replacing the Laurel-Langley Agreement.

The fascist dictator has always asserted that US imperialism should keep its military bases in the Philippines, provide a “nuclear umbrella” and guard the skies and seas. Negotiations on the US-RP military treaties have been an old ritual repeatedly resorted to in a futile attempt to deflect the people’s anti-imperialist struggle.

The only new thing in current negotiations on such treaties is that the Marcos fascist dictatorship wants some rent on the vast tracts of land occupied by the US military bases, relinquishment of some small sections of the land for Marcos’ real estate speculation and assurances of more US financial and military assistance. The question of sovereignty over the US military bases has long been resolved; the point has always been to assert such sovereignty by deeds.

We must strive to have the Philippine revolution enjoy not only the political support of friendly forces abroad but also concrete assistance from them. US imperialism has not stopped but has even stepped up the giving of congressional and extra-congressional military and other kinds of assistance to the Marcos fascist dictatorship.

Remaining a puppet of US imperialism, the Marcos fascist dictatorship misappropriates such terms as “self-reliance” and “nonalignment” in the same fashion that he domestically misappropriates such a term as “democratic revolution” for the fascist counterrevolution. Snatching terms from the revolutionary movement is an old trick of the fascist thief. But reality speaks louder.

Unlike the reactionaries, we stand on the basic principles of independence and self-reliance. Foreign assistance should only be supplementary to our independent and self-reliant efforts. Even without any foreign assistance, we should be able to fight on and advance step by step. As already pointed out, practically everything that we need can come from the people and from the battlefield.

We should be able to draw support and assistance from as many foreign friends as possible, short of falling any trap set by the US imperialists and

the Soviet social-imperialists. We appreciate most the kind of assistance that enhances self-reliance, our armed struggle and our propaganda.

Aside from developing the closest and most fruitful relations with the Marxist-Leninist parties and other revolutionary organizations, we should pay attention to our own Filipino compatriots abroad. Associations of our compatriots should extend every possible kind of support to the revolutionary struggle in their motherland and should win the widest possible support from their host people.

The half-a-million Filipinos in the United States have a very important role gathering support for the Philippine revolution not only from their own ranks but also from the American people. US intervention and the possibility of another US war of aggression in the Philippines must be effectively opposed with the support of the American people.

Overseas Filipinos are found in various parts of the world. Wherever they are, they should do what they can to help their people and should prepare themselves to join the ranks of the revolutionaries in the motherland. We assume that the most progressive among them study Marxism-Leninism and take appropriate interest in the revolutionary struggles in their host countries.

The conditions in the world which now favor the advance of the Philippine revolution are bound to become more excellent. The future for all revolutionary people is bright. That of the imperialists and the reactionaries is bleak.

**Two Articles on the
People's Struggle for a
Just Peace**

The main reason for the defeat of the armed revolutionary movement in the early fifties was the Left opportunist or adventurist line of quick military victory in two years' time, exaggerating the spontaneous character of the masses due to the social crisis and not paying attention to the balance of forces and the need for painstaking mass work to lay the ground for social revolution and to counteract the military superiority of the enemy forces. But the deceptive "peace" approaches to local leaders of the revolutionary movement by US and reactionary agents augmented and complemented the heavy military onslaughts of the blatant enemy in the entire strategy to defeat the revolutionary forces.

Revolutionaries determined to carry out the objectives of the national democratic revolution can logically and legitimately consider peace negotiations as a way of pushing forward the aforesaid objectives, in the same way that the other side considers the same peace negotiations as a way of pushing forward its own objectives. Inevitably, the struggle across the table reflects first of all the struggle in the battlefield and then influence further developments in the battlefield.

The sincerity of the NDF.. is to be measured by its steadfastness in defending and upholding the people's interests, its firmness of principles even while making policy adjustments to achieve certain specific anti-imperialist (e.g., the immediate removal of US military bases) and democratic (e.g., genuine and thoroughgoing land reform) demands, and its vigilance in frustrating every scheme to undermine the gains and achievements of the revolutionary movement and the people.

Published as a pamphlet by the International Network for Philippine Studies in 1991. The text here was extracted from *For Justice, Socialism and Peace*, the fourth volume of the Sison's selected works, pp. 28-89.

HISTORY AND CIRCUMSTANCES RELEVANT TO THE QUESTION OF PEACE

May 10, 1991

A just and lasting peace is possible only if the Filipino people's demand for national liberation and democracy is satisfied. It is the outcome of the people's revolutionary struggle. The national-democratic revolution is also a struggle for a just and lasting peace. The strategic line of this revolution which is to complete the struggle for national liberation and democracy, is the same strategic line the NDFP has to pursue in seeking a just and lasting peace.

There can be no other strategic line. To say that the NDFP does not have such a line in seeking peace negotiations is to suggest another line or to confuse the line. To engage in peace negotiations without addressing the roots of the armed conflict and without seeking substantial satisfaction of the people's demands for national liberation and democracy, is to create confusion and even fall into capitulation.

Peace negotiations may be conducted before the total victory of the national-democratic revolution. If the success of these involve a truce between the two contending sides in the civil war for the purpose of uniting against a common foe or against a certain set of problems, there is a mutual adjustment of policies. But the NDFP is not obliged to give up its firm revolutionary principles. Neither can the GRP be expected to change its counter-revolutionary policies.

Peace negotiations constitute only one of the forms of struggle in the overall struggle for a just and lasting peace. They may arise only because, in the first place, there is an armed conflict to deal with. They reflect and yet interact with the balance of strength in the battlefield. To obscure or to underrate the relationship of the battlefield to the negotiating table is to fly into fantasy, unless the "realistic" objective is to capitulate.

Peace negotiations do not always happen between the two sides in a civil war. That they may arise depends on the strength and willingness of the two warring sides and on the concrete situation. An incumbent state power can refuse to negotiate peace because it thinks it can beat its opposite side in the battlefield. However, it is always willing to negotiate if the other side wishes to capitulate or can be tricked into capitulation. It can also use peace rhetoric to misrepresent itself as the just and reasonable side, split the ranks of the armed opposition and mislead the people.

It is known in history that quite a number of regimes have refused to negotiate seriously even when they are desperate or when they are about to be defeated. Even in such a case, the revolutionary movement must show that its position is just and reasonable, that it seeks a just and lasting peace, in order to gain more popular support at home and abroad and to isolate and defeat the side that stands for the violence of an oppressive and exploitative system.

Before undertaking peace negotiations, it is necessary for the Philippine revolutionary movement to study both the relevant historical experience and current circumstances in order to understand profoundly and pursue correctly the struggle for a just and lasting peace.

The Philippines has a rich experience with various types of armed conflict and peace negotiations. It is useful to review this experience and learn from it.

Peace Negotiations in Philippine History

In precolonial times, the disparate communities in the Philippines engaged in trade and cultural interaction as well as in wars. Wars were settled either through the victory of one side and the defeat of the other or were negotiated through the mediation of a third party in the course of war or in its aftermath.

The peace process of the precolonial past can still be observed in certain areas which are not tightly integrated into the dominant social and legal system. The revolutionary movement has understood this kind of peace process in the hinterlands and has often acted as the third party to assist in the peacemaking between conflicting communities and unite them against the Manila-based and local forces of oppression and exploitation.

For instance, in the mountain provinces of Northern Luzon, the tradition of the bodong (peace pact) has been adopted by the revolutionary forces to settle tribal or communal armed conflicts and has acquired a national and democratic orientation.

Pacification by Spanish Colonialism

In the conquest of the Philippines, the Spanish colonialists used the divide-and-rule policy. They engaged in blood compacts and alliances wherever they could, and pacified one community in order to conscript troops to augment the few foreign troops needed to conquer and subjugate another community.

In the conduct of pacification, Spanish colonial troops used armed force or threatened the use of it to suppress or discourage native resistance. The Spanish

priests had the special function of persuading the natives that it was better to submit to rather than resist colonial rule.

The sword-and-cross combination worked effectively while the native indios were still lacking in national consciousness. The Moros, the Igorots and other tribes could resist longer because of definite factors which favored resistance, like Islam as the rallying point of the Moros and the spontaneous tendency of the Igorots to unite against the uninvited foreigners and lowlanders and use their mountainous terrain to their advantage. The Sulu sultanate accepted Spanish colonial garrisons only in the middle of the nineteenth century. Some Igorot communities were subjugated only in the last quarter of the nineteenth century.

The concept of local dialogues and community-based peace espoused by General Fidel Ramos through his peace and order councils or by the Coalition for Peace under the slogan of “zones of peace and zones of life” harks back to the pacification of the Philippine islands by Spanish colonialism. The colonial use of this concept of pacification is a much earlier tactic than that of denying the armed revolutionary movement of its mass base, as in the US conquest of the Philippines, and the use of “strategic hamlets” in the Vietnam war.

In the course of the protracted war between the Spaniards and the Moros through the centuries, there were interludes of peace negotiations and truce agreements. The Moros had the strength and dignity of being able to go into these because of their determined armed resistance. They were always ready to fight against the threat of total conquest.

The Pact of Biak-na-Bato

Following the outbreak of the Philippine Revolution of 1896, the Spanish colonialists used both armed force and peace negotiations to end the Aguinaldo-led armed resistance of the Filipino people. As a result of the efforts of Pedro Paterno as intermediary, the first negotiations between the colonial power and the Philippine armed revolution led to the capitulation and exile of Aguinaldo and other leaders of the revolution under the Pact of Biak-na-Bato in 1897.

In resuming the armed revolution against Spanish colonial power, the Filipino revolutionaries cooperated and negotiated with the United States. Subsequently, the US negotiated them out of advantageous positions in the siege of Intramuros and secretly negotiated with Spain the surrender of the Spanish

forces to the US. Eventually, the Treaty of Paris of December 10, 1898, was forged strictly between the US and Spain.

In the course of the Filipino-American War, which started in early 1899, the US offered “peace” and “benevolent assimilation” to the Philippine revolutionary government. The “peace” offer induced a split within the Cabinet of the Philippine revolutionary government, resulting in the replacement of the Mabini Cabinet by the Paterno Cabinet and ultimately in the assassination of General Antonio Luna, the commanding general of the revolutionary army.

In conquering the Philippines and imposing its colonial rule on the people, the US combined the use of superior military force to crush the armed revolutionary forces and localized “peace” dialogues and agreements (with the assistance of the reactionary clergy) to recruit the local gentry into the service of US domination. The localized “peace” dialogues and agreements were always crowned with local elections dominated by the local gentry.

While it was preoccupied with quelling the revolutionary forces in Luzon, the US went so far as to enter into a peace agreement, the Kiram-Bates Agreement of 1899, with the Sulu sultanate. After Luzon and Visayas were in the main pacified, it was the turn of the Moro people to be brutally conquered.

Upon the intercession of Dr. Dominador Gomez, Macario Sakay of the Filipino Republic placed himself and his forces in the hands of US colonial authorities in 1906 after an informal peace agreement. After a brief period of being feted and escorted by enemy troops, Sakay and his colleagues were tried and hanged for “banditry.”

The Neocolonial Compromise

In Philippine history so far, the most successful negotiations regarding the fate of the entire Philippines have been those between the US government and the puppet legislative officials from the Nacionalista Party on the subject of changing the colonial status of the Philippines to a semicolonial or neocolonial one. Thus, in 1935 the Philippine Constitution and the transitional Commonwealth government and in 1946 the proclamation of nominal independence became possible.

The Nacionalista Party did not have to lead a people’s army and wage a people’s war. Nationalist rhetoric, peaceful campaigns and missions to Washington seemed sufficient. But in fact, the US took into account the revolutionary history and potential of the Filipino people and mass agitation for independence as well as the conditions of social unrest in the Philippines, in the US and in

the world at large due to the great depression, the rise of fascist regimes and the need for an antifascist popular front in the 1930s.

What was important for the colonialists, in agreeing to a neocolonial compromise, was that they retain their property rights and control of security forces even as national administration was handed over to the natives.

It was in the latter half of the 1930s that President Quezon informally negotiated with Crisanto Evangelista and other detained leaders of the Communist Party for the legalization of the CP and cooperation in a “program of social justice” and in the antifascist struggle. With no objection from the US authorities, the representative of the Communist Party of the USA prodded Quezon to release the imprisoned CP leaders in 1936 and 1937.

Towards the outbreak of World War II, the merger party of the Communist Party and Socialist Party pledged its loyalty to the Commonwealth government and pleaded for the arming of the people against the imminent threat of Japanese invasion. But the puppet government refused to arm the people.

The Japanese “Peace” Offer

In imposing its rule on the Philippines from 1942 onwards, the Japanese fascists negotiated “peace” with all the available pre-war pro-US officials to shift their loyalty to Japan. If the pro-US officials were not available for one reason or another, the new foreign rulers recruited their own political puppets from the local exploiting classes.

After the arrest of the principal leaders of the CP-SP merger party in early 1942, the Japanese fascists sent out Guillermo Capadocia from prison to contact the other CP-SP merger party leaders for peace negotiations on the condition that his failure to return before the deadline would mean the execution of the imprisoned party chairman Crisanto Evangelista and the general secretary of the party Pedro Abad Santos.

Capadocia was arrested by the Manila-Rizal command of the Hukbalahap and was tried and subjected to disciplinary action by the CP-SP merger party for agreeing to be the messenger of the Japanese fascists. His failure to return to prison sealed the martyrdom of Evangelista and Abad Santos.

In the course of the resistance against Japan, the CP-SP merger party was able to build a people’s army, the Hukbalahap. But even before the landing of the US troops in late 1944, the CP-SP merger party decided to opt for parliamentary struggle and to convert the Hukbalahap into a veterans’ organization. This domestic political line would be reinforced by the international line of

peace and democracy proclaimed by the Soviet Union and the international communist movement.

Once More, Pax Americana

In reconquering the Philippines in 1945, the US reinstated its pre-war officials or set up provisional officials wherever the former were no longer available. It put into prison local officials installed by the revolutionary forces in Central Luzon.

Informally, Sergio Osmeña, the last president of the Commonwealth, accommodated the CP-SP merger party in the arena of parliamentary struggle and agreed to the alliance of his Nacionalista Party and the Democratic Alliance in 1946 elections, notwithstanding the bloody actions already being undertaken by US and local reactionaries against the Hukbalahap and the progressive movement.

After his electoral victory, Manuel Roxas as first president of the puppet republic was able to extract from the right opportunist leadership of the CP-SP merger party a commitment to surrender Hukbalahap arms and register Hukbalahap fighters. But the massive anticommunist campaign of terror against the people and the people's army continued and the members of the Democratic Alliance elected to Congress were unseated in order to pave the way for the legislative approval of the Parity Amendment and other unequal agreements between the US and the Philippines. Nevertheless, through various devices, the merger party continued to plead for peace negotiations and forward peace proposals to the reactionary government.

The Quirino-Taruc Peace Agreement

Under President Elpidio Quirino in 1948, the reactionary government showed interest in negotiating with the revolutionary movement. The main negotiator of the government was Judge Antonio Quirino, brother of the President. With the approval of the leadership of the CP-SP merger party but without correct and clear explanations to the rank and file of the revolutionary mass movement, the commander of the Hukbalahap Luis Taruc engaged in peace negotiations in Hukbalahap territory with the Quirino government. An agreement was reached on amnesty, surrender of arms and renewed registration of Hukbalahap fighters and reinstatement in Congress of the ousted congressmen from the Democratic Alliance.

The objectives of the CP-SP leadership in allowing Taruc to do what he did were to make propaganda and to try the road of parliamentary struggle. Undermining the stand and will of the revolutionary forces, Taruc and his kind put themselves above the armed conflict and premised the desire for peace on the claim that the people were tired of war and its costs.

The CP-SP merger party also presented in 1948 to the Committee on Un-Filipino Activities of the Philippine House of Representatives, a memorandum reiterating support to the Constitution of the reactionary government and declaring that the new democratic revolution would have a capitalist basis.

While the amnesty agreement was in effect, the troops and secret agents of the Philippine Constabulary could mingle with the fighters of the Hukbalahap and enjoyed safe conduct in the Huk-controlled barrios of Central Luzon. Large numbers of cadres of the underground were exposed as they surfaced and facilitated the surrender of arms and the registration of Hukbalahap fighters.

After a short period of only two months, the amnesty agreement was broken as the Philippine military started to kill leaders of the revolutionary movement. Among those killed was the principal leader of the peasant movement, Juan Feleo, who was under constant escort and surveillance by the Philippine Constabulary. The demonstrated bad faith of the Quirino regime and its US master was a powerful motive for the declaration of “all-out armed struggle” by the CP-SP merger party in 1950.

Localized “Peace” Approaches

Even after the failure of the Quirino-Taruc amnesty and truce agreement, Filipino assets of the US Central Intelligence Agency like Manuel Manahan and Colonel Osmundo Mondoñedo (who belonged to the outfit of Colonel Edward Lansdale) systematically approached local revolutionary leaders and local commanders of the Hukbong Mapagpalaya ng Bayan (new name for the Hukbalahap adopted in 1950) to offer localized peace and personal concessions to their family members, including jobs and scholarships for their children.

Because the role of Taruc in negotiating with the Quirino regime was never correctly and properly explained to them, field commanders of the HMB and local leaders of the revolutionary movement were susceptible to approaches by enemy agents masquerading as men of peace and goodwill. A number of them made separate deals from a narrow localist or even personal viewpoint.

The main reason for the defeat of the armed revolutionary movement in the early 1950s was the Left opportunist or adventurist line of quick military

victory in two years' time, exaggerating the spontaneous character of the masses due to the social crisis, and not paying attention to the balance of forces and the need for painstaking mass work to lay the ground for social revolution and to counteract the military superiority of the enemy forces. But the deceptive "peace" approaches to local leaders of the revolutionary movement by US and reactionary agents augmented and complemented the heavy military onslaughts of the enemy in the entire strategy to defeat the revolutionary forces.

After the crushing defeat of the armed revolutionary movement, no basis whatsoever was left for any kind of peace negotiations for a long time. In 1957, the Garcia regime enacted the Anti-Subversion Law (drafted during the earlier Magsaysay regime by the American Jesuit priest Father Weiss and US embassy political officers), which gave leaders of the Communist Party and related organizations an ultimatum to either surrender and seek amnesty within six months, or face the death penalty.

Peace Through Revolutionary Struggle

With regard to the Communist Party of the Philippines, reestablished in 1968, the Marcos regime never saw the need to go through the motions of seeking peace negotiations with it. Instead, the regime always tried to destroy it outright. What the regime found more appropriate was to secure the formal surrender of the Lava revisionist group in 1974 and to give it paltry concessions in the vain hope of using it for intelligence and propaganda purposes against the Communist Party of the Philippines, New People's Army and the National Democratic Front of the Philippines.

The Lava revisionist group surrendered its firearms and registered its personnel with the GRP. In exchange, the GRP legalized the group, recruited some members into the Constabulary Security Unit and conceded to other members homestead rights on the slope of the Sierra Madre in eastern Bulacan. The Lava group murdered at least 25 of its own members who resisted its line of capitulation.

Since the beginning, the Communist Party of the Philippines has always regarded its program for a people's democratic revolution as the strategic line and political basis for a just and lasting peace. Despite the all-out determination of the Marcos regime to destroy the armed revolutionary movement, which Marcos had pointed to as the principal reason for declaring martial law in 1972, the CPP in its sixth anniversary statement in 1974 declared that there

could be a truce if the regime was willing to come to a mutually satisfactory agreement sufficiently beneficial to the people in terms of national independence and democracy. At the same time, so as not to confuse its own ranks, the CPP described the possibility as a remote one.

As it has proceeded from the very beginning, the armed revolutionary movement has always championed and promoted a just peace, especially wherever it and the people can exercise revolutionary power and undertake campaigns of social benefit. The armed propaganda teams and other units of the people's army have always espoused and helped build a social life that is productive and just and that is peaceful, quiet and tranquil against the depredations of the ruling system and the bad elements in local communities.

The armed revolutionary movement led by the Communist Party of the Philippines builds people's democratic power in the rural areas even as reactionary state power is still entrenched in the cities. Such a democratic power defends the people, enables them to achieve the all-round progress that is possible, and fights for a just peace. Such a power rejects the very idea that a just peace consists of laying down the arms of the people and seeking accommodation with the violent ruling system of oppression and exploitation.

The local units and leaders of the revolutionary movement have had long experience in effecting peace and working relationships with allies since the beginning of the revolutionary movement. These have not involved the movement in giving up people and territory to GRP authority under any guise.

There is certainly a qualitative difference between the peace instituted in localities by the people's organs of democratic power and the "community-based peace" which the GRP and the Right-wing advocates of pacification are pushing in order to remove the revolutionary forces from localities and put the people under the sway of their oppressors and exploiters.

The Tripoli Agreement

The most conspicuous peace negotiations carried out by the Marcos regime were with the Moro National Liberation Front (MNLF) in Tripoli, Libya in 1976. The Manila-based regime was compelled to negotiate with the MNLF and to negotiate abroad because the latter was waging an armed struggle of such a magnitude as to tie down in Moro land one third of the total combat strength of the Armed Forces of the Philippines at that time. The Libyan government acted as the third party.

There was give-and-take in the Tripoli Agreement. In the first provision of this agreement, the MNLF submitted to the principle that the Moro question was within the framework of Philippine national sovereignty and territorial integrity. At the same time, the MNLF gained recognition for its status of belligerency, especially among the Islamic states.

The biggest practical gain by the Marcos regime was in inducing the highest MNLF officials, local MNLF commanders and units to expose themselves in displays of strength before the eyes of the AFP during the prolonged ceasefire. Consequently, the political agents of Marcos were able to offer material concessions to specific MNLF officials and commanders and their families and persuade them to leave the MNLF. The MNLF has been weakened by breakaways and desertions since the Tripoli Agreement.

Peace Overtures of Marcos

The first significant instance that the Marcos regime brought up the subject of peace negotiations with the Philippine armed revolutionary movement was when Marcos did so with this writer when he was presented as a captive on November 10, 1977. He told this writer that armed struggle was passé and that national unity and reconciliation could be negotiated and agreed upon between the regime and the revolutionary movement.

Conscious of the bad example of Aguinaldo in issuing a capitulationist statement to the revolutionary forces and the people after his capture by the US Army at the beginning of the century, this writer replied to Marcos that he was no longer in a position to represent the revolutionary movement upon his capture and that the automatic loss of position upon capture by the enemy is a protection of the movement against the bad example of Aguinaldo.

But this writer also told Marcos that the latter could always get in touch with him about anything beneficial to the people like he did with his captive Senator Benigno Aquino, and reminded him of historical examples of the highest authorities talking with political prisoners, like Quezon with Crisanto Evangelista in 1935 and 1936; Sukarno with D.N. Aidit in 1951; and Khan with Bhutto in the early 1970s. This writer also reminded him of the French consulting with Ben Bella and the British with Jomo Kenyatta in prison. However, it was made absolutely clear that the active leaders of the revolutionary movement made the decisions on the question of war and peace.

Notwithstanding the physical torture this writer was put through from November 13 to 18, 1977 and his being shackled to a cot in solitary confine-

ment, a series of Marcos emissaries from the military came to his isolation cell from late November 1977 onwards, to discuss the possibility of peace negotiations and, of course, to try also to fish for information. The very first of them was a ranking security consultant of Marcos, a supposedly retired military officer, who had been most instrumental in the surrender agreement between the Marcos regime and the Lava group. He never returned, but the second emissary, also a senior military officer, was the most persistent.

The premises of the emissaries were constant: there could be a peace agreement, in fact an agreement of surrender, if the revolutionary armed movement renounced violence and surrendered its arms. The premises of this writer were also constant: the movement might be willing to consider agreeing to a truce if there were basic anti-imperialist and democratic reforms.

When Marcos announced the elections for the Interim Batasang Pambansa in February 1978, the second emissary came to the cell of this writer to offer his removal from solitary confinement and from his chains in exchange for a public statement endorsing the elections and expressing an intention to run as candidate for a seat in the sham parliament. The example of Benigno Aquino and other political detainees was cited. But this writer refused.

Conference of Detainees

The emissary made the rounds of the principal political prisoners, including Bernabe Buscayno, Jose Luneta, Satur Ocampo and this writer in 1978. Come November 1978, they were allowed to confer. All of them understood that they were in no position to negotiate with the regime, that they were only being consulted by the enemy and that, if Ocampo and Luneta were temporarily released, they would be able to communicate to the movement what the regime wished to communicate.

Valuable knowledge and experience were gained by talking to the emissaries of Marcos from 1977 onwards. The strategy and tactics of those in power in talking about peace were clear and sharpened the sense of those political detainees approached of what could be the strategy and tactics of the movement. There is a lot of difference between the reading of the history of the Philippines and other countries on the one hand and actually conversing with reactionaries who talk “peace” on the other hand.

In all discussions with the “peace” emissary of Marcos, the aforementioned political detainees held the moral high ground in expressing their opinions, which can be distilled in the following manner:

The free and active leaders of the revolutionary movement make the decisions. There can be no giving up of revolutionary principles, although there can be a mutual adjustment of policies to achieve a truce and not the capitulation of any side. The constant principled point is to satisfy the people's demands for national liberation and democracy. Following the precedent of talks between the Philippine government and the MNLF in Tripoli, Libya, the venue of peace negotiations should be abroad. Besides bilateral peace talks between the GRP and NDFP, a council for national reconciliation and unity may be considered.

One of the political detainees was able to have a comprehensive exchange of information and ideas with the active leadership of the revolutionary movement about the approaches of the regime. For the first time in the history of the reestablished CPP, there was a serious effort to consider and clarify under what terms the movement could negotiate with its enemy. The movement ultimately decided that conditions were not yet ripe to engage in any kind of negotiations.

Calls for Peace

In the 1980s, before the assassination of Benigno Aquino, former president Diosdado Macapagal, Lorenzo M. Tañada, Jose W. Diokno and this writer issued public statements proposing at various instances a peaceful settlement of the armed conflict, but always with the big IF: if the people's national and democratic interests were to be served. The statements were in accordance with the national and democratic interests of the people and were correctly done more to expose the antinational and antidemocratic character of the regime than anything else in view of the regime's own objective of seeking the capitulation of the opposition forces.

After the assassination of Benigno Aquino and the rise of popular outrage against the fascist regime, no one of national significance could seriously entertain the idea of reconciliation and unity with the forces of Marcos. By then, Marcos was completely hemmed in by the popular outrage, US pressures and other factors.

The kind of peace proposals then being made by various leaders opposed to the Marcos regime was meant to broaden and strengthen the united front against the fascist regime and was supposed to be realized after the fall of Marcos.

It was in this spirit that Aquino supporters made contacts and cooperated with the progressive underground and aboveground organizations, and the widow Corazon Aquino visited political prisoners in Bicutan to make a dramatic expression of support for them. She advocated their release and ceasefire with the armed revolutionary movement upon the end of the fascist regime.

Through public statements, the revolutionary movement and this writer, in his personal capacity, encouraged the idea of a broad united front of democratic forces to overthrow the fascist regime, satisfy the people's demands for national freedom and democracy and thereby work for a just and lasting peace. In her campaign speeches in 1986, Aquino pledged to release all political prisoners and to negotiate a ceasefire with the revolutionary movement.

GRP-NDFP Peace Talks During the Aquino Regime

Soon after assuming power on February 25, 1986, GRP President Aquino fulfilled her pledge to release the political prisoners of the fallen Marcos regime. This was considered as both an act of her gratitude to the national-democratic movement and a signal for negotiating a ceasefire. At the same time, Aquino retained Juan Ponce Enrile as her defense minister and General Fidel Ramos as AFP chief of staff.

In March 1986, NDFP spokesman Antonio Zumel announced in a press conference the willingness of the NDFP to dialogue with the Aquino regime on a possible ceasefire between the AFP and NPA.

This writer delivered a speech on the "Conditions for a Ceasefire" on March 29, 1986 before the Santa Mesa Heights Rotary Club. He demanded:

1. further unilateral acts of goodwill on the part of the new regime; and
2. further substantial changes mutually agreed upon by the GRP and the revolutionary movement, in order to pave the way for a ceasefire.

In her speech at the graduation exercises of the University of the Philippines in April 1986, President Aquino expressed her desire for a negotiated ceasefire. The NDFP and NPA issued statements responding affirmatively.

The formation of the National Reconciliation Commission was announced in a newspaper report. Chairmanship of the commission was reportedly offered to but refused by Lorenzo M. Tañada. It was also floated in the press that the job was going to be offered to this writer. But he was never formally approached, and he never had the chance to refuse it on the grounds of propriety.

At any rate, the Jesuits, especially Fr. Bienvenido Nebres, and Defense Undersecretary General Rafael Ileto tried to push the formation of the Nation-

al Reconciliation Commission and undertook a series of consultations with Bernabe Buscayno, former commander-in-chief of the New People's Army, from April to June 1986.

But it would be the feelers of the Aquino regime through Executive Secretary Joker Arroyo and the late Jose W. Diokno, chairman of the Philippine human rights committee, that would be seriously entertained by the revolutionary movement. Fidel Agcaoili, the secretary general of SELDA (the association of former political detainees of the Marcos regime), played a key role in the preliminary communications between the presidential palace and the underground.

The NDFP as Peace Negotiator

Among GRP officials, General Ramos kept on insisting that the Communist Party of the Philippines should be the one to face the Government of the Republic of the Philippines in negotiations. But the decision in the revolutionary movement was that it should be the National Democratic Front of the Philippines. It was made clear that all member-organizations of the NDFP, including the CPP and NPA, could sign the authorization for it to negotiate and make agreements.

In early June 1986, at the Singapore seminar on Philippine trends sponsored by the Institute of Southeast Asian Studies, this writer essayed to make a comprehensive estimate of the CPP's view on a possible peace process and related matters. As in previous speeches and press interviews in Manila, he made clear that there could be a just and lasting peace only if the basic demands of the people for national liberation and democracy were to be substantially met; and that if the GRP really desired a ceasefire all that it had to do was to end the strategic offensive of the AFP, pull back its troops to the barracks, disband the paramilitary forces and put the police under local executive officials who were appointees of the new regime.

Also in June, the GRP and NDFP announced that they had engaged in discreet preliminary talks and were ready to form their negotiating panels. The GRP stated that no representative of the military would sit in its panel, although this panel would consult with the Armed Forces of the Philippines.

The NDFP Peace Framework

In July 1986, the leaders of the revolutionary movement were able to fully discuss and formulate its framework for peace negotiations; and to appoint

the members of the negotiating panel and related personnel. The framework included the principles guiding the NDFP negotiating panel; the agenda consisting of an exchange of views on the experience of the Filipino people since 1972, the issues of democracy and national sovereignty, the question of temporary ceasefire, and the terms and methods for realizing the truce; safety and immunity guarantees; the time scale of negotiations; the alternate venues; the procedures and technical requirements of the talks; and other related matters.

Some of the basic decisions were the following:

1. The fundamental principles and strategic line of the NDFP in peace negotiations are all in the program of the national democratic revolution. The roots of the armed conflict are to be addressed and the satisfaction of the basic demands of the people for national liberation and democracy is to be sought up to a certain level that allows an adjustment of policy and a truce.
 - a. The substantive issues to be put in the agenda came under the headings of antifascism (civil liberties and human rights), anti-feudalism (land reform) and anti-imperialism (national independence in questions of economic policy, foreign military bases, etc.).
 - b. Coming ahead of these issues in the agenda was to be the discussion and agreement on the experience of the Filipino people since 1972 so that a common ground of facts could be established, the objectives of negotiations could be made clear, the demands on each side of the negotiations could be put within reasonable context and no mechanical quid pro quos could be demanded at the expense of the revolutionary movement, especially with regard to the question of armed forces.
2. A nationwide ceasefire could be agreed to at any time only if the Aquino regime at the minimum called its troops back to the barracks, dismantled the paramilitary forces and put the police under the local executive officials, or at the maximum issued an executive declaration ordering the dismantling of the US military bases on or before their expiry date in 1991, in accordance with her own signature on the Declaration of Unity on December 26, 1984.

When someone suggested that localized peace talks and ceasefires could relieve guerrilla fronts under attack, it was made clear that such localized peace talks and ceasefires could not be allowed because these were

calculated to confuse and fragment the revolutionary movement. It was stressed that guerrilla fronts under heavy onslaughts by the AFP were to be relieved by NPA offensives in other areas and not by seeking localized ceasefires.

3. The alternate venues were supposed to be mainly in the countryside and secondarily in Metro Manila, although in the latter place there would be a strong information office. Safety and immunity guarantees for the negotiators and related personnel were clarified and were supposed to be on a mutual and reciprocal basis. It was also made clear that the share of publicity to be expected from the bourgeois mass media was not worth the exposure of cadres to the AFP and would be overwhelmed anyway by the amount of publicity to be given to the GRP.

Modifications During Negotiations

The foregoing NDFP framework for peace negotiations underwent modifications by the leadership of the revolutionary movement during the actual course of negotiations because the other side, the GRP, had its own framework. The GRP panel was obsessed with a ceasefire. Ceasefire first, then matters like affirmation of the GRP constitution, general amnesty, legalization of the CPP and other underground forces, rehabilitation of rebel returnees and surrender of NPA personnel and arms could be discussed. These were the items in the agenda the GRP insisted upon.

In deference to the head of the GRP negotiating panel, former Senator Jose W. Diokno, who was not in good health, the ceasefire talks between the GRP and NDFP panels proceeded from August onwards in Metro Manila at the great risk of surveillance and sabotage by the Armed Forces of the Philippines and at the probable expense of the NDFP panel, and the underground and aboveground allies on whom the panel was relying.

It is worthwhile to compare the technical conduct of the pre-ceasefire talks and the talks during the ceasefire in 1986 and 1987 with that of negotiations towards the Pact of Biak-na-Bato of 1897 and those towards the Quirino-Taruc Agreement of 1948. In the latter two cases, negotiations were held in the countryside and the security of the negotiators was in the hands of the revolutionary forces.

The talks became narrowly known as ceasefire talks in the bourgeois mass media. Moreover, the reactionaries pushed the line that ceasefire meant the surrender of arms and that the sincerity of the NDFP was to be measured along

this line. In the days towards the visit of Aquino to the US, the GRP panel pressed hard that an unconditional 30-day ceasefire be declared as a kind of send-off gift for her to impress the US authorities in Washington. The NDFP did not give in to this demand.

In her speech before the US Congress in September 1986, Aquino declared that she was engaged in ceasefire talks so as to gain the moral high ground for subsequently unsheathing the sword of war. While Aquino cultivated the image of being the champion of human rights and peace, her big comprador-landlord regime sought to consolidate its power and the reactionary armed forces launched large offensives against the NPA in five regions of the country and quietly organized and trained the vigilante groups.

In September 1986, CPP leader Rodolfo Salas, his wife and his driver were arrested. The NDFP accused the GRP of bad faith in arresting Salas, who was described as an NDFP consultant in the peace process. The NDFP suspended the pre-ceasefire talks. After three weeks, however, these talks were resumed.

In an effort to push the talks forward, the NDFP presented on November 1, 1986, the proposal for 100 days of peace. The suggestion for a prolonged ceasefire was accompanied by another for “the formation of counterpart negotiating panels of the NDFP and GRP on the regional and/or provincial levels.” These two suggestions in the same proposal had the potential of undermining and fragmenting the revolutionary movement. But, fortunately, these were not realized.

In quick response to the kidnapping and brutal murder of Rolando Olalia, chair of Partido ng Bayan (PnB) and the Kilusang Mayo Uno (KMU) and Vice-Chair of Bayan on November 13, 1986, the NDFP announced the suspension of its negotiations with the GRP. Members of the NDFP panel attended the huge Olalia funeral march of one million people.

On November 22, the coup plot Oplan “God Save the Queen” was reported to have been completely defeated by the Aquino regime. Defense minister Enrile was replaced by Deputy Defense Minister General Rafael Iletto.

The GRP and NDFP panels announced that they would sign the two memoranda of agreement concerning the ceasefire and the safety and immunity guarantees on the birth anniversary of Benigno Aquino, November 27.

The explanation for the NDFP’s quick resumption of the talks was that the anti-Aquino Reform the Armed Forces Movement (RAM) had been the one responsible for the Olalia murder and Oplan “God Save the Queen” and that

Aquino had resolved to remove defense minister Enrile from his office upon the demand of the progressive forces.

The Two-Month Ceasefire

The Memorandum of Agreement for a Preliminary Ceasefire (MAPC) and the Memorandum of Agreement on Safety and Immunity Guarantees (MASIG) were signed on schedule, to be effective for 60 days, from December 10, 1986 to February 8, 1987. Ceasefire had been agreed upon before a substantive agenda could be agreed upon. The understanding was that the ceasefire would provide the atmosphere for setting the agenda for peace negotiations and negotiating the substantive issues.

The MAPC co-signed by the GRP and NDFP stated: “This agreement, the preliminary ceasefire agreement, and any other subsequent agreement, or any provision or provisions thereof shall not invest the NDFP with the status of belligerency under the laws of war.”

The NDFP status of belligerency is not something invested by any document but acquired through revolutionary armed struggle and the building of democratic political power. On the other hand, the pre-ceasefire negotiations, the co-signing of the documents and the ceasefire implied recognition by GRP of the NDFP’s status of belligerency.

In negotiating sessions during the ceasefire period, the GRP panel insisted that the NDFP submit to the GRP Constitution as the legal and political frame for negotiations and then such matters as general amnesty, rehabilitation, legalization of underground organizations and the surrender of arms, could be subsequently discussed. The NDFP correctly and successfully resisted the GRP line of asking the NDFP to capitulate.

By insisting that the NDFP must first submit itself to the GRP Constitution as the legal and political frame of negotiations, the GRP panel was in principle and in effect killing the peace process and thus fended off the demand of the NDFP panel that substantive issues such as those in the NDFP list be put into the agenda. For the NDFP to submit to the GRP Constitution would be to render the peace talks unnecessary, because then the NDFP would accept GRP authority, its institutions and processes as the way to deal with the basic demands of the people.

On December 23, 1986, the NDFP through its chairman Andres Macias issued the “Agenda for a Just and Enduring Peace” which declared the four guideposts for settling the armed conflict: (1) the complete dismantling of the

vestiges of the Marcos fascist dictatorship and full protection of basic democratic and human rights; (2) the full promotion of the people's welfare and livelihood; (3) the assertion of national dignity and sovereignty; and (4) the adoption of concrete guarantees for durable peace.

Within December 1986, the revolutionary movement decided to let the NDFP negotiating panel make the most out of the ceasefire by pressing for the discussion of substantive issues. And in view of the refusal of the GRP to take up the substantive issues and in consideration of certain valid criticisms, the revolutionary movement decided not to extend or renew the ceasefire agreement.

What had been expected as negotiations to set and cover a comprehensive range of substantive issues was further frustrated by the GRP when its panel declared that it could no longer assure its own safety and the NDFP panel's in the face of death threats from certain military groups.

Sabotage of Ceasefire Agreement

In fact, in a clear act of perfidy and sabotage of the negotiations, General Ramos issued "Guidelines," ordering the AFP units to disarm, arrest, detain and charge in court all armed NPA members they could surveil and encounter. This was in direct contravention of the safety and immunity guarantees and specifically the agreement of the GRP and NDFP panels that violations of the ceasefire agreement by any member or unit of both the AFP and NPA would be subject to the discipline of the army concerned. The NDFP panel filed a formal protest to President Aquino, but she took no action.

On January 22, 1987, peasants and their urban supporters who were demonstrating in front of the presidential palace were brutally fired upon by presidential guards and additional military and police units, massacring at least 13 demonstrators and seriously injuring hundreds. That was the last straw. The NDFP panel and all their personnel decided to return to the underground, although the ceasefire was still to last up to February 8, 1987.

A week after the massacre, hundreds of thousands of the people marched to the presidential palace to protest, notwithstanding the pleas of presidential subalterns against the holding of the march.

During the ceasefire period, the NDFP panel engaged in consultations with the people and organizations from various walks of life and generated mass actions all over the country. Some underground cadres and NPA units

appeared in public places for press coverage and visited their relatives and friends in a relaxed manner.

Post-Ceasefire Evaluation

In breaking off from the peace negotiations and declaring the end of the ceasefire according to schedule, the NDFP issued on February 7, 1987 a statement, "We Cannot Betray the People's Trust," reaffirming its revolutionary principles and its determination to seek a just and lasting peace on the basis of addressing the roots of the armed conflict and arriving at the solutions to the basic problems of the Filipino people. The NDFP also reiterated its policy commitment to engage in a new round of peace talks upon this basis at any-time.

Despite the shakiness of the ceasefire, agents of the GRP and the pro-Aquino Jesuits tried to coax the NDFP to extend or renew the ceasefire agreement. They failed.

The GRP actually sought not only to consolidate the position of the new ruling clique and make it look good as a champion of peace and human rights but also to do harm to the revolutionary movement by trying to deceive, split, discredit and induce its leaders and members to surface and set them up for surveillance and punitive action. The GRP failed to split the revolutionary movement.

After the GRP-NDFP negotiations broke down, Generals Ileto and Ramos were boasting to the press that the AFP intelligence services had increased their surveillance stocks by 25 percent during the ceasefire. The ceasefire brought to a high point the laxity of some revolutionary personnel which had been inspired by the euphoria over the downfall of the Marcos regime. The precision enemy raids and arrests from 1987 onwards and earlier including the arrest of Rodolfo Salas and his driver (who had also driven for Satur Ocampo during the pre-ceasefire talks) were definitely the result of effective surveillance.

In the aftermath of the ceasefire, a press monitoring group sponsored by the Catholic Bishops Conference of the Philippines made a quantitative analysis of how much space in seven major Manila newspapers were allocated to the major players in the ceasefire drama. The GRP (including the GRP panel, civil and military officials) got the overwhelming amount of space. The much lesser amount of space given to the NDFP was not always necessarily favorable to the NDFP cause.

Unsheathing the Sword of War

On February 28, Aquino unleashed a Marcos-type propaganda campaign, calling on the Red fighters of the NPA to surrender their firearms in exchange for amnesty, financial reward and jobs.

In March, the NDFP offered a new round of talks, provided the roots of the armed conflict were addressed. But the GRP falsely claimed that it was holding negotiations with regional and local NPA commanders.

At the graduation exercises of the Philippine Military Academy on March 22, Aquino unsheathed the “sword of war” and declared her total war policy. The GRP and AFP touted the “peace and order councils” and the vigilante groups. The massacres increased in different parts of the country, especially in the countryside. And the US authorities in Manila and Washington boasted of increased military aid to the GRP.

Aquino formed the National Peace Commission under Administrative Order No. 2 to pursue the aim of effecting the pacification and capitulation of the armed revolutionary movement.

In 1987, the NDFP declared its adherence to Protocol II of the Geneva Convention and challenged the GRP to comply with the terms of this protocol which it had signed.

Notwithstanding the bellicosity of the GRP, the NDFP still offered the reopening of talks to the Aquino regime on October 13. In the humanitarian spirit of the season, the NDFP unilaterally declared a ceasefire on December 24-26 and December 31-January 1, 1987. The GRP grudgingly followed suit.

Throughout 1988, there were no significant moves of any kind from either the GRP or NDFP towards peace negotiations. Instead, there was an intensification of the armed conflict and the exchange of fierce words.

Aquino incited the AFP to carry out her total war policy and to crush the NPA before the end of her term. The NDFP exposed her as unwilling to engage in peace talks because of US dictation, particularly from the Pentagon and State Department. The NPA delivered telling blows on the AFP in 1988 as in the previous year.

In an editorial of *Liberation*, the NDFP official publication, a proposal was made that the NDFP joined up with all other willing political forces to create the conditions for a just and lasting peace and to compel the Aquino regime to continue the aborted peace negotiations.

Third Party Initiatives

In December 1988, the Coalition for Peace (CfP) organized a forum on peace to which the NDFP was invited. The NDFP refused to attend not only because CfP could not assure the NDFP representatives of their safety in Manila but essentially because the forum was strongly slanted against the NDFP's concept of a just and lasting peace. However, the NDFP expressed interest in a proposal by International Alert for an agreement between the GRP and NDFP on a code of conduct for the combatants.

The Coalition for Peace has been trying to present itself as a domestic third party wishing to revive the peace process in the Philippines between the GRP and NDFP. Its favorite interest, however, is to promote its concept of and campaign for local dialogues and zones of peace/zones of life even without and prior to the GRP-NDFP negotiations at the appropriate national level. All experiments of the CfP on zones of peace/life have proven to be devices to support the GRP authority and displace the NDFP and the NPA from local areas.

The concept of zones of peace/life is similar to the concept of peace and order councils promoted by General Ramos under Oplan Mamamayan during the time of Marcos and subsequently under Aquino. It seeks to mobilize the local "respectables" (especially reactionary politicians, businessmen, landlords and conservative clergy) and create public opinion against the armed revolutionary movement and "restore trust and confidence" in the GRP, including its perpetuation of the violence of oppression and exploitation.

In 1989 the concept of a forum for representatives of the GRP, NDFP and MNLF to air their respective views on the terms and methods of resolving the armed conflict was initiated within the National Council of Churches of the Philippines (NCCP). This was supposed to be held abroad and sponsored by international Christian organizations, especially the World Council of Churches, the Christian Conference of Asia and the Catholic Institute of International Relations on an ecumenical basis.

The concept was further developed from a one-shot international forum regarding the peace process to one of a long-term program to promote and assist the peace process, especially in the international arena. This concept has gained the support of several international organizations, including the World Council of Churches, which has provided valuable assistance to peace processes in different parts of the world.

Renewed Peace Efforts

In February 1989, through its chief international representative Luis Jalandoni, the NDFP expressed willingness to start a new round of peace talks if the Aquino regime issued an executive proclamation against the renewal of the bases agreement with the US on or before September 16, 1991. In response, Aquino set the surrender of arms by the NPA as a precondition to peace talks.

In April, the NDFP through spokesman Satur Ocampo announced that the NDFP would declare a unilateral ceasefire and enter into negotiations with the GRP if President Aquino issued an executive declaration to dismantle the US military bases and prevent their extension. Ocampo reiterated the same point in July 1989. But the arrogant reply of Aquino was that she did not take cues from the NDFP. Shortly afterwards, former NDFP negotiators Ocampo and Carolina Malay were arrested in Manila while they were pursuing a new initiative for a peace process.

In August 1989, an emissary of a group interested in peace negotiations, which included a close associate of President Aquino, came to the Netherlands to explore the possibility of a new round of peace talks between the GRP and NDFP. He consulted with this writer and talked appropriately with Luis Jalandoni, chief international representative of the NDFP. The latter readily agreed to discuss holding peace talks abroad. But the GRP backed out as a result of the most serious coup attempt launched against the Aquino government in December 1989.

In January 1990, President Aquino launched the “Decade for Peace” (1990-2000) in a meeting at the presidential palace, attended by church representatives and other conservative organizations. The idea of pacification was promoted.

On February 27, the NDFP wrote Senator Wigberto Tañada and reiterated its offer to declare a unilateral ceasefire in exchange for Aquino’s commitment to dismantle the US military bases. Tañada requested Aquino to initiate a “national forum for peace.” She turned down the offer.

Within the first quarter of the year, representatives of various organizations initiated efforts to formulate a conceptual framework for a peace process, giving rise to such formations as the People’s Caucus and the Multisectoral Peace Advocates.

Separately, the National Peace Conference (NPC) under the auspices of the Catholic Bishops’ Conference of the Philippines (CBCP) and the Peace Desk of the protestant National Council of Churches of the Philippines (NCCP)

also started efforts to promote the peace process in the Philippines. Such efforts have been welcomed by the NDFP, provided these are even-handed and are not slanted towards the GRP. Representatives of peace advocates from the religious sector have exchanged views with NDFP representatives.

In collaboration with foreign organizations, especially International Alert, the CFP attempted to organize a forum in Hongkong in July 1990. But this forum was aborted because, contrary to a previous agreement, the GRP refused to have an interface with the NDFP. The NDFP was also critical of the fact that so-called participants in the forum were being chosen solely and lopsidedly by CFP in favor of the GRP. This happened despite the fact that they were even supposed to evaluate the GRP and NDFP positions.

But in the Philippines, a dialogue was held in lieu of the forum and was participated in by GRP and NDFP representatives on July 20. Because this meeting was held shortly after a strong earthquake that caused devastation over large areas in Northern Luzon, NDFP representatives committed the NDFP to a unilateral ceasefire in earthquake-devastated areas on humanitarian grounds. Within 24 hours, the General Command of the NPA announced that the NPA would take a defensive posture and abstain from launching offensives in the aforesaid areas, would participate in relief work and would not interfere with the relief work of others.

The GRP did not express willingness to dialogue with the NDFP and did not reciprocate the unilateral ceasefire of the NDFP until after some weeks, and only after the Philippine Senate, former President Macapagal, Justice Cecilia Muñoz-Palma, church leaders and several respected organizations urged Aquino to declare a ceasefire and engage the NDFP and other political forces in a dialogue. In September, the NPA ended its ceasefire and held the GRP responsible for duplicity by pursuing offensive operations against the NPA and the people in guerrilla fronts in the quake-devastated areas.

Multisectoral Peace Advocates

From this meeting would emerge the Multisectoral Peace Advocates (MSPA). Although progressive elements like Senator Wigberto Tañada and Dr. Maria Serena Diokno were prominently present, representatives of conservative organizations with a pro-GRP orientation, like the Coalition for Peace, had a strong presence.

The MSPA has put forward a framework for a peace process and has been conversing with Cluster E of the Aquino Cabinet (the cluster in charge of

national security matters) for the purpose of promoting the settlement of armed conflicts and bilateral peace talks between the GRP and NDFP.

The NDFP has welcomed the domestic third party initiative of MSPA and has expressed appreciation for its views (1) that the roots of the armed conflict must be addressed and (2) that the GRP-NDFP bilateral peace talks may be held abroad if necessary. At the same time, the NDFP objects to certain points in the MSPA framework.

1. Conscious of its national revolutionary status, the NDFP refuses to be regarded as being at par with RAM, SFP and YOU (mutinous forces within the AFP) or even with the MNLF (scope limited to Moro people and land). The NDFP is a nationwide alliance of patriotic and progressive forces, carrying out a national-democratic revolution, with organs of political power and a well-disciplined people's army and in control of considerable portions of the Philippine population and territory. It is engaged in a civil war with the GRP and not a mere insurgency. It is a belligerent force and not a mere insurgent force.
2. True to its revolutionary principles, the NDFP does not accept the GRP Constitution as the sole and one-sided legal and political frame of negotiations and refuses to be drawn at the outset to the line of "restoring trust and confidence in GRP." Neither does the NDFP demand that the GRP submit itself to the NDFP Constitution and Program. Instead, the NDFP proposes such mutually acceptable principles as national sovereignty, democracy, social justice and the like and the agreements still to be made as the legal and political frame of negotiations.
3. The NDFP is opposed to the scheme of any particular organization or institution, posing as a third force morally superior to the contending parties in the civil war and claiming the people for itself; to focus on areas where the NDFP and its member-organizations (especially the New People's Army) as well as people's organs of political power exist; seek to push out or paralyze these popular entities; picture the NPA as a force unwanted by the people like the AFP; but in fact to uphold the political authority of the GRP. Proposals for "localized peace dialogues," "localized ceasefires," "community-based peace" and "zones of peace, zones of life" are calculated to undermine and fragment the revolutionary movement and run counter to the proposal for GRP-NDFP bilateral peace talks at the national level.

4. The NDFP does not agree to the surrender of arms as the predetermined objective of the peace process. The substantive issues, addressing the roots of the armed conflict, must first be addressed. In the meantime, with regard to the question of ending the armed conflict, it may simply be put in the agenda by referring to armed forces and their redistribution. To effect the end of hostilities, there are several possibilities, including a lasting truce.
5. The question of ceasefire cannot be taken up until after discussion and agreement on the substantive issues, unless such a ceasefire is based on a humanitarian ground for a limited period of time or in connection with the dismantling of the US military bases. A ceasefire on humanitarian grounds is best clarified in a full agreement on human rights.

On its own ground and understanding of a just and lasting peace and upon the stimulus of a broad array of peace advocates in the Philippines and abroad, the CPP as the leading party in the revolutionary movement and the NDFP as the united front organization have further developed their own framework for a peace process.

This framework has been developed in line with the national-democratic program, taking into account new conditions and lessons learned from the 1986-87 pre-ceasefire talks and ceasefire period.

In response to an invitation from the NDFP, a close associate of President Aquino met with NDFP Vice-Chair for international affairs Luis Jalandoni in Singapore on September 23-24, 1990. There was no substantial result from this meeting, except a show of goodwill between the two sides.

First Meeting with Yap

The first serious emissary of the GRP to seek an audience with the NDFP and show readiness to talk concretely about the peace process was Rep. Jose Yap, chair of the national defense committee of the Philippine house of representatives and close political associate of President Aquino. He came to Amsterdam, the Netherlands on September 26, 1990, consulted with this writer and sought his help as a consultant for the peace process. Subsequently, Yap met with Luis Jalandoni, NDFP Vice-Chair for international affairs, and Byron Bocar, NDFP international representative, from September 27 to 29.

Other members of the Yap mission were his advisors, Horacio Morales, president of the Philippine Rural Reconstruction Movement, and Atty. Romeo Capulong, chair of the Ecumenical Movement for Justice and Peace. This writ-

er had the privilege of being consulted by both the Yap mission and the NDFP officials.

Rep. Yap and the NDFP representatives agreed to work for certain measures to improve the atmosphere for GRP-NDFP bilateral negotiations. These measures included the review of cases of political prisoners and their release in accordance with respect for the right to bail and the eventual repeal of the Marcos PD 1866, which negates the right to bail in many cases.

Most important of all, the letter of Manuel Romero, NDFP chairperson dated September 20, 1990, comprehensively unfolding the NDFP's strategic view of the peace process, was given to Rep. Yap for delivery to President Aquino. In addition, upon the request of Yap, the NDFP also sent to Aquino the aide-mémoire of NDFP vice chairman Jalandoni on the lessons from the 1986-87 peace talks.

The NDFP Peace Framework

The NDFP framework for the peace process includes the following points:

1. A new round of peace talks can be started at any time, without any substantive precondition that is unilaterally beneficial or costly to any side. The NDFP is willing to form a negotiating panel simultaneously with the GRP at any time.
2. Safety and immunity guarantees are agreed upon and co-signed by the two sides or are issued by one to the other side on a mutual and reciprocal basis to enable the free and unhampered movement of the members and related personnel of the negotiating panels.
3. To create a favorable atmosphere for negotiations, the NDFP expects the GRP in accordance with its own Constitution and laws to do the following as a matter of course: respect the right to bail, repeal PD 1886, review cases of political detainees and release said detainees on the basis of their right to bail or by dropping charges. A number of the released detainees will participate in the negotiations, either as members or support personnel of the NDFP negotiating panel and working groups. Also, to create a favorable atmosphere, NDFP will declare a unilateral ceasefire if the GRP in accordance with its own Constitution and the principle of national sovereignty and territorial integrity bans the US military bases and troops on or before September 16, 1991.

4. The legal and political frame of the peace negotiations is constituted by the mutually acceptable principles of national sovereignty, democracy and social justice and by the agreements still to be made through the negotiations. Neither should the GRP insist on its Constitution as the sole and one-sided legal and political frame, nor the NDFP on its own Constitution and Program.
5. The substantive agenda of comprehensive peace negotiations includes the following:
 - a. A preliminary mutual understanding on the objectives of the negotiations and the basic problems of the people.
 - b. Mutual respect for human rights and international humanitarian law.
 - c. Social and economic reforms.
 - d. Political, constitutional and electoral reforms.
 - e. Armed forces and redistribution thereof.
6. Notwithstanding its willingness to forge agreements on a wide range of issues, the NDFP seeks as immediate minimum goal an agreement with the GRP on human rights and international humanitarian law and on the mechanisms and processes to ensure respect for these. Such an agreement should be able to stand whether the armed conflict continues or a peace settlement is ultimately achieved. This agreement is immediately demanded by the Filipino people and all domestic and international organizations concerned with human rights.
7. A quarter of a year can be devoted to each of the major items in the substantive agenda for negotiations and agreement, as enumerated under No. 5 above. The time frame can be accelerated with the employment and assistance of working groups per item, which shall prepare in advance the working drafts of the negotiating panels.
8. The peace negotiations must be held in a mutually agreed place abroad in order to assure safety and convenience. In this connection, lessons must be learned from the pre-ceasefire talks and ceasefire period in 1986-87. The GRP has repeatedly held peace talks with the MNLF abroad. It is the common practice for parties in armed conflicts to hold peace talks abroad.

9. At best, a state or interstate entity or the UN Secretary-General can provide the good offices or act as intermediary in the peace talks. Such a third party can assume the role of a witness, observer, good office or intermediary. At the least, for a start, any respectable international non-governmental organization or appropriate UN agency may be a facilitator of the peace talks.
10. The broad array of peace advocates in the Philippines is recognized by the NDFP as a moral force for a just and lasting peace, as a forum and medium of national consensus, and as a resource base for assisting the peace process.

On October 3, 1990, Jalandoni, Yap and this writer as a consultant in the peace process issued parallel and similar press statements regarding their respective roles and what was accomplished in the Amsterdam talks. The three of them expressed optimism about the prospects of peace talks.

Peace Advocates: Right, Middle and Left

On October 5, 1990, the NDFP National Council issued the “Message to the Advocates of a Just Peace,” affirming the NDFP position on the peace process and the need to address the roots of the armed conflict and criticizing those who seek the pacification of the revolutionary movement. In a letter to Senator Tañada and other members of the MSPA dated November 5, NDFP chair Romero reiterated the position of the NDFP and reaffirmed the valuable role of the peace advocates.

There is a broad array of peace advocates inside and outside the MSPA in the legal arena. They are not a homogeneous lot. They include the Right, Middle and Left. The Right concurs with the basic premises of the GRP rather than with those of the NDFP. The Left concurs with those of the NDFP rather than with those of the GRP. At the same time, there is the Middle trying to be the honest broker, operating according to principles and general terms which do not offend any of the basic negotiating parties, the GRP and NDFP.

So far, the Right wing “peace” advocates have been the most articulate and active in putting forward a comprehensive framework for the pacification of the revolutionary forces calling on them to submit to the GRP Constitution, to restore trust and confidence in GRP, to beg for accommodation and paltry concessions, abandon the people in one locality after another under the slogan of zones of peace/life and to surrender arms.

So far, the legal progressive forces (Left and Middle) have concentrated on the general call for addressing the roots of the armed conflict and have not yet put forward a comprehensive framework for a peace process, comparable to that of the Right. Thus, the Right has gained some initiative in swaying some elements of the Middle and even the Left.

In the Philippines, the united front for addressing the roots of the armed conflict and for a just and lasting peace was broadened through a meeting of advocates for a just peace on October 6 and a multisectoral conference called the People's Caucus on October 13-14. This issued the declaration, "Assert the People's Sovereign Will: Ensure and Work for the Supremacy of Genuine Democratic Coalition Rule." This carried the signatures of GRP legislators, religious, academicians and concerned individuals and church groups, coalitions and alliances, people's organizations and other political and social groups and institutions.

On October 19-21, the National Peace Conference was convened, with 200 participants from 17 sectoral groups headed by former President Diosdado Macapagal. Because of the strong presence of the Catholic Bishops Conference of the Philippines, businessmen and executive officials of the GRP, this formation of "peace advocates" had a far more conservative complexion than the People's Caucus headed by Senator Wigberto Tañada.

The NDFP has rejected the importunings of the Right "peace" advocates for the pacification of the revolutionary forces and has been waiting for the legal progressive forces (Left and Middle) to unite, take initiative and put forward their own peace proposals towards a just and lasting peace. The broad array of genuine peace advocates can serve as a strong moral force to compel the GRP to negotiate, as a forum and medium of national consensus and as a resource base for assisting the peace process.

The Substantive Peace Agenda

In further support and elaboration of NDFP chair Romero's letter to Aquino dated September 20, 1990, Jalandoni, the NDFP Vice-Chair for international affairs, delivered the speech, "Sovereignty and Peace: Options and Alternatives for the Philippine Revolutionary Movement" on November 17, 1990, on the occasion of the 10th anniversary of the trial of the Marcos regime by the Permanent People's Tribunal. He went into detail about the substantive agenda proposed by the NDFP.

Hereunder is the outline of the substantive agenda of the NDFP.

1. Agreement on Human Rights and Humanitarian Law
 - a. Respect for and compliance with Protocol II of the Geneva Conventions and other international humanitarian laws.
 - b. End of the government's total war policy, investigation and prosecution of human rights violations, and indemnification of the victims, including return of internal refugees to their domicile.
 - c. Repeal of all repressive laws and reversal of the Supreme Court ruling on warrantless arrest.
 - d. Safe conduct for the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) and all other medical personnel across battle lines and contested areas.
 - e. Respect for personnel and facilities of schools, medical profession, religious institutions and places of worship, voluntary evacuation centers and development projects of genuine NGOs.
 - f. Exchange of prisoners, preferably thru a UN agency or the ICRC.
 - g. Occasional local ceasefires of definite brief duration on humanitarian grounds (natural disasters and medical reasons) approved by the national authorities of both the NDFP and GRP (not by local authorities);
 - h. A mechanism and process to ensure compliance with the agreement, the exchange of complaints and monitoring.
2. Agreement on Socio-Economic Reforms
 - a. Guidance by the International Covenant on Economic and Social Rights.
 - b. A genuine and thoroughgoing agrarian reform.
 - c. A policy of national industrialization, with strong incentives to local entrepreneurs and restrictions on foreign multinational firms.
 - d. Freedom from foreign debt through cancellation of fraudulent debts, moratorium on payments, debt cap, rescheduling and other measures.

- e. Rechanneling of funds from debt service payments and military spending to social services and genuine development programs.
 - f. Urban reform plan, which stops rendering people homeless and which provides low-cost housing for the poor and assistance for means of livelihood.
 - g. Strict measures to stop the degradation of the environment and to protect and promote a healthy environment.
3. Agreement on Political, Constitutional and Electoral Reforms
- a. Guidance by the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the UN Covenant on Political and Civil Rights.
 - b. Guarantees to basic human and democratic rights of the people, especially the workers and peasants, in accordance with mutually acceptable principles and provisions of the Constitution and other laws of the GRP and those of the NDFP.
 - c. Abrogation of unequal agreements and treaties, especially the Military Bases Agreement, Military Assistance Agreement and the Mutual Defense Pact with the US
 - d. Immediate removal of US bases and a program of base lands conversion.
 - e. Respect for the right to self-determination of the Bangsa Moro, Cordillera and other indigenous peoples.
 - f. Electoral reforms to take away undue advantages of political parties of the comprador and landlord classes and provide for genuine democratic pluralism, allowing a fair chance for political parties representing the workers, peasants and the middle class.
 - g. A mechanism like a Council of National Unity to ensure the implementation of political, constitutional and electoral reforms and the holding of free and fair elections as well as the economic and social reforms agreed upon.
4. Agreement on the Armed Forces and the Redisposition thereof
- a. Removal of US control over the Armed Forces of the Philippines (AFP).

- b. Reorientation, reorganization, and reduction of the AFP.
- c. Demobilization of AFP units and disbanding of paramilitary forces and private armies.
- d. Mutual general amnesty.
- e. Status of the New People's Army.
- f. Lasting truce.

Second Meeting with Yap

In late November 1990, the Yap mission came for the second time to Amsterdam, the Netherlands. Yap reported on actions undertaken by President Aquino and consultations with defense secretary Ramos and AFP chief of staff de Villa, but did not carry with him any formal written reply from President Aquino to the letter of NDFP chairman Romero.

Instead, he brought with him the “framework for peace” drafted by the Department of National Defense and Armed Forces of the Philippines for the Government of the Republic of the Philippines. This is not a framework for peace negotiations but for killing the peace process by demanding at the very outset the surrender of the NDFP to the Constitution of the GRP and ultimately the liquidation of the NPA and surrender of NPA arms.

The NDFP did not take offense at the lack of a formal written response from Aquino but noted in strong terms that the DND/AFP cannot deal directly with the NDFP and bypass the political authority of the GRP. According to a later report from MSPA, Cluster E of the Aquino Cabinet confirmed the framework of the DND/AFP as that of the GRP.

Hereunder are verbatim extracts from the GRP framework:

Statement of General Principles:

- 1.1. The supremacy of the GRP Constitution as the fundamental law of the land and the basis for national peace and progress must be accepted by all. No one may be allowed to violate the fundamental law of the land. The Supreme Court is the sole and final arbiter on questions of constitutionality. The Constitution recognizes the right of political forces to lawfully compete for the political leadership of the country. The use of force and violence to achieve political ends must be renounced.

- 1.2. Peace is of paramount importance to the well-being of the people and the country's political, economic and social development. The current internal conflict can be resolved through a peace process. All paths towards peace must be explored. Peace must be given a chance.
- 1.3. There must only be one authorized and recognized armed forces of the country. All other organized armed groups must be deemed illegal and are to be disbanded.

Agenda for the Peace Process:

The agenda for the peace process shall be limited to relevant issues that can be resolved within the mandate of the parties concerned. Principal agenda items shall be composed of the following:

1. Suspension of hostilities in mutually agreed upon specified prioritized areas.
2. Amnesty for insurgents.
3. Laying down of arms.
4. Disbanding of the NPA.
5. Safe return of insurgents to a peaceful and productive life.
6. Government assistance to and protection of insurgent returnees.
7. Legalization of the CPP.
8. Treatment of NPA "hold outs."

Phases of the Peace Process:

The phasing of the peace process is a vital dimension of the framework. The peace process shall proceed along the following:

1. Initiation of peace process through exploratory talks between the government and peace advocates (MSPA).
2. Establishment of formal mechanism for the peace process.
3. Formalization of Agreements.
4. Implementation of Agreements.
5. Monitoring and evaluation of substantive compliance.

6. Treatment of violations and sanctions against violators.

Obstruction by General Ramos

At any rate, certain tentative agreements were still made by the NDFP representatives with Rep. Yap regarding the possible release of political prisoners and mutual ceasefire in the humanitarian spirit of Christmas and New Year; and the formation of the human rights working groups of the GRP and NDFP, which were to lay the groundwork for negotiations and agreement on human rights and international humanitarian law.

The tentative agreement on mutual ceasefire in the humanitarian spirit of Christmas and New Year would be carried out, with changes towards a shorter duration of three days per occasion. But the release of political prisoners and the formation of negotiating panels and working groups on human rights were not fulfilled according to the agreed time frame.

In the name of the DND and AFP, General Ramos had been obstructing the peace process. President Aquino and Cluster E of the Aquino cabinet went along with General Ramos whenever he took an adverse initiative to sabotage the peace process. He was reported to be consulting with US authorities and following their orders.

Subsequent to the last Yap mission to Amsterdam, the GRP limited itself to dealing with the MSPA in accordance with the DND-AFP line that the GRP must first talk with the MSPA and only after agreements have been made between the two can the NDFP deal with the prior agreements between the GRP and MSPA. In other words, a device is being used in which the bilateral peace talks between the GRP and NDFP are being blocked.

Taking advantage of the nonviolence pact among the reactionary parties and the growing fever over the 1992 elections, the GRP has cut down talks even with the MSPA.

It is clear once again that the GRP uses the show of willingness to talk with the NDFP only as a tactical ploy for trying to cope with the worsening crisis, to douse social unrest and to blunt the offensives of the revolutionary movement.

Nevertheless, the NDFP has remained firm in its comprehensive framework, which adheres to revolutionary principles and has the flexibility of adjusting policy to allow negotiations and agreements with the GRP, for the benefit of the people along the national and democratic line.

The National-Democratic Line

Like any strategic line, the national democratic line in the entire peace process and in any concrete peace negotiations contains and permits certain tactical lines which serve the strategic line. It is always possible to work out a truce agreement or even an agreement of alliance between two adversaries in order to confront a bigger adversary of the nation like US imperialism or to solve certain crucial problems.

As a revolutionary force, the NDFP can be expected to reject any proposal for surrender but can always be expected to consider any proposal for truce and alliance if predicated on the national and democratic rights and interests of the people and on a popular struggle against common adversaries and common problems.

It is noteworthy that Senator Juan Ponce Enrile (defense minister/secretary under Marcos and Aquino) seems to have a better and more positive understanding of the NDFP's strategic line than President Aquino or General Ramos. Enrile was quoted by the press as saying that if he were president of the GRP, he would engage the NDFP in a truce and coalition government for three years and would not require the NPA to surrender its arms.

At whatever rate the GRP shows interest or loss of it in the peace process at any point, the NDFP can persevere in taking a just and reasonable stand on behalf of the people in seeking to inspire a broad united front for national liberation and democracy and in working in the international arena for recognition of the NDFP as the legitimate representative of the revolutionary forces and people.

Confidence of the NDFP

Whichever conservative party or clique of reactionaries is in power in Manila, the NDFP can be expected to be ready to negotiate a just and lasting peace in accordance with the national democratic line. A common resolve to address the roots of the armed conflict and face a common foe or confront certain problems; and a truce and realignment of forces along the national-democratic line can be the initial stage in the process of attaining a just and lasting peace.

Abroad, through the efforts of the NDFP, the European Parliament approved on December 13, 1990 a resolution endorsing the bilateral peace talks of the GRP and NDFP. For the first time, no less than an interstate entity, the parliament of the European Community, recognized the NDFP and put it on an equal footing with the GRP. There are also specific states which have

been approached by the NDFP and have agreed to offer their good offices to both the GRP and the NDFP.

At the same time, respected international organizations and institutions are expressing support for the just and reasonable peace framework of the NDFP and are extending moral and material support for its realization and for the NDFP as a legitimate political force, representative of the ever-growing number of people militantly engaged in carrying out a national-democratic revolution and building a new kind of government.

The NDFP is confident that in due time the growing strength of the revolutionary forces and people, the worsening crisis of the Philippine ruling system and the moral forces of domestic and world public opinion would compel the GRP to engage the NDFP in peace negotiations.

THE NDFP FRAMEWORK IN CONTRAST WITH THE GRP FRAMEWORK

MAY 15, 1991

Upholding its revolutionary principles and recognizing its own strength and the ever worsening crisis of the ruling system, the Philippine revolutionary movement through the National Democratic Front of the Philippines (NDFP) has amply demonstrated its willingness and readiness to engage in bilateral peace negotiations with the GRP.

NDFP Chair Manuel Romero sent to GRP President Aquino a letter dated September 20, 1990, defining the NDFP framework for peace negotiations. She never replied. Intransigently, the GRP insists that the NDFP must submit to the GRP Constitution and surrender the arms of the revolutionary movement.

It is completely the responsibility of the GRP that the peace process desired by the Filipino people and the organized revolutionary forces has been obstructed and prevented from progressing. While the NDFP desires a just and lasting peace on the basis of satisfying the national and democratic demands of the people, the GRP simply wants the pacification of the revolutionary forces and the people and to win by peace rhetoric what it cannot win by force of arms and thus preserve the ever violent system of oppression and exploitation.

Contrary to the claim of certain quarters, the NDFP and the revolutionary forces through their documents and their practice have made clear that they have a consistent strategy for the peace process and that they do not view the process as a mere tactical ploy. It is the intention of this article to demonstrate the sincerity and seriousness of the revolutionary movement in pursuing the peace process.

1. The Struggle for a Just and Lasting Peace

Since its very beginning and long before the GRP paid any lip service to the need for a peace process, the Philippine revolutionary movement has always been committed to the struggle for a just and lasting peace in the most comprehensive and strategic way.

The struggle for national liberation and democracy against US imperialism and local reactionary classes is a struggle for a just and lasting peace because it strives to solve the fundamental problems of the nation and people, fight and

defeat the violence of oppression and exploitation and bring about the basis for a just and lasting peace.

The strategic line of national-democratic revolution is the NDFP's strategic line for a just and lasting peace. There is no other strategic line. To claim the absence of it or to replace it is to confuse the people and the revolutionary forces.

The struggle for a just peace entails as many specific forms of struggle as does the national-democratic revolution. These include all legal and illegal forms of struggle. Among these forms of struggle is armed struggle, the principal form of struggle because it settles the question of power, which is the principal question in any revolution. No social revolution is possible without the prior change of political power.

There can be no peace negotiations between the GRP and NDFP if in the first place there is no armed conflict between them. It is only when there is an armed resistance of a certain level of strength that the incumbent reactionary state starts to consider whether it should seek peace negotiations or not.

The struggle for a just peace cannot be narrowed down to peace negotiations between the GRP and NDFP. Peace negotiations are only one of the specific forms of the struggle in the constant and comprehensive struggle for national liberation and democracy and, therefore, for a just and lasting peace.

Even as the NDFP is willing to negotiate, there can be no guarantee at any time that peace negotiations with the GRP would occur. In history, oppressive regimes either negotiate at some point or refuse to do so to the very end.

Since the very beginning, the revolutionary movement has created the conditions for a just peace in the areas where organs of people's democratic power are established. The people undertake campaigns to benefit themselves within the context of the national-democratic revolution.

In contrast with the strategic view of the NDFP that the national-democratic revolution is the way to a just and lasting peace, the GRP has for its strategic view the preservation of the oppressive and exploitative system and the defeat and pacification of the revolutionary forces.

Thus, the GRP demands first of all the submission of the NDFP to the GRP Constitution and as soon as possible the liquidation of the New People's Army and the surrender of its arms.

What the GRP has been demanding or angling for is not a peace process but a process of surrender. If the NDFP were to accept the terms of such a pro-

cess of surrender, then the GRP would engage in talks with the NDFP without delay or hesitation.

In sharp contrast, the NDFP has manifested its just and reasonable position by declaring that although the optimum condition for a just and lasting peace is the total victory of the people in their national-democratic revolution, the NDFP is willing to engage in peace talks for several important reasons, including the promotion of national independence and democracy and a number of basic reforms, immediately beneficial to the people.

The revolutionary movement keeps to its fundamental principles and its strategic national-democratic line. But in the sphere of policy, it can make readjustments and expects the other side to do likewise. There has to be a mutual adjustment of policy regarding the armed conflict and related issues.

It takes the two basic parties in the armed conflict to agree on a truce and what national social purpose is to be served. Even if the peace talks were to fail, then the people can see who has the just and reasonable position.

One may call as merely tactical any one reason or any series of reasons provided for peace talks that falls short of the strategic goal. But the strategy and tactics of the revolutionary movement or any other force are inseparable from each other. The strategy consists of tactics; and the tactics constitute and serve the strategy. It is wrong to say that the revolutionary movement has only a tactical view of peace negotiations.

Peace negotiations are an important form of struggle in the constant and comprehensive strategic struggle for a just and lasting peace. These are also the form of struggle which refers most directly to a peace agreement, if the other side is willing to engage in peace negotiations. The significance of peace negotiations can change from one period to another.

Revolutionaries determined to carry out the objectives of the national-democratic revolution can logically and legitimately consider peace negotiations as a way of pushing forward the aforesaid objectives, in the same way that the other side considers the same peace negotiations as a way of pushing forward its own objectives. Inevitably, the struggle across the table reflects first of all the struggle in the battlefield and then influence further developments in the battlefield.

But revolutionaries can also see that short of winning total victory, it is possible to engage in peace talks towards a truce in order to undertake a common struggle against a common national foe or to try to solve in common

the fundamental national and social problems. At one time, the GRP may be interested in talks. At another time, it may not be.

With or without peace negotiations, the revolutionary forces and the people firmly fight for a just and lasting peace through the stages and phases of the national-democratic revolution.

2. Character of the Armed Conflict and the Basic Conflicting Parties

The armed conflict between the GRP and NDFP is a civil war. It is an armed conflict between two belligerent forces. One is the incumbent government centrally seated in Manila; and the other is a revolutionary movement, with absolutely clear features that qualify it as a belligerent force under the laws of war.

As a belligerent force, the NDFP has a demonstrated national political leadership over a considerable part of the population and territory of the Philippines; has effective command over a sizeable people's army; and comprehensively performs functions of government through local organs of political power, which may be summarily called the people's revolutionary government.

The NDFP has the capability to exercise the rights and obligations of a belligerent force under the laws of war within its ample jurisdiction. The two-month ceasefire in 1986-87 proved beyond doubt that the NDFP has effective political leadership and command over revolutionary forces nationwide.

The NDFP is a belligerent force in a civil war and not a mere insurgent force engaged in unlawful armed actions against a lawful and duly-constituted authority. In fact, the GRP has already recognized the NDFP's status of belligerency by engaging the NDFP in pre-ceasefire negotiations, co-signing the memoranda of agreement and the 60-day ceasefire in 1986 and 1987.

The GRP and the bourgeois mass media keep on calling the NDFP an insurgent force in order to propagate the lie that it has no belligerency status. To be an insurgent is to be criminally liable for rebellion under the Philippine penal system. It is a slightly better status than banditry or ordinary criminality but short of belligerency status under the laws of war.

The NDFP or the armed revolutionary movement is not a mere police problem, which insurgency is. The fact is that all the regular services of the Armed Forces of the Philippines have been engaged in a strategic offensive against the NDFP and NPA for a long time (for more than 22 years) and to no avail. Instead, the revolutionary forces keep on growing.

In July 1986, the revolutionary forces had the choice of allowing the Communist Party of the Philippines as the leading party or the NDFP as the united front organization to represent them in negotiations. They chose the NDFP.

It is perfectly a legitimate objective for the NDFP to seek recognition of its status of belligerency. This proceeds from the fact that it has the status of belligerency. It wants the GRP and AFP to conform to and be accountable under the laws of war. The recognition of the NDFP's status of belligerency may arise from GRP-NDFP bilateral negotiations and from the involvement of a state or interstate entity as a third party in the negotiations.

The European Parliament resolution, dated December 13, 1990, endorses the Philippine peace process, mentions in the same breath the GRP and NDFP as parties to the armed conflict and in effect puts the NDFP on an equal footing with the GRP. This is a step forward in the international recognition of the NDFP's status of belligerency.

In the Memorandum of Agreement for a Preliminary Ceasefire co-signed by the GRP and NDFP representatives on November 27, 1986, there is an attempt by GRP to preempt the recognition of the NDFP's status of belligerency with the provision which runs as follows: "This agreement, the preliminary ceasefire agreement, and any other subsequent agreement, or any provision or provisions thereof shall not invest the NDFP with the status of belligerency under the laws of war."

But the status of belligerency cannot be vested or preempted by the document. It is something acquired through the people's revolutionary struggle and the building of their democratic political power.

When it comes to the NDFP, the GRP is extremely cautious about any action or statement that could explicitly mean a recognition of the NDFP status of belligerency. But in the Tripoli Agreement in 1976, the MNLF clearly gained the recognition of its status of belligerency by virtue of the mediation of Libya. At the same time, MNLF submitted to the first provision of the agreement which declared that the settlement of the Moro question was within the framework of Philippine national sovereignty and territorial integrity.

The MNLF retreated from its previous assertion of Moro national independence but gained recognition for its status of belligerency through the mediation of Libya in the Tripoli Agreement and the continuing mediation of the Organization of Islamic Conference.

The GRP is afraid of the recognition of the NDFP's status of belligerency because it does not want the NDFP to hold it responsible under the laws of

war and does not want the NDFP to relate to and transact business with other states, without the GRP being able to charge such states for interference in Philippine affairs. The MNLF has enjoyed relations with Islamic states, without the GRP being able to accuse these of interference.

The character of the armed conflict between the GRP and NDFP as a civil war can be further clarified by reference to the fact that it is an armed conflict between political forces domestic to the Philippines and that it is not yet a national war against foreign aggression, although US intervention in favor of the GRP is escalating on the side of the GRP and has the potential of escalating further to the level of aggression.

At the moment in the Philippines, the two basic forces in the nationwide civil war are the GRP and NDFP and should therefore be the two basic parties in peace negotiations. They can have equal footing as belligerent forces.

Recently, a notion was propagated that there could be multilateral peace talks among the GRP, NDFP, MNLF, RAM, SFP and YOU in order to settle the armed conflicts in the Philippines.

There are points of principle that make multilateral peace talks impossible, whether these be formal talks seeking binding agreements or these be a mere forum for ventilation of views without seeking any binding agreement.

The only nationwide civil war going on in the Philippines now is between the GRP and NDFP. Definitely, RAM, SFP and YOU cannot be put on an equal footing with the NDFP. They are mutinous forces of the GRP, specifically of the AFP. They are the internal problems of the GRP.

The MNLF is of a higher political category than these mutinous forces of the GRP. They enjoy recognition of the status of belligerency accorded by the GRP and by a number of Islamic states. But the population and territory claimed by the MNLF is limited to the Moro population and Moro land. So, there lies the big difference between the NDFP and MNLF.

In fact, the GRP has repeatedly admitted that on a national scale and in terms of revolutionary challenge, the NDFP is the most "serious threat" to the GRP. The NDFP is therefore the force that GRP must talk to in any serious bilateral negotiations about peace in the Philippines.

3. Talking About Peace Talks

To begin with, the GRP and NDFP positions are diametrically opposed to each other comprehensively, strategically and on many crucial issues. That is why there is an armed conflict between them. There is a bitter struggle between

revolution and counterrevolution because of fundamental national and social issues.

Preliminary talks about bilateral peace talks between the GRP and NDFP are therefore important. These can try to thresh out a framework of peace negotiations which can be accepted by the two warring sides. It is more fruitful to engage in formal bilateral talks if there is a prior agreement on the objectives, the legal and political frame, agenda, timetable, venue, procedures and other matters. However, the NDFP has expressed willingness to form a negotiating panel simultaneously with the GRP and let these two panels complete and firm up what may otherwise be threshed out in preliminary talks.

Before any formal meetings of the two panels, there must be written agreement, reached in preliminary talks, on the safety and immunity guarantees for the members and related personnel of the negotiating panels of the GRP and NDFP. These guarantees are agreed upon on a mutual and reciprocal basis and are strengthened by the good offices of a foreign state or interstate agency.

So far, there has yet been no serious peace talks, with a substantive agenda, between the GRP and NDFP. Setting the agenda involves a struggle. The agenda desired by each side in negotiations carries its strategic and tactical objectives.

The two-month ceasefire of 1986-87 was supposed to have been undertaken in order to create a favorable atmosphere for peace talks and to provide the conditions for an agreement on a substantive agenda.

Before the ceasefire, the GRP panel had refused to agree with the NDFP panel on a substantive agenda. The former simply wanted a ceasefire and wished to accomplish certain one-sided objectives through such a ceasefire. And during the ceasefire, it parried and refused any legal and political frame and any agenda other than its own.

The GRP was responsible for the failure to set a substantive agenda. It insisted that the NDFP should first of all submit itself to the GRP Constitution. Had the NDFP done so, then the very idea of peace negotiations would have been killed instantly. Because a submission to the GRP Constitution would mean NDFP surrender to the principle that the so-called duly-constituted authorities of the GRP had the superior authority and jurisdiction over any agenda.

The GRP declared that it was willing to discuss with the NDFP only such matters as modes of surrender of firearms, general amnesty, rehabilitation and legalization of underground forces after submission to the GRP Constitution.

For its part, the NDFP stood firmly for a substantive agenda, encompassing items most demanded by the people, under the headings of human rights, democratization and national independence.

Aside from trying to effect the capitulation of the NDFP in principle and in fact, the GRP tried to use the ceasefire in 1986-87 to break the momentum of the armed revolutionary movement, cause the revolutionaries to split and induce them to go out into the open for surveillance and eventual punitive action.

In the preliminary talks about peace talks between the Yap mission of the GRP and the representatives of the NDFP in September 1990, the NDFP made concrete proposals for creating a favorable atmosphere for peace negotiations and for a comprehensive substantive agenda. These are contained in the 20 September 1990 letter of NDFP Chair Manuel Romero to the GRP President Aquino.

GRP President Aquino did not formally reply in writing to this letter and did not take any step to get the GRP-NDFP bilateral peace talks started, notwithstanding the second meeting of the Yap mission and the NDFP in November 1990. Instead, the DND-AFP has taken all the initiative to determine the GRP position and to offer nothing but a framework of arrogant unilateral assertions and wishful thinking for the process of NDFP surrender.

The NDFP has made clear that it is ready to form a negotiating panel anytime and as soon as the GRP forms its own. Without any substantive precondition beneficial or costly to any side, the two negotiating panels can meet in order to discuss and agree on their substantive agenda and all procedural matters.

In so many ways, the GRP has made it appear to the NDFP that Cluster E of the Aquino Cabinet and the Department of National Defense and the Armed Forces of the Philippines are opposed to any peace negotiations outside of the framework unilaterally decided by the GRP.

The GRP has refused the NDFP proposal for the GRP to act according to its own avowed commitment to Philippine national sovereignty and democracy and to create a favorable atmosphere for peace negotiations by dismantling the US military bases and respecting the right of political detainees to bail and dropping charges which run counter to this right.

The GRP has also rejected the NDFP proposal that separately and simultaneously they announce the formation of the negotiating panels and the work-

ing groups on human rights, irrespective of whatever rate the GRP can act on the proposal to improve the atmosphere for peace negotiations.

The Yap mission to the NDFP was the most serious and the most willing to go into concrete discussions and tentative agreements. But there are rabidly reactionary elements in the Aquino regime, especially among the military who are opposed to serious GRP-NDFP peace negotiations. Thus, the preliminary talks about peace talks did not result in formal peace negotiations.

It is becoming obvious that the Aquino regime engaged in peace rhetoric for a certain period in the latter half of 1990 in a vain attempt to prevent the broad range of opposition forces from uniting, preempt the revolutionary mass movement and break out of the isolation caused by the virulently worsening crisis of the ruling system.

Even the Multisectoral Peace Advocates (MSPA), which tried to be a domestic third party between GRP and NDFP and whose framework concurred on several points with that of the GRP, observed reduced interest on the part of Cluster E (part of the Aquino cabinet in charge of national security) in discussing the peace process.

On April 5, 1990 the NDFP met with MSPA representatives Senator Wigberto Tañada and Dr. Maria Serena Diokno and discussed with them fully and extensively the NDFP framework for peace negotiations. The NDFP also expressed its view on the role of the domestic third party and expressed appreciation as well as criticism of various points in the MSPA framework.

4. On the Question of Violence and Ceasefire

Whether or not there is armed resistance by the people and the revolutionary forces, the violence of oppression and exploitation is the full responsibility of the oppressors and exploiters ruling the people and the country.

The response of the people to the violence of the ruling system is armed revolution. Not satisfied with the violence inherent in their system, the oppressors and exploiters have escalated their violence in the vain hope of suppressing the armed revolution.

The NDFP condemns the violent ruling system and the “total war” policy of the US-supported Aquino regime. The NDFP cannot allow itself to be maneuvered into a position of being pictured as equally violent and equally responsible as the GRP for the armed conflict or even worse as an insurgent or bandit force without popular support and without a just and reasonable cause for armed resistance.

It is unreasonable for anyone to demand in the name of peace that the NDFP show its “sincerity” in wishing peace negotiations by unilaterally ending the armed resistance of the revolutionary forces and the people or by agreeing to any ceasefire outside of humanitarian considerations for limited periods of time, and outside the commitment to declare a ceasefire in connection with the dismantling of the US military bases.

The sincerity of the NDFP in this regard is to be measured by its steadfastness in defending and upholding the people’s interests, its firmness of principles even while making policy adjustments to achieve certain specific anti-imperialist (e.g., the immediate removal of US military bases) and democratic (e.g., genuine and thoroughgoing land reform) demands, and its vigilance in frustrating every scheme to undermine the gains and achievements of the revolutionary movement and the people.

In a speech in Singapore in June 1986 and in further statements, this writer observed that the New People’s Army was still in the stage of strategic defensive and the Armed Forces of the Philippines was in the stage of strategic offensive; and that if the GRP had been truly interested in the drastic reduction of the armed conflict, it could order the AFP troops to desist from launching offensive operations and to go back to their barracks and that it could also disarm and disband the paramilitary and warlord gangs.

This writer thinks that his views in 1986 were still valid in 1991. The burden of responsibility for reducing the armed conflict lies on the part of the GRP and its military instrument, the AFP. As soon as they desist from carrying out onslaughts against the people and the guerrilla fronts, there would be a dramatic reduction of the armed conflict. Consequently, the GRP would even be able to save on military expenditures and reallocate its resources towards nonmilitary activities.

The NDFP has made known to the public that it is willing to agree with the GRP on the mechanisms and processes of undertaking ceasefires on the basis of humanitarian considerations, for limited periods of time, that are defined in a formal agreement on human rights and international humanitarian law.

But the NDFP has also made known that it will not repeat the error of going into any protracted ceasefire (two months subject to extension or renewal, as in the 1986-87 period) before a substantive agenda is agreed upon. Neither can the NDFP be expected to go into such protracted ceasefire upon an agreement merely on the substantive agenda still to be taken up item by item in negotiations.

The only exception made by the NDFP is its commitment to declare a unilateral ceasefire upon the dismantling of the US military bases. The political ground is patriotism and the promotion of national independence.

In case the US military bases are dismantled, the NDFP can be expected to declare a unilateral ceasefire and at the same time demand that the GRP reciprocate its patriotic goodwill. It is logical that the NDFP will not allow itself to be destroyed by its own unilateral ceasefire but will expect the GRP to hold back its own armed forces and move towards peace negotiations.

Aside from temporary ceasefires for reasons already explained, the NDFP is interested in a lasting truce that is the result of mutually satisfactory agreements which substantially benefit the people in accordance with the national-democratic line. The NDFP is vigilantly against proposals for ceasefires, local or nationwide, which are outside of those reasons already clarified.

The NDFP is also opposed to the proposal and propaganda that so-called community-based peace (like “zones of peace, zones of life”) should be undertaken by GRP and pro-GRP entities posing as third party. The NDFP regards this as calculated to preempt and undercut bilateral GRP-NDFP peace talks at the national level and to take away people and areas from the revolutionary movement under the pretense of excluding both the AFP and NPA but in fact retaining GRP authority and supporting the AFP in such areas.

Even if mutually agreed upon for a good reason, any protracted ceasefire is more advantageous to the GRP and AFP and potentially more damaging to the revolutionary movement.

During ceasefires there will inevitably be accusations and counteraccusations of ceasefire violations. The NDFP and NPA can suffer not only from the propaganda assaults but also from straining to verify the truth or falsity of the enemy claims. At the same time, the NDFP will be exerting strenuous efforts to counteract the ceasefire violations of the enemy and collect the information regarding these.

The ceasefire can also be GRP’s way of inducing revolutionary personnel to relax and expose themselves to surveillance for punitive operations; of weakening the revolutionary will; and of introducing dissensions within revolutionary ranks.

The NDFP has to take seriously the lessons from the pre-ceasefire talks and ceasefire in 1986-87. AFP intelligence raised its surveillance stocks by twenty-five percent, according to Generals Ileta and Ramos. The line of showing the “human face” of the NDFP not only to the bourgeois mass media and the

general public beyond the revolutionary mass base but also to covert operatives of the enemy could produce bitter consequences.

The NDFP has also to consider seriously how the MNLF has split several times, weakened and lost personnel politically and militarily as a result of the Tripoli Agreement and the ceasefires that transpired under the Marcos and the Aquino regimes.

The GRP, especially AFP, is always obsessed with ceasefires, without satisfying the requirements for a just and lasting peace, because it expects to thereby damage the NDFP and benefit from them more than the NDFP can. The GRP and AFP officials are feigning whenever they say that the NDFP gains more from ceasefires than the GRP does.

5. The Legal and Political Frame of Negotiations

In demanding that the NDFP submit itself to the GRP Constitution as the legal and political frame of negotiations, the GRP instantly kills the very idea of bilateral peace negotiations with the NDFP and prevents them from starting. The demand has been made by the GRP in preliminary talks about peace talks between GRP and NDFP representatives.

The NDFP has objected to the unreasonable character of the demand but has not retaliated by demanding that the GRP submit itself to the Constitution and Program of the NDFP.

Instead, with utmost reasonableness, the NDFP has proposed that the legal and political frame be one of adherence to mutually acceptable principles such as Philippine national sovereignty, democratization, respect for human right, social justice and the like; and an open-mindedness towards the agreements that are still to be made in the peace process.

If the GRP is insistent on a reference to the GRP Constitution, then an equal reference must also be made to the NDFP Constitution and Program in the preamble of any agreement to be made. The key point is to refer to the mutually acceptable principles and provisions in the basic documents of the GRP and NDFP.

Per item in the substantive agenda, there may be pertinent treaties, covenants, protocols and other international legal instruments which have been signed by the GRP. These can provide valuable guidance in the negotiations.

The preliminary talks about peace talks can do a lot to clear the way for the formal bilateral talks. But in its sincere desire to start the formal talks, the NDFP has repeatedly declared that it is willing to form its negotiating panel as

soon as the GRP is willing to do the same. The GRP and NDFP negotiating panels can meet as soon as possible and start the negotiations even prior to a mutually agreed legal and political frame of peace negotiations.

The two negotiating panels can discuss and work out what would be the mutually satisfactory legal and political frame. The formation of the negotiating panels and the opening of formal negotiations should not be prevented by the intransigent demand of the GRP that the NDFP must first submit itself to the GRP Constitution.

Before the two panels tackle the substantive agenda, they can agree not only on the mutually acceptable guiding principles and objectives but also on the historical facts and current circumstances which make the peace negotiations necessary and desirable.

6. The Substantive Agenda

The NDFP has proposed four major items in the substantive agenda of peace negotiations. These are: (a) respect for human rights and international humanitarian law; (b) social and economic reforms; (c) constitutional, political and electoral reforms; and (d) the end of hostilities and redistribution of armed forces.

Regarding respect for human rights and international humanitarian law, there can be an agreement that binds both the GRP and NDFP and their respective armed forces, whether the armed conflict continues or whether there will ultimately be a comprehensive peace settlement. This agreement should be the minimum goal to be achieved immediately even as peace negotiations are aimed at the maximum goal of comprehensive peace settlement.

More important than any abstract reaffirmation of the principles and provisions of domestic and international laws, the agreement to be made by the GRP and NDFP should create the mechanisms and processes for promoting and protecting human rights; investigating, trying and punishing human rights violations on both sides; and indemnifying the victims and their survivors.

The two sides should be able to verify compliance with the laws on human rights; exchange complaints on human rights violations; define certain categories of persons, facilities and sites which should not be targeted by any military operations; declare ceasefire of limited duration on humanitarian grounds; effect the exchange of prisoners of war; and so on.

The agreement on human rights and international humanitarian law should be so framed and worded that it can either be the preparation for the lasting

truce or the way to promote respect for human rights even if the civil war cannot as yet be ended.

Regarding social and economic reforms, the GRP and NDFP should make an agreement which can effect economic emancipation, national industrialization, genuine and thoroughgoing land reform, the improvement of the people's livelihood, freedom from the crushing debt burden, the expansion and improvement of the educational system and the protection and healthy utilization of natural resources.

There can be some crucial provisions in the agreement which are effective in solving the social and economic malaise. There may at the same time be other problems which can be dealt with in general terms in the agreement but which will have to be dealt with in detail consequent to the realization of constitutional, political and electoral reforms.

Regarding constitutional, political and electoral reforms, the GRP and NDFP should agree which can end foreign domination and the monopoly of political power by the political representatives of exploiting classes of the big bourgeoisie and landlord class and allow the empowerment and greater freedom of the broad masses of the people.

The political parties, movements and organizations of the basic exploited classes and the middle social strata must have a fair chance in electoral struggle; acquire the guarantees of representation in elective and appointive positions; and fully enjoy democratic rights free from coercion and punitive actions by antinational and antidemocratic forces.

There must be a Council of National Unity to direct the enactment and implementation of constitutional, political and electoral reforms until such time that a new set of leaders are elected under the reforms.

Regarding the armed forces and the redistribution thereof, the GRP and NDFP can make an agreement more easily if all the aforementioned agreements are made. The NDFP knows what policy to take regarding its armed strength if the roots of the armed conflict are addressed first to the satisfaction of the oppressed and exploited people.

The NDFP can agree to a lasting truce, but never to the liquidation of the NPA and the surrender of its arms. Any framework of peace negotiations which requires the surrender of NPA arms is totally unacceptable to the NDFP. This is not the only option there is. The NDFP is not also demanding that the AFP liquidate itself and surrender its arms to the NDFP and NPA.

Even former defense secretary Enrile has apparently seen the light when he proposes that were he to become president he would invite the Left, the Middle and the Right to a coalition government and would be satisfied with a truce with the armed revolutionary movement for three years and not require the liquidation of the NPA and the surrender of NPA arms.

The concept of a lasting truce is worthy of discussion and realization. But the surrender of any side is considered preposterous by the NDFP at this specific time.

It is better to first discuss and agree on the substantive issues, redounding to the benefit of the people in accordance with their national and democratic rights and interests, than to ram through the bias of any side for the surrender of arms by the other side.

7. Time Frame of Negotiations

The NDFP has told the GRP that, as far as the NDFP is concerned, the peace negotiations can be as short as one year, a quarter of a year per major item in the agenda.

Indeed, the time frame of negotiations can only be as short as the time it takes for both the GRP and NDFP to come to terms in accordance with the national and democratic demands of the Filipino people.

The peace negotiations can be accelerated by the formation of working groups by the GRP and NDFP for the different major items in the substantive agenda. These working groups of the GRP and NDFP can undertake research, make tentative agreements and draft in advance the agreements to be made; and thus provide effective assistance to the negotiating panels.

In November 1990, the Yap mission agreed tentatively with the NDFP representatives that the negotiating panels and the human rights working groups of the GRP and NDFP could be formed in December 1990 or in January 1991. But General Ramos prevented the realization of the agreement by interposing that the negotiating panels should not yet be formed and that there would only be one working committee on human rights to consist of three members from the GRP and one from the NDFP and that the GRP decides who should be the NDFP representative.

It was absurd of General Ramos to propose that the NDFP subordinate itself in any way or degree to any single committee constituted and dominated by the GRP.

In the formal GRP framework for peace negotiations, drafted by the Department of National Defense and approved by Cluster E, the GRP indicated no time frame for peace negotiations.

Instead, it indicated two kinds of time frame for a process of surrender. First, the NDFP can surrender immediately and directly to the GRP. Second, the GRP can talk first with “peace advocates” regarding the terms of surrender; and subsequently the NDFP can approach the “peace advocates” and either take or refuse the terms of surrender. In effect, the GRP tried to use the “peace advocates” as a buffer to delay or frustrate direct bilateral peace negotiations.

Because the GRP insisted on its absurd framework, the peace negotiations cannot start at all.

8. Venue of the Negotiations

The NDFP has declared that negotiations must be held abroad in view of the lessons learned from the pre-ceasefire talks and ceasefire in the 1986-1987 period.

It is definitely clear that if talks were held in Metro Manila or in the countryside, the AFP intelligence services would surely surveil the NDFP negotiating panel, its technical and other personnel and supporters and facilities for punitive operations.

The talks would be vulnerable to attack and sabotage by military, police or vigilante groups belonging to the AFP and GRP and antagonistic to the peace process.

The arrest of NDFP consultant Rodolfo Salas and his companions in September 1986; the murder of Rolando Olalia, chairman of the Kilusang Mayo Uno in November 1986; the guidelines of General Ramos for the arrest of and other punitive actions against the NDFP during the 1986-87 ceasefire; the Mendiola massacre of peasants and other people in January 1987; the admitted surveillance of NDFP personnel and supporters by the AFP during the ceasefire; and the numerous arrests of NDFP personnel and supporters after the ceasefire are the incontestable factual arguments against peace talks being held in the Philippines.

Practically all peace negotiations of the same nature as those possibly between the GRP and NDFP have been held in foreign venues. Talks abroad have been more safe and convenient. In fact, GRP representatives have already held preliminary meetings with NDFP representatives abroad in Italy, Singapore and the Netherlands.

The GRP has repeatedly negotiated with the MNLF in the Middle East; and has made it possible for the latter to acquire recognition for its status of belligerency. There is no reason why the GRP cannot negotiate with the NDFP abroad. The GRP is being unreasonable whenever it insists that having a foreign venue for peace negotiations with the NDFP is not possible.

The European Parliament and a number of states are willing to provide the venue for the peace negotiations as soon as the GRP agrees. Such a venue will certainly be more safe and convenient for both sides of the negotiations.

The free movement of the members and related personnel of the NDFP negotiating panel from the Philippines to the foreign venue and in foreign countries can be covered by the safety and immunity guarantees and by the good offices of the foreign third party.

9. The Foreign Third Party

The foreign third party may be a state or interstate entity or agency thereof, which assumes a formal role in the peace negotiations as a witness, observer, good office, intermediary and mediator.

The witness is one who signs as such on any agreement made between the two negotiating parties. The observer can give his opinions and signs as such on any agreement made. The good offices mean the assistance of the go-between in making the peace negotiations possible.

The intermediary can give proposals to both sides and each of the negotiating parties on the basis of what he has gathered from the negotiations and consultations. The mediator can arbitrate the negotiations.

The NDFP has been seeking the good offices of a state or interstate agency as the foreign third party in bilateral peace negotiations with the GRP. Such a foreign third party can also become the intermediary.

The European Parliament and a number of states have already indicated their willingness to become third party and to provide good offices. But the GRP must agree.

The third party does not only provide the safe and convenient venue and other material forms of assistance, but also exercises a moral influence that encourages serious talks and concrete agreements for a just and lasting peace.

There can be another type of foreign third party. This may be any nongovernmental organization or institution which assists the peace process in any appropriate way.

Even before GRP-NDFP peace negotiations can occur abroad, the NDFP has gained support for these from people's organizations, respected parties and institutions, states and interstate organizations; and has thereby gained recognition for the sincere desire of the NDFP for a peace process.

The European Parliament resolution dated December 13, 1990 endorsing bilateral peace negotiations between the GRP and NDFP and the agreement of certain states to provide good offices are a step forward in the NDFP's drive to draw the GRP to the negotiating table and seek recognition for its status of belligerency and its struggle for a just and lasting peace.

10. The Domestic Third Party of Peace Advocates

The Multisectoral Peace Advocates (MSPA) headed by Sen. Wigberto Tañada was the most active and most prominent in seeking to promote the bilateral peace talks between the GRP and NDFP.

There are organizations represented in the MSPA like the Coalition for Peace, the National Peace Conference sponsored by the Catholic Bishop's Conference of the Philippines, Association of Major Religious Superiors of the Philippines, the National Council of Churches of the Philippines and so on. The People Caucus also had representatives in the MSPA.

The MSPA has put forward a framework for the peace process. The NDFP welcomed the proposals for addressing the roots of the armed conflict to make a just and lasting peace and for a foreign venue of peace negotiations; and considered the proposal for ceasefire upon agreement on a substantive agenda as a positive although insufficient departure from the kind of ceasefire (prior to substantive agenda) in the 1986-1987 period.

But at the same time, the NDFP took exception to the MSPA premises of upholding the GRP Constitution, restoring trust and confidence in the GRP, localized peace dialogues, community-based peace ("zones of peace/zones of life") and surrender of the New People's Army. These were being pushed by Right-wing advocates of pacification within the MSPA.

The NDFP recognized that there was a broad array of peace advocates, inside and outside of MSPA and the People's Caucus. They are linked by an avowed commitment to address the roots of the armed conflict and thereby pave the way for a just and lasting peace. They are not homogeneous but are heterogeneous even when they belong to the same organizations, alliances or caucuses.

The broad array of peace advocates ranges from Left through Middle to the Right. The Left has the basic points of agreement with the NDFP, and the Right has those in agreement with the GRP. The Middle has some points of agreement with the NDFP and other points with the GRP and tries to use principles and general terms which are not offensive to any side. The points of differences between the GRP and NDFP positions and therefore of the pro-GRP and pro-NDFP positions are clear enough in this paper.

The NDFP is alert and opposed to the Right wing which espouses and supports basically the position of the GRP and seeks to turn the people against the armed revolutionary movement and deprive it of people and territory zone by zone.

The NDFP regards Left and Middle peace advocates as helpful in building a national consensus and a broad united front for a just and lasting peace through the solution of the basic national and social problems of the people and in possibly acting as a facilitator and resource base in the peace process.

11. Some Examples of Peace Negotiations Abroad

If the revolutionary forces (represented by the NDFP) are resolute in carrying through to the end the national-democratic revolution of a new type, it is worthwhile to study the peace negotiations undertaken by the Chinese Communist Party with the Kuomintang for a truce and a united front between them in the war of resistance against Japan; and once more those in Chungking in 1945. The pertinent articles of Mao Zedong can be enlightening.

It is also worthwhile to study the experience of the Vietnamese in peace negotiations in Geneva in 1954 and those from the late 1960s to 1972 in Paris. Each time the Vietnamese knew how to work for an agreement beneficial to their revolutionary side and never missed the correct relationship between the negotiating table and the battlefield.

All the national liberation movements, which have achieved a high degree of national independence and anti-imperialism through revolutionary armed struggle, provide good lessons to the Philippine revolutionary movement on the question of war and peace. But it is also useful to recognize the historical instances when colonial powers grant nominal independence to colonies as in the Philippines and elsewhere.

There are also examples of prolonged or frozen peace processes. These are resolved after decades, such as the one in Namibia. There are those still to be resolved even after so long, such as those involving Palestine and South Africa.

The peace process depends on the balance of strength between the contending forces and related factors.

The Sandinista National Liberation Front (FSLN) seized political power without having to undertake any peace negotiations with the Somoza regime. Then, it would provide the unique example of an anti-imperialist government negotiating itself out of power under the pressure of US antagonism and decrease of Soviet support.

The Farabundo Marti National Liberation Front (FMLN) was able to gain politically from peace negotiations but was taking risks and changing attitudes in the backwash of the FSLN fall from power. The political retreat of FSLN was the main prize sought by the US when it allowed the El Salvador government to negotiate with FMLN. The NDFP can critically learn from the El Salvador government-FMLN peace negotiations.

We are reminded of Quezon and the Nacionalista Party negotiating with the US in the 1930s as we witnessed Nelson Mandela and the ANC negotiate within South Africa and without a people's army actively waging a people's war. The African National Congress (ANC) was opposing colonialism and racism and seeking a modus vivendi with the ruling South African white reactionaries who insisted on retaining their property rights and control over security forces.

Quezon and the Nacionalista Party were able to obtain the Philippine Constitution of 1935 and establish the Philippine armed forces. But they yielded to the property rights of US citizens and corporations. They could successfully negotiate for nominal Philippine independence in the Philippines and US, without a people's army behind them but by taking advantage of the revolutionary history and potential of the Filipino people; their growing clamor for national independence; the social unrest due to the US economic depression; and the international antifascist current.

The revolutionary struggle now being waged by the Filipino people is beyond the stage of neocolonial compromise. It is a national-democratic revolution of a new type, with a socialist perspective. Rated in the history of the Filipino people or in comparison with many revolutionary movements abroad and notwithstanding tremendous odds, shortcomings and being in the strategic defensive stage for more than twenty-two years, the new democratic revolution in the Philippines has made great achievements in laying the basis for a just and lasting peace.

These achievements are due to a self-reliant protracted people's war and the successful building of Red political power. However, there is still much to do in

gaining international support and recognition for the status of belligerency for the revolutionary movement represented by the NDFP. There is also still much more to do in achieving total victory in the Philippines.

12. Perspective on the Struggle for a Just and Lasting Peace

The chances are currently dim for bilateral peace negotiations between the GRP and NDFP to occur before the end of the current term of the Aquino regime. More than ever, General Ramos is determined to obstruct and prevent any progress towards peace negotiations. His position has been undermined within the Aquino regime but not to the point that he and his likes in the Armed Forces of the Philippines cannot block peace negotiations.

Notwithstanding the current obstacles to peace negotiations, the NDFP is more than ever pursuing the struggle for a just and lasting peace because it is pursuing the national-democratic revolution and waging all possible forms of struggle.

The further advance of the national-democratic revolution might someday compel or induce the GRP to agree to negotiate with the NDFP. Whether peace negotiations are still possible or no longer possible under the Aquino regime, the NDFP continues to firm up the framework and prepare the personnel for peace negotiations. This preparedness will someday serve the NDFP in good stead.

As the peace negotiations do not occur due to the intransigence of the GRP, the NDFP gains time to strengthen its fighting and negotiating position, broaden the united front and gain further international recognition for the NDFP's status of belligerency and international support for the people's demand for a just and lasting peace.

**The Philippine
Revolution and the
Nationality Question**

February 15, 1996

The nationality question can be dealt with only in historical terms. It involves correctly relating the political, socio-economic and cultural aspects of nationality as well as the whole national formation, its parts and the world. In its origins and development, Philippine or Filipino nationality is first of all a political concept that has arisen and developed from the necessity of uniting and activating the entire people of various social conditions and cultural traits in the anticolonial and then the anti-imperialist struggles for national independence and democracy.

To this day, the Marxist-Leninist teachings on the nationality question are our best guide. There is yet no experience more advanced than that of Lenin, Stalin and Mao in successfully dealing with the nationality question in the course of overthrowing the counter-revolutionary state and establishing and building socialism. It is to the credit of all the great Marxist-Leninist builders of socialism that it took the modern revisionists a considerable period of time and effort both in the social-imperialist center and in its neo-colonies to completely destroy the national formations under proletarian class dictatorship and to cast away the bonds of proletarian internationalism.

Taken from a lecture by Prof. Jose Maria Sison on February 15, 1996, when he was Chairman of the International Network for Philippine Studies. The text here was extracted from *For Democracy and Socialism against Imperialist Globalization*, the seventh volume of the Sison's selected works, pp. 39-58.

1. THE PHILIPPINE REVOLUTION OF 1896 AND FILIPINO NATIONALITY

The Philippine Revolution of 1896, whose centennial the Filipino people are celebrating this year, had the distinction of being the first bourgeois democratic revolution to overthrow a Western colonial power in Asia. It was guided by the bourgeois liberal ideology. It was for national liberation against Spanish colonial domination and racial oppression. It was for democracy not only in terms of civil and political liberties for individuals, associations and the people but also in terms of being opposed to the feudal oppression inflicted on the people, chiefly by the Spanish religious corporations, the biggest landlords in the country then.

As a concept and historical force, Filipino nationality was originally the product of the revolutionary movement of the people led by the revolutionary organization Katipunan. Previously, the Spanish colonialists referred to their colonial native subjects as *indios* or *indigenes* and to the Philippine-born Spaniards as *Filipinos*. The revolutionaries categorically appropriated the term *Filipino* in a manifesto to refer to the entire colonized people of various ethnolinguistic communities in the struggle for national liberation. Previously, the Katipunan leaders and common people often referred to themselves as *Tagalog*, *Malay*, or *lahing kayumanggi* (brown race) and the reformists in the propaganda movement in Spain as *indios bravos* (noble *indios*).

Filipino nationality was first of all a political-revolutionary term and at the same time carried political, socioeconomic and cultural significance and content. It denoted the revolutionary will and movement of the people to establish the first nation-state encompassing the entire archipelago. It was essentially in the manifestoes and decrees of the Katipunan and the Philippine revolutionary government, in the proclamation of Philippine independence on June 12, 1898 and in the Philippine Constitution of 1899.

The Philippine Revolution of 1896, which developed the concept of Filipino nationality, was the product of a long series of armed uprisings of the people in various localities through more than 300 years of Spanish colonial rule. More than 200 uprisings had taken place, at first sporadically and then increasing in scale, intensity and duration. The Spanish colonialists could continue their colonial rule for as long as there was yet no national consciousness and no nationwide revolutionary mass movement to wage the anticolonial resistance.

In the 19th century, especially within its last three decades, Filipino national consciousness spread throughout the archipelago.

National consciousness arose in response to the intensification of colonial, feudal and racial oppression. The people started to realize that they must rise up as a new nation in armed revolution in order to liberate themselves from the foreign oppressors. National sentiment and aspirations became defined in terms of achieving national independence from Spanish colonialism and establishing a modern nation-state. This was in repudiation of the reformist demand in the Propaganda Movement for the Philippines to become a regular province of Spain in order to enable the native people in the archipelago to acquire rights and duties under the 1812 liberal Cadiz Constitution of Spain.

In the course of the revolutionary struggle against Spanish colonialism from 1896 to 1898 and then against US imperialism from 1899 onward, the Filipinos of the Malay race, the mestizos (with Chinese and Spanish blood) and non-Malay ethnic communities united and participated in the struggle for national liberation and democracy. They were bound by socioeconomic relations, by a lingua franca and growing mutual respect for each other in every region and by a long-running resentment over and resistance to colonial impositions.

Upon the coming of Spanish colonialism, the Malay people, who according to anthropologists, had been in the Philippines around 500 BC with an iron age culture, comprised more than 85 percent of the one million population and inhabited the seacoasts and banks of big rivers. Generally, they had small-scale communities of the patriarchal slave form of society. They belonged to more than 100 ethnolinguistic communities but the overwhelming majority of them belonged to the biggest eight ethnolinguistic communities: Ilocano, Pangasinan, Kapampangan, Tagalog, Bisaya, Ilonggo, Waray and Maguindanao.

It was possible for the Spanish colonialists to conquer by armed force and convert some communities into Christianity and then conscript troops from one locality in order to further carry out the conquest and conversion of another locality from the late 16th century onward because the native people were characteristically divided into so many independent small societies and scores of ethnolinguistic communities.

The highest sociopolitical formation attained in the archipelago before the coming of the Spaniards were the Islamic sultanates in southwestern Mindanao whose population then comprised around four percent of the population of the entire Philippine archipelago. These sultanates had been established since

at least the 15th century. They carried the elements of slave and feudal societies and were the most conscious and best organized to engage in prolonged armed resistance against the Spanish conquest. The Spaniards derisively called them Moros in recollection of the Catholic reconquista against the Moors in the Spanish peninsula and for a long time systematically roused the Christianized population against them.

The Spaniards also had great difficulties in extending their rule to the upland hill tribes which comprised some 10 percent of the population. They were in the main descendants of pre-Malay inhabitants (the so-called Austronesians with a Neolithic culture) who had been in the archipelago since at least 5000 BC. Like the Moros of southwestern Mindanao, the Igorot tribes (currently presumed to have been in the archipelago since the first Christian millennium) continuously resisted attempts of the Spaniards to occupy the Cordilleras in Northern Luzon and to open gold mines there until the last quarter of the 19th century.

The Spaniards simply did not have enough troops and priests to go into the areas of the Lumads in Mindanao and found no necessity to conquer and proselytize among the nomadic forest-based and food-gathering aborigines, the Negritos, who comprised less than one percent of the population. The Negritos or Aetas are most probably the earliest people in the Philippines. Archaeological evidence shows that the islands were inhabited by people since 22,500 BC. But human fossils and associated artifacts of the Tabon cave man do not indicate the racial stock.

Long before the coming of Spanish colonialism, the people in the Philippine archipelago had commercial and cultural connections with the rest of the Malay people, who were earlier and more heavily influenced by Hindu and Arab culture, and with the Arab, Indochinese and Chinese traders. Islamic proselytization had been extended from southwestern Mindanao to the Visayas and Luzon only a few decades before the coming of the Spanish colonialists. Trade with the Chinese became so brisk that a few of them stayed on as permanent residents, very often marrying native women.

The Spanish colonialists encouraged the residence of Chinese traders and artisans. They were most interested in the trade of goods between Mexico and China via the galleon trade via the Manila-Acapulco route long before the opening of the Suez Canal in 1815. But almost every 30 years on the average they roused the native population to engage in racial pogroms against the Chinese in the environs of the walled city of Manila.

To achieve their oppressive and exploitative purposes, the Spanish colonialists imposed a centralized system of administration on the colonized people and laid out a network of Spanish lay administrators and priests to control them. In more than 300 years of colonial rule, Spain developed a colonial and feudal society in the Philippines. The owners of the best and biggest estates were the religious corporations and the colonial bureaucrats, the religious corporations and the foreign merchant companies dominated commerce, especially foreign trade.

At the end of Spanish colonial rule, the social structure of the native population was as follows: the top class were the landlords who concentrated on the production of staple crops; the intermediate strata, which included the small entrepreneurs, master craftsmen, merchants and the few professionals; and the basic exploited classes, which included a huge peasant class comprising more than 90 percent and a working class comprising no more than five percent and consisting of workers in transport, printing, wood, tobacco, food processing and the like.

2. FILIPINO NATIONALITY UNDER US IMPERIALISM

The bourgeois-democratic revolution of the old type led by the liberal bourgeoisie in alliance with the native landlords against the Spanish colonialists and religious landlords was eventually frustrated by US imperialism. The US prevailed in the Filipino-American war from 1899 to 1902 by using its military superiority, directly and indirectly causing the death of ten percent of the seven million Filipino people, and by issuing the proclamation of “benevolent assimilation” which promised autonomy and liberal reforms in order to coopt the dominant bourgeois liberal ideas in the revolutionary leadership and to split the revolutionary movement.

The main forces of the Philippine revolutionary army were broken in 1902. But armed resistance continued or reemerged in substantial parts of Luzon and the Visayas until 1910. When this dwindled, the US military forces increasingly paid attention to the Moro provinces. The Moro people fought heroically but were completely defeated in 1916 and brought under US colonial administration.

The US imposed its own colonial rule on the Philippines, banned all expressions of Filipino patriotism and promoted a blatantly counter-revolutionary political party of native puppets that espoused assimilation into the US federal state. Due to the people’s irrepressible resistance and demands for national independence, however, the US colonial regime would subsequently allow the formation of a political party among another set of puppet politicians who grabbed the slogan of “absolute, immediate and complete independence” but who in fact pushed the reformist line of begging for the grant of national independence by the colonial master in order to avert armed revolution.

The revolutionary concept of national independence along the bourgeois liberal line in 1896 was at first suppressed, then reinterpreted and divorced from the requisite of armed revolution and ultimately became subordinated to a pro-imperialist kind of bourgeois liberalism, masking the power of US monopoly capitalism. The prevailing framework was for the US to teach the Filipino people “democracy” and train them in self-rule before nominal independence was to be granted to the US-trained puppet politicians, bureaucrats and professionals. The US cleverly used the public school system and the Catholic and Protestant missionaries to bring the people in the remotest areas under US colonial administration and counter the influence of the Philippine revolution.

A pro-imperialist bourgeois-liberal concept of Filipino nationality prevailed under US colonialism as the US developed a semi-feudal type of society. The US promoted the more efficient production of certain agricultural crops for export, opened mines and introduced US companies in the manufacture of certain products for domestic consumption. It improved the system of transport and communications. It expanded and encouraged the public and private educational system in correspondence with the expanded requirements of the bureaucracy and business under modern imperialism. Unlike old-type colonialism, which engaged in sheer plunder to serve the primitive accumulation of capital in the West, foreign monopoly capitalism delivered surplus goods and capital from abroad in order to extract maximum profit from the colony.

The social structure among the people changed. The comprador big bourgeoisie among the natives and permanent residents, including the Spanish and Chinese descendants of the colonial ruling class, arose as the most wealthy and powerful basic exploiting class and acted as the principal financial and commercial agent of the foreign monopoly capitalists. At the same time, the landlord class was retained and remained as the more widespread basic exploiting class. The intermediate social strata expanded and included the national bourgeoisie limited to light manufacturing of goods for domestic consumption and the urban petit bourgeoisie. Among the basic exploited classes, the working class expanded but the peasantry remained as the most numerous exploited class.

Inspired by the national consciousness as Filipinos, the people of various ethnolinguistic communities, religions and races, persevered in various forms of struggle for national independence. The struggle for national independence against imperialism favored and forged a revolutionary sense of national unity; from decade to decade under US colonial rule, the most progressive of the workers and peasant organizations carried the political demand for national independence in combination with their social and economic class demands. They launched strikes and other forms of mass actions. There were outbreaks of armed resistance in every decade.

When organized for the first time under the guidance of Marxism-Leninism in 1930, the Communist Party of the Philippines called for national independence but simplistically focused on the contradiction between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie. It neither stressed sufficiently the need to gain genuine national independence nor succeeded in making a profound analysis of Philippine society and revolution. Nonetheless, in a few months' time, it was suppressed. When it was legalized in 1937 and merged with the Socialist

Party in 1938, it accepted the US-approved Philippine Constitution of 1935 and the Commonwealth government as the transition form of government towards the US grant of independence in 1946, as provided for by the US Tydings-McDuffie Law of 1935.

Among Filipino communists then, there was yet no complete clarity about all the basic requirements of the new-democratic revolution both in theory and in practice. However, in opposition to the Japanese invasion and occupation of the Philippines in World War II, the merger party of communists and socialists took the political lead against imperialist Japan in the Central Luzon region, waged armed struggle and carried out land reform. As a result of the armed struggle against the Japanese invaders, the revolutionary forces became strong enough to be considered by US imperialism and the local reactionaries as the principal threat to them. And yet the merger party never withdrew its reformist support for the US grant of independence and readily adopted the slogan of “peace and democracy” after World War II.

In the course of the patriotic armed resistance during World War II, the Filipinos of various ethnolinguistic communities, including the aboriginal Aeta clans and hill tribes of the Itnegs, Igorots, Mangyans, Lumads and the like, participated actively and fiercely in the guerrilla warfare against the Japanese collaborators. The Japanese grant of nominal independence to the Philippines ahead of the US version failed to deceive the people and only incited them to fiercer national resistance.

As soon as the US imperialists returned to the Philippines within the last year of World War II in the Pacific, they used their troops and their puppets to suppress the armed revolutionary movement, reconcile the pro-US and pro-Japanese reactionaries, dismantle the provisional provincial and municipal governments proclaimed in Central Luzon by the revolutionary movement and undo the land reform carried out there by the revolutionaries during the war. As if blind to the determination of the US and local reactionaries to wipe out the revolutionary movement, the old merger party of communists and socialists decided to convert the People’s Army against Japan (Hukbalahap) into a veterans’ association and a legal peasant association to engage solely or mainly in parliamentary struggle.

In the aftermath of the three-year Japanese occupation of the Philippines in World War II, the US granted nominal independence to the Philippines on July 4, 1946 and thereby shifted from direct colonial to indirect semi-colonial rule over the Philippines. Responsibility for administration was turned over to

the representatives of the local exploiting classes of big compradors and landlords. At that time, the Philippine population had risen to 17 million, despite the loss of one million Filipino lives in World War II.

The US had no choice but to grant nominal independence in 1946 not only because it was bound by the Tydings-McDuffie Law and the long historical train of popular demand for national independence but also because it wanted to head off the armed revolutionary movement for national liberation. This became more assertive and militant after the imperialists and local reactionaries frustrated the reformist and revisionist line. They expelled from Congress the elected communist and progressive noncommunist representatives who had run for office under the banner of the Democratic Alliance in 1946. A patriotic war for national liberation and democracy, led by the merger party of communists and socialists, ensued until the main revolutionary forces were defeated in the early 1950s.

In granting sham national independence, the US retained its all-round economic, political, military and cultural power over the Philippines. It preserved and expanded the property rights of US corporations and citizens in the Philippines; it kept its military bases; it made the armed forces of the neocolonial state dependent on the Pentagon; it continued to manipulate the reactionary parties and advise and direct the bureaucracy—and in so many ways superimposed cultural imperialism on the Philippines. The US kept the Philippines in neocolonial subordination not only in the framework of bilateral relations but also in the framework of regional and global relations under the hegemony of US imperialism.

Among the colonies in Asia, the Philippines was the first to be granted nominal independence by a Western colonial power after World War II. For 25 years the US touted the Philippines as the show window of democracy until 1972 when martial rule was imposed on the Filipino people upon the instigation of the US. Nonetheless, the Philippines continued to be the model of neocolonial subservience to foreign monopoly capitalism.

3. THE NEW-DEMOCRATIC REVOLUTION AND FILIPINO NATIONALITY

Since the 1960s, the proletarian revolutionaries responsible for reestablishing the CPP on the theoretical foundation of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought have clarified as never before the character of Philippine society as semi-colonial and semi-feudal, the character of the Philippine revolution as national-democratic of the new type, the motive forces of the revolution such as the proletariat, the peasantry and other patriotic and progressive strata of Philippine society, the targets of the revolution such as the comprador big bourgeoisie and the landlord class, the national-democratic and socialist stages of the revolution, the current national-democratic tasks and the socialist perspective of the Philippine revolution.

The ongoing national-democratic revolution in the Philippines is a resumption of the old democratic revolution in the sense that it struggles for national liberation and democracy in the entire Philippines. But the struggle is at a new and higher level. The class leadership no longer belongs to the bourgeoisie or any of its stratum but to the working class whose advanced detachment, the Communist Party of the Philippines, follows the ideological line of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism and pursues the general line of new-democratic revolution through protracted people's war. In the era of modern imperialism and proletarian revolution, it is only under the class leadership of the proletariat that the struggle for national liberation can be completed and that the struggle for land reform can be realized as the main substance of democracy.

At this time, the class proportions in the structure in Philippine semi-colonial and semi-feudal society have become as follows: the basic exploiting classes of big compradors and landlords are a mere fraction of one percent, the intermediate stratum of the national bourgeoisie is some one percent and that the urban petit bourgeoisie is six to eight percent and the basic exploited classes of workers and peasants are 14 percent and 76 percent, respectively. This class structure has basically persisted from 1968 when the Philippine population was still 36 million to the present when the population is already 71 million, especially because of the deterioration of the socioeconomic conditions during the Marcos and post-Marcos regimes.

The CPP adheres to the line that the big comprador-landlord state must be overthrown through armed revolution and replaced by a people's democratic state. Accordingly, the character of Filipino nationality must change politically,

socially and culturally. The CPP criticizes and repudiates the counter-revolutionary line of the imperialists and the local exploiting classes that the bourgeois concepts of nation-state and Filipino nationality are unchanging and irreplaceable, that these permanently transcend, gloss over or reconcile exploiting and exploited classes and that these are expressible only in abstract terms such as individuals, associations and the state, with constitutional rights and duties unrelated to imperialism and the exploiting classes.

The CPP and the revolutionary movement of the Filipino people are fighting for the overthrow of the existing counter-revolutionary state which is the joint class dictatorship of the comprador big bourgeoisie and landlord class and for the establishment of a people's democratic state under the leadership of the working class. The character and concrete content of Filipino nationality under the people's democratic state are radically different from those under the big comprador-landlord state.

It is of crucial importance to know the differences. There are reformists and revisionists who masquerade as Marxist-Leninists and who cannot think of nationality beyond the confines of the big comprador-landlord state because in the first place they do not wish to overthrow such a state and do not recognize at all the need to establish the people's democratic state. Every time there is resistance to the existing counter-revolutionary state, they denounce this automatically as an attack on national unity which is in fact the social system ruled by the exploiting classes.

The CPP's Program for a People's Democratic Revolution clearly defines what constitutes the Filipino nation and the Filipino people, as including all the patriotic and progressive classes and strata and excluding the comprador big bourgeoisie and landlord class whose loyalty is to foreign monopoly capitalism and to themselves.

In waging the national-democratic revolution through a protracted people's war, the CPP is building the people's army as the main component of democratic state power and is building the local organs of democratic political power among the people. It is building a new state even while the big comprador-landlord state is still well-entrenched in the cities. Since 1972, the building of revolutionary state power has been guided by the Rules for Establishing the People's Democratic Government.

There are now thousands of local organs of political power, especially at the village and municipal levels. At levels higher than those at which organs of political power have not yet been organized, the CPP Central Committee is

responsible for governmental leadership. The National Democratic Front has the task of assisting in the formation of the organs of political power and has also been authorized to engage in diplomatic and other international relations.

The CPP considers the political revolution as the most important prerequisite to the making of the people's democratic state and the new Filipino nationality. In connection with the political revolution, which involves the overthrow of the old counter-revolutionary state and the establishment of the new revolutionary state, the socioeconomic and cultural revolutions are carried out. The political, socioeconomic and cultural aspects of the people's democratic revolution result in the further revolutionary development of the character and content of Filipino nationality.

In the social revolution, the relations of production are so arranged that foreign monopoly capitalism and the local exploiting classes are overthrown and cease to exploit the working people and that the forces of production are liberated. The land problem is solved and national industrialization is carried out. The nationalization of the industrial means of production, sources of raw materials and major lines of distribution, land reform and cooperativization of agriculture and the temporary concessions to small and medium producers are done to facilitate and not to obstruct and delay the socialist transformation of the economy and society.

In the cultural revolution, a national, scientific and mass culture is promoted under the guidance of Marxism-Leninism. The national cultural heritage must be cherished to serve the present. The scientific outlook and education must be propagated to let the nation learn and benefit from the outside and advance materially and spiritually with the rest of the world and must combat imperialism, chauvinism, religious obscurantism, bourgeois decadence and racism. Culture must serve the people, especially the working people.

The national language, Pilipino, and the literature in this language must be vigorously promoted to replace English as the principal domestic language in the Philippines and the local languages and literature must be respected, cherished and promoted and not to be the target of any chauvinist discrimination. However, English may still remain as the number one foreign language of the country for international intercourse.

So far, the reactionaries have used the English language, rather than the officially designated national language, as the principal medium in bureaucratic communications, legislation, judicial proceedings, education, public infor-

mation and all other fields and as an instrument for the exploiting classes to browbeat and discriminate against the exploited classes.

The revolutionaries have promoted the use of the national language to facilitate nationwide revolutionary communication and understanding in opposition to the absurd primacy of English over the national language within the country. They have demonstrated that the national language is a beautiful language in literature and is a precise language in any kind of discourse.

At the same time, they use and promote whatever is the language of any locality because the point is to arouse, organize and mobilize the people immediately for the new-democratic revolution. So far, in recent times, the imperialists and the local exploiting classes have failed to generate any widescale communal conflicts from ethnolinguistic, racial, religious or other cultural differences by way of dividing and ruling the people. The people have a high sense of Filipino nationality as a consequence of the old-democratic revolution, the continuing opposition to foreign domination be it old colonial or modern imperialist and, of course, the new-democratic revolution.

Discrimination due to ethnolinguistic differences is subdued by the development of social, political, economic and cultural relations and by the now widespread acceptance of the national language in addition to the much earlier acceptance of a lingua franca on a regional or provincial scale.

Malay chauvinism, usually against Negritos and the Chinese, is subdued by a number of factors. The Negritos stand up for their rights and participate in the revolutionary movement against the oppressors and exploiters. Some Chinese have adopted Filipino nationality in an all-round sense, whether or not they retain their distinctive cultural traits. Other Chinese have legally opted for citizenship in the People's Republic of China since the latter half of the 1970s. The Chinese have their own cultural and commercial associations and tend to cluster in residential and commercial areas in various cities.

Christian chauvinism is usually directed against the Muslims and the animists who are derided as heathens. But it is counteracted by the forces of the national-democratic revolution movement and by the people of various religious beliefs who uphold the freedom of belief. They have so far frustrated every major attempt of the reactionaries to rouse Christian chauvinism against the Moros. But the imperialists and their local agents persist in trying to build political parties and movements based on religion and directed against the new-democratic revolution.

In principle, policy and concrete practice, the CPP has exerted the utmost effort to put into full play in the new-democratic revolution the unity and militant participation of the Filipino people with diverse customs, race, languages, religious affiliation and other cultural traits. In more than 27 years of revolutionary struggle since its reestablishment on December 26, 1968, the CPP has surpassed all previous revolutionary and patriotic movements in going to the remotest areas and going deep among the native inhabitants and the poor settlers there.

The reasons are obvious. The people there are the most oppressed, exploited and neglected by the counter-revolutionary state and are exceedingly interested in the new democratic revolution. Even as they are being rapidly dispossessed of land and other natural resources by the foreign monopoly capitalists and the local exploiting classes, they still inhabit an extensive and rough terrain suitable for guerrilla warfare in the protracted people's war. They have valiantly fought against the enemy and withstood the most brutal campaigns of suppression and genocide, including bombardments, arson and forced mass evacuations.

The CPP and the revolutionary movement unite the native inhabitants and the poor settlers against the foreign and domestic agro-corporations, the bureaucratic and military landgrabbers and speculators, the logging firms, the big ranchers, the mining firms and other types of "development" aggressors who grab the land and despoil the environment. The right of the native inhabitants to their ancestral land is upheld and defended. At the same time, the poor settlers who have come to the hinterland and stayed for generations are accommodated.

4. THE RIGHT TO SELF-DETERMINATION AMONG THE MINORITIES

The CPP and the revolutionary movement recognize the right to self-determination of the national minorities, including the right to secede from an oppressive state and the right to autonomy under a non-oppressive state. The principle of self-determination is an inalienable right. The right is always there to be invoked and exercised whenever there is the need to struggle against oppression, to promote the legitimate interest of a community and to demand and undertake affirmative action.

But the right cannot be justly invoked nor exercised in order to deliver a community to the imperialists and the counter-revolutionaries or to serve micro-chauvinism, ethnocentrism, racism, counter-revolutionary localism, cultural nationalism, religious and other cultural prejudice against the common interest of the Filipino nation. The forces of the national-democratic revolution criticize and repudiate those imperialist and reactionary forces that superimpose cultural nationalism on political and social questions in order to slander and attack the revolutionary movement and prevent the people with various cultural traits to participate in the national-democratic revolution.

In opposition to the revolutionary political concept of Filipino nationality as encompassing all the people in the Philippine archipelago of whatever ethnolinguistic, religious, racial or other cultural affiliation, some ideologues and propagandists of the imperialists and reactionaries try to drum up the notions that only those who have been Christianized, Hispanized or Westernized are Filipinos and that, according to their counter-revolutionary definition, Filipinos are intrinsically chauvinist or colonialist (relative to the upland people and the Moro people) even when promoting the national revolutionary consciousness and unity of the entire Filipino people against the imperialists and their local lackeys.

The objective of the enemies of the national-democratic revolution, in whipping up Filipino chauvinism or some micro-chauvinism against the revolutionary concept and reality of Filipino nationality is to divide the entire people of the Philippines now and in the future and undermine the Philippine revolution. The enemies of the Philippine revolution seek to manipulate the differences in the cultural traits of the people and to disrupt the course of the political, socioeconomic and cultural revolution.

Historically and currently, the imperialists and the local reactionaries have directed and funded the ideologues, publicists and so-called NGOs (nongovernmental organizations) who push the line that ethnicity is beyond the range of communists and the anti-imperialist and class struggles. At the moment, the imperialist-dominated UN is pretending to be concerned about indigenous peoples. In fact, the imperialists and their agents have been responsible for the most dastardly forms of oppression and exploitation as well dispossession and destruction of the environment at the expense of the Indigenous peoples.

The forces of the national-democratic revolution have consistently championed the right to self-determination of all the peoples in various ethnolinguistic communities against the chauvinism and national oppression and exploitation perpetrated by the counter-revolutionary state, the foreign monopolies, the local exploiters, the Catholic church and other dominant institutions. The principle of the revolutionary movement is to rely on the masses everywhere in the Philippines, to respect their cultural characteristics and to put into full play their all-round initiative.

While the necessary number of outside cadres are utilized in order to open any new area of revolutionary work, the unwavering purpose of the CPP and the revolutionary movement is always to let the local masses assume responsibilities in the revolutionary struggle for their own social benefit and to develop revolutionary cadres and organizations among them. In the building of organs of political power of whatever scale, there is always a special regard for the particular characteristics and interests of minorities and for local autonomy and proportionate representation whenever there is a mixture of people with different ethnic characteristics.

In doing revolutionary work among the hill tribes and other upland people, the cadres and forces of the national-democratic revolution do rigorous social investigation, integrate themselves with the local people and their way of life. They show respect for the local customs and beliefs and avoid bureaucratism and roughness in dealing with these. Even in combating superstition, they use the most persuasive means of education and the good results of appropriate scientific alternatives to put forward the new ideas and practices.

They have respected traditional but benign forms of local leadership, like the council of elders, and have acted as facilitators and guarantors of unity and peace in intertribal relations even as the new mass organizations and organs of political power are established. They have also recruited, trained and transformed the local warriors as people's militia auxiliary to the New People's Army.

There are scores of ethnolinguistic communities or national minorities in the upland. They comprise around ten percent of the Philippine population (excluding the Moros). They include such communities as those under the generic names of Aetas, Itnegs, Igorots, Mangyans, Lumads and the like.

Revolutionary organizations have arisen among the national minorities, such as the Cordillera People's Democratic Front (CPDF), the Revolutionary Organization of the Lumads, Moro Revolutionary Organization (MORO) and are allied organizations within the National Democratic Front of the Philippines. At the same time, there are legal progressive organizations of national minorities, such as the Cordillera People's Alliance (CPA), the Federation of Indigenous Peoples in the Philippines (KAMP), the Central Luzon Aeta Association (CLAA), the Subanen Union of Lumad Organizations (SULO) and the Tribal Association of Mangyans in Mindoro.

The various ethnolinguistic communities are not known to easily invoke the right to secede for obvious reasons. Their respective population and social economies are small scale. They are interconnected with the existing social system in the country. They have repeatedly joined up with the lowlanders in patriotic armed struggles against foreign oppressors. Their way out of oppression and exploitation is bound up with the new-democratic revolution of the rest of the Filipino people.

So far, only one significant force has arisen from among the ethnolinguistic communities or national minorities to invoke the right to secede. This is the Moro National Liberation Front (MNLF). It had its historic distinction of adopting the political concept of Moro nation to encompass some 13 small ethnolinguistic communities in southwestern Mindanao, with the current population of some three million and with Islam as the common dominant cultural characteristic. Originally, the MNLF was a petit-bourgeois radical organization trying to combine Moro nationalism, Islam and Marxism. From 1972 to 1976, it waged an armed struggle strong enough at its peak to absorb 30 percent of the combat effectiveness of the reactionary armed forces and was objectively helpful to the new-democratic revolution when the NPA was still germinal in most parts of the Philippines.

The forces of the national-democratic revolution have always supported and encouraged the MNLF and other Moro organizations to act according to the Moro people's right to self-determination, including the right to secede, as a weapon against the counter-revolutionary state, national oppression and Christian chauvinism. It is in the common interest of the Filipino people,

including the Moros, that the Moro organizations wage armed struggle, for self-determination.

The CPP and the revolutionary movement have therefore repeatedly offered revolutionary alliance, cooperation and coordination with the MNLF and other Moro organizations and have held in prospect regional autonomy under a non-oppressive unitary or federal state of the future. At the same time, they have taken definite steps to organize the Moro masses and develop cadres among them wherever the MNLF and other Moro organizations are not doing revolutionary work.

The Christians for National Liberation (CNL), a major allied organization in the NDF, has been active since the early 1970s in counteracting and frustrating every scheme and attempt of the counter-revolutionary state to rouse Christian chauvinism among the Filipino people in general and against the Moro nation in particular. Contrary to the view of Moro micro-chauvinists, the Filipino people in general and the Moro people in particular need each other in the common struggle against foreign monopoly capitalism, domestic feudalism and bureaucrat capitalism.

Moro chauvinism, which denounces even Filipino revolutionaries as colonialists, must be opposed. It circulates the myth that the Moros have never been conquered by any foreign power and are different from and superior to the rest of the Filipino people. While it is true that the Moros have retained Islam as the dominant religion among them, it is not true that they have never been conquered.

The heroic prolonged resistance of Sultan Kudarat was subdued in the 17th century by the Spanish colonialists. Equipped with iron-side gunboats, the Spaniards forced the sultanate of Sulu to agree to the deployment of Spanish garrisons in the Sulu archipelago in the middle of the 19th century. The US imperialists subjugated all the Islamic sultanates by force of arms after the defeat of the forces of the old democratic revolution in Luzon and Visayas. Thus, the Moro people were put under US colonial rule and subsequently under the existing counter-revolutionary state.

From the viewpoint of the national-democratic revolution, the MNLF has contradictory characteristics. Even if led by petit-bourgeois radicals who use nationalism and Islam as their rallying points, it is progressive in fighting for self-determination against a counter-revolutionary state. But it is also reactionary because it has a negative attitude towards the new-democratic revolution of the entire Filipino people and does not have any clear democratic program

for the benefit of the Moro people. It has nothing to say against the Moro big bureaucrats, big compradors and landlords conniving with the existing counterrevolutionary state.

The MNLF leadership has verbally attacked the forces of the national-democratic revolution as those of what it defines as Filipino colonialism. And yet it has repeatedly gone into accommodations with the counter-revolutionary Philippine state. In 1976, it signed with the Marcos regime the Tripoli Agreement, whose first provision requires the MNLF to submit itself to the principle that the Moro problem be solved within the framework of Philippine "sovereignty and territorial integrity". It chose to capitulate in principle to the Marcos fascist regime at a time that the Filipino people, including the Moro people were under extreme oppression by that regime.

The MNLF leadership has also compromised with the succeeding Aquino and Ramos regimes. It entered into a truce agreement with the Aquino regime and renewed this with the Ramos regime. It has solicited from both the privilege of ruling the whole of Mindanao in utter contempt of demographic facts. The 1990 population of the Moro nation is 2.6 million, only 4.3 percent of the total Philippine population of 71 million and only about 19 percent of the entire Mindanao population of 13.9 million.

Even as it has gone into peace negotiations and agreements with the counter-revolutionary state, the top leadership of the MNLF has repeatedly refused to negotiate and enter into alliance, cooperation and coordination with the forces of the national-democratic revolution. On several occasions, it has even issued hostile statements to the effect that the forces of the national-democratic revolution are even worse as an enemy than the counter-revolutionary state.

The forces of the national-democratic revolution have avoided making any hostile statement towards the MNLF. They have consistently supported the Moro people's struggle for self-determination, have repeatedly urged the MNLF and other Moro organizations to wage revolutionary armed struggle against the oppressive state and have exerted efforts to cooperate with the MNLF at any level. However, they are aware of the anticommunist influence exercised on the MNLF by its supporters among the oil-producing Islamic countries.

When the new-democratic revolution wins in the Philippines, it is highly probable that the imperialists and the reactionaries abroad will utilize the pro-imperialist and reactionary forces all over Mindanao and in particular in the Moro areas against the people's democratic state. It is therefore absolutely

necessary for the forces of the national-democratic revolution to arouse, organize and mobilize the Moro people in concert with the rest of the Filipino people and develop truly revolutionary forces and cadres among the Moro people.

5. THE PEOPLE'S DEMOCRATIC STATE

After the basic completion of the new-democratic revolution through the nationwide armed overthrow of the big comprador-landlord state, it becomes necessary and possible to proclaim the people's democratic state and begin the socialist revolution even as bourgeois-democratic reforms are still undertaken in the transition.

Under these conditions, the people of various nationalities, ethnolinguistic communities, religious affiliation and other cultural traits, will become united in a revolutionary modern nation-state of a higher type than the one envisioned and struggled for in the Revolution of 1896. Filipino nationality or citizenship in the people's democratic state means national liberation from imperialism, freedom from class exploitation and the enjoyment of individual and collective rights in the political, social, economic and cultural spheres.

The socialist revolution will strengthen the national cohesion and integration of the entire Filipino people. The unity of the international proletariat and the cooperation of socialist countries under the principle of proletarian internationalism will also strengthen the entire nation against chauvinism at any level in the country and against imperialism from without.

The defeat of the imperialists and the local exploiting classes will certainly drive these evil forces to multiply their resistance to the revolution, in ways more clever than before, when the opportunities for a violent return to power are not immediately available. They will use sugarcoated bullets. As already demonstrated by the experience in socialist countries, where capitalism has been restored through a gradual process of peaceful evolution, revisionism can arise and prevail if unchecked by proletarian revolutionary vigilance and militancy despite all socialist achievements.

The most clever counterrevolutionaries will attempt to undermine the proletarian ruling party, the state, economy and the whole of society by misrepresenting revisionist ideas as proletarian, spreading cynicism against socialism and the masses and ultimately claiming that the working class has accomplished its historic mission or that the class struggle is dying out and all that needs to be done is to develop the forces of production. The revision of the fundamental principles of Marxism-Leninism is carried out and the policies are adopted to dissolve socialism.

When socialism and proletarian internationalism are lost in a country, the most reactionary centrifugal forces reemerge. The imperialists and their agents

now misrepresent the preceding period of revisionism and capitalist restoration as a period of socialism and blame socialism for the reemergence of unbridled bourgeois nationalism, ethnocentrism, racism and religious obscurantism. But they cannot really conceal the culpability of the bureaucrat monopoly capitalists as well as their own culpability for the ever worsening national disorder and disintegration in the former revisionist-ruled countries.

The crisis of overproduction in the world capitalist system is accelerated by the competitive use of high technology and the most abusive methods of finance capitalism. It is wreaking unprecedented havoc in the industrial capitalist countries and more so in the neocolonial client-states. It is generating social turmoil and armed warfare and is pushing the exploiting classes to use nationalism, ethnocentrism, religious fundamentalism and fascism as their tools of political rivalry and mass deception. Nevertheless, economic crisis and war create the conditions favorable to the revolution.

A new round of revolutionary struggle is bound to develop under the initiative and leadership of the proletariat against imperialism and the local reactionaries. When the forces of national liberation and socialism resurge, they shall be led by the revolutionary parties of the proletariat that are guided by Marxism-Leninism-Maoism because these are at a vantage point to comprehend the previous experience of socialism, the betrayal of modern revisionism and the current world disorder and are in the best position to further develop in theory and practice, under the new global conditions, the requirements for national and social liberation at a new and higher level.

Collection “Colorful Classics”

1. *Marxism-Leninism-Maoism Basic Course: Revised Edition*
Communist Party of India
(Maoist)
2. *Philosophical Trends in the Feminist Movement*
Anuradha Ghandy
3. *Minimanual of the Urban Guerrilla*
Carlos Marighella
4. *The Communist Necessity*
J. Moufawad-Paul
5. *Maoists in India: Writings & Interviews*
Azad
6. *Five Golden Rays*
Mao Zedong
7. *Stand for Socialism Against Modern Revisionism*
Armando Liwanag
8. *Strategy for the Liberation of Palestine*
PFLP
9. *Against Avakianism*
Ajith
10. *Specific Characteristics of our People's War*
Jose Maria Sison
11. *Rethinking Socialism: What is Socialist Transition?*
Deng-Yuan Hsu & Pao-yu Ching
12. *Fedai Guerillas Speak on Armed Struggle in Iran*
Dehghani, Ahmadzadeh, Habash, Pouyan, Ashraf
13. *Revolutionary Works*
Seamus Costello
14. *Urban Perspective*
Communist Party of India
(Maoist)
15. *Five Essays on Philosophy*
Mao Zedong
16. *Post-Modernism Today*
Siraj
17. *The National Question*
Ibrahim Kaypakkaya
18. *Historic Eight Documents*
Charu Mazumdar
19. *A New Outlook on Health*
Advocators
20. *Basic Principles of Marxism-Leninism: A Primer*
Jose Maria Sison
21. *Toward a Scientific Analysis of the Gay Question*
Los Angeles Research Group
22. *Activist Study—Araling Aktibista (ARAK)*
PADEPA

Collection “Works of Maoism”

1. *Collected Works (1968-1987)*
Communist Party of Peru
2. *Selected Works, Volume VI*
Mao Tse-tung
3. *Selected Works, Volume VII*
Mao Tse-tung
4. *Selected Works, Volume VIII*
Mao Tse-tung
5. *Selected Works, Volume IX*
Mao Tse-tung
6. *Selected Works, Volume I*
Mao Tse-tung
7. *Selected Readings from the Works*
Jose Maria Sison

Collection “New Roads”

1. *From Victory to Defeat: China’s Socialist Road and Capitalist Reversal*
Pao-yu Ching
2. *Silage Choppers and Snake Spirits*
Dao-yuan Chou
3. *Which East is Red?*
Andrew Smith
4. *Mao Zedong’s “On Contradiction” Study Companion*
Redspark Collective
5. *Critique of Maoist Reason*
J. Moufawad-Paul
6. *Like Ho Chi Minh! Like Che Guevara!*
Ian Scott Horst
7. *Critiquing Brahmanism*
K. Murali (Ajith)
8. *Operation Green Hunt*
Adolfo Naya Fernández
9. *Of Concepts and Methods*
K. Murali (Ajith)
10. *The German Communist Resistance*
T. Derbent
4. *Socialism: Utopian and Scientific*
Frederick Engels
5. *The State and Revolution*
V. I. Lenin
6. *Labour in Irish History*
James Connolly
7. *Anarchism or Socialism?
& Trotskyism or Leninism?*
Joseph Stalin
8. *Manifesto of the Communist Party
& Principles of Communism*
Karl Marx & Frederick Engels
9. *Essays in Historical Materialism*
George Plekhanov
10. *The Fascist Offensive & Unity of the Working Class*
George Dimitrov
11. *Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism*
V. I. Lenin
12. *The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State*
Frederick Engels
13. *The Housing Question*
Frederick Engels
14. *The Modern Prince & Other Writings*
Antonio Gramsci

Collection “Foundations”

1. *The Foundations of Leninism*
Joseph Stalin
2. *Wage Labour and Capital & Wages, Price and Profit*
Karl Marx
3. *Reform or Revolution?*
Rosa Luxemburg
15. *What is to be Done?*
V. I. Lenin
16. *Critique of the Gotha Program*
Karl Marx
17. *Elementary Principles of Philosophy*
Georges Politzer