



jon bustamante



jon bustamante

Jose Maria Sison

***Imperialism
in the Philippines***



Sison Reader Series

Book 18

Julieta de Lima

Editor

Copyright © 2023

by International Network for Philippine Studies (INPS)

Published by

International Network for Philippine Studies (INPS)

Cover and Book Design by Ricardo Lozano

Table of Contents

Foreword

The Mercenary Tradition in the Armed Forces of the Philippines

Towards a National Democratic Teachers' Movement

On Philippine Independence Day

Fake Controversy Concocted to Obscure Fundamental Issues in Church

On the Philippine Business for Social Progress

All Blows against US Imperialism and its Running Dogs Are Fine

Philippine Economy Worsens in the Wake of the Worldwide Crisis of US Imperialism

IMF and World Bank Denounced as Tools of US Imperialism

Marcos Hypocrisy Exposed during IMF-WB Meeting

On the Casey Visit, US Pressures and Synchronized Elections

On US Moves re Elections and Counterinsurgency

On Soviet Aid and Relations with the Soviet Union

Message to the Conference on US Intervention and the Nationalist Response

US Intervention in the Philippines

My Ancestors in the Revolution

Further On the Plaza Miranda Bombing

Still Further on the Plaza Miranda Bombing

[*The new US Scheme concerning the Plaza Miranda Bombing*](#)

[*On Salonga's Unfounded Claims*](#)

[*The CIA Connections of Gregg Jones and Westview Press*](#)

[*On the US Military Bases in the Philippines*](#)

[*On the US Military Bases*](#)

[*Let Aquino Regime and Its US Imperialist Masters Answer for Their Gross Crimes against the Filipino People*](#)

[*On the Initialing of the Draft US-RP Military Bases Treaty*](#)

[*For the Immediate Turnover of the US Military Bases upon Rejection of the Draft Treaty by Philippine Senate*](#)

[*The CIA-BVD Collaboration against Filipino Political Refugees and Asylum-Seekers*](#)

[*Cultural Imperialism in the Philippines*](#)

[*On Celebrating the Centennial of the Philippine Revolution of 1896*](#)

[*On 100 Years of Struggle against US Imperialism*](#)

[*Experience of the Communist Party of the Philippines in the Anti-Imperialist and Anti-War Fronts*](#)

[*Stand with the Filipino People against the Imperialist Master and the Puppet*](#)

[*Admiral Timothy Keating's Threat to Escalate US Military Intervention*](#)

[*US Ambassador Kenney Is Lying About US Involvement in MOA-AD Sham*](#)

[*Politics of Repression in the Philippines*](#)

[*On US Strategic Interests in the Philippines*](#)

[*The Way Forward for the Filipino People Interview by Bill Fletcher, Jr.*](#)

Message of Solidarity and Gratitude for the Launch of my Selected Works

On Balikatan Exercises and Oplan Bayanihan

Questions on the Philippine Mode of Production

The Philippines between Two Greedy Giants

National Democratic Struggle and People's Trial of US Imperialism and its Puppets

Fight and Defeat US Imperialism's Monstrous Cacique Puppet Regime

Concerning the Maritime Dispute of the Philippines and China

Enhanced Defense Cooperation Agreement Highlights Obama-Aquino Meeting in Manila

Perpetuated US Aggression against the Filipino People

US Imperialism and People's Resistance in the Philippines

The Relation of Activism to Philippine Development Issues

Foundations and Motivations of Imperialist Aggression and Most Important Tasks of the People in the Struggle

On Current Issues with US and China

On China Expansion and the US Pivot to East Asia

On China and US Aggression in the Philippines

On the Philippine Supreme Court Decision regarding EDCA's Constitutionality

Eight Questions about Chinese Loans

US Imperialism Plagues the Philippines

Statement on China-Philippine Exploration Deal

Author's Preface to Strengthen the People's Struggle against Imperialism and Reaction

How Chinese Loans Become Unrepayable

False Choices on the Basis of Simpleton Arguments

The Anticolonial Resistance in the Philippines

Chinese Imperialist Motivations and Initiatives in Relation to US and other Imperialist Powers

On the Filipino People's Revolutionary Struggle for National and Social Liberation

On Fil-Am Friendship Day: USA as Fake Friend

Initial Q & A on Chapter 2 of Philippine Society and Revolution

Preface to On the GRP-NDFP Peace Negotiations

Foreword

The book contains Jose Maria Sison's writing on the workings of imperialism in the Philippines from the US imperialist conquest of the Philippine Islands in the course of the Spanish American War in 1898 until the today when several imperialist powers, including China, have tightened their tentacles over the country and its people economically, politically, militarily and culturally.

It is very important for people to understand how through the control of the Philippine military the US and other imperialists are able to maintain the continuing stranglehold on Philippine society through puppets and collaborators among the domestic ruling classes of compradors, landlords and bureaucrat capitalists that requires the Filipino people and its revolutionary forces to wage the struggle for national and social liberation.

The book reveals how the US principally and other imperialist powers control the Philippines; as well as how the Filipino people resist and struggle against imperialist control, occupation, intervention and aggression.

Julieta de Lima

Utrecht, The Netherlands

June 30, 2023

The Mercenary Tradition in the Armed Forces of the Philippines

Speech delivered before the Junior and Senior classes of the Philippine Military Academy, Fort Del Pilar, Baguio City October 12, 1966

I understand that an increasing number of officers and rank-and-filers of the Armed Forces of the Philippines are reconsidering their traditions and the basic postulates by which commands have been sent down from the top with the most rigid discipline characteristic of the military establishment.

In the Philippine Military Academy, I would presume that the fresher minds of young men are striving to clarify that the true military tradition, which every Filipino must be proud of and whose spirit he must be imbued with should hark back to the Katipunan and the Philippine Revolution.

On the surface, every soldier of the government carries with him the initial of the Katipunan on his uniform. The Philippine Military Academy carries the name of the great anti-imperialist general, Gregorio del Pilar, who fought both against Spanish colonialism and US imperialism. He died fighting US imperialism, faithful to the sovereignty of the Filipino people but betrayed by a fellow Filipino who showed the imperialist soldiers how, in familiar Yankee slang, to rub him out at Tirad Pass.

We are once again at a point in our national history where the body politic is pervaded by the collective desire to assert our people's sovereignty and to give substance to those forms of seeming independence that a foreign power has conceded as a measure of compromise and chicanery in its favor. There is now

an evident political flow involving all patriotic classes, groups and individuals. Our people as a whole, including those who have been conservative, are beginning to reexamine the status of our national life and the strategic relations that have bound us from the beginning of this century.

An intensive inquiry is now being made as to how our society has remained semicolonial and semifeudal; as to how our political system has not actually permitted the masses of our people to enjoy the bounty of genuine democracy; as to how an imperialist culture wedded to a colonial culture has persisted; as to how some of us have persisted in considering themselves under the protection of a foreign power, which extracts superprofits from our country and which constantly involves it in selfish imperialist enmities throughout Asia and throughout the world in the guise of a religious crusade called anti-communism.

We fear aggression and supposedly we prepare for it. But many of us forget the aggression that has succeeded in perpetuating itself within our shores. Many of us lose sight of the fact that actually a foreign aggressor persists within our territory, always trying to cause petty confusion among our people and trying to retain the present local officialdom as a mere bunch of overseers for its selfish imperialist interests.

A conservative man like Speaker Cornelio Villareal has exposed, in a series of articles in the Manila Times, the fact that the Joint United States Military Advisory Group (JUSMAG) has developed a built-in control of our armed forces through its firm control of logistics, intelligence, planning and personnel training on a strategic level. Guided no less by his experience, Representative Carmelo Barbero, an ex-army officer, has also made statements in support of the contention that an undue amount of foreign control exists within the very machinery upon which the people are supposed to depend for their national security.

It should be pertinent to ask whether we should allow the Armed Forces of the Philippines to continue in the mercenary tradition of the Civil Guards of Spanish times, the Macabebes, the Philippine Scouts and the USAFFE under direct US command and the Ganaps and puppet constabulary of the Japanese imperialists. Is the military willing to reject this mercenary tradition and replace it with the revolutionary spirit of the Katipunan?

After the successful US imperialist aggression which started in 1898, the

aggressor has made use of so many devices in the exercise of its superior military and financial power, converting so many of our countrymen into their mercenaries and puppets. We have indeed come a long way from the martyrdom of General Gregorio del Pilar and the uncompromising stand against US imperialism of General Antonio Luna. Only the slogan of “benevolent assimilation” seems to be able to ring a bell and make some of us the running dogs in a successful Pavlovian experiment of US imperialism. These running dogs in every field of our national life can only respond to the imperialist bell; they forget the principle of redeeming themselves as true patriots in the present situation and of redeeming the hundreds of thousands of patriotic Filipinos who died in fighting the US aggressors only a few decades ago.

From the point of view of our revolutionary patriots who would rather die than surrender and compromise with the US imperialists, our fellow countrymen who went over to the side of the enemy and became the core of the American-trained Philippine military were no different from the Civil Guards who were indios but who served the interests of the Spanish colonizers.

No foreign aggressor can successfully stay in the Philippines without adopting a divide-and-rule policy; without being able to direct a significant number of our countrymen to fight their fellow countrymen. If we trace the military history of the Philippines, we would realize that a foreign power succeeds in imposing its rule by making use of a part of our countrymen against fellow countrymen. The Spaniard Magellan thought it wise to side with King Humabon against Lapu-Lapu. This was the pattern of military activity that the colonialists employed to retain control of the Philippines for more than three centuries. One barangay cooperative to the colonizers was used against another uncooperative barangay. Visayan recruits impressed into the Civil Guards were used to pacify Tagalog areas and keep colonial peace and order while fostering regional antagonism. The recruits in one island were used to quell resistance in another island. In trying to expand the area of its colonial domination, the Spaniards made use of their recruits in Luzon and Visayas to fight the great people of Mindanao. Peasant recruits whose own class was being oppressed in the Philippines were sent on expeditions to fight Spanish wars in the Moluccas, Borneo, Carolines, and Indochina.

Dr. Jose Rizal depicted this colonial irony in the story of Cablesang Tales and son Tano in *El Filibusterismo*. The former was being oppressed by the colonial masters, the friar landlords, but his son was impressed into the colonial military

service to fight the inhabitants of the Carolines. Subsequently, when he was reassigned to his own country, Tano was perplexed why he had become the instrument for the suppression of his own people. In one engagement he had to fight his own father, with the nom de guerre Matanglawin, and in the process killed his own grandfather, Tandang Selo. That is a sad story of a peasant enlisted to fight his own peasant brothers.

Under US imperialism, many Filipinos have been converted into mercenaries and with their military service set back the Philippine Revolution. It was with the help of such traitors that General del Pilar was killed in battle, Aguinaldo captured and the Philippine Revolution subsequently broken. After the pacification of Luzon and Visayas, the mercenaries from these islands were employed as the first units of the Philippine Constabulary that helped General Pershing pursue his bestial mission of subjugating the people of Mindanao by military force. Under Japanese imperialism, many Filipinos also became the armed agents used to kill and suppress the patriotic movement of their own people. In the style of all foreign aggressors, the Japanese imperialists made use of Korean and Taiwanese conscripts to help them overrun Southeast Asia.

In this same fashion, US imperialism has used Filipino troops in Korea and South Vietnam to fight their fellow Asians. Vietnam today suffers from military campaigns waged by a mercenary Vietnamese army and by mercenary troops from other Asian countries under the command of US imperialism. The shameless dispatch of Filipino troops in the guise of “civic action” to Vietnam is no different from the sending of Filipino expeditionary forces to the same place in Spanish colonial days in the middle of the last century.

What seems to obscure the fact that US imperialism continues to perpetuate its aggression in the Philippines is our World War II experience. Because we were on the same side against Japanese imperialism and because there was a brief interruption of direct US rule, many fell into the misconception that US imperialist aggression had already been superseded once and for all by the Japanese imperialist aggression and, furthermore, by the promise of fake independence. In truth, when World War II ended and after the July Fourth proclamation of “independence,” the United States had succeeded in reasserting its military and economic power over the Philippines. Its reoccupation and reconrol of the Philippines were essentially no different from the reinstatement of Spanish colonial power after the brief British occupation of the Philippines during the latter part of the eighteenth century. The USAFFE siding with the US

imperialists against the Japanese was essentially no different from Filipino civil guards siding with the Spaniards against the Dutch and the British. We fought a second aggressor only to be more subjugated by the first aggressor. We failed to make use of the war of two aggressors to build up our own national liberation forces that could eliminate both aggressors.

Indeed, the anti-Japanese struggle could have given the Filipino people the chance to build up their own national liberation forces. The masses of our people became armed and became highly organized. But they were not armed with the correct thought of fighting for their independence from both Japanese imperialism and US imperialism. Instead, the widespread USAFFE forces accepted and were even proud of their American commanders and they were childishly carried away by MacArthur's seemingly innocent and romantic slogan of "I shall return." Little did they realize that it would mean the return of US imperialism, with its bag of unequal agreements which up to now keep our people in bondage. Despite the fact that Wainright shamelessly surrendered to the Japanese imperialists as a mock climax to the mock glory of Bataan, and despite the fact that we, the Filipinos, did the fighting and dying in multitudes in the absence of our American "protectors," we would still acclaim the latter as our "liberators." So servile are some of us to US imperialism that we obscure the fact that it was the genius, courage and patriotism of the Filipino people which unfolded a widespread guerrilla movement undermining the substance of the Japanese aggression and breaking its backbone before the other imperialist power came to reclaim its colony, destroy Filipino lives and property in its mopping-up operations.

The singular achievement of the Japanese imperialists during World War II was the brutal destruction of Filipino lives. The singular achievement of the US imperialists was the wanton destruction of Filipino homes and property under the pretext of engaging in mopping-up operations despite the fact that the Japanese had already fled the towns and cities in the face of avenging Filipino partisans. The US imperialists wantonly destroyed Filipino property with their air bombardment and artillery fire as if to prepare us for war damage payments, the war damage payments by which we were to be forced to approve the Bell Trade Act; the war damage payments which were given mostly to big US corporations, US citizens and to church institutions. These facts are attested to by the records of the US Congress and the War Damage Commission.

In its attempt to reinstitute the mercenary tradition in the military, the US

government made it clear that only those guerrillas it would recognize would receive backpay and unrecognized ones had better disband or submit themselves to American purposes. Otherwise, they would be punished for war crimes. Filipino patriots who fought in Central Luzon and Southern Luzon and who wished to remain independent of the imperialist purposes of the United States were arrested, disarmed and subjected to massacres as in the case of Huk Squadrons 77 and 99. The conditions for civil strife, wherein Filipinos would kill Filipinos, were prepared by the imperialists in order to successfully reestablish their political, economic and military power over the Philippines.

Using its armed power and its local agents, the United States succeeded in destroying the national-democratic forces opposing the Parity Amendment and the Bell Trade Act. Likewise, under the guise of protecting the Philippines from the Soviet Union and Communism, its erstwhile ally in the great antifascist struggle, the United States succeeded in extorting from the Filipino people a series of military agreements which directly transgress our national sovereignty.

The 99-year US-RP Military Bases Agreement was effected by the United States. It has meant US extraterritorial control of close to 200,000 hectares of Philippine territory. More than that, it is supposed to grant to troops extraterritorial rights — the “right” to move to any part of the country without being bound by Filipino jurisdiction and sovereignty, particularly when such troops are on military duty. By this “right” the United States assumes that the Philippines is under its occupation and Philippine sovereignty dissolves as US troops by the presumption of their government move to any point in the country. What an arrogant presumption! The US military bases, as they are now, represent the reinstallation and perpetuation of US aggression against Filipino sovereignty.

These US military bases, as they have been so in other countries, serve as the trump card of US imperialist power in the country. They serve as the grim reminder of the US capability for violence against the Filipino people in the event that they effectively reassert their sovereignty in the uncompromising tradition of the Philippine Revolution. Of course, these military bases will be used only after so many intermediate measures of political maneuver by American interests shall have failed. US propaganda will always claim that these military bases are here to prevent a “communist takeover” or to prevent “communist aggression.” A national-democratic takeover will certainly be called a communist takeover.

In a clear analysis of the problem of US military bases in the Philippines, Senator Claro Mayo Recto gave the lie to the claim of Yankee protection. These bases serve only to oppose the advance of national-democratic forces and to protect US investments in time of peace and these actually serve to attract nuclear belligerence from other countries—enemies of the United States, not our own—in time of war.

For a long time it may remain unnecessary for the US government to make any overt use of its military bases in order to protect its foreign investments in the Philippines. It has been said that after all it controls the Armed Forces of the Philippines; that the latter can be used to oppose the national-democratic movement that wishes to remove US imperialist power in the Philippines. The national-democratic movement can always be represented as an exclusive communist “conspiracy” and its organized forces can be subsequently attacked by the puppet armed forces. Even the President of the Republic of the Philippines himself has to be careful of an imperialist-inspired or CIA-inspired coup d’etat in the event that he dares to be nationalist in the anti-imperialist sense. President Carlos P. Garcia himself was once threatened with a coup d’etat for dilly-dallying on decontrol.

What the Filipino people should see with regard to other military agreements like the US-RP Mutual Defense Treaty and the Manila Pact or SEATO Pact is the formal recognition of the “right” of the United States to make military intervention in Philippine affairs, in the case of the first, and the extended “right” of the United States and other countries, members of the SEATO, to make multinational intervention, in the case of the second. At this moment, while the reactionaries in the Philippines do not yet need overt foreign troop intervention to maintain their rule, the Philippine government is being required to expend its limited resources for foreign adventures in the guise of helping put out the fire on a neighbor’s house. Many of us do not yet realize that in joining US imperialism, the Philippines becomes an accomplice of the real arsonist. It is clear that we need to reject the mercenary tradition in every field of our national life, especially in the military. We propose the full adoption of the patriotic tradition of the Katipunan and the Philippine Revolution.

The Filipino people fought under the banner of the Katipunan and the Philippine Revolution not because they were paid to fight but because they considered it a patriotic duty to do so. It was a people’s war; and as a people’s war, our revolutionary fighters had to merge with the great masses and they had to keep

away from the city strongholds of the alien enemy until such time that the latter had been weakened in the countryside where its forces were thinly spread and where the forces of the revolution could develop strong political bases over expanding areas. As it was applied, the Filipino people's war effectively weakened Spanish colonialism despite meager weapons at the start.

Before the Filipino revolutionary forces could reach Manila, however, the US imperialists forced, as in a coup, the transfer of power over Manila from the Spaniards to themselves. Subsequently the Filipino people's power had to be directed against US imperialism. But it failed because of the flabby class leadership of the Filipino ilustrados which initiated severe dissensions within the very ranks of the revolutionary government. The liberal-bourgeois character of the ilustrados enraged the anti-imperialist leader, General Antonio Luna, for compromising with the enemy and for their gullibility in the negotiations presided over by the enemy. The ilustrado leadership resorted to murder; it had to kill General Luna in order to clear the path for compromise.

During the Japanese occupation, we showed our capability for fighting against modern imperialism. We showed that we were capable of fighting successfully against the Japanese invaders despite the deliberate absence of arms distribution to the masses by the US imperialists before the imminent outbreak of the war; despite the American evacuation and Wainright's surrender order. As a matter of fact, the US imperialists refused a petition for arms distribution to antifascist organizations and the masses as a measure of preparing the people for the antifascist struggle.

In the course of the Japanese occupation, the US command in Australia ordered all anti-Japanese forces to maintain a "lie low" policy. This imperialist command obviously implied distrust in the Filipino people.

It was afraid of allowing the Filipinos to develop armed self-reliance. The US imperialists cunningly planned to land arms massively to their own agents in the USAFFE only when they themselves were about to land.

We gained experience and confidence in the people's war of resistance against the Japanese, nevertheless. Although we have again fallen into the hands of the US imperialists, we gained experience as a people in the anti-Japanese war of resistance. We have shown our mastery of the techniques of guerrilla war and our ability to merge with the masses in time of crisis; but we need now to realize

that we have to be guided by a thorough understanding of the tasks of a genuine national and social liberation and the motive forces that need to be impelled with the proper demands so as to move correctly against the current enemy and then the subsequent one, both of whom we should clearly identify.

We fought successfully against Japanese imperialism; we were successful in fighting and in arming ourselves. But we were inadequate in so far as it concerned arming ourselves ideologically and politically. Many fell for America's false promise of independence. Many thought that genuine independence could be granted by a foreign power. The "independence" that was indeed granted was empty of substance, particularly for the masses of our people. By arming ourselves with the correct ideology, all of us could have acted more independently and used our resistance forces to assert our independence from both Japan and the United States. For instance, we could have allowed the peasant masses all over the archipelago to enjoy land reform immediately on the lands abandoned by the landlords who sought safety in Manila under the care of the US imperialists. Instead a few American stragglers were allowed to lead the USAFFE. The leadership of the guerrilla movement was submitted to them on a silver platter. The mercenary backpay mentality was allowed to seep and corrode the patriotic movement. Until now, some of us suffer the humiliation of mercenaries; of constantly begging for veterans' pay from a foreign government.

If an occasion like the anti-Japanese struggle should again arise, we must make use of all our lessons as a people and strike out on our own as an independent force, independent of the strategic demands of a foreign power like the United States. It is not only that we on our own have learned our lessons or that we have developed as a more forceful nation, but it is also that we find ourselves now at a certain level of world development that is far higher than that on which we found ourselves during the Japanese occupation. National liberation movements are now all over the world; the socialist states have become more powerful. These two forces combined have now the capability of scattering and weakening the imperialist power of the United States; US imperialism is increasingly weakened by the over-extension of its power and the consistent opposition of peoples all over the world.

The diabolic stories of "communist aggression" concocted and circulated by US propaganda have become too overused in the Philippines. More people are reading about the experience of the socialist countries and how on the other hand they have been the ones subjected to imperialist intervention. The true facts

about the Korean War and Sino-India border dispute are now coming to light before the Filipino intelligentsia; and the US aggression against South and North Vietnam, US occupation of Taiwan and the hundreds of US intrusions into Chinese territory certainly debunk the claim that China is the No. 1 aggressor and the United States is the No. 1 peacemaker.

“Communist aggression” is one of the myths we are beginning to perceive with greater clarity. As a matter of fact, our reactionary leaders have started to use such contradiction of terms as “internal aggression” and “aggression by proxy.” Whenever there are labor or peasant unrests and strikes, or anti-imperialist demonstrations of students and the youth, the pathological anti-communists see in these dynamic expressions of popular demands “the scheming hands of foreign communists using local agents.”

The soldiers of the government should ask themselves why in strikes they find themselves categorically on the side of the capitalist establishment or in agrarian conflicts, on the side of the landlords. In anti-imperialist demonstrations, they also find themselves together with the police lined up against unarmed ordinary people. Oftentimes, they find themselves being briefed that these strikers and demonstrators are “subversive” agitators.

I know for a fact that most of the enlisted men of the Armed Forces of the Philippines come from the peasantry. But why is it that in disputes between the landlords and the peasants, the soldier who is actually a peasant in government uniform finds himself being used as a tool of the landlord? Why point your guns at the masses and not at the foreign big comprador and feudal interests that exploit the people?

The officers and rank-and-file of the Armed Forces of the Philippines should have the honor and conviction to fight for the interests of the people. If they should find themselves being ordered from the top to take the side of the US imperialists, the compradors, the landlords and bureaucrat capitalists and fight the peasant masses, the workers, progressive intelligentsia and other patriots, they should have the honor and conviction of changing their sides and throwing in their lot with the oppressed who have long suffered from their exploiters.

“Peace and order” or “rule of law” has become the convenient slogan for motivating the soldier against the masses who resort to their right of free assembly and expression. In the first place, it should be asked: Peace and order

for whom? Rule of whose law? The exploited masses who daily suffer from deprivations and exploitation must be allowed to organize and express themselves freely. Why should they be quieted down by the force of arms, under the pretext of maintaining peace and order and rule of law? Why should they be prevented from making clear their demands? In taking your side against the oppressed masses, you become no different from the civilian guards of the landlords, the private security guards of the capitalists and the sentries of the US Embassy and US military bases.

In tracing the chain of armed power in the country, we can see that the possession of arms is attached to property as indicated by the license laws. So, the private entities who have the most private arms are the big compradors, landlords and bureaucrat capitalists and yet they have the most access to the use of the government police and armed forces. When a certain local situation cannot be taken care of by the civilian guards, the municipal police comes in and in a series, the Philippine Constabulary, the Philippine Army, Air Force and ultimately, US military intervention.

The chain of armed power leads to US imperialism. With this understanding, the masses have a strategic hatred for US imperialism. The exploiters and their armed satellites are recognized as being within the same hierarchy of power, with US imperialism as the presiding power. US imperialist propaganda keeps on harping that there would be no more serious threat to national security and internal peace and order without the Communists here and abroad. People were compelled to hate Communists or those who are construed to be Communists in the same way that the Spaniards and the friars tried to play up hatred against Filipinos who were called Masons and filibusteros. The Philippine military is indoctrinated to have a violent unreasoning hatred for Communists in the same way that the Civil Guards were indoctrinated to hate filibusteros by the Spaniards in order to maintain their colonial loyalty.

We must realize that the masses will always be restless so long as they are exploited. At certain stages, they may actually be quieted down by the violent force of the state. But when they rise up again, their previous rising, though defeated, serves as a mere dress rehearsal for a more powerful and sweeping revolution. In 1872, our colonial masters thought they had finished once and for all the popular protests. Only fourteen years later, they reaped a whirlwind — not only a stronger wave of the secularization movement among priests but a widespread separatist movement which wanted national independence no less.

During the '50s, the US imperialists might have thought that they had suppressed the national-democratic movement for good. But as they continue to deprive the Filipino people of true independence, they shall certainly reap the whirlwind — an even more powerful national-democratic movement. As the compradors and landlords have repressed the people for so long, they await a time when the people shall in a revolutionary tempest sweep them away from the land.

US imperialism, feudalism and bureaucrat capitalism are not the creation of communist agitators. They are objective results of extended historical processes. If the people join the nationalist or communist movement, we should first of all consider that it is the imperialists, the compradors, landlords and bureaucrat capitalists who shall have forced them to lose trust in the present system. It is wrong to blame the Communists and all other patriots for the failure of the present system that is dominated by US imperialists, compradors, landlords and bureaucrat capitalists.

I understand that the Armed Forces of the Philippines is now trying to engage in a “civic action” campaign more massive than the one initiated by the late President Ramon Magsaysay. It is also sending “civic action” groups abroad to help in the US war of aggression in South Vietnam.

As a piece of psychological warfare, “civic action” has only a tactical, superficial and temporary value if the basic problems of US imperialism, feudalism and bureaucrat capitalism remain unsolved. Even as a tactic, it can easily be counteracted by the masses becoming conscious that “civic action” comes only to critical areas where more basic demands for change are being raised. Thus, there is an over-concentration of “civic groups” in Central Luzon. The masses of many more neglected areas are complaining that they are not being benefited by “civic action” and that South Vietnam has been given priority. They regard the phrase “civic action” as a mere euphemism to deceive the people of its real military content, particularly its psychological and intelligence functions.

Many intelligent people have access to the literature and armed forces manuals on “civic action” provided by the Pentagon through JUSMAG. They have expressed disgust over the emphasis placed on psychological warfare and deception of the people. They are disgusted over the obsession of hating the Communists and trying to gain the initiative from them through deception.

We can see very clearly that the “civic action” groups of the Armed Forces of the Philippines will not at all disturb the unjust structure of private ownership of land and the feudal and semi-feudal relations in the countryside. As a matter of fact, they would only attempt to create the superficial image that they are friends of the people while at the back of that image they uphold the rule of the landlords, the US imperialists, the compradors, and the bureaucrat capitalists. They may build roads and bridges, they may build irrigation works and help in agricultural extension work, they may engage in sanitation work and they may perform so many other traditionally non-military projects. They will not change the basic social structure that keeps the masses exploited.

It was US Defense Secretary Robert McNamara who first announced that the United States will make its client-states field indigenous military forces in the guise of “civic action” groups. The idea is to build a different image of the local military and make it more effective in counterinsurgency. The United States is supposed to continue providing the military hardware as the shield but this new dimension, “civic action,” is created to deceive the people that the local military is no longer the instrument of feudal and foreign interests or the obnoxious parasite on the national budget. This entails the intrusion of the military in fields which have been traditionally in the hands of the civilians. In other words, this requires the militarization of operations formerly civilian in character. It is anticipated that the military will gobble up funds that should be allocated to the departments of public works, of health, of education and of others.

An increasing number of constitutionalists are seriously questioning the intrusion of the military into civilian affairs. They are wary of a developing process of fascization that might eventually push out civilian supremacy, what with the increasing control by military men of civilian offices. In accordance with this new method adopted by the Pentagon and implemented locally by the JUSMAG, the military is being made to operate in such a way as to take over civilian operations and to gain political influence. Indeed, it is evident in Asia, Africa and Latin America that when the United States becomes insecure over its control of the client-states it resorts to local fascism; for after all a local fascism depends on the military hardware and financial support of its imperialist master.

Another subversive development that needs careful watching is the reverse intrusion of certain civilian organizations into the military. There are those narrow-minded forces wanting to develop a clerico-fascism of the Franco and Salazar type. They wish to combine the sword and the cross. Not yet satisfied

with the undue amount of foreign control and influence in the Armed Forces of the Philippines, a certain sectarian movement has carried over from Spain and Portugal certain fascist techniques and has been systematically “brainwashing” military men and police officers in a manner opposed to the principle of rendering unto Caesar what is Caesar’s and rendering unto Christ what is Christ’s.

Again under the banner of anti-communism, men are being led into anti-democracy. As believers of the freedom of religion, we need to be alert to any clerico-fascist movement that will reverse Philippine history to that long period wherein the exploiting power had a cross in one hand and a sword in the other. We do not want to revive a monster. Those who believe in liberal democracy are now deeply troubled by certain Jesuit priests with CIA credentials. Certainly, we do not wish to have a large-scale revival of the Padre Damasos and Padre Salvis.

Let us above all strive for national democracy in this country. For our national security, let us rely above all on the strength and national unity of the people. That national unity can only be created if we are bound with the masses in a common struggle against US imperialism, feudalism and bureaucrat capitalism.

The political system is dominated by the political agents of the US imperialists, big compradors and landlords. The officers and men of the Armed Forces of the Philippines themselves have become victims of both the petty and grand political discrimination made by one political faction or another of the ruling class of exploiters.

Officers and members of the Armed Forces of the Philippines should learn to disobey US imperialism and the local exploiting classes and learn to side with the masses in their basic demands. Of course, it is really futile to expect the entire machinery of the state to go over to the masses even in time of the most decisive crisis when the ruling classes are entirely discredited. But these officers and men who join the masses in their fight against US imperialism, feudalism and bureaucrat capitalism, can always hasten the victory of the masses.

A movement within the Armed Forces of the Philippines should be started to reclaim alienated territory of the Philippine government from the US government. We must uphold Filipino sovereignty over the US military bases in the Philippines. We must place these military bases under Filipino command. We should demand the immediate termination of the US-RP Military Bases

Agreement as an instrument nullifying our sovereignty.

The true sons of Bonifacio, Emilio Jacinto, Gregorio del Pilar and Antonio Luna within the armed forces should reject US military dictation. They should reject the Military Assistance Pact and the JUSMAG as instruments of foreign control and influence over the Philippine military. They should reject all psychological warfare measures such as “civic action” and others, that have been proposed by US counterinsurgency experts to deceive the people who must be patriotically assisted in their struggle to liberate themselves from US imperialism, feudalism and bureaucrat capitalism.

Let us not depend on one power which abuses our sovereignty and takes advantage of our people. Let us stop US indoctrination in the armed forces and the police force so that an anti-imperialist and democratic orientation can be propagated among them.

We should rely on the patriotism, courage and capability of the people in defending themselves. We demonstrated in the anti-Japanese struggle and other struggles that we could actually convert the enemy into a supplier of arms for the masses by capturing them. Let us dismiss the imperialist presumption that we can only be under the protection of a foreign power.

In this era of worldwide people’s war against colonialism, imperialism and neocolonialism, we are in a position not only to learn from our local experience but also from the struggles of so many other peoples. Let us not repeat the mistakes of Aguinaldo in the Filipino-American War. Let us not again make the mistake of being fooled by US imperialism. In this era of mounting worldwide anti-imperialist movements, the main enemy has become unmistakably clear, and objectively the national struggle shall be assisted by external developments to an extent higher than any other point in Philippine history.

Let us withdraw from the US-RP Mutual Defense Treaty because it is a license for the United States to intervene militarily in our national affairs.

Let us withdraw from the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization because it is essentially an anti-Southeast Asia compact controlled by non-Southeast Asian imperialist powers. Let us redeem ourselves in the eyes of our fellow Asians from the ignominy of having long been dominated by US imperialism.

We have long been curtailed off by the United States from a huge part of the

world. Many of us have long believed in the servile line that the enemies of the United States are also the enemies of the Philippines.

Let us be more aware of the present world reality. Let us be aware and let us take advantage of the contradictions among the imperialist powers and the contradictions between socialism and capitalism. Let us be aware of alliances against US imperialism. Let us join the international united front against US imperialism and its accomplices. Let us turn the present world situation to our national-democratic advantage.

Towards a National Democratic Teachers' Movement

March 30, 1968

To speak before the fellow teachers and future teachers is always a welcome opportunity for one involved in what has come to be called the Second Propaganda Movement, a movement that takes after the first efforts of the anti-colonial patriots to establish a national democratic regime.

We are in the midst of renewed efforts to push forward the national democratic revolution to its completion and fulfillment in accordance with the terms and requirements of our exploited masses in the present era.

The first propagandists like Rizal, Del Pilar and Lopez Jaena were the first teachers of the nation. Beyond the walls of the churches and clerical schools, they tried to spread enlightenment among their own people. Being good teachers in their own time, they learned at the later stages of their movement that the first reformist demands that they had made had to be transformed into revolutionary and separatist demands. Thus the sense of nationhood ultimately gave form and direction to their movement for public enlightenment.

The propagandists that followed, like Bonifacio and Jacinto, combined their ideas of independent nationhood and freedom with revolutionary practice and directed their movement against the colonial enemy. They drew their wisdom from social practice and from familiarity with the problems of the masses and tested their knowledge in the struggle against the enemy.

The mobilization of the Philippine revolution was a process of converting political ideas into a material force against the colonial power structure whose oppressiveness had stimulated national democratic enlightenment.

The process of awakening the masses from centuries of frustrations and suffering was basically a process of education. To be more precise, it was a process of re-education. The colonial system had held the mind of the indio through a system of “brainwashing” performed mainly by a theocracy under conditions of feudal stress and with the pedagogic principles of the rod and rote.

Against colonial miseducation, a national democratic re-education movement had to be waged under the extreme dangers of being called “Communists” and “subversive” that today national democrats are harassed and restricted in their present movement of enlightenment.

A whole system of thought and prejudices induced by the colonialists was based on the material foundation of a feudal society. For this system of thought regimentation to persist and prevail, there had to be a system of educational institutions and processes, which were increasingly parasitic as their teachings became more and more irrelevant to the actual needs of the masses of the people. There were the Church and its catechetical and higher schools which were limited by the scope opportunity that could be provided by a feudal mode of production. The literacy achieved by a feudal mode of production. The literacy achieved by a few was needed chiefly for religious purposes—for reading prayers, novenas and hagiographies. Higher courses were available to the children of the principalia so that they may be endowed with enough apologetics, Latinized pedantry and fluency in the Hispanic language that would set them apart from the native masses. The colonial feudal system was merely in need of a thin buffer line between the foreign elite and the colonized peasantry. As an all-encompassing instrument, comparable in scope to the mass media of today, the pulpit and the confessional box were used to keep the masses of the people in a feudal grip.

As rebels of their own time, the first propagandists disputed the system of thought control that put up mental blocks rather than taught scientific knowledge. The intellectual rebellion sought new content and new methods of education that suited the needs of the people. The Noli and the Fili and the essays of Dr. Rizal exposed principally the miseducation and brutalization of the Filipino masses, dispelled misconceptions about the supposedly natural indolence of the indio and advocated a system of public education free from the control of the friars. It was through the prism of liberalism that the first propagandists perceived the people’s needs and aspirations. The most progressive educational outlook and methods that they were able to grasp at the

time was of a liberal frame which concurred with their own middle class aspirations in the historical period of old type colonialism and feudalism. Unable to merge themselves right away with the masses in a practical revolutionary way, they were under extreme dangers from the Padre Damasos and Padre Salvis and so they sought the freer atmosphere of Europe.

It was men like Andres Bonifacio and Emilio Jacinto, men closer to the Filipino masses, who would bring the national democratic movement to a higher stage that sought the realization of national freedom through revolutionary struggle. It was the higher stage of combining the concepts of sovereignty and freedom with revolutionary practice, necessitated by popular demand and by the intransigence of the oppressor. It was the higher stage of using both the sword and the pen in confrontation with an enemy that had long been using his sword and pen.

The revolution of 1896 continued to issue pamphlets and manifestos and hold mass meetings to arouse the masses. Under the aegis of a revolutionary government, they set up the Academia Literaria as the spearhead of formal educational system.

The national democratic objectives and the educational plans of the Philippine revolution of 1896 were to be frustrated, however, by the successful aggression against Filipino sovereignty perpetrated by US imperialism. Using the gun to defeat the Filipino revolutionaries, they subsequently used to pen that wrote the slogan of "benevolent assimilation." A public school system was deliberately wet up by the Thomasites and the alien soldiers who turned teachers, not so much to endow the local people unilaterally with the boons of science and democracy, but to convert the Philippines into an Asian outpost in America's "manifest destiny" of achieving world hegemony.

There are the simple-minded among us who restrict educational history to a static comparison of the Spanish record and the US record in setting up public schools. To cultivate a pro-imperialist mentality, they deliberately discount the plans of the Philippine revolutionary government to set up a public school system as a necessary instrument for citizenship training and progress. They obscure the fact that the imperialist conquest of the Philippines was not so much directed against a colonial power that was already losing out to the forces of national liberation but mainly against the national sovereignty of the Filipino people; and whatever educational system the US imperialists would establish would have to serve and "justify" the purposes of their imperialism.

For the thought-control of a colonized people, US imperialism is not exclusively reliant on a system of churches and cleric-run schools. On the other hand, it is mainly reliant on a widespread educational system and on the modern mass media to achieve its capitalist purposes. Concretely, in a country like the Philippines which has come to be semicolonial and semifeudal, US imperialism has its own system of thought-control and it also compromises with the old paraphernalia of colonial thought-control. Here, feudal culture and education have served as the base for the superimposition of imperialist culture and education. The integration of feudal and imperialist culture and education is best demonstrated by sectarian schools run by foreign clerics who defend both feudal and imperialist values; these are schools that serve the native oligarchy and their children — an extension of the privileged schooling of the stalwarts of the colonial principalia.

It is not enough to have schools and to have literacy. What is even more important is that these must be made to serve the purposes of the nation and the masses. It is not enough to have the bottle; it is more important to determine its content. If the Philippine revolution had triumphed, we would have had the bottle and we would have also determined its content.

US imperialism is fond of making the condescending assertion that it taught us self-government and democracy. That is a big lie that actually denies the value of the revolutionary efforts of our people. When the US imperialists came, it was precisely to suppress the revolutionary national democratic regime that had been made possible by the struggle of the masses.

US monopoly-capitalism, in its functions of exporting surplus products and surplus capital, has been compelled to train a more extensive local bureaucracy and technocracy in the Philippines unlike the old colonial system which was based on a lower form of social development and which needed a thinner layer of educated puppets. The illusion of free exchange is maintained under imperialism, say free trade relations in raw materials from the colony and finished products from the capitalist metropolis or free wage contracts between capitalists and workers within a society. This structure of relations requires a more extensive local bureaucracy and technocracy.

In our educational system today, students are indoctrinated in the concepts and methods of an imperialist culture and feudal culture. The typical student in the present educational system at every level has a sophisticated split personality

that suffers from a double constriction of outlook. A docile feudal mentality is mixed up with the avaricious mechanical mentality of the bourgeoisie so typical of career men in every field.

The national democratic movement, as a movement for re-educating those who have been miseducated, is now twice difficult. If the First Propaganda Movement had to contend with a clerical structure of thinking, the Second Propaganda Movement still has to contend with it and, in addition, with an imperialist-oriented system of education. And yet we are already in the era of the global triumph of national democratic and socialist revolutions.

Asserting the true purposes of education, asserting its national and social purposes, is now a challenge that all of us must face. This is no longer just the time for stating hypocritically that we are already free and independent as a nation. This is now the era when the underpinnings of the semicolonial and semifeudal Philippine society and also the underpinnings of the master state in the “free world,” US imperialism, are disintegrating.

Revolutionary forces here and abroad are arising so rapidly to replace the old with the new. The toiling masses and the intelligentsia in our country are definitely clamoring for a national democratic revolution to free them from foreign and feudal domination. The movement of events in this nation and in the whole world is so rapid. We who presume to be teachers must be constantly alert students or else our schools will become isolated purveyors of outmoded thoughts and illusions. If the teacher fails to update the content and quality of his teaching, he will surely fail to prepare his students for a fruitful and practical struggle. The surge of the national democratic revolution will certainly expose their ineptitude and inadequacies. The teacher who doggedly allows himself to be bound by traditional relations, methods and illusions becomes an instrument of reaction. It is now our duty to re-examine and repudiate the structure of thinking that exploiting nations and exploiting classes have built into our educational system.

All teachers and future teachers who place themselves on the side of truth, justice and progress should band themselves into the Second Propaganda Movement and become a definite force in the national democratic movement. They should reject every kind of nonsense taught in school; grasp the theory resolutely in concrete Philippine conditions. It is not enough for them to consider their walled-in classrooms as the incubators of revolutionary movement. It is

also necessary for them to exert without delay efforts to convert the entire country into a huge classroom for revolution. In the Second Propaganda Movement, teachers and future teachers should join the workers, peasants, the urban petty bourgeoisie and other revolutionary elements in their mass activities of self-education.

On Philippine Independence Day

June 12, 1968

It was in 1962 that the Philippine government decided to change the official Independence Day of our country. Previously, our people had been indoctrinated by the educational system and the entire officialdom that July 4th was our Independence Day.

A shifting of the tablets of Philippine history has occurred. No little embarrassment still flushes the face of teachers, government officials and our elders who pontificated not too long ago that, thanks to the United States of America, we were “granted” independence on the star-spangled day of July 4th . But, in many cases, it is not yet the significance of the error that embarrasses them, it is plainly the reversal of the dates.

The error of historical recall and political principle is calculatedly obfuscated by our officialdom which declares apologetically that July 4th may still be commemorated as the day when Philippine independence was “restored” by the US government.

There is a question of political principle as well as the question of historical truth in rejecting July 4th as our Independence Day. Independence cannot be granted or restored by one state or people to another people; sovereignty cannot be extended as if it were a gift. It cannot be properly proclaimed for us by a foreign president or a foreign power. It can only be recognized by other states or peoples. American jurisprudence itself would uphold that independence can be asserted or proclaimed only by the people themselves and that, therefore, the US government could not have granted independence to the Filipino people on July 4, 1946.

The kind of independence that was so pretentiously extended to the Filipino people in dubious ceremonies all over the country was clearly a nominal one that carried the restrictions, limitations and qualifications required by the pseudo donor. The United States was willing to tack the label of independence on the Philippines but was not willing to and could not let the sovereign Filipino people

assert their political, economic, cultural and military independence. The grant of nominal independence was precisely to blunt and avert a genuine national independence movement among the Filipino people. After July 4, 1946, we continued to be deprived of the true essence of independence.

The process of granting what cannot be granted, sovereignty and independence, is reflected by such colonial documents as the Tydings-McDuffie Act of 1934, the Proclamation of Philippine Independence by the President of the United States of America and the Treaty of General Relations of July 4, 1946. These documents contain clever provisions and phrases which bless the continuance of US property rights and parity rights and the persistence of installations and occupied land areas essential to the maintenance of an imperialist hegemony.

A series of agreements and treaties has continuously unfolded to reflect the reality of an imperialist power stubbornly depriving the Filipino people of the substance of national freedom and democracy even as it proclaims itself to have “granted” Philippine “independence.” The Parity Amendment and the Bell Trade Act have perpetuated American violation of the national patrimony and of the very preamble of the Constitution and have allowed US citizens and corporations, together with their landlord and comprador allies, in the country, to foster a semicolonial and semifeudal type of economy. Economic subservience to US imperialism has detracted essentially from political independence. Economic independence is the basis of political independence.

The whole gamut of military pacts with the United States, the Military Bases Agreement, the Military Assistance Pact, the Mutual Defense Pact and the Manila Pact, respectively, provide the United States with the military and legal presumption to occupy large areas of Philippine territory and even to extend them in the course of military operations, to exert control and pressure on the Philippine government and to intervene in Philippine affairs in the name of mutual defense and even to allow other allies of the United States to intervene likewise. If we truly grasp the meaning and content of state power, then we can very well say that a puppet state, a protectorate, has actually been created by the United States in the Philippines. Conservative and reactionary countrymen, those who are favored by the semicolonial and semifeudal conditions, are fond of referring to the United States as our “protector,” in addition to such titles as “liberator” and “independence-giver.”

What may lead some of our countrymen to believe that we have independence is

the fact that there is an extensive native bureaucracy and that Americans are no longer to be seen conspicuously in government offices as was the case in former times. The electoral system is also boasted of as an effective medium of free nationhood although it has always been clearly monopolized and abused in visible and invisible ways by the political representatives of the dominant classes. It is relevant to refer to the public confession made by former President Diosdado Macapagal in a recent speech that no president or candidate for president can afford to incur the ire of powerful American interests in the Philippines. He said:

Filipino incumbent presidents and most presidential candidates endeavor to obtain the support of the American government or at least not to antagonize it in their bid for the presidency. This is significant on two counts. Firstly, it indicates that American authorities perform acts, overt or clandestine, calculated to bear on the actions of incumbent Filipino presidents and most presidential candidates and to affect the campaign and its outcome. Secondly, this practice lessens the independence of mind and action of Filipino presidents, a fact which could jeopardize the interests of the Filipino people.

Our ruling politicians are very much within the political framework designed, built up and defended by the imperialists, compradors and landlords. Historically, our civil and military bureaucracy has been merely carried over to the present in its colonial mold. There are certain basic policies of a colonial and undemocratic cast that can be changed to advance the cause of national freedom and democracy only at the risk of incurring the ire and violence of those who fear the loss of imperialist and class privileges. Is it any surprise to us that there is now a growingly conspicuous alienation between the government and the governed?

June 12 is a glorious and significant date to celebrate, chiefly to accord honor to the masses of the people and their patriotic leaders who rose in armed struggle and shed their blood in a great endeavor to liberate their nation from foreign tyranny and oppression. June 12th is certainly a more honorable day than the mock independence day of July 4th, made in the United States of America.

Nevertheless, let it be remembered that the Proclamation of Independence at Kawit in 1898 carried an unfortunate phrase to the effect that the Philippine Republic was “under the protection of the Mighty and Humane North American Nation.” This phrase, this fly in the ointment, reflected the fact that the

Aguinaldo leadership had put good faith in the pledge of agents of the US government that it would provide military aid to the Filipino revolutionaries without prejudice to the cause of Philippine independence.

The chicanery and treachery of US imperialism soon came to light in their arrogant exclusion of the Filipino revolutionaries from the capture of Manila and in the subsequent all-out US aggression against the Filipino people. The Filipino-American war had to explode as an extension of the Philippine Revolution of 1896, with Apolinario Mabini and General Antonio Luna steadfastly denouncing the US imperialists for robbing us of our independence, for slaughtering Filipino patriots, for suppressing our democratic aspirations.

The First Philippine Republic or the Aguinaldo government was over-powered by both the imperialist superiority of arms and by dissensions created in the revolutionary ranks by those ilustrados who capitulated in the face of the enemy, who were carried away by McKinley's pretentious proclamation of "benevolent assimilation."

The era of the national democratic revolution of the old type under the ideological and political leadership of the liberal bourgeoisie is over. The period of suppressed nationalism, the period of the Jones Law, the period of the Commonwealth, the period of the Japanese occupation and American retreat and this period of nominal independence have proven beyond doubt that the national democratic revolution will continue to be frustrated by the traitors and opportunists in our midst, if it is not renewed accordingly at this higher historical stage by arousing and mobilizing the masses of workers, peasants, the urban petty bourgeoisie and militant youth under the ideological and class leadership of the working class.

A new type of national democratic revolution, a continuation of the Philippine revolution of 1896 and yet a renewal of strength in a more advanced way, needs to be waged. The basic problems of imperialism and feudalism must be rooted out by the broad alliance of workers, peasants and all other patriots under the leadership of the working class.

A new type of national democratic revolution is now rising in our country at a time that the people of the world are striking at every overextended tentacle of the US imperialist octopus, at a time that all capitalist societies, especially their American bulwark, are internally crisis-stricken, at a time that the Filipino

people are learning the lessons of the past and the present and are fighting for a far more definite future founded on the democratic alliance of workers and peasants.

Because the proclamation of June 12th was not crowned by a lasting revolutionary triumph and because we cannot accept the improper proclamation of July 4th, a challenge continues to face the Filipino people to stand up and fight for genuine independence and democracy and to inaugurate a new republic and a new proclamation of independence.

It is easy to draft a new proclamation of independence and to adopt a new independence day as a matter of form and ceremony but we must be determined to struggle at all cost for its substantive realization. A new proclamation and a new day of independence can only emerge from the renewed efforts at national democratic revolution. A day is still to come when we shall deal the most effective blows against imperialism and feudalism, when the youth of the land and the masses of the people shall reassert their national and democratic aspirations with revolutionary feats. A day will surely come when true independence shall have been won and its bounties shall belong to the masses of the people.

Fake Controversy Concocted to Obscure Fundamental Issues in Church

Ang Bayan, Vol. I, No. 4, September 15, 1969

Lately, the Catholic Church has been rocked by contradictions within the clergy and among the laity concerning the reactionary social character of the Church, its enormous holdings in big business corporations, the undue amount of foreign control, its traditional landed estates, its ministry chiefly for the exploiting classes, its educational service for the children of the well-to-do in so-called exclusive schools, its doctrinal irrelevance and the corruption of the clergy at all levels. Demonstrations, especially of the young who are already in the stage of losing their metaphysical outlook, have harped on the alien, big bourgeois and feudal practices of the Church.

But the Jesuits in their traditional cleverness have concocted a fake controversy obviously calculated to draw fire away from the more substantial controversies within the Church. Creating an artificial situation where a girl "misreported" to Rufino Cardinal Santos that the lectures of Fr. Jose Blanco, SJ, and Rolando Quintos were "communistic," the Jesuits brought to the metropolitan press how "unfair" Cardinal Santos had been for causing the distribution of an alleged document "branding" the Jesuit priest and his sidekick as "communists." A dull, empty and scholastic "controversy" dragged on in the bourgeois newspapers during the whole month of August concerning this.

No controversy ever existed. The two well-known reactionaries and anti-communists had merely exhorted their listeners in some obscure forum to imitate the "zeal" of communists so as to pursue their counterrevolutionary, anti-people and anti-communist ends.

Fr. Blanco has always boasted of being an expert in "psychological warfare" and of being a CIA agent who participated in the organization of KAMI units in Catholic schools in Indonesia which were used in the Indiscriminate mass killings of democratic elements, whether men, women or children. Fr. Blanco and his sidekick obviously calculated that if they were known as "communists" and "controversial figures," they would become more interesting speakers in student forums.

Fr. Blanco and Quintos are extremely active anti-communists in the Philippine Anti-Communist League. They have been responsible for the issuance of fake leaflets misrepresenting a number of mass organizations in several occasions. They regularly make the rounds of Catholic and non-Catholic schools denouncing mass organizations and certain personalities as communists in what they call "brainwashing sessions." For their enlightenment, they should know that Padre Mariano Gil is a detestable figure in Philippine history for denouncing the Katipunan to the Spanish butchers.

On the Philippine Business for Social Progress

Ang Bayan, Vol. III, No. 1

February 1, 1971

Worried to death by the fast-growing revolutionary mass movement, the US imperialists, the comprador big bourgeoisie and their running dogs launched last December 17, 1970, the "Philippine Business for Social Progress" in another desperate attempt to placate the rapidly developing revolutionary mood of the Filipino masses. Earlier, on October 6, 1971, three business groups, the so-called "Council for Economic Development," the "Philippine Business Council," and the "Association for Social Action," were brought together to form the PBSP.

Patterned after the Dividendo Voluntario para la Comunidad (Voluntary Dividend for the Community) in semicolonial and semifeudal Venezuela, the PBSP is envisioned to have the same counter-revolutionary purpose as the so-called "businessmen's revolution" in Venezuela. The PBSP, a supposed brainchild of the top comprador big bourgeois, Andres Soriano, Jr., is allegedly designed to coordinate all the "socially-oriented" projects of business firms into two programs, namely: the "Business for Nation-Building" and the "Business for Social Development."

Member companies of the PBSP will pledge one percent of their annual net income before tax to be used in projects such as "vocational education for immediate employment, community development, and low-cost housing for the poor." Starting with the first quarter of 1971, the PBSP member firms will turn over to the PBSP in four payments 10 percent of their pledged contributions, while retaining 40 percent for their own individual "donations" programs.

In commenting on the PBSP, Sixto K. Roxas, one of the Philippines' wealthiest compradors, tried to sugarcoat this latest attempt to deceive the working masses with the avowed intention "to commit (himself) to social development, to invest his financial and managerial resources not mainly for profit but to raise the level of human living in our depressed communities all over the country." Impliedly, the comprador Roxas engages in "social development" mainly for "altruistic reasons and secondarily for profit."

All this sweet talk to coat a clever scheme to further exploit and oppress the toiling masses and pass it off as an act of "philanthropy" is immediately uncovered by a cursory reading of the lists of the names of the officers, representatives and member companies of the PBSP. The men behind the PBSP are either imperialists like J.J. Wolahan of Caltex (Philippines) Inc., or big time compradors and landlords like Soriano, ElizaIde, Roxas, Montelibano, Cabarrus, Sycip, Ledesma and many others. All the member companies of the PBSP are tied up with US monopoly capital in one way or another: either they are actual branches or subsidiaries of foreign monopolies (i.e., Caltex, Shell, Union Carbide, T.N. Davies), either they are controlled and partly-owned by foreign monopolies, or they are heavily dependent upon US monopolies for their raw materials, equipment and spare parts, foreign markets or loans (i.e., Northern Motors, DMG Inc., Lepanto, Philippine Iron Mines, Bancom, PDCCP, etc.).

The class character of the PBSP being starkly clear, it is obvious that the PBSP will be used to consolidate the semicolonial and semifeudal order with false promises of social reform, because it is to the best interests of the ruling classes represented in the PBSP that the status quo is maintained.

The annual contribution of one percent of net income before taxes, roughly Ph ₱10 million for all the PBSP members combined, is a paltry sum compared to the hundreds of millions of pesos in profits that the imperialists and compradors amass each year. To make a big show about supposedly returning to the people what has been robbed from them is to be callous and hypocritical.

The specific stipulation that this contribution is to be deducted from net income before taxes, and is tax deductible, is a very convenient way of reducing tax payments while pretending to be philanthropic. The retention of 40 percent of the annual contribution by the company is again another clever trick by which the company is made to appear a generous benefactor although the company retains control over two-fifths of the supposed contribution, and is free to use it

on whatever it considers part of "research" and "social development."

At the outset, the paltry fund of the PBSP already limits the scope and size of its projects to be of widespread and lasting benefit to the masses. For example, Ph ₱10 million is not even sufficient to finance a decent project to replace the slum dwellings in Tondo.

Such measly "donations" can never comprehensively solve the basic economic and social problems of the people. Obviously, the monopoly and comprador capitalists prefer to set aside one percent of their income for self-serving "social development" projects rather than adjust the wages of workers upwards by 50 percent to compensate for the devaluation of the peso. Thus the imperialists and big bourgeoisie try to appear magnanimous while they continue to cheat the workers of their subsistence wages.

The institution of these so-called "social development" projects is done by the PBSP not out of genuine conviction to serve the people, but obviously out of fear of, and consequently obsession to arrest, the growth of the revolutionary movement that threatens to put an end to the system of US imperialist and feudal exploitation.

What the PBSP has billed as "self-help" projects are actually designed to help the imperialist and comprador firms themselves. "Vocational education for immediate employment" qualifies workers for immediate exploitation, and saves the monopoly and comprador capitalists the cost of training workers in their factories. Indeed, if undertaken on a larger scale collectively by the PBSP member firms, substantial savings could be had due to economies of scale.

"Community development" as a social welfare project had long been introduced by the US AID and JUSMAG to facilitate the penetration and control of the masses in the countryside under the guise of superficial improvement projects that gloss over feudal relations of production. The PBSP has taken on "impact" projects in the same manner as the puppet has done. Preferred are projects which have immediate but superficial effects on the people's livelihood and in the final analysis merely serve to perpetuate and intensify national and class oppression and exploitation.

The local ruling classes further betray their bankruptcy by even summarily copying their counterrevolutionary tactics from another neocolony of US

imperialism, Venezuela. The local compradors even brought over to the Philippines a ranking official of Venezuela's "Dividendo" to instruct the local reactionaries on how the PBSP should be formed. It is typical of reactionaries all over the world to use real bullets and sugarcoated bullets in waging counterrevolution. The crumbs from the tables of the ruling classes that the PBSP would like to dispense among the masses are in the nature of sugarcoated bullets.

The Venezuelan ruling classes abetted by US imperialism has perpetrated the same counterrevolutionary dual tactics — combining fascist violence with dole outs. However, the Venezuelan masses have not been fooled by such dole outs. Under the banner of the National Liberation Front, they continue to wage armed struggle and build revolutionary bases in the countryside by waging agrarian revolution.

Likewise in the Philippines, alms-giving by the PBSP is bound to be rejected by the broad masses of the people in the same manner that they have rejected the scheme of "profit-sharing." The Communist Party of the Philippines, as the vanguard of the people's democratic revolution, will lead the people to rebuff the new schemes and plots of the reactionaries and score brilliant advances in the armed revolution against US imperialism, domestic feudalism and bureaucrat-capitalism.

All Blows against US Imperialism and its Running Dogs Are Fine

Ang Bayan, Special Release

February 24, 1971

Like all blows against US imperialism and its running dogs, the February 2 to 10 general strike of transport workers, fishermen, students and other patriotic segments of the population against the US oil monopolies is fine. The student-teacher boycott of classes, the barricading of streets and the seizure of the University of the Philippines in militant support of the anti-imperialist strike are likewise fine.

As a result of these mass protest actions, US imperialism and its running dogs — principally the Marcos fascist puppet clique — have become more isolated throughout the country. These patriotic actions can be repeated, intensified and expanded to aggravate the isolation of the enemy.

The spirit of braving and resisting the fascist acts and threats of violence should be carried forward. The Communist Party of the Philippines, the national democratic mass organizations and the broad masses of the people can always employ the tactics of united front to prepare for, if not prevent, an all-out military attack by the Marcos fascist puppet clique against assemblies of protest in cities.

It was possible on January 25 to hold marches and a people's congress in front of Congress to expose the true state of the nation and condemn the Plaza Miranda massacre during the first general strike. It was also possible on January 30 to

hold marches and another people's congress at Plaza Miranda to commemorate the heroic martyrdom of those who first fell during the first quarter storm of last year and to prepare for the second general strike.

All of these were possible because of a broad and militant mass support and the correctness of the proletarian leadership. So, it was subsequently possible to conduct the second general strike. Though the enemy deployed more military troops and police to impose the dictates of the US oil monopolies, the general strike advanced further and succeeded to make clearer to the people the main cause of their suffering — US imperialism and its running dogs. The anti-imperialist strike became even more militant as the enemy resorted to counter-revolutionary violence, including the murder of five protesters, serious injuries to hundreds, mass arrests and torture in police precincts.

The outstanding characteristic of the second general strike was the forging of more intimate links among workers and students on a wider scale in the national and class struggle for people's democracy. The seizure of the University of the Philippines, especially of its radio station and printing press, and the student-worker barricades all over Greater Manila constituted new victories in the national democratic cultural revolution which is rapidly promoting the ideological and political leadership of the proletariat and rallying the peasantry and the urban petty bourgeoisie to follow this leadership on a national scale.

The second general strike served to expose more fully the reactionary nature of the state that is in the service of US imperialism and the local reactionaries. The issue of rising prices of such strategically important commodities as the petroleum products which was raised in the strike taught the broad masses of the people that it is US imperialism that is causing the unbearable economic hardship of the whole nation. The wanton attacks of the fascist military troops and police once more showed clearly that US imperialism will not hesitate to use its armed puppets to repress the people's aspirations for national freedom and democracy.

The second general strike constituted another test of the revolutionary mettle of the workers and student activists. It further tempered them in revolutionary struggle. The successful integration of revolutionary theory with the practical problems of the strike assured the continuous development of proletarian revolutionary cadres.

The second general strike drew more clearly the demarcation line between the revolutionaries and the sham revolutionaries. In that great revolutionary struggle, traitors and saboteurs like the Lava revisionist renegades, the CIA-instigated clerico-fascists and labor aristocrats of the Oca, Lacsina and Lazaro types were exposed and cast away. Though seemingly different from each other, they were one in turning against the broad masses of the people. They found themselves together crying in dismay, "It's terrible!," at the sight of the revolutionary masses.

While the reactionary mass media pretended to sympathize with their petty-bourgeois mass of readers, they in the final analysis supported the US oil monopolies and the comprador big bourgeoisie that comprise their largest source of advertising income. The ultra-reactionary mass media were most vicious in joining the Lava revisionist renegades, the clerico-fascists and the labor aristocrats in calling the main current of the revolutionary mass movement as the "radical fringe." In the glare of bourgeois publicity, there was much ado by reactionary politicians about taking up the case of the US oil monopolies in Congress and the Supreme Court in a vain attempt to cover up the anti-national and antidemocratic nature of the entire puppet government.

The violent assaults by the Marcos fascist puppet clique and the blustering airs of various counterrevolutionary saboteurs during the second general strike reinforced the truth that the rebelling masses successfully struck at the evils plaguing the people and all the more convinced true revolutionaries of the correctness of their action. Chairman Mao correctly pointed out: "I hold that it is bad as far as we are concerned if a person, a political party, an army or a school is not attacked by the enemy, for in that case it would definitely mean that we have sunk to the level of the enemy. It is good if we are attacked by the enemy, since it proves that we have drawn a clear line of demarcation between the enemy and ourselves. It is still better if the enemy attacks us wildly and paints us as utterly black and without a single virtue; it demonstrates that we have not only drawn a clear line of demarcation between the enemy and ourselves but achieved a great deal in our work."

In praise of the revolutionary mass movement, the Party once more raises its clenched fist in revolutionary salute and declares, "It's fine!"

Long live the national democratic mass organizations!

Long live the ever-growing unity and strength of the revolutionary workers, peasants, urban petty bourgeoisie and all other patriots!

Down with US imperialism and its running dogs, the Marcos fascist puppet clique and such counterrevolutionary cliques as the Lava revisionist renegades, clerico-fascists and the labor aristocrats!

Long live the Philippine revolution!

Philippine Economy Worsens in the Wake of the Worldwide Crisis of US Imperialism

Ang Bayan, Vol. IV, No. 1

January 15, 1972

Chief US puppet Ferdinand E. Marcos, in a recent speech before businessmen, rattled off a chain of claims in an attempt to show that the Philippine economy had improved under his fascist regime. He forecast, in the fashion of a sorcerer, that the economic situation would improve “further” in 1972.

As usual, he merely mouthed the policies dictated by US advisers, the IMF, World Bank and other agencies of US imperialism. The stark realities were there to see: the economy had suffered from an unprecedented inflation since 1969 and was still on its rapid backslide. By no stretch of the imagination could the prospects for the new year be encouraging.

The people suffer increasing unemployment, fast declining purchasing power of the peso, unmitigated increase in the cost of living (prices of basic commodities, house rental, electric and telephone rates, transportation rates, tuition fees and other needs), higher taxes and the threat of more of them, and deteriorating peace and order (rampant killings, robbery, kidnappings, mass arrests and other crimes).

Since the de facto peso devaluation via the floating rate on February 21, 1970, the broad masses of the people have been agitated by a grave economic crisis. The steeply rising prices have pushed the workers to demand for higher wages and strikes have become common among business and industrial houses. Credit

has tightened further because the government has been grabbing more and more private funds to shore itself up. Cost of imported raw materials to feed the local industries has remained prohibitive. The government is foisting more taxes on top of so many, while bureaucratic corruption has further cramped the initiative of the national bourgeoisie in the face of intensifying competition from foreign capital spurred by state policies barefacedly geared toward attracting more foreign capital to exploit and plunder the country.

The devaluation of the Philippine peso in February 1970 was prescribed by US imperialism through the International Monetary Fund as a precondition for the Philippines to be able to have its old external debts “rolled over” as well as secure new external debts. Through this measure, US imperialism sought to shift on a part of the burden of its own worsening financial and economic crises to the broad masses of the Filipino people. As is to be expected, the prescription has only exacerbated the internal crisis. Inflation persisted and breakdown in industry and agriculture ensued, spawning price increases and worsening unemployment.

The so-called technocrats harnessed by the US-Marcos regime exhausted their expertise and failed to stem the deterioration of the economy. These so-called technocrats have simply proven themselves servitors of the US imperialists and the domestic ruling classes. The policies and stopgap measures that they push have only served to accommodate the rapaciousness of the US monopoly capitalists, the comprador-landlords and the bureaucrat capitalists and spawned the outright graft and bureaucratic corruption of the US-Marcos clique at the expense of the broad masses of the people. Also, the external factors bred by the intensifying worldwide crisis of imperialism have aggravated the internal economic crisis.

It was, in fact, the worldwide crisis of imperialism, the decay and decline of the entire capitalist system, that set the destructive forces at work in the Philippine economy.

A concrete manifestation of the worldwide crisis of imperialism is the deterioration of the value of the US dollar which from 1944 to 1958 held undisputed sway over the world capitalist economy. Since 1958 when US imperialism intensified its wars of aggression in various areas of the world, the dollar consistently lost value vis-à-vis the currencies of other capitalist countries, such as Japan and West Germany. US imperialism accumulated external debts by

war spending, maintaining military bases overseas and supporting unpopular regimes in client-states.

US imperialism built up a balance of payments deficit running to US\$10.7 billion as of 1970. So heavy has been its spending for its war of aggression in Vietnam, which in any case it cannot hope to win. Inflationary pressures at home caused a rise in consumer prices from a 3 percent rate of increase in 1967 to 6.6 percent in 1969, something alarming for Americans struggling to maintain a high standard of living. The US economy's growth rate dwindled from an average of 5 percent in 1965-68 to only 3 percent in 1970. The unemployment level rose from 3.3 percent in 1968 to 5.9 percent in 1970, which is serious for a highly industrialized country. In certain areas in the United States, unemployment went up to as high as several tens of percent.

The measures to "protect the dollar" adopted by the Nixon ruling clique on August 15, 1971 showed that US imperialism respects no commitment it makes with other nations when its interests are threatened. By suspending the convertibility of the dollar into gold to stop speculations in the major currency markets where the dollar had been losing value, US imperialism threw overboard the Bretton Woods Agreement (IMF Articles of Agreement) and set off a chain of crises for the currencies of other capitalist countries principally Japan, West Germany and other West European countries.

Not satisfied with junking an international commitment, the Nixon ruling clique slapped a 10 percent additional tax or surcharge on US imports to protect domestic industries on the slump. As a result, exports to the United States became more expensive and were therefore discouraged. This move spurred protests and threats of retaliatory action on US exports by the countries affected. For small exporting countries such as the Philippines, this meant a tremendous blow to the effort to build up dollar earnings so as to meet growing payment requirements for imports and foreign loans.

The Nixon ruling clique used these unilateral measures as clubs to force the other big capitalist nations to upvalue their currencies vis-à-vis the dollar instead of the other way around, as these countries had demanded. Principal US protagonists were Japan, West Germany, France and other West European nations. These countries opposed the Nixon position because upvaluing their currencies without any devaluation of the US dollar would make their exports much costlier than those of the United States in the world market, thus

diminishing their competitive position in world trade.

A temporary compromise was reached among the capitalist countries within the "Group of Ten." US imperialism agreed to increase the price of gold from US\$35 per ounce to US\$38, thus devaluing the dollar by 7.89 percent on December 18, 1971. It also agreed to lift the 10 percent import surcharge. In return, the other capitalist countries agreed to upvalue their currencies.

The net effect of the accord is still to the advantage of US imperialism at the expense of the other capitalist countries. Japan and West Germany have in fact started to suffer slowdown in production, the former predicting its gross national product growth rate to be reduced by more than half the 10 percent average over the last few years. These two countries are now contending with rising prices and growing unemployment.

Intensified trade war is inevitable among the imperialist countries: a battle for exports markets, for a redivision of the countries of the world as economic preserves. US imperialism is bent on waging a trade offensive in areas dominated by other big trading countries, but Japan, West Germany and the European Economic Community are not likely to take this lying down. This trade war will mean further exploitation of colonies and semicolonies, like the Philippines.

In this trade war, US imperialism will try hard to remain dominant, arguing the need to preserve the world capitalist system with the United States as its center. In fact, US imperialism has long laid the foundation for holding on to its status as No. 1 imperialist power. It has kept a tight hold on West Germany and the rest of Western Europe through its military bases and its overseas investments now either well-entrenched in key industries or safely tied up with local capital all over Europe. It has made Japan its fogleman in Asia by tying up its re-militarization with the US privilege of maintaining military bases all over Japanese territory and by forcing it to open up its investment fields to US monopoly capital via joint ventures which require less dollar outflow. Japan remains US imperialism's biggest military ward in Asia, a fact that has only fanned the fire of protest and anti-imperialist and anti-militarist struggle of the Japanese people.

The crisis of imperialism is not likely to be solved either on the short range or over the long haul. Since it carries within itself the seed of its own destruction,

imperialism will reel from one crisis to another. The raging anti-imperialist movement of the world within and outside the capitalist countries and the growing strength of socialism with the People's Republic of China as its iron bastion will not give imperialism any respite, till its doom.

Meanwhile, the Philippines under a puppet regime of US imperialism will continue to be pressed down by the crisis of imperialism. There is no prospect of improvement in the Philippines' balance of payments position. Contrary to earlier projections of a surplus by monetary authorities, the year 1971 was projected to end with a deficit because of falling prices of primary exports and the high cost of imports of capital goods, raw materials and other basic commodities composing the bulk of Philippine imports. Higher price of crude oil, for instance, greatly boosted the value of imports. Now the US and British monopoly oil companies are seeking another round of price increases for gasoline and other products from crude oil. The US-Marcos regime is bound to grant such price increases as well as those asked by other foreign monopolies, to the detriment of the consumers.

The continuing payments imbalance will not permit a fixing of the new peso rate, hence speculation and inflation will persist. Fixing the rate would spawn new problems since the peso will surely go down further in value following the US dollar.

Filipino entrepreneurs must also contend with intensified competition from and growing dominance of US and Japanese monopoly capital and other foreigners. The policies adopted by the US-Marcos clique through the Board of Investments have opened the gates to the invasion by Japanese monopoly capital of key sectors of the economy, such as mining, merchandising and manufacturing. US and Japanese monopoly capital, including Guomindang capital, has been allowed to dominate the field of oil exploration, as well as various manufacturing sectors.

Japanese monopoly capital poses the newest and gravest danger to the Philippine economy, particularly because it is squarely tied up with US monopoly capital in many areas. While records of the Securities and Exchange Commission show that Japanese monopoly investments in the country amounted to only PhP91.6 million as of June 1971, Japanese publications indicate that they have reached US\$450 million, which presumably includes capital equipment sold on long-term payment terms. But even on the comparatively smaller figure of the SEC,

records of that office reported in the bourgeois press show that Japanese firms had borrowed from local sources no less than PhP15.5 million.

The US-Marcos clique directly facilitated the entry of Japanese capital into the country, proving itself a true servitor of foreign monopoly interests. In 1967 the chief US puppet Marcos directed the National Economic Council and the department of commerce to allow 17 Japanese liaison offices to do business here, despite the non-ratification of the “treaty of friendship, commerce and navigation” which is an unequal treaty in favor of the Japanese. Subsequently, under the Investment Incentives Act, the BOI rolled out the red carpet for Japanese monopoly and other foreign capital.

This collusion between US-Japanese monopoly capital and the US-Marcos clique, unless stopped by the resolute struggle of the Filipino people, will aggravate the already wanton exploitation of the country’s natural resources and the foreign monopoly domination of the national economy. Militarist Japan is determined to appropriate for itself the raw material resources of the Philippines, as well as those of other countries like Indonesia, to feed its bloating industries and fuel its military machine. By 1980, Japanese militarism is projected to require 80 percent of the world’s supply of raw materials. With the other imperialist countries competing with Japan, what would remain for indigenous industries in the raw-material-supplying countries?

In the face of these realities of world imperialism and the Philippine economy, the Filipino people shall not relent in their struggle to destroy the stronghold of imperialism in the country and sweep away all local lackeys. They will carry on the fight for national liberation and join forces with all other anti-imperialist forces all over the world.

Notes

Under the IMF Articles of Agreement signed in Bretton Woods, New Hampshire, USA in 1944, the US dollar was made the basis for settling the values of all currencies of countries in the capitalist world, to facilitate world trade and currency exchanges. This was done because the US dollar then was the world’s strongest currency as a result of the unprecedented boom in the US economy fueled by armaments production during World War II.

While all currencies are supposed to be fixed in value in relation to the dollar,

the value of the dollar was in turn pegged in relation to gold; that is, a dollar could be exchanged for one-thirty-fifth ($1/35$) of an ounce of gold (which explains the US\$35 per ounce gold price).

Theoretically, any country in possession of US dollars may present these to the United States in exchange for gold. The United States was supposed to keep a sufficient reserve of gold to make good this exchange anytime. But the US gold reserve in Fort Knox dwindled from US\$26 billion worth at the end of the war to only US\$9.7 billion by August of 1971. Against this low reserve, governments and private sectors in Europe hold US\$95 billion in US currency and US\$15 billion in Japan, all theoretically exchangeable for gold by the United States. The United States, however, is no longer in a position to make good the exchange.

This situation caused alarm among the dollar holders in Europe and in Japan and as a consequence of massive speculation, the dollar gradually lost value in the currency exchange markets. On the other hand, the currencies of the other big capitalist countries which had built up dollar reserves rose in value in terms of the US dollar. Thus, the US dollar lost its reliability as a medium of exchange in international trade and currency transactions.

The pressure of the countries with huge dollar holdings for the dollar to devalue and US imperialism's insistence against devaluation caused the monetary crisis in the capitalist world to escalate.

IMF and World Bank Denounced as Tools of US Imperialism

Ang Bayan, Special Issue

October 20, 1976

The IMF-World Bank joint annual meeting became an occasion for popular education on the workings of US imperialism as well as on the puppetry and bankruptcy of the Marcos fascist dictatorship.

Both the IMF and World Bank were subjected to scrutiny and denounced as tools of US imperialism in statements issued by progressive organizations, in symposia held in colleges and universities and in discussions within progressive circles in Manila and throughout the country a full month before and during the IMF-World Bank meeting.

Marcos' claim to "self-reliance" became thoroughly exposed as a big lie to more people. Attention became focused on the fact that as a result of "aid" by the IMF and World Bank, the broad masses of the Filipino people have undergone increasingly severe suffering.

US imperialism made use of the IMF in 1961 to "advise" the Macapagal administration to adopt the decontrol policy, devaluing the peso from the level of PhP2.00 to PhP3.90 per US dollar; reverse the policy of promoting "new and necessary industries"; allow the unhindered remittance of profits by foreign investors; push the takeover of Filipino enterprises by US multinational firms; encourage an economy of raw-material production for export; and push forward a comprehensive foreign investment incentives law.

At the same time, the World Bank came in as partner of the IMF in making recommendations on a large-scale infrastructure program and a program for “stabilizing” finances (increasing tax burden, accelerated foreign borrowing and tight credit for national businessmen) and promoting foreign investments and raw-material production for export.

Before decontrol, foreign debt was only US\$174 million. When Macapagal was booted out in 1965, because he could not push through congress a foreign investment incentives law satisfactory to the US imperialists, the foreign debt reached US\$541 million.

The Marcos regime pushed through the foreign investment incentives law demanded by the US imperialists in anticipation of the termination of the Parity Amendment and the Laurel-Langley Agreement and carried out the recommendations of the IMF and the World Bank more vigorously than the Macapagal regime ever did. At the end of his first four-year term, Marcos had already incurred the grand debt of US\$1.8 billion, composed mostly of short-term loans on which a repayment obligation of US\$700 million was due.

Once more pretending concern over the financial stability of the Philippines, the IMF directed Marcos to adopt the “floating rate” in 1970 which further devalued the peso to the level of PhP6.00 per US dollar. This put the peso on a career of continuous devaluation.

The broad masses of the people found their incomes automatically cut down. An economy dependent on imported manufactures and even food products imposed higher prices on the toiling masses of workers and peasants. The national businessmen were squeezed by the tight credit situation. The US imperialists and the big comprador-landlords made more hay than ever before.

Satisfied with Marcos’ national betrayal, the IMF and the World Bank worked together to help the Philippines convert the old foreign loans into medium and long-term ones and get new loans. The World Bank organized a “consortium” of foreign banks, mainly US and Japanese, to further extend loans to the Philippines.

As early as 1969, the US imperialists had pushed the idea of a constitutional convention through the Manglapus group to firm up or even exceed their gains already in the foreign investment incentives law. Marcos accepted the idea and

saw his personal advantage in the making of a new constitution.

Grabbing unlimited powers within the ruling system in 1972, the fascist dictator Marcos wrote out the constitution in the way his imperialist masters and he himself wanted, revoked the Supreme Court decisions on the Quasha and Lustevenco cases and issued a series of orders and decrees trampling on the democratic rights of the people, especially the toiling masses, and expanding the privileges of foreign investors with regard to profit remittances and investments in banking, oil exploration, agriculture, shipping, domestic trade and many other businesses.

Philippine foreign debt is now more than US\$5.0 billion, a long way from the US\$2.1 billion at the beginning of fascist rule. This is the result of compliance with US imperialist dictation through the IMF and the World Bank.

Foreign loans are depleted so fast because of the accelerated remittance of superprofits by US and other foreign investors, the worsening of the unequal exchange of raw-material exports and manufacture imports and the heavy burden of debt repayment. All the major raw-material exports of the Philippines are in a bad fix today in the world capitalist market.

The Marcos fascist dictatorship has reached the point of being driven to get foreign loans at whatever cost. It has recently resorted to getting large short-term loans from the Euro-dollar market at high commercial interest rates. Within the first six months this year, it borrowed from this market US\$765 million in addition to US\$253 million this year.

These loans from the Euro-dollar market have in the main been the artificial prop for the retention of the peso value at around PhP7.40 per US dollar. The international reserve of US\$1.1 billion is composed entirely of loans in the process of being spent, with the exception of a US\$45-million gold hoard and a marginal amount of net foreign exchange in Philippine commercial banks.

The Philippines is in the clutches of debt slavery, thanks to the IMF and the World Bank. To go on being able to get foreign loans, with increasingly onerous terms because of the world capitalist crisis, the Marcos fascist dictatorship is bound to accede to the most obnoxious wishes of US imperialism.

The country is laid open to the plunder of its human and natural resources by foreign investors, especially US multinational corporations. Raw-material

production for export continues to be stressed, even while the imperialists are doing everything to press down the prices of raw-material exports. Inflation rides high on the kind of trade carried on with the imperialists and on unbridled deficit public spending required by foreign investments and foreign loans. And yet the tax burden is rapidly becoming heavier.

The exploitation of the Filipino people has its limits. Resistance to the fascist dictatorial regime of the US-Marcos clique is steadily growing. The people recognize clearly that while the Marcos fascist dictatorship is outwardly pompous, it is inwardly rotten. Its economic crisis and political isolation is daily worsening. Under these circumstances, the people's revolutionary movement for national independence and democracy is advancing.

Marcos Hypocrisy Exposed during IMF-WB Meeting

From Ang Bayan, Special Issue

October 20, 1976

In his keynote speech before the 31st joint annual meeting of the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank, the fascist dictator Marcos harped on the theme of poverty and the “global rebellion of the poor.” He said, “Unless we conquer poverty in our time, we shall forever continue to move from problems caused by poverty to problems that cause more poverty.”

His words were clearly demagogic and hypocritical in view of the financial resources his fascist regime wasted on the preparations for the five-day conference. These cost the Filipino people the whopping sum of Ph₱3.5 billion, exceeding the 1976 budget of any department of the reactionary government, except the department of national defense.

The construction of 14 new hotels cost Ph₱2.5 billion and the Philippine International Convention Center, Ph₱1.0 billion. More than US\$440 million borrowed abroad were poured into these nonproductive, inflationary constructions, almost twice the US\$268 million lent by the World Bank to the Philippines in fiscal year 1976. And yet millions upon millions of the people are jobless and have no decent dwellings.

The new hotels are owned by the Marcoses, Romualdez and their cronies. The construction contracts, including that on the convention center, went to a host of US-Marcos corporations headed by the Construction Development Corporation of the Philippines. Knowledgeable sources say that the building projects actually cost less than half the officially declared cost. In brief, these have been used as

quick devices of the fascist dictatorship for robbing the people. The construction projects show in the most glaring way the essence of “aid” that the Philippines is getting under the auspices of the IMF and the World Bank. There is no scarcity of loans from the imperialists so long as these are drawn at onerous terms and used to divert resources from genuine development, thereby laying the country prostrate to imperialist plunder generation after generation.

In preparation for the conference, the fascist dictator Marcos ordered the ejection of some 10,000 urban poor families. Entire communities were razed without prior notice while Metrocom troops and police stood guard. Many displaced families were dumped at garbage sites and far-flung areas while others were left to fend for themselves. This clean-up operation was supervised by the National Housing Authority which now specializes in demolishing communities to clear the way for imperialist-sponsored projects and Marcos’ real estate speculation.

Wanting to push further his scheme to use the IMF-World Bank meeting as a change to grab favorable publicity, Marcos called the foreign press correspondents gathered in Manila to a televised press conference last October 7. Instead of being able to make a flurry of boasts, he was cut down to size and roasted by pointed questions on his autocracy and profligacy by a number of correspondents.

Repeatedly giving their official guides the slip, the foreign correspondents were also able to witness the October 3 and 10 mass protest actions against the “referendum-plebiscite” and against the Marcos fascist dictatorship. Both mass actions demonstrated the people’s growing open resistance to fascist tyranny and the Marcos fascist regime’s utter hypocrisy in calling for “free and open discussions” while resorting to all sorts of tricks and threats to suppress the people’s protests.

On the Casey Visit, US Pressures and Synchronized Elections

June 3, 1985

**Interview by Victor Soriano of Philippine News and Features
through the good offices of legal intermediaries**

What is your reading of the Casey visit and the US Senate Resolution setting conditions on US assistance?

The visit of US Central Intelligence Agency chief William Casey and the US Senate Resolution are part of the series of US pressures on the Marcos regime to make tokens of reform for the purpose of stabilizing it and promoting US imperialist interests. These US moves are in pursuance of the National Security Study Directive of the State department in November 1984 and US President Reagan's National Security Directive of January this year.

The CIA chief's mission was to give Marcos a political-military intelligence briefing and serve warning on him that if he does not follow the US recipe for some so-called reforms in the autocracy and the military, the armed revolutionary movement would continue to advance and threaten to finish off the US and local reactionaries in a few years' time.

The US Senate Resolution gives Marcos a strong message that there is a bipartisan consensus of the Republicans and the Democrats on the need for certain tokens of reform and minor shifts of policy. The "conditions" set on US assistance to the Marcos regime are meant to make the US look good even as it continues to prop up an undiminished and fortified fascist dictatorship.

Do these mean that the US is junking or phasing out President Marcos?

Marcos is merely being ordered to apply more cosmetics on his brutal and corrupt autocratic regime. But he is being allowed to appear as resisting US orders so that only the smallest concessions within the longest possible time until 1987 will be given to his political opponents within the system.

The US has all the leverage to compel Marcos to give up his despotism within a short period. But amidst all the pretenses at so-called democratization, the US is in fact encouraging Marcos to sharpen his knives and escalate his campaigns of terror against the people as well as his political rivals within the system under the shibboleth of anticommunism and counterinsurgency.

The US is allowing Marcos to rig the forthcoming local and presidential elections and to use fraud and terrorism on a wide scale. At the moment, the US and its fascist puppets are planning to humor the legal opposition parties by conceding to them some ten to thirty percent of local seats but to keep the presidency in the hands of Marcos or his surrogates.

The deeper US game plan is to sponsor a coup d'etat against Marcos or his surrogate in 1988 or 1989 in order to meet the probability of the people's war reaching the stage of strategic stalemate and to expedite massive US military intervention as well as the extension of the terms of the US military bases beyond 1991.

At present, the struggle within the Armed Forces of the Philippines is conspicuously between the Ver and the Ramos factions which are loyal to both the US and Marcos. But the US is at the same time cultivating a new faction that is pro-US and anti-Marcos. This faction is steadily gaining ground by denouncing the shenanigans of the Marcos loyalists, especially the overstaying generals, and intends to ride on the people's hatred for Marcos.

The US is bent on perpetuating an anti-national and anti-democratic system, with or without Marcos, in the style of South Korea, Taiwan and Indonesia. But the Filipino people and their revolutionary forces do not cease to prepare themselves against the worst as they hope for and achieve the best within the shortest possible time.

Can you comment on the bipartisan moves for "synchronization" of elections late this year or early next year?

As a matter of course, the KBL [the ruling New Society Movement party] in the sham legislature goes through the motions of considering the views of the minority as stipulated in the electoral code. But personally, I do not think that there will be synchronized local and presidential elections this year. What is more likely is that local elections will be held next year.

Talks of synchronized elections this year or early next year are intended to whip up election fever and focus attention on electoral parties, personalities and the false hope of reforms under the auspices of the fascist dictatorship. What the US and its fascist puppets wish to achieve is to isolate the revolutionary mass movement by means of an early and prolonged election fever (long before the actual elections), while trying to destroy the revolutionary forces through an escalation of military campaigns.

But the armed revolutionary movement and the legal democratic mass movement are expanding and intensifying and cannot be led astray by such transparent tricks. The revolutionary forces are not allowing themselves to be isolated by the election fever and eventual elections. Obviously, they are even taking advantage of these in pursuance of higher goals in the revolutionary struggle.

Some quarters claim that there is a polarization within the anti-dictatorship alliance regarding the US and early elections. Could you comment on this?

First, let me point out that there is the overriding polarization between the people and the fascist dictatorial regime of the US-Marcos clique. Then, we can talk about the polarization within the anti dictatorship front.

The Right oppositionists who depend on the US and elections in hoping to remove Marcos from power are few and impotent. But the Left and Middle opposition forces which rely on the people in waging all forms of struggle on all fronts are rapidly increasing their strength and effectiveness.

The Right oppositionists take the class stand of the comprador big bourgeoisie and the landlord class. The Left and Middle opposition forces take the stand of the toiling masses of workers and peasants as well as such middle social strata as the urban petty bourgeoisie and the national bourgeoisie respectively.

What would be your advice regarding the polarization in the anti-dictatorship front or rifts within any alliance organization?

The most stable and reliable basis for the national united front is the alliance of the working class and the peasantry who comprise at least 90 percent of our people. This alliance is easily broadened by further alliance with such middle social strata as the urban petty bourgeoisie and the middle or national bourgeoisie.

In dealing with those sections of the reactionary classes which oppose the Marcos clique but depend on the US and elections, the point is to take advantage of the splits within the reactionary classes and to further narrow the target to the fascist ruling clique.

There are several ways of dealing with anti-Marcos reactionaries. One way is to deal with them outside of a formal united front organization and achieve cooperation through ad hoc committees. Another way is to include them in a formal united front organization, but care should be taken that the basic national democratic interests are not sacrificed but in fact advanced.

The broader a united front is, the more there should be independence and initiative of the component organizations. Differences and debates are healthy so long as these are directed towards united action for toppling the fascist dictatorial regime of the US-Marcos clique.

On US Moves re Elections and Counterinsurgency

Circa May 1985

Some sectors have made the observation that the US must be engaged now in activities, independent of Marcos, in preparation for his replacement — which could happen either in the event of his sudden demise or through parliamentary means, such as election, impeachment or resignation. What are the indications of these US moves? Is the recent expose of US funding for anti-Left propaganda part of it?

The most important preparations being made by the US for the possible replacement of Marcos are two-fold. On the one hand, the Pentagon and the CIA are trying to develop a pro-US but anti-Marcos movement among officers of the Armed Forces of the Philippines. On the other hand, funds are also flowing in from CIA coffers and the National Endowment for Democracy in particular to promote anti-Left propaganda.

If Marcos remains healthy, there is no way the legal opposition can overcome him solely through elections. The US continues to support Marcos and still allows him to control the AFP, the Batasang Pambansa, the Commission on Elections and the Courts, etc. He can rig the electoral rules, processes and results. He can remain president beyond 1987.

However, the US is giving false assurances of conservative opposition victories in or before 1987 and handing out substantial funds to some pro-US but anti-Marcos elements in order to encourage them to distance themselves from the Left. These anti-Left and anti-Marcos elements are wittingly and unwittingly undermining the broad front against the Marcos dictatorship. They fall for the US strategic objective of removing Marcos by a coup d'etat sometime beyond

1987 should he fail to destroy the people's revolutionary movement that grows ever stronger.

At the moment, Marcos is worth less than a minor CIA operation. A major CIA operation was said to cost about US\$6.0 million several years ago. It would cost much less than that to muster an anti-Marcos coup. Marcos has been thoroughly isolated from the people and there is serious discontent within the Armed Forces of the Philippines. But the US imperialists think that they must first extract advantages from a desperate Marcos and at the same time induce pro-US opposition leaders to steer clear of the Left.

The US is seeking to install in the post-Marcos period either an outright military regime or a military-civilian regime or a civilian regime that will be strictly pro-US and reactionary. If the revolutionaries were alert to the US scheme they would not lose pace in expanding and intensifying the armed struggle. The insoluble economic and political crisis of the dying ruling system is working in their favor.

It would not be easy for the US and its American and Filipino agents to isolate the Left and break up the Left-Middle alliance. The Rightist elements who deck themselves out as "moderates" are isolating themselves by seeking to disrupt the people's democratic movement and in effect helping Marcos keep himself in power up to 1987 and perhaps even far beyond 1987 if they remained without any clout vis-à-vis Marcos.

However, some politically reasonable sections of the anti-Marcos Right are exposing the maneuvers of the US and realize the need to keep the broad antifascist alliance.

Considering that the country is witnessing the rise of insurgency, crucial to the moves of the regime and of those for a pre-martial law status quo, what is the role of the military. How would you interpret the recent policy, which Marcos himself has admitted to a foreign correspondent, of allowing the civilian forces to participate in the counterinsurgency? Both Marcos and Ramos have admitted that the feudal lords, in Negros at least, are now paying the COLA of the ICHDF. Is this to be interpreted as a reversion to the past practice of submitting the military for direct use by big landlords?

Since the beginning of his fascist rule in 1972, Marcos has always sought to

have a complete monopoly of the military and the police. It was in this regard that the police and the paramilitary forces were integrated with the Philippine Constabulary, a major service in the AFP. As a result, the mayors became powerless even as they were held responsible for peace and order. Now, Marcos and the military think that their counterrevolutionary campaign can become effective by activating the mayors as mere supervisors or foremen of the local police. There is also the specific urgent purpose of allowing the KBL mayors to use the police and paramilitary forces for fraud and terrorism in the forthcoming elections.

Under the integrated defense program the military wants to muster civilian forces (including local officials, prominent propertied citizens, the religious and civic organizations) for military purposes so as to be able to claim that the counterinsurgency campaign is a much “civilianized” effort. The fact is that civilian forces are being militarized and placed under military command for military purposes.

For quite a long time now, the military has been organizing fanatical cults to massacre suspected revolutionary fighters and supporters. Now, the military wants to trap bishops and priests in so-called peace and order councils and use them for psywar campaigns. In several instances, people in villages have been rounded up, misrepresented as “surrenderers,” brought to churches to hear thanksgiving mass and take oaths of allegiance to the Marcos regime after the mass.

In view of the rising armed revolutionary movement and the growing inability of the State to give adequate support to the military and police, Marcos and the military are now officially allowing the big landlords to organize and maintain paramilitary forces.

The reactionary pro-landlord character of the state and its main component, the armed forces, is being stressed. There is a reversion to the old practice of proliferating private armies under landlord control. These complement the regular military and police forces of the big comprador-landlord state.

The intensification of the armed counterrevolution is resulting in the accelerated growth in strength and advance of the New People’s Army. The proliferation of disjointed regular military, police, ICHDF and hacienda armed units will provide an excellent source of arms for the revolutionaries.

After Vatican Council II and the rise of progressive trends within the Catholic Church, Marcos and the military cannot go very far in utilizing bishops and priests for counterrevolutionary military purposes. The military itself is repeatedly fouling up its own scheme of using the religious by using its agents in killing the likes of Frs. Favali, Romero and Bernardo; kidnapping Bishop Escaler and Fr. Romano and by detaining so many priests like De la Torre, Tizon, Remigio and attacking basic Christian communities, etc.

The armed revolutionary movement is developing backward villages into advanced political, economic, cultural and military bastions of the revolution. Marcos and the military cannot defeat the revolution through sheer military force or through the militarization of civilian entities and psywar campaigns.

The now open US participation in counterinsurgency has enabled people to discover certain analogies between the present and the situation in the late 1940s and 1950s particularly in the persecution of nationalists like Recto and Laurel. Do you think this is a valid perception?

Yes, it is a valid perception. There are basic similarities. Aside from using the Marcos fascist gang in a vicious armed counterrevolution, the US is trying to use the most reactionary elements in business, professional, academic, civic and religious circles to vilify anti-imperialists.

There are relatively good Jesuits and there are bad Jesuits. A handful of the latter are again active in vicious anticommunist campaigns. There are also some Opus Dei elements who seek to vilify anti-imperialists. There is rivalry between the Jesuits and the Opus Dei within and outside the Church; but the most reactionary elements among both of them are united in their rabid anti-communism even if it means prolonging the tyranny of the fascists by exploiting the reactionary fear of the future (for which they put up a communist bogey of their own making) and disdain for the masses among the upper classes of big compradors and landlords.

There is, however, a big difference between now and the time of Recto and Laurel. The proletarian revolutionary party is much stronger now; has a rapidly growing people's army; and engages in a broad united front along the national democratic line. The broad masses of the people, especially the workers and the peasants and the intelligentsia, have a far higher level of consciousness, organization and militancy, thanks to the persevering work of proletarian revolutionaries since the 1960s.

Progressive liberals and advocates of all-round independence from US imperialism are flourishing under conditions where proletarian revolutionaries are also thriving through revolutionary struggle. Recto's successors — Tañada, Diokno, Lichauco, Constantino — are true nationalist representatives of the Middle and have more abundant support and larger audience than ever before.

All anti-imperialists — be they progressive liberals or proletarian revolutionaries — are rapidly gaining in strength. It is by uniting with proletarian revolutionaries that progressive liberals become a potent force for the attainment of national freedom and democracy in the resurgent Philippine revolution.

On Soviet Aid and Relations with the Soviet Union

Interview by Philippine News and Features

Circa September 9, 1985

It is often bruited about as in the recent column of Jesus Bigornia (Bulletin Today, September 9) that you are opposed to the Filipino revolutionary movement having relations with the Soviet Union and the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. What is your comment?

I am a political detainee. My opinion on this matter is as good as yours. The revolutionary forces — the Communist Party of the Philippines, the New People's Army and the National Democratic Front — can very well decide what is best for them and for the Filipino people.

There is much talk about possible Soviet support for the Filipino revolutionaries in the US imperialist and local reactionary media only because of the need to justify the rapidly increasing US military support for the fascist regime as well as the most flagrant US military intervention.

Is it necessary for the CPP or the NPA or the NDF to have relations with and get every possible support (especially military assistance) from the Soviet Union and the CPSU?

Even without military assistance from abroad, the Filipino revolutionaries can win their struggle for national liberation and democracy. Practically all the firearms in the hands of the NPA have been seized from the enemy.

The CHDF, police and small detachments of the AFP are ready sources of arms

for the guerrillas. Eventually, the NPA will become stronger enough to take on larger enemy units from stage to stage in a people's war conducted in a self-reliant way.

Let the puppet Marcos regime get the arms from the Pentagon. In the course of people's war, Marcos unwittingly becomes the chief transport and supply officer of the New People's Army.

According to the same column of Bigornia, the Mindanao revolutionaries are for getting military assistance from the Soviet Union while their Luzon counterparts who are supposed to be your faithful followers are against such assistance. Can you comment on this?

I cannot pretend to know what goes on in deliberative bodies of revolutionary organizations. But I can say that the Marxist-Leninist revolutionaries have proved to the entire world that they can gain armed strength by seizing arms from the enemy.

I have made modest contributions to the entire national democratic movement not only in Luzon but also in Mindanao and the Visayas. Bigornia's sources are making guesses and trying to sow intrigues against the revolutionary movement.

In your estimate, do the CPP/NPA/NDF already have relations or are they about to have relations with the CPSU? Why?

I do not have any factual basis to make any estimate.

To those who think, especially the US imperialists and their Filipino puppets, that it is wrong to have relations with the Soviet Union and the CPSU, I would like to throw a question: Why do they not take the Marcos regime to task for having relations with the Soviet Union?

Moreover, it is the pseudo-communist party headed by Felicisimo Macapagal in behalf of the Lava clique that has close relations with the Soviet Union and this party is in collusion with the Marcos regime against the Filipino people.

On what grounds do you suppose should revolutionary forces in the Philippines have relations with the Soviet Union or the CPSU?

Any government, movement, party or organization abroad can establish fraternal

and friendly relations with the revolutionary forces in the Philippines so long as they respect the sovereignty of the Filipino people and deal with their Filipino counterparts on the basis of independence, equality, mutual benefit, mutual respect and noninterference.

If the US-Marcos regime can have good relations with the Soviet Union now, there is no reason why the revolutionary forces cannot look forward to good relations with the Soviet Union on the basis of the above principles.

It is necessary for Filipino revolutionary forces to seek every possible assistance from abroad in order to countervail US domination, interference, intervention and aggression. It is US imperialism which makes proletarian internationalism an urgent necessity.

Mr. Bigornia says that should the Soviet Union or CPSU give military assistance to Filipino revolutionaries, the people's war would become more protracted. Please comment on this.

It will become less protracted, provided the Filipino revolutionaries can absorb and internalize such foreign assistance. At best, foreign assistance can only be supplementary. The self-reliant efforts of the Filipino people should render it of marginal weight in the total effort against the armed counterrevolutionaries.

Is there anything more you would like to say?

The US is hellbent on pouring in military support for the fascists. It is out to crush the revolutionary movement and exclude the Left from political institutions and processes in the Philippines.

It is the rabid anti-communist policies of the US and the local reactionaries coupled with all-out military campaigns of suppression that push the Filipino revolutionaries to seek international support for their struggle.

Message to the Conference on US Intervention and the Nationalist Response

September 19, 1985

I wish to express my solidarity with the officers and members of the Nationalist Alliance for Justice, Freedom and Democracy on the occasion of their Conference on US Intervention and the Nationalist Response. I share with you a profound interest in the full exposure of the various types and methods of US intervention as well as the reasons for such intervention in our country today. I hope that by this conference you can strengthen the basis for a broad united front of the people against US imperialism and for waging ever more militant struggles against this alien power and its rabid puppets.

There are enough indications that the US would retain the Marcos fascist dictatorship beyond 1987 and that only the flimsiest of concessions will be granted to the anti-Marcos reactionaries in US-Marcos controlled elections. This is because the US continues to regard the anti-Marcos reactionaries as mere reserves for the perpetuation of foreign and feudal domination.

US bridge financing has propped up the ruling clique of fascists since 1983. This year, the US-controlled multilateral agencies (International Monetary Fund and World Bank) and the foreign private banks have granted the regime further financial props in exchange for the surrender of economic sovereignty and intensified exploitation of the people.

Under US dictation, the fascist puppets are increasing the extraordinary privileges of the US multinational corporations, aggravating the agrarian character of the economy, pushing down real income levels of the people,

pushing further import trade liberalization, increasing the domestic tax burden and sinking the country deeper into foreign indebtedness. There can be no economic recovery but only further misery under the US monopolies and the fascist big comprador monopolies.

Despite pretenses at conforming with certain reformist demands, the US has finally approved for 1986 and 1987 the bilateral economic and military assistance in connection with the US military bases, with no conditions whatsoever that would drastically improve the political chances of the anti-Marcos reactionaries.

The fascist dictatorship remains undiminished to do the bidding of US imperialism. The overriding political concern of the US-Marcos tandem is to launch brutal campaigns against the people and their revolutionary movement as well as to make the legal opposition grovel for the flimsiest of concessions in exchange for the further entrenchment not only of US dominance but also of the fascist dictatorship.

The US imperialists are now of the belief that they have achieved success with the ruling clique of fascists in mollifying the people's outrage over the Aquino assassination and all other barbarities as well as in canalizing such outrage toward electoral exercises completely controlled by the US-Marcos regime.

The US scheme is to use the fascists in a vicious campaign of terror against the people, especially the toiling masses, and to extend the life of the US military bases beyond 1991.

If Marcos or his surrogate retains the presidency, of course through fraud and terror, the US will give him all-out military support to attack and seek the total destruction of the revolutionary movement of the people. At the same time, the life of the US military bases will be extended by an agreement made a few years before 1991.

If Marcos or his surrogate succeeds in crushing the armed revolution, he will be rewarded with the completion of his term beyond 1987. If the armed revolution continues to rapidly grow in strength it will be able to launch tactical offensives in more than half of Philippine municipalities and cities within the latter half of the decade, and the strategic stalemate shall have begun.

The US has begun to introduce special operations forces and build up facilities

in the Philippines in preparation for all-out US military support for the Marcos fascist gang and for direct US participation in military campaigns against the people.

The current increase of military advisers under the pretext of assisting Philippine puppet troops in the operation and maintenance of US-supplied weapons is comparable to US military intervention in Vietnam in the early 1960s or in Central America today.

The yearly joint military exercises of US and Philippine puppet troops have a clear sabre-rattling orientation against the Filipino people and have been used as a method for leaving and passing on military equipment to the Armed Forces of the Philippines beyond the level of US military assistance approved by the US Congress. Of course, the US military bases are always ready channels for weapons delivery and training services to the AFP.

The Filipino people must be farsighted enough to anticipate a US war of aggression before the end of the decade or early part of the next decade. US military strategists think that they can no longer win a war on the Asian mainland but that they still can in the Philippine archipelago.

It is good to prepare against the worst and hope for the best even as we need to act according to the current circumstances. Foresight and deep analytical thinking is necessary so that the people will know exactly how to frustrate every increased level of US intervention in our country. We must also actively seek the support of the American people and other peoples of the world in frustrating US intervention.

It is sad to note that some anti-Marcos elements have the illusion that with the support of the US they can remove the Marcos puppet clique from power in or before 1987 solely through electoral exercises controlled by the fascist dictatorship and the US.

Funds are being given to some anti-Marcos reactionaries by the US Central Intelligence Agency and the National Endowment for Democracy, Asia Foundation and other subversive US entities in order to spread anticommunist hysteria and attack the Left and the middle forces who take the line of fighting for national sovereignty and democracy.

These US funds are chicken feed, if not chicken shit, when compared to the far

larger funds and other kinds of support received by the Marcos ruling clique from the US. By taking an antinational and antidemocratic line under the guise of anti-communism, these pro-US but anti-Marcos reactionaries are undermining their own position and rendering special service to the US-Marcos combine.

They seem to forget that anticommunism has been the convenient tool of the US and the Marcos clique in attacking the entire range of the antifascist opposition — the forces of the Left, the Middle and the anti-Marcos Right. Aquino was called a communist yet his murderers in power continue to claim that he was killed by the communists.

The Bishops-Businessmen Conference has been used recently by the Asia Foundation to adopt and “sanctify” a “sociopolitical survey” which turned out to be a rigged (faulty framework and methods, including bad sampling and leading questions) propaganda coup for Marcos and the KBL.

The institutional church and its high clergy are also being cajoled to engage in rabid anticommunist propaganda and take part in the so-called counterinsurgency campaign in exchange for US supplies of food for the victims of the economic crisis and military depredations. The Opus Dei and some Jesuits are concentrating on pro-imperialist and anticommunist propaganda with US funding.

The US is trying to create an anticommunist alliance between the fascist dictatorship and the anti-Marcos Right in seeking to destroy the armed revolution and preserve the oppressive and exploitative semicolonial and semifeudal system. This is an unrealizable scheme.

The now obvious total whitewash of the Aquino assassination and what can be anticipated as electoral fraud and terrorism in forthcoming elections will scandalize and anger even the most naive and timid among the anti-Marcos Right. The violent contradictions within the reactionary classes of big compradors and landlords will increasingly flare up.

The inability of the ruling classes to rule in the old way has been clearly proven by the emergence of a full-blown fascist dictatorship in 1972. Since then, the crisis of the ruling system has worsened to the extent that we can now foresee the death of that system.

The victory of the national democratic revolution is inevitable not only because

its integral forces — based on the toiling masses and the middle strata — are rapidly growing in strength but also because the contending cliques of the reactionaries are hopelessly split.

The best move that the US can make is to lay off and allow a broad alliance of the Left, the Middle and the anti-Marcos Right to remove the ultra-Right Marcos regime from power. But this cannot be expected of the US as it maintains an extremely counterrevolutionary policy towards the Philippines.

The inability of the US to discard the Marcos fascist gang soon enough signifies not only a defect in perception and analysis but an increasingly untenable and desperate imperialist position in Philippine and in world affairs. US imperialist power continues on a course of general decline although it continues to have some relative strength in the Philippines.

The US finds it convenient to retain the fascist dictatorship. It distrusts a considerable number of anti-Marcos reactionaries and the spokesmen of the middle social strata who voice out in their own way some of the major demands of the nation and the people. And it is mortally afraid of the revolutionary movement of the workers, the peasants and the urban petty bourgeoisie.

Before the US can discard the Marcos fascist gang, the revolutionary movement shall have become several times stronger than it is now. By their own counterrevolutionary violence and rapacity, both the US and its puppet clique will continue to incite the people to wage an even fiercer armed revolution.

Long live the Nationalist Alliance for Justice, Freedom and Democracy!

Unite to expose and oppose US intervention!

Down with US imperialism and the fascist dictatorship!

Long live the Filipino people!

Victory to the national democratic movement!

US Intervention in the Philippines

Circa October 1985

The United States government sponsors and props up tyrannical regimes and when the people's resistance to tyranny grows, the former acquires more presumption to intervene in the client states.

1. The US instigated the Marcos coup in 1972 to suppress the anti-imperialist movement and to reverse such nationalist gains as the Supreme Court decisions in the Quasha and the Luzteveco cases. The US openly and enthusiastically supported and propped up the Marcos fascist dictatorship for a long time before pretending to call for "normalization" (under President Carter) and for "democratization" (under the Reagan administration), which in both instance are in fact calculated to further entrench and prettify the fascist dictatorship.
2. The US is responsible for sinking the Philippines into the debt trap by pouring loans to the Marcos puppet regime. The former has steadily increased bilateral loans (through its Agency for International Development, Export-Import Bank, Commodity Credit Corporations, etc.) and military assistance (through grants, sales credits and international military education and training or IMET).
3. While foreign loans poured in in great amounts, the Marcos regime was in a position to allocate an increasingly large part of the government budget for the military. At the same time, the increasing military assistance was not reflected in the budget. During most years of the 1970s there was more indirect US military aid (foreign loans) than direct US military assistance and the pattern of high military spending was set.
4. The increase of direct military assistance accelerated in connection with the

retention of the US military bases — the US\$500 million package under Carter and the US\$900 million under Reagan, both spread out over five years. Total US economic and military assistance rose from US\$151 million in 1984 to US\$231 million in 1985, involving an increase of 53 percent and far exceeding any previous rate of increase. These have included the economic support fund (ESF), military grants, military sales credit and IMET. The ESF has a military thrust as it is being used for “civic action” with its psywar and intelligence objectives in the counterinsurgency campaign.

5. The counterinsurgency scheme being implemented by the Marcos regime involves the advice and approval of the US, specifically its agencies such as the Pentagon and the Central Intelligence Agency. Oplan Katatagan was formally presented to the US during President Marcos’ state visit and was approved by the US.

6. Now that the US is worried by the rapid growth of the Communist Party of the Philippines and the New People’s Army, it is giving more military assistance beyond the US\$900 million five-year package. The US is also bringing in more military advisers, in addition to the present level of personnel in the JUSMAG.

7. The US is stepping up its military intervention as in Vietnam in the early 1960s and in El Salvador currently. Deliveries of war materiel and military advisers have increased. This is in preparation for an outright US war of aggression as in Vietnam.

8. The US has always directed and controlled the Armed Forces of the Philippines through the US-RP Mutual Defense Board and the JUSMAG in terms of anti-communist indoctrination, strategic concepts and plans, counterinsurgency advice, military supplies, intelligence, office training, etc. US direction and control of counterinsurgency operations are being enhanced.

9. War exercises are used for sabre-rattling purposes against the Filipino revolutionary movement. These are being used to intimidate the people. These are actual preparations for US armed intervention and aggression against the Filipino people.

10. Under the present US scheme of intervention, Marcos is being assured that he can prolong his fascist dictatorship under the guise of counterinsurgency. But in fact, the US wants to strengthen its own hold over the AFP to be in a position

to use the AFP in any way that best serves US interests.

My Ancestors in the Revolution

July 2, 1986

A book by William Henry Scott, *Ilocano Responses to American Aggression 1900-1901* (Quezon City, New Day Publishers, 1986), saves from almost total oblivion the just and heroic struggle of the Ilocanos against US imperialism that reached the Ilocos at the turn of the century. As an account of the Ilocano guerrilla war which followed the dissolution of the regular forces of the Philippine revolutionary army, the book adds zest and drama to the retelling of the entire Filipino people's struggle for national freedom. The Ilocano resistance was a major part of that struggle.

One of the values of the book is Scott's fair presentation of both the strengths and weaknesses of the patriotic forces fighting US aggression. The Filipino revolutionary of today can discern the causes of failure in the resistance as well as draw lessons for the ongoing struggle against US imperialism and local reactionaries. Well-informed knowledge formed by hindsight of the changed objective and subjective conditions of the Philippine revolution promises eventual victory for the people against US imperialism.

The guiding ideology of the Philippine revolution which started in 1896 was liberal democratic. Its national spirit was strong insofar as it confronted blatant oppression and racial discrimination by a foreign power; and its antifeudal democratic content was likewise strong insofar as it was directed against friar landlordism, forced labor, heavy taxation on production and trade, and excessive religious exactions.

The Philippine revolution was victorious in its fight against Spanish colonialism. But when confronted by US imperialism, with the call for benevolent

assimilation even as it unleashed its vastly superior weapons, most of the revolutionary leaders floundered and eventually capitulated. As a class, they had no interest in carrying out a protracted people's war and soon worried about loss of their lives and property. They roused and shared the patriotism of the peasant masses, but did not offer them their share of the land or real freedom to sustain their interest in the armed struggle.

US imperialism was able to accommodate the newly emerged liberal bourgeois intelligentsia, the landlord class and the merchants. It could also momentarily and partially relieve some of the peasants' hunger for land by buying most of the friar estates for redistribution and by opening public land to homesteaders. Subsequently, however, the landlords and merchant-usurers were able to take over the small holdings of the peasants on former friar estates or in frontier areas.

The United States aligned the interests of monopoly capitalism with those of domestic feudalism; promoted the free trade of locally produced raw materials and US products, and fostered the growth of the comprador big bourgeoisie; and expanded the educational system to produce the professional and technical personnel for its growing business and bureaucracy. Thus, the feudal society of the 19th century could glide into the semifeudal society of the 20th century.

Given the objective social conditions and the type of leadership of the old democratic revolution in 1900-1901, the guerrilla warfare that was waged in the Ilocos could not have made much headway against US imperialism, even if the guerrillas had been better marksmen, or had learned better guerrilla tactics.

Once more, in the resurgent Philippine revolution of today, the most progressive but minority class — the proletariat — is striving through its revolutionary party to lead the entire people to attain national liberation and democracy under the critical conditions of acute political repression and rapid economic deterioration. But unlike the Katipunan and the revolutionary government of the liberal bourgeoisie, the revolutionary party of the proletariat clearly recognizes that a people's war can be waged protractedly and victoriously against US imperialism and local reaction by arousing, organizing and mobilizing the peasant majority of the people in accordance with their democratic class interests against feudalism and semifeudalism.

Because of the integration of the armed struggle, agrarian revolution and mass

base building among the peasants, the people's army has persevered, grown in strength and advanced nationwide against an enemy far superior in military strength and using all the barbaric methods used successfully by the US during the Filipino-American War.

The proletarian revolutionaries today clearly recognize the country's semicolonial and semifeudal conditions and are carrying out a national democratic rather than a socialist revolution. The main content of the current revolution is the solution of the land problem. At the same time, the realization of the progressive demands of the petty and middle bourgeoisie are an integral part of the revolution. The new democratic revolution is a continuation of the old democratic revolution at a new and higher level in the era of modern imperialism and proletarian revolution. This time, however, the Filipino proletarian revolutionaries have better chances of winning than the bourgeois liberal revolutionaries had in the Filipino-American War.

Though still a minority class, the Filipino proletariat today is far more formidable than the liberal bourgeoisie was in the social landscape at the time of the old democratic revolution. The proletariat-peasant alliance today is far more solid and powerful than the liberal bourgeois-peasant alliance was then. The theory and practice of people's war is far more developed today than ever before. Above all, social conditions as well as comprehensive theory permit the proletariat to become the most progressive political and productive force to lead social revolution now and in the future.

My own family participated in the Ilocos resistance to American aggression in 1900 and 1901, and quite a number of my relatives by blood or affinity are mentioned in Scott's book. Belonging to the landed and mercantile principalia of Ilocos, they got inevitably involved in the Ilocano resistance. While the armed revolution raged, they played the role of enlightened patriotic gentry. Some information not revealed by the archival data on which Professor Scott's book is based may provide further basis for thought relevant to the ongoing struggle.

The acknowledged patriarch of my family was my great grandfather, Don Leandro (Capitan Cando) Serrano of Cabugao, Ilocos Sur. He was one of the country's magnates in his time. He had become the largest landowner in Ilocos Sur by the last quarter of the 19th century; his estate surpassed that of the Vigan-based Florentinos. It was concentrated in Cabugao but also covered large portions of Sinait, Lapog and Magsingal in Ilocos Sur and Badoc in Ilocos

Norte. His maguey plantations covered extensive portions of the seacoast of more than ten towns from Badoc to Santa Lucia in Ilocos Sur.

He was a Filipino patriot. Under Spanish colonial rule, specifically soon after the outbreak of the Philippine revolution in 1896, he and his son Enrique (married into the leading Valdez family of San Nicolas, Ilocos Norte) were among the Ilocos Sur principales (wealthy persons) arrested, interrogated and tortured by Spanish military officers and Augustinian friars on suspicion of being secret officers and promoters of the Katipunan in the province. Under the Philippine revolutionary government, he became the town's delegado de rentas y de propiedad on August 24, 1898, and collected taxes and donations as well as contributed much of his own resources to support the newly organized national government and the Ilocos armed resistance to the US aggression.

Capitan Cando was the love child of the Spanish-indio mestizo Modesto Solosa and the Spanish-Malay mestiza Dominga Serrano. He had little formal education but received plenty of informal tutoring as an acolyte and young fiscal to the Spanish Augustinian curate, and he engaged in self-study. He was gobernadorcillo or capitan municipal (mayor) of the town for a long time, and was proud to have built the largest mansion in the province. With 25 rooms, it was said to have a total floor space of 5,000 square meters, excluding a dining hall that could seat hundreds, a chapel, and a four-level storehouse that was the biggest in the province. He derived much profit from exploiting the labor of his tenants and evidently took pleasure in spending much of his income — from land rent, interest on loans and trade profits — to build large brick structures. He built residences for his married sons, as well as a pleasure house in a barrio hideaway which after his death became a vacation house for nuns. These were all brick structures, built in the old European style.

After the defeat of the Spaniards and the withdrawal of Spanish forces from Cabugao on August 12, 1898, General Manuel Tinio and other revolutionaries often stayed in my great-grandfather's mansion. Hundreds of Spanish prisoners from Ilocos Norte and Ilocos Sur north of Vigan were assembled here, and Don Leandro housed and fed them while they were waiting to be moved out. Quite a number of them who had married Ilocana women became his household servants while the revolution was on. I remember when I was a small boy, former Spanish servants of my great grandfather's would still visit my parents and call me among (master) or señorito (little sir). Obviously, they had not yet gotten over the Spanish defeat of 1898.

Although the US military had a large garrison in the poblacion of Cabugao, General Tinio's favorite guerrilla base was the eastern mountain barrios of the town. Here he could command a view of the Ilocos coast from Laoag to Vigan, his troops could take advantage of excellent ambush spots and have a sufficient food supply, besides. He himself could have easy access to his wife and sweetheart in Sinait.

My great grandfather gave strong support to General Tinio, Major Estanislao Reyes and the local Katipunan leader Faustino Centeno, a relative. All of Don Leandro's tenants in four municipalities were under orders to deliver a certain portion of their crop to the guerrillas and to give them every possible support. In the latter part of 1900, when the US aggressors moved to seize suspected guerrilla rice stocks, some of their biggest hauls were made in and around Cabugao.

For this reason and because he refused to billet US officers in his house, he was arrested late in 1900 on a trumped-up murder charge (no specific victim and circumstances on record) and complicity in the armed resistance. Subsequently, three of his sons were also arrested — my granduncles Simeon (married into the Florentino family of Vigan), Cesareo and Santiago — and all four of them were deported.

According to family tradition, the details are as follows: After a short stint in the Vigan jail, Capitan Cando and his three sons were blindfolded, tied together, deposited in a box and put in the hold of a ship. The ship sailed for several days, and while at sea in the cargo hold, they were feverish and delirious. My granduncle Santiago estimated that it was four days and nights before they were dumped into a Spanish dungeon. Not until after the 1901 capitulation of the resistance forces were they returned to the Ilocos, and then by the same manner and length of time; so that they never knew where they had been. It was their common guess that they had been taken to the Marianas.

Back in Ilocos, Capitan Cando was no longer bothered by the new colonial authorities with the completely baseless charge of murder but he retained an enduring dislike for the American conquerors — an attitude passed on to succeeding generations in my family.

Even while Don Leandro and his sons were in exile, his son-in-law, Don Gorgonio Sison — my grandfather, Capitan Gonyong — continued the Serrano-

Sison policy of giving clandestine support to the guerrillas while presenting a cordial face to the enemy. Don Gorgonio had been the last gobernadorcillo under the Spaniards and he became the first elected municipal president or mayor under the US colonial regime. His father was Don Julian Sison, the Chinese-Spanish-Malay son of Vigan-based landlord Don Pancrasio, who had left his birthplace in Lingayen as an itinerant merchant in the early years of the 19th century.

As was customary in Filipino families of Chinese ancestry, the Sisons kept a genealogy which traced their origins back to one Sy Son, a 16th century Fujianese ship captain in the merchant fleet of Lin Tao-k'ien. It seems that during the last 30 years of the 18th century, the Sisons were listed for the first time as mestizos de sangley in the Lingayen church registry.

The Sisons had a knack for marrying into landed families in Pangasinan and elsewhere, and keeping themselves within the ruling elite. My grandfather, Capitan Gonyong, and his brothers absorbed most of the property of the Soller family, the biggest landholders in Cabugao in the middle of the 19th century, through inheritance from their Soller mother and a childless great-aunt who married Gorgonio's brother-in-law (Don Teodoro Soller). Subsequently, two Sison brothers (including my grandfather) married the daughters of Leandro Serrano. By absorbing major portions of the Soller estate and the later and far larger Serrano estate as well as by making their own acquisitions, the astute Sison family acquired and maintained a preeminent position in my hometown.

With his advantageous parentage and his marriage into the ascendant Serrano family, my grandfather became gobernadorcillo and built a mansion second in size only to that of his father-in-law Capitan Cando. This smaller mansion burned down accidentally in the course of a supposed revelry among US officers who had occupied it — and with it the record of my grandfather's Chinese genealogy being lost in the flames. US officers were also known to boast that the easiest way to locate gold was to burn down a big house; but Don Leandro's own cache of gold coins, buried under the ground floor of his granary in eleven jars, was thought to have been dug up by US soldiers.

My family has always believed that my grandfather Gorgonio was responsible for the arrest, trial and hanging of Commandant Francisco Celedonio in August 1901 following the Ilocos capitulation. Under the pretext of patriotism but actually out of personal animosity, Celedonio was supposed to have bayoneted

my grandfather's brother Benigno (a cabeza de barangay) to death, together with his father-in-law Basilio Noriega, who was elected jefe del pueblo of Cabugao under the First Philippine Republic. This was supposed to have happened soon after the arrival of the US aggressors in December 1899. However, some members of the Sison family still insist that Benigno and his father-in-law were actually killed by a firing squad of the US cavalry beside the San Marcos Church in Cabugao for suspected guerrilla support, not by Commandant Celedonio.

After the Filipino-American War, my granduncle Don Mena Crisologo, became the foremost Federalista and first governor of Ilocos Sur under the US colonial regime, while another Vigan granduncle, Isabelo de los Reyes, remained consistently pro-independence and critical of US colonialism. My great-grandfather, Leandro, continued to expand his landholdings, accumulate land rent and engage in money lending. He traded in rice, tobacco, indigo and maguey, and bought out some Tabacalera properties.

In the ersatz democracy under US colonial and semicolonial rule, his estate provided the income and captive tenant votes that enabled the Serrano-Sison family to keep the mayorship of Cabugao within the fold most of the time, and back up the election of my uncles Jesus Serrano and Sixto Brillantes as congressmen or governor.

Our families became close friends with US colonial officials: my grandfather Gorgonio, as mayor until he died in the 1920s, was always the first to entertain them when they came to town. A large tract of Serrano-Sison land in Tapao, Salomague, became a US naval reservation. And some of my relatives married US soldiers and bore Filipinos with names like Barbers and Wingo.

During the Japanese occupation, a situation developed similar to that during the US invasion at the turn of the century. When the Japanese fascists noticed a reduction in the rice being delivered by tenants to Serrano and Sison granaries, they realized that it was being coursed to the guerrillas and so subjected members of the two families to detention and torture. Indeed, as 40 years earlier, the tenants were instructed to reduce their deliveries to the granaries in the poblacion so as to serve the resistance forces.

As a young boy at the end of the Second World War, I often heard stories from my elders about this patriotic tradition of our family in the struggles against both the United States and Japan. Thus did I learn something about the Filipino-

American War in the Ilocos while other children my age were cherishing images of candy-throwing GI Joes.

But some of my playmates would also remind me of how my great grandfather had foreclosed mortgages on their great grandparents' lands. Thus, even as a boy, I got a bit of anticolonial and antifeudal education long before I could read Marx or Mao Zedong.

Further On the Plaza Miranda Bombing

Letter to Atty. Capulong

September 12, 1989

1. I have been invited by my American publisher to promote my book in the US from October 15 to November 15. I doubt it if the US State Department would grant me a visa despite the right of my publisher to do business and the right of American citizens to hear me directly.

Since you are going to the US, I suggest that you try to work out an invitation for me from a Democrat senator or congressman. This is the only kind of invitation for me that would be respected by the State Department.

I can be invited by a legislator for consultations in aid of legislation regarding Philippine conditions and peace prospects from October 15 to December 15. Preliminary talks can be done soon after my Washington arrival and final talks can be in December.

The letter of invitation can also state casually that I shall have the opportunity to promote my book and visit my academic peers and relatives between the aforesaid talks. Please draft the letter for the busy senator or congressman.

2. Please contact Boudin and Weinglass. I faxed materials regarding the Plaza Miranda inquiry, the US scheme to oppose the approval of my political asylum and my publisher's invitation; and have sought their legal advice and assistance in a letter dated September 11.

3. Journalists with integrity and/or a press organization should expose the

flagrant lies being passed off as the truth.

Amando Doronila sensationalized Jones' book and touted nonevidence as evidence in a series of articles at top front page.

The story about a CPP reformist underground cell is blatantly a plant. No communist would ever call his group reformist.

Rodolfo Salas confirmed only that Danilo Cordero made a claim that he bombed Plaza Miranda. That is clear from the text of the news story. But an editorial hand bannered the lie that Salas confirmed that the CPP committed the crime.

There is obviously a network of hacks who are in the pay of the CIA and the AFP and who are under orders to carry out the trial by publicity.

4. Is my long article (Reply to Jones' Allegations) already being serialized? Manila Chronicle through Op-Ed editor Paulynn Sicam assured me by fax September 7 that serialization would start on September 9.

Still Further on the Plaza Miranda Bombing

Letter to Attys. Capulong and Sanidad

October 5, 1989

I agree with the idea that investigation should be made into the connections of Gregg Jones and Westview Press with the US Central Intelligence Agency.

For guidance in such an investigation, it is necessary to study pages 192-197 and pages 452 and 453 of Book I, Foreign and Military Intelligence, Final Report of the US Senate Select Committee to Study Governmental Operations, with Respect to Intelligence Activities, April 26, 1976; and pages 262 to 265 of Book VI, Supplementary Reports on Intelligence Activities, Final Report of the US Senate Select Committee to Study Governmental Operations, with Respect to Intelligence Activities, April 23, 1976. Copies of these two documents are attached hereto.

Regarding Gregg Jones

1. Within the period of five years, 1984 to 1989, he was a freelancer or news stringer. Unlike a regular news correspondent, he was supposed to be paid per article published. And yet beyond his visible source of income or beyond what he could earn from his writing, he had the money to live comfortably and travel widely.

He boasts of having freelanced for so many US publications (Atlanta Constitution, Washington Post, Boston Globe, The Guardian, St. Petersburg Times, Dallas Morning News, National Catholic Register, San Diego Union and US News and World Report) until he became steadily known as news stringer

for the Washington Post. But in fact the income from his published output was not up to his level of spending.

2. Without any track record as a book writer or even as a regularly employed journalist, he was by his own claim given a commission by Westview Press to write a book on the Philippine guerrilla movement. The commission, involving a large payment in advance, was supposed to be enough to cover his living and traveling expenses and those of his wife.

Normally, a publishing firm does not commission anyone who has no book-writing track record to write a book. If the firm does, some other entity is putting up the money. A publishing firm commissioning a book and advancing a large amount (large, especially in relation to Jones' lack of a track record in book-writing) usually gets exclusive world copyright. But there is proof that Jones sought to have the book published in a London left-wing publishing house, Pluto Press, in an obvious attempt to put a "left label" on his book and increase its credibility.

Regarding Westview Press

1. It was established by Frederick A. Praeger, the admitted and notorious publishing agent of the Central Intelligence Agency. The early catalogs of the Westview Press listed a string of organizations for which they would publish on contract. The CIA and the US Defense Department were listed. The commissioning of an untested book writer by Westview Press indicates a special relationship and special funding.

2. It is of great importance to refer to Frederick A. Praeger, Publishers. It is declared by the CIA itself on US Senate records that it is a publisher and money conduit of the CIA for its information-gatherers and propagandists.

Before setting up Westview Press, Praeger went through the motion of selling his original firm and retiring. But eventually, after claiming boredom in retirement, he set up Westview Press to publish CIA and other US official publications as well as some commercially profitable nonpropaganda books.

There are strong indications that Gregg Jones is a CIA agent or asset and that his book is financed by the CIA through Westview Press, a Praeger publishing firm.

To quote from page 196 of Book I, Foreign and Military Intelligence: The third,

and largest, category of CIA relationships with the US media includes freelance journalists; “stringers” for newspapers, news magazines and news services; itinerant authors; propaganda writers; and agents working under cover as employees of US publishing houses abroad.... Most are paid by the CIA, and virtually all are witting; few, however, of the news organizations to which they contribute are aware of their CIA relationships.

Jones has obviously used as his cover the several news organizations for which he pretended to freelance.

Apparently, he has been promoted with the assistance of Seth Mydans from news stringer to book writer. As one chief of the CIA’s Covert Action Staff said in the past : “Books differ from all other propaganda media, primarily because one single book can significantly change the reader’s attitude and action to an extent unmatched by the impact of any other single medium ... this is, of course, not true of all books at all times and with all readers — but it is true significantly often enough to make books the most important weapon of strategic (long-range) propaganda.”

I am now asking knowledgeable friends in the US to further investigate the record and character of Jones and his specific kind of relationship with Westview Press and bring out all the related facts. I also wish to request my American lawyers to do their own investigation and give legal assistance to friends in getting more facts under the Information Act.

The panel of lawyers defending my rights should urge the Philippine Senate and its investigating committees to inquire into the relationship of Jones with the CIA in the psywar system and campaigns being waged not only against me but also against other Filipinos.

One benefit for the people that can be derived from the Senate investigation of the Plaza Miranda bombing is the adoption of safeguards by legislation against trial by publicity in general and against CIA manipulation of the mass media to reverse the people’s verdict on Marcos and shift the blame for his crimes to the CPP and myself.

Let me review the chain of psywar operations against the CPP and myself, with regard to the Plaza Miranda bombing:

1. Gregg Jones interviewed me for several hours on April 19, 1988. He asked

only a few questions about the Plaza Miranda bombing and did not ask me the most important questions involving his derogatory claims, especially the serious charge of masterminding multiple murder.

2. Red Revolution was not available to me in its published form before Amando Doronila played it up in a series of three articles at the top front page of Manila Chronicle for four days in early August. I could make an immediate answer only in a summary form.

3. In a misleading headline in a major Manila daily, Rodolfo Salas was subsequently misrepresented as having confirmed that Danny Cordero had been a grenade thrower at Plaza Miranda.

4. To internationalize the campaign of disinformation against me, Richard Vokey wrote "Who bombed Plaza Miranda?" for the September 11 issue of Newsweek; and Frans Nijhof, "Rebel in Holland" for the September 9 issue of Elsevier. Both articles carried the strong prejudgment that I was the mastermind of the crime.

I am confident that any fair investigation will clear my name and show even more clearly the responsibility of Mr. Marcos and his military agents for the commission of the Plaza Miranda bombing and for the subsequent cover-up.

Please provide me as soon as possible with the transcript of the hearings so far made by the Senate investigating committees. Thank you.

The new US Scheme concerning the Plaza Miranda Bombing

October 15, 1989

Following the Plaza Miranda bombing on August 21, 1971, Ferdinand E. Marcos assumed the role of the strong man by first suspending the privilege of the writ of habeas corpus and eventually imposing martial rule, in fact a full-blown fascist dictatorship, on the Filipino people. All that time, at least up to the Aquino assassination in 1983, the US was happy with Marcos and never questioned in public his drive to blame the Communist Party of the Philippines for the Plaza Miranda bombing and subsequent bombings which prepared the declaration of martial law. We would learn only in 1988 from Raymond Bonner in his book *Waltzing with a Dictator* that US intelligence and diplomatic officers had their own findings and conclusions secretly contradicting the anti-CPP claims of Marcos.

Bonner writes on the Plaza Miranda bombing on page 80 and 81 in the following manner: “It wasn’t a mystery to American intelligence and diplomatic officers who were in the Philippines at the time or who looked into the incident later. They are convinced that the bombing was not the work of the communists. ‘Without question’ it wasn’t, one CIA officer said. The Communists at the time were a fledgling organization with fewer than 100 members, and they were very disorganized. Moreover, their efforts were concentrated in rural areas, building for a peasant revolution along the lines of Mao’s in China. They had no urban capability. “

Nor was the bombing the work of any of Marcos’ opponents. Rather, according to American diplomats and intelligence officers, it was carried out by Marcos

loyalists within the military—the grenades were traced to an army arsenal — though they don't know whether or not Marcos himself ordered it.

Bonner further writes in his notes on page 481: “In 1986 a Philippine military officer, Victor Corpuz, who had defected to the Communist guerrillas, then returned to the military fold after six years, wrote a letter claiming that the Communists were responsible for the Plaza Miranda incident. Seth Mydans, “Fears of a Coup,” *The New York Times*, November 8, 1986; Gregg Jones, “Aquino Asks Enrile About Plot Reports,” *Washington Post*, November 8, 1986. After this story appeared, I contacted several American officials with whom I had previously spoken about Plaza Miranda. They scoffed at Corpuz's story. “I've never heard anybody seriously allege that before,” said one intelligence officer who had been in Manila at the time of the bombing. “Do you believe it?” I asked another. “No!” What they couldn't explain were Corpuz's motivations, though they assumed they had something to do with the power struggle going on in late 1986 between the military and President Corazon Aquino. Since Ninoy Aquino had been linked with Communists and the bombing in 1971, if the Communists were implicated, she would be weakened. There was also a personal motivation: Corpuz was trying to rehabilitate himself with the army, and he was reinstated as a reserve officer after implicating the Communists.

But recently it suits the US, CIA or some US agents to take the initiative in recycling the old Marcos canard that it was the CPP which was responsible for the Plaza Miranda bombing.

The point of the US detractors of the CPP is to discredit and destroy the CPP, get Senate President Salonga to join the anti-CPP campaign, put President Aquino under pressure by reminding her of Marcos' old claim that her late husband was an accomplice of the CPP and rehabilitate not simply Marcos but the Marcosist background of General Ramos, who is being groomed as strong man in a civilian-military junta or as a presidential figure for 1992.

Thus, the CIA through the Westview Press, firm of a long-standing CIA publisher Frederick A. Praeger, commissioned and financed Gregg Jones, a freelancer with no track record in book-writing, to rush the writing of a book to revive the unfounded Marcos charge against the CPP concerning the Plaza Miranda bombing.

For some mysterious reasons, probably one of which was lucrative, Amando

Doronila touted the book as “backed with impressive evidence” and ran his series of top front page articles for four days in the Manila Chronicle praising and echoing the book. Never has any newspaper ever given any book such excessive rave review.

Seeing an opportunity to grab the significance of August 21 (the date of both the Plaza Miranda bombing and the Aquino assassination) and get back at the Aquino faction for the exposure of “Operation Big Bird,” Senate President Jovito Salonga — one of the most prominent survivors of the massacre — ordered the investigation of the crime by the Blue Ribbon committee and the committee on justice and human rights.

Before ordering the Senate investigation, Salonga had publicly declared that he was inclined to believe that the CPP and its leaders were responsible for the Plaza Miranda bombing. On September 17, 1989, in an interview with Noli de Castro in the Channel 2 program “Magandang Gabi Bayan,” Salonga categorically accused the CPP chairman of masterminding the atrocity in 1971.

Abusing his position as Senate President and as leader of the Liberal Party (LP), he repeated the prejudgment despite the fact that the Senate investigating committees had held only a few hearings and these hearings had shown more clearly than before that Marcos was responsible for the crime and the subsequent cover-up. It needs to be recalled that Senator Gerardo Roxas, as LP president, had held Marcos responsible for the crime in 1971 and thereafter.

Salonga is quick to make a prejudgment obviously because as the most prominent survivor of the bombing he can draw public sympathy for his presidential ambition and take away political initiative away from an Aquino faction that is fast becoming discredited and is about to exhaust as political capital the assassination of Benigno S. Aquino who himself was accused of having foreknowledge of and complicity in the Plaza Miranda bombing.

Teodoro Locsin, Jr., who is close to President Aquino and her late husband, has correctly read the anti-Aquino motivation of Salonga; and has gone to the extent of criticizing the ingratitude of those who benefited from the late Senator Aquino’s anti-Marcos struggle but who now dare challenge his faction.

One more powerful reason for Salonga’s adamant prejudgment of CPP leaders is that he calculates that it is an effective way of pursuing an anti-communist line

that is satisfying to the US and the local upper classes. This fits in with his political calculations for 1992. He obviously believes that exculpating Marcos from the Plaza Miranda bombing, blaming the Communists and putting the memory of the late Senator Benigno Aquino under a cloud of doubt would not only discredit the Aquino faction but would even help him amass votes in so-called Marcos country, the Ilocandia.

Salonga considers himself as the ultimate beneficiary of the scheme to blame the CPP for the Plaza Miranda bombing. But the US has in its own scheme General Fidel Ramos as the ultimate beneficiary. The scheme of the US is not only to whitewash Ramos' background as major accomplice of Marcos in crime but also to justify the repressive measures taken by Marcos and the military against the Communists and their suspected sympathizers and allies and to promote and make acceptable the concept of the strongman.

The article of Richard Vokey, "Who Bombed Plaza Miranda," appearing in the September 11, 1989 issue of Newsweek trumpets the multiple hearsay, gossip, speculations and extrapolations against the CPP in Jones book as "evidence." Most important of all, he gives us a clear view of the US psywar scheme to discredit and destroy the CPP.

He declares, "... evidence increasingly suggests that the bombing was ordered not by Marcos but by the leaders of the Communist Party of the Philippines (CPP)."

The Vokey declaration was made even as nothing new against the CPP had come up after the Jones book and even as the hearings of the two Philippine Senate committees had shown even more clearly the responsibility of Marcos and his military associates for the bombing and the subsequent cover-up.

Vokey echoes a new canard from the direction of General Ramos and AFP psywar experts that "an unwitting Aquino was lured away to another meeting to be sure he was not hurt in the attack." This lie was made by an AFP-made "Underground CPP Reformist Cell" (real communists are never proud to call themselves reformist!). Vokey also fabricates from thin air the "threat of NPA reprisals against those who talk."

In his article, he reveals the US scheme — higher than the Salonga scheme — by suggesting that the late Benigno S. Aquino can be excised from the old story-line

of Marcos about the Plaza Miranda bombing. The American journalist—who always expresses the rabid anticommunist line of the US—also suggests that the “loyal democrats” (codeword for the anti-Marcos loyalists of the ruling system) that there is nothing for them to fear in shifting the blame for the Plaza Miranda bombing from Marcos to the Communists.

He states, “It’s not only the country’s communists who are nervous about the hearings’ outcome: some loyal democrats are worried that exonerating Marcos of his particular crime could lead to his political rehabilitation — although their fears seem implausible, given the scale and sweep of Marcos’ other depredations.”

Vokey is actually giving us a hint that it is all right to take away just one crime from the Marcos record and blame it on the communists because after all Marcos would still be damned with a long list of crimes.

But the Plaza Miranda bombing is not simply one isolated crime. It was the key or crucial crime which was used by Marcos as pretext for his power grab and which would enable him to commit more crimes against the people.

Contrary to his assurances, Vokey himself makes clear at the end of his article that if the CPP can be blamed for the Plaza Miranda bombing then it can be blamed for everything else. He writes, “The explosions in Plaza Miranda brought years of political, economic and social ruin on the Philippines.”

The preposterous point driven in is that the CPP is responsible for the social crisis and disaster of the ruling system and that the US, the Marcos regime and the exploiting classes are not responsible.

Luis Jalandoni, chief international representative of the National Democratic Front, has pointed out in a statement dated September 9, 1989, “The Vokey Newsweek article itself is not just one of those things. It reflects the US scheme to shift the blame for the Plaza Miranda bombing in a bid to discredit and destroy the Communist Party and the entire revolutionary movement, rouse up all upper class factions into an anticommunist frenzy, whitewash the complicity of General Ramos with Marcos in the Plaza Miranda bombing and martial rule and boost the presidential ambitions of Ramos.”

On behalf of his organization, Jalandoni makes a just demand. He states, “The National Democratic Front urges the investigation, trial and punishment of

General Ramos for his active complicity with Marcos in plotting and realizing the evil objectives of Oplan Double Strike and Oplan Saggitarius. It should not only be the Plaza Miranda bombing that should be investigated but also all the massacres and other barbarous crimes perpetrated by General Ramos and his close associates under martial rule.”

He continues, “It is a grave travesty of justice if those truly responsible for the Plaza Miranda bombing and all the human rights violations under martial rule continue to be allowed to cover up their criminal responsibility by once more trying to make the CPP the scapegoat as Marcos did for a long time.

“So far there is not a single official of the Marcos regime who has been punished for human rights violation. It would be the strangest of ironies if the US and Philippine reactionaries would have their way in exonerating Mr. Marcos from the Plaza Miranda bombing and its evil consequences and in punishing CPP leaders for the crimes of the Marcos dictatorship.

“We, in the National Democratic Front, urge the entire Filipino people to demand justice not only for the victims of the Plaza Miranda bombing but also for all victims of all other grievous crimes of the successive regimes in the Philippines. The advance and total victory of the Filipino people’s struggle will bring about justice.

“It is simply unacceptable to the Filipino people and to the people of the world that the CPP and its leaders are the ones who are condemned for human rights violations and the social ruin under the despotic Marcos regime which enjoyed the support of the US for a long time.”

In line with the prejudgment already made repeatedly made by Salonga, some of his followers have been saying that they will exclude the late Benigno Aquino from the range of suspicion and will damn only the CPP and its leaders by concluding that there is circumstantial evidence to show probability of their guilt, notwithstanding the absence of evidence that can stand in court.

The people must be forewarned. No less than the US, especially the CIA, is interested in using the Plaza Miranda bombing to malign and attack the CPP and the entire revolutionary movement. There is the illusion of both the US and the Philippine reactionaries that through psywar they can destroy the revolutionary movement and override the worsening crisis of the ruling system.

On Salonga's Unfounded Claims

Letter to Atty. Romeo T. Capulong

October 15, 1989

1. Especially because of the Salonga interview on September 17 in Channel 2, I agree with you absolutely that participation in the Senate investigation is with the expressed reservation of my right at any stage of the process to raise questions of prejudgment, partisan motivations and partiality in the conduct of the hearings and adequacy of due process safeguards.
2. Even now, please protest in writing to the Senate investigating committees through the chairman the prejudgment made by the Senate President in the aforesaid interview with Noli de Castro in Magandang Gabi Bayan of Channel 2. I agree with you that the Salonga pronouncements in the interview prejudice me as guilty, influence his colleagues and party-mates and have already tainted the prospective findings and conclusions of the Senate. The interview was broadcast after a few hearings, which in fact showed more clearly the opposite of the Senate President's prejudgment.
3. Herewith is my letter to Noli de Castro asking for equal time in presenting my side and for a copy of the interview tape. Please have this fax letter delivered to him immediately, with your covering letter certifying that it comes from me. And please send me the interview tape as soon as possible by hand carrier or by DHL.
4. Also send me as soon as possible the pertinent rules of the Blue Ribbon Committee, the transcripts of hearings and documents submitted in the course of hearings. You may fax to me the most urgent papers that I must know and must

respond to.

5. Please propose to Jose Mari Velez to come over to Europe to interview me. The taping equipment and facilities are available here. If he cannot pay for his own fare, we may be able to solicit it from a human rights or lawyers' organization.

6. Herewith is my article, "The CIA Connections of Gregg Jones and Westview Press." Has Chronicle published it in full? I have sent this to Paulynn Sicam, the Op/Ed Editor. I anticipate that Chronicle Op/Ed will publish only a part of this or no part at all. So, please provide copies to the editors of Philippine Daily Inquirer and Midweek.

Separately, I am communicating with them immediately and advising them to get copy from you.

7. Under separate cover by hand carrier is the letter of Jones to me dated February 13, 1988 in which he states that he got a commission from Westview Press. Together with the US Senate documents, this is an appendix to my article on "The CIA Connections of Gregg Jones and the Westview Press."

8. Please provide all journalists acutely interested in the Plaza Miranda bombing, like Sylvia Mayuga of Philippine Daily Globe, with information and materials regarding our position.

9. I see the political motivation of Salonga in echoing false accusation against me. Rather than seek help of the Left, he thinks that he can grab the significance of August 21 for 1992. He estimates that the Left is a pushover and is a convenient whipping boy. He does not see General Ramos as ultimate beneficiary.

I agree with you that he is using Plaza Miranda bombing to retaliate against the expose of Operation Big Bird by the Aquino faction. Further on, he calculates that he can draw public sympathy to himself as a victim, remind people of Ninoy's friendly relations with the CPP and NPA, seize political initiative from the Aquino faction and at the same time make an effective anticommunist campaign to satisfy the US and the local reactionaries. By exculpating the dead Marcos from the Plaza Miranda bombing he expects to amass votes even in the Solid North.

10. We will send Weinglass US\$500. Was he able to retrieve from Rex Hotel the materials which we had sent him by DHL? He did not contact me from Bangkok either by phone or fax, despite the messages I had left at Rex Hotel. Please see to it that he gets by mail all materials pertinent to the case and useful to him.

11. We are sending you by hand carrier an amount for photocopy and communications expenses.

12. Also by hand carrier, I am sending you copies of my letters to Garbus dated October 6 and 13 and to Kennedy dated 12. I suggest that you write them, especially if there are deficiencies in my letters.

Thank you.

P.S. Please inform us immediately if the transmission of any part of this letter and its attachments is not clear. We are using again the fax at 31-30-870249. You can also use it again. But if this fax gives you problems, you can use our other fax: 31-30-322989. We expect word from you after the Tuesday meeting with Tañada.

The CIA Connections of Gregg Jones and Westview Press

October 24, 1989

In an article entitled “Red Revolution Is an Obligation to the Truth,” appearing in the September 2 issue of Manila Chronicle, Gregg Jones tries to dispel his obvious connections with the Central Intelligence Agency.

He uses the insidious method of claiming authorization not only for the preparation of his book but also for the book itself from no less than those he points to as the senior leaders of the revolutionary movement, especially Carolina Malay, whom he claims to have affirmed his work as history and have given him the go signal.

Who am I to call him a CIA agent or asset when he is supposed to have enjoyed authorization and accommodation from his fellow champions of truth in the revolutionary movement?

After accusing me of masterminding multiple murder, Jones also tells me with a false air of magnanimity, “In my efforts to be fair, I cut from the manuscript several unflattering anecdotes about Sison and other personalities because I thought the items might be misconstrued or detract from the main thrust of the book....” No thanks to you, Mr. Jones, you can keep your false kindness and intrigues.

The “impartial” intriguer loves to say that my detractors are my own close associates. And in his final paragraph, the self-proclaimed official historian of the CPP throws the largest terms at me: “As founder of the revolutionary

movement, Sison is entitled to his opinions. But he is not entitled to falsify history. And he owes the Filipino people and the individual members of the movement the right to be the final judges of the Red Revolution.”

Jones seeks to sow intrigue not only between former and current senior CPP leaders on one side and me on the other but also between the people and the entire membership of the movement on one side and me on the other.

The insidious tactics of Jones are evident in the preparation of his book, in the text and notes of the book and in the consequences desired by him.

To develop access to some former and current leaders of the movement and some guerrilla fronts, he rented an apartment in the Malay compound, wrote a few articles “sympathetic” to the revolutionary movement and was in the same compound where the NDF negotiating panel was openly based in late 1986 and early 1987.

The book, even excluding Chapters 5 (Ghosts of Plaza Miranda) and 6 (Prisoners in a Gilded Cage), is a denigration of the concrete organizations and leaders of the movement. The statements critical of social conditions and sympathetic to the Filipino people and the revolutionary movement in the abstract are merely a clump of sugar into which he puts arsenic.

Of course, Chapters 5 and 6 are meant to deliver a head blow against the movement and puts forward the theory that the political achievements of the Communist Party of the Philippines are based not on mass work and hard struggle but on a terrorist act of intrigue and that no less than the chief advocate of protracted people’s war does not believe in what he advocates and is overdependent on foreign assistance.

The text and notes after the chapters pretend to conceal large numbers of sources. But the trick of using unidentified sources serves as Jones’ license for fabrications, inaccuracies and misrepresentations. In fact, he gives away the identities of his few “substantial” sources.

My lawyers have now a complete identification of the few detractors whom he has given away by his own post-chapter notes. They also have my notes on how to refute each one of them in accordance with the truth and the rules of evidence.

The common characteristics of these detractors are that they are purveyors of

mere hearsay and gossip and are dropouts from the revolutionary movement. At least two can be proven to be cranks by their available psychiatric records. One of the two most consistently “concealed” sources of hearsay was never a Central Committee member of the CPP, contrary to the assertion of Jones.

Since 1969, the revolutionary movement has grown from a few scores of CPP members, scores of full-time NPA fighters, hundreds of advanced mass activists and a few tens of thousands of mass followers to tens of thousands of CPP members, thousands of full-time NPA fighters, tens of thousands of mass activists and millions of mass followers. It is always possible for a muckraking CIA agent to build a story of intrigue from a handful of dropouts from the revolutionary movement.

The consequence of the book most desired by Jones and his funders is to discredit and destroy the revolutionary movement through the psy-op method of intrigue. But let us see how far they can go after their exposure and after Jones himself is subjected to cross examination on his charge and investigation of his role.

At this point, let me start to uncover Jones and his publisher, Westview Press. In this task, I am guided by pages 192-197 and pages 452 and 453 of Book I, Foreign and Military Intelligence, Final Report of the US Senate Select Committee to Study Governmental Operations, with Respect to Intelligence Activities, April 26, 1976; and pages 262 to 265 of Book VI, Supplementary Reports on Intelligence Activities, Final Report of the US Senate Select Committee to Study Governmental Operations, with Respect to Intelligence Activities, April 23, 1976.

Regarding Gregg Jones

1. Within the period of five years, 1984 to 1989, he was a freelancer or news stringer. Unlike a regular news correspondent, he was supposed to be paid per article published. And yet beyond his visible source of income or beyond what he could earn from his writing, he had the money to live comfortably and travel widely.

He boasts of having freelanced for so many US publications (Atlanta Constitution, Washington Post, Boston Globe, The Guardian, St. Petersburg Times, Dallas Morning News, National Catholic Register, San Diego Union and

US News and World Report) until he became steadily known as news stringer for the Washington Post. But in fact the income from his published output was not up to his level of spending.

He wrote a few articles “sympathetic” to the revolutionary movement and critical of Philippine conditions and made friends with people in progressive circles in order to build his credibility and develop access to the revolutionary movement. William Branigin, former Manila correspondent of Washington Post had also used the same method of appearing progressive for a period of time but would eventually write the slanderous articles against the revolutionary movement.

2. Without any track record as a book writer or even as a regularly employed journalist, he was by his own declaration given a commission by Westview Press to write a book on the Philippine guerrilla movement. He made the declaration in a letter to me dated February 13, 1988. According to Jones when we met, the commission was enough to cover his living and traveling expenses and those of his wife.

Normally, a publishing firm does not commission anyone who has no book-writing track record to write a book. If the firm does, some other entity is putting up the money.

In fact, after I granted an interview to Gregg Jones on April 19, 1988 due to an endorsement from the Philippines, an American friend of mine who is a prominent book author and an expert in US publishers, wrote me the following on June 2, 1988: “If Gregg Jones, still unknown to me, has a commission from Westview Press, then you may have made an error. Westview was founded by Frederick Praeger, once the CIA’s major front publisher (even though they also did other things). When Westview got set up they announced in the catalog they would still be doing CIA and other US official books in addition to others.”

A publishing firm commissioning a book and advancing a large amount (large, especially in relation to Jones’ lack of a track record in book-writing) usually gets exclusive world copyright. But there is proof that Jones sought to have the book published in a London left-wing publishing house, Pluto Press, in an obvious attempt to put a “left label” on his book and increase its credibility, despite the fact that Westview Press has a London office.

Regarding Westview Press

1. It was, indeed, established by Frederick A. Praeger, the admitted and notorious publishing agent of the Central Intelligence Agency. The early catalogs of the Westview Press listed a string of organizations for which they would publish on contract. The CIA and the US Defense Department were listed. The commissioning of an untested book writer by Westview Press indicates a special relationship and special funding.

2. It is of great importance to refer to Frederick A. Praeger, Publishers. It is declared by the CIA itself on US Senate records that it is a publisher and money conduit of the CIA for its information-gatherers and propagandists. Anyone can consult page 264 of Book VI, Supplementary Report on Intelligence Activities.

Before setting up Westview Press, Praeger went through the motion of selling his original firm and retiring. But eventually, after claiming boredom in retirement, he set up Westview Press to publish CIA and other US official publications as well as some commercially profitable books.

The kind of book produced and the prior special financing provided by Westview Press, a Praeger publishing firm, show that Gregg Jones is a CIA agent or asset.

To quote from page 196 of Book I, Foreign and Military Intelligence: The third, and largest, category of CIA relationships with the US media includes freelance journalists; “stringers” for newspapers, news magazines and news services; itinerant authors; propaganda writers; and agents working under cover as employees of US publishing houses abroad....Most are paid by the CIA, and virtually all are witting; few, however, of the news organizations to which they contribute are aware of their CIA relationships.

Jones has obviously used as his cover the several news organizations for which he freelanced.

He has been promoted from news stringer to a commissioned book writer. As one chief of the CIA’s Covert Action Staff said in the past: “Books differ from all other propaganda media, primarily because one single book can significantly change the reader’s attitude and action to an extent unmatched by the impact of any other single medium ... this is, of course, not true of all books at all times and with all readers — but it is true significantly often enough to make books the

most important weapon of strategic (long-range) propaganda.”

Knowledgeable friends in the US are now working to further investigate the record and character of Jones and his specific kind of relationship with the Westview Press and bring out all the related facts. My American lawyers are also doing their own investigation and are poised to give legal assistance to friends in getting more facts under the Freedom of Information Act.

The panel of lawyers defending my rights should urge the Philippine Senate and its investigating committees to inquire into the relationship of Jones with the CIA in the psywar system and campaigns being waged not only against me but also against other Filipinos.

One benefit for the people that can be derived from the Senate investigation of the Plaza Miranda bombing is the adoption of safeguards by legislation against trial by publicity in general and against CIA manipulation of the mass media to reverse the people’s verdict on Marcos and shift the blame for the Plaza Miranda bombing and the subsequent repression to the CPP and myself.

Red Revolution was not available to me in its published form before Amando Doronila played it up in a series of three articles at the top front page of Manila Chronicle for four days in early August. I could make an immediate answer only in a summary form.

In a misleading headline in a major Manila daily, Rodolfo Salas was subsequently misrepresented as having confirmed that Danny Cordero had been a grenade thrower at Plaza Miranda.

To internationalize the campaign of disinformation against me, Richard Vokey wrote “Who bombed Plaza Miranda?” for the September 11th issue of Newsweek; and Frans Nijhof, “Rebel in Holland” for the September 9th issue of Elsevier. Both articles carried the strong prejudgment that I was the mastermind of the crime. I am confident that any fair investigation will clear my name and show even more clearly the responsibility of Mr. Marcos and his military agents for the commission of the Plaza Miranda bombing and for the subsequent cover-up. So far, the hearings of the Blue Ribbon Committee and the committee on justice and human rights of the Philippine Senate have exposed the responsibility of Mr. Marcos and the military.

I would like Gregg Jones to be called by the Philippine Senate investigating

committees to present and shed light on what kind of “evidence” he has against me. I would like him to present his interview tapes and notes in the interest of truth about a grievous crime. And I wish him to be cross-examined by my lawyers.

Before I close this article, I wish to raise a question to those who authorized and gave free rein to Jones in certain urban circles and even in some guerrilla fronts. Why was there no sufficient check on the background and status of Jones and his publisher, Westview Press? The media experts in the revolutionary movement had better reexamine their expert knowledge and capabilities.

The revolutionary movement has been made open and vulnerable to a considerable extent by a number of irresponsible actions and events such as uncritical accommodations for foreigners who turn out to be spies and anticommunist propagandists rather than genuine journalists, the spilling over of internal discussions to inappropriate ears, unnecessary exposures of NDF personnel and facilities in connection with the ceasefire extravaganza, an atrocious and scandalous witch-hunt and repeated capture of knowledgeable personnel and documents.

To preserve and make itself stronger, the revolutionary movement has to keep information about itself from being exploited by adversaries in psywar campaigns of intrigue as well as in punitive campaigns.

As in the book of Jones, facts about the movement can be manipulated and mixed with lies in order to make the false appear true and the true appear false. The enemies of the revolutionary movement can use information, misinformation and disinformation to instigate intrigues within revolutionary organizations and among the people, and cause serious damages within the movement.

On the US Military Bases in the Philippines

Interview with Reuben Seguritan

May 23, 1990

Jose Maria Sison is the founding chairman of the Communist Party of the Philippines. He is presently in exile in the Netherlands, as a result of the cancellation of his Philippine passport in 1988 by the Aquino government. Since his release from political detention in 1986 a few days after the fall of Marcos, he has devoted himself to university lecturing, social research and writing. His most recent book is the Philippine Revolution: The Leader's View (New York: Crane Russak, 1989). Although he prefers to describe himself as an itinerant academic, Sison is still widely regarded in the Philippines and abroad as the chief ideologue of the Philippine revolutionary movement for national liberation and democracy. His selected works from the 1960s to the present in three volumes are now under preparation. Hereunder is the full text of the interview conducted by telephone.

Reuben Seguritan (RS): What is your view of the conduct of the talks between the US and Philippine panels concerning the US military bases?

The RP panel is acting like a beggar; and the US panel, like an arrogant patron. The exploratory talks have centered on the question of money. But this question does not take into account the removal of nuclear wastes buried in the bases and that of the chemical contamination in the training areas.

Anyone acquainted with talks between an imperialist master and a client-state knows that such talks are scripted towards a secret agreement already made beforehand. We are witnessing a charade for public consumption.

Are you not satisfied that the Philippine government has already served a notice of termination on the US government?

Like the rest of our people who uphold Philippine national sovereignty, I am not satisfied. The Philippine government connives with the US government in scheming to extend the tenure of the US military bases in the Philippines.

The Philippine government has no choice but to serve notice of termination in accordance with a provision of the 1987 constitution. But in the same breath, this government welcomes a treaty to replace the existing bases agreement.

You refer to a secret agreement already made beforehand. What is it?

There is already a draft for an "agreement of friendship, cooperation and

security". Both the US and Philippine authorities have expressed satisfaction over the exploratory talks and have announced that they will discuss such an agreement.

The agreement may either be an executive agreement, a mutually ratified treaty or a draft treaty ratified by only one side, like the 1947 bases agreement.

How will tenure of the US bases be extended? The Philippine constitution is explicit that no foreign bases shall be allowed on Philippine territory, except by treaty?

In a treaty or executive agreement, the US military bases can be formally described as US facilities on Philippine bases. Marcos and his US masters started to make this kind of distinction between US bases and facilities.

The extension of these US "facilities" can be made under the guise of a "phaseout". Furthermore, indefinite extension of these "facilities" can be effected under the concept of joint use and mutual defense after the term of pretended phaseout.

Still further, the treaty or agreement can have a provision defining certain areas and facilities as off-limits to Philippine authorities for some euphemistic reasons and allowing – just like now – the storage and transit of nuclear and chemical weapons.

What is the purpose of the United States in maintaining military bases in the Philippines?

It is for perpetuating US domination and exploitation of the Filipino people and maintaining US hegemony over the Asia-Pacific region. The US bases in the Philippines are part of an international network of US military power. The United States claims that its bases in the Philippines are for the defense of the Philippines and the region are all hogwash.

After admitting that there is no effective Soviet threat to the Philippines and the region, the United States is trying to frighten the Filipino people with new spectres it has conjured such as Japan, China and India. The United States humiliates the Filipino people by considering them as no better than a passive ward or captive of one foreign power or another to rationalize the maintenance of US military bases.

If the US military bases are dismantled, what are the benefits to the Filipino people?

This will put an end to a gross violation of Philippine national sovereignty and territorial integrity; a prolonged humiliation of the Filipino people; and a threat to national survival.

The facilities and other improvements on the land are by themselves of high value and can be put to commercial and other economic uses, far more profitable to the people than the paltry amounts given by the United States for their use. The large tracts of land can be used for agriculture, mining, industry and commerce.

If the Philippine military camps in Metro Manila are moved out to relatively small portions of the land occupied by the US bases, the proceeds from the sale of the prime land now occupied by the Philippine military camps in Metro Manila run into tens of billions of pesos.

What are the benefits for the United States and the American people if US military bases are dismantled?

The dismantling of the US military bases and the withdrawal of US troops will help reduce the budgetary deficit of the United States. The savings made can be used for the social benefit of the American people.

What will be the response of the revolutionary forces to the extension of the US military bases or facilities?

The revolutionary forces like the Communist Party of the Philippines, the New People's Army and the National Democratic Front have time and again condemned the US military bases as a violation of Philippine national sovereignty and territorial integrity and as instruments of aggression and intervention.

As they have repeatedly made themselves clear, the revolutionary forces can be expected to carry out punitive actions against the US military bases and personnel as well as against Filipinos whom they regard as traitors for conniving with the United States in perpetuating US military presence and intervention in the Philippines.

On the US Military Bases

September 25, 1990

The US and Philippine governments, through their negotiating panels, are currently engaged in a shameless process of deceiving the Filipino people.

Behind the scenes they have already agreed to extend the tenure of the US military bases under the guise of such deceptive expressions as “orderly withdrawal,” “phasedown” and “transition period” going beyond September 16, 1991.

By using semantical tricks, they are also about to circumvent the provision of the Aquino constitution requiring a treaty for the extension of the US military bases. They conspire to misrepresent what are actually US military bases as “US installations” on “Philippine bases” and give US forces “access” to these so-called installations for an indefinite period or in perpetuity.

In accordance with the US-RP military bases agreement, the period of withdrawing US military personnel, dependents and movable property, should be from September 16, 1990 to September 1991. All permanent structures on the land must go to the owner of the land especially because in fact and by its own word the United States has never paid rent for use of the land. Moreover, no compensation whatsoever has ever been paid for serious damage to the environment.

The period of one year from notice of termination to the expiry date of the bases agreement is more than enough time within which the US can withdraw its supposed 40,000 military personnel and their dependents as well as movable property.

In its current deployment of aggressive military forces in the Middle East, the US has been able to move 200,000 troops and heavy military equipment of various sorts to Saudi Arabia within a period of only two months.

There is therefore absolutely no reason why the US cannot vacate its military bases in the Philippines and move out a comparably far smaller number of personnel and property within one year before the expiry date of September 16, 1991.

It is an act of treason for Philippine government officials, including President Aquino and Foreign Secretary Manglapus, to pay lip service to Philippine national sovereignty and territorial integrity and yet allow the extension of the US military bases beyond the expiry date. The brutality with which the Philippine military and police forces are trying to suppress patriotic mass actions of the Filipino people against the continuance of US military forces and facilities in the Philippines underscores the treason being committed by the highest officials of the Aquino regime.

In the face of treachery, the Filipino people should intensify their efforts to condemn the swindle being inflicted on them by both the US and Aquino governments and assert national sovereignty and territorial integrity.

All legal democratic forces have a great opportunity for launching a crescendo of protest mass actions concerning the US military bases and other issues. They must frustrate the provocations of the military and police; and must count their achievements in terms of ever larger mass participation.

It is as much a perception of mine as that of the general public that it is the task of the armed revolutionary movement to intensify its own offensives mainly in the rural areas, where there is a reduction of enemy strength because a considerable number of troops of the Armed Forces of the Philippines have been pulled out for redeployment to the urban areas against patriotic mass actions and the coup threats.

Let Aquino Regime and Its US Imperialist Masters Answer for Their Gross Crimes against the Filipino People

February 11, 1991

In its almost five years in office, the Aquino regime, in connivance with its US imperialist principals, has deliberately and treacherously committed one serious crime after another against the Filipino people. These have been highlighted all the more by developments related to the war in the Gulf.

Among its principal crimes is its total, treasonous puppetry to US imperialism at the expense of national welfare. It has acquiesced to the use of US military bases in the Philippines in imperialism's war of aggression and genocide in the Gulf. It has agreed to extend the stay of these military bases beyond September 1991 to further enable the US to intervene in the Philippines and other parts of the world. It insists upon paying the foreign debt of almost US\$30 billion to imperialist institutions even in the face of a grave economic crisis that has reduced 80 percent of the national population—or almost 50,000,000 out of more than 60,000,000 Filipinos—to hunger and starvation. And it now contemplates to dispatch Filipino troops, disguised as an engineering battalion, to this unjust war upon the insistence of the US.

It has also demonstrated, for all to see, its criminal disregard for the welfare of hundreds of thousands of Filipino workers in the Middle East whose lives have been placed in extreme jeopardy as a result of the US-led war of aggression against Iraq. At home, has further intensified the exploitation and oppression of the workers and other people.

In early December 1990, the Aquino regime abided by one of the latest dictates of the imperialist institution International Monetary Fund (IMF) by imposing previously unheard of price increases of gasoline and other oil products, sending the prices of all basic commodities and services skyrocketing. These price increases are now spelling further misery for a people who have long been leading a hand-to-mouth existence.

The regime gave further evidence of its subservience to US imperialism by endorsing "without reservation" imperialism's war of aggression in the Gulf whose ultimate objective, as spelled out by US President Bush, is the establishment of a "new world order." This means a world under the tighter and unrestrained domination and control of the US and other imperialist countries.

Her puppet regime virtually involved the Philippines in the war by allowing without challenge the use of US military bases in the Philippines in support of that war of aggression. It also sent a so-called medical mission and, on the prodding of its US imperialist principals, was preparing to send a so-called military engineering contingent.

Mrs. Aquino had earlier gone back on her word, given during the Marcos dictatorship, by agreeing to maintain by at least another five years the US military bases on Philippine soil when these bases are supposed to be dismantled by September. This would enable the US to tighten its neocolonial rule on the Philippines and to directly intervene militarily as the Filipino people's revolutionary struggles to change the semicolonial and semifeudal system advance towards higher levels. This decision by Mrs. Aquino's to extend the tenure of the US bases is evidently in exchange for continuing US imperialist support for her regime. This includes the direct US military intervention in December 1989 to save her crisis-ridden rule from an attempted coup d'etat launched by cliques within her own armed forces.

In addition, the Aquino regime recently agreed to still another set of IMF impositions in exchange for more loans which it hopes will revive the moribund national economy. The so-called Economic Stabilization Plan (ESP), submitted by the regime to the IMF in obedience to the latter's wishes, was so secret that its text was denied even to the president and members of the Philippine Senate. From experience, however, we know that the usual IMF impositions include the maintenance of the export-oriented economy, the devaluation of the Philippine peso, the freezing of wages, new and higher taxes, higher power and water rates,

tax holidays for foreign investors, and the lowering or removal of tariff walls for the easier dumping of US and other capitalist countries' surplus products on the Philippine market.

In the meantime, even as democratic organizations were demanding the suspension of payments for the foreign debt in the face of the grave socioeconomic and political crisis, the Aquino regime said it would continue paying no matter what the consequences since it was an "honorable" debtor. The regime estimated that in the next two years, the country would have to pay more than US\$7 billion to cover principal and interest payments to foreign creditors, even as 50,000,000 Filipinos were going to sleep hungry night after night. The dispatch of Filipino troops to the war in the Gulf would further strain Philippine finances and unduly involve the country in a war to promote imperialist domination over the world.

Criminal disregard for the people's welfare

It is general knowledge that Filipino men and women have been forced to seek employment abroad—on Philippine government sponsorship—because of the bankruptcy of the semicolonial and semifeudal system which President Aquino upholds and nurtures.

True, it is not Mrs. Aquino but her immediate predecessor, the fascist puppet dictator Marcos, who had institutionalized the sending of Filipino workers abroad. But she continues the policy and the practice as a means of relieving the increasingly acute problem of domestic unemployment and under-employment, and as a means of bringing in billions in foreign exchange to shore up a system that is on the brink of total bankruptcy and collapse.

Since assuming office in February 1986 upon the overthrow of the Marcos dictatorship, the Aquino regime has stepped up the dispatch of Filipinos to work overseas while totally denying them the least semblance of official protection and hypocritically calling them the country's "new economic heroes". It is now callously exposing them to the perils of the US-led war of aggression and genocide on Iraq which threatens to spread throughout the entire Middle East.

There are an estimated 650,000 Filipino workers in the Middle East, almost 400,000 of them in Saudi Arabia alone, driven to seek livelihood there as a result of a 50-percent unemployment and underemployment rate at home. As early as

last December and early January, when US imperialism was already undertaking all-out preparations to launch its war of aggression in the Gulf, concerned citizens were already urgently appealing that the imperiled Filipino workers be repatriated home.

The Aquino regime not only rejected these proposals but continued to send an average of 500 workers every day to the Middle East, even as other countries were already evacuating their citizens from the danger areas. The Aquino regime deliberately tried to minimize the dangers confronting the Filipino workers, mendaciously trying to give the impression that it had drawn up contingency plans to evacuate them should war break out.

At first, the Aquino regime said the US-led bombings on Iraq had crippled that country's ability to launch counteroffensives. It said the 110,000 workers in Saudi Arabia's exposed Eastern Province could easily be evacuated to the capital city Riyadh which, it asserted, was safe. When eastern Saudi Arabia came under attack, many of the Filipino workers were forced to evacuate on their own, without any assistance whatsoever from the Aquino regime. But neither was Riyadh safe as it, too, came under attack. Representatives of 10,000 workers in Saudi Arabia's Eastern Province, who were seeking government help last January 31 were seeking government help in having them repatriated home were shocked by the chilling reply of Consul General Amable Aguiluz who spelled out the government's callous policy in these words: "As long as there are no wounded or dead Filipinos resulting from the war, there is no need for repatriation."

To this day, Filipino workers in areas exposed to the war continue to evacuate on their own, condemning the Aquino regime for its criminal neglect. A late report from the war zone indicates that three Filipino workers have already been killed. It is a miracle that not more have perished or been wounded. But as US imperialism continues to escalate the war—ignoring urgent calls for peace from peoples of the world, including the American people—many more of the hundreds of thousands of Filipino workers abandoned by the Aquino regime in the war zone will be facing increasing hazards to life and limb.

In the home front, meantime, President Aquino and members of her clique have used the war in the Gulf to heighten economic exploitation and political oppression even more, making life for the workers and the rest of the Filipino people more miserable than ever before. She has sought emergency powers,

including the power to ban workers' strikes, and, together with her defense secretary, Fidel Ramos, has revived the plan to institute a nationwide identification system to check on and curtail the movements of citizens. A similar plan had been foisted during the Marcos fascist puppet dictatorship but was scuttled due to popular resistance. Taking a cue from Mrs. Aquino, capitalists have started laying off workers, using the Gulf crisis as a "reason". Recently, a nationwide curfew has also been proposed ostensibly to save on energy and enhance "discipline". The regime is virtually trying to impose fascist martial law without the benefit of a formal declaration.

The list of crimes can go on. But in this statement, we will not go into a lengthy discussion into the regime's refusal to formulate a genuine land reform program, keeping the vast Philippine peasantry in feudal and semifeudal bondage, and its "total war" policy against the people under which it has chalked up a record of human rights violations worse than that of the murderous US-Marcos dictatorship. Neither shall we go here into a serious discussion of Secretary Ramos' slanderous and ridiculous disinformation that the National Democratic Front (NDF) of the Philippines has offered uniforms to the Iraqi army or has offered the services of the New People's Army (NPA) for "terrorist" operations. What we have discussed here are just some of the grossest crimes of the US-Aquino fascist dictatorship.

But these crimes of the US-Aquino regime, taken together, certainly justify the Filipino people's heightened revolutionary struggles to eliminate the existing semicolonial and semifeudal system and set up one that is independent, democratic, peaceful, just and prosperous. These struggles, in the armed and unarmed spheres, in city and countryside, are ever advancing towards higher levels.

As the people's struggles move forward, let the Aquino regime and its US imperialist masters face up to their culpability. Let them answer for their gross crimes against the Filipino people!

On the Initialing of the Draft US-RP Military Bases Treaty

August 29, 1991

Mindful of the people's national sovereignty and the integrity of the motherland, I join all Filipino compatriots in condemning as an act of treason the initialing of the draft US-RP Military Bases Treaty by the executive arm of the Philippine reactionary government.

As this draft treaty goes to the Philippine Senate for consideration and possible ratification, we hear the Senate President no less defining four options: 1) outright rejection; 2) endorsement for floor discussion; 3) passage with amendments or reservations; and 4) sitting on the issue at the level of the Senate foreign relations committee.

Thus, the trend has become unclear whether the current Philippine Senate is going to reject the draft treaty on constitutional grounds and expressly prevent the next Senate from ratifying it. Because there is yet no clear trend towards the final rejection of the treasonous treaty, the revolutionary forces cannot be expected to declare a unilateral ceasefire.

Salonga has given Sen. Leticia Shahani, foreign relations committee chairman and sister of his pro-US rival for the presidency, a free hand on what to do with the draft treaty.

He dangles the false hope that this draft treaty, if it wins Senate ratification, could be challenged before the Supreme Court on constitutional grounds.

Agents of US imperialism are now offering to senators opposed to the treaty

huge amounts of money as bribe, under the guise of campaign contributions for the forthcoming elections, in exchange for immediate ratification of the treaty in 1991 or passing on the treaty to the next Senate for ratification in 1992.

In the absence of a categorical rejection of the draft treaty on constitutional grounds by the Philippine Senate, the United States can invoke the Ramos-Rusk agreement to retain the US military bases and wait for the next Senate to ratify it in 1992.

At the same time, there is a scheme to whip both houses of Congress into forming themselves into a constituent assembly and erase the prohibition against foreign military bases, except by treaty. There is also a scheme to make a coup d'état to pave the way for the ratification of the treaty.

While the issue of ratification is being pressed on the Philippine Senate, the US Senate is not poised to ratify the treaty before September 16, 1991. The United States intends to have only the Philippine Senate one-sidedly ratify the treaty, as in the case of the 1947 US-RP Military Bases Agreement. The United States has absolutely no respect for the constitution of its Philippine neocolony.

All imperialist agencies and reactionary organizations and their propaganda mills are trying with might and main to conjure the illusion of public support for the retention of the US military bases for the cheapest and most despicable reasons.

The humiliation of the nation comes on top of the acute suffering of the people from the ever worsening socioeconomic crisis. All patriotic and progressive forces and the broad masses of the people are challenged to rise up against the unceasing violation of Philippine sovereignty and territorial integrity.

For the Immediate Turnover of the US Military Bases upon Rejection of the Draft Treaty by Philippine Senate

September 16, 1991

In accordance with its own constitution, the Philippine government cannot allow US military bases to stay one day longer in the Philippines after September 16, 1991 in the absence of a treaty allowing them.

Therefore, upon the rejection of the so-called treaty of friendship, cooperation and security, the US government must immediately turn over all US military bases to the Philippine government. To delay the turnover up to September 16, 1992 would definitely be a violation of the constitution of the Philippine government.

The immediate turnover of authority and general control over the US military bases can allow the withdrawal of the US troops and movable assets within two weeks and the residual presence of specific US technicians needed for the transfer of certain facilities and equipment and for the rehabilitation and development of the former US bases.

The withdrawal of US troops and movable assets can and must be accomplished before the end of September this year. Only a small number of residual US personnel may be allowed up to the end of 1991 to effect the transfer of certain specific facilities and equipment to the appropriate personnel of the Philippine government.

The long-term rehabilitation and development of the areas damaged and polluted

by the US military bases must be done under the responsibility and authority of the Philippine government by employing Filipino professionals and workers, with some foreign technical and financial assistance.

The immediate takeover of all the US military bases and facilities by the Philippine government provides the soonest opportunity to convert these to productive uses, more profitable than the measly amount offered by the United States for their military use.

The continued stay of the US military bases under the guise of “orderly withdrawal” or continuing “access” will give the US and its Filipino political agents the opportunity to negate the non-concurrence or rejection resolution of the Philippine Senate. The US government and the Aquino regime openly declare that they are determined to overturn such a resolution of the Philippine Senate by holding a referendum under Republic Act 6735. The pro-bases forces are set to wage a US-funded campaign for the retention of the US military bases.

After the nonconcurrence resolution of the Philippine Senate, the broad masses of the people face the tremendous odds posed by the imperialists and traitors and must wage a resolute struggle against the US military bases on a nationwide scale.

In the absence of the immediate turnover of all US military bases and facilities to the Philippine government and the complete withdrawal of the US military forces from the Philippines before the end of September, I will not be surprised if the National Democratic Front would soon consider terminating its unilateral ceasefire order to all units of the New People’s Army.

As regards the NDF call for the Philippine government to reciprocate the NDF unilateral ceasefire, agree to the opening of a new round of peace talks and end the barbaric total war policy, the latter and its armed forces have made only negative, arrogant and bloodthirsty responses and have escalated offensive campaigns and operations against the people and the revolutionary forces. I do not think that the people and the revolutionary forces can indefinitely limit themselves to defensive measures.

It is entirely the responsibility of the Philippine government and the Armed Forces of the Philippines that the civil war continues. The broad masses of the people, the revolutionary forces and the genuine advocates of a just and lasting

peace have ceaselessly pointed out that the two belligerent forces must address the roots of the civil war and move towards ending the violence of oppression and exploitation in the country.

Notwithstanding the fact that the US supplies weapons to its reactionary agents in many countries where there are no US military bases, the traitors in the Philippines use the specious logic that they need the US military bases to assure themselves of the supply of US weapons and operational funds for killing Filipinos.

While assisting US economic power in bleeding the people through the extraction of superprofits and debt service and in keeping the country underdeveloped, the traitors also use the desperate economic and financial situation as the very reason for retaining the US military bases, notwithstanding the fact that the US makes quick-profit investments, trade accommodations and loans for its own neocolonial exploitative purposes even in countries where there are no US military bases.

The National Democratic Front has so generously offered the olive branch of peace by declaring a unilateral ceasefire. But the chief political and military agents of US imperialism are obsessed with keeping the people in bondage and in suppressing the popular demand for national liberation and democracy.

The CIA-BVD Collaboration against Filipino Political Refugees and Asylum-Seekers

October 28, 1991

I wish to protest the collaboration of the US Central Intelligence Agency and the Dutch Binnenlandse Veiligheidsdienst (BVD) 40 in acting against the rights of Filipino political refugees and asylum-seekers in the Netherlands, including myself.

My attention has been called to the attempt of a US CIA agent, assisted by a Dutch officer of the BVD, to coerce, bribe and recruit a Filipino asylum-seeker, Mr. Nathan Quimpo, as an informer against other Filipino refugees and asylum-seekers in the Netherlands.

The attempt of both the CIA and BVD to take advantage of a Filipino asylum-seeker and turn him against his own compatriots who have sought refuge in the Netherlands is a violation of their rights and is abominable.

I am particularly concerned about instructions of the US CIA agent to Quimpo to provide information that is derogatory to me.

This is not the first time that the US Central Intelligence Agency with the collaboration of the BVD has acted against my civil rights and interfered with my application for political asylum in the Netherlands. Together with the Philippine government, the CIA has fed the BVD with false information against me.

In turn, the BVD has submitted the false information to the Justice Ministry in several documents in order to prevent the approval of my application for

political asylum, notwithstanding the strong juridical merits of my application in accordance with the Geneva Convention relating to the status of refugees.

Cultural Imperialism in the Philippines

November 23, 1994

This lecture was delivered before a research class under the American Studies Program of the University of Utrecht, 23 November 1994. It is hereby reproduced and distributed by ALAY SINING, a national-democratic cultural organization based in the University of the Philippines–Diliman, and KARATULA, its national counterpart, seventeen years later in the midst of worsening crisis due to US imperialism, feudalism, and bureaucrat capitalism.

From a Eurocentric viewpoint, the Philippines is in the Far East. It is a group of 11 major islands and more than 7,000 minor islands. The islands total more than 300,000 square kilometers of land in the Pacific.

The archipelago has a configuration of being strung on a north-south axis, parallel to the coast of southern China and Vietnam which are hundreds of kilometers away westward. Northward are Taiwan and Japan and southward are East Malaysia and Indonesia, with which you are very familiar in Dutch history. East of the Philippines is the vast Pacific Ocean and some thousands of kilometers away in the same direction is the United States of America.

Since the Spanish-American war at the close of the 19th century, the United States had eyed the Philippines as a prize colonial catch because of its comprehensive natural resource base and its strategic location in the US imperialist design to turn the Pacific into an American lake for US big business and take a piece of the huge Chinese market.

The Philippines has a current population of 96 million. Its gross national income is about PhP 3,089 billion. By averaging this, you get an average annual per

capita income of around PhP32 thousand. This figure is dismal enough, but the reality is so much worse. Most of the income actually goes to the foreign transnational corporations and banks and to the local exploiting classes. Some 80 percent of the people, mainly workers and peasants, including urban and rural odd-jobbers, fall below the poverty line.

Around 85 percent of the people may be considered Malay. The rest include the aboriginal Negroids, hill tribes of Austronesian origin and mixed-blood descendants of Chinese and Caucasians, including Spanish, American and Indian mestizos. Since 500 BC, the Malays have lived along the seacoast and big riverine areas. They speak more than 170 languages and dialects. But the overwhelming majority speak 8 major Malay languages: Tagalog (29.7 percent), Cebuano (24.2 percent), Ilocano (10.3 percent), Ilonggo (9.2 percent), Bicol (5.6 percent), Kapampangan (2.8 percent), Pangasinan (1.8 percent) and Waray (0.4 percent).

The Malays were the most exposed to the control and influence of Spanish colonialism and Catholicism from the late 16th century to the end of the 19th century. They have also been the most exposed to the control and influence of American imperialism since the beginning of this century. But they retain their ethnolinguistic diversity.

Around 4.3 percent of the Philippine population belong to 12 ethno-linguistic communities called the Moro people in southwestern Mindanao, with Islam as a rallying point in their culture since the 13th century. Around five percent belong to the hill tribes whose origins may be traced back to the Austronesian migrations in the Neolithic period. Only a fraction of one percent belongs to the Negritude clans whose origins date back to 25,000 years ago, according to archeological evidence.

Manila-based Tagalog is the national lingua franca. Comprehension and use of this language have been popularized mainly by nationwide radio networks, Tagalog cinema, comics, the public school system and accelerated inter-island migrations. But there is the regional lingua franca in various parts of the country.

Regional and local languages are retained by the people, despite the spread of Manila-based Tagalog, the preferred use of English as a medium of instruction in the school system, as official language in the bureaucracy and as the language of the major electronic and print mass media and the use of Taglish (mixture of

Tagalog and English) mainly among the university-educated people in Manila.

Eighty-five percent of Filipinos are baptized or registered Catholics; 4.3 percent are Muslim; 3.9 percent belong to the Philippine Independent Church (a patriotic breakaway from the Roman Catholic Church in the aftermath of the old democratic revolution in the Philippines); 3.6 percent belong to the Protestant churches of US origin and 1.3 percent belong to the Iglesia ni Kristo (Church of Christ), one more Protestant sect of Philippine origin.

I. Brief primer on the history and culture of the Philippines

Philippine history may be divided into five periods: the precolonial period up to the late 16th century; the Spanish colonial and feudal period from late 16th century to the end of the 19th century; the brief but highly significant period of the old democratic revolution from 1896 to 1902; the period of US colonial and semifeudal rule up to 1946, with an interregnum of Japanese colonial rule from 1942-45; and the current period of semicolonial and semifeudal rule which started in 1946.

In precolonial Philippines, small autonomous societies of patriarchal slavery prevailed among the predominant Malays. There were slave owners, a large number of free men and full slaves and half-slaves. The highest socio-political formation achieved was that of the Islamic sultanates in south-western Mindanao, especially that of Sulu.

The Iron Age culture of the Malays persisted. However, the people absorbed the influences of neighboring Southeast Asian countries and China. There were no megalithic structures but the sultans, rajahs and barangay chieftains had large wooden houses and boats of varying sizes and capacities. The barangay which could carry a few persons was commonplace. The caracoa which could carry 50-100 persons was used for trade and war on an inter-island scale. The joangga which could carry more than 300 persons was used for trade on a grander scale.

Spanish colonialism came to the Philippines upon the impulse of European mercantilism and the drive to spread Catholicism. The process of colonial conquest started in the late 16th century. A colonial and feudal social system evolved in the course of more than 300 years, with the Spanish colonial administrators and religious friars on top of the colonized people, extracting taxes from them, mainly in the form of labor, rent from the land, religious tribute,

and commercial profits from the Manila-Acapulco trade until the early years of the 19th century and finally from trade with the industrial capitalist countries in most of the 19th century.

In the colonial and feudal society, the landlords comprised the highest class among the natives. They rode roughshod over the peasants who were about 90 percent of the population. The artisan and manufacturing workers were a small minority. The native priests, professionals and administrative clerks were even smaller in number up to the end of the Spanish colonial rule.

The overriding cultural force in colonial and feudal society was Catholicism propagated by the religious orders under royal patronage. The Spanish priests enjoyed social, political, cultural and moral power over the colonized people. They used catechetical instruction, the pulpit, the confessional box and the rituals to control the people and legitimize the colonial and feudal system.

In fact, they effectively shared power with the lay colonial administrators in what was veritably a theocratic state.

In the 1880s, the reformist leaders of the Propaganda Movement of the Indios and mestizos imbibed the rational philosophy and liberal political ideas of the French enlightenment, the French revolution and the Spanish enlightenment. In the 1890s, the leaders of the Philippine revolution grasped the revolutionary ideas of bourgeois nationalism and liberal democracy. Thus the Philippine revolution burst out in 1896.

By 1899, the revolutionary forces of the Filipino people had wiped out Spanish colonial power throughout the country, with the exception of the walled citadel of the Spaniards in Manila, and established a nationwide revolutionary government. But also in the same year, after pretending to help the Philippine revolutionary movement against Spain, the United States launched the Filipino-American war to seize the Philippines for itself.

The Filipino people and the revolutionary forces valiantly fought the militarily superior US forces. To effect the conquest of the Philippines, the United States resorted not only to military force and genocide, killing off at least 10 percent of the population, but also the deceptive slogans of “benevolent assimilation”, Jeffersonian liberal-democracy, Christianity and “free enterprise” in order to sow confusion among the ranks of the leaders of the revolutionary movement.

The United States imposed its own colonial rule on the Philippines. But this was different from the old colonial system of sheer plunder by Spain. It was the colonial rule of a modern imperialist power which was out to dump on the Philippines its surplus commodities and surplus capital. It was out to go through the motion of investing capital in the colony in order to extract superprofits.

From the outset, the United States was willing to evolve a semifeudal society with the big compradors and landlords as the basic exploiting classes among the natives, with the middle social strata of the urban petty and middle bourgeoisie and with the workers and peasants as the basic exploited classes.

To effect the shift from feudal to semifeudal society, the United States broke up a portion of the much-hated landed estates of the religious organizations, allowed the free movement of peasants to resettle on frontier lands or work in plantations, opened the mines, brought in more milling facilities in plantations and the mines, initiated the manufacturing of household products from local raw materials, improved transport and communications and established a public school system to produce the personnel for expanding business and bureaucratic operations.

To achieve economic and political control, the United States had to exercise cultural control over the Filipino people. It did so by super-imposing itself on and penetrating the priorly existing colonial and feudal culture and on the folk culture of precolonial Philippines. After the brutal conquest of the Philippines, some of the American troops ingratiated themselves with the people by becoming public school teachers and teaching English. Then, shiploads of American teachers came.

The development of the public school system came into sharp contrast with the lack of it in the Spanish colonial era. American Catholic and Protestant missionaries also came in. English became the medium of instruction at all levels of the educational system. It became the means for propagating a pro-imperialist liberal political philosophy and denigrating the patriotic and progressive ideas and values of the revolutionaries who themselves were being co-opted within the colonial and semi-feudal system.

At the same time, political power was exercised to suppress as criminal offense the mere display of the Philippine flag or any other manifestation of patriotism through written articles, theatrical performances or mass actions. School children

were indoctrinated in the so-called American way of life and came to know more the anecdotes about George Washington than about the heroes of the Philippine revolution of 1896 and about the national and democratic aspirations of the Filipino people.

At an early age, Filipinos were made to adopt ideas, attitudes and tastes receptive to US colonial rule and to commodities made in the USA. imperialist kind of liberal philosophy and became the highest institution of learning for producing the leaders of the country in all fields. The so-called pensionado system of scholarship grants and assured job promotions involved the sending of bureaucrats and graduate students to the United States for higher education.

Not to be left behind in the Americanization of the Philippine educational and cultural system, the American Jesuits took the lead among the religious organizations to replace the Spanish priests with American priests in their upper-class academic institutions. While they babbled about the supremacy of the Catholic faith over capitalism and socialism in accordance with the social encyclicals of the Pope, they enthusiastically prepared their students to take their professional place in the society dominated by American monopoly capitalism. In all the years prior to World War II, the US colonial rulers harped on subjecting the Filipino people to a “tutelage for self-government and democracy.”

The US steadily developed the semifeudal economic foundation and the political and cultural superstructure for semicolonial or neocolonial domination. The political, economic and cultural leaders were trained and prepared for the shift from a colonial to a neocolonial arrangement. By 1936, the Commonwealth government was established to prepare for the establishment of a neocolonial republic ten years hence.

Also by this time, English as the official medium fully replaced Spanish in the civil service. Professional and technical training was done in the American way. Writers and artists patterned their works after US literary and artistic models. Hollywood films, American pop music, dances and clothes fashion and Philippine imitation of these became the craze in the archipelago.

II. US cultural imperialism in neocolonial Philippines

After World War II, the United States granted nominal independence to the Philippines in 1946 and gave to the politicians of the big compradors and

landlords the responsibility for national administration. The Philippines became a neocolonial republic. Its social economy remained semifeudal and its political system, semicolonial.

The United States touted the Philippines as the show window of democracy in Asia, a proof of American “altruism” or “benevolence” until only 25 years in 1972 Marcos imposed on the Philippines 16 years of fascist dictatorship until 1986. Just as it retained the property rights of US corporations and citizens, parity rights in the exploitation of natural resources, its military bases and control over the Philippine armed forces through treaties and executive agreements, the United States retained control over the Philippine educational and cultural system through the accumulated colonial mentality and through new arrangements, new programs and new techniques.

Anti-communism which first became pronounced in the '30s became even more amplified as a crucial component of colonial mentality and it intensified after World War II in reaction to the communist-led national liberation movement in the Philippines and to the socialist countries and the national liberation movements in Asia and elsewhere in the world. The cold war became a driving force in American cultural imperialism in the Philippines. Anticommunism has become the pretext for continuing US domination of the Philippines, preserving the unjust colonial system of the big compradors and landlords and for suppressing the national and democratic aspirations of the people. It has been a strong glue of the antinational and antidemocratic combination of US cultural imperialism and the feudal culture at various levels of Philippine society and in various fields of social activity.

Since then, the study programs and textbooks have been ideologically designed and directed by US educational advisors, visiting professors and their Filipino sidekicks and have been financed by grants under the US Agency for International Development (AID) and its predecessor agencies, under US Public Law 480 and under a variety of US foundations like Ford and Rockefeller.

Scholarships and study travel grants under the Fulbright and Smith-Mundt programs, the private US foundations, US-based religious organizations and direct exchange relations between US and Philippine universities and other institutions have been exceedingly important in determining or influencing the mode of thinking of university professors and their students.

The US Information Agency and its predecessor agencies, the Voice of America, the Peace Corps and American religious missionaries have been active in spreading anticommunist and pro-imperialist propaganda and biases against the national and democratic aspirations of the people. Information from abroad is fed to the Philippines mainly by US wire services, like the Associated Press and United Press International, and by the Voice of America. A recent powerful US source of information is CNN on television. In its shadowy ways, the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) deliberately plants stories in the Philippine mass media in order to slander and demonize personalities and movements considered anathema to US national interests.

The agents of US cultural imperialism always raise a hue and cry about objective reporting whenever they are confronted with the proletarian revolutionary stand and with the anti-imperialist line of national liberation. But in fact news and features in the bourgeois mass media are characterized by selectivity and a slant against those who oppose the dominance of foreign monopoly capital and local reaction. But the direct purveyors of US cultural imperialism do not have to be Americans. The print and electronic mass media have been nationalized since 1972 and are again under the pressure of de-nationalization.

Nonetheless, Filipino owners, broadcast managers and editors have colonial mentality and use either canned US-made or Filipino-made features and programs aping the current US trend or fashion. In the first place, commodities in the market are prestigious and preferable because they are US-made or of US origin. Coca Cola, McDonald and Marlboro are popular brands. Commercial advertising in electronic and print media popularize US goods. The biggest advertising firms in the Philippines are American, or if Filipino-owned, advertise US products and ape Madison Avenue style.

The persistence of English as the principal medium of instruction in schools and likewise of official and mass communications provides an ever ready medium of US cultural imperialism. English is not simply the No.1 foreign language in the Philippines. Together with its Taglish (Tagalog-English admixture -- like Brutch in the Netherlands) by-product, English is the No.1 language to which the Filipino or Manila-based Tagalog runs a far second as a medium of communications among Filipinos who have gone beyond high school.

The gains made by the movement for a national and democratic culture, from the '60s to the early '70s, were reversed by the Marcos fascist regime, starting in

1972. For instance, the increasing preference of university teachers for Tagalog as medium of instruction and radio broadcasters for Philippine music in Tagalog were reversed. Of course, songs, films and articles critical of the oppression and exploitation of the people by US imperialism and the local exploiting classes were banned and their authors came under severe persecution, including job dismissals, confiscation of property, incarceration and torture.

Literature in English enjoys a higher stature than that in Tagalog among the university-educated even if the latter enjoys a wider readership in Tagalog publications. In fact, the standards and canons of what is considered good creative writing are still set in the main by aesthetics and literary criticism derived from US bourgeois literature by the general run of university teachers, writers and critics who are rotated on scholarships and travel grants to the United States.

Whatever are the sophisticated theories that revolve around art for art's sake or the so-called purity of poetry among the university-educated, the fact remains that when they leave the classrooms, they buy mostly the mediocre American pulp novels or potboilers featuring sex and violence, comics and magazines featuring movie and athletic pop stars.

One very striking manifestation of the widespread and deep-going influence of US cultural imperialism in the Philippines is the result of a poll survey among public school children for someone's doctoral dissertation in the '80s. The children were asked what citizenship they would opt for had they been given the choice. The overwhelming majority opted for US citizenship.

US cultural influence, imperialist or otherwise, runs strong in the Philippines not only because of its superimposition on or penetration of the culture in the Philippines by American agencies and agents but because of the heavy traffic of Filipinos between the United States and the Philippines and the fact that around two million Filipinos now reside in the United States.

Since 1989, when the revisionist bureaucrat capitalist regime of China went into turmoil and similar regimes in Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union masquerading for a long time as socialist started to disintegrate, the US ideological and propaganda machinery has gone into high gear in spreading the line that the struggle for national liberation and socialism is hopeless and that history can go no farther than capitalism and liberal democracy.

A small section of the intelligentsia has tended to be carried away by the imperialist ideological and political offensive. And a handful of paid agents of the US and some unreliable elements have drummed up the idea that the anti-imperialist struggle and the class struggle have become marginalized and futile. They have prated that nothing can be done but to seek bourgeois democratic reforms within a “new world order” under the single hegemony of the United States.

The NGOs financed by US, West European and Japanese funding agencies have misrepresented themselves as the alternative to the revolutionary mass movement led by the working class party. Notwithstanding the hegemony of US cultural imperialism in the Philippines, tightened by high technology in transport and communications, it rides on the persistent layers of feudal and folk culture due to the unchanged semicolonial and semifeudal character of Philippine society. There is resistance and collaboration between imperialist and feudal culture but there is mainly a schizophrenic collaboration, especially in the maintenance of the economic, political and cultural status quo.

III. Resistance to US cultural imperialism

There is strong and consistent resistance to US cultural imperialism by patriotic and progressive forces that take the general line of the national-democratic revolution and call for a national, scientific and mass culture. I count myself among these forces. Modesty aside, I have been known as an articulator of these forces since 1959 when I was still a graduate student and lecturer at the University of the Philippines.

The current national-democratic revolution may be considered as a resumption of the unfinished Philippine revolution of 1896. It is a movement to complete the struggle for national liberation and democracy against foreign and feudal domination. This struggle has been frustrated by the United States since the beginning of this century.

The ongoing national-democratic revolution may be described as one of a new type. There is a shift of class leadership from that of the nascent liberal bourgeoisie in the old democratic revolution of 1896 to that of the working class. At the core of the

revolutionary movement are the cadres who are guided by Marxism-Leninism;

whereas at the core of the Philippine revolution of 1896, were cadres who were guided by an anti-colonial liberal bourgeois ideology.

The national-democratic revolution now takes into account the objective and subjective conditions in the era of modern imperialism and proletarian revolution. While upholding the class leadership of the working class, it bases itself on the alliance of the working class and peasantry, seeks to win over the middle social strata and tries to take advantage of the contradictions among the reactionaries in order to oppose and depose foreign monopoly capitalism, domestic feudalism and bureaucrat capitalism.

The national-democratic revolution programmatically takes up political, economic and cultural issues to arouse, organize and mobilize the people. It aims to replace the US-controlled big comprador-landlord state with a people's democratic state to dissolve the agrarian semi-feudal economy with a program of national industrialization and land reform and the anti-national, feudal and anti-people culture with a national, scientific and mass culture. Why must Philippine culture become national? It has long been captivated, burdened and exploited by colonial mentality under more than three centuries of Spanish colonialism and then by a colonial and neocolonial mentality imposed by US imperialism.

The local cultures and the developing national culture must be cherished and affirmed and integrated into a revolutionary national consciousness in order to serve national liberation and do away with the stultifying sense of subservience to foreign domination. Thus, the Filipino nation can take its place in the community of nations with dignity.

The people should not be regarded as a vapid mass. At this historical stage of the Philippine revolution it is clear that the working class leads the people and that they are constituted mainly by the workers and peasants in the overwhelming majority. The intelligentsia must take a choice in their favor against the exploitative owners of land and capital.

Why must Philippine culture be scientific? It must do away with the deadening weight of feudal and semifeudal culture, release the people from the bondage that is due to superstition, lack of education and miseducation and avail itself of the scientific advances in the world.

Before World War II, there were efforts to undertake the resumption of the

Philippine revolution by either the working class or the urban petty-bourgeoisie. But these were always frustrated after some time until 1959 when something could be started and developed continuously up to the present.

The scientific culture must release the working people and other creative forces from the forces of oppression and exploitation. Science and technology must serve the all-rounded development of the people. The scientifically educated men and women must no longer be the mere servants of the imperialists and the local reactionaries.

The Student Cultural Association of the University of the Philippines was established in 1959 as an exponent of the new-democratic revolution and a culture along this general line. It included a secret core of Marxist-Leninists. This eventually became the main engine for the establishment of the Kabataang Makabayan (KM–Patriotic Youth), a comprehensive organization of young workers and peasants, students and young professionals on 30 November 1964. The KM became the most outstanding organization promoting the legal democratic movement along the anti-imperialist and antifeudal line in most of the 1960s until 1972. It considered its educational program, its propaganda and militant mass actions as constituting the Second Propaganda Movement, reminiscent of the first propaganda movement in the 1880s that paved the way for the Philippine revolution of 1896. The KM became in fact the training school of revolutionary cadres in the political and cultural fields. Among the mass organizations of various types, it was chiefly responsible for promoting a new-democratic cultural revolution against the dominant pro-imperialist and reactionary culture since the latter half of the '60s and for carrying out the First Quarter Storm of 1970, which involved a series of mass actions ranging from 50,000 to 100,000 people and consequently inspired the formation of several cultural and literary organizations advocating a national, scientific and mass culture.

Why must Philippine culture have a mass character? It must serve the toiling masses above all. The people themselves must develop this kind of culture. The most vital knowledge is drawn by knowing their conditions, needs and capabilities. Whatever higher knowledge there may be from any section of the people can and must be popularized.

From the '60s to 1972 when Marcos proclaimed martial law, the KM promoted the adoption of the national language as the principal medium of instruction at

all levels of the educational system, the reconstitution of study and reading courses as to include progressive and revolutionary works, the program of sending teams of students, writers and cultural workers to the factories and farms to conduct social investigation and learn from the masses, the organization of cultural groups among the workers and peasants.

The martial law regime forced KM and all the legal patriotic and progressive cultural organizations into the underground. But many of the cultural activists joined the revolutionary armed struggle in the countryside and continued the cultural revolution on a wider scale and in a more profound way. Since 1969 when it was established by the Communist Party of the Philippines, the New People's Army (NPA) had been promoting an anti-imperialist and anti-feudal cultural revolution in the countryside.

Even during the harshest years of martial rule, anti-imperialist and anti-feudal cultural activity could thrive even in the urban areas despite censorship and military suppression. The cultural cadres secretly wrote and circulated their poems, plays, short stories and novels. Many dared to improvise stage performances among the workers and peasants. There were lightning cultural performances and lightning exhibits of visual art works. When the fascist regime started to crumble and eventually fell in the '80s, the revolutionary mass movement and the cultural movement that it nurtured came out strongly and brilliantly.

The cultural movement is a major component of the national-democratic revolution. It is connected with the legal democratic mass movement based in the urban areas as well as with the people's war based in the countryside. The cultural cadres undertake cultural studies among the masses, create works such as music, paintings, poetry, plays, short stories, novels and produce films, stage and street performances.

There are specialized cultural associations both aboveground and underground. Aboveground are the Concerned Artists of the Philippines, Bugkos, Panulat and the like. The most prominent and comprehensive cultural organization underground is ARMAS which is an allied organization within the framework of the National Democratic Front. All the major legal mass organizations of workers, peasants, youth women and many of their lower organizations have their own groups of cultural cadres and performers.

In the countryside there are also the cultural teams attached to the NPA and there are the countless cultural groups of the local communities. The benign content and forms of folk culture have been adopted and integrated with the proletarian revolutionary line of the working class, the national-democratic program and the national, scientific and mass culture. Revolutionary content is put into the traditional forms of art and literature.

You might ask whether the national-democratic revolution and its cultural movement are adversely affected by the unprecedented globalization of production, the apparently unquestioned single hegemony of the United States, the use of high technology for the extraction of superprofits, the collapse of the revisionist regimes ruled by bureaucrat capitalists masquerading as socialist, the apparent success of neocolonialism and the unprecedentedly strong imperialist ideological and political offensive since 1989.

As I have earlier pointed out, only a small section of the intelligentsia is confused and disappointed. It is the same section that has always tended to be subservient to the United States and the local exploiting classes. Some elements in this section of the petty-bourgeoisie appeared to be Left in the past, especially in the fight against the Marcos fascist regime, but upon the frustration of their illusions of quick victory in the revolution they have openly taken a Rightist position.

As far as the masses of workers and peasants and most of the urban petty-bourgeoisie are concerned, they say resolutely that there is no choice for them but to keep up their anti-imperialist and anti-feudal struggle in the same manner that their revolutionary predecessors never gave up their struggle for national liberation and democracy despite centuries of Spanish colonial rule and decades of US imperialist domination. They look forward to the resurgence of the anti-imperialist movement and socialist movement precisely as a consequence of the current world disorder.

IV. Concluding remarks

In conclusion, I wish to make a few remarks comparing the Philippines and The Netherlands with regard to US cultural influence. I hope that these can help sharpen your understanding of what I have discussed at length.

Definitely, there is strong US cultural influence in the Netherlands. It is a

country often described as having the closest cultural relations with the United States among the countries in mainland Europe now and since the Dutch settlers went over to the North American continent. It is a close all-round US ally and one of the major US allies in the colonial, imperialist and neocolonial exploitation of 20th century Asia, in the cold war of the bygone bipolar world and in the current new world disorder.

US cultural imperialism is exceedingly obvious in the Philippines because my country is a pre-industrial neocolony of the United States. The Netherlands is far more independent because it is a well developed industrial country and is even a neocolonial power on its own account.

Let me use language as a point of reference. The Dutch use English as their No.1 international language because it is objectively the No.1 language in international affairs. But within the Netherlands and among the Dutch people, the Dutch language is prevalent and dominant over any foreign language in all fields of activity. In the case of a neocolony like the Philippines, the English language is in fact dominant over what is formally recognized as the national language and is a vehicle of ideas, attitudes and tastes that subordinate the people to US power.

There is a high degree of consumer interest in certain US products in the Netherlands. But the Dutch people have a far wider range of its own products and a wider choice of imported products than the Filipinos. Urbanites in the Philippines are captives of a wide range of US consumer products and are subject to the barrage of commercial advertising not only in the electronic and print media but also in the most unsightly billboards.

My impression is that the Netherlands is far more selective in importing American films. But the Philippines import a lot more indiscriminately, catering to the most vulgar taste. Filipino filmmakers produce far more feature films than do Dutch filmmakers but the general run of movies in Tagalog are patterned after Hollywood films and also after martial arts films from Taiwan and Hongkong. Movie houses are far more capacious in the Philippines because video players are fewer and less available to the people who have far lesser income than in the Netherlands.

My impression is that Dutch and Philippine TV stations have a penchant for canned American programs, especially the soap opera and comedy series. So far,

I have not yet made even a rough estimate of the degree of addiction to such programs in the Netherlands and the Philippines.

With regard to American pulp novels, there are probably more Dutch buyers of these from the Bruna bookstore chain in both the English original and in Dutch translation than Filipino buyers who are usually university-educated and who so much prefer to read these in English that no Tagalog translations are made of these.

I hope that in my comparisons of US cultural influence on the Philippines and the Netherlands you can grasp both the differences and similarities between a neocolonial vassal and a neocolonialist partner of the United States.

On Celebrating the Centennial of the Philippine Revolution of 1896

August 23, 1995

I am elated to learn that the organizations of the toiling masses of workers and peasants (Kilusang Mayo Uno and Kilusang Magbubukid ng Pilipinas) and the organizations of the student youth (League of Filipino Students, Student Christian Movement, National Union of Students of the Philippines and College Editors Guild of the Philippines) and teachers are combining to launch a year-long celebration of the centennial of the Philippine revolution of 1896 on August 23.

This celebration is of great importance. It should inspire us to continue the struggle for national liberation and democracy which was started by our revolutionary forefathers in 1896. So long as the Filipino people are under foreign and feudal domination, there is the ever crying need for carrying out the national democratic revolution.

It took more than 300 years of suffering and struggle under Spanish colonialism before the Philippine Revolution assumed the force and form of the bourgeois-democratic revolution of the old type in 1896. Andres Bonifacio, the supreme leader of the Katipunan, had the resolve and courage to declare the independence of the Filipino people. He was a worker. But his guiding ideology was still bourgeois liberal. Ultimately, the ilustrados themselves laid him aside.

The revolution was in prospect of winning total victory in 1898. But US imperialism intervened, unleashed a brutal war of aggression against the Filipino people and turned the Philippines into its own colony. It did not only deploy a far

superior military force to defeat the revolutionary army and massacre 10 percent of the people but also launched the deceptive propaganda of benevolent assimilation and pro-imperialist liberalism which coopted the bourgeois liberal leadership of the revolutionary movement.

Until 1946, with the exception of the Japanese occupation from 1942 to 1945, the US kept the Philippines as a colony. Since 1946, the country has been a semicolony, with nominal independence and under the national administration of politicians and bureaucrats representing the local exploiting classes. Since the beginning of its colonial rule, however, the US turned the Philippine social economy from a feudal into a semifeudal one, dominated by the comprador big bourgeoisie and landlord class as basic exploiting classes, which comprise one percent of the population.

The working class has expanded up to 15 percent of the population from a negligible percentage at the beginning of the century. The peasantry has qualitatively decreased from around 90 percent to 75 percent. The urban petty-bourgeoisie and the middle bourgeoisie have expanded from negligible percentages to eight percent and one percent, respectively.

The growth of the working class and the adoption of the theory and practice of Marxism-Leninism have given rise to the leadership of the working class in the resumption of the Philippine revolution. The new class leadership transforms the national democratic revolution into one of a new type, puts it in the context of the world proletarian-socialist revolution and gives it a socialist perspective.

The working class is the most productive and progressive force in the Philippines today. But it is a minority class under the persistent agrarian semifeudal conditions. To carry out its revolutionary mission, it must forge the basic alliance with the peasantry. This is the current foundation of the Philippine revolution.

In the era of modern imperialism, the urban petty bourgeoisie is no longer in a position as in 1896 to lead the Philippine revolution. But it can still play the role of a basic revolutionary force by taking part in the national democratic movement under the leadership of the working class.

In celebrating the centennial of the Philippine revolution of 1896, we must carry out the general line of national democratic revolution against foreign monopoly

capitalism, domestic feudalism and bureaucrat capitalism. In this regard, we must be able to make a class analysis of Philippine society and must grasp the correct and effective relationship of the basic revolutionary forces.

The working class and the peasantry are driven by their intolerable oppression and exploitation to fight for national and social liberation. As less oppressed and less exploited than the toiling masses, the urban petty bourgeoisie needs to be encouraged to join the national democratic revolution. The educated youth and teachers who are already in the national democratic movement must attract to it the entire urban petty bourgeoisie.

The revolutionary mass activists from the ranks of the educated youth and teachers can best serve the people by integrating themselves with the workers and peasants in the revolutionary struggle and can remold themselves into proletarian revolutionaries in the process.

The year-long celebration will be most fruitful as the workers, peasants, the students, teachers and other people grasp the continuity of and differences between the old and new types of national democratic revolution and carry out the tasks of raising to a new and higher level their revolutionary consciousness and militancy in the struggle for national liberation and democracy.

Uphold the revolutionary legacy of 1896!

Carry the Philippine revolution forward!

Long live the Filipino people!

On 100 Years of Struggle against US Imperialism

February 3, 1999

In the spirit of anti-imperialist solidarity, I convey warmest greetings to all the participants in the International Conference on 100 Years of Struggle Against US Imperialism.

We recall the outbreak of the Philippine-American War on February 4, 1899 and we celebrate the people's revolutionary struggle against US imperialism. We draw inspiration from our revolutionary forebears, honor our people who persevere in the struggle, learn lessons from the past and current circumstances and define the tasks for completing the struggle for national liberation and democracy.

In celebrating the 30th anniversary of its reestablishment, the Communist Party of the Philippines has expressed the resolve to continue the national-democratic revolution through protracted people's war against US imperialism and the local reactionaries even if this revolution should take another hundred years.

For as long as the Filipino people remain under US imperialist domination, we do not cease to wage all forms of revolutionary struggle for national liberation and democracy. As the enemy never gets tired of oppressing and exploiting them, the people can never get tired of resisting oppression and exploitation and fighting for national and social liberation.

The absence of genuine national independence and the reign of greed and terror in our country are the bitter consequence of the successful US war of aggression. The US destroyed the Philippine republic that issued from the armed revolution against Spanish colonialism. The US imposed its own colonial rule on the people

and granted them nominal independence only after making sure that it could continue to profit from semicolonial rule through the local exploiting classes of big compradors and landlords.

I commend CONTEND for celebrating the Filipino people's armed resistance against the US war of aggression and the continuing US imperialist domination. This celebration comes into sharp contrast with that of the big comprador-landlord state which has spent a lot of tax money in order to gloss over the people's revolutionary struggle and the need to continue it.

The US war of aggression

Since the beginning of its alliance with the Aguinaldo-led revolutionary movement against Spain, the US had been driven by its monopoly capitalist interests to deceive and betray the Filipino leaders, wage a war of aggression against the Filipino people and take over the Philippines as its own colony. It coveted the Philippines as a strategic post for turning the Pacific Ocean into an American lake and for allowing US monopolies to take a slice of the Chinese melon.

The historians present in your conference can tell you all the facts about the double-faced dealings of US agents in Singapore and Hongkong, the arrogant and clever military maneuvers of the US forces in Manila, the pre-arranged surrender of the Spanish authorities and the mock battle for Intramuros, the Proclamation of Benevolent Assimilation, the US-Spanish Treaty of Paris on December 10, 1898 ceding the Philippines to the US for US\$20 million, and the US provocation at San Juan bridge on February 4, 1899.

To impose themselves on the Filipino people, the US aggressors arrested, tortured and killed hundreds of thousands of Filipinos. Millions of our people suffered forced relocations and food blockades. The genocidal methods previously used against the American Indians were used in the conquest of the Philippines and would be used again and again in the '40s and '50s and from 1969 to the present. The same methods were also used against the Vietnamese people during the '60s and '70s.

The estimate of Filipino casualties from the US war of aggression ranges from 250,000 to one million or more than 10 percent of the entire population. General Bell testified before the US Congress that at least 600,000 Filipinos were killed

in Luzon alone. Until now, there has been neither the full satisfaction of the people's demand for revolutionary justice nor official apology from the US government over its dastardly crimes against the Filipino people and entire humanity.

Moved by the spirit of patriotism and by democratic aspirations, the Filipino people fought heroically against the US imperialists. The Philippine-American war lasted from 1899 to 1902 when the main forces of the revolutionary army were destroyed or their leaders capitulated. But the armed resistance, including that of the Moro people, continued in many regions up to 1916.

At great cost to Filipino lives and property, the US imperialists were able to conquer and impose direct colonial rule on the Philippines. This persisted until the Japanese imperialists invaded and occupied the country in 1942. The interimperialist war was a big opportunity for the people to build their own independent revolutionary armed strength. But the subjective forces of the revolution could develop strength only in Central Luzon, Manila and Southern Tagalog.

Continuing US domination

The US reconquered the Philippines in 1945. In advance of the grant of bogus independence to the country, it made sure that US military bases and US property rights and privileges would persist. And yet it tried vainly to postpone the shift to semicolonial rule. However, confronted by an armed revolutionary movement, it relented and gave way to such a rule in 1946, with national administration conceded to the politicians and bureaucrats of the big compradors and landlords in subordination to US imperialism.

The key factors for continued US control over the Philippine neocolonial state are the following: the conversion of the economy into a semifeudal one since the beginning of the century, dependence of the coercive apparatuses of the state on US indoctrination and military supplies, the pro-imperialist training of puppet political, business and cultural personnel and the merger of imperialist and feudal culture.

In the semicolonial political system, the people have suffered a series of puppet regimes. The US is the most responsible for the prolonged the oppressive and exploitative policies of all these puppet regimes, from Roxas to Estrada, and for

the prolonged Marcos fascist dictatorship. The US dictates all major policies either bilaterally or through US-controlled multilateral agencies like the IMF, World Bank and WTO. The US remains as the No. 1 imperialist power dominating the Philippines even as it has found it convenient since the '60s to take cover behind multilateral arrangements.

The US military bases have been closed down since 1992 because after all US military control is effected through the puppet military and police forces, and US military bases in nearby countries and spy satellites are being used as additional instruments for US control over the Philippine archipelago. In addition, there is the US-Japan security partnership. But the US is always interested in multiplying its military control over the country. Thus, it is pushing the Visiting Forces Agreement, which the people are now vigorously opposing.

So far, US imperialism has succeeded in keeping the Filipino people under its domination, not only because of its superior military force but also because of its capabilities for deception. In the face of US imperialism, the old democratic revolution was not only limited by its inferior arms but was confounded by a foreign power that used bourgeois liberal slogans to advance its monopoly capitalist interests.

To this day, US imperialism misrepresents itself as the teacher and prime example of democracy and its Filipino marionettes in the political, economic and cultural fields echo and ape the misrepresentation. In this regard, we have always taken pains to distinguish the official ideology of pro-imperialist conservative liberalism from the anticolonial and anti-imperialist progressive liberalism that has characterized the best of petty-bourgeois thinking since the old democratic revolution.

US imperialism and the local reactionaries use the subjectivist and opportunist ideology and language of the petty bourgeois to sugarcoat imperialist as well as subservient policies, trample upon the basic national and democratic rights of the toiling masses of workers and peasants and attack the new-democratic revolution. They talk about free enterprise and individual rights in the abstract to obfuscate the reality of imperialist and class exploitation and oppression.

The neoliberal language of so-called globalization is nothing but a recycling of the antiquated bourgeois-liberal catchphrase, "free marketplace of goods and ideas". It is calculated to assail and put aside the Marxist-Leninist critique of

modern imperialism, exactly at a time that the rapidly rising social character of the productive forces through the adoption of higher technology by the imperialists in their own countries makes the capitalist relations of production and the relations of the imperialists and the oppressed peoples more untenable than ever before.

In a conspicuously sinking “emerging” market like the Philippines, the mainstream exponents of “free trade” globalization insist on using neoliberal language. But marginal though special ideological and political agents of the ruling system tout globalization as an irresistibly new fact of life, as something that supposedly makes the anti-imperialist and class struggle irrelevant and outdated and as something that can be reformed for making a “civil society”.

Since the late 1970s these pseudoprogressive recruits of imperialism and local reaction from the petty bourgeoisie have claimed that the Philippine social economy is no longer predominantly agrarian and semifeudal but an industrial capitalist one because of the supposed economic development under the big comprador-landlord Marcos regime. Since the coming to power of Ramos in 1992, they have proceeded to claim that the Philippine economy is so tightly integrated into the global economy that the question of national sovereignty and independence has become passe.

The current worsening crisis of the world capitalist system is bringing to the surface the basic contradictions between the imperialist countries and the oppressed peoples, among the imperialist countries themselves, and between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie in the imperialist countries. The illusion of free trade globalization is dissipating. The reality of nation-states and distinct modes of production are more conspicuous than ever before. The whole world is now in social and political turmoil. This is the eve of social revolution on an unprecedented scale.

We are clearly still in the era of modern imperialism and the proletarian revolution and not in a nebulous era of “globalization” or in a utopia of liberalism where everything is for sale and the invisible hand of self-interest peaceably settles everything in the market. In fact, the crisis of overproduction is already driving the imperialists to wrangle over the shrinking market.

Most important development

So far in Philippine history, the most important development by way of continuing the unfinished democratic revolution against the imperialists and the local reactionaries is the reestablishment of the Communist Party of the Philippines under the guidance of the theory of the revolutionary proletariat and its adoption and implementation of the general line of new-democratic revolution through protracted people's war.

In representation of the revolutionary proletariat, the CPP brings to a new and higher level the revolutionary struggle of the Filipino people for national liberation and democracy. It is armed with the ideological weapon to contend with and defeat the fallacies and lies of imperialism, revisionism and reaction. It has also proven in deed for more than three decades that it has an effective strategy and tactics to preserve and accumulate the revolutionary armed strength of the people.

Without the ongoing new-democratic revolution through protracted people's war, there is no hope for the Filipino people to liberate themselves from the clutches of foreign and feudal domination. Foreign domination would continue for another 400 years and US domination would continue for another hundred years if all that we did in that course of time were to seek accommodation, reforms and civility from a ruling system that is inherently oppressive and violent against the toiling masses.

For the Filipino people to achieve national liberation and democracy, there must be organized forces, including a revolutionary party, a people's army, mass organizations and organs of political power to carry on the struggle and defeat the enemy. Fighting the enemy also involves fighting its special ideological and political agents who are used either to penetrate and liquidate from within the revolutionary forces or attack them from the flanks or behind.

The Second Great Rectification Movement within the Communist Party of the Philippines is of great importance not only for the Party itself but also for the broad masses of the people. It is an educational movement to heighten revolutionary resolve against the enemy and to rectify both malicious and honest errors. It is also a practical constructive movement to further strengthen the revolutionary forces and the people in their struggle.

In the new-democratic revolution, there is always the need for an echelon of alliances: the basic alliance of the workers and peasants, the progressive alliance

of the toiling masses and the urban petty bourgeoisie, the patriotic alliance of the progressive forces and the middle bourgeoisie and, whenever possible and necessary, the unstable temporary alliance with sections of the reactionaries — all for the purpose of isolating and destroying the power of the enemy, the most reactionary puppet of the imperialists.

Front runner in the anti-imperialist struggle

By staying on the road of new-democratic revolution through protracted people's war, the CPP builds the strength of the people to win victory and march further on to socialism. In the whole world today, the Filipino people are among front runners in the revolutionary struggle of the oppressed peoples for national liberation and democracy against imperialism and the local reactionaries.

In the past, the Filipino people had the distinction of being the first nation in Asia to wage and win the old democratic revolution against a colonial power. Again, they have the distinction of being among the most persevering and most successful in waging the new-democratic revolution through protracted people's war. They serve as a torch bearer of international significance in the transition from the 20th to the 21st century.

This transition is one from a century of great victories of socialist and national liberation movements, temporarily defeated due to revisionist betrayal, to a century of greater struggles and greater victories of the world proletariat and oppressed peoples. It is pure nonsense to think that history ends with monopoly capitalism and bourgeois liberalism.

The scientific basis for our revolutionary optimism is the chronic and ever worsening crisis of the world capitalist system and the irrepressible efforts of the revolutionary forces to learn from history, to resist oppression and exploitation and to carry the revolutionary struggle forward.

Experience of the Communist Party of the Philippines in the Anti-Imperialist and Anti-War Fronts

May 4, 2003

Dear comrades: warmest greetings of comradeship and revolutionary solidarity to all the delegations in the current Brussels Communist Seminar! I am grateful to the Workers Party of Belgium for affording me the opportunity to interact with you even as certain obstacles prevent me from being with you.

The European Council of the European Union, in obedience to the US government, has listed me, together with the Communist Party of the Philippines (CPP) and the New People's Army (NPA), as "terrorist". In that connection, the Dutch state has terminated the measly benefits for food, rent and medical insurance that are due to me as a recognized political refugee. My small personal bank account has been frozen. I am restrained from traversing the short distance between Utrecht in The Netherlands and Brussels in Belgium.

The US has the temerity to call the CPP, NPA and me as "terrorist" and to impose punitive measures. It uses the 11 September attacks as a license for demonizing and attacking as "terrorist" national liberation movements, governments assertive of national independence and their leaders, and for launching wars of aggression against Afghanistan and Iraq and threatening anti-imperialist leaders with assassination by the CIA.

US imperialism is the No. 1 terrorist power in the entire history of mankind. It has inflicted the daily violence of imperialist exploitation on the people in their billions. By unleashing wars of aggression, using nuclear and other high-tech weapons of destruction, sponsoring puppet regimes of open terror and instigating

massacres, it has murdered and injured people by the millions.

I. CPP view of US imperialism and war

As Lenin said, imperialism, as the highest stage of capitalism in America and Europe, and later in Asia, became defined in the period 1898-1914. He pointed out that the chief historical landmarks that ushered in the era of modern imperialism or monopoly capitalism were the Spanish-American War (1898), the Anglo-Boer War (1899-1902), the Russo-Japanese War (1904-05), and the economic crisis in Europe in 1900.

Having become monopoly capitalist towards the end of the nineteenth century, the US was impelled to expand its economic territory. It acquired colonies as market for its surplus manufactures, as field of investment for its surplus capital, as cheap source of raw material and as sphere of influence.

As a latecomer in the acquisition of colonies for imperialist exploitation, the US calculated that it could easily grab such colonies as Puerto Rico, Cuba and the Philippines from the old colonial power Spain. Thus, it started the Spanish-American War in 1898. It blew up its own battleship Maine in Cuba, killing nearly 300 of its own naval officers and men, and blaming Spain for this to gain a pretext for declaring war.

The Philippines was of special interest to the US imperialists as a key point in their scheme to turn the Pacific Ocean into an "American lake" and as a staging base for them to get a piece of the "Chinese melon". But the Filipino people had already begun their revolution for national independence against Spain as early as 1896. Theirs was the first bourgeois democratic revolution in Asia. And they succeeded in 1898 in liberating the entire Philippines, with the exception of the walled city of Manila.

At first, the US imperialists pretended to make friends with the Philippine revolutionary leadership. But soon enough, they revealed fully their evil intent to become the new colonial masters of the Filipino people. After purchasing the Philippines from Spain for US\$20 million in the Treaty of Paris on 30 December 1898, they ignited on 4 February 1899 a full-scale war of aggression against the Filipino people.

To justify the aggression, the aggressors spread the lie that Filipino revolutionaries were poised to massacre all white foreigners in Manila, and that

they were so uncivilized as to need education for self-government. President McKinley went so far as to claim that God woke him up one night and mandated him to further Christianize the Filipino people and teach them democracy.

From the beginning of the Filipino-American War in 1899 to the formal end of the so-called pacification campaigns in 1913, the US aggressors killed at least 1.5 million Filipinos. But claiming far more victims, from generation to generation, is the daily violence of imperialist exploitation: first, in the colonial and semifeudal period from 1902 to 1941, and then in the semicolonial and semifeudal period from 1946 to the present.

The Japanese fascists drove away the US colonialists in early 1942 and occupied the Philippines in 1942-45 during the second interimperialist world war. And for three years, the merger party of the communists and socialists led the People's Army Against Japan in waging a successful people's war against the Japanese imperialists and establishing a people's government in several provinces. But in 1945, the US imperialists came to re-conquer most and eventually all provinces of the Philippines.

The US granted sham independence to the country in 1946. But since then, it has retained economic, political, military and cultural dominance, and has used the local exploiting classes of big compradors and landlords as agents of exploitation and oppression. The Philippine ruling system has remained semicolonial and semifeudal in character. Correspondingly, the Filipino people wage a national democratic revolution.

II. CPP experience in the anti-imperialist front

All Filipino communists and other Filipino patriots are keenly aware of the fact that US imperialism is responsible for the brutal conquest and colonization of the Philippines, repeated suppression of the communists since its establishment in 1930, re-conquest of the country after World War II, the crushing of the people's armed revolutionary movement in the early 1950s and the rule of intense anti-communist reaction up to the early 1960s.

Since its reestablishment on 26 December 1968, the Communist Party of the Philippines (CPP) has always resolutely and militantly upheld the general line of struggle for national liberation and democracy through protracted people's war against US imperialism and the local exploiting classes.

In 1968 the CPP included in its ranks proletarian revolutionaries who had been tempered in struggles against US and Japanese imperialism since the 1930s, and who had been inspired by the victories of the communists and the people in the Soviet Union, China, Korea, Indochina, Cuba, and elsewhere.

Since 1968, CPP cadres and members have gained rich experience from the antifascist, anti-imperialist, democratic and antifeudal struggles from the time of Marcos to the present. They have studied, emulated and supported the anti-imperialist struggles abroad since the 1960s, especially those in Cuba, Vietnam, China, and elsewhere.

The CPP has led the Filipino people in mass struggles against all unequal treaties, agreements, policies, laws and arrangements that put the US in control of the Philippine economy, politics, military and culture. Most potent of the weapons wielded by the CPP are the New People's Army and the National Democratic Front of the Philippines.

The CPP leads the NPA to fight and overthrow the reactionary puppet ruling system through a protracted people's war. This is waged mainly on the basis of the worker-peasant alliance. The people's army fights and accumulates armed strength in the countryside until it can seize power in the cities on a nationwide scale. Currently, the revolutionary war has taken the form of intensive and extensive guerrilla warfare on an ever expanding and deepening mass base.

In carrying out the united front, the CPP develops several types of alliances: the basic worker-peasant alliance that is the foundation of the entire revolutionary movement, the progressive alliance of the toiling masses and urban petty bourgeoisie, the patriotic alliance of the progressive forces and middle bourgeoisie, and the unstable and temporary alliance with sections of reactionaries in order to isolate and destroy the power of the enemy, which is the most reactionary force most servile to US imperialism.

In any kind of alliance, the CPP, as the advanced detachment of the working class, proves itself as the leading force. It makes clear the line of march and works hard to ensure the realization of objectives. It unites with other forces, in accordance with the line and objectives agreed upon, in order to gather large numbers of masses against the enemy.

The CPP also uses reasoning based on the facts, to struggle against wrong ideas

and acts that prejudice the interest of the alliance either through "Left" opportunist recklessness or Right opportunism, yielding to the demands of the enemy. It maintains initiative and independence in order to resolutely advance the revolution even as there is flexibility in the application of united front policy and tactics.

The CPP builds organs of democratic political power and mass organizations in connection with the rural-based revolutionary armed struggle as the principal form of struggle. At the same time, it coordinates the various forms of struggle, armed and nonarmed, illegal and legal, and various types of mass organizations (for workers, peasants, women, youth, professionals, and so on) and mass movements in urban and rural areas.

Soon after the re-establishment of the CPP in 1968, the US imperialists and the Marcos regime calculated that they could destroy the CPP and the resurgent revolutionary mass movement by releasing more funds to increase military troops and equipment. Eventually, the US-Marcos regime declared martial law and imposed a 14-year fascist dictatorship on the people.

But the CPP and the revolutionary mass movement were not destroyed. They grew in strength by persevering in armed struggle along the antifascist, anti-imperialist and anti-feudal line. Ultimately, the CPP proved successful in using the policy and tactics of the broad united front to cause the isolation and downfall of the Marcos fascist dictatorship.

Marxism-Leninism guides the CPP. The Party has firmly pursued the general line of new democratic revolution, with a socialist perspective. It has rectified major errors of subjectivism and opportunism through the Second Great Rectification Movement. As a result, it has further strengthened itself ideologically, politically and organizationally.

By using the policy and tactics of the broad united front, the CPP has succeeded in causing the downfall of the puppet president Estrada in 2001 and recently compelled his successor Arroyo to announce her withdrawal from the 2004 presidential elections.

Any reactionary president or ruling clique can be isolated and removed from power through peaceful and gigantic mass actions. But it is not possible to overthrow the entire ruling system without armed revolution.

The CPP is therefore determined to pursue the strategic line of protracted people's war by which the armed revolutionary movement encircles the cities from the countryside and accumulates armed strength until this becomes adequate for seizing political power in the cities on a nationwide scale. At the same time, the CPP uses the policy and tactics of the united front to isolate, weaken and remove from power one reactionary ruling clique after another and in the process strengthen the revolutionary movement until it can overthrow the entire ruling system.

The crisis of the world capitalist system and the Philippine ruling system is worsening so grievously. By following the US-dictated line of "free market" globalization, the post-Marcos regimes have successively generated a crisis of the domestic ruling system. This crisis is linked to and is far worse than the crisis of the world capitalist system.

The current Arroyo puppet regime has become so desperate economically and politically that it accepts the US demand to intervene militarily in the Philippines under the pretext of waging a war on terrorism in a "second front". The Bush regime is trying to deploy more US combat troops under various guises, such as training exercises and civic action, and to build US military bases in the Philippines in violation of Philippine national sovereignty and territorial integrity.

The armed revolution in the Philippines has the character of a civil war between the revolutionaries and the local reactionaries. But the US imperialists are hell bent on engaging in and escalating military intervention, possibly up to the level of all-out aggression. By its own pronouncements, the CPP is prepared to lead a war of national liberation against US imperialism if necessary, and to let the Filipino people avail themselves of the opportunity to exact retribution from the US imperialists for their blood debts.

III. Need for broad solidarity against imperialism and war

The CPP is engaged in a just struggle for national liberation and democracy against US imperialism and local reaction. In the spirit of proletarian internationalism as well as of broad anti-imperialist solidarity, it understands and supports similar struggles waged by the people of the world against imperialism and all reaction.

The CPP regards as just the revolutionary wars waged by the people against the imperialists and their reactionary puppets. And it opposes as unjust all wars of aggression and other violent actions unleashed by the imperialists. It adheres firmly to the line of struggling against imperialism and stopping imperialist war with the anti-war mass movement and, wherever possible, with revolutionary war.

US imperialism is by its nature aggressive. It uses terrorism in order to extend and strengthen its hegemony. It is the biggest producer, stockpiler and user of weapons of mass destruction. It engages in military intervention and aggression in order to have its way. It installs and props up puppet regimes of open terror and uses them to attack the people and revolutionary forces.

The crisis of overproduction within the world capitalist system has become so grave that the US has become more rapacious and more aggressive than ever, and is intensifying the exploitation of the people of the world and exacerbating the interimperialist contradictions by seizing the lion's share in the spoils of war. The monsters of chauvinism, racism and fascism are rearing their ugly heads in all imperialist countries and are indicating more violent strife in the struggle of the imperialist powers to redivide the world.

The current leaders of US imperialism calculate that they can revive the US and world capitalist economy by putting more capital into the hands of the monopoly bourgeoisie, whipping up hysteria over the 9/11 attacks, encouraging war production, unleashing wars of aggression, and capturing additional economic territory, especially sources and supply routes of oil. The US is extremely arrogant with its position as sole superpower and its high-tech weaponry.

In fact, US imperialism is afflicted with hyperpower hubris. It is overextended and continues to overreach. Its aggressive actions generate resistance from national liberation movements, people's revolutionary movements, and governments assertive of national independence. Other imperialist governments are squeezed and offended by the US drive for greater hegemony.

Since its reestablishment in 1968, the CPP has taken the initiative and cooperated with various forces in the Philippines to arouse and mobilize the broad masses of the people against imperialist wars of aggression, military intervention, threats of war, nuclear blackmail, foreign military bases, and economic and military blockades against countries asserting national

independence and nations and people struggling for national liberation and social revolution.

The CPP is ever conscious of the fact that the Philippines is an archipelago and that the people and revolutionary forces must be self-reliant, and must advance wave upon wave through expansion and consolidation. It is careful not to overextend itself beyond its current capabilities. It is also conscious of avoiding dependence on external factors. It welcomes support from abroad but does not depend on it. It supports revolutionary forces abroad and exhorts them to be self-reliant.

As communists, the cadres and members of the CPP wish the Philippine proletariat and people to seize political power in order to complete the national democratic revolution and proceed to socialist revolution. They wish thereby to contribute to the development of a broad anti-imperialist movement and the world proletarian revolution.

The CPP has engaged in certain types of relations with foreign parties and organizations. Some relations are distinctly within the ideological framework of Marxism-Leninism and others within the framework of broad anti-imperialist solidarity. The CPP promotes direct people-to-people relations through mass formations, on the basis of broad anti-imperialist solidarity. In opposing imperialism and war, the CPP directly or through the NDFP strives to develop relations of cooperation with some foreign governments and intergovernmental agencies.

There is an acute need for all possible forces in the world to engage in mutual support and cooperation in order to build a broad anti-imperialist solidarity. An international united front is needed to confront the No. 1 imperialist and terrorist power, and be on guard against other imperialist powers. The revolutionary proletariat, through communist parties, trade unions and states committed to socialism, must somehow be involved and active in such an international united front and must give full play to the broad mass movement.

As in the national united front, there are pitfalls, and there are ways of avoiding them in the international united front. The communists leading the progressive forces must see to it that the international united front is not led astray, shrunk or disintegrated by either "Left" or Right opportunist errors. The forces of the Left must always strive to win over the Middle and take advantage of splits within the

Right in order to isolate and defeat the enemy US imperialism, which is now the worst of the imperialists.

It is inspiring to see the growing mass movement throughout the world against imperialism and against war, particularly against the US war of aggression against Iraq and the subsequent occupation of this country. This global mass movement has been successful. Communist parties have supported it and have consciously avoided prejudicing the broad united front and mass character of the movement. Thus, a broad range of political forces and the organized and the spontaneous masses come together easily to rise up and rally against the imperialist war.

Recent public pronouncements of the CPP express the hope that the mass movement will continue to develop extensively and vigorously so that US imperialism will be discredited, isolated and ultimately defeated despite its powerful high-tech weaponry. The internal rottenness of US imperialism as a politico-economic system has become conspicuous. It is only a matter of time that US military power is exhausted by its own success in carrying out aggressive acts and driving the people of the world to rise up in revolutionary resistance.

The cadres and members of the CPP have constantly called for a common front against US imperialism. They are determined to carry forward the Philippine revolution and to extend moral and political support to the revolutions of other peoples all over the world. They are grateful to the people abroad who support the Philippine revolution by their revolutionary movements. They have drawn lessons and inspiration from them.

In their very formation as communists, they have committed themselves to advance the Philippine revolution as well as the world proletarian revolution. They hope that someday imperialism would be defeated, socialism becomes dominant in the whole world and communism becomes possible. They look forward to a bright future without imperialism, without war and without exploitation of one class by another.

Stand with the Filipino People against the Imperialist Master and the Puppet

Press Statement, October 18, 2003

I hereby stand with the Filipino people in demonstrating their outrage against US imperialism and the puppetry of the Macapagal-Arroyo regime through mass protest actions and the burning of US flags and the effigies of Macapagal-Arroyo and Bush junior on the occasion of the latter's eight-hour visit to Manila today.

The occasion reminds the entire nation of the malevolent relationship between the imperialist superpower and the chief representative of local reactionary classes in perpetuating the semicolonial and semifeudal character of Philippine society, in escalating oppression and exploitation and maintaining the current anti-national, anti-democratic corrupt and brutal regime.

The imperialist master is on a rendezvous with his most servile puppet in Southeast Asia in order to exchange flatteries and celebrate their obscene relationship amidst the rapidly worsening global and domestic crisis due to the basic plunderous and aggressive character of monopoly capitalism. They are renewing their lopsided collaboration in hyping and pursuing the bankrupt policies of neoliberal globalization, state terrorism, wars of aggression such as those against Afghanistan and Iraq and the growing US military intervention in the Philippines.

I am deeply pleased that the recent publication of the books, *Philippine Economy and Politics* and *US Terrorism and War in the Philippines*, has somehow helped in the preparations for mass protest against the Bush visit. I hope that such educational material can continuously help to strengthen the resolve of the Filipino people to fight for national and social liberation against US imperialism and the local exploiting classes of big compradors and landlords.

I condemn the orders of the US-directed Macapagal-Arroyo regime to the military and police forces to show off and use force against the broad masses of the people in order to block, attack and frustrate the free exercise of the

democratic right to speak and assemble. I urge the military and police personnel of the regime to desist from violating the rights of the people.

At the same time, I am confident that by their own patriotic determination and their resourcefulness and skills the broad masses of the people in the national capital region and nationwide will express in utmost clarity and full strength their repudiation of the historical, continuing and latest schemes of US imperialism and its local puppets against the Filipino nation.

Admiral Timothy Keating's Threat to Escalate US Military Intervention

June 28, 2007

Far worse human rights violations can be expected to follow from the statements of US Pacific Forces commander Admiral Timothy Keating that the US is going to tighten its “anti-terror military cooperation” with the Arroyo regime and is willing to escalate the long-running US military intervention in the Philippines in order to fight the New People’s Army (NPA) led by the Communist Party of the Philippines (CPP) upon the request of the Arroyo regime.

Admiral Keating’s statements appear to be coordinated with attempts of the Arroyo regime to use the so-called Human Security Act (Anti-Terror Law) to intimidate the National Democratic Front of the Philippines (NDFP), further escalate human rights violations and pressure the NDFP towards capitulation in the guise of a ceasefire agreement. In violation of The Hague Joint Declaration, the national security adviser Norberto Gonzales has shamelessly set such kind of ceasefire as precondition to the resumption of formal talks in the peace negotiations.

My estimate is that the Filipino people and the revolutionary forces will become more determined than ever before to wage the national democratic revolution through people’s war and that they are not at all cowed by the actual atrocities and threats that have been unleashed against them by the US and the Arroyo puppet regime. In their most recent pronouncements, the CPP and NPA have expressed readiness to fight every degree of military intervention and aggression by US imperialism.

At the same time, the NDFP has consistently made clear that it is willing to resume the formal talks in peace negotiations after certain prejudicial questions are answered satisfactorily and that ceasefire is possible upon the forging of a 10-point concise agreement for an immediate just peace proposed by the NDFP since several years ago through Speaker Jose de Venecia.

The prejudicial questions that need to be resolved first of all include the gross and systematic human rights violations, the murder and abduction of NDFP consultants in the peace negotiations, the “terrorist” listing of the CPP, NPA and the NDFP chief political consultant and the misappropriation of funds for the indemnification of the victims of human rights violations under the Marcos regime.

The ten points in the aforesaid concise agreement for an immediate just peace are clear principles to guide the forging of comprehensive agreements on socio-economic and on political reforms. But the bloodthirsty elements in the Cabinet Oversight Committee on Internal Security (chiefly executive secretary Eduardo Ermita and national security adviser Norberto Gonzales) have frenziedly engaged in gross and systematic human rights violations in a vain attempt to terrorize and pacify the revolutionary movement and compel the NDFP to capitulate.

Further military actions and further threats from the US are futile. Everyone knows that the collaboration between US imperialism and the Marcos fascist dictatorship failed to destroy the revolutionary movement but succeeded in pushing its growth and advance. Since 2002, the US and the Arroyo regime have exposed the limits of what they can do by failing to completely subdue the minuscule Abu Sayyaf bandit group. The US is sinking in the quagmires of its own making in Iraq and Afghanistan. Bush himself is floundering in Washington because of his wars of aggression, abuse and misuse of public resources and other impeachable crimes.

Further atrocities and further threats from the Arroyo regime are also futile. The excessive local and foreign borrowing to conjure the illusion of economic growth and misuse of huge public funds to rig the local and congressional elections will come crashing down on the regime. The crisis of the world capitalist system is worsening and is aggravating the crisis of the local ruling system.

In their publications on philippinerevolution.net, the revolutionary forces have made clear that they will frustrate the scheme of the Arroyo regime to auction off the mineral wealth, land and other natural resources of the country and that they will target the worst of the foreign predators, human rights violators and plunderers. The broad masses of the people are so fed up with the impositions of the US imperialists and the puppetry of the Arroyo regime that they are intensifying more vigorously than ever before the struggle for national liberation and democracy.

US Ambassador Kenney Is Lying About US Involvement in MOA-AD Sham

August 16, 2008

US ambassador to the Philippines Kristie Kenney is blatantly lying by claiming that she was merely invited to witness the aborted signing of the Memorandum of Agreement on Ancestral Domain (MOA-AD), that she was ignorant of its content and that the US government had nothing to do with the GRP-MILF peace negotiations nor with the controversial MOA-AD.

It is a matter of public knowledge that on behalf of the US government she frequently travels to Mindanao and oversees US interests there, including US direct investments, military forces and pseudo-development projects. She has worked closely with the Philippine Facilitation Project of the US Institute of Peace in steering the course of GRP-MILF peace negotiations for the sake of US interests. The Filipino people know that the US covets the oil and other natural resources of Mindanao and wants to establish US military bases there to protect US imperial interests.

There is documentary evidence to prove that Ambassador Kenney is lying. This is the Special Report 202 by the US Institute of Peace, titled "Toward Peace in the Southern Philippines" (A summary and assessment of the USIP Philippine Facilitation Project) and dated February 2008. The report declares, "In 2003 the US State Department ...engaged the United States Institute of Peace (USIP) to facilitate a peace agreement between the government of the Republic of the Philippines (GRP) and the MILF."

It goes further, "Despite the challenges, USIP managed to build productive

relationships with both the GRP and MILF, helped the parties come up with creative solutions to stubborn issues of ancestral domain, and started dialogue between disparate Moro ethnic groups." It admits, "Through its activities, USIP introduced concepts and approaches that were useful to both government and MILF peace panels."

The report is quite frank in admitting the selfish interests of the US, "Today's complex diplomatic landscape increasingly requires new tools and techniques of conflict management, including quasi and nongovernmental actors, to accomplish US foreign policy goals. Because of its ability to deal with nonstate actors and sensitive issues underlying civil conflict, USIP can be a useful instrument for advancing US interests."

The USIP is funded by the US Congress and is an instrument of US foreign policy. But it misrepresents itself as an independent and nonpartisan institution. The chairman of the board is J. Robinson West who is chairman of PFC Energy, Washington. Members ex-officio are Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice and Secretary of Defense Robert Gates. Executive director of the Philippine Facilitation Project is G. Eugene Martin, a retired diplomat who once served as the deputy chief of mission at the US embassy in Manila.

The US is not interested in a just and lasting peace in either Bangsamoro land or in the entire Philippines. It is interested solely or mainly in advancing US interests amidst conditions of armed conflict. It merely pretends to facilitate the GRP-MILF peace negotiations when it sees big advantages in doing so. But in the case of the GRP-NDFP peace negotiations, it has outrightly sabotaged them by designating the revolutionary forces as "terrorist" and emboldening the Arroyo regime and its military forces to engage in gross and systematic human rights violations under the guise of combating "terrorism".

Politics of Repression in the Philippines

October 31, 2009

I thank the International Committee Against Disappearances, IBON Europe and the Filipino Refugees in the Netherlands for inviting me to give a brief background on the politics of repression in the Philippines.

It is an honor and privilege for me to speak on the same occasion with Edith Burgos and Jayel Burgos, whose beloved Jonas Burgos has been a victim of forced disappearance by the military forces of the Arroyo regime.

I have always admired the late Jose Burgos and his entire family for their high sense of patriotism and devotion to democracy. I am happy to provide the general historical, socioeconomic and political background to Edith's presentation of the current human rights situation in the Philippines and Jayel's of the Free Jonas Movement.

History of repression and exploitation in the Philippines

The Filipino people have long suffered a history of repression and exploitation. They went through more than three centuries of colonial rule by Spain, from the 16th to the 19th century. After they won national independence in 1898, the US unleashed an imperialist war of aggression to conquer the Philippines. It imposed a new colonial rule and laid out a semifudal economy. In 1946 it established a puppet state to rule the current semicolonial and semifudal ruling system.

Those who have wielded political power in several stages of Philippines history have repressed the Filipino people not merely for the pleasure of intimidating,

imprisoning, torturing and killing people but for such coldblooded reasons as the accumulation of private wealth through exploitation and all the social and cultural gratifications that wealth brings.

Spanish colonialism reached the Philippines initially in search of gold and spices. It was on a long term pursuit of sheer plunder upon the impulse of European mercantile capitalism. In addition to the dispossession and proletarianization of the peasants of Europe, colonialism was a major method of the primitive accumulation of capital. The Spanish colonizers employed divide and rule tactics and repressed the Filipino people in order to maintain a colonial and feudal system.

The most brutal forms of suppression were applied on the people who opposed the system or any of its aspects. Even when blood was not being shed, exploitation was a daily and more widespread form of violence to people who were required to render forced labor, pay feudal rent and give religious tribute. Ultimately, the Filipino people developed a national consciousness and a revolutionary unity of purpose, fought for national independence and won the first bourgeois democratic revolution of the old type in the whole of Asia.

Unfortunately, the US intervened and launched a war of aggression against the Filipino people. It killed 1.5 million Filipinos from 1899 to 1913 in order to impose a colonial and semifeudal system on the Philippines. The new colonial system of US monopoly capitalism involved a method of exploitation in which direct and indirect investments were made by US banks and corporations on a limited number of modern enterprises in order to facilitate the export of raw materials and the extraction of superprofits.

In the entire period of direct colonial rule, the US adopted and implemented repressive policies against the growing working class, against the peasant masses who demanded land reform and against the entire Filipino people who clamored for genuine, immediate and full independence. The US imperialists and their local reactionary allies became more repressive as the Communist Party, the revolutionary party of the working classes, emerged in 1930 and challenged the ruling system.

Another imperialist power, that of Japan, took over the Philippines from 1942 to 1945 and exacted a toll of one million deaths on the Filipinos in barbarous acts of repression. At the same time, the conditions of World War II and the Japanese

occupation gave rise to the armed revolutionary movement of the people led by the merger party of the Communist and Socialist parties in certain regions.

In reconquering the Philippines from Japan, the US wrought heavy destruction on Filipino lives and property. Soon after landing troops on Philippine soil in late 1944, it sought to destroy the revolutionary forces of the people that had run ahead in liberating Central Luzon. At any rate, the revolutionary forces and people held on to their arms and demanded national liberation and democracy for the Philippines.

Repression under the semicolonial and semifeudal system

The US granted a bogus kind of independence to the Philippines and established a puppet state in 1946. Since then, the Philippines has been a semicolonial and semifeudal country. The US conceded to the politicians and bureaucrats of the big compradors and landlords the responsibility for national administration. But it retained its dominant economic and military power as well as political and cultural sway through unequal treaties, agreements and arrangements.

The US has continued to rule the Philippines but this time indirectly through the local reactionary classes. Factions of the political representatives of these classes have taken turns in administering the puppet republic at first through the duopoly of the Liberal and Nacionalista parties from 1945 to 1972, then through the monopoly of political power by the fascist party, Kilusang Bagong Lipunan, from 1972 to 1986 and currently through the multiplicity of reactionary parties and coalitions.

Whichever of these parties has taken the reins of national administration, it has been subservient to the interests of US monopoly capitalism and the local exploiting classes. It goes to any length to repress the patriotic and progressive forces and mass movement of the people for national liberation and democracy. It collaborates closely with the US in undertaking repression.

The US has the biggest interest and the most decisive say in the policy-making and planning of repression in the Philippines. It provides indoctrination, strategic direction, officer training and military equipment to the apparatuses of repression. The military and police forces are beholden to the US. Up to 1992, they were controlled by the US military forces in huge US military bases that existed in the Philippines.

Even after their military bases were dismantled in 1992, the US military forces have continued to control the forces of repression in the Philippines. They have done so from their military bases in Japan, South Korea, Guam and Australia. They cover the Philippines with satellites, air patrols and naval patrols. They control the Philippine radar and sonar system. They have military stations in Philippine military camps as well as advisors, trainers, assets and units embedded in Philippine military and police offices and units.

The US used the regimes of Roxas, Quirino and Magsaysay to attack and destroy the revolutionary forces of the Filipino people within the period of 1946 to 1957. The backbone of the armed revolutionary movement was strategically broken in the years of 1950 to 1952, with more than 10,000 mass activists and cadres tortured and murdered by the military. As this movement subsided, the US and the local reactionaries became even more repressive and enacted the Anti-Subversion Law in 1957 in order to destroy any remnant, extension or successor of the old merger party of the Communist and Socialist parties.

However, the chronic crisis of the Philippine ruling system continued to worsen during the regimes of Garcia, Macapagal and Marcos within the period of 1957 to the end of the 1960s. The proletarian revolutionaries revived the anti-imperialist and anti-feudal mass movement among the workers, peasants and the youth. The puppet regimes tried to suppress the mass movement. Instead, this grew in strength and led to the founding of the new Communist Party of the Philippines in 1968 and the New People's Army in 1969.

Under the instigation of the US, the Marcos regime decided to declare martial law and impose a fascist dictatorship on the Philippines in 1972 in the vain hope of destroying the CPP and NPA. In fourteen years from 1972 to 1986, the military and police arbitrarily arrested and detained hundreds of thousands of people, tortured more than a hundred thousand, murdered tens of thousands of people and displaced more than 5 million people.

In the human rights case against Marcos in the US court system, nearly 10,000 cases of disappearances, torture and extrajudicial killings were documented and proven. But justice and indemnification for the victims of human rights violations have been elusive in the Philippines. Not a single military or police officer has been punished for any of the human rights violations.

The US and the local reactionaries have maintained the system of impunity for

the perpetrators of repression, from the level of Marcos to the master sergeant in the army. They decided in 1986 to drop Marcos and stop the blatant autocracy only because he had failed to suppress the revolutionary movement and also because he put the entire system at risk by having his political rival Aquino assassinated in 1983.

Further, they made sure that the post-Marcos regimes would continue the repression of the Filipino people even without martial law in order to maintain the system of exploitation by the multinational banks and firms and the local big compradors and landlords. The apparatuses of repression and their officers remained intact and continued to engage in human rights violations against the people, the legal democratic forces and the revolutionary forces.

The widow of Aquino became the president and put up a liberal democratic facade to her reactionary regime. After consolidating her ruling position and pretending to seek a peace agreement with the revolutionary movement, she unsheathed the sword of war and repression under Oplan Lambat Bitag and under the US-dictated doctrine of low intensity conflict against the revolutionary forces and the people. The subsequent regimes of Ramos, Estrada and Arroyo would have their respective national operational plans and also seek to suppress the revolutionary movement despite short periods of lip service to the need for peace negotiations.

What we are confronted with today in the Philippines under the Arroyo regime is state terrorism under Oplan Bantay Laya inspired by the US global war of terror and backed up by increased US military supplies and by the permanent deployment of US interventionist troops under the Visiting Forces Agreement. The US and the local reactionaries in the Philippines make the pretense of combating terrorism but they are in fact the ones perpetrating terrorism through the gross and systematic violation of human rights.

Oplan Bantay Laya has involved 1,093 documented cases of extrajudicial killings, 209 of forced disappearances, hundreds of those detained on trumped up charges, more than a thousand victims of torture, and hundreds of thousands of victims of forced evacuation. The reactionary military forces are escalating their gross and systematic violation of human rights as they follow the impossible order of the Arroyo regime to destroy or reduce the armed revolutionary movement to inconsequentiality before June 2010.

The Arroyo regime has become notorious throughout the world for the abduction, torture and extrajudicial killing of unarmed social activists, including workers, peasants, women, youth, priests and pastors, human rights advocates and journalists. The violators of human rights set up their victims by making false charges of terrorism, rebellion and murder and putting them on the list of the enemies of the state or the order of battle. Then the abductions, torture and extrajudicial killings follow.

Still further the psywar machinery of the reactionary armed forces spreads lies that the victims have committed offenses against the revolutionary movement and have therefore been victimized by their own comrades. The level of criminal cunning and malice of the perpetrators of human rights violations under the Arroyo regime surpasses that under the Marcos fascist dictatorship.

Further repression in prospect and need for international solidarity

The current crisis of the world capitalist system is the worst since the Great Depression. It will continue to worsen in the years to come because the imperialist powers are not solving it but are aggravating it by using public money to bail out the big banks and corporations and raise profits on their balance sheets and not to revive the economy and increase employment. The imperialist powers and their puppets are promoting chauvinism, racism and fascism and are increasingly using state repression and unleashing wars of aggression in order to overcome the resistance of peoples and national liberation movements.

The crisis of the Philippine ruling system will continue to worsen due to its internal weaknesses and the global economic crisis. For decades, the US-directed policy of neoliberal globalization has further aggravated and deepened the underdeveloped pre-industrial and agrarian character of the Philippine economy. The demand for Philippine raw-material and semi-manufactured exports has gone down. Debt service is increasing and yet new credit is decreasing.

Social discontent is widespread and intense among the toiling masses of workers and peasants and the middle social strata due to the rising mass unemployment, the sinking real incomes, the soaring prices of basic commodities and services, the growing tax burden, the lack or inadequacy of social services and other socioeconomic problems. The rulers in the Philippines do not solve these problems but increasingly unleash violence to suppress the people's protests and

demands for respect for their rights and improvement of their social conditions.

The US and the local reactionaries are shifting the burden of crisis to the working people. As they exploit the people more, they repress the people more as they seek to preempt or stop resistance. The broad masses of the Filipino people are capable of fighting for their rights and interests. But they also need the solidarity and support of the people of the world to fight the imperialist powers most effectively.

On US Strategic Interests in the Philippines

Interview by John Toledo, Philippine Collegian

November 24, 2011

1. Please comment on the reopening and continuous strengthening of the MDT (Mutual Defense Treaty) as seen in Hillary Clinton's visit here in the Philippines.

JMS: The Mutual Defense Treaty is the oft-cited foundation for the Visiting Forces Agreement, which has been used to allow the stationing of US military forces and the endless relay of such forces in larger numbers in the country, despite the well-celebrated end of the US-RP Military Bases Agreement. The MDT is a one-sided document which imposes obligations on the Philippines in violation of national sovereignty and territorial integrity and allows the US to go through its constitutional process and balance its conflicting interests before coming to the defense of the Philippines in case of an attack on the latter.

At any rate, Hillary Clinton came to the Philippines to declare that the US is increasing its attention on its economic, political and security interests in the Philippines and East Asia and is seeking to strengthen US hegemony in the Asia-Pacific region. The US is pushing the so-called Trans-Pacific Partnership in order to pressure China to privatize its state-owned enterprises and to submit further to US wishes in the world capitalist system. It is also trying to increase its military presence in East Asia by way of confronting the rising power of China in the region.

2. How would this affect the Philippines as a whole, especially in terms of protecting the sovereignty of our country and in the issues regarding the Spratlys and disputes in Mindanao (continuous Balikatan/VFA and the MILF fight for

sovereign Bangsamoro land)?

JMS: The US has always regarded the Philippines as a strategic base in various respects and considers our islands as practically an unsinkable US naval fleet. The Philippines has gained even more importance as a strategic base to the US because it wants to counter the rise of China in the region and because it simply has to pay close attention to a region where a great part of the world's economic activity and trade occur. The US wants to increase its economic, political and military domination of the region and is decided on using the Philippines for the purpose.

We can expect more US military intervention in the Philippines. It has used for sometime the CIA-created Abu Sayyaf as the pretext for introducing military forces via Balikatan/VFA not only in Mindanao but in the entire country, for meddling in the negotiations between the Manila government and the MILF and for seeking to grab oil and other major natural resources from Moroland. It is also using the issue of the Spratlys in order to beef up its military forces in the Philippines. But the Philippines cannot be too sure about US support because the US has far greater economic and security interests in its relations with China.

3. Please comment on Barack Obama's speech that Southeast Asia shall be the center of focus by imperialist America.

JMS: Indeed, Barack Obama's speech underscores the focal interest of the US in Southeast Asia. In that regard, the Philippines plays the key role in serving US hegemony in Southeast Asia and further on Southeast Asia plays the key role for the maintenance of US hegemony in East Asia. In the previous answers, I have already laid out the interests and the new considerations and new thrusts of the US in the region.

4. Please comment on the continuous stranglehold of America, as imperialist, in our country. They have actually said in the Wikileaks to maintain our country's mode of production as "feudal" especially in setting up their markets and killing our local industries.

JMS: It is a sad fact that the US controls the Philippines economically, politically, culturally and militarily. The Philippines remains a semicolonial and semifeudal country because of the continuing infringement of our national sovereignty and prevention of economic development by the US. Indeed, the US

wants to maintain a “feudal” or more precisely a semifeudal mode of production in the Philippines in order to make it a political underling and an easy source of superprofits for the US monopoly banks and firms.

The rise of China in the region and because it simply has to pay close attention to a region where a great part of the world’s economic activity and trade occur. The US wants to increase its economic, political and military domination of the region and is decided on using the Philippines for the purpose. We can expect more US military intervention in the Philippines. It has used for sometime the CIA-created Abu Sayyaf as the pretext for introducing military forces via Balikatan/VFA not only in Mindanao but in the entire country, for meddling in the negotiations between the Manila government and the MILF and for seeking to grab oil and other major natural resources from Moroland. It is also using the issue of the Spratlys in order to beef up its military forces in the Philippines. But the Philippines cannot be too sure about US support because the US has far greater economic and security interests in its relations with China.

The Way Forward for the Filipino People Interview by Bill Fletcher, Jr.

November 25, 2011

1. Most people in the USA know little about the Philippines, its history, and/or its relationship to the USA. What do you believe are the reasons for this ignorance?

JMS: The US mass media are most responsible for informing, disinforming or simply keeping the American people ignorant about a country like the Philippines. I presume that most people in the USA become most aware of a country when the mass media are blaring out a certain extended course of sensational events of great interest to the US officialdom and the ruling class. I am sure that in the past there were times of long duration when the mass media called the attention of the American public to the Philippines, like when the US was justifying and carrying out its war of aggression against the Filipino people from 1899 onwards, when the Japanese fascists pushed the US out of the Philippines at the start of World War II and the US reconquered the Philippines in 1945 and when the US-propped Marcos fascist dictatorship was in the process of being overthrown.

When the extraordinary or sensational subsidies, the mass media pay less attention to the country and do not say much about the protracted reality of US colonial rule in the Philippines in most of the first half of the 20th century or the US semicolonial domination of the Philippines since 1946. The ruling system in the US does not allow the Americans who know the truth about the Philippines to impart their knowledge to the public promptly, widely and sustainedly through the mass media or any other means.

2. Given what you are saying, do you think that the US media has consciously mischaracterized the situation in the Philippines by focusing on groups like Abu Sayyaf?

JMS: Yes, the US media drum up US policy and corporate interests and consciously misrepresent the Philippine situation, as in the focusing on the Abu Sayyaf. This small bandit gang, whose origin can be traced to the CIA and intelligence operatives of the Philippine army who organized and used it against the Moro revolutionaries (MNLF and then MILF), is magnified as an extension of Al Qaida in order to serve the false claim of Bush that the Philippines is the second front of a global “war on terror” as well as to rationalize state terrorism and US military intervention in the Philippines.

Through the mass media, the US has spread the scare about terrorism in order to justify a whole range of actions: the curtailment of democratic rights in the US and on a global scale, the stepping up of war production to please the military-industrial complex and the unleashing of wars of aggression.

3. Would you sum up the situation in the Philippines, particularly the state of negotiations between the NDFP and the government; the situation facing workers and farmers; the overall economy; and fighting that may be taking place?

JMS: The Philippines is severely stricken by crisis because of the rotting semicolonial and semifeudal ruling system and the growing impact of the crisis of the US-led global capitalist system. The prices of the raw materials and semimanufactures produced for export by the Philippines are depressed and foreign loans to cover the trade deficits and debt service are becoming more onerous than before. There is now less demand for overseas contract workers and thus their remittances are decreasing. The global economic and financial crisis is hitting hard the Philippines. The growing public deficits (budgetary and trade) and the public debt are growing and exposing the bankruptcy of the big comprador-landlord state.

Various forms of popular resistance, including people’s war, are ever growing because of the extreme and ever-worsening conditions of exploitation and oppression of more than 90 percent of the people, the toiling masses of workers and peasants. Like preceding regimes, the Aquino regime wants to destroy the armed revolutionary movement. It is implementing the US-designed Oplan

Bayanihan, which is the same dog as Arroyo's Oplan Bantay Laya but which tries to be different by dressing up brutal military operations as peace and development operations and maintaining human rights desks in the reactionary army and national police for the purpose of shifting the blame for human rights violations to the revolutionaries. On the other hand, the New People's Army led by the Communist Party of the Philippines is carrying out a five-year plan to advance from the strategic defensive to strategic stalemate in the people's war, increasing the number of guerrilla fronts from 120 to 180.

While their respective armed forces continue to fight, the Government of the Philippines (GPH) and the National Democratic Front of the Philippines (NDFP) are supposed to engage in peace negotiations in order to address the roots of the armed conflict by forging agreements on social, economic and political reforms. But the GPH has paralyzed the peace negotiations by refusing to release a few political prisoners who are NDFP consultants in the negotiations and thus violating the Joint Agreement on Safety and Immunity Guarantees (JASIG). The GPH is also grossly violating the Comprehensive Agreement on Respect for Human Rights and International Humanitarian Law (CARHRIHL) by refusing to release more than 350 political prisoners who are imprisoned on false charges of common crimes.

4. You have described the Philippines as semicapitalist/semifeudal. Please explain what this means in practical terms. We are in the early years of the 21st century. How could there be a semifeudal situation in the Philippines? The Philippines seems, for all intents and purposes, to be tied into global capitalism.

JMS: You can say bluntly that the Philippines is capitalist and has long been capitalist since the 19th century if you mean that the commodity system of production and exchange through money has come on top of the natural economy of feudalism when local communities could subsist on a diversified agriculture and engage mainly in barter. The specialization in crops for domestic food (rice and corn) and for export (tobacco, hemp and sugar) and the import of a certain amount of manufactures from Europe for consumption pushed the domestic commodity system of production as well as integration with global capitalism through colonialism as a part of the primitive accumulation of capital in Europe and subsequently under the banner of colonial free trade.

But it is utterly wrong to say that the Philippines is industrial capitalist or even semi-industrial capitalist. The Philippines does not have an industrial foundation.

Its floating kind of industry consists of imported equipment paid for by the export of raw materials and by foreign loans necessitated by the chronic trade deficits. It is most precise to describe the Philippine economy as semifeudal to denote the persistence of the large vestiges of feudalism in the form of disguised and undisguised landlord-tenant relations and usury at the base of the economy, the peasant class constituting 75 percent of the population and the combination of the big compradors and landlords as the main exploiting classes. The big compradors are the chief financial and trading agents of the foreign monopolies and are often big landlords themselves, especially on land producing crops for export.

Global capitalism under the neoliberal policy of “free trade” globalization has not changed but has aggravated and deepened the pre-industrial and underdeveloped semifeudal character of the Philippine economy. The share of manufacturing with the use of imported equipment and raw materials under the policy of low-value added export-oriented manufacturing in the last three decades has decreased in comparison to that share under the previous policy of import substitution. The illusion of industrial development has been conjured by excessive foreign borrowing for consumption of foreign manufactures, by conspicuous private construction projects and by the sweatshops that engage in the fringe processing of imported manufactured components and yield little net export income.

Neither the series of bogus land reform programs since decades ago nor the neoliberal policy of imperialist globalization has broken up feudalism completely and given way to a well-founded industrialization. The backward agrarian and semifeudal character of the Philippine economy is now increasingly exposed by depression and ruination due to the decreasing demand for its type of exports, the closure of many semi-manufacturing sweatshops of export products, the tightening international credit and the decreasing remittances by overseas contract workers in the current prolonged global economic and financial crisis in this 21st century of desperate, barbaric and imploding global capitalism. The conditions have become more fertile for people’s war in the Philippines.

In the 1980s, certain elements in the Philippines pushed the notion that the Philippine economy was no longer semifeudal but semicapitalist or semi-industrial capitalist in order to glorify the Marcos fascist dictatorship as having industrialized the Philippines. This notion also aimed to undercut the Communist Party’s strategic line of protracted people’s war involving the encirclement of the

cities from the countryside by the armed revolutionary movement of the workers and peasants until such time that they have accumulated enough politico-military strength to seize the cities on a nationwide scale in a strategic offensive.

The bureaucrat big comprador Ferdinand Marcos conjured the illusion of industrial development by borrowing heavily from abroad and by importing consumption goods and luxuries and construction equipment and structural steel in order to build roads, bridges, hotels and other tourist facilities. The profligate spending of foreign loans only served to maintain the agrarian and pre-industrial character of the Philippine economy. Cognizant of the persistent semifeudal reality, the New People's Army under CPP leadership has been able to wage people's war successfully with the main support of the peasantry and under the class leadership of the working class.

5. When one talks of the Philippine working class, what are the main sectors in which it is found and how is neoliberalism affecting it?

JMS: The Philippine working class is found in such main sectors as the following: food and beverages, hotels and restaurants, public utilities (power generation, water and sewage system), mining and quarrying, metal fabrication (imported metals), car assembly, ship assembly, transportation, communications, mass media, assembly of electronic and electrical products, chemicals, pharmaceuticals, oil refining, construction, construction materials (cement and wood), banks and other financial institutions and public sector services (education, health, etc).

In the Philippines, the neoliberal policy has favored certain enterprises away from industrial development and has expanded employment in such enterprises during boom periods. The favored enterprises include those in mining and export-crop plantations, the assembly of electronic and electrical products, the semimanufacturing of garments, shoes and other low-value added products for reexport, car assembly, construction of office and residential towers, cement production, hotels and restaurants, business call centers and financial services. They are vulnerable to ups and downs characteristic of global capitalism under the neoliberal policy; and now to the worst crisis since the Great Depression. Closures and reduction of production have resulted in a high rate of unemployment and the further immiseration of the people.

Under the neoliberal policy, the working class has been subjected to wage

freezes and reductions, loss of job security, flexibilization or casualization (reducing the number of regular employees and increasing the number of temporaries or casuals), systematic prevention or break up of workers' unions and ceaseless attacks on trade union and other democratic rights. The kinds of enterprises generated by the neoliberal policy involve cheap labor and the most tiring and health-damaging processes and conditions. They also limit the number of regular employees and expand the ranks of the casuals subjected to a series of short-term employment contracts in order to circumvent the law on regular employment. The scarcity of employment opportunities in the Philippines has compelled nearly 10 percent of the population to seek employment abroad as overseas contract workers and undocumented workers with practically no rights. This fact proves the lack of national industrial development.

6. You mention that certain elements in the Philippines had a different view than yours (and the CPP) on how to characterize the Philippines today. What were/are the practical implications of these differences? Do the differences preclude any degree of unity or are there strategic differences that are irreconcilable?

JMS: Certain elements in the revolutionary movement put forward the subjectivist notion in the early 1980s that Marcos had truly carried out land reform, industrialized the Philippines and raised its urbanization to the level of 40 percent. They subjectively concluded that it was already wrong to call the Philippines semifeudal and to pursue the strategic line of protracted people's war by way of accumulating strength in the countryside before seizing the cities. The subjectivist notion gave rise to two opportunist currents, Right and ultra-Left, both grounded on rejecting the line of protracted people's war but taking two different directions, one along the line of legalism and parliamentarianism and the other along the line of military adventurism.

The ultra-Left opportunists adopted the line of speeding up the regularization of the people's army or the premature formation of absolutely concentrated companies and battalions supposedly to catch up with the expected development of urban insurrections as the lead factor in the revolution. The prematurely enlarged military formations were unsustainable, became divorced from the masses and were easy for the enemy to locate and attack. When they incurred heavy losses, the ultra-Left opportunists engaged in scapegoating and blamed so-called deep penetration agents as the cause of their disasters.

Meanwhile, the Right opportunists called for making legal struggle the main form of struggle against the dictatorship and for taking out working class leadership from the National Democratic Front of the Philippines supposedly to attract more people. After Marcos fell in 1986, they wanted to join the Corazon Aquino government and some of them succeeded in joining the new reactionary government. After failing to swing the Communist Party to a line of reformism, they fragmented into various groups and adopted various lines, including Gorbachovism, Trotskyism, social democracy, neorevisionism and even neoliberalism.

The most notorious and most aggressive of the Right and ultra-Left opportunists have found jobs in the regimes of Cory Aquino, Ramos, Estrada, Arroyo and Noynoy Aquino and the very worst of them have even joined the intelligence agencies. They would be most hostile to any suggestion of reconciliation or unity with the CPP. But many of those they have misled are known to have returned to the revolutionary movement or have dropped out to mind their own private lives.

7. What have been the chief obstacles to a negotiated settlement between the NDFP and the government?

JMS: The Manila government and NDFP have their respective constitutions, governments and armies. To lay the ground for peace negotiations, they issued The Hague Joint Declaration to define the framework for peace negotiations. They agreed to address the roots of the armed conflict or the civil war by negotiating and forging agreements on human rights and international humanitarian law and on social, economic and political reforms. They also agreed that they are guided by the mutually acceptable principles of national sovereignty, democracy and social justice and that no precondition shall be made by any side to negate the inherent character and purpose of peace negotiations, i.e., no side can demand the surrender of the other side.

Under the current Aquino regime, his presidential adviser and his negotiating panel want to undermine and nullify the aforesaid declaration by asserting that it is a document of perpetual division. They are practically demanding the immediate surrender of the revolutionary movement. They do not respect the agreement on the sequence, formation and operationalization of the reciprocal working committees that are to negotiate and work out the agreements on reforms. The question of what kind of authority will be formed to implement the

comprehensive agreements on reforms shall be settled when the time comes for negotiating the political and constitutional reforms.

The Benigno Aquino III regime has shown no respect for and has in fact violated the Joint Agreement on Safety and Immunity Guarantees (JASIG) by refusing to release some 14 political prisoners who are NDFP negotiating personnel and are therefore JASIG-protected. It has not called to account those military and police personnel who have abducted, tortured and murdered NDFP consultants who are JASIG-protected. Also, it has violated the Comprehensive Agreement on Respect for Human Rights and International Humanitarian Law by condoning violations of human rights of suspected revolutionaries and sympathizers by the Arroyo regime and by his own troops and by refusing to release 350 political prisoners who are unjustly imprisoned on trumped-up charges of common crimes.

The regime keeps on demanding ceasefire in order to distract public attention from the agreements to address the roots of the civil war through basic reforms. The NDFP has offered truce and alliance on the basis of a general declaration on common intent on ten points, including the assertion of national independence, empowerment of the working people, land reform and national industrialization, immediate assistance and employment for the impoverished and unemployed, promotion of a patriotic, scientific and popular culture, self-determination of national minorities and independent foreign policy for peace and development.

The biggest obstacle to the peace negotiations is US political and military intervention. The US has upset the peace negotiations by unjustly designating the CPP, the NPA and the NDFP chief political consultant as terrorists. It has dictated upon the Aquino regime to draw up Oplan Bayanihan under the US Counterinsurgency Guide, which considers peace negotiations as a mere psywar device for outwitting, isolating and destroying the revolutionary movement. Oplan Bayanihan is a campaign plan of military suppression. But it masquerades as a peace and development plan. It regards peace negotiations only as a means to enhance the triad of psywar, intelligence gathering and combat operations. Many people think that the US does not allow the puppet regime to make the overall agreement for a just and lasting peace with the NDFP.

8. Optimally what would a settlement between the NDFP and the government look like? What is the vision of the NDFP for a future Philippines?

JMS: The Communist Party of the Philippines, the New People's Army and the National Democratic Front of the Philippines have declared that their line in the peace negotiations is no different from their line of struggle for national liberation and democracy in the people's war, whose ultimate goal is a just and lasting peace. Through peace negotiations, they seek to forge agreements with the Manila government on social, economic and political reforms in order to pave the way for a just and lasting peace.

The NDFP is desirous of a settlement in which the national sovereignty of the Filipino people and territorial integrity of the Philippines are upheld and unequal treaties, agreements and arrangements with foreign powers are done away with. The workers and peasants who compose the majority of the people must be empowered in order to have real democracy. Land reform and national industrialization must be carried out in order to have real development and realize just social relations. A national, scientific and mass culture and system of education and information must be promoted. An independent policy must be carried out in order to promote development and world peace.

The vision of the NDFP is for the Filipino people to enjoy far better conditions when they have national independence, democracy, economic development and social justice. They can aspire for still better conditions in a socialist society. The protracted and worsening crisis of global capitalism is resulting in the resurgence of the anti-imperialist movement as well as the socialist movement. An increasing number of people are saying that it is not enough to fight against capitalism and imperialism. It is necessary to fight for socialism.

9. Are you optimistic that negotiations can result in a just settlement?

JMS: Frankly speaking, I am not optimistic that negotiations can result in a just settlement. Like its predecessors, the Aquino regime is too servile to US imperialism and stands as the current chief representative of the local exploiting classes, the comprador big bourgeoisie and landlord classes. It has shown no inclination to assert national independence and undo unequal treaties, agreements and arrangements that keep the Philippines semicolonial. It also has shown no inclination to realize democracy through significant representation of workers and peasants in government and through land reform and national industrialization.

It has become clear that the reactionary government is not seriously interested in

peace negotiations as a way of addressing the roots of the armed conflict through agreements on basic reforms. Especially under the Aquino regime, the negotiators are always trying to lay aside the substantive agenda and to push the NDFP towards capitulation and pacification. Failing to accomplish their vile objective, they paralyze the peace negotiations by refusing to comply with obligations under the Joint Agreement on Safety and Immunity Guarantees.

10. What has been the role of the USA? And, have US policies towards the Philippines changed under President Obama? If so, how? What is your overall assessment of the Obama administration?

JMS: The USA has not been helpful to the peace negotiations. In fact, it has obstructed these. The US designation of the CPP, NPA and myself (the NDFP chief political consultant) as terrorists is meant to intimidate and put pressure on the NDFP in the peace negotiations. The US Counterinsurgency Guide actually tells the Philippine reactionary government that peace negotiations are dispensable but are useful only for purposes of psywar to mislead the people, possibly split the revolutionary forces and make the reactionary killing machine more efficient. But the US policy against peace negotiations with the NDFP has served to make the revolutionary forces and people more vigilant and more resolute in opposing US intervention in the internal affairs of the Philippines.

From the Bush II to the Obama regime, there has been no change in US policy towards the Philippines. Obama continues the policy of serving the interests of the US imperialists in the economic, political, military and cultural fields, collaborating with the big compradors and landlords, manipulating the puppet regime and its military forces, preventing land reform and national industrialization, controlling the fundamentals and direction of the Philippine cultural and educational system and stationing US troops in the Philippines and maintaining a permanent relay of US military forces under the US-RP Mutual Defense Pact and the Visiting Forces Agreement. Obama is a good servant of US imperialism. He used his glibness to make himself look better than the brazenly brutal Bush. But he is using the same glibness to cover many acts as bad as or even worse than those that made Bush infamous.

11. How did the CPP and NPA end up on a list of terrorist organizations? How did you end up on a list of supporters of terrorism? What steps are being taken to remove this label from you, the CPP and the NPA?

JMS: During the November 2001 visit of then Philippine president Gloria M. Arroyo to Washington, she requested then US President Bush to have the US agencies (State Department and the Office of Foreign Asset Control of the Treasury Department) designate the CPP, NPA and myself as “terrorists.” When US state secretary Colin Powell visited the Philippines in the early days of August 2002, he was reminded of the request and he assured Arroyo that he would act on it immediately upon his return to the US. Indeed, within August 2002 the CPP, NPA and I were designated as “terrorists.”

The Philippine and US governments connived to take advantage of the terrorism scare that followed 9/11. They themselves engaged in terrorism by deciding to undertake harmful actions against the CPP, NPA and myself. The designation of the CPP and NPA as “terrorist” is absolutely absurd because they have carried out revolutionary actions strictly within the Philippines, have not engaged in any cross-border attacks against the US and up to now have not been discovered to keep bank accounts in the US or anywhere else outside of the Philippines.

In my case, I have been falsely accused of being the current CPP chairman and being responsible for the alleged terrorist acts, in fact the revolutionary actions, of the NPA despite the fact that I have been out of the Philippines since 1986 when I was released from nearly a decade of detention under the Marcos fascist dictatorship. The malicious intention of the US and Philippine governments is to pressure the entire NDFP negotiating panel and me as its chief political consultant.

Like the Arroyo regime, the Aquino regime uses the terrorist designation as a kind of lever against the NDFP in the peace negotiations. It is impossible for the CPP, NPA or myself to begin any legal process for undoing the terrorist designation in the US or in any other country trailing after the US in the so-called war on terror, without proving first the legal personality and material interest of the plaintiff. In my case, I could take legal action against the Dutch government for putting me in the terrorist list because I live in The Netherlands. After my administrative complaint, the Dutch government repealed its decision to put me in its terrorist list but took the initiative in having me put in the terrorist list of the European Union in October 2002. I went to the European Court of Justice and I succeeded in having my name removed from the EU terrorist list in December 2010 after eight years of legal struggle.

12. Has the “terrorism” designation made it difficult for NDFP supporters in the

Philippines and in other parts of the world? If so, how? Have civilian political activists faced increased government-inspired violence as a result of this terrorism designation?

JMS: The “terrorism” designation is an incitement to hatred and violence and various forms of discrimination and harassment against known or suspected NDFP supporters in the Philippines and other parts of the world. Although the NDFP is not designated as terrorist, everyone knows that the CPP and NPA are the most important components of the NDFP. In the Philippines, the incitement to hatred and violence is quite deadly because the military, police and their death squads are emboldened to go on terrorist-hunting and are assured that they can abduct, torture and kill people with impunity.

Abroad, the EU, The Netherlands, the United Kingdom, Canada, Australia and New Zealand have followed the US in labeling the CPP and NPA as terrorists and there are adverse consequences to Filipinos who oppose imperialism and the puppet government in the Philippines. The overseas Filipinos are vulnerable to discrimination, harassment, nonrenewal of work contracts and denial of residence permits.

The Dutch authorities have advised the Norwegian government not to give any assistance to the NDFP negotiating panel for maintaining office and staff in The Netherlands on the claim that such assistance would be for building the infrastructure of “terrorists.” They have also raided the NDFP office and houses of NDFP panelists and consultants and seized documents and equipment needed in the peace negotiations.

13. Periodically the US media discuss alleged Muslim fundamentalist terrorism in the Philippines. What is the situation? In Mindanao there have been efforts at autonomy and self-determination. What has been the stand of the NDFP on these efforts? What is your take on allegations of Muslim terrorism?

JMS: The NDFP supports the Moro people’s struggle for self-determination, including the right to secede from an oppressive state or opt for regional autonomy in a non-oppressive political system. The Moro people have long been oppressed by the Manila government and by local reactionary agents. They are not free in their own homeland and are victims of Christian chauvinism and discrimination. They have been deprived of their ancestral domain. They have been robbed of agricultural land as well as forest, mineral and marine resources.

The Moro people have all the right to fight for national and social liberation. The NDFP has therefore found common ground for alliance with the Moro National Liberation Front (MNLF) and subsequently with the Moro Islamic Liberation Front (MILF) after the MNLF capitulated to the Ramos regime in 1996. By fighting well against their common enemy, the NDFP and the MILF gain better conditions for growing in strength and advancing in their respective struggles.

The US government and the US media exaggerate the threat of Muslim fundamentalist terrorism because they wish to promote the entry of US corporations for the purpose of plundering the rich natural resources of Mindanao, especially oil, gold and deuterium. They also wish to justify the current stationing of US military forces and eventually the basing of larger US military forces for the purpose of strategic control over Islamic countries in Southeast Asia and strategic countervailing of China and the DPRK in Northeast Asia.

Like Al Qaida, Abu Sayyaf was originally a creature of the CIA and the intelligence agency of the Armed Forces of the Philippines to counteract the MNLF. It has become a bandit gang since the capitulation of the MNLF. It has also been convenient for the US and Manila government to depict the Abu Sayyaf as a Muslim fundamentalist group and as an extension of the Al Qaida, since 2001 when Bush declared Moro land as the second front in the so-called global war on terror. There are indications that the US and Philippine governments continue to arm and finance the Abu Sayyaf in order to block the advance of the MILF in Sulu and to provide the pretext for US military intervention in the Philippines.

14. In the 1990s there were several splits from the CPP. There were charges and countercharges regarding sectarianism and militarism. Some who split seemed to have chosen to engage primarily in electoral politics. Some former CPP members have suggested that the CPP/ NPA has attempted to kill/silence political opponents. Please give us your take on this and on these allegations.

JMS: In answer to a previous question, I discussed the subjectivist ideological line that the Philippines was no longer semifeudal. Such line began to emerge in 1981 and induced the political currents of ultra-Left and Right opportunism among a few members of the CPP. Eventually in the early 1990s, there would be splinters, not big splits, initiated by grouplets who opposed the Rectification Movement which was launched by the Central Committee of the CPP in early

1992.

The rectification movement was an educational movement inside the CPP to repudiate, criticize and rectify the major errors of ultra-Left and Right opportunism that had caused serious damage to the CPP and the revolutionary mass movement since 1981. But there were elements, whose connections with enemy intelligence were eventually exposed, who stridently attacked the rectification movement as a bloody scheme of “Stalinist purge” and who tried to spread the fear that those found in error would be terribly punished.

The rectification movement was undertaken precisely to rectify the sectarian and military adventurist line of the ultra-Left opportunists who tried to accelerate ill-prepared tactical offensives and the unsustainable formation of companies and battalions supposedly to back up the impending urban uprisings of the armed city partisans and spontaneous masses as the leading force. No such armed urban uprisings ever occurred. But mass work in the countryside was neglected and the rural mass base had decreased by 15 percent in 1988 and by 60 percent in 1991.

Under the influence of the ultra-Left opportunists, CPP cadres in the urban underground (Davao City and Cagayan de Oro) also exposed themselves in the early 1980s to the enemy through mass actions which did not use the mantle of protection from the broad antifascist united front. When the ultra-Left line was resulting in effective enemy offensives, the ultra-Left opportunists did not look into their wrong line but instead engaged in scapegoating and in a bloody witch-hunt for presumed deep penetration agents and saboteurs.

By 1988, the ultra-Left opportunists were already a spent force, especially after the failure of the so-called nationally coordinated NPA operations, which resulted in a big loss of ammunition, without any gain in rifles. Frustrated, they swung to the Right and joined the longstanding Right opportunists. But certain ultra-Left opportunists who were captured by the enemy were recruited into the intelligence service. They were used to attack the CPP line of new democratic revolution through protracted people’s war. And they tried to discredit the rectification movement and they collaborated with the Right opportunists in doing so. At any rate, the Right opportunists became a relatively wider array of grouplets than the ultra-Leftists.

Since the 1989-91 fall of the revisionist regimes in Eastern Europe and disintegration of the Soviet Union, which they revered as socialist, the

incorrigible Right opportunists have shed off their communist pretenses and have become bitterly anti-communist. They have joined the ruling system by getting employment in the bureaucracy and corporate offices, operating imperialist-funded NGOs or attaching their grouplets to major reactionary parties. Those who have chosen to engage in electoral politics have limited success because they are divorced from the masses and do not have a substantial mass base like the CPP, NPA and NDFP and the electoral parties being Red-baited as proxies of the CPP. A handful of them have been appointed to high positions by the Aquino regime.

The so-called ex-communists are the worst anticommunists. At one time, they misrepresented a political map of pseudo-progressive groups published in the organ of the CPP's Central Committee, Ang Bayan (The People), showing how the opportunists of the past have divided and subdivided, as a hit list for NPA assassination teams in order to slander the CPP and Red-bait progressive legal mass activists. The psywar attack by the ex-communists emboldened the death squads of the reactionary government to abduct, torture and kill suspected communists and to cover their criminal deeds by claiming that communists were killing each other.

15. We are in a tumultuous global situation with a convergence of economic and environmental crises. In this conjuncture, what do you see as the prospects for socialism? In many parts of the Muslim World so-called political Islam seems to be a leading force. Is this political tendency outpacing socialism (and the Left)? Are there viable Left-wing alternatives or are we still grappling with the implications of the crisis of socialism?

JMS: The prospects for socialism are bright precisely because of the convergence of the grave economic and environmental crises which point to monopoly capitalism as the culprit and cause of the crises. This is the criminal force that plunders labor power in the economy and the material resources in the environment all for the sake of profitmaking and capital accumulation. The identification of the monopoly bourgeoisie and the financial oligarchy as the class enemy that captivates and plunders nature and society points to the working class as the opposite force capable of leading the entire people towards liberation in a revolutionary process. The epochal struggle of the working class against the bourgeoisie involves zigs and zags and ups and downs. On the 150th anniversary of the Communist Manifesto in 1998, I traced the alternation of great advances and retreats of the working class in periods of from three to five

decades. It is about time that the working class rises again from a deep trough and moves forward from the disintegration of socialist societies due to revisionist betrayal by degenerated ruling communist parties. The crisis conditions comparable to those of the Great Depression are again favorable for the rise of communist and workers' parties and the resurgence of anti-imperialist and socialist movements. In the last three decades, the CPP has been proud to call itself a torch bearer in a relatively dark period for the world proletarian revolution. For some three decades under the neoliberal policy, the greediest of capitalist relations of production thrived on the adoption of higher technology which facilitated production, distribution and abuse of finance capital as well as powered the system of education and information to serve the purposes of monopoly capitalism. But the higher social character of production made possible by higher technology contradicts the capitalist character of the relations of production and demands the socialist revolution to remove production from the clutches of the monopoly bourgeoisie. But it takes decades before the communist and workers' parties can take power again through the revolutionary process.

In the meantime, political Islam can arise and grow in certain Muslim countries against imperialism and against the most reactionary currents. But we cannot foreclose the possibility that Muslims, bourgeois nationalists and Marxists in Muslim countries can unite on the common ground of anti-imperialism and democracy to form secular states that assert national independence and aspire for socialism. There may also be viable Left-wing alternatives arising from the petty bourgeoisie or from a mix of workers and petty bourgeoisie. At the moment, they may be grappling with the petty bourgeois modes of thinking as well as with the implications of the defeats of the socialist cause. But we can be confident that in the long run communist and workers' parties will re-emerge and resurge and will come to a united front and united actions with other anti-imperialist and progressive forces.

16. Do the experiences of the 20th century with attempts at socialism, particularly socialism as articulated by Stalin, still hang over the heads of the revolutionary Left? Do you think that the crisis of socialism tells the radical Left something about a different vision that it needs for the 21st century?

JMS: We should recognize the great victories won by the proletariat and the rest of the people in building socialism in the 20th century. In the countries where socialism was built, especially in the Soviet Union and China, imperialist

domination was ended and the exploiting classes were overthrown. The workers' socialist state was established. Socialist revolution and socialist construction were carried forward. Science and technology and proletarian culture flourished. Fascism was defeated. A powerful system of defense was established and the US and its imperialist allies were deterred from launching aggression against the socialist countries during the Cold War. It was modern revisionism (bourgeois degeneration of the party and state bureaucracy), not the US or Stalin, that corroded and ultimately brought down socialism in both the Soviet Union and China.

The imperialists and petty bourgeois anticommunists of various types have been demonizing Stalin and Mao as responsible for the defeat of socialism in the Soviet Union and China, respectively. The cause of socialism cannot be carried forward by those who simplistically scapegoat the longest-time builders of socialism Stalin and Mao for the defeat of socialism and the restoration of capitalism. These two great leaders had their share of achievements and shortcomings, with Mao correcting and improving on Stalin in certain important respects. We should be able to learn a lot of positive and negative lessons from the class struggles in the socialist countries and the comprehensive experiences of building socialism in the 20th century. By learning such lessons, we have the advantage of knowing what principles, policies and methods we can carry over into the 21st century and what major errors we should avoid.

In 1992 the CPP issued a long document, *Stand for Socialism Against Modern Revisionism*, as a major document of the rectification movement and as a counter to all the attacks on the socialist cause churned out by the imperialists and the petty bourgeois anticommunists in the aftermath of the rapid full restoration of capitalism in the revisionist-ruled countries. For the purpose of building socialism in the 21st century, the CPP restated the basic principles of Marxism-Leninism, pointed to the positive and negative lessons from the socialist past, made proposals among others for the development of democracy, legality and restrictions on leading organs within the socialist framework, the mass line in every type of social activity, the well-balanced economy in the service of the people, the various aspects of cultural revolution and the use of science and higher technology for material and cultural progress and for promoting democracy.

17. You are generally identified as a Maoist. First, in light of various analyses of China during the time of Mao's rule, do you see any limitations or weaknesses in

Maoism? What is your sense of other left-wing tendencies (globally)? Do you see the chances for global and local strategic collaboration between differing left-wing tendencies? If so, do you have any examples from the Philippines or elsewhere? What role does Maoism have to play in the renewal of the Left?

JMS: I am aware of various analyses of China during the time of Mao's leadership in China. But despite my overall favorable view of Mao in philosophy, political economy, social science, strategy and tactics and so on, I do not think that Maoism is some kind of final perfection in theory and practice. It is a further development of Marxism-Leninism and goes as far as the theory and practice of cultural revolution under proletarian dictatorship in order to combat revisionism, prevent the restoration of capitalism and consolidation of socialism. But soon after Mao died, the Dengist capitalist counterrevolution prevailed in China. It means to say that even as the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution prevailed for ten years there must be reasons for its defeat. The lessons can be learned as in the earlier case of the defeat of the Paris Commune of 1871 which held power for some two months. The Paris Commune would serve as the prototype of the Great October Socialist Revolution in 1917.

I have my grounding in Maoism. It is my guide to action. But I am open to all Left tendencies on the ground of anti-imperialism and common struggle for national liberation, democracy and socialism. The CPP is not confined in any exclusive club of Maoist parties. It has publicly declared that it avails of bilateral and multilateral ways to exchange ideas and information, debate ideological and political issues, raise the level of common understanding through resolutions and arrive at various forms of practical cooperation. The protraction, worsening and deepening of the crisis of the world capitalist system inflicts intolerable suffering on the people but it also generates favorable conditions for the resurgence of the revolutionary mass movement and for the strategic collaboration and united front of various Left-wing tendencies.

There are various multisectoral, sectoral and issue-based alliances of anti-imperialist and democratic forces in the Philippines. Maoism can play a major role in the renewal of the Left because it is concerned not only with the ideological building of the Maoist party but it is also concerned with political work, such as arousing, organizing and mobilizing the masses for the revolution and availing of the united front and united actions of various parties and groups in order to reach and militate the masses in their millions in the quickest possible manner. Maoist parties are waging people's war in a number of countries and

have gained the respect of many people in the world for daring to answer the central question of revolution in the appropriate conditions. They are expected to increase in number as the crisis of global capitalism protracts and worsens. Thus, they will be more inspiring to all Left forces and the people on a global scale. They will also need broad international support.

18. Let's focus, for a minute, on this matter of Stalin. Nationalities were expelled from their homelands; the leadership of the CPSU was largely annihilated; antisemitism was promoted after World War II; and it is difficult to identify any real mechanisms of worker control that were built during the Stalin period. What does the experience of the USSR and, in a different way, the PR of China, say about a vision for socialism for the 21st century? You speak about modern revisionism bringing down these various systems, but for our readers who have observed undemocratic systems that have called themselves "socialist," what would you say? What lessons have been taken from these experiences?

JMS: To say the least, despite all the allegations against him, Stalin must have made significant achievements with regard to keeping the Soviet Union as a state of various nationalities, with regard to maintaining the CPSU as the lead force in socialist revolution and socialist construction, with regard to letting Jews excel in Soviet society and defending them and the rest of the people against the racism of Nazi Germany and with regard to workers' control in factories and collective farms through the party and the workers' courts.

I think that is inaccurate and unfair to make a complete negation of Stalin and/or Mao or to simply dismiss them as anti-socialist and antidemocratic. It is even more unfair and unjust to use allegations against them as a way of burdening or denigrating non-Soviet and non-Chinese communist parties and leaders or later generations of fighters for socialism, who must be assessed and evaluated according to their own history and circumstances in the light of Marxist-Leninist theory and related experiences. I need not clutter my answer with trying to cover what you sweep as undemocratic systems that have called themselves as "socialist."

Let me underscore that Stalin and Mao and their respective parties had remarkable merits and demerits. In studying their theory and practice, we must be as sober and fair as when we do not condemn and totally negate the French Revolution, the Jacobins and the liberal democratic revolution just because the French Revolution was followed by the Reign of Terror, the Thermidorean

reaction and the monarchical restorations in France. We can learn valuable lessons, positive and negative, from the experiences of socialist revolution and socialist construction in the 20th century, for the purpose of fighting for and building socialism in the 21st century.

I have earlier referred to some lessons and proposals in this regard. Let me stress one of them: In the course of uniting the people for fighting imperialism and the persistent reaction and building socialism, let us ensure that democratic rights are respected and the state, the leading organs and leaders are prevented from abusing their power. We do so as a matter of principle as well as a matter of practical wisdom in view of the new means of communications which allow people to speak out to the whole world.

19. Did you ever think that the struggle would be this long? This is a question I have wondered for a while. When you and others formed the CPP and when the struggle started, did you ever conceive that it would be going on for this long?

JMS: At the founding of the CPP, I thought that the armed struggle to seize power would be protracted, perhaps ten to 20 years. I did not think that it would take this long, more than 42 years already. It is even longer if you start counting from 1942 when the People's Army Against Japan (Hukbalahap) was formed or from the three centuries of Spanish colonial rule when more than 200 armed uprisings occurred before the Philippine Revolution could come into force in 1896. The people's struggle for national liberation and democracy will go on for as long as imperialism and the local exploiting classes of big compradors and landlords continue to oppress and exploit the people.

20. When the People Power uprising took place against Marcos, it appeared that the CPP and much of the Left was taken by surprise. What are your reflections on that period and lessons learned? I thought about this in light of the Occupy movement that we are seeing taking place in the USA and elsewhere and the role/place of the Left in it.

JMS: The CPP was not taken by surprise. The course of events was too clear. In fact, soon after the Marcos dictatorship cheated in the February 1986 presidential snap election, the CPP leadership issued a call for all-out people's resistance to overthrow the regime in concert with the Catholic Bishops' Conference of the Philippines which condemned the illegitimate and immoral foundation of the Marcos regime and Cory Aquino who called for civil disobedience. The legal

organizations of the national democratic movement were at the forefront of the open mass struggles to overthrow the fascist regime along EDSA highway and in front of the presidential palace and in the provinces in all the days before Marcos was flown out of the Philippines by the US.

The biographical books, *The Philippine Revolution: The Leader's View* which I co-wrote with the German social scientist Dr. Rainer Werning in 1988, and *At Home in the World: Portrait of a Filipino Revolutionary* which I co-wrote with the Filipino novelist Ninotchka Rosca in 2004, describe the significant participation of the CPP and the patriotic and progressive forces, which are often Red-baited as organizations of the CPP. Their participation in large numbers was not only in Metro Manila but also in major provincial cities and towns. These organizations played a key role in starting the mass uprising and in providing a conscious and disciplined force, a hard core, for the mass uprising at EDSA and elsewhere.

What detractors of the CPP misrepresent as failure of the CPP to join the so-called EDSA revolution is actually the boycott policy adopted by the CPP leadership, in particular Chairman Rodolfo Salas and the Executive Committee, against the presidential snap election. The CPP leadership correctly stated that Marcos would use the election to keep himself in power but failed to see that, as in what was then a recent example in the Haiti of Duvalier, the US and the anti-Marcos forces would discredit and seek to oust Marcos on the charge of electoral cheating. Afflicted by sectarianism, the CPP leadership went to great lengths in disciplining CPP cadres in Metro Manila who opted for participation in the election and it failed to complement its boycott policy with a deployment of secret Party cadres and alternative legal formations to join the pro-Aquino electoral alliance. For sectarianism and inflexibility in the boycott policy, Salas himself would be removed from his position in May 1986.

I think that unarmed mass uprisings to confront those in power and seek their ouster are an important part of the revolutionary process. At a given time, such unarmed uprisings may not result in the overthrow of the entire ruling system but only the ouster of a corrupt and despotic regime and the adoption of some significant reforms. At any rate, they are part of a chain of events that can lead to the overhaul or overthrow of the ruling system. In this connection, I take a positive view of the Occupy movement in the US and elsewhere wherever are the initiators at Wall Street. I appreciate the role that Left forces are taking in this movement. As chairperson of the International League of Peoples' Struggle, I

have expressed solidarity with and support for the movement and have called on the more than 300 member-organizations of the ILPS and their allies in more than 40 countries to expand and intensify the Occupy movement.

Message of Solidarity and Gratitude for the Launch of my Selected Works

February 13, 2012

I am deeply pleased that the four volumes, which contain a selection of my writings from 1991 to 2009, are being launched today in New York. I thank the sponsors of the launch and I convey warmest greetings of solidarity to everyone present.

The volumes encompass all major developments in the world, especially the ever worsening crisis of the world capitalist system. They are acutely pertinent to the NATO/G8 summit which you will confront in Chicago in May and to the people's summit of resistance which you are now busy preparing.

The titles of the volumes show the relevance. Volume I has the title: For Justice, Socialism and Peace; Volume II, For Democracy and Socialism Against Imperialist Globalization; Volume III, Crisis of Imperialism and People's Resistance; and Volume IV, People's Struggle Against Imperialist Plunder and Terror.

I am gratified that the sponsors of the book launch consider the distribution and reading of the volumes as an important part of preparations for the people's summit against the NATO/G8 summit. The volumes contain many articles which critique imperialism and the escalation of imperialist plunder and war under the neoliberal policy of imperialist globalization and which call for people's struggles to achieve national liberation, democracy and socialism.

The neoliberal policy of imperialist globalization was adopted more than three

decades ago by the US and imposed on the rest of the world capitalist system supposedly to solve the problem of stagflation by pressing down wages and cutting back on social spending by governments and by giving free rein to the monopoly banks and firms in accessing state resources and accumulating capital through liberalization, privatization and deregulation under the slogan of “free market“.

Since then, the US and world capitalist system have been struck hard by numerous economic and financial crises. The recurrent crisis of overproduction has always been temporarily solved and even obfuscated by rising levels of indebtedness on the part of the state, the corporations and the consumers. The monopoly bourgeoisie and its cream of financial oligarchy have gone into runaway financial speculation, wantonly generating derivatives and making one bubble after another.

The imperialist powers in G8 and puppet states have bound themselves to the neoliberal dogma that they refrain from intervening in the economy, except to give resources to and bail out the big bourgeois and let them further exploit the people. Now, the world is beset by the public debt crisis and austerity measures at the expense of the people. We are confronted by the global depression, rising levels of unemployment and the rise of state terrorism and wars of aggression.

When the revisionist regimes fell and the Soviet Union disintegrated in the period of 1989-1991, the imperialist powers and their camp followers were beside themselves with glee and proclaimed the end of history with capitalism and liberal democracy. They seemed not to realize that the full integration of Russia and China into the world capitalist system would cramp the space for capitalist exploitation and push further the interimperialist struggle for a redivision of the world. They also talked of peace dividends only to expand the NATO and escalate military production and wars of aggression.

We are now in a world of great suffering for the people, great disorder and great upheavals. This is also a time of great opportunities for the proletariat and people to strengthen their revolutionary forces and advance in their struggle for a fundamentally new and better world of greater freedom, democracy, social justice, all round development and international solidarity and peace. We must seize every moment to struggle and achieve victories!

On Balikatan Exercises and Oplan Bayanihan

Interview by John Toledo, Philippine Collegian

May 3, 2012

1. Please comment on the continuation of Balikatan exercises and Oplan Bayanihan by the US here in the Philippines.

JMS: The Balikatan exercises are a demonstration and sharpening of US military intervention. They are supposed to put into practice the interoperability of the US and its Filipino puppet forces. They are a show of force aimed at intimidating the Filipino people and the peoples in the Asia-Pacific region.

Oplan Bayanihan is a national campaign plan of military suppression designed under the US Counterinsurgency Guide. It is a continuation of Arroyo's murderous Oplan Bantay Laya and it aims to surpass it in perpetrating abductions, torture and extrajudicial killings and other human right violations. Cynically and shamelessly, the Aquino regime misrepresents military operations against the people as peace and development operations.

2. What are the implications of these on our sovereignty?

JMS: The Balikatan exercises flagrantly violate the national sovereignty of the Filipino and the territorial integrity of the Philippines. The US and the Aquino regime collaborate in invoking the US-RP Mutual Defense Treaty and the Visiting Forces Agreements and in allowing US military forces to conduct military operations and commit crimes with impunity. US military personnel are practically beyond the criminal jurisdiction of Philippine courts.

Oplan Bayanihan is supposed to be carried out by Filipino puppet troops to suppress the revolutionary movement of the Filipino people in order to preserve the ruling system under US domination. In violation of national sovereignty, US military forces stationed in the Philippines collaborate with the puppet troops in intelligence, psywar and combat operations, especially with the use of the latest US-provided weapons and gadgets.

3. What are the implications economically?

JMS: The US-directed military exercises and military operations against the revolutionary movement in the Philippines are aimed at preserving the unjust ruling system of big compradors and landlords servile to US imperialism. The preservation of the system means the continuance of the exploitation of the people by the local exploiting classes of big compradors and landlords and by US and other foreign monopolies.

Thus, the Philippines remains economically backward, agrarian and semifeudal. It is prevented from undertaking national industrialization and genuine land reform. The people continue to suffer a high rate of unemployment, low incomes, soaring prices and expensive yet deteriorating social services, especially now that the world capitalist system and the local ruling system are stricken by a severe and protracted crisis.

4. Please comment on America's move to expand its military power here in the Philippines, aside from the fact that China looms as an emerging imperialist country.

JMS: US military intervention in the Philippines is being escalated for the purpose of further oppressing and exploiting the Filipino people as well as for the purpose of serving as part of the deployment of US military forces to strengthen US hegemony over the Asia-Pacific region and encircle China and the People's Democratic Republic of Korea.

China is now being vilified as an imperialist power that is about to pounce on or aggress against the Philippines. The anti-China scare campaign is used to justify the deployment of more US military forces in the Philippines and in East Asia. In fact, the US is by far the biggest imperialist power that has long violated the national sovereignty of the Filipino people and subjected them to perpetuated aggression and extreme plunder.

China has a large GDP second only to the US but it has a huge population and is still poor. The per capita GDP places China in the lower part of the list of countries. China has weapons that merely suffice to defend itself within its national borders and to deter foreign aggression. It has not engaged in any sustained war of aggression like the US has done so many times since it became an imperialist power towards the end of the 19th century.

5. Please comment on the possible future instances of harassment, violations on women, children and indigenous people's communities, and events of extrajudicial killing.

JMS: We can be certain that human rights violations will increase by leaps and bounds upon the deployment of a bigger number of US troops in the Philippines as well as upon the escalation of military operations under the supervision of US military officers and with the collaboration of US troops. Among the most vulnerable people are the women, children and the indigenous peoples.

We can be certain that the rape of women, prostitution, drug use and spread of sexually transmitted diseases will become rampant. The condition of children will be greatly degraded. More of them will be abandoned and orphaned. Many will take to the streets and forced to become slave labor, child prostitutes, drug runners or beggars. Great numbers of peasants and indigenous people will be subjected to bombings, mass dislocation, illegal detention, torture and extrajudicial killings in the course of campaigns of military suppression.

Questions on the Philippine Mode of Production

Interview by J. V. Jayme,

University of the Philippines-Baguio

August 21, 2012

1. Please describe the characteristics of a semifeudal society. What are its basic contradictions and how is it applicable to Philippine society?

JMS: The principal exploiting classes in a semifeudal and society are the comprador big bourgeoisie and the landlord class which are dominant in the cities and the countryside, respectively. Politically, they form a joint class dictatorship oppressing the working class and peasantry that they exploit.

The main contradiction in Philippine semifeudal society is between the big compradors and landlords subservient to US imperialism on one side and the toiling masses of workers and peasants on the other side. The semicolonial character of the Philippines takes into account the indirect rule of the US through one puppet regime after another which represents the local exploiting classes.

The big compradors are the trading and financial agents of the foreign monopoly firms and banks. They are far more powerful and wealthy than the general run of landlords. And they are the main local determinants of the semifeudal economy. They are also the biggest owners of urban and rural land. They own assembly plants, mines and plantations. They include the super rich families like those of Jaime Zobel de Ayala, Andres Soriano, Henry Sy, Andrew Tan, Eduardo Cojuangco and Jose Cojuangco.

2. How did the concept of a semifeudal society develop vis-à-vis Marx's formulation of the mode of production?

JMS: In their presentation of historical materialism, Marx and Engels showed the stages in the development of the mode of production: primitive communal, slavery, feudalism, capitalism and the possibility of socialism and communism. Marx made a penetrating and thoroughgoing critique of capitalism in *Das Kapital*.

Lenin studied the impact of modern imperialism on feudal societies and categorized as semifeudal those which departed from the natural economy of feudalism, adopted the system of commodity production, produced raw materials for export, imported manufactures and remained agrarian and preindustrial. Mao adopted the term semifeudal and further analyzed and elaborated on its characteristics.

To take completely into account the role of US in the Philippines, we must recognize that the US was already promoting a semifeudal economy while it still exercised direct colonial rule and continued to do so after it shifted to semicolonial or indirect colonial rule in 1946. The import-substitution manufacturing in the 1950s and 1960s and the export-oriented manufacturing that followed were calculated to prevent national industrialization, that is well grounded on basic and heavy industries and encompassing primary, secondary and tertiary stages of production.

3. Could you give the extent of economic development achieved in the Philippines by the early part of the 1980s? Please give special importance to the forces and the means of production.

JMS: The Philippine economy remained agrarian and semifeudal. Such character was aggravated and deepened by the Marcos policy of heavy foreign borrowing for graft-ridden infrastructure projects (roads and bridges) and tourist facilities (hotels and conference halls). Both local and borrowed resources were spent in such a way as to avoid industrial development. All the equipment and steel material for construction were imported.

By the early 1980s, Marcos had become desperate because of tighter international credit. And comforted himself with boasts about developing 11 construction-related industries (excluding the steel industry), universal banking

for industrialization and seeking construction projects abroad.

In fact, the US was dictating on the Marcos regime to go into low-value added semimanufacturing for reexport, which had far higher imported content and far less employment potential than the previous import-substitution manufacturing. The Marcos regime was under orders not to industrialize the country but to send out workers and professionals as overseas contract workers.

4. In terms of the social relations of production, what are the dominant class/es in this society?

JMS: As I have already pointed out, the comprador big bourgeoisie and landlord class are the dominant classes and are the main exploiters of the workers and peasants. The comprador big bourgeoisie is more powerful and more wealthy than the landlord class. Because these two classes interlap, we can validly say that the big comprador-landlords rule the semifeudal society.

5. It is said that the social base for imperialism is feudalism. How is this so?

JMS: Upon its historical entry in the Philippines, US imperialism adopted feudalism as its social base. It pretended for a while to subject the friar estates to land reform. But it allowed the landlord class to persist, exploiting the peasants and accumulating land.

To this day, feudalism continues to exist and serve as the social base of imperialism even as the comprador big bourgeoisie has grown in importance as mediator between feudalism and imperialism and even as the wholeness of the economy may be described as semifeudal.

The mediation of the comprador big bourgeoisie between imperialism and feudalism is what makes the whole Philippine economy semifeudal even as certain specific parts of the economy such as the modern plantations, machine-operating farm workers, and the like may also be called semifeudal.

6. Could you please elaborate how monopoly capital (imperialism) stunts the growth of capitalism here in the Philippines?

JMS: Monopoly capitalism puts in just enough capital (direct investments and loans) to be able to extract superprofits from cheap labor and cheap raw materials. It keeps the Philippines underdeveloped and agrarian so that the

foreign monopoly firms can continue to extract superprofits from cheap labor, the unequal exchange of manufactures and raw materials and the ever mounting debt service.

7. What are your thoughts regarding the theory that neocolonial industrialization is possible since industrialization of a neocolony would actually be beneficial for imperialism to eliminate feudalism since it makes profit extraction easier?

JMS: What is described by Ofreneo as neocolonial industrialization consists of reassembly, repackaging or fringe-processing of basically finished components from abroad. This kind of enterprises inside and outside the export processing zones do not constitute the national industrialization that the people demand and do not change the feudal situation in villages from where mainly the sweatshop workers come.

By the way, I use the terms semicolonial and neocolonial interchangeably. I use the term semicolonial to emphasize the indirect political rule of the US in the Philippines. I use the term neocolonial to emphasize the US use of economic and financial means to achieve control over the Philippines.

8. Given that the two terms describe a 'mixed' economy, what differentiates the concept of semifeudalism from semicapitalism?

JMS: Mixed economy of private and state enterprises is not the issue when you consider the difference between the two terms semifeudalism and semicapitalism. The kind or degree of industrial capitalist development or the lack of it may be a more pertinent issue.

If you wish to call the Philippines fully capitalist rather than semicapitalist, you can validly do so by pointing out that the Philippines has adopted the system of commodity production since the 19th century. But it is another thing to use the term semicapitalism to invalidate semifeudalism and even to explicate or imply that the Philippines has become industrialized and is no longer agrarian and semifeudal.

Those who claimed that the Philippines was no longer semifeudal wanted the Communist Party of the Philippines to give up its strategic line of encircling the cities from the countryside. They went so far as to insinuate that Marcos had greatly industrialized and urbanized the country and that it was already outdated

for the CPP to rely on the peasant masses as the main force in the new democratic revolution through people's war.

9. What are your thoughts re Popoy Lagman's text PSR: The Semifeudal Alibi for Protracted War?

JMS: Popoy Lagman carried the Trotskyite line that it is enough to make revolution in the Philippines by ignoring the peasants and rousing the workers of Metro Manila to engage in armed insurrection as in Petrograd. He forgot that even in Russia the civil war proceeded to the countryside. It is not an alibi but a fact that the protracted people's war is made necessary and possible by the persistence of feudalism and semifeudalism and the peasant demand for land as the main content of the new democratic revolution.

10. Could you also give some reactions to his claim that the term semifeudal only muddles up the description of the Philippine mode of production as it is 'imprecise'?

JMS: The long interview of Julie de Lima with me on "The Mode of Production in the Philippines" and the book Philippine Economy and Politics should give you the statistics and analysis to clarify the term semifeudalism.

The Philippines between Two Greedy Giants

Interview by John Toledo, Philippine Collegian Features Editor

January 15, 2013

I am John Toledo, features writer of the Philippine Collegian. I am again writing another article on geopolitics and its implications in the Philippines specifically on the West Philippine Sea conflict. The article will be published on January 22, 2013 next week Tuesday in the Philippine Collegian. Here are the following questions:

1. Historically, who are the original claimants of the West Philippine Sea? Where did this dispute come from? Who are the claimants today?

Let us first put into context what you refer to as the West Philippine Sea. The Spratlys are a group of 250 islets plus the shoals and reefs spread over 265,542 square kilometers. They are claimed entirely by China, Taiwan and Vietnam and in part by Malaysia, Brunei and the Philippines. The part of the Spratlys claimed by the Philippines is what it calls the Kalayaan group of islets located in the West Philippine Sea.

China, Taiwan and Vietnam claim ownership of all the Spratlys supposedly since ancient times on the basis of historical references, seasonal visits by their fishermen and assertions of claims against colonizers as well as yielding of the Spratlys by the Japanese to the French and thus to Vietnam in the San Francisco peace treaty after World War II. Malaysia, Brunei and the Philippines claim parts of the Spratlys that are geographically closest to them and within the 200-mile exclusive economic zone under the UN Convention on Law of the Sea (UNCLOS) plus prehistoric and historical claims that the islets concerned have

long been the fishing grounds of their respective fishermen.

2. Why is the West Philippine Sea being claimed by China and Philippines? Is it economically and politically useful? Why or why not?

China arrogantly claims not only the entire Spratlys but also the entire sea south and east of China as its property and by making military shows of strength to assert its claims. But the Kalayaan group of islets, the Recto Bank and Panatag Shoal (Scarborough) are all within the exclusive economic zone of the Philippines under the UNCLOS. It is wrong for China to claim these.

In economic terms, the contested islets and shoals and the waters around them are at least rich fishing grounds and sources of corals but they also have a high potential as sources of gas and oil. The Recto Bank is well known for having rich gas and oil deposits as a result of explorations. In political and military terms, the contested islets and shoals can serve as outposts for military vessels and for controlling navigation and commerce or evoking power and influence.

3. Why is US joining in the conflict? Why is it strategic for US to support the Philippines with many armed forces and materials?

The US is fishing in troubled waters. As a matter of fact, it is responsible for stirring up trouble in the first place. It has undertaken controlled trouble-making just to make the Philippine reactionary puppet government run to it for support, to have the reason for entrenching US military forces in the Philippines and to have the Philippines as a base for influencing policies and development within China. The US has strategic objectives in using the Philippines as a strategic base in the US encirclement of China.

4. Is it logically possible that China will wage war on the Philippines because of this West Philippine Sea dispute? Or is it just a ploy for US to wage war with China? Why or why not?

China will not wage war on the Philippines but it will continue to take calculated actions, including shows of force, to discourage and prevent Philippine attempts to control and occupy the contested islets and develop the gas and oil resources there. Neither will the US wage war with China to support the Philippines in the territorial dispute. It has far more economic and political interests in good relations with China than in those with the Philippines.

The US has repeatedly proclaimed that it is neutral in the territorial dispute between China and Philippines. The most it can say is that it is militarily entrenching itself in the Philippines in order to discourage China from attacking the Philippines. However, it will not act militarily against the calculated military moves of China to prevent Philippine attempts to explore and develop the gas and oil resources in the contested islets and shoals.

But China and the US might even make a deal to exploit the gas and oil resources for the benefit of US and Chinese corporations and some big comprador Filipino-Chinese firms or the Indonesian-Chinese firm (Salim group) being managed by Manuel V. Pangilinan. The whole world knows that the mineral ores of the Philippines are being wantonly excavated by US, Japanese, Canadian, Australian, Swiss, Chinese and other foreign firms, together with their big comprador allies. And China has been a major destination of the mineral ores.

In an attempt to look nationalist, the US-Aquino regime is obviously play-acting against China over the well-hyped territorial disputes. It is well within the bounds of the collaboration between the US and China. The US is steering the Philippine government towards the attainment of the narrow self-interest and strategic objectives of the US.

One more reason why the US is entrenching itself militarily in the Philippines and using this as part of the US encirclement of China is not to wage war soon but to influence policies and developments in China. The US is trying to realize the complete privatization of the most strategic state-owned enterprises in China and to promote the liberalization of Chinese politics to the point of doing away with the authoritarian rule and causing the weakening or even disintegration of the bureaucrat monopoly capitalism.

5. What are the implications of the Sino-Philippine territorial dispute in relation to the sovereignty of the Philippines?

What is tragic about the Philippine ruling system of big compradors and landlords is that it is weak and servile to imperialist powers and that both the US and China take advantage of the Philippines. The US pretends to protect the Philippines but it is a bantay salakay. Having long become a capitalist country, China cannot be expected to be a gentle and generous giant.

The Filipino people can best assert their national sovereignty and defend their territorial integrity by overthrowing the ruling system and establishing a people's democratic state that is truly independent and democratic, determined to carry out land reform and industrialization, realizes social justice and aims for socialism. Such a state is capable of using effective diplomacy and defending its territory against intruders.

National Democratic Struggle and People's Trial of US Imperialism and its Puppets

Lecture at the New World Academy in

Utrecht, The Netherlands

November 15, 2013

Fellow artists and friends, good afternoon! Thank you Maria Hlavajova of the Basis voor Actuele Kunst for the warm welcome and Jonas Staal of the New World Academy for the introduction to the program.

My task today is to talk about the national democratic struggle and the people's trial of US imperialism and its puppets in the Philippines. This is in connection with the title of this session, Towards a People's Culture, which centers on the critical role of arts and artists in the struggle for national liberation and democracy in the Philippines. I am pleased that Luis Jalandoni of the National Democratic Front of the Philippines will focus on the conflict between cultural imperialism and people's culture.

I shall describe the political, socioeconomic and cultural aspects of the national democratic struggle. Thus, I provide a broad context for the conflict of cultural imperialism and people's culture and the more direct discussion by the other speakers on art and specific forms of art, like the musical, graphics, the effigy and the "people's trial" as a theatrical model, in relation to the national democratic movement of the Philippines.

I shall also give my views on how art and literature are necessary and essential

in “putting on trial” US imperialism and its puppets by exposing their crimes and bringing about the condemnation and judgement of the malefactors and their crimes. Thus, art and literature contribute decisively to arousing, organizing and mobilizing the masses and to advancing from the symbolic trial to the real trial of the criminals in the drama of the revolutionary process.

In keeping with the theme of people’s trial, I wish to present the coldblooded and systematic crimes of US imperialism and its puppets in oppressing and exploiting the people, the programmatic demands of the people for national and social liberation and the process of rendering justice. By taking up the Philippine case in a broad context, I hope to contribute to the development of a transnational “people’s trial” as a major function of art against oppression and exploitation.

1. The national democratic struggle in the Philippines

The Filipino people have the distinction of being the first nation in the whole of Asia to carry out and win a revolutionary war of national independence against a Western colonial power. The Philippine revolution started in 1896 and triumphed over Spain in 1898. But after pretending to be friendly and helpful to the revolution, the US ignited the Filipino-American War in 1896 and carried out a war of aggression in order to destroy the Philippine republic and impose its own colonial rule over the Philippines.

The Philippine revolution of 1896 was anticolonial and antifeudal and had therefore a national democratic character. The bourgeois liberal intelligentsia (ilustrados) successfully provided the leadership to end Spanish colonial rule. But it failed to prevail over the newly risen modern imperialist power of the US, based on industrial monopoly capitalism, with superior military weapons and with the capacity to use the bourgeois liberal ideology to coopt the Filipino intelligentsia and deploy investments to extract superprofits.

The US carried out a barbaric war in order to defeat the Philippine republic. It killed a total of 1.5 million Filipinos out of a population of seven million in the course of the officially designated Filipino-American War of 1899 to 1902 and further pacification campaigns up to 1914. It used a brutal strategy and tactics it had applied against the First Nation and Mexicans. It unleashed food blockades, forced relocations of entire communities and the extensive use of torture and extrajudicial killings.

The US forced the Filipino people to finance their own military conquest and subjugation. It floated war bonds in Wall Street and subsequently made the people pay for these through taxation. To extract superprofits, it made investments in the expansion of plantations, opening of mines, establishment of a few monopoly enterprises and acceleration of domestic and foreign trade. It generated a semifeudal type of social economy dependent on imported manufactures and raw material exports from a persistent feudal base.

It established an educational and cultural system that perpetuated colonial mentality but this time servile to the US instead of Spain. It superimposed bourgeois ideas and values on those feudal and religious ones previously propagated by the dominant Catholic church. It systematically used education and culture to breed a new and bigger corps of puppet politicians and to produce the professionals and clerks to serve the expanded bureaucracy and businesses.

The social structure that has arisen from the semifeudal economy includes the basic ruling classes of the comprador big bourgeois and landlords, who are fractions of one percent of the population. The intermediate social strata are the middle bourgeoisie and petty bourgeoisie which are around 1 percent and 8 percent, respectively. The basic exploited classes are the workers and peasants, which are around 15 and 75 percent respectively.

Since the early years of the 20th century, the trade union movement had developed among the workers. Since 1930 upon the establishment of the Communist Party of the Philippine Islands (CPPI), the revolutionary idea of the working class leading the people in the national democratic revolution and consequently the socialist revolution had acquired reality and taken roots in the Philippines.

As soon as it was established in 1930, the CPPI was suppressed by the US colonial regime. It was allowed to operate legally under the auspices of the antifascist Popular Front in 1937.

It organized the People's Army Against Japan in 1942 after the Japanese invasion of the Philippines. The opportunities and prospects for advancing the Philippine revolution were undermined by strategic errors of the CPPI leadership, swinging from Right opportunism (from 1942 to 1946) to "Left" opportunism (1948 to 1952) and again to Right opportunism (1954 to 1962).

In 1946 the US granted nominal independence to the Philippines. Since then, the political system has become semicolonial, no longer ruled directly by the US but indirectly through puppet politicians who are essentially bureaucrat capitalists and who serve the US as well as the interests of the big compradors and landlords in the semifeudal economy. The US has retained its dominance and control over the economic, political, cultural and security system of the Philippines.

The Philippines was touted by the US as the show window of democracy (in fact a cesspool of neocolonialism and semifeudalism) because the duopoly of the Liberal Party and Nacionalista Party alternated in taking presidential power through periodic elections. But after getting himself reelected through fraud and terrorism in 1969, Marcos carried forward his scheme to impose a fascist dictatorship and carried it out through the proclamation of martial law in 1972.

While the socioeconomic and political crisis of Philippine society was rapidly worsening in the latter half of the 1960s, the proletarian revolutionaries who were guided by Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought separated from the old Communist Party in 1966. They repudiated the wrong line and strategic errors of the Lavaite leaders of that party since 1942.

They clarified the character of Philippine society as semicolonial and semifeudal and the corresponding character of the Philippine revolution as national and democratic under the leadership of the working class. The motive forces of the revolution are the workers, peasants and the urban petty bourgeoisie. The enemies are US imperialism, the big compradors, landlords and bureaucrat capitalists. The current stage of national democratic revolution through protracted people's war is directed towards reaching the stage of socialist revolution.

Accordingly, the Communist Party of the Philippines was established under the theoretical guidance of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought on December 26, 1968. It founded the New People's Army on March 29, 1969. It initiated the formation of the National Democratic Front on April 24, 1973. In the progression of these events, the revolutionary cadres and the people fought the frenzied and violent preparations and imposition of the fascist dictatorship on the people.

The revolutionary advance of the CPP, NPA and NDF was the decisive factor in

the overthrow of the Marcos fascist dictatorship in 1986. But since then, one regime after another has masqueraded as democratic and has oppressed and exploited the people for the benefit of US imperialism and the local exploiting classes of big compradors and landlords.

The new democratic revolution through protracted people's war has therefore continued in order to fight for national liberation, democracy, social justice, development through land reform and national industrialization, a national, scientific and mass culture and international solidarity for peace and development. The revolutionary forces and people have gained strength through the people's war in the countryside and the legal mass movement in the urban areas.

II. Crimes of US imperialism and its puppets

For the purpose of the people in putting on trial US imperialism and its puppets, we must be aware of the comprehensive range of crimes that they are culpable for. US imperialism must be held accountable. When we speak of US imperialism, we refer to the US federal state and its various agencies, the corporations and banks which are impelled by monopoly capitalism to engage in aggression and plunder.

1. The genocidal killing of 1.5 million Filipinos amounting to 20 percent of the Philippine population of seven million is a horrendous crime. It was the brutal way by which US imperialism violated the national sovereignty of the Filipino people and destroyed the Philippine republic.
2. The direct colonial occupation of the Philippines from 1902 to 1946, except for the interregnum of Japanese occupation from 1942 to 1945, meant the oppression and exploitation of the Filipino people. The people were taxed by the colonial state to pay for the costs of US aggression and colonial occupation.
3. The US monopoly capitalists extracted superprofits from the Philippine colony by plundering its natural resources, subjecting the workers to inhumanly low wages in public works and in US enterprises, promoting the unequal exchange of raw-material exports and manufactured imports and subjecting the country to debt peonage to US banks.
4. The US used the Philippines as launching base for aggression against China and for getting a piece of the Chinese melon in the colonial game. This started

the criminal use of US military bases in the Philippines for aggression against the neighboring countries of the Philippines, especially after World War II, against China, Vietnam, Laos, Cambodia and Indonesia.

5. The US engaged in cultural imperialism and perpetuated colonial mentality. It imposed on the people not only the English language but also pro-imperialist ideas and values that obscured the blood debts of the US and misrepresented the exploitation of the people as beneficial. It bent the feudal and medieval belief system of the dominant Catholic church to serve the interests of US monopoly capitalism.

6. The US trained the bureaucrats, politicians and professionals to be servile to US imperialist power and to use the language of pro-imperialist liberal democracy to deceive the people. It was most responsible for promoting bureaucrat capitalism. It taught the children of the exploiting classes and the urban petty bourgeois to seek and hold power and amass private wealth through bureaucratic corruption

7. The US has fostered the comprador big bourgeoisie as its principal trading and financial agents in the country. This class is responsible for ensuring raw material production for export and for importing foreign manufactures and distributing them in the country. The US has also retained the landlord class for the purpose of controlling food production and agricultural production for export.

8. When the US pretended to grant independence in the Philippines in 1946, it was sure of being able to rely on its puppets: the big compradors and landlords and bureaucrat capitalists. Since then it has retained control over the economy, the politics, the culture, security and diplomatic relations of the Philippines.

9. The US is culpable for the semicolonial system of exploitation, underdevelopment and rampant poverty. The daily violence of exploitation has caused the untimely death of many more Filipinos than those 1.5 million killed from 1899 to 1913.

10. To this day, the US provides arms, indoctrination, training and strategic planning to the military and police forces of the reactionary state and is culpable for military campaigns of suppression and the gross and systematic human rights violations. It has forces of military intervention in the Philippines and uses these

to dominate the Philippines and threaten neighboring countries under the US pretext of a permanent war on terrorism and the US strategic policy of pivot to East Asia.

US imperialism maintains hegemony over the Philippines because it is assisted by the big compradors, landlords and bureaucrat capitalists. These reactionary puppets are complicit with the US in grave crimes against the Filipino people and they take their own initiatives to oppress and exploit the people.

1. Puppetry to US imperialism is a grave crime against the people. It is treason. It is the betrayal and violation of the people's sovereignty and national independence in an all-round way. Traitors are subject to trial by the people.

2. Bureaucratic corruption is a grave crime committed by the bureaucrat capitalists. They auction off the economic sovereignty, the national patrimony and business privileges to foreign monopoly corporations and big compradors. They impose a heavy tax and debt burden on the people and rob the national treasury through the pork barrel system.

3. The big compradors based in the cities collaborate with and assist the foreign monopoly capitalists in undertaking super-exploitation and extracting superprofits through investments, trade and finance. In combination with US imperialism, they get the most out of the sweat and blood of the people.

4. The landlords hold sway over the countryside and impose feudal and semifeudal forms of exploitation on the masses of peasants and farm workers. The despotic landlords wield political power and use the armed personnel of the state and private guards to suppress any form of resistance from the exploited.

5. The rights of the workers are curtailed. The law of the reactionaries is slanted against the workers' right to form trade unions and exercise their democratic rights. Violence is easily employed by the proprietors and the state against the workers' trade unions and their strikes. Thus, the wage and living conditions of workers are always deteriorating.

6. The puppet reactionary state engages in bogus land reform program to deceive the peasant masses and preserve landlordism in the Philippines. The landlords sell land to the state for the purpose of "land reform" only upon their volition and compensation at the current market price. Landlordism is rampant and so is landgrabbing for the purpose of unbridled mining, logging, plantation and real

estate speculation.

7. Every regime of the reactionary puppet state has a campaign plan for the suppression of peasants who demand land reform and the workers who fight for their trade union rights. The puppets receive arms and advice from their imperialist master for the purpose. The US and every puppet regime wantonly engage in human rights violations.

8. The share of public education, health, housing and other social services is ever subject to diminution while the funds flow mainly to military expenditures, bureaucratic corruption and debt service.

9. The right to self-determination of the national minorities and indigenous people is grievously violated. They are deprived of their right to ancestral domain and their land and other natural resources are grabbed from them by the local exploiting classes and by the mining, logging, plantation and real estate companies.

10. The reactionary puppet state constantly invites the US military forces to further entrench themselves in the Philippines and provides facilities to them in violation of the national sovereignty and territorial integrity of the Philippines. It also supports US imperialism in realizing its hegemony and strategic plans over the Asia-Pacific region.

III. The Process of trying the malefactors

Upholding, defending and promoting the people's culture is a crucial and necessary part of the comprehensive program for the people's democratic revolution in the Philippines. People's culture has a national, scientific and mass character.

By having a national character, it upholds national independence and serves the needs and aspirations of the nation. It cherishes and harmonizes all the regional and local cultures in the country. It learns from other countries but is not subservient to them or dependent on them. It contributes what it can to the advance of human civilization and international solidarity.

By being scientific in character, it is free from the shackles of medieval belief and superstition and at the same it respects the freedom of thought and belief. It adopts revolutionary ideas from the high road of human civilization. It seeks to

modernize and develop society by benefiting from scientific and technological advances.

By having a mass character, it serves the rights and interests of the toiling masses of the people and not of the few who belong to the exploiting classes. The culture of the people is opposed to the culture of the exploiting few.

The arts are a great part of culture. They include architecture, sculpture, painting, creative writing, music, dance, theatre, photography and comics. All these art forms and their creations are not simply passive objects of appreciation or static reflectors of reality, they should be an active force for exposing and opposing the crimes of malevolent forces in society, for arousing, organizing and mobilizing the masses and for making fundamental social change.

It is fine that we have with us in this session Walkie Miraña who can explain to us the role of the cultural worker as an organizer of resistance and how the various art forms are concentrated in the theatre as a distinct form of art and done so with minimal costs but with maximum effect in activating the people against injustices and crimes. It is also fine that we have Lisa Ito who can explain to us the art of protest puppetry and how effigies of the malefactors are made and burned in an act of judgement and condemnation. We appreciate the New World Academy for inviting them and also for arranging the exhibition of the works of art that have been created to reflect and advance the national democratic struggle in the Philippines.

It will still take some time before the people's democratic revolution can overthrow the existing ruling system on a nationwide scale in the Philippines in order to put on trial the worst of criminals, mete out punishments to them and put to an end the root causes of oppression and exploitation. But while the juridical processes of the people's democratic state system are not yet available, except in the countryside where revolutionary organs of political power and people's courts have come into existence, the cultural process of putting on trial the criminals through the various art forms can run ahead and have influence and effects on a wide scale.

In reflecting social reality and exposing and opposing the crimes of oppression and exploitation, the various art forms metaphorically, symbolically or allegorically perform the various stages and functions of the criminal trial, such as preliminary investigation, indictment and the trial proper in which facts are

established on the basis of evidence and testimonies and the application of law in the judgment. It is the moral court of public opinion rather than a court of law that is addressed in the people's trial of the malefactors. The people's trial can be further invigorated and reinforced by integrating or coordinating it with artistic works and performances.

The existing courts of the oppressors are theatrical in trying and deciding cases within the parameters of the unjust ruling system. The revolutionary people and forces in the Philippines have all the right to stage people's trials of US imperialism and local reactionaries in order to expose and oppose the real criminals and fight for justice. The people's trial has been demonstrated by Philippine organizations since a long time ago. During the First Quarter Storm of 1970, the mass meetings at public squares were referred to as people's tribunals. There have also been internationally well-known indoor trials like those of the Russell Tribunal since 1967 and the Permanent People's Tribunal since 1979.

The people's trial acquires moral authority and political weight 1) because the people themselves and their organizations establish it; 2) because it takes up serious issues which affect the life of an entire nation or the entire humankind but which are ignored or suppressed by the oppressive authorities and by their courts; 3) because it has for judges those respected for moral integrity, knowledge and a high sense of justice; 4) because it adopts the process of hearing out the conflicting sides, especially the long repressed aggrieved side; 5) because it applies the principles and standards provided by international law, especially the International Bill of Rights and International Humanitarian Law; and 6) because the people further legitimize the decisions by propagating and carrying them out.

The people's trial of US imperialism and puppets by the various art forms is meant to arouse, organize and mobilize the masses for the revolutionary movement to get rid of the oppressive and exploitative ruling system and establish a new system in accordance with the people's demands for national Independence, people's democracy and social justice, economic development through land reform and national industrialization, national, scientific and mass culture and international solidarity of peoples for peace and development.

The highest and most serious purpose of the cultural people's trial is to arouse, organize and mobilize the masses and consequently to replace the unjust ruling system. Thereafter, it is the people in a just system that exercise revolutionary

power to end national and class oppression and exploitation and authorize and oversee the real juridical people's trial of the criminals.

Fight and Defeat US Imperialism's Monstrous Cacique Puppet Regime

Message to Kilometer 64 Poetry Collective

March 11, 2014

I extend my solidarity to all of you patriotic authors and poets brought together by Kilometer 64. I am glad that you have gathered to celebrate the eleventh anniversary of our association that was begun on March 14, 2003.

You already have a wealth of experience and should celebrate your successes. Your creative work, publications and presentations of patriotic poems are praiseworthy. You are renowned for your diligent propagation of significant poems in schools, streets, bars, picket lines and urban poor communities.

As the founding chairman of Kabataang Makabayan, I consider it a matter of great pride for the KM membership to have inspired the patriotic spirit and militant actions of Kilometer 64. With KM's 50th anniversary fast approaching, let us prepare its celebration this November 30.

It is well that Kilometer 64 continues and further invigorates the propagation of the culture of patriotism and draw lessons from the revolutionary history of the Filipino nation. Our prominent icons are the patriotic poets Andres Bonfacio and Amado V. Hernandez.

So long as our motherland suffers from semifeudal and semicolonial status, it remains our task to write and deliver poems as weapons in the struggle for national liberation and democracy against foreign monopoly capitalism,

domestic feudalism and bureaucrat capitalism.

Let us participate in all actions to arouse, organize and mobilize all of the oppressed and exploited classes and sectors of our nation. Let us engage in struggle whatever the danger, difficulties and sacrifice. The enemy is brutal and avaricious and we must exhaust all means to win the people's struggle.

Our constant inspiration is the brilliant role played by Kabataang Makabayan in advancing the democratic revolution before the fascist dictatorship was imposed, while it repressed and wrought havoc on the people and after it was defeated.

We are now again being challenged to fight and defeat the monstrous regime of the cacique Aquino that is dementedly servile to US imperialism. Our current struggle is part of advancing along the path towards complete national liberation and democracy.

To end this message, I would like to recite my poem,

The master puppeteer and the puppets

In neocolonial times, the master puppeteer

Lends grandeur to the puppets and places them

On stage, the mass media and various gatherings.

To create the illusion of democracy, he arranges

Electoral contests like the colorful cockpits

In many a town fiesta for a few months.

But most important to the master puppeteer

Is to choose the puppet politicians most eager to serve

In collaboration with the US and local exploiters,

And make the exploited and oppressed believe

That they have freely chosen from the best possible.

But the revolutionary movement arose
To arouse, organize and mobilize the masses
To confront the oppressors and exploiters,
To seize power in the localities wave upon wave
And attain the strength to liberate the nation
Mainly the workers and peasants.
The Filipino people hate the master puppeteer
For changing the puppet leaders to oppress them.
They reject Marcos' brazen despotism
As well as the bogus democratic successors
Who take turns in oppressing the people
And serve the foreign and local exploiters.

Concerning the Maritime Dispute of the Philippines and China

Interview by Roselle Valerio, Liberation International

April 23, 2014

1. Why do you support the Philippine reactionary state in invoking the UN Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS) and pursuing an arbitration case against China before the International Tribunal on the Law of the Sea (ITLOS), particularly in the Arbitral Tribunal based in The Hague?

JMS: What I support is not so much the Philippine reactionary state as the invocation of the UNCLOS and upholding the sovereign rights of the Philippines and the Filipino people over the 200-nautical mile exclusive economic zone (EEZ) as well as the extended continental shelf (ECS) in another 150 nautical miles from the outer limits of the EEZ. Thus, I have urged the Philippine government to act promptly on the matter.

It so happens that the Philippine state has the legal personality to pursue the case before the ITLOS. It is fine that it has filed a case against China under UNCLOS in January 2013 and the ITLOS has referred the case for hearing by one of its four mechanisms, the Arbitral Tribunal based in The Hague. On March 30, 2014 the Philippine Department of Foreign Affairs submitted its Memorial to the Arbitral Tribunal that is hearing the case.

China claims “indisputable sovereignty” over 90 percent of the South China under the so-called 9-dash line map in violation of the UNCLOS. It has hypocritically called for peaceful negotiations and consultations over what it

asserts as a non-negotiable issue and has also called for shelving disputes and going into joint development projects in the EEZ and ECS of the Philippines. For quite sometime, the consistent point of China has been to maneuver and paralyze the Philippines into a position of acquiescence to the false claim of China and prevent a legal case from being brought before the ITLOS under the UNCLOS.

If China is allowed to violate the UNCLOS and claim 90 percent of the South China Sea under the so-called 9-dash line map, the Philippines would suffer the loss of 80 percent of its EEZ in the West Philippine Sea, including the Reed Bank and even Malampaya. It would also lose all its ECS. We have practically lost Mischief Reef and the Scarborough Shoal to what is veritably Chinese aggression.

Irrespective of the political and social character of the present government occupying the seat of the Philippines in the community of states, the Filipino people and all patriotic and progressive forces must uphold the national sovereignty and safeguard the territorial integrity of the Philippines, including sovereignty over the territorial sea and the internal waters and sovereign rights over the EEZ and ECS. These are fundamental points of principle in the Program of the People's Democratic Revolution.

2. The arbitration case is supposed to involve a maritime dispute rather than a territorial dispute. Why a maritime dispute? What are the implications and consequences?

JMS: It is a given fact that the Philippines and China have their sovereign rights over their respective EEZs under the UNCLOS beyond their respective 12-mile territorial seas from their respective baselines. The EEZs, including the ECSs, of both countries do not overlap and are far apart from each other by hundreds of nautical miles. And the UNCLOS has extinguished the so-called historical rights of China over the islets, reefs and shoals outside of its EEZ and ECS. Moreover, these so-called historical rights beyond Hainan island are false and baseless even in the time before the UNCLOS.

The Philippine case brought before the ITLOS involves a maritime dispute. It is not about a territorial dispute or a case of maritime delineation, which is not governed by the UNCLOS and is not within the jurisdiction of the ITLOS. What the Philippines is simply after in the legal case is a court ruling that there are no

overlapping EEZs and ECSs between the Philippines and China and that China has no reason whatsoever to prevent or interfere with the Philippines enjoying its sovereign exclusive rights over its own EEZ and ECS.

There is no territorial dispute whatsoever between the Philippines and China, involving issues of sovereignty or ownership over land territory, such as islands or other elevations above water at high tide. Rocks or reefs that are below water at high tide cannot be considered land that is subject to territorial dispute. They are properly subject to maritime dispute that is governed by the UNCLOS. Under the UNCLOS, maritime disputes among the signatory states like the Philippines and China are subject to compulsory arbitration. In contrast, territorial disputes can be the subject of arbitration only with the consent of each disputant state.

According to the Supreme Court Justice Antonio Carpio who has done scholarly legal work on the matter, the arbitration case of the Philippines against China is solely a maritime dispute. It does not involve any territorial dispute. The Philippines asks the tribunal whether China's 9-dash lines can negate the EEZ that is guaranteed to the Philippines under UNCLOS. The aggrieved state also asks the tribunal whether rocks above water at high tide, like Scarborough Shoal, generate a 200-nautical mile EEZ or only a 12-nautical mile territorial sea. The Philippines further asks the tribunal whether China can appropriate low-tide elevations (LTEs), like Mischief Reef and Subi Reef, within the Philippines' EEZ.

3. The whole world knows how China arrogantly claims almost the entire South China Sea as being under its "indisputable sovereignty," how in this regard it has expressed contempt towards any judicial process and how it has engaged in bullying and in aggressive occupation of islets and rocks within the EEZ of the Philippines. But in legal terms, how does China react to the arbitration case filed by the Philippines? And how does the Philippines answer?

JMS: China is determined to avoid participation in the proceedings of the Arbitral Tribunal. It argues that the Arbitral Tribunal has no jurisdiction over the case submitted by the Philippines, supposedly for two reasons: first, China can opt out of compulsory arbitration because the dispute involves maritime boundary delimitation arising from overlapping EEZs of the Philippines and China, requiring the consent of both to litigate; and second, China's 9-dash line claim is a historical right that predates UNCLOS and cannot be invalidated by

UNCLOS.

The answer of the Philippines is that the waters within China's 9-dash lines do not constitute an EEZ because said lines are not drawn from baselines along the coast of China or any of its islands. China's 9-dash lines do not comply with the UNCLOS for drawing EEZs. There is in fact no EEZ of China that overlaps with the Philippines' EEZ. Relative to the Scarborough area, China's baselines are either along the coast of Hainan Island, which is 580 NM from Luzon, or along the coast of mainland China, which is 485 NM miles from the Zambales coastline in Luzon facing Scarborough Shoal. Even the Chinese-held Paracels are 480 miles from Luzon.

Low-tide elevations (LTEs) in the Spratlys within the 200-nautical mile EEZ of the Philippines, like Mischief Reef and Subi Reef, are subject to the sovereign rights of the Philippines. Under the UNCLOS, only the Philippines can construct structures here. China has no right whatsoever to occupy and construct structures on any of the LTEs in the EEZ of the Philippines.

4. How does the Philippine debunk China's invocation of historical rights to claim almost the entirety of the China Sea and even certain habitable islands (as in the Paracels) previously conceded to Vietnam at the 1951 San Francisco Peace Conference and nonhabitable islets, shoals and reefs that are within the EEZ of the Philippines and other countries?

JMS: The prevalent view, if not almost unanimous, among non-Chinese scholars on the law of the sea is that China's "historical right" to the waters within the 9-dash lines in the South China Sea is completely without basis under international law. First of all, the UNCLOS extinguished all historical rights of other states within the EEZ of a coastal state. Thus, the term "exclusive" is used to denote the sovereign rights of a coastal state over its exclusive economic zone. Fishing rights that people from Hainan, Taiwan and Japan previously enjoyed in what would become the Philippine EEZ were automatically terminated upon the effectivity of UNCLOS. The UNCLOS does not allow any state to invoke historical rights in order to claim the EEZs or ECSs of other coastal states.

The historical records show that never did any state claim, beyond the 12-nautical mile territorial sea, that the South China Sea is its internal waters or territorial sea, until 1947 when China domestically released its 9-dash line map and 2009 when China officially notified the world of its 9-dash line claim and

submitted the 9-dash line map to the United Nations Secretary General. No country other than China recognizes the validity and effectivity of China's 9-dash line claim. China has never effectively enforced its claim between 1947 and 1994 when UNCLOS took effect, and even thereafter. Outside of the valid territorial sea of China, ships have freely crossed the South China Sea and planes have flown over it, without having to get permission from China. The waters enclosed within China's 9-dash lines cannot form part of China's EEZ or ECS because they are beyond the limits of China's EEZ and ECS as drawn from China's baselines in accordance with UNCLOS. Such waters do not fall under any of the maritime zones -- internal waters, territorial sea, EEZ and ECS -- which are recognized by international law or UNCLOS. So far, China has not explained to the world what kind of maritime regime the 9-dash line waters fall under. It simply keeps on harping ad nauseum that it has "indisputable sovereignty" over such waters by "historical right."

5. You have made fun of China's "historical right" to having "indisputable sovereignty" over the entire South China Sea by comparing it with the irridentist ambitions of Mussolini to reclaim the territories that previously belonged to the ancient Roman empire. Don't you think that it is useful to examine and test the factual basis of the "historical right" invoked and asserted by China in order to debunk its arrogant claim to "indisputable sovereignty" over the South China Sea.

JMS: Indeed, it is useful to examine and test the factual basis of China's claim of sovereignty over the South China Sea as a matter of "historical right." And in the process, you can have a few laughs. For instance, China claims that Scarborough Shoal, or Huangyan Island to the Chinese, is the Nanhai island that the 13th century Chinese astronomer-engineer-mathematician Guo Shoujing allegedly visited in 1279, upon the order of Kublai Khan, the first emperor of the Yuan Dynasty, to conduct a survey of the Four Seas to update the Sung Dynasty calendar system.

But in the document entitled "China's Sovereignty Over Xisha and Zhongsa Islands Is Indisputable" dated January 30, 1980, China's Ministry of Foreign Affairs officially declared that the Nanhai island that Guo Shoujing visited in 1279 was in Xisha or what is internationally called the Paracels, a group of islands more than 380 nautical miles from Scarborough Shoal. China has thus debunked itself and is estopped from claiming the shoal. The Chinese claim to the shoal becomes hilarious when the purported historical account depicts Guo

Shoujing going ashore on the small rock and building on it a massive observatory with a height of 12.6 meters.

The Murillo map is the oldest map in the world showing Scarborough Shoal as part of the Philippine archipelago. It was first issued in 1734 during the Spanish colonial period. It is entitled Mapa de las Islas Filipinas. It was drawn up by the Spanish priest Fr. Pedro Murillo. It clearly shows Scarborough Shoal, then called Panacot, in the vicinity of Zambales. Filipino fishermen called the shoal Panacot and often went to it for fishing.

One more absurd and funny claim of China is that the southernmost territory in the South China Sea is James Shoal, 50 nautical miles from the coast of Bintulu, Sarawak, East Malaysia. This shoal is a fully submerged reef, 22 meters under water. It is entirely within Malaysia's EEZ and is more than 950 nautical miles from China. It is obvious that Chinese leaders and cartographers claimed James Shoal as China's southernmost territory without anyone of them seeing it. But once more the Chinese narrative goes hilarious as it speaks of Chinese going ashore to "visit" James Shoal. James Shoal is unique for being the only national border in the world that is fully under the sea and too far beyond the territorial sea of the claimant state.

Many errors crept into the map of South China Sea made by the "Inspection Committee for Land and Water Maps" created by the Republic of China in 1933. The committee merely copied the existing British maps and changed the names of the islands by either translating them or transliterating them to make them sound Chinese. For example, Antelope Reef was translated as Lingyang and Spratly Island was transliterated as Sipulateli. The Chinese map even copied 20 errors in the British map (which misrepresented non-islands as islands) which the British map makers would later correct.

All Chinese official maps during the Yuan, Ming and Ching Dynasties acknowledged Hainan island as the southernmost border of China. These Chinese dynasty maps never mentioned the Paracels, the Spratlys, Scarborough Shoal, the 9-dash lines or the U-shaped lines. The Chinese Government officially declared to the world in 1932 that the "southernmost part of Chinese territory" or border was Hainan Island. In the 1951 San Francisco Peace Conference, the Soviet Union demanded on behalf of China that the Paracels and Spratlys be turned over to China but the demand was rejected by a vote of 48 states to 3 states.

The Chinese should not mislead themselves into thinking that they own the entire South China Sea just because the European mariners and cartographers gave it such name. The Chinese do not own it as much as the Indians do not own the entire Indian Ocean. Long before the Chinese imperial admiral Zeng He undertook his famous sea voyages from 1405 to 1433 A.D., the prehistoric inhabitants of the Philippines had fished in the waters, now within the Philippine EEZ, and the Filipino traders had become masters of the South China Sea in the course of trading with China, Indochina and their brother Malays in what are now Indonesia, Kalimantan and Malaysia.

6. A Chinese professor from the University of Beijing wrote recently that China has the right to own islands, islets, reefs and shoals even within the EEZ of the Philippines, as in the case of British isles being dependencies of Britain even as they are geographically far closer to France?

JMS: Such scholars conveniently do not mention the fact that the British Isles referred to have long been inhabited by the British and have been recognized as British dependencies by nearby states and to my knowledge all other countries. They might as well mention the colonial possessions of Britain in far flung areas in the history of British colonialism and imperialism. In an effort to hold on to the Malvinas or what they they call the Falklands, the British have combined the aggressive use of imperialist force and the deployment of British settlers.

7. Is it possible and mutually beneficial for the Philippines and China to engage in joint development projects within the exclusive economic zone of the Philippines? What are now the obstacles? Why is it that China has manifested aggressive behavior?

JMS: It is possible and mutually beneficial if first of all both China and the Philippines simultaneously recognize their sovereign rights over their respective EEZs and ECSs and then immediately agree on joint development projects. It is preposterous if such joint development is subject to the precondition of recognizing China's "indisputable sovereignty" under its 9-dash line claim over almost the entire South China Sea.

Surrendering to such precondition would mean the Philippines giving away and losing automatically at least 80 percent of the EEZ and 100 percent of the ECS and probably even losing the right to free and safe navigation in the South China Sea. Not one of the claimant states to the Spratlys has accepted China's joint

development offer because of the precondition of recognizing China's imperial claims of "indisputable sovereignty" over the South China Sea.

The Philippines and the Filipino people cannot take lightly or ignore the aggressive actions already taken by China in connection with its greedy claim of owning almost the entire South China Sea. Through aggressive actions, China has grabbed the Mischief Reef in 1995 and Scarborough Shoal in 2012. Earlier it grabbed from Vietnam the Paracels in 1974 and Fiery Reef Cross in 1988. By all indications, China is poised to force out the handful of Philippine marines aboard the shipwrecked Philippine navy boat on Ayungin Reef, a low tide elevation in the EEZ of the Philippines in the Spratlys. Armed aggression violates the UN Charter.

The Filipino people should understand that China since the death of Mao has become a capitalist country. As the neoliberal partner of US imperialism, it has prominently promoted big comprador operations such as the proliferation of export-oriented sweatshops, privatization of the rural industries built under Mao and the wanton use of finance capital to generate a private construction boom and consumerism among less than 10 percent of the population.

It converted proletarian state power into a bourgeois nationalist power and indeed developed further its industrial base, including its production of advanced weapons. Although it still has a relatively low per capita GDP, China is already a big capitalist power with the economic features of a modern imperialist power and is on the verge of a definitive kind of military aggression.

8. In legal terms, what are the prospects of the arbitration case filed by the Philippines against China? What are the prospects in political and economic terms? How do you take into account the further entrenchment of US imperialism in the Philippines and the collusion and contention between the US and China?

JMS: The Philippines has a good chance of winning the case. The approach in the case is excellent. It is a maritime dispute and not a territorial dispute. It attacks the outrageous claim of "indisputable sovereignty" over the South China Sea. To be benefited is not only the Philippines but also the other state claimants to EEZs and ECSs under the UNCLOS and all the people of the world who are interested in free and safe navigation over the South China Sea by ship and by airplane.

I estimate that the judges will make a ruling that yields the benefits that I have just mentioned and that keeps the South China Sea from becoming a hotbed of aggression based on the overreaching claims of China or the US. China insists that it can defy compulsory arbitration by arguing out of court that the case filed by the Philippines with the ITLOS is not a maritime but a territorial dispute or dispute over maritime delineation, which are not governed by the UNCLOS and are outside the jurisdiction of the UNCLOS.

It cannot escape from compulsory arbitration because the tribunal can consider and rule on the pleading of the Philippines and weigh the arguments given by China for not participating in the process. If the ruling of the Arbitral Tribunal is not favorable to it, China will probably behave better in the face of the international community or will proceed on a path of imperialist aggression.

A decision favorable to the Philippines can be a good basis for pro-actively offering cooperation to China and for telling the US to stop pretending as the protector of the Philippines against China and to cease its unbridled plundering and further military entrenchment in the Philippines. Unlike the US, China is a country that has never carried out a fullscale aggression to conquer the Philippines. It has the capacity and probable willingness to help the Philippines achieve national industrialization through equitable and friendly economic and trade relations.

However, the Philippines and the Filipino people must be always vigilant to the relationship of collusion and contention between the US and China in a world still suffering from imperialism, neocolonialism and the revisionist betrayal of socialism and the revolutionary forces of the people are just beginning to reinvigorate themselves and resurge.

9. What ought to be the long term view of the Filipino people and the patriotic and progressive forces in upholding national sovereignty, territorial integrity and sovereign rights over the exclusive economic zone and the extended continental shelf?

JMS: The Philippines should be independent of the US, China and other capitalist powers. To have their own strength and gain the respect, solidarity and cooperation of other peoples, the Filipino people should win the new democratic revolution and proceed to the socialist revolution. They must attain national sovereignty and democracy for the toiling masses of workers and peasants,

realize social justice, carry out land reform and national industrialization, promote a patriotic and progressive culture and develop cooperative relations with all countries for the sake of peace and development.

10. What would you suggest as study material for understanding the dispute of the Philippines and China in connection with the latter's claim of indisputable sovereignty over the entire South China Sea and even the West Philippine Sea, where the Philippines has its exclusive economic zone (EEZ) and extended continental shelf (ECS)?

JMS: The most studious should read and study the 4,000-page memorial of the Philippines in its arbitration case against China, submitted to The Hague-based Arbitral Tribunal. There are plenty of scholarly legal works on the issue by Filipino and foreign experts on international law and the law of the sea. But for general readers, I suggest as the most concise and yet comprehensive and profound material the speech of Supreme Court Senior Justice Antonio Carpio, "What's at Stake in Our Case Vs. China," delivered before the Philippines Women's Judges Association on March 14, 2014.

Enhanced Defense Cooperation Agreement Highlights Obama-Aquino Meeting in Manila

April 24, 2014

Hyped as a major advance in the strategic partnership of the US and the Philippines, the Enhanced Defense Cooperation Agreement (EDCA) highlights the meeting of US President Obama and Philippine President Aquino in Manila on April 28-29.

EDCA circumvents the ban on foreign military bases and troops by the Philippine constitution and allows the US to increase the so-called rotational presence of its troops and build military bases under the guise of authorized temporary facilities in areas of the Philippine armed forces.

The Filipino people's patriotic sentiments against EDCA are rising high. Bagong Alyansang Makabayan (BAYAN) and other organizations have issued statements denouncing it as a violation of Philippine sovereignty and territorial integrity. They have called for mass protest actions against Obama and the Aquino regime.

The Filipino people are averse to US military bases. These are reminders of the brutal US conquest of the Philippines. More than 10 percent or 700,000 of the Philippine population were killed in the Filipino-American War starting in 1899 and formally ending in 1902. The carnage continued until 1913, bringing the total of Filipino death casualties to 1.5 million.

In more recent history, the Filipino people's hatred for the US military bases intensified when they perceived these as the main reason for US support of the Marcos fascist dictatorship from 1972 to 1986. Thus, the framers of the 1987

Philippine constitution decided to ban foreign military bases, troops and nuclear weapons from Philippine territory.

However, the 1947 US-RP Military Assistance Agreement and 1951 US-RP Mutual Defense Treaty have remained intact. The US military bases were dismantled in 1992 after the Philippine Senate passed the 1991 resolution ending leases for the US military bases. Since then, the US has maneuvered to circumvent the ban and obtain the US-RP Visiting Forces Agreement (VFA) in 1998 to cover the annual joint US-RP military exercises.

The VFA allows the rotational presence of US military forces and their operations anywhere in the Philippines for any length of time to train and inter-operate with the Philippine armed forces and use their facilities; and retain jurisdiction over criminal cases, including capital offenses, involving US troops.

EDCA is now widely considered far worse than the VFA as it allows not only unlimited increase in the rotational presence of US military forces but also the building of US military bases and stations in areas of the Philippine armed forces, thus reducing Filipino troops to mere perimeter guards at Philippine expense.

The US requires the Philippines to upgrade certain AFP camps and reservations in Palawan and Rizal for accommodating US military bases. It is spending PhP1 billion to improve naval facilities in Ulugan Bay and Oyster Bay in Palawan to accommodate and service the growing traffic of US warships, planes and combat troops.

The Filipino people are further outraged by the Aquino regime's promise to the US to amend the Philippine constitution in order to allow foreign investors unlimited ownership of land and businesses. The regime also intends to impress Obama with the capture of alleged leaders of the Communist Party of the Philippines as proof of success of Oplan Bayanihan, a military plan aligned with the US Counterinsurgency Guide.

The Aquino regime decks out EDCA as a major contribution to the continuing US-directed war against "terrorism" and to the US pivot to East Asia, which aims to deploy 60 percent of US naval forces and 50 percent of US ground and air forces in the region. Both US and Philippine authorities tout EDCA as part of US military rebalancing to restrain China from threatening neighboring countries

and keep the South China Sea open to international navigation and commerce.

The US presents itself as protector of the Philippines from China's bullying and has thus emboldened the Aquino regime to oppose China's 9-dash line claim to almost the entire South China Sea. The exaggerated image of China as threat to the security of other countries is used as justification for further entrenchment of US military power in the Philippines and US military expansion in the Asia-Pacific region.

In this regard, China itself has not helped to allay fears by actually claiming about 90 percent of the South China Sea, including the high seas, and threatening to grab the Philippine exclusive economic zone and extended continental shelf to the extent of 90 percent and 100 percent, respectively, in violation of the UN Convention on the Law of the Sea.

The Aquino regime supports the US scheme to pressure China economically by participating actively in the US-instigated Trans-Pacific Partnership Agreement (TPPA), a mega-free trade agreement which pointedly excludes China, and offering the US and its closest allies 100 percent ownership of land and businesses in the Philippines.

Meanwhile, the US maintains a dual policy of cooperation and contention towards China. The US and China maintain close bilateral economic and trade relations under the policy of neoliberal globalization. Their economic and political relations far outweigh those between the US and the Philippines. The Aquino regime deludes itself by imagining that the US values more its relations with the Philippines than those with China.

The US military pivot to East Asia is not meant to provoke a war with China soon but is calculated to encourage so-called political liberalization within China, discourage ultra-nationalist outbursts of the Chinese political leaders and blockade the Democratic People's Republic of Korea. The TPPA seeks to pressure China to privatize state-owned enterprises completely and further liberalize the economy in favor of foreign investors.

Servility to the US in economic and security matters will not save the Aquino regime from its growing disrepute for exploitativeness, incompetence, corruption and repression. The Philippines continues to reel from the ever worsening and deepening crisis of global capitalism and the domestic ruling system.

Social discontent is widespread and about to explode in massive protest actions. Meanwhile, the people's armed movement for national and social liberation is conspicuously advancing with the nationwide guerrilla offensives of the New People's Army.

Perpetuated US Aggression against the Filipino People

May 28, 2014

I wish to discuss with you how US imperialism has imposed itself on the Filipino people and violated their national sovereignty and thwarted their aspirations for democracy, social justice and development since 1898 by military, political, economic and cultural means.

In this connection, I wish to discuss first how monopoly capitalism or modern imperialism arose as the final stage in the development of capitalism and how the era of imperialism began. Monopoly capitalism is parasitic, decaying and moribund, opening more widely than before the possibility of socialism. In being imperialist, it is emphatically violent and aggressive in repressing revolution and in acquiring economic and political territory abroad.

As early as the middle of the 19th century, from 1848 to 1868, England showed at least two major characteristics of imperialism: its possession of vast colonies and its industrial monopoly by which it could draw monopoly profits or superprofits. It was the first among the capitalist countries in which free competition capitalism developed into monopoly capitalism as the dominant force in the economy.

However, it would be in the last three decades of the 19th century that several countries, including the US, France, Germany, Italy, Japan and Russia, would see the development of free competition capitalism to monopoly capitalism.

Altogether with England, they manifested the five features of imperialism. The fifth feature, which is the completed division of the world by the capitalist powers, directly set the stage for imperialist wars: the dominance of capitalist monopolies in the economy; the merger of industrial and bank capital and the emergence of the finance oligarchy; the greater importance of the export of surplus capital than the export of surplus commodities as the means to obtain superprofits; the alliances and counter-alliances of cartels, syndicates and trusts on an international scale; the completion of the division of the world by the great

capitalist powers, covering underdeveloped or less developed countries or areas as economic territory (sources of cheap raw materials and cheap labor, captive markets and fields of investment) and as political territory (colonies, semicolonies, protectorates, dependent countries and spheres of influence).

For a monopoly capitalist power, a certain country or area abroad becomes a more reliable economic territory when it is also a political territory acquired through military intervention or aggression. The newcomers in the colonial game like the US had to engage in acts of aggression in their emergence as imperialists. In comparison to the Western imperialist powers, Russia and Japan had developed monopoly capitalism to a lesser extent but aggressive use of military power enabled them to acquire territories from which to extract monopoly profits.

Then as now, the capitalist powers try to amicably divide the world market among themselves, until their economic competition and political rivalry break out into wars. The completion of the division of the world among the capitalist powers towards the end of the 19th century laid the ground for the violent struggle among them for the redivision of the world. Latecomers in the colonial game upset the balance of forces and pushed the outbreak of wars.

Thus, the era of modern imperialism was inaugurated by wars and took final shape in the period of 1898 to 1914. The Spanish-American War (1898), the Anglo-Boer War (1899–1902), the Russo-Japanese War (1904–05) and the economic crisis in Europe in 1900 were the chief historical landmarks in the new era. Lenin categorically stated that the era of imperialism did not begin earlier than 1898 to 1900 and that neither Marx nor Engels lived long enough to see it.

Perpetuated US aggression

The US fully assumed the character of an imperialist power, on the basis of monopoly capitalism, when it deliberately provoked the Spanish-American War of 1898 in order to seize the colonies of Spain: Cuba, Puerto Rico and the Philippines. In connection with said war, the US pretended to make friends with the Aguinaldo junta in Hongkong and actually brought Aguinaldo back to the Philippines on an American cutter to proclaim Philippine independence (under

the “protection” of the US) and to resume the national war of independence against Spain.

The Filipino people succeeded in liberating themselves nationwide and were about to seize Intramuros, the walled citadel of the Spanish colonizers. But the US interfered with the deployment of Filipino troops for the purpose and maneuvered to prepare for the landing of more US troops. Behind the back of their supposed Filipino allies, the US interveners arranged with the Spanish side a mock battle on August 13, 1898 to justify the surrender of the latter to the former. It was done on the day after Spain and the US signed an armistice agreement ending the Spanish-American War.

The US and Spain were forged the Treaty of Paris of December 10, 1898 in which Spain sold the Philippines to the US for the amount of US\$20 million. On December 21, 1898 US President McKinley issued the Proclamation of Benevolent Assimilation to manifest the US plan to colonize the Philippines. The US started to unleash a war of aggression against the Filipino people on February 4, 1899. This has come to be known as the Filipino-American War. The US used superior military force and extreme barbarity of more than 126,000 troops to conquer the nation of 7,000,000 people. It ruthlessly carried out massacres, the torture of captives, the reconcentration of population, scorched earth tactics and food blockades. It killed more than 700,000 or 10 percent of the Filipino people from 1899 to 1902, directly through its brutal operations and indirectly through consequent famines and epidemics. Likewise, it proceeded to kill 1.5 million Filipinos until 1916.

To keep the Philippines as a colony, the US established military bases at various strategic points. It organized the so-called Philippine Scouts as puppet troops and subsequently converted them into the Philippine Constabulary. As a result of relentless demands of the Filipino people for national independence, the US decided as early as 1935 to make the Philippines a semicolony in 1946 after a ten-year transition period under the so-called Commonwealth government.

The National Defense Act of 1936 was this government’s first legislative act making the puppet constabulary the First Regular Army under the direct supervision of US Army’s Philippine Department. Commonwealth president Quezon made General Douglas MacArthur the field marshal of the puppet army. The US formed, indoctrinated, equipped and trained the puppet army. On the eve of World War II, it placed this puppet army within the frame of the US Army

Forces in the Far East (USAFFE). .

When World War II broke out in 1941, the Japanese fascists defeated the US army in Bataan and occupied the Philippines up to 1945. To recover the Philippines as a colony, the US coordinated with the USAFFE guerrillas. Before the grant of nominal independence to the Philippines in 1946, the US imposed on the puppet Filipino leaders the Treaty of General Relations which ensured the continuance of US military bases and the property rights of US citizens and corporations. This treaty even required in advance that the diplomatic relations of the Philippines would be subject to approval by the US.

After the Philippines became a semicolony, the US perpetuated its successful aggression and continued to control the Philippine state militarily. It obtained a military assistance agreement to make the Philippine armed services dependent on US planning, training, intelligence and equipment; and a military bases agreement for US military forces to stay in the Philippines for another 99 years. It also bound the Philippines to a mutual defense pact and a US controlled regional security pact, the SEATO.

Because of its military power over the Philippines, the US has been able to dominate the Philippine economy and politics and intervene at will in Philippine affairs since 1946. It manipulated the outcome of presidential elections in favor of the candidate most compliant with and servile to US interests in the Philippines and in the region .

It instigated the Marcos fascist dictatorship in 1972 in a futile attempt to suppress the revolutionary mass movement that had emerged and developed since 1961 because of the wanton extraction of superprofits by US corporation, bureaucratic corruption and the exhaustion of the land frontier.

The Filipino people were outraged that the fascist regime could persist for so long, from 1972 to 1986, because of US military and economic assistance to it. They were also incensed by the direct and indirect consequences of US planes, ships and troops operating in and around the US bases. Thus, after the downfall of Marcos, the framers of the 1987 constitution enjoyed overwhelming popular support and took courage in adopting provisions that banned foreign military bases, troops, facilities and nuclear weapons from the Philippines. This ban was indeed the fruit of the people's revolutionary struggle against the fallen US-instigated dictatorship.

The military bases agreement with the US was terminated in 1991 by the Philippine Senate, with the open and strong support of the national democratic movement. But since then, the US has resorted to all sorts of maneuvers to circumvent the constitutional ban on foreign military bases. By invoking the US-RP mutual defense pact. It has used the Balikatan joint US-Philippine military exercises and interoperability training as pretext for the forward stations and rotational presence of US troops in the Philippines.

It has been able to obtain the Visiting Forces Agreement and the Mutual Logistics Support Agreement to allow the entry and stationing of US military forces anywhere in the Philippines for any duration of time. It has used 9-11 and the so-called US global war on terror to justify US military presence and intervention in the Philippines. It has also expanded the pretexts for such Intervention. These include humanitarian aid, medical mission, civic action, disaster-related aid for rescue, relief and rehabilitation; and so on.

The latest pretext of the US for further entrenching itself militarily in the Philippines is to make a strategic pivot to Asia-Pacific region and to protect the country from a putative Chinese aggression in view of the overreaching claims of China over 90 percent of the South China Sea, encroaching on 90 percent of the exclusive economic zone (EEZ) and 100 percent of the extended continental shelf (ECS) of the Philippines. Thus, with the servile collaboration of the Aquino regime, the US has been able to obtain the so-called Enhanced Defense Cooperation Agreement (EDCA).

This agreement allows the US to establish military bases in an indefinite number of so-called Agreed Areas, fortified at Philippine expense, paying no rent, enjoying perimeter security from puppet troops free of charge, barring Philippine authorities from knowing things and activities inside the US military enclaves or bases and allowing US air planes and ships to come and go, with the Philippine authorities barred by the US military from knowing whether such vessels carry nuclear, chemical, bacteriological and other weapons of mass destruction. Moreover, the agreement requires the AFP to provide or facilitate access by US forces to any place whatsoever in Philippine territory that the US decides.

Despite the treason and obsequiousness of the Aquino regime in acceding to EDCA, US President Obama in his recent visit to Manila clearly declared that the US is neutral over the Philippine-China maritime dispute in the West Philippine Sea and that US policy is not to counter or contain China. In fact, the

US has a dual policy of cooperation and contention with China and makes its decisions according to US national interest. At any rate, the US has far more interest in relations with China than in those with the Philippines. The people should be alert to the possibility that the US and China could agree to jointly explore and exploit the oil, gas and other natural resources in the EEZ and ECS of the Philippines.

In the face of the perpetuated aggression of US imperialism in the Philippines, the Filipino people and their revolutionary forces have adopted the line of people's democratic revolution through protracted people's war. They are waging a civil war against the semicolonial political system. At the same time, they condemn the escalating military intervention of the US in favor of the puppet regime. They are therefore prepared to wage a war of national liberation should the US unleash a full-scale war of aggression. They are not afraid of such possibility but prepare against it. They consider it an opportunity to realize justice for the heroes martyred by US imperialism and for the suffering of the millions of people as a consequence of the direct and indirect rule of US imperialism.

Continuing economic plunder

The US had a strategic motive and objective for seizing and making the Philippine its colony. This was connected with the expressed desire of the US to expand the international market for its manufactures, to turn the Pacific Ocean into an "American lake" for the purpose and to have a base for launching efforts to get a share of China in the frenzy of the capitalist powers to establish spheres of influence.

The US floated bonds in Wall Street to finance its war of aggression in the Philippines. Ultimately, it made the Filipino people pay for their own military conquest through taxation. But the biggest gain for US imperialism came from the extraction of superprofits from the colonial exchange of US manufactures and Philippine raw materials as well as from the direct and indirect US investments in the Philippines. In the process, the US imperialists turned the Philippine economy from feudal to semifeudal.

US imperialism did not have to eliminate feudalism. It merely superimposed the imperialist mode of exploitation to change the total complexion of the social economy to semifeudal. In an attempt to appease the people's hatred of the landed estates owned by the foreign religious orders, the US colonial government expropriated some of them for redistribution to the peasants. But the peasants could not afford to complete payments for the redistribution price. The land eventually fell into the hands of the landlord class.

The US colonial government lifted the feudal restrictions on the physical movement of peasants. This enabled peasants to open land in frontier areas or to seek jobs in urban areas, public works and mines. Bureaucrats and landlords enticed peasants to make their homesteads in frontier areas but ultimately they claimed and registered the land as their own. Merchant usurers also followed the peasants into frontier areas and eventually became landlords.

The US colonial rule differed significantly from that of the Spanish by taking superprofits from a far greater flow of manufactured imports and raw material exports, from the chronic need to take loans to cover trade deficits and new schemes of overconsumption and from the far greater inflow of direct foreign investments. The US opened the mines, expanded the plantations for raw-material export production and established a few factories manufacturing consumer products from locally available raw materials. The roads, bridges, ports and other means of transport and communications were improved for the growing domestic and foreign trade. The system of public and private schools was developed to produce the professionals and technicians for the expanded bureaucracy and business enterprises.

In the semifeudal economy and society, the joint class rule of the big compradors and landlords (one percent of the population) arose and replaced the singular dominance of the landlord class in the feudal period of previous centuries. The intermediate social strata of middle bourgeois and urban petty bourgeoisie expanded and would ultimately come to 1 and 8 percent, respectively. From a few percentage points, the working class grew to 15 percent. The peasants descended from a feudal high of about 90 percent to its current semifeudal level of about 75 percent.

The US economic domination of the Philippines was interrupted by the Japanese invasion and occupation during World War II. Japan's imperialist character and war of aggression prevented it from making credible its slogan of "Greater East

Asia co-prosperity”. The Japanese aggressors wrought havoc and destruction on the lives, communities and properties of Filipinos. In the course of recapturing the Philippines, especially in its haste to oust the Japanese through massive bombardment, the US added to and aggravated the destruction of lives and properties. US war damage payments were made mainly to the US corporations for reestablishing US economic domination of the Philippines.

The US did not only retain the property rights of US corporations and citizens through the Treaty of General Relations before the grant of nominal independence to the Philippines in 1946 but also imposed on the supposedly independent Philippine state the so-called Parity Amendment in the Philippine Constitution. This amendment allowed US corporations and citizens to have the same rights as Filipinos in owning public utilities and exploiting natural resources. Furthermore, the US extracted from the Philippines the privilege of operating all kinds of businesses without restriction.

A civil war broke out in the Philippines between the reactionary forces of foreign and feudal domination and the revolutionary forces of national liberation and democracy in 1948. The demand for national industrialization and land reform became so strong that the reactionary authorities had to fake land reform in the form of land resettlement programs and token expropriation of landed estates as well as to feign national industrialization in the form of import-substitution manufacturing which was in fact reassembly and repackaging operations dependent on licensing, financing, technical and marketing agreements with US corporations.

The Philippine economy went from bad to worse when the Marcos regime went on a spending and borrowing spree to build infrastructure and conspicuous tourist facilities and opted for the so-called export-oriented manufacturing in export-processing zones and for the export of labor in the absence of real industrial development for generating local employment. Export-oriented manufacturing is a far worse kind of pseudo-industrialization than the import-substitution manufacturing. It overprices the imported components and underprices the exported semi-manufactures. Workers are mostly categorized as casuals, apprentices or learners. They are paid substandard wages and are deprived of job security. Their trade union and other democratic rights are curtailed.

To this day, export-oriented manufacturing is misrepresented as industrial

development. It has been greatly set back by the Asian financial crisis of 1997 and the global financial meltdown of 2007-08. The reassembly and export of semi-conductors and other products have plunged. What has become glossier than export-oriented manufacturing is the bubble in office and residential towers and upscale tourist enclaves, which is now about to pop because of the growing flight of portfolio investments. All regimes since the time of the puppet president Ramos have gone into a mad frenzy of opening the entire country to foreign mining companies that ruin agriculture and the environment, preempt future industrialization and take mineral ores out of the country without paying the commensurate taxes.

Philippine economic policy has always been dictated by US imperialism. In the time of Marcos, the World Bank was active in pushing a Keynesian policy of undertaking public works to promote raw-material production and the colonial exchange of raw material exports and manufactured imports and thereby diverting resources and foreign loans from what should be a line of national industrialization. The first Aquino regime drew the Philippines further away from national industrialization by following the US-dictated policy of neoliberalism and carrying out trade liberalization at the expense of both local industry and even agriculture. The Ramos regime followed up the anti-industrialization policy by channeling huge resources and foreign loans to upscale private construction and tourist facilities.

Altogether the post-Marcos regimes have been bound to exporting raw materials and labor and have been trapped within the frame of the imperialist policy of neoliberal globalization under the so-called Washington Consensus of the IMF, the World Bank (especially its private investment arm IFC) and the WTO (including its GATT predecessor). The US has used these multilateral agencies to push the liberalization of trade and investments, privatization of public assets, deregulation of social and environmental protection and the denationalization of such underdeveloped economies as the Philippines. Like their imperialist masters, the puppet regimes in the Philippines have clung to the neoliberal policy because it suits their greed, they believe that they can always shift the burden of crisis to the people and they still have to see a more powerful revolutionary mass movement to challenge them.

Under the general auspices of the WTO and the proliferation of bilateral and multilateral free trade agreements with the US and other imperialist powers, the Philippines is prevented from upholding economic sovereignty, conserving its

national patrimony for the benefit of the Filipino people and undertaking national industrialization and land reform. The Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation, the Trans Pacific Partnership Agreement and ASEAN Economic Community are frameworks for binding the Philippines to the imperialist system of plunder and particularly to its neoliberal policy of unbridled monopoly capitalist greed.

In the face of the continuing plunder of the Philippines by US imperialism, enjoying the collaboration of the local exploiting classes of big compradors and landlords, the Filipino people and their revolutionary forces are committed to fighting for national liberation and democracy, realizing social justice, conserving the national patrimony and carrying out a program of development through national industrialization and land reform. They can end the underdevelopment of the Philippines only by destroying the exploitative system of big compradors and landlords subservient to US imperialism and thereby releasing the patriotic and progressive forces to undertake genuine development and achieve social justice.

Unrelenting puppetry of officials

Even while it carried out its war of aggression against the Filipino people, the US sought to entice leaders of the Philippine revolutionary government to surrender. This caused a split within the Aguinaldo Cabinet, between the revolutionary members like Apolinario Mabini and Antonio Luna and the capitulationists like Pardo de Tavera, Paterno and Buencamino. But the revolutionary mass movement was too strong to be derailed by the capitulationists, who were ridiculed as asimilistas and Sajonistas.

The US aggressors carried out a brutal war of conquest to serve the interests of US monopoly capitalism. But hypocritically they declared that they came to the Philippines to “civilize” and “Christianize” the people, after more than three centuries of Spanish colonial rule and Roman Catholic proselytization. They also claimed to have no interest in possessing the Philippines but in teaching democracy and self-government to the Filipinos, despite the success of the Filipinos in exercising democracy by building a revolutionary government and

army and defeating Spanish colonialism.

They touted Jeffersonian democracy to embellish modern imperialism. With this, they were confident of being able to coopt the bourgeois liberals leading the Philippine revolution. The Filipino bourgeois liberals derived their political enlightenment from the study of bourgeois liberalism in Europe. They did not arise as the offshoot of a manufacturing bourgeoisie as in Europe. In fact, they were children of landlords, colonial bureaucrats and merchants.

The US calculated that it could rely on a growing number of political collaborators by developing the semifeudal economy of the big compradors and landlords, using the educational system and the pensionado system of sending native scholars to US universities to promote a pro-US colonial mentality and expanding the bureaucracy and businesses to accommodate those produced by the schools.

After his capture in 1901, President Aguinaldo was threatened with death and coaxed by his US captors to issue a Peace Manifesto calling on the revolutionary forces to surrender. The leaders who turned against the revolution were given positions at various levels of the US colonial government and were encouraged to form in 1901 the Partido Federal to serve the colonial regime and to help it to discourage and suppress the revolutionary resistance of the people.

Those who continued to wage revolutionary resistance were subjected to a series of draconian laws and were made to suffer torture and death by hanging and other means. Even after several years from the formal end of the Filipino-American War, the US issued in 1907 the Flag Law prohibiting the Filipino people from displaying the Philippine flag. They continued to be subjected to massacres, arbitrary detention and torture, food blockades and reconcentration.

When the US calculated that it had sufficiently broken the armed revolutionary movement and trained a large corps of puppet politicians and professionals, it allowed the Nacionalista Party to exist and call for immediate, absolute and complete national independence. The Nacionalista Party was a reformist party, committed to demanding national independence only by legal and peaceful means and sending missions to Washington to plead for an eventual grant of independence.

Consequent to the inspiration of the victorious Great October Revolution in 1917

and the dire colonial and social conditions, the modern trade union movement which started in 1902 became relatively stronger and became the basis for the establishment of the Communist Party of the Philippine Islands in 1930. The US immediately tried to suppress this party by trumping up charges of sedition against the leaders. When the Great Depression worsened social conditions in the Philippines in the 1930s and the danger of fascism was running high, the rise of the broad antifascist Popular Front paved the way for the release of communist leaders from prisons and internal exile.

By 1935 the US was ready to establish the Commonwealth government as a transition to a semicolonial status for the Philippines. It approved the Philippine Constitution as framed by Filipino politicians and promised the grant of national independence by 1946. The Japanese imperialists and fascists invaded and occupied the Philippines from 1941 to 1945 and pretended to be even more generous than US imperialism by swiftly granting nominal independence to a puppet Philippine republic. In the course of the interimperialist war, the Communist Party was able to build a people's army against Japan (Hukbalahap), local organs of political power and a powerful mass movement that confiscated land from the landlords.

During World War II, the US kept a Commonwealth government in exile in Washington and directed from Australia the Filipino guerrilla forces, which swore loyalty to the US Army Forces in the Far East. It was able to recover the Philippines in 1945 and grant national independence in 1946 to a group of Filipino puppets headed by Manuel Roxas who had broken away from the Nacionalista Party and formed the Liberal Party. Thus, the Philippines became a semicolony run by puppets who served US imperialism and the local exploiting classes of big compradors and landlords.

The US and the local exploiting classes provoked the revolutionary resistance of the people by making impositions on them in violation of national independence and the national patrimony, by nullifying land reform and other social gains made by the anti-Japan revolutionary movement and by carrying out brutal campaigns of military suppression. The backbone of the armed revolutionary movement was broken in the early 1950s. But it succeeded in calling attention to the dire semicolonial and semifeudal conditions and the need for a democratic revolution led by the working class.

It seemed as if the phoney democracy of the big comprador-landlord oligarchs

could go on forever as a game of musical chairs between the Nacionalista and Liberal parties, with each party trying to replace the other in periodic elections that they monopolized. The two parties were a duopoly patterned after that of the Republican and Democratic parties in US. But the chronic crisis of Philippine society kept on worsening, exposing the inability of every regime to solve the crisis, pointing to the need for a revolution but also tempting a president like Marcos to carry out a counterrevolution.

The Communist Party of the Philippines was established in 1968 as the advanced detachment of the working class under the guidance of Marxism-Leninism. It rectified the errors and shortcomings of the previous revolutionary movement. It put forward the general line of people's democratic revolution through protracted people's war. It considered the peasantry as the main force of the revolution in combination with the proletariat. The basic worker-peasant alliance linked itself with the urban petty bourgeoisie as a revolutionary force and further with the middle bourgeoisie against the joint class dictatorship of the big compradors and landlords.

Upon the instigation of the US, Marcos launched a fascist dictatorship under the pretext of “saving the republic and building a new society” in 1972. He sought to destroy the armed revolutionary movements of the Filipino and Moro people. He succeeded only to inflame the resistance of the broad masses of the people. Eventually, the people totally discredited, isolated and overthrew the fascist regime. Even his US imperialist master turned against him when it became indubitably clear that he was more of a liability than an asset. Fearing that the revolutionary forces could grow strong enough to overthrow the entire ruling system, the US and the local exploiting classes decided to junk Marcos and go back to the old track of pseudo-democratic regimes.

The pseudo-democratic regimes, from that of Cory Aquino to her son Benigno III, have proven to be utterly servile to US imperialism, exploitative and oppressive, corrupt and brutal. They have imposed on the Filipino people the policies of neocolonialism and neoliberalism and have inflicted extremely terrible suffering on the people. A multiplicity of reactionary parties has not proven any better than the duopoly of the Nacionalista and Liberal parties or the one-party rule of Marcos. Bureaucrat capitalism has grown worse since the Marcos dictatorship. Thus, the Filipino people and their revolutionary forces have become ever more determined to overthrow the entire ruling system and consequently end US domination in order to fully realize national and social

liberation.

Persistence of colonial mentality

From the very start of its colonial rule in the Philippines, US imperialism was determined to dominate and control the Filipino people culturally aside from militarily, economically and politically. It sought to capture the hearts and minds of the people by misrepresenting itself as beneficent and altruistic and making the people forget about the extreme brutality of the US war of aggression through political propaganda and through the educational and cultural system. Thus, it dramatized the arrival of hundreds of American teachers on the ship Thomas and the conversion of some US troops to school teachers in pacified areas.

The US imperialists misrepresented themselves as far more gentle and kind than Spanish colonialists whom they demonized. And yet they cleverly forged a compromise between their own cultural imperialism and the feudalism of the dominant Roman Catholic Church. The US controlled the expanding public school system and allowed the church and its religious orders to control in the main the private educational system. It propagated a conservative and pro-imperialist kind of liberalism, while the religio-sectarian schools continued religious instruction and accepted the new colonial dispensation. It suppressed the expression of patriotism and anti-imperialism by political and mass leaders, by journalists, creative writers, artists and teachers.

A pro-US kind of colonial mentality supplanted the previous pro-Spanish kind among those educated in the schools under the US colonial regime. The US colonial authorities established the pensionado system, providing scholarships to bright students for higher studies in various fields in the US. When the pensionados returned, they propagated their adulation of the US and were assured of promotions in the educational system, bureaucracy, business and professions. The supplantation of Spanish by English as the principal medium in the schools and in government guaranteed the predominance of a pro-US colonial mentality.

But such colonial mentality could never obliterate the patriotism and

revolutionary aspirations of the Filipino people. In so many ways, the people demanded national independence and democracy and condemned the US colonial regime. Formations of the working people and the intelligentsia persevered in upholding and propagating patriotic and progressive ideas and sentiments. They were reinforced and revitalized by the establishment of the Communist Party of the Philippine Islands which was avowedly guided by Marxism-Leninism and which demanded a national, scientific and mass culture.

The influences of the Great October Revolution and the revolutionary movements in China, Spain, Germany, US and elsewhere reached the Philippines, especially when the Great Depression worsened and fascist and antifascist movements arose in various parts of the world. The US colonial authorities tried to combine anti-communism with colonial mentality to discourage the patriotic and progressive forces. But they failed because the economic and social crisis was worsening and the threat of fascism moved the people towards the struggle for national independence, democratic rights and social justice.

During their occupation of the Philippines from 1942 to 1945, the Japanese imperialists tried to ape the US imperialists in using the schools, mass media, puppet organizations such as the KALIBAPI, the Japanese language, and other cultural vehicles to impose on the people the most colonial aspect of their culture, including their fascist ideas and practices that carried markedly feudal vestiges, even their body language (e. g., deep bowing to show respect or submission). They aroused patriotic anger among the Filipino people. Many Filipinos did not send their children to the Japanese-controlled public schools to keep them away from Japanese indoctrination.

After their reconquest of the Philippines in 1946, the US imperialists misrepresented themselves as liberators of the Filipino people even as they were clearly reestablishing their military, economic, political and cultural dominance. They showed signs of wishing to postpone the grant of nominal independence, unless their unjust impositions were accepted. They were confronted by the old merger party of the Communist and Socialist parties that had led the People's Army Against Japan and by a broad Democratic Alliance of patriotic and progressive forces that demanded national independence and resisted the imperialist impositions.

From the US grant of nominal independence in 1946, when the Philippine ruling

system became semicolonial, the US tried to perpetuate a pro-US colonial mentality among the Filipinos and combined it with anti-communism. It used the dominant political parties, the schools, the mass media, the churches, the movies, pop music and stage entertainment to tout the US as the defender of democracy or distract the people from the cause of national and social liberation in the Philippines and from the advancing forces of national liberation and socialism abroad.

The political ideas and sentiments generated by the duopoly of the Liberal and Nacionalista parties were pro-imperialist and reactionary. The higher political and educational authorities directed the school administrators and teachers to adopt the curricula and syllabi that they had approved. The US granted scholarships under the Fulbright and Smith-Mundt programs to maintain its influence in key universities and the entire educational system. It also used conferences, seminars and travel grants to promote pro-imperialist and anti-communist ideas and sentiments among academics, journalists, creative writers, artists, trade unionists and other people.

The Central Intelligence Agency became most notorious, through its front foundations (Asia Foundation, PEN and Congress for Cultural Freedom), in funding and manipulating cultural organizations and activities along the pro-imperialist and anti-communist line as a major part of the US-instigated Cold War. The reactionary authorities in state and religious schools were also notorious in trying to prevent the study of the works of the intellectual and political leaders of the old democratic revolution and oppose the speeches and writings of contemporary anti-imperialists like Claro Mayo Recto.

When the advocates and mass organizations that espoused the new democratic revolution grew in strength in the 1960s and early 1970s, the US foreign aid and educational agencies and private US foundations like those of Ford and Rockefeller intensified their interference in the educational and cultural field in the Philippines. After declaring martial law in 1972, Marcos established draconian control over mass media and cultural channels, and deepened the propaganda of his fascist dictatorship through the educational system with its censored curricula and syllabi. The fascist regime and the US also started to use the World Bank to fund so-called reforms to align education to US policies.

The post-Marcos regimes have propagated anti-national and anti-democratic ideas and sentiments along the neocolonial and neoliberal line. US cultural

imperialism has become even more pronounced. While one regime after another has increasingly channeled public funds to foreign debt servicing, bureaucratic corruption and military campaigns of suppression, all have reduced appropriations for state colleges and universities in order to press them to raise tuition fees and seek assistance from the private sector, especially US and foreign entities.

The US and other imperialist governmental agencies and private foundations fund and direct nongovernmental or so-called civil society organizations to subvert educational and cultural institutions and attack the cultural, educational and other works of the people's national democratic movement. US agencies like the Agency of International Development, the National Endowment of Democracy, the US Institute of Peace and the like are well known for funding groups for subverting and attacking the endeavors and aspirations of the Filipino people for national and social liberation.

More than ever the Filipino people and their revolutionary forces demand and struggle for a national, scientific and mass culture and education. The cadres and mass activists are propagating this patriotic and progressive type of culture and education and contributing creatively to its advance even in the schools and other cultural institutions of the ruling system. But certainly they are most effective in the mass movement, in the people's army and in the areas governed by the people's democratic government.

Perspective of the Filipino people in the new democratic revolution

The Filipino people and their revolutionary forces persevere in the struggle for national liberation and democracy under the leadership of the working class and its advanced detachment, the Communist Party of the Philippines. It is precisely through the revolutionary struggle that they build their strength to overthrow the ruling system and to establish a people's democratic state system. They are prepared to fight US imperialism as it escalates its military intervention and proceeds to a full scale war of aggression.

Both US imperialism and the ruling system of big compradors and landlords cannot persist forever in the Philippines. By their own unbridled greed and

terrorism under the auspices of neocolonialism and neoliberalism, they increasingly expose their unjust character and bankruptcy and drive the people to intensify their struggle for national and social liberation. After winning the new democratic revolution, the Filipino people can proceed to the socialist stage of the Philippine revolution.

The betrayal of socialism by the modern revisionists since the late 1950s, culminating in their full restoration of capitalism in their respective countries from 1989 to 1991, led to the full sway of neocolonialism in the underdeveloped countries and neoliberalism in the entire world capitalist system. Since 2007-2008 when the US and other imperialist powers were hit hard by an economic and financial crisis comparable to that of the Great Depression, the conditions of exploitation and oppression have worsened as if without end; but have at the same time driven the broad masses of the people to wage resistance.

US imperialism has undermined its position as the sole superpower by becoming overdrawn to high tech military production and wars of aggression, by making China a major partner in neoliberal globalization, by relying on cheap Chinese labor to produce consumer goods, by undercutting manufacturing and employment in the US, by accelerating the financialization of the US economy and becoming a debtor to China, Japan and a host of other countries. The full entry of China and Russia into the ranks of big capitalist powers has not strengthened the world capitalist system but has made it more cramped and more prone to the intensification of interimperialist contradictions.

Until the first decade of the 21st century, China and Russia have been acquiescent to the US engaging in wars of aggression, as in Iraq and Afghanistan. But subsequently, they have become wary of US expansionism and have formed the Shanghai Cooperation Organization to countervail the growing aggressiveness of the US and NATO. They have also promoted the BRICS as an economic bloc to serve as counterfoil to US arrogance in economic, trade and financial matters. The interimperialist contradictions are still apparently far from breaking out into direct or indirect war between any of the big capitalist powers, notwithstanding their involvement in civil strifes, such as those in Syria and Ukraine.

In East Asia, China has moved on from being known as the sponsor of the Chinese comprador big bourgeoisie collaborating with US and other multinational firms in sweatshop operations and private construction to being a

rising industrial capitalist power, involving the nationalist collaboration of both state and private monopoly capitalism. But China is still avoiding being called a full imperialist power that uses aggression to grab both economic and political territory. Even in UN peacekeeping missions, it prefers to contribute police advisors rather than military troops.

In maritime disputes over the South China Sea, China is conspicuously overreaching and potentially violent. But so far it has not engaged in any act of aggression for the purpose of subjugating any country. The submission by the Philippines of its maritime dispute with China to the International Tribunal on the Law of the Sea is a peaceful act and could be a peaceful way of resolving the said maritime dispute and similar disputes. A situation in which China can always insist on indisputable sovereignty over 90 percent of the South China Sea is more fraught with violence.

The reactionary Aquino regime has boasted that the US will protect the Philippines from China and has allowed the US to have military bases, troops, facilities, war materiel (tanks, warships and attack planes) and even nuclear weapons on Philippine territory under the new Enhanced Defense Cooperation Agreement, in flagrant violation of the 1987 constitution. In fact, the US has declared neutrality between the Philippines and China over their maritime dispute. It is deliberately maintaining a dual policy of cooperation and contention towards China. It is mindful that it has far more economic, trade, financial and security interests in China than in the Philippines. Even the Aquino ruling clique has lucrative relations with Chinese mining, construction, export-processing and marketing firms.

The Filipino people and the revolutionary forces have to grasp the complexity of the world capitalist system today and study how to avail of opportunities presented by interimperialist contradictions as did the Bolsheviks when there was no preceding socialist country to aid them. They must resolutely raise the level of their revolutionary consciousness and fighting capabilities. They must be determined to win the people's democratic revolution and proceed to the socialist revolution. They must be prepared to confront and counter the No. 1 imperialist enemy at every stage.

They can be confident that the turmoil of the world capitalist system, wracked by protracted, intensifying and widening crisis, is the eve of renewed anti-imperialist and proletarian revolutions on a global scale. They must rely

primarily on themselves in waging revolution as they have done successfully for so long, intensify the efforts to win the solidarity and support of other peoples and revolutionary movements and take advantage of the worsening global crisis, interimperialist contradictions and the rise and spread of anti-imperialist and proletarian revolutions on a global scale.

US Imperialism and People's Resistance in the Philippines

Paper for the Forum on Imperialism and Resistance, organized by the ILPS Netherlands in Amsterdam

June 6, 2014

I wish to discuss with you how US imperialism has imposed itself on the Filipino people and violated their national sovereignty and thwarted their aspirations for democracy, social justice and development since 1898 by military, political, economic and cultural means.

In this connection, I wish to discuss first how monopoly capitalism or modern imperialism arose as the final stage in the development of capitalism and how the era of imperialism began. Monopoly capitalism is parasitic, decaying and moribund, opening more widely than before the possibility of socialism. In being imperialist, it is emphatically violent and aggressive in repressing revolution and in acquiring economic and political territory abroad.

As early as the middle of the 19th century, from 1848 to 1868, England showed at least two major characteristics of imperialism: its possession of vast colonies and its industrial monopoly by which it could draw monopoly profits or superprofits. It was the first among the capitalist countries in which free competition capitalism developed into monopoly capitalism as the dominant force in the economy.

However, it would be in the last three decades of the 19th century that several countries, including the US, France, Germany, Italy, Japan and Russia, would see

the development of free competition capitalism to monopoly capitalism. Altogether with England, they manifested the five features of imperialism. The fifth feature, which is the completed division of the world by the capitalist powers, directly set the stage for imperialist wars: 1) the dominance of capitalist monopolies in the economy; 2) the merger of industrial and bank capital and the emergence of the finance oligarchy; 3) the greater importance of the export of surplus capital than the export of surplus commodities as the means to obtain superprofits; 4) the alliances and counter-alliances of cartels, syndicates and trusts on an international scale; 5) the completion of the division of the world by the great capitalist powers, covering underdeveloped or less developed countries or areas as economic territory (sources of cheap raw materials and cheap labor, captive markets and fields of investment) and as political territory (colonies, semicolonies, protectorates, dependent countries and spheres of influence).

For a monopoly capitalist power, a certain country or area abroad becomes a more reliable economic territory when it is also a political territory acquired through military intervention or aggression. The newcomers in the colonial game like the US had to engage in acts of aggression in their emergence as imperialists. In comparison to the Western imperialist powers, Russia and Japan had developed monopoly capitalism to a lesser extent but aggressive use of military power enabled them to acquire territories from which to extract monopoly profits.

Then as now, the capitalist powers try to amicably divide the world market among themselves, until their economic competition and political rivalry break out into wars. The completion of the division of the world among the capitalist powers towards the end of the 19th century laid the ground for the violent struggle among them for the redivision of the world. Latecomers in the colonial game upset the balance of forces and pushed the outbreak of wars.

Thus, the era of modern imperialism was inaugurated by wars and took final shape in the period of 1898 to 1914. The Spanish-American War (1898), the Anglo-Boer War (1899–1902), the Russo-Japanese War (1904–05) and the economic crisis in Europe in 1900 were the chief historical landmarks in the new era. Lenin categorically stated that the era of imperialism did not begin earlier than 1898 to 1900 and that neither Marx nor Engels lived long enough to see it.

I. Perpetuated US aggression

The US fully assumed the character of an imperialist power, on the basis of monopoly capitalism, when it deliberately provoked the Spanish-American War of 1898 in order to seize the colonies of Spain: Cuba, Puerto Rico and the Philippines. In connection with said war, the US pretended to make friends with the Aguinaldo junta in Hong Kong and actually brought Aguinaldo back to the Philippines on an American cutter to proclaim Philippine independence (under the “protection” of the US) and to resume the national war of independence against Spain.

The Filipino people succeeded in liberating themselves nationwide and were about to seize Intramuros, the walled citadel of the Spanish colonizers. But the US interfered with the deployment of Filipino troops for the purpose and maneuvered to prepare for the landing of more US troops. Behind the back of their supposed Filipino allies, the US interveners arranged with the Spanish side a mock battle on August 13, 1898 to justify the surrender of the latter to the former. It was done on the day after Spain and the US signed an armistice agreement ending the Spanish-American War.

The US and Spain forged the Treaty of Paris of December 10, 1898 in which Spain sold the Philippines to the US for the amount of US\$20 million. On December 21, 1898 US President McKinley issued the Proclamation of Benevolent Assimilation to manifest the US plan to colonize the Philippines. The US started to unleash a war of aggression against the Filipino people on February 4, 1899. This has come to be known as the Filipino-American War. The US used superior military force and extreme barbarity of more than 126,000 troops to conquer the nation of 7,000,000 people. It ruthlessly carried out massacres, the torture of captives, the reconcentration of population, scorched earth tactics and food blockades. It killed more than 700,000 or 10 percent of the Filipino people from 1899 to 1902, directly through its brutal operations and indirectly through consequent famines and epidemics. Likewise, it proceeded to kill 1.5 million Filipinos until 1916.

To keep the Philippines as a colony, the US established military bases at various strategic points. It organized the so-called Philippine Scouts as puppet troops and subsequently converted them into the Philippine Constabulary. As a result of relentless demands of the Filipino people for national independence, the US decided as early as 1935 to make the Philippines a semicolony in 1946 after a ten-year transition period under the so-called Commonwealth government.

The National Defense Act of 1936 was this government's first legislative act making the puppet constabulary the First Regular Army under the direct supervision of US Army's Philippine Department. Commonwealth president Quezon made General Douglas MacArthur this puppet army within the frame of the US Army Forces in the Far East (USAFFE).

When World War II broke out in 1941, the Japanese fascists defeated the US army in Bataan and occupied the Philippines up to 1945. To recover the Philippines as a colony, the US coordinated with the USAFFE guerrillas. Before the grant of nominal independence to the Philippines in 1946, the US imposed on the puppet Filipino leaders the Treaty of General Relations which ensured the continuance of US military bases and the property rights of US citizens and corporations. This treaty even required in advance that the diplomatic relations of the Philippines would be subject to approval by the US.

After the Philippines became a semicolony, the US perpetuated its successful aggression and continued to control the Philippine state militarily. It obtained a military assistance agreement to make the Philippine armed services dependent on US planning, training, intelligence and equipment; and a military bases agreement for US military forces to stay in the Philippines for another 99 years. It also bound the Philippines to a mutual defense pact and a US controlled regional security pact, the South East Asia Treaty Organization (SEATO).

Because of its military power over the Philippines, the US has been able to dominate the Philippine economy and politics and intervene at will in Philippine affairs since 1946. It manipulated the outcome of presidential elections in favor of the candidate most compliant with and servile to US interests in the Philippines and in the region.

It instigated the Marcos fascist dictatorship in 1972 in a futile attempt to suppress the revolutionary mass movement that had emerged and developed since 1961 because of the wanton extraction of superprofits by US corporation, bureaucratic corruption and the exhaustion of the land frontier.

The Filipino people were outraged that the fascist regime could persist for so long, from 1972 to 1986, because of US military and economic assistance to it. They were also incensed by the direct and indirect consequences of US planes, ships and troops operating in and around the US bases. Thus, after the downfall of Marcos, the framers of the 1987 constitution enjoyed overwhelming popular

support and took courage in adopting provisions that banned foreign military bases, troops, facilities and nuclear weapons from the Philippines. This ban was indeed the fruit of the people's revolutionary struggle against the fallen US-instigated dictatorship.

The military bases agreement with the US was terminated in 1991 by the Philippine Senate, with the open and strong support of the national democratic movement. But since then, the US has resorted to all sorts of maneuvers to circumvent the constitutional ban on foreign military bases. By invoking the US-RP mutual defense pact. It has used the Balikatan joint US-Philippine military exercises and interoperability training as pretext for the forward stations and rotational presence of US troops in the Philippines.

It has been able to obtain the Visiting Forces Agreement and the Mutual Logistics Support Agreement to allow the entry and stationing of US military forces anywhere in the Philippines for any duration of time. It has used 9-11 and the so-called US global war on terror to justify US military presence and intervention in the Philippines. It has also expanded the pretexts for such Intervention. These include humanitarian aid, medical mission, civic action, disaster-related aid for rescue, relief and rehabilitation; and so on.

The latest pretext of the US for further entrenching itself militarily in the Philippines is to make a strategic pivot to Asia-Pacific region and to protect the country from a putative Chinese aggression in view of the overreaching claims of China over 90 percent of the South China Sea, encroaching on 90 percent of the exclusive economic zone (EEZ) and 100 percent of the extended continental shelf (ECS) of the Philippines. Thus, with the servile collaboration of the Aquino regime, the US has been able to obtain the so-called Enhanced Defense Cooperation Agreement (EDCA).

This agreement allows the US to establish military bases in an indefinite number of so-called Agreed Areas, fortified at Philippine expense, paying no rent, enjoying perimeter security from puppet troops free of charge, barring Philippine authorities from knowing things and activities inside the US military enclaves or bases and allowing US air planes and ships to come and go, with the Philippine authorities barred by the US military from knowing whether such vessels carry nuclear, chemical, bacteriological and other weapons of mass destruction. Moreover, the agreement requires the AFP to provide or facilitate access by US forces to any place whatsoever in Philippine territory that the US decides.

Despite the treason and obsequiousness of the Aquino regime in acceding to EDCA, US President Obama in his recent visit to Manila clearly declared that the US is neutral over the Philippine-China maritime dispute in the West Philippine Sea and that US policy is not to counter or contain China. In fact, the US has a dual policy of cooperation and contention with China and makes its decisions according to US national interest. At any rate, the US has far more interest in relations with China than in those with the Philippines. The people should be alert to the possibility that the US and China could agree to jointly explore and exploit the oil, gas and other natural resources in the EEZ and ECS of the Philippines.

In the face of the perpetuated aggression of US imperialism in the Philippines, the Filipino people and their revolutionary forces have adopted the line of people's democratic revolution through protracted people's war. They are waging a civil war against the semicolonial political system. At the same time, they condemn the escalating military intervention of the US in favor of the puppet regime. They are therefore prepared to wage a war of national liberation should the US unleash a full-scale war of aggression. They are not afraid of such possibility but prepare against it. They consider it an opportunity to realize justice for the heroes martyred by US imperialism and for the suffering of the millions of people as a consequence of the direct and indirect rule of US imperialism.

II. Continuing economic plunder

The US had a strategic motive and objective for seizing and making the Philippine its colony. This was connected with the expressed desire of the US to expand the international market for its manufactures, to turn the Pacific Ocean into an "American lake" for the purpose and to have a base for launching efforts to get a share of China in the frenzy of the capitalist powers to establish spheres of influence.

The US floated bonds in Wall Street to finance its war of aggression in the Philippines. Ultimately, it made the Filipino people pay for their own military conquest through taxation. But the biggest gain for US imperialism came from the extraction of superprofits from the colonial exchange of US manufactures and Philippine raw materials as well as from the direct and indirect US investments in the Philippines. In the process, the US imperialists turned the Philippine economy from feudal to semifeudal. US imperialism did not have to

eliminate feudalism. It merely superimposed the imperialist mode of exploitation to change the total complexion of the social economy to semifeudal. In an attempt to appease the people's hatred of the landed estates owned by the foreign religious orders, the US colonial government expropriated some of them for redistribution to the peasants. But the peasants could not afford to complete payments for the redistribution price. The land eventually fell into the hands of the landlord class.

The US colonial government lifted the feudal restrictions on the physical movement of peasants. This enabled peasants to open land in frontier areas or to seek jobs in urban areas, public works and mines. Bureaucrats and landlords enticed peasants to make their homesteads in frontier areas but ultimately they claimed and registered the land as their own. Merchant usurers also followed the peasants into frontier areas and eventually became landlords. The US colonial rule differed significantly from that of the Spanish by taking superprofits from a far greater flow of manufactured imports and raw material exports, from the chronic need to take loans to cover trade deficits and new schemes of overconsumption and from the far greater inflow of direct foreign investments. The US opened the mines, expanded the plantations for raw-material export production and established a few factories manufacturing consumer products from locally available raw materials. The roads, bridges, ports and other means of transport and communications were improved for the growing domestic and foreign trade. The system of public and private schools was developed to produce the professionals and technicians for the expanded bureaucracy and business enterprises.

In the semifeudal economy and society, the joint class rule of the big compradors and landlords (one percent of the population) arose and replaced the singular dominance of the landlord class in the feudal period of previous centuries. The intermediate social strata of middle bourgeois and urban petty bourgeoisie expanded and would ultimately come to 1 and 8 percent, respectively. From a few percentage points, the working class grew to 15 percent. The peasants descended from a feudal high of about 90 percent to its current semifeudal level of about 75 percent.

The US economic domination of the Philippines was interrupted by the Japanese invasion and occupation during World War II. Japan's imperialist character and war of aggression prevented it from making credible its slogan of "Greater East Asia co-prosperity." The Japanese aggressors wrought havoc and destruction on

the lives, communities and properties of Filipinos. In the course of recapturing the Philippines, especially in its haste to oust the Japanese through massive bombardment, the US added to and aggravated the destruction of lives and properties. US war damage payments were made mainly to the US corporations for reestablishing US economic domination of the Philippines.

The US did not only retain the property rights of US corporations and citizens through the Treaty of General Relations before the grant of nominal independence to the Philippines in 1946 but also imposed on the supposedly independent Philippine state the so-called Parity Amendment in the Philippine Constitution. This amendment allowed US corporations and citizens to have the same rights as Filipinos in owning public utilities and exploiting natural resources. Furthermore, through the Laurel-Langley Agreement, the US extracted from the Philippines the privilege of owning and operating all kinds of businesses without restriction.

A civil war broke out in the Philippines between the reactionary forces of foreign and feudal domination and the revolutionary forces of national liberation and democracy in 1948. The demand for national industrialization and land reform became so strong that the reactionary authorities had to fake land reform in the form of land resettlement programs and token expropriation of landed estates as well as to feign national industrialization in the form of import-substitution manufacturing, which was in fact reassembly and repackaging operations dependent on licensing, financing, technical and marketing agreements with US corporations.

The Philippine economy went from bad to worse when the Marcos regime went on a spending and borrowing spree to build infrastructure and conspicuous tourist facilities and opted for the so-called export-oriented manufacturing in export-processing zones and for the export of labor in the absence of real industrial development for generating local employment. Export-oriented manufacturing is a far worse kind of pseudo-industrialization than the import-substitution manufacturing. It overprices the imported components and underprices the exported semimanufactures. Workers are mostly categorized as casuals, apprentices or learners. They are paid substandard wages and are deprived of job security. Their trade union and other democratic rights are curtailed.

To this day, export-oriented manufacturing is misrepresented as industrial

development. It has been greatly set back by the Asian financial crisis of 1997 and the global financial meltdown of 2007-08. The reassembly and export of semiconductors and other products have plunged. What has become glossier than export-oriented manufacturing is the bubble in office and residential towers and upscale tourist enclaves, which is now about to pop because of the growing flight of portfolio investments. All regimes since the time of the puppet president Ramos have gone into a mad frenzy of opening the entire country to foreign mining companies that ruin agriculture and the environment, preempt future industrialization and take mineral ores out of the country without paying the commensurate taxes.

Philippine economic policy has always been dictated by US imperialism. In the time of Marcos, the World Bank was active in pushing a Keynesian policy of undertaking public works to promote raw-material production and the colonial exchange of raw material exports and manufactured imports and thereby diverting resources and foreign loans from what should be a line of national industrialization. The first Aquino regime drew the Philippines further away from national industrialization by following the US-dictated policy of neoliberalism and carrying out trade liberalization at the expense of both local industry and even agriculture. The Ramos regime followed up the anti-industrialization policy by channeling huge resources and foreign loans to upscale private construction and tourist facilities.

Altogether the post-Marcos regimes have been bound to exporting raw materials and labor and have been trapped within the frame of the imperialist policy of neoliberal globalization under the so-called Washington Consensus of the IMF, the World Bank (especially its private investment arm IFC) and the WTO (including its GATT predecessor). The US has used these multilateral agencies to push the liberalization of trade and investments, privatization of public assets, deregulation of social and environmental protection and the denationalization of such underdeveloped economies as the Philippines. Like their imperialist masters, the puppet regimes in the Philippines have clung to the neoliberal policy because it suits their greed, they believe that they can always shift the burden of crisis to the people and they still have to see a more powerful revolutionary mass movement to challenge them.

Under the general auspices of the WTO and the proliferation of bilateral and multilateral free trade agreements with the US and other imperialist powers, the Philippines is prevented from upholding economic sovereignty, conserving its

national patrimony for the benefit of the Filipino people and undertaking national industrialization and land reform. The Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation, the Trans-Pacific Partnership Agreement and ASEAN Economic Community are frameworks for binding the Philippines to the imperialist system of plunder and particularly to its neoliberal policy of unbridled monopoly capitalist greed.

In the face of the continuing plunder of the Philippines by US imperialism, enjoying the collaboration of the local exploiting classes of big compradors and landlords, the Filipino people and their revolutionary forces are committed to fighting for national liberation and democracy, realizing social justice, conserving the national patrimony and carrying out a program of development through national industrialization and land reform. They can end the underdevelopment of the Philippines only by destroying the exploitative system of big compradors and landlords subservient to US imperialism and thereby releasing the patriotic and progressive forces to undertake genuine development and achieve social justice.

III. Unrelenting puppetry of officials

Even while it carried out its war of aggression against the Filipino people, the US sought to entice leaders of the Philippine revolutionary government to surrender. This caused a split within the Aguinaldo Cabinet, between the revolutionary members like Apolinario Mabini and Antonio Luna and the capitulationists like Pardo de Tavera, Paterno and Buencamino. But the revolutionary mass movement was too strong to be derailed by the capitulationists, who were ridiculed as asimilistas and Sajonistas.

The US aggressors carried out a brutal war of conquest to serve the interests of US monopoly capitalism. But hypocritically they declared that they came to the Philippines to “civilize” and “Christianize” the people, after more than three centuries of Spanish colonial rule and Roman Catholic proselytization. They also claimed to have no interest in possessing the Philippines but in teaching democracy and self-government to the Filipinos, despite the success of the Filipinos in exercising democracy by building a revolutionary government and army and defeating Spanish colonialism.

They touted Jeffersonian democracy to embellish modern imperialism. With this, they were confident of being able to coopt the bourgeois liberals leading the

Philippine revolution. The Filipino bourgeois liberals derived their political enlightenment from the study of bourgeois liberalism in Europe. They did not arise as the offshoot of a manufacturing bourgeoisie as in Europe. In fact, they were children of landlords, colonial bureaucrats and merchants.

The US calculated that it could rely on a growing number of political collaborators by developing the semifeudal economy of the big compradors and landlords, using the educational system and the pensionado system of sending native scholars to US universities to promote a pro-US colonial mentality and expanding the bureaucracy and businesses to accommodate those produced by the schools.

After his capture in 1901, President Aguinaldo was threatened with death and coaxed by his US captors to issue a Peace Manifesto calling on the revolutionary forces to surrender. The leaders who turned against the revolution were given positions at various levels of the US colonial government and were encouraged to form in 1901 the Partido Federal to serve the colonial regime and to help it to discourage and suppress the revolutionary resistance of the people.

Those who continued to wage revolutionary resistance were subjected to a series of draconian laws and were made to suffer torture and death by hanging and other means. Even after several years from the formal end of the Filipino-American War, the US issued in 1907 the Flag Law prohibiting the Filipino people from displaying the Philippine flag. They continued to be subjected to massacres, arbitrary detention and torture, food blockades and reconcentration.

When the US calculated that it had sufficiently broken the armed revolutionary movement and trained a large corps of puppet politicians and professionals, it allowed the Nacionalista Party to exist and call for immediate, absolute and complete national independence. The Nacionalista Party was a reformist party, committed to demanding national independence only by legal and peaceful means and sending missions to Washington to plead for an eventual grant of independence.

Consequent to the inspiration of the victorious Great October Revolution in 1917 and the dire colonial and social conditions, the modern trade union movement which started in 1902 became relatively stronger and became the basis for the establishment of the Communist Party of the Philippine Islands in 1930. The US immediately tried to suppress this party by trumping up charges of sedition

against the leaders. When the Great Depression worsened social conditions in the Philippines in the 1930s and the danger of fascism was running high, the rise of the broad antifascist Popular Front paved the way for the release of communist leaders from prisons and internal exile.

By 1935 the US was ready to establish the Commonwealth government as a transition to a semicolonial status for the Philippines. It approved the Philippine Constitution as framed by Filipino politicians and promised the grant of national independence by 1946. The Japanese imperialists and fascists invaded and occupied the Philippines from 1941 to 1945 and pretended to be even more generous than US imperialism by swiftly granting nominal independence to a puppet Philippine republic. In the course of the interimperialist war, the Communist Party was able to build a people's army against Japan (Hukbalahap), local organs of political power and a powerful mass movement that confiscated land from the landlords.

During World War II, the US kept a Commonwealth government in exile in Washington and directed from Australia the Filipino guerrilla forces, which swore loyalty to the US Army Forces in the Far East. It was able to recover the Philippines in 1945 and grant national independence in 1946 to a group of Filipino puppets headed by Manuel Roxas who had broken away from the Nacionalista Party and formed the Liberal Party. Thus, the Philippines became a semicolony run by puppets who served US imperialism and the local exploiting classes of big compradors and landlords.

The US and the local exploiting classes provoked the revolutionary resistance of the people by making impositions on them in violation of national independence and the national patrimony, by nullifying land reform and other social gains made by the anti-Japan revolutionary movement and by carrying out brutal campaigns of military suppression. The backbone of the armed revolutionary movement was broken in the early 1950s. But it succeeded in calling attention to the dire semicolonial and semifeudal conditions and the need for a democratic revolution led by the working class.

It seemed as if the phoney democracy of the big comprador-landlord oligarchs could go on forever as a game of musical chairs between the Nacionalista and Liberal parties, with each party trying to replace the other in periodic elections that they monopolized. The two parties were a duopoly patterned after that of the Republican and Democratic parties in US. But the chronic crisis of Philippine

society kept on worsening, exposing the inability of every regime to solve the crisis, pointing to the need for a revolution but also tempting a president like Marcos to carry out a counterrevolution.

The Communist Party of the Philippines was reestablished in 1968 as the advanced detachment of the working class under the guidance of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought (or Maoism). It rectified the errors and shortcomings of the previous revolutionary movement. It put forward the general line of people's democratic revolution through protracted people's war. It considered the peasantry as the main force of the revolution in combination with the proletariat. The basic worker-peasant alliance linked itself with the urban petty bourgeoisie as a revolutionary force and further with the middle bourgeoisie against the joint class dictatorship of the big compradors and landlords.

Upon the instigation of the US, Marcos launched a fascist dictatorship under the pretext of "saving the republic and building a new society" in 1972. He sought to destroy the armed revolutionary movements of the Filipino and Moro people. He succeeded only to inflame the resistance of the broad masses of the people. Eventually, the people totally discredited, isolated and overthrew the fascist regime. Even his US imperialist master turned against him when it became indubitably clear that he was more of a liability than an asset. Fearing that the revolutionary forces could grow strong enough to overthrow the entire ruling system, the US and the local exploiting classes decided to junk Marcos and go back to the old track of pseudo-democratic regimes.

The pseudo-democratic regimes, from that of Cory Aquino to her son Benigno III, have proven to be utterly servile to US imperialism, exploitative and oppressive, corrupt and brutal. They have imposed on the Filipino people the policies of neocolonialism and neoliberalism and have inflicted extremely terrible suffering on the people. A multiplicity of reactionary parties has not proven any better than the duopoly of the Nacionalista and Liberal parties or the one-party rule of Marcos. Bureaucrat capitalism has grown worse since the Marcos dictatorship. Thus, the Filipino people and their revolutionary forces have become ever more determined to overthrow the entire ruling system and consequently end US domination in order to fully realize national and social liberation.

IV. Persistence of colonial mentality

From the very start of its colonial rule in the Philippines, US imperialism was determined to dominate and control the Filipino people culturally aside from militarily, economically and politically. It sought to capture the hearts and minds of the people by misrepresenting itself as beneficent and altruistic and making the people forget about the extreme brutality of the US war of aggression through political propaganda and through the educational and cultural system. Thus, it dramatized the arrival of hundreds of American teachers on the ship Thomas and the conversion of some US troops to school teachers in pacified areas.

The US imperialists misrepresented themselves as far more gentle and kind than Spanish colonialists whom they demonized. And yet they cleverly forged a compromise between their own cultural imperialism and the feudalism of the dominant Roman Catholic Church. The US controlled the expanding public school system and allowed the church and its religious orders to control in the main the private educational system. It propagated a conservative and pro-imperialist kind of liberalism, while the religio-sectarian schools continued religious instruction and accepted the new colonial dispensation. It suppressed the expression of patriotism and anti-imperialism by political and mass leaders, by journalists, creative writers, artists and teachers.

A pro-US kind of colonial mentality supplanted the previous pro-Spanish kind among those educated in the schools under the US colonial regime. The US colonial authorities established the pensionado system, providing scholarships to bright students for higher studies in various fields in the US. When the pensionados returned, they propagated their adulation of the US and were assured of promotions in the educational system, bureaucracy, business and professions. The supplantation of Spanish by English as the principal medium in the schools and in government guaranteed the predominance of a pro-US colonial mentality.

But such colonial mentality could never obliterate the patriotism and revolutionary aspirations of the Filipino people. In so many ways, the people demanded national independence and democracy and condemned the US colonial regime. Formations of the working people and the intelligentsia persevered in upholding and propagating patriotic and progressive ideas and sentiments. They were reinforced and revitalized by the establishment of the Communist Party of the Philippine Islands which was avowedly guided by Marxism-Leninism and which demanded a national, scientific and mass culture.

The influences of the Great October Revolution and the revolutionary movements in China, Spain, Germany, US and elsewhere reached the Philippines, especially when the Great Depression worsened and fascist and antifascist movements arose in various parts of the world. The US colonial authorities tried to combine anti-communism with colonial mentality to discourage the patriotic and progressive forces. But they failed because the economic and social crisis was worsening and the threat of fascism moved the people towards the struggle for national independence, democratic rights and social justice.

During their occupation of the Philippines from 1942 to 1945, the Japanese imperialists tried to ape the US imperialists in using the schools, mass media, puppet organizations such as the KALIBAPI, the Japanese language, and other cultural vehicles to impose on the people the most colonial aspect of their culture, including their fascist ideas and practices that carried markedly feudal vestiges, even their body language (e.g., deep bowing to show respect or submission). They aroused patriotic anger among the Filipino people. Many Filipinos did not send their children to the Japanese-controlled public schools to keep them away from Japanese indoctrination.

After their reconquest of the Philippines in 1946, the US imperialists misrepresented themselves as liberators of the Filipino people even as they were clearly reestablishing their military, economic, political and cultural dominance. They showed signs of wishing to postpone the grant of nominal independence, unless their unjust impositions were accepted. They were confronted by the old merger party of the Communist and Socialist parties that had led the People's Army Against Japan and by a broad Democratic Alliance of patriotic and progressive forces that demanded national independence and resisted the imperialist impositions.

From the US grant of nominal independence in 1946, when the Philippine ruling system became semicolonial, the US tried to perpetuate a pro-US colonial mentality among the Filipinos and combined it with anti-communism. It used the dominant political parties, the schools, the mass media, the churches, the movies, pop music and stage entertainment to tout the US as the defender of democracy or distract the people from the cause of national and social liberation in the Philippines and from the advancing forces of national liberation and socialism abroad.

The political ideas and sentiments generated by the duopoly of the Liberal and Nacionalista parties were pro-imperialist and reactionary. The higher political and educational authorities directed the school administrators and teachers to adopt the curricula and syllabi that they had approved. The US granted scholarships under the Fulbright and Smith-Mundt programs to maintain its influence in key universities and the entire educational system. It also used conferences, seminars and travel grants to promote pro-imperialist and anti-communist ideas and sentiments among academics, journalists, creative writers, artists, trade unionists and other people.

The Central Intelligence Agency became most notorious, through its front foundations (Asia Foundation, PEN and Congress for Cultural Freedom), in funding and manipulating cultural organizations and activities along the pro-imperialist and anti-communist line as a major part of the US-instigated Cold War. The reactionary authorities in state and religious schools were also notorious in trying to prevent the study of the works of the intellectual and political leaders of the old democratic revolution and oppose the speeches and writings of contemporary anti-imperialists like Claro Mayo Recto.

When the mass organizations that espoused the new democratic revolution grew in strength in the 1960s and early 1970s, the US foreign aid and educational agencies and private US foundations like those of Ford and Rockefeller intensified their interference in the educational and cultural field in the Philippines. After declaring martial law in 1972, Marcos established draconian control over mass media and cultural channels, and deepened the propaganda of his fascist dictatorship through the educational system with its censored curricula and syllabi. The fascist regime and the US also started to use the World Bank to fund so-called reforms to align education to US policies.

The post-Marcos regimes have propagated anti-national and anti-democratic ideas and sentiments along the neocolonial and neoliberal line. US cultural imperialism has become even more pronounced. While one regime after another has increasingly channeled public funds to foreign debt servicing, bureaucratic corruption and military campaigns of suppression, all have reduced appropriations for state colleges and universities in order to press them to raise tuition fees and seek assistance from the private sector and US and foreign entities.

The US and other imperialist governmental agencies and private foundations

fund and direct nongovernmental or so-called civil society organizations to subvert educational and cultural institutions and attack the cultural, educational and other works of the people's national democratic movement. US agencies like the Agency of International Development, the National Endowment of Democracy, the US Institute of Peace and the like are well known for funding groups for subverting and attacking the endeavors and aspirations of the Filipino people for national and social liberation.

More than ever the Filipino people and their revolutionary forces demand and struggle for a national, scientific and mass culture and education. The cadres and mass activists are propagating this patriotic and progressive type of culture and education and contributing creatively to its advance even in the schools and other cultural institutions of the ruling system. But certainly they are most effective in the mass movement, in the people's army and in the areas governed by the people's democratic government.

V. Perspective of the Filipino people in the new democratic revolution

The Filipino people and their revolutionary forces persevere in the struggle for national liberation and democracy under the leadership of the working class and its advanced detachment, the Communist Party of the Philippines. It is precisely through the revolutionary struggle that they build their strength to overthrow the ruling system and to establish a people's democratic state system. They are prepared to fight US imperialism as it escalates its military intervention and proceeds to a full scale war of aggression.

Both US imperialism and the ruling system of big compradors and landlords cannot persist forever in the Philippines. By their own unbridled greed and terrorism under the auspices of neocolonialism and neoliberalism, they increasingly expose their unjust character and bankruptcy and drive the people to intensify their struggle for national and social liberation. After winning the new democratic revolution, the Filipino people can proceed to the socialist stage of the Philippine revolution.

The betrayal of socialism by the modern revisionists since the late 1950s, culminating in their full restoration of capitalism in their respective countries from 1989 to 1991, led to the full sway of neocolonialism in the underdeveloped countries and neoliberalism in the entire world capitalist system. Since 2007-2008 when the US and other imperialist powers were hit hard by an economic

and financial crisis comparable to that of the Great Depression, the conditions of exploitation and oppression have worsened as if without end; but have at the same time driven the broad masses of the people to wage resistance.

US imperialism has undermined its position as the sole superpower by becoming overdrawn to high-tech military production and wars of aggression, by making China a major partner in neoliberal globalization, by relying on cheap Chinese labor to produce consumer goods, by undercutting manufacturing and employment in the US, by accelerating the financialization of the US economy and becoming a debtor to China, Japan and a host of other countries. The full entry of China and Russia into the ranks of big capitalist powers has not strengthened the world capitalist system but has made it more cramped and more prone to the intensification of interimperialist contradictions.

Until the first decade of the 21st century, China and Russia have been acquiescent to the US engaging in wars of aggression, as in Iraq and Afghanistan. But subsequently, they have become wary of US expansionism and have formed the Shanghai Cooperation Organization to countervail the growing aggressiveness of the US and NATO. They have also promoted the BRICS as an economic bloc to serve as counterfoil to US arrogance in economic, trade and financial matters. The interimperialist contradictions are still apparently far from breaking out into direct or indirect war between any of the big capitalist powers, notwithstanding their involvement in civil strifes, such as those in Syria and Ukraine.

In East Asia, China has moved on from being known as the sponsor of the Chinese comprador big bourgeoisie collaborating with US and other multinational firms in sweatshop operations and private construction to being a rising industrial capitalist power, involving the nationalist collaboration of both state and private monopoly capitalism. But China is still avoiding being called a full imperialist power that uses aggression to grab both economic and political territory. Even in UN peacekeeping missions, it prefers to contribute police advisors rather than military troops.

In maritime disputes over the South China Sea, China is conspicuously overreaching and potentially violent. But so far it has not engaged in any act of aggression for the purpose of subjugating any country. The submission by the Philippines of its maritime dispute with China to the International Tribunal on the Law of the Sea is a peaceful act and could be a peaceful way of resolving the

said maritime dispute and similar disputes. A situation in which China can always insist on indisputable sovereignty over 90 percent of the South China Sea is more fraught with violence.

The reactionary Aquino regime has boasted that the US will protect the Philippines from China and has allowed the US to have military bases, troops, facilities, war materiel (tanks, warships and attack planes) and even nuclear weapons on Philippine territory under the new Enhanced Defense Cooperation Agreement, in flagrant violation of the 1987 constitution. In fact, the US has declared neutrality between the Philippines and China over their maritime dispute. It is deliberately maintaining a dual policy of cooperation and contention towards China. It is mindful that it has far more economic, trade, financial and security interests in China than in the Philippines. Even the Aquino ruling clique has lucrative relations with Chinese mining, construction, export-processing and marketing firms.

In the meantime, the long running provocative thrust of the neoconservative policy to make the US dominant in the entire 21st century and use a broad spectrum approach to put down any imperialist rival and the more recent provocations of the US pivot to Asia against China and the US-EU-NATO expansion into the Ukraine against Russia have pushed China and Russia to sign on May 21 a 30-year US\$400 billion natural gas agreement. This agreement solidifies the alliance of China and Russia against the hegemonic schemes of the US and is at the center of the most pertinent economic, financial and trade agreements and is concomitant to a greatly increased security alliance and cooperation between the two giant neighbors. The struggle for a redivision of the world among the great capitalist powers is steadily developing before the huge earthquakes break out to serve as prelude to the unprecedented rise of the anti-imperialist and socialist movements.

The Filipino people and the revolutionary forces have to grasp the complexity of the world capitalist system today and study how to avail of opportunities presented by interimperialist contradictions as did the Bolsheviks when there was no preceding socialist country to aid them. They must resolutely raise the level of their revolutionary consciousness and fighting capabilities. They must be determined to win the people's democratic revolution and proceed to the socialist revolution. They must be prepared to confront and counter the No. 1 imperialist enemy at every stage.

They can be confident that the turmoil of the world capitalist system, wracked by protracted, intensifying and widening crisis, is the eve of renewed anti-imperialist and proletarian revolutions on a global scale. They must rely primarily on themselves in waging revolution as they have done successfully for so long, intensify the efforts to win the solidarity and support of other peoples and revolutionary movements and take advantage of the worsening global crisis, interimperialist contradictions and the rise and spread of anti-imperialist and proletarian revolutions on a global scale.

The Relation of Activism to Philippine Development Issues

Lecture to Students of International Development Studies of Utrecht University

November 17, 2014

I thank Prof. Robert Fletcher and the International Development Studies Program for the invitation to speak on the role of activism in relation to development issues in the Philippines.

Let me try to give you a brief introduction on the basic problems of economic underdevelopment in the Philippines and the program of action for economic development being proposed and demanded by three types of activism associated with the legal national democratic movement, the people's democratic revolution and the movement for a just and lasting peace.

Mr. Luis Jalandoni, Chief International Representative and Chairperson of the Panel of the National Democratic Front of the Philippines (NDFP) Negotiating with the Panel of the Government of the Philippines (GPH), will speak on the minimum and maximum programs of land reform in relation to the people's democratic revolution which integrates armed struggle, land reform and mass base building.

Ms. Julieta de Lima, Chairperson of the NDFP Committee on Social and Economic Reforms negotiating with its counterpart in the GRP-NDFP peace negotiations, will speak on economic sovereignty, genuine land reform, national industrialization and social justice being demanded by the peace movement and

the people.

The Philippines is an archipelagic country east of the Asian mainland, north of Indonesia and south of Japan. It has a population of more than 100 million and a workforce of 59 million. It has rich natural resources, including 14 out of the 16 mineral ores necessary for industrial development. But the Filipino people are poor and consigned to an underdeveloped, agrarian, pre-industrial and semifeudal economy, despite the abundance of Filipino professionals, scientists, technologists and skilled workers. More than 10 percent of the population or more than 20 percent of the workforce have to look for work abroad and are in more than 120 countries.

The Philippines has a current GDP of US\$272 billion. The GDP per capita of US\$2,790 puts the Philippines at the 126th spot. Because of the inflow of hot money or portfolio investments, there was a rise of the GDP by 6.8 percent in 2012 and 7.2 percent in 2013. This has led the multilateral agencies, hedge funds and the business journalists to hype the Philippines as a newly-industrialized country, an emergent market or a tiger cub economy. The false illusion of industrialization is conjured by teaming up the output values of the service and industry sectors at 54.4 percent and 33 percent, respectively, against that of agriculture at 12.3 percent and the work force distribution of 52 percent and 15 percent in the service and industry sectors against 33 percent in agriculture. But the service and industry sectors are heavily dependent on foreign debt and imported equipment and fuel, add low values and are consumption-oriented.

Let me give you a bit of history. The Filipino people underwent more than three centuries of Spanish colonial rule and became the first Asian people to overthrow a Western colonial power in 1898. But the US launched an imperialist war of aggression in 1899 and imposed colonial rule on the Philippines. Despite the nominal grant of independence in 1946, the US continues to dominate the Philippines as a semicolony (if you wish to stress political control) or as a neocolony (if you wish to stress the economic and financial control). The domination is done through unequal treaties, agreements and arrangements in the political, economic, financial, security and other spheres.

Let me give you a view of the social structure. The ruling classes in the Philippines are the comprador big bourgeoisie based in the big cities and the landlord class based in the expanse of the countryside. They are the main exploiting classes and are merely 1 percent of the population. The intermediate

social strata are middle bourgeoisie and urban petty bourgeoisie which are 1 percent and 7 percent of the population, respectively. The basic exploited classes are the working class and the peasantry, which are 16 percent and 75 percent, respectively.

The high officials of the Philippines are essentially political representatives of the aforesaid ruling classes. They do compete as factional groups in periodic elections but they are bound to adopt and implement social and economic policies that harmonize the interests of the US and multilateral agencies and the local exploiting classes. They have been called the bureaucrat capitalists serving as brokers between the foreign monopoly capitalism and domestic feudalism. Whether they take the form of autocracy or an oligarchy, these bureaucrat capitalists equally oppress and exploit the people.

Under the auspices of neocolonialism, we have some industries dependent on imported equipment and fuel. We have undertaken reassembly and repacking enterprises, token land reform and graft-ridden infrastructure building since the 1950s. We have gone through the First UN Development Decade of the 1960s and the Second Development Decade of the 1970s, with the IMF looking after the financial subordination of the Philippines to the US and other developed countries and the World Bank financing graft-ridden infrastructure programs and projects to facilitate the traditional exchange of raw material exports and manufactured imports. The UN development decades coincided with the Marcos fascist dictatorship prolonging the import-substitution assembly plants and eventually paving the way for the reexport-oriented semimanufacturing enterprises in export-processing zones.

The basic problems of foreign monopoly capitalism, domestic feudalism and bureaucrat capitalism have persisted. These have been aggravated under the auspices of neoliberalism, which has resulted in increased investment privileges for multinational firms and banks, privatization of public assets, deregulation and denationalization of the economy. Under the neoliberal policy dictated by the US to the post-Marcos regimes, the WTO has drawn the Philippines to “free trade” agreements at the global and regional levels, multilaterally and bilaterally. The Philippines to some extent has been one of those underdeveloped countries favored at times with money and credit flows for private construction booms and reexport-oriented semimanufacturing of semiconductors and basic consumer goods like garments, footwear and subsequently hard hit by the global financial and economic crisis.

The Philippines is chronically beset by foreign trade deficits and mounting foreign debt because of the unequal exchange of imported manufactures on one hand and the exported raw materials and semimanufactures on the other hand. The construction of high-rise buildings, the accelerated export of mineral and plantation crops and the remittances of overseas contract workers have not resulted in industrial development but in further underdevelopment. Budgetary deficits have also grown because of economic stagnation and wastage of public funds in bureaucratic corruption and military expenditures.

The underdeveloped Philippine economy is in a chronic state of crisis. This is well manifested by widespread poverty, high rates of unemployment, landlessness, ever-decreasing levels of income, soaring prices of basic goods and services, grossly inadequate social services (in education, health, housing, poverty alleviation, disaster relief and so on) and the ever-deteriorating infrastructure. The dire economic and social conditions, the exploitativeness and repressiveness of the ruling system have made the Philippines a fertile ground for social activism.

In 1958 when I was a graduate student and teaching fellow at the University of the Philippines, I was among the students who wrote patriotic and progressive articles and formed a student organization to demand full national independence and democracy, social justice, economic development through land reform and national industrialization, a patriotic and progressive culture and international solidarity with peoples fighting against imperialism and reaction. We succeeded in reviving anti-imperialist and anti-feudal protest actions and generating a significant national democratic movement among students nationwide by 1961.

We proceeded to bring our political and organizational work to the toiling masses of workers and peasants. In 1962 we joined the research and education department of the Workers' Party and we conducted seminars among the trade unions. We were also able to establish connections with peasant associations and provided them with refresher courses on land reform and the national democratic movement. By 1964 we were able to establish the Patriotic Youth, a comprehensive organization of students and young workers, peasants, teachers and other professionals.

By 1966 we formed a united front organization for workers, peasants, youth, women, professionals, patriotic businessmen, bourgeois national members of Congress and progressive religious organizations. We were able to hold mass

actions with as many as 25,000 participants. We consistently demanded the abrogation of unequal treaties, agreements and arrangements with the US, especially in the economic and military spheres, and the adoption of policies for land reform and industrialization. We joined the workers in their strikes against particular employers and against government policies. We also joined the peasants in demanding genuine land reform.

Our demands were not heeded by those in power, although we were allowed extremely limited time to express our views in public congressional hearings and in the bourgeois mass media. By 1968 we were confronted by increasingly repressive measures. We raised the level of our activism from entirely legal forms of struggle to revolutionary armed struggle without giving up or opposing the patriotic and progressive forces that carry out legal struggle, including electoral struggle and struggle in court against human rights violations in the political, civil, economic, social and cultural fields.

We reestablished the Communist Party of the Philippines (CPP) and we issued the Program for a People's Democratic Revolution. We have consistently called for economic sovereignty, social justice and economic development through land reform and national industrialization. We have considered land reform as the main content of the democratic revolution because it spells the economic, social and political liberation of the peasant majority of the people. We stressed the complementary relationship of land reform and national industrialization. The open secret about the CPP being able to wage a protracted people's war is the persistence of gross exploitation and rampant poverty and the success of the CPP and the peasant movement in carrying out agrarian revolution in stages.

The Communist Party of the Philippines, the New People's Army, the mass organizations and the local organs of political power grew in strength as fascist dictatorship was imposed by Marcos on the people from 1972 to 1986. As soon as Marcos fell, the revolutionary forces were ready to negotiate peace with those who came to power. But the worst reactionaries have so far succeeded in fouling up the possibility of peace by being far more interested in the capitulation and pacification of the revolutionary than in addressing the roots of the civil war with agreements on social, economic and political reforms.

Even then, the NDFP as representative of the revolutionary forces and people is ever ready to resume formal talks in peace negotiations. It appreciates the rise of one more form of activism undertaken by peace advocates and people from

various classes and sectors who demand that the Manila government and the NDFP pursue the peace negotiations seriously in accordance with The Hague Joint Declaration of 1992 and succeeding agreements. The peace movement reflects the clamor of the people for social, economic and political reforms as the basis of a just and lasting peace.

As the social and economic crisis is worsening in the Philippines, it is urgent to resume the negotiations on social and economic reforms. The NDFP has submitted its 50-page draft of the Comprehensive Agreement on Social and Economic Reforms since a long time ago. Development issues are addressed in this draft. They refer to the problems of foreign economic domination, persistence of feudal and semifeudal exploitation and bureaucratic corruption.

The solutions are spelled out, such as upholding economic sovereignty, conservation of the national patrimony, wise utilization of natural resources, land reform, national industrialization, immediate provision of livelihood and employment and expansion of social services. The NDFP continues to hope that said solutions can be realized by the combined strength and cooperation of the now conflicting forces.

Foundations and Motivations of Imperialist Aggression and Most Important Tasks of the People in the Struggle

Keynote Address to the Symposium: Demanding Justice for Imperialist Crimes against Humanity, De Kargadoor, Utrecht, February 21, 2015

On behalf of the International League of Peoples' Struggle, I thank the Filipino Refugees in the Netherlands and the Netherlands chapter of the ILPS for inviting me to deliver the keynote address. It is an honor and privilege to be among the distinguished speakers, the members of the ILPS International Coordinating Committee, and all other participants in this symposium on demanding justice for imperialist crimes against humanity. I am deeply pleased that representatives of revolutionary movements in Palestine, Kurdistan, Philippines, Ireland, Belgium and other countries are here.

It is my assignment this afternoon to try setting the context and tone for the presentations and discussions by describing the foundations and motivations of imperialist aggression and pointing to the most important tasks of the people in struggling against imperialism and achieving revolutionary objectives.

I. Foundations and motivations of imperialism

Adam Smith and his successors have pontificated that the supposed invisible hand of self-interest in the capitalist market has produced the social good through the ever dynamic balance of supply and demand. Indeed, capitalism is founded on greed and exploitation. And to keep the system of exploitation going, there is the concomitant system of oppression. The bourgeois state or the class

dictatorship of the bourgeoisie consists of the instruments of coercion, such as the army, policemen, the courts and prisons, to enforce the law of the oppressor class against the working classes of workers and peasants.

The bourgeoisie used the most vicious methods of exploitation and oppression in the primitive accumulation of capital. Workers, including women and children, were forced to work extremely long hours, 14 to 16 hours a day for six days a week, and accept extremely low wages. The enclosure movement or similar actions of the bourgeoisie deprived the peasants of the land in order to proletarianize them in the course of making capitalist farms, force the dispossessed peasants to take factory jobs and make a reserve army of unemployed manpower to press down the wage level. Colonialism and slavery were major components of the primitive accumulation. Forced labor was used and natural resources were plundered in the colonies. Men and women were abducted in Africa and traded as slaves.

Marx and Engels explained how new economic values are created by labor power by using the equipment and raw materials in the process of production, and how the owners of capital take away a greater amount of surplus value by pressing down the wages paid to the workers. The crisis of overproduction arises because the capitalist exploiters keep on increasing profits and accumulating capital by pressing down wages. As a result, the market slumps because the workers cannot afford to buy the very goods they produce for their consumption.

The use of finance capital to override the economic crisis with the ever-growing private and public debt, and likewise to override the tendency of the profit rate to fall, has resulted in financial bubbles and financial crises. The recurrent bouts of economic and financial crisis result not only in worse conditions of the working class but also in the intensified competition of capitalist firms, leading to the bankruptcy of weaker capitalist firms and the ultimate growth of the winning capitalist firms into monopolies. Thus, towards the end of the 19th century, the era of free competition led to monopoly capitalism or modern imperialism.

Lenin described the features that characterize the imperialist countries. Monopoly capitalism has become dominant over society. Industrial capital and bank capital have merged, thus creating a financial oligarchy. The export of surplus capital has gained importance over the export of surplus commodities. Monopoly capitalist firms based in various countries engage in combinations like syndicates and cartels in order to compete with and prevail over their

competitors. The competition for economic territory and the struggle for a redivision of the world intensify among the monopoly capitalist powers, which form blocs against each other.

Towards the beginning of the 20th century, there was no longer any part of the world, outside of the imperialist countries, which was not somehow covered by the earlier colonial powers as colony, semicolon or dependent country and as a source of cheap labor and cheap raw materials, as a market, as a field of investment or as spheres of influence. To join the colonial game in order to gain economic and political advantage over other countries, the new players jointly and separately took a collision course with the old players.

Thus, a series of wars occurred from 1898 to the eve of World War I (the Spanish-American War of 1898, the Anglo-Boer War of 1899-1902 and the Russo-Japanese War of 1904-05) to signal the arrival of the era of modern imperialism and manifest the extremely violent and aggressive character of monopoly capitalism. State monopoly capitalism arose to bring the domestic crisis under control and to ensure preparedness for wars of aggression. It emerged overtly in the form of state monopoly companies or, as in the US, through private companies favored by state subsidies and contracts to produce war equipment.

The first full-scale global interimperialist war between two imperialist powers, the Allied Powers and the Central Powers, broke out in 1914. It signified the inability of the imperialist countries to peacefully solve their domestic economic and social crisis and the general crisis of capitalism. World War I cost the lives of more than 23 million people. It proved beyond doubt the moribund and aggressive character of monopoly capitalism. Far more telling was the victory of socialist revolution over one-sixth of the surface of the earth in the October Revolution of 1917.

The Bolsheviks and the Soviet Union showed how a new social system could arise and develop through the exercise of proletarian class dictatorship against the bourgeoisie, the growth of socialist industry and collectivization of agriculture through a series of five-year economic plans, and the promotion of a socialist culture ennobling the working people and inspiring them to achieve greater revolutionary victories. They established the Third International to cause the establishment of the revolutionary parties of the proletariat and encourage the advance of movements for national liberation and socialism.

The Soviet Union was flourishing when the world capitalist system was again wracked by a general crisis (the Great Depression) and the rise of fascism, while two blocs of imperialist powers were threatening each other. In due time, World War II broke out between the Allied and Axis Powers. It was essentially an interimperialist war. But this time, the Allied Powers could not have won if not for the immense Soviet war effort, leading to the decisive defeat of Nazi Germany at Stalingrad and the subsequent Soviet counteroffensive which liberated Eastern Europe and the eastern part of Germany. The war cost the lives of more than 50 million people, including those of 27 million Soviet people.

The communists excelled in fighting the fascist powers. As a result, people's democracies and socialism came to power in several countries. The colonial system weakened. One third of humanity were in countries under the leadership of communist and worker's parties up to the time Khrushchov and modern revisionism came to power in the Soviet Union in 1956. China won power in 1949 and became one giant bulwark of anti-imperialism and socialism. National liberation movements continued to grow in strength in Asia, Africa and Latin America.

Among the imperialist powers, the US emerged as the No. 1 economic and military power. It spearheaded the establishment of the United Nations and the Bretton Woods Agreement. It declared the Cold War against the socialist countries and carried out wars of aggression against peoples in the third world. In 1951, the Korean people defeated the US war of aggression and its scheme of occupying the entire Korean peninsula. The Vietnamese and other Indochinese people defeated the US war of aggression in an even more resounding way in the middle of the 1970s.

Modern revisionism turned the Soviet Union into a monopoly bureaucrat, social fascist and social imperialist power. The US and the Soviet Union competed in the practice of neocolonialism. China stood for the cause of national independence and socialist revolution and construction. Under the leadership of Mao Zedong, the Chinese Communist Party stood for Marxism-Leninism and for the proletarian revolution, combated modern revisionism, imperialism and reaction and carried out the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution from 1966 to 1976. But the Dengist capitalist counterrevolution categorically defeated socialism in 1978.

By 1975, the US was already crisis-stricken and in a process of decline because

of stagflation brought about by its high military spending and wars of aggression, and the competition offered by Germany and Japan. In 1980, it began to carry out its economic policy of neoliberalism, imposed it on the entire capitalist system, and used it to engage both the Soviet Union and China by extending loan and trade accommodations. By 1989, the US was in a far worse position than in 1975. It had accelerated its military spending, it had become the biggest debtor country in the world and its manufacturing base had been significantly undermined. Japan was also on the eve of beginning its decades-long stagnation.

But the crisis of the US and world capitalist system was obscured by the events of 1989 to 1991 that were interpreted as the final fall and death of socialism. These included the outbreak of mass protests against corruption and inflation in some 80 cities of China and the Tiananmen protests which led to the Dengist massacre in 1989, the breakdown of the Soviet bloc revisionist regimes, the full scale privatization of public assets in an undisguised restoration of capitalism, and the collapse of the Soviet Union in 1991. The bourgeois ideologues and publicists trumpeted that history could no longer go beyond capitalism and liberal democracy, and that peace dividends would come from the end of the Cold War and from the acclamation of US imperialism as the sole superpower.

Since the end of the Cold War, however, the US has freely imposed its neoliberal economy on the whole world and has unleashed a series of aggressive wars to break up Yugoslavia, to destroy the Saddam government in Iraq, to oust the Taliban government in Afghanistan, to overthrow the Qaddafi government in Libya, and now to seek the overthrow of the Assad government in Syria. The bankruptcy of the neoliberal economic policy has been thoroughly proven. It has resulted in a series of economic and financial crises, which are increasingly worse and which have led to the current crisis that started in 2008. This is comparable to the Great Depression that led to World War II.

The US imperialists, their allies and puppets have been boasting that the full restoration of capitalism in China and Russia has killed the revolutionary cause of national liberation and socialism once and for all time. But the integration of Russia and China into the world capitalist system has in fact led to the intensification of interimperialist contradictions. The BRICS Bloc has emerged as a foil to the US hegemony over the global economy. The Shanghai Cooperation Organization is also a foil to the aggressiveness of the US-NATO combine.

All major contradictions in the world are sharpening: between the imperialists and the oppressed peoples and nations; between the imperialist powers and the self-respecting independent states; among the imperialist powers themselves; and between labor and capital in the imperialist countries. The conditions are favorable for the rise and spread of armed revolutionary movements for national and social liberation, for independent states to become more assertive, for the peoples of the world to take advantage of the interimperialist contradictions; and for the proletariat in imperialist countries to wage fiercer class struggle against the big bourgeoisie.

II. Most important tasks in the anti-imperialist struggle

The most important tasks in the anti-imperialist struggle include the following: building the revolutionary party of the proletariat that leads the anti-imperialist struggle; waging the anti-imperialist and democratic mass struggles in the imperialist countries and in the dominated countries; bringing the anti-imperialist and democratic struggles to the level of social revolution; and promoting and strengthening proletarian internationalism and international anti-imperialist solidarity of peoples.

Since the rise of modern imperialism as the dominant force in the world, the class struggle of the bourgeoisie and the proletariat has intensified and become the most crucial dynamic in the process of social revolution. The necessity of proletarian-socialist revolution is most discernible in the industrial capitalist countries even as the struggle for democracy must be waged against repression and the threat of fascism. The socialist revolution is definitely prepared by a new type of democratic revolution led by the proletariat in the underdeveloped countries.

The era of modern imperialism and proletarian revolution has been validated without any doubt by the emergence of socialist countries as a result of capitalist crisis and interimperialist wars. Although modern imperialism has dealt a major blow to the cause of socialism and has effected its strategic retreat, the class struggle between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat has persisted and has intensified as a result of the severe economic and political crisis generated by neoliberal economic policy and the recurrent wars of aggression.

At this stage of world history, the proletariat is the most advanced productive and political force. It is capable of emancipating itself and other exploited

classes. And it is capable of bringing about socialism after seizing political power from the bourgeoisie. It must have for its advanced detachment a revolutionary party. This must be built in order to lead the proletariat in the class struggle against the bourgeoisie and achieve the overthrow of the bourgeois dictatorship and the establishment of the proletarian dictatorship. In the process, it must lead the broad masses of the people in order to defeat imperialism.

The revolutionary party of the proletariat must build itself ideologically by educating its cadres and members on the basic principles of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism in philosophy, political economy and social science, and training them to apply materialist dialectics in analyzing history and current circumstances. They must understand materialist and historical materialism, political economy from capitalism to socialism, the strategy and tactics of proletarian revolution, and the ever continuing process of socialist revolution and construction towards the threshold of communism. They must combat subjectivism and rise to the level of understanding how to fight and defeat revisionism.

The revolutionary party of the proletariat must build itself by adopting and implementing the general line of political struggle based on the concrete social conditions, and by arousing, organizing and mobilizing the people accordingly. There are two very distinct types of societies in the world today: the industrial capitalist societies and the underdeveloped pre-industrial societies. In the industrial capitalist countries, the general line of socialist revolution applies, but the struggle for democracy must be taken into account because the monopoly bourgeoisie is bound to use state terrorism or fascism to prevent socialist revolution. In the underdeveloped pre-industrial societies, the general line of people's democratic revolution based on the worker-peasant alliance is a necessary preparation for the consequent socialist revolution.

If truly revolutionary, the proletarian party in any country must seriously study the Marxist-Leninist theory of the state and revolution and the historical experience of the working class in applying the theory. No exploiting ruling class is ever willing to give up its power voluntarily. And it is the central task of the oppressed and exploited people to develop the process of armed revolution in order to forcibly seize power from the exploiting ruling classes.

In the underdeveloped pre-industrial countries, the chronic crises and extreme conditions of exploitation and oppression allow the proletarian revolutionary party to organize the people's war. But even in the industrial capitalist countries,

it is possible to organize armed self-defense groups against criminality and state repression, or even just sports gun clubs. Such groups can transform themselves into revolutionary combat units against intolerable oppression or in the course of transforming an imperialist war to a civil war.

But arms are of no use for a possible revolution if in the first place there is no revolutionary mass movement. There must be mass organizations of the workers, peasants, women, youth, minority nationalities, and other exploited and oppressed people, and these must be engaged in developing mass movements that uphold, defend and promote the political, civil, economic, social and cultural rights of the oppressed and exploited. These mass organizations can develop their groups for self-defense. And the mass movements must become so strong as to create influence and following even within the counterrevolutionary apparatuses of the state, especially among the personnel recruited from the exploited classes and who continue to suffer oppression and exploitation by the system and by their corrupt and bullying officers.

When the revolutionary party of the proletariat is successful at educating and organizing the revolutionary mass organizations, it can also be successful at mobilizing not only their mass following but also the masses which are not organized or who belong to other organizations. Being successful at arousing, organizing and mobilizing the masses, the revolutionary party of the proletariat can engage in alliances with other parties, organizations and personages who agree to a united front against imperialism and reaction on particular issues or a whole range of issues. In having its own mass base and allies, the party can easily build its self-defense groups or even an entire people's army.

The membership of the revolutionary party can increase only on the basis of an increasing mass base. The mass organizations are the recruiting ground for the party. The party makes it a point to recruit as its candidate members those mass activists who come from the ranks of the toiling masses of workers and peasants and the urban petty bourgeoisie, and those who have shown resoluteness, militancy and willingness to join the revolutionary party of the proletariat, to study, and to work harder for the advance of the revolution.

The revolutionary party of the proletariat must build itself organizationally on the basis of the mass organizations and ensure that it is deeply rooted among the toiling masses and has a national scale. It must follow the principle of democratic centralism. Decision-making is based on democracy and is guided by

centralized leadership. At every level of the organization, the majority prevails over the minority vote. The higher organs prevail over the lower organs. The Central Committee is responsible for centralized leadership in accordance with the Constitution and Program and the decisions of the Congress.

In each country, the revolutionary party of the proletariat wages all forms of struggle to fight and defeat imperialism, its allies and puppets. The most decisive form of struggle is the armed struggle because it is the most effective way for ending the class dictatorship or state of the bourgeoisie, and installing either a socialist state or a people's democracy under the leadership of the working class within certain national boundaries. At the same time, the proletariat and people of the entire world must unite and fight to defeat imperialism and allies because these are an international force exploiting and oppressing the entire humankind.

The working class and the rest of the people who are in the belly of the beast in the imperialist countries have a special duty in defeating imperialism in its own home ground. The metaphor should be well understood. If you are in the belly, you can hit the heart and other vital organs of the beast, especially when it brings to you one catastrophe after another. In the other parts of the world, the overextended body, arms and legs of imperialism are vulnerable to the people's counteroffensives and can also make the beast bleed to death.

It is important for the revolutionary parties of the proletariat as well as the mass organizations and mass movements of the exploited and oppressed to hold their respective international gatherings to share ideas and experiences and learn from each other on how to fight imperialism most effectively and how to take advantage of the economic, social and political crisis and the interimperialist contradictions.

The world proletariat and the revolutionary parties of the proletariat must raise high the Red banner of proletarian internationalism against the imperialist powers. The peoples of the world must further strengthen their international anti-imperialist solidarity. The respective international gatherings of proletarian revolutionary parties and of the people's organizations can initiate and carry out international campaigns against imperialism on the issues of oppression, exploitation and environmental destruction.

As a global alliance of mass organizations and mass movements, the International League of Peoples' Struggle has successfully launched anti-

imperialist and democratic campaigns of mass work and political action on the following major concerns: the cause of national liberation, democracy and social liberation; socioeconomic development and social justice; human rights in the civil, political, economic, social and cultural fields; the cause of just peace; independent trade union and workers' and toilers' rights and reduction of working hours at full pay against mass unemployment and decreasing wage levels; agrarian reform and rights of peasants, farm workers and fisherfolk; the cause of women's rights and liberation; rights of the youth to education and employment; children's rights against child labor, sexual abuse and other forms of exploitation; rights of indigenous peoples, oppressed nations and nationalities against chauvinism and racism; the rights of teachers, researchers and other educational personnel; the right of the people to health care and the rights of health workers; science and technology for the people and development, and environmental protection; arts and culture and free flow of information in the service of the people; justice and indemnification for the victims of illegal arrest and detention; rights and welfare of displaced homeless persons, refugees and migrant workers; and rights of gays, lesbians, bisexuals and transgendered.

As Chairperson of the International Coordinating Committee of the International League of Peoples' Struggle, I am happy to announce that we have just concluded a meeting of the aforesaid committee to review the work of the ILPS and to prepare for the Fifth International Assembly of the ILPS in Manila in November this year. Your mass organizations and mass movements are invited to participate. We hope to work harder and achieve greater victories in the anti-imperialist and democratic struggle. Thank you.

On Current Issues with US and China

Interview by Tonyo Cruz

April 21, 2015

TC: How would you assess the impact of the Visiting Forces Agreement (VFA) and the Enhanced Defense Cooperation Agreement (EDCA) to Philippine national interests? Is the Philippines better off, safer and more prepared to meet security challenges under the VFA and EDCA?

JMS: The VFA and EDCA serve the imperialist interests of the US and not the national interest of the Philippines. The VFA has allowed the rotational and permanent presence of US military forces in the Philippines. Meanwhile, the EDCA has blatantly allowed the building of US military bases and forward stations in so-called Allowed Areas.

Under the VFA and EDCA, the Philippines has not become better off, safer and more prepared to meet security challenges. At the expense of Philippine national interest, the US has gotten back its military bases in the Philippines and has allowed China to grab the West Philippine Sea, including 100 percent of the Extended Continental Shelf (ECS) and 80 percent of the Exclusive Economic Zone (EEZ) of the Philippines. The Philippines has suffered violations of national sovereignty and territorial integrity in the conniving hands of the US and China.

TC: As the founding chairman of the KM and the CPP, could you quickly apprise the movement's views on China in 1964-1968 and from the passing of Mao Zedong until today? How does it view China?

JMS: In the period from 1964 to 1968, the Kabataang Makabayan (KM, Patriotic Youth) and the CPP admired China as a socialist country, with the Chinese Communist Party and Comrade Mao as resolute fighters for socialist revolution and construction against imperialism, modern revisionism and reaction. Subsequently, the KM and the CPP have viewed China as a country where the revisionist and capitalist roader Deng Xiaoping succeeded in making a capitalist counterrevolution after the passing of Comrade Mao.

TC: Is the Philippines really “helpless” on its own regarding Chinese intrusions into the country’s territory?

JMS: The Philippines is not really helpless in opposing Chinese acts of aggression in its grabbing of 100 percent of the Philippines’ ECS and EEZ, and in its reclamation activities on the reefs and islets of the Philippines. China is engaged in aggression to counter the case filed by the Philippines before the International Tribunal for the Law of the Sea (ITLOS) in accordance with the UN Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS).

If the court case before the ITLOS would be decided in favor of the Philippines, China would be liable for grabbing the West Philippine Sea and destroying the maritime environment. But still, if China would not respect the court decision, the Philippines and the other countries of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) will be able to expose as hypocritical the so-called peaceful rise of China.

But the most that the Philippines can do is to ban and nationalize Chinese state and private enterprises in the Philippines, which are now involved in private construction and real estate, shopping malls and retail trade, import-export, semimanufacturing, power generation, transport and communications, banking, insurance, mining, logging, plantations, and so on.

TC: Vietnam has been actively courting the Philippines to form a sort of alliance to fight Chinese incursions in their territories. Is that a better option than exclusively depending on US forces?

JMS: The best option is to rely on the patriotic strength of the Filipino people in fighting for their national sovereignty and territorial integrity. Filipinos should stop thinking small. The Philippines has about 102 million population (the 12th largest in the world), has rich natural resources and is bigger in size than several

developed countries.

Of course, the next best option is to unite with Vietnam and other ASEAN countries in opposing China's arrogant claim of over 90 percent of the South China Sea. The Philippines cannot rely on US support. The US has already declared its neutrality and has allowed China to make the aggressive reclamations, because the US has bigger interests in relations with China than in those with the Philippines.

TC: What are your recommendations to the Philippine government and the Philippine military, if any, on how to confront and stop Chinese intrusions?

JMS: The Aquino regime and its military minions should stop being hypocritical. They should stop pretending to be for national sovereignty, territorial integrity, and for strengthening external defense, while they take no action whatsoever to discourage the Chinese reclamation of Philippine reefs; continue pleading to the US and even Japan to establish military bases in the Philippines; and at the same time allow Chinese state and private enterprises to plunder the Philippines.

TC: What could Filipinos do to protest China's actions?

JMS: Increasingly, the Filipino people and the patriotic organizations are already protesting in the streets and in the print and electronic media. Filipinos are often making protests before the Chinese embassy, to cite an outstanding act of protest in the Philippines. Even Filipinos abroad, especially in the US, are making sustained campaigns of protest against Chinese acts of aggression.

Such protests can become more strong-willed if there is widespread consciousness to fight for national sovereignty and territorial integrity against all aggressors, to ban and nationalize all foreign enterprises that extract superprofits and prevent the development of the Philippines, to strive for national industrialization, and to produce its own means for social progress and defense against aggressors.

On China Expansion and the US Pivot to East Asia

Interview by Jan Victor Ayson

June 6, 2015

I have some complex questions on the issue of Chinese expansion and the US pivot to East Asia.

1. People are wondering about the stand of the mass movement and the revolutionary movement, as well as yours on the issue of Chinese aggression in the Kalayaan group of islands and Bajo de Masinloc in the West Philippine Sea. Kindly state your personal analysis on this issue and your personal stand.

JMS: I resolutely and vigorously oppose the aggressive acts of China, especially the occupation of the Bajo de Masinloc and the ongoing reclamations being made in the Kalayaan group of islands. I have published my position in several articles and interviews.

I agree with the revolutionary underground forces and the open legal forces of the national democratic movement that have expressed their position against China's acts of aggression, which seek to grab 100 percent of the ECS and 80 percent of the EEZ of the Philippines.

There is a new broad alliance called PINAS which oppose the US and China for violating Philippine national sovereignty and territorial integrity. PINAS will be launched on June 8 and will spearhead the mass actions against the US and China for committing such violations.

2. The Aquino regime and its military and political underlings have repeatedly

begged for US military assistance in the Filipino nation's territorial claims. Is it possible that US intervention would sustain this nation's territorial claims?

JMS: The US has expressed a neutral position on the maritime dispute between the Philippines and China and speaks only for freedom of navigation in the South China Sea. But it has expressed support for Japan's invalid claim on Diaoyu islands on the basis of previous imperialist aggressions of Japan.

It has its spy satellites always in operation. It has known about China's reclamations in the West Philippine Sea since the beginning. But it has not made any timely opposition. It is mainly and essentially interested in making its own violations of Philippine national sovereignty and territorial integrity in collaboration with its Filipino puppets. It allows China's acts of aggression and yet cites them to further entrench itself in the Philippines and reestablish US military bases under the Enhanced Defense Cooperation Agreement (EDCA).

3. China's emerging economic power is the presumed target of the US "pivot" (another English word for rebalance) from the Middle East to East Asia. Kindly state your observations on the rebalance of American military forces on East Asia as a political scientist and an international situation observer.

JMS: The US pivot to East Asia or rebalance towards deploying 60 percent of its naval assets and 50 percent of its ground and air assets is meant to influence China's economic, social, political, military and cultural policies and affairs in the direction of favoring a pro-US big bourgeoisie within China and restraining the trend of Sino-Russian collaboration. At the same time, the US is unwittingly pushing China to strengthen its relations with Russia. US is using Japan as a pawn to pressure China.

4. What can the Filipino people do in spite of the Filipino nation's economic underdevelopment/maldevelopment, absence of military modernization for the defense of Philippine waters (lack of planes, ships and missiles), the shameless treason of the Philippine government's highest officials, and the Chinese expansion, the US pivot to East Asia, and current international events?

JMS: The Filipino people can become more resolute and militant in carrying out the people's revolution and realize full national sovereignty, the nationalization of the economy, the development of the economy through national industrialization and land reform, boycott against the hostile powers and disable

or dismantle their enterprises on Philippine territory.

There are many people already proposing that mass organizations and the people's army can take offensive actions against the enterprises of hostile powers. They say that they can disable or even dismantle such enterprises, like mines, plantations, logging, power plants, warehouses, real estate businesses, towers, commercial and financial enterprises, and so on.

Many people say that they only need to have a patriotic will, a lighter or match box and cans of petrol to disable or even destroy any unwanted enterprise. They are outraged by China's reclamations and by the basic condonation of these by the US. They oppose the US and China trying to divide and dominate the Philippines for their respective imperialist benefit.

Because of the ever-worsening crisis of the world capitalist system, the contradictions among the imperialist powers will continue to intensify and will result in opportunities for revolutionary advances. The global crisis, depression and the imperialist wars of aggression inflict terrible suffering on the people. Thus, the people are bound to rise up and take their destiny into their own hands. The movements for national liberation, democracy and socialism will resurge to a new and higher level.

On China and US Aggression in the Philippines

June 9, 2015

Interview by Kodao Productions on the issue of Chinese and American intervention in Philippine territory. Prof. Sarah Raymundo of the Congress of Teachers and Educators for Nationalism and Democracy (CONTEND) was the main facilitator and interviewer.

1. What is the International League of Peoples' Struggle (ILPS)'s view on the burning issue of Chinese and American intervention in territories owned by the Philippines?

JMS: The International League of Peoples' Struggle assails and resists China's intervention in the West Philippine Sea, the reclamation being undertaken by China in the Kalayaan group of islands which is near Palawan and China's occupation of Panatag Shoal or Bajo de Masinloc, which is near Zambales. The ILPS likewise assails and resists the rotational deployment of US forces under the Visiting Forces Agreement and the construction of US military bases under the Enhanced Defense Cooperation Agreement.

2. The Filipino people have long been opposed to continuing US intervention in many issues in our country. But the government defends this, saying that agreements between the Philippines and the US such as the Visiting Forces Agreement (VFA) and the Enhanced Defense Cooperation Agreement (EDCA) ensure that there will be no acts of aggression by other countries. What is your view on this? Can we really rely on the US, now that China keeps on claiming a number of Philippine marine territories?

JMS: The US cannot be relied upon to defend the Philippines against Chinese

aggression. The US is more interested in relating with China than with the Philippines. Since the beginning, the US has known about the reclamation being conducted by China in Kalayaan but has not opposed it. The US itself has been engaged in imperialistic intervention in the Philippines for a long time. It has been committing aggression in the Philippines long before China. The US only pretends to defend the Philippines. It is pretending to be benevolent. It just wants to impose its interests on the Philippines. It turns out that the US and China are conniving to divide and dominate the Philippines.

3. In your view, can the progressive groups and advocates of Philippine integrity and sovereignty win the fight against Chinese aggression? Can you cite an example where a small country fought the intervention of a bigger country and won?

JMS: The Philippines has a strong and just position within the framework of the UN Convention on the Law of the Sea. It is clear that the Philippines owns 12 nautical miles of territorial sea and is entitled to 200 nautical miles of exclusive economic zone and 150 more nautical miles of extended continental shelf. The Philippines should win the case it has filed against China in the International Tribunal on the Law of the Sea. But China has said that it would not abide by the tribunal's decision if it favors the Philippines.

The Philippines may not have enough ships, planes and missiles to fight Chinese intervention, but the Filipino people can unite and nationalize and put an end to Chinese state enterprises and corporations inside the Philippines. There are also many countries that would support the Filipino people's just objectives.

4. What is your message to the Filipino people on our podcast's current topic?

JMS: Of the utmost importance is the Filipino people's unity in defending the national patrimony and territorial integrity. It is fine to build a movement of Filipinos united for national sovereignty. If we are strongly and firmly united, we can implement the nationalization of enterprises owned by foreign enemies and enforce political and economic sovereignty and economic development through national industrialization and land reform.

5. What is your message for June 12th, Independence Day?

JMS: The advancement of national independence, territorial integrity, people's democracy, genuine development, social justice, peace and solidarity with all

peoples is in the hands of the Filipino people. We must have the decisiveness and firmness to resist the imperialists, landlords and corrupt officials who collaborate with the imperialists to trample on the people's national and democratic rights.

On the Philippine Supreme Court Decision regarding EDCA's Constitutionality

July 28, 2016

The International League of Peoples' Struggle views the recent ruling of the Philippine Supreme Court, which upheld with finality the constitutionality of the Enhanced Defense Cooperation Agreement (EDCA), as a stark reminder that the Philippines remains a staunch bulwark of US imperialist hegemony in the Asia-Pacific region, and that reactionary pro-US forces remain in control of the main levers of the Philippine state.

The Philippine SC, voting 9-4, upheld its earlier January 2016 decision, which ruled that the EDCA is an executive agreement that merely "operationalizes" the Mutual Defense Treaty (MDT) and the Visiting Forces Agreement (VFA) between the US and the Philippines, and therefore does not need Senate concurrence. The SC thus upheld EDCA's constitutionality and its implementation under the existing VFA, which allows US troops, planes, and ships to establish a rotational but permanent presence, build storage facilities and preposition weapons in military bases in the Philippines.

The most important issue is whether the EDCA as executive agreement can be allowed to violate the constitutional ban on the foreign military forces and bases absent a treaty as required by Sec. 25 Art XVIII of the Constitution. But the SC skirted this issue on technical grounds, by arguing that constitutional restrictions on the entry of foreign troops or facilities refer only to the initial entry -- which was already allowed by the 1999 VFA, a mere executive agreement -- and that subsequent entries are henceforth allowed such as those defined by the EDCA.

The SC ruling upheld the EDCA on the narrow ground that the president can make executive agreements with foreign governments and that there is therefore no need for the Senate process of ratification. The SC has therefore rendered useless and a mere surplusage the treaty requirement under Section 25 of the 1987 Constitution because based on the decision, a mere executive agreement called the VFA and later EDCA under the framework of a 1952 defense treaty has done away with the constitutional demand for a treaty. The SC refused to comprehend that the Constitution, despite the 1952 MDT, required a new treaty for the entry of foreign troops, bases or facilities because of the humiliating and unequal treatment of the Philippines under the US-RP Bases Agreement.

This SC ruling represents a narrow, unpatriotic, and even unconstitutional view. It is an outrageous affront to Philippine sovereignty. It is tantamount to asserting that a peasant woman who is married off to her landlord master after being abducted and raped by him no longer has any legal basis for complaining against further rape and abuse because of marriage. At the same time, it further exposes the utter inequity and illegitimacy of the MDT and VFA as unequal treaties and agreements foisted by the US on the Philippines in the past decades.

The presence of US troops, facilities and bases in the country is violative of the Filipino people's interest because: (i) these are magnets of attack as we become legitimate target of the many US enemies worldwide; (ii) it results in human rights violations including rape and murder not to mention prostitution that goes with US bases; (iii) it is a threat to peace both in the Philippines and the region; (iv) we are also vulnerable to nuclear accident and toxic waste contamination, and more importantly; and (v) it violates our sovereignty as thousands of foreign troops roam our country at will.

Patriotic groups led by the Bagong Alyansang Makabayan and former and incumbent legislators had filed a motion for reconsideration against the earlier January 2016 SC decision, arguing that the EDCA is unconstitutional because it did not pass through Senate ratification and violated the constitutional ban on basing foreign military troops or facilities in the country. But the SC rejected their petition, explaining that its "only concern is the legality of EDCA and not its wisdom or folly; their remedy clearly belongs to the executive or legislative branches of government."

The SC ruling is especially revolting since it was issued on the day US Secretary of State John Kerry arrived to visit the Philippines — a welcoming gift of the

native subjects to their foreign master, as it were. The timing is reminiscent of a similar scene in 2014, when the previous Aquino government signed EDCA in time for Obama's first visit to the country.

The previous Aquino regime and other reactionary pro-US circles have been trying to justify EDCA as an effective Philippine leverage against China, particularly to ensure US support for its assertion of sovereignty over the disputed islands in the West Philippine Sea and of its sovereign rights over its Exclusive Economic Zone and Extended Continental Shelf.

But events are proving otherwise. The recent ruling by the Permanent Court of Arbitration as mandated by UNCLOS can already provide that leverage, if only the Duterte government decides to wield it effectively through a genuinely independent foreign policy. After all, during the two years since it was signed in 2014 EDCA and the US did not provide any succor when China harassed our fisherfolks, built islands through reclamation, constructed airports and destroyed marine environment in the disputed area.

For the Philippines to invoke the military involvement of the US by allowing it wider access to domestic facilities in the guise of "agreed locations" through EDCA will only further invite more Chinese countermeasures and escalate tensions in the region. It was multilateral initiatives such as the Tribunal case under UNCLOS and diplomatic offensive to gather international support -- not EDCA -- that gained positive results for the Filipino people.

The ILPS hereby reiterates its long-standing call for the peoples of Asia-Pacific, including the people of the Philippines, to persevere in their struggles to kick out or resist the return of US bases and interventionist forces in the region.

We reiterate our support for the Filipino people in their general efforts to resist the entry and continuing presence of all foreign bases and troops within their national territory. This is in the spirit of asserting the country's sovereignty and territorial integrity, especially based on the 1987 constitutional provision that bans the presence of foreign bases and troops.

Now that the Philippine Senate is legally barred by the SC ruling from subjecting EDCA to its treaty-ratifying process (and possible rejection), the Filipino people may shift their political action towards other courses of action. In particular, the ILPS joins Filipino patriotic forces in challenging the Duterte

government to terminate the EDCA since it is within his power to do so, and to subject the VFA, MDT, and other unequal military treaties to review. All forces of the ILPS Philippine chapter have committed to heighten their participation in anti-imperialist mass actions in the coming months.

Eight Questions about Chinese Loans

May 15, 2017

1. Can the Philippines really borrow the huge amount of P167 billion from China at so fast a rate?
2. Will not the Philippines become a debt slave of China?
3. Will not the drive to build, build, build infrastructure (rails, roads, and bridges) draw resources away from a program of national industrialization proposed by the NDFP in the negotiation of CASER?
4. At a certain point, will not China demand that the Philippines give up its EEZ (exclusive economic zone) and ECS (extended continental shelf) in the West Philippine Sea or else the loans will be called or cut off?
5. Will not China further nail down the Philippines to the status of an underdeveloped country providing raw materials to China, consuming manufactures from China, and ever begging for new loans to cover the trade deficit?
6. Does not the Philippines have already bad experiences in making deals with China, such as the overpriced NBN-ZTE and MRT scams during the Arroyo regime and the P3 billion wasted on defective trains from China during the Aquino regime?
7. How reliable or unreliable are those Filipino-Chinese and Chinese businessmen that are close to Duterte?

8. How does Duterte's expectation of P167 billion compare with actual outcomes of China's big loans to certain countries like Venezuela, Sri Lanka, etc?

My point in asking the eight questions is to assert the sovereign rights and interests of the Filipino people and get the best possible agreements in international relations on the basis of mutual respect, noninterference and mutual benefit. The Philippines should and can take advantage of a multipolar world in which the US can no longer dictate everything. Definitely, the Filipino people should avail of the best possible they can in dealing with a wider range of countries, including China and Russia.

US Imperialism Plagues the Philippines

**(Article contributed to How the US Creates “Sh*thole” Countries,
edited by Cynthia McKinney)**

June 6, 2018

US imperialism has imposed itself on the Filipino people and violated their national sovereignty and thwarted their aspirations for democracy, social justice and development since 1898 by military, political, economic and cultural means.

In this connection, I wish to discuss first how monopoly capitalism or modern imperialism arose as the final stage in the development of capitalism and how the era of imperialism began. Monopoly capitalism is parasitic, decaying and moribund, opening more widely than before the possibility of socialism. In being imperialist, it is emphatically violent and aggressive in repressing revolution and in acquiring economic and political territory abroad.

As early as the middle of the 19th century, from 1848 to 1868, England demonstrated at least two major characteristics of imperialism: its possession of vast colonies and its industrial monopoly by means of which it could draw monopoly profits or superprofits. It was the first among the capitalist countries in which free competition capitalism developed into monopoly capitalism as the dominant force in the economy.

However, it was not until the last three decades of the 19th century that several other countries—the US, France, Germany, Italy, Japan and Russia — would see the development of free competition capitalism to monopoly capitalism. Altogether with England, they manifested the five features of imperialism. The

fifth feature, which is the completed division of the world by the capitalist powers, directly set the stage for imperialist wars: 1. the dominance of capitalist monopolies in the economy; 2. the merger of industrial and bank capital and the emergence of the finance oligarchy; 3. the greater importance of the export of surplus capital than the export of surplus commodities as the means to obtain superprofits; 4. the alliances and counter-alliances of cartels, syndicates and trusts on an international scale; 5. the completion of the division of the world by the great capitalist powers, covering underdeveloped or less developed countries or areas as economic territories (sources of cheap raw materials and cheap labor, captive markets and fields of investment) and as political territories (colonies, semicolonies, protectorates, dependent countries and spheres of influence).

For a monopoly capitalist power, a certain country or area abroad becomes a more reliable economic territory when it is also a political territory acquired through military intervention or aggression. The newcomers in the colonial game like the US had to engage in acts of aggression in their emergence as imperialists. In comparison to the Western imperialist powers, Russia and Japan had developed monopoly capitalism to a lesser extent but again, aggressive use of military power enabled them to acquire territories from which to extract monopoly profits.

Then as now, the capitalist powers try to amicably divide the world market among themselves, until their economic competition and political rivalry breaks out into wars. The completion of the division of the world among the capitalist powers towards the end of the 19th century laid the ground for the violent struggle among them for the redivision of the world. Latecomers in the colonial game upset the balance of forces and pushed the outbreak of wars. Thus, the era of modern imperialism was inaugurated by wars and took final shape in the period of 1898 to 1914. The Spanish-American War (1898), the Anglo-Boer War (1899–1902), the Russo-Japanese War (1904–05) and the economic crisis in Europe in 1900 were the chief historical landmarks in the new era. Lenin categorically stated that the era of imperialism did not begin earlier than 1898 to 1900 and that neither Marx nor Engels lived long enough to see it.

I. The perpetuated US aggression

The US fully assumed the character of an imperialist power, on the basis of monopoly capitalism, when it deliberately provoked the Spanish-American War of 1898 in order to seize the colonies of Spain: Cuba, Puerto Rico and the

Philippines. In connection with said war, the US pretended to make friends with the Aguinaldo junta in Hong Kong and actually brought Aguinaldo back to the Philippines on an American cutter to proclaim Philippine independence (under the “protection” of the US) and to resume the national war of independence against Spain.

The Filipino people succeeded in liberating themselves nationwide and were about to seize Intramuros, the walled citadel of the Spanish colonizers. But the US interfered with the deployment of Filipino troops for this purpose and maneuvered to prepare for the landing of more US troops. Behind the back of their supposed Filipino allies, the US arranged a mock battle with the Spanish side on August 13, 1898 to justify the Spanish surrender to the US. This was done on the day after Spain and the US had signed an armistice agreement ending the Spanish-American War.

The US and Spain then forged the Treaty of Paris of December 10, 1898 in which Spain sold the Philippines to the US for the amount of US\$20 million. On December 21, 1898 US President McKinley issued the Proclamation of Benevolent Assimilation to manifest the US plan to colonize the Philippines. The US started to unleash its war of aggression against the Filipino people on February 4, 1899. This has come to be known as the Filipino-American War. The US used superior military force and extreme barbarity by more than 126,000 troops to conquer the nation of 7,000,000 people. It ruthlessly carried out massacres, torture of captives, concentration camp internment of the population, scorched earth tactics and food blockades. It killed more than 700,000 or 10 percent of the Filipino people from 1899 to 1902, directly through its brutal operations and indirectly through consequent famines and epidemics. Then it proceeded to similarly kill a further 800,000 Filipinos up to 1916.

In order to keep the Philippines as a colony, the US established military bases at various strategic points. It organized the so-called Philippine Scouts as puppet troops and subsequently converted them into the Philippine Constabulary. As a result of relentless demands of the Filipino people for national independence, the US decided as early as 1935 to make the Philippines a semicolony in 1946 after a ten-year transition period under the so-called Commonwealth government.

The National Defense Act of 1936 was this government’s first legislative act, making the puppet constabulary the First Regular Army under the direct supervision of the US Army’s Philippine Department. Commonwealth president

Quezon made General Douglas MacArthur the field marshal of the puppet army, which the US had formed, indoctrinated, equipped and trained. On the eve of World War II, the US placed this puppet army within the framework of the US Army Forces in the Far East (USAFFE).

When World War II broke out in 1941, the Japanese fascists defeated the US army in Bataan and occupied the Philippines up to 1945. To recover the Philippines as a colony, the US coordinated with the USAFFE guerrillas. Before the grant of nominal independence to the Philippines in 1946, the US imposed on the puppet Filipino leaders the Treaty of General Relations which ensured the continuance of US military bases and the property rights of US citizens and corporations. This treaty even required in advance that the diplomatic relations of the Philippines would be subject to approval by the US.

After the Philippines became a semicolony, the US perpetuated its successful aggression and continued to control the Philippine state militarily. It obtained a military assistance agreement to make the Philippine armed services dependent on US planning, training, intelligence and equipment; and a military bases agreement for US military forces to stay in the Philippines for another 99 years. It also bound the Philippines to a mutual defense pact and a US-controlled regional security pact, the South East Asia Treaty Organization (SEATO).

Because of its military power over the Philippines, the US has been able to dominate the Philippine economy and politics and intervene at will in Philippine affairs since 1946. It manipulated the outcome of presidential elections in favor of the candidate most compliant with and servile to US interests in the Philippines and in the region. It instigated the Marcos fascist dictatorship in 1972 in a futile attempt to suppress the revolutionary mass movement that had emerged and developed since 1961 because of the wanton extraction of superprofits by US corporations, bureaucratic corruption and the exhaustion of the land frontier.

The Filipino people were outraged that the fascist regime could persist for so long — from 1972 to 1986 — because of US military and economic assistance to it. They were also incensed by the direct and indirect consequences of US planes, ships and troops operating in and around the US bases. Thus, after the downfall of Marcos, the framers of the 1987 constitution enjoyed overwhelming popular support and took courage in adopting provisions that banned foreign military bases, troops, facilities and nuclear weapons from the Philippines. This

ban was indeed the fruit of the people's revolutionary struggle against the fallen US-instigated dictatorship.

The military bases agreement with the US was terminated in 1991 by the Philippine Senate, with the open and strong support of the national democratic movement. But since then, the US has resorted to all sorts of maneuvers to circumvent the constitutional ban on foreign military bases by invoking the US-RP mutual defense pact. It has used the Balikatan joint US-Philippine military exercises and interoperability training as pretext for the forward stations and rotational presence of US troops in the Philippines.

The US has been able to obtain a Visiting Forces Agreement and a Mutual Logistics Support Agreement to allow the entry and stationing of US military forces anywhere in the Philippines for any duration of time. It has used 9-11 and the so-called US global war on terror to justify US military presence and intervention in the Philippines. It has also expanded the pretexts for such intervention. These include humanitarian aid, medical missions, civic actions, disaster-related aid for rescue, relief and rehabilitation, and so on.

The latest US pretext for further entrenching itself militarily in the Philippines is its strategic pivot to the Asia-Pacific region which purports to protect the country from Chinese aggression in view of the overreaching claims of China over 90 percent of the South China Sea, encroaching on 90 percent of the exclusive economic zone (EEZ) and 100 percent of the extended continental shelf (ECS) of the Philippines. Thus, with the servile collaboration of the Aquino regime, the US has been able to obtain the so-called Enhanced Defense Cooperation Agreement (EDCA).

This agreement allows the US to establish military bases in an indefinite number of so-called Agreed Areas, fortified at Philippine expense, while paying no rent, enjoying perimeter security from puppet troops free of charge, barring Philippine authorities from any knowledge of activities inside the US military enclaves or bases. It also allows US air planes and ships to come and go, barring the Philippine authorities from knowing whether such vessels carry nuclear, chemical, bacteriological and/or other weapons of mass destruction. Moreover, the agreement requires the AFP to provide or facilitate access by US forces to any place whatsoever in Philippine territory that the US decides.

Despite the treason and obsequiousness of the Aquino regime in acceding to

EDCA, US President Obama in his recent visit to Manila clearly declared that the US is neutral over the Philippine-China maritime dispute in the West Philippine Sea and that US policy is not to counter or contain China. In fact, the US has a dual policy of cooperation and contention with China and makes its decisions according to US national interest. At any rate, the US has far more interest in relations with China than in those with the Philippines, leading to the possibility that the US and China could agree to jointly explore and exploit the oil, gas and other natural resources in the EEZ and ECS of the Philippines.

In the face of the perpetuated aggression of US imperialism in the Philippines, the Filipino people and their revolutionary forces have adopted the line of people's democratic revolution through protracted people's war. They are waging a civil war against the semicolonial political system. At the same time, they condemn the escalating military intervention of the US in favor of the puppet regime. They are therefore prepared to wage a war of national liberation should the US unleash a full-scale war of aggression. They are not afraid of such a possibility but rather they prepare against it. They consider it an opportunity to realize justice for the heroes martyred by US imperialism and for the suffering of millions of people as a consequence of the direct and indirect rule of US imperialism.

II. Continuing economic plunder

The US had a strategic motive and objective for seizing and making the Philippines its colony. This was connected with the expressed desire of the US to expand the international market for its manufactures, to turn the Pacific Ocean into an "American lake" for the purpose and to have a base for launching efforts to get a share of China in the frenzy of the capitalist powers to establish spheres of influence.

The US floated bonds in Wall Street to finance its war of aggression in the Philippines. Ultimately, it made the Filipino people pay for their own military conquest through taxation. But the biggest gain for US imperialism came from the extraction of superprofits from the colonial exchange of US manufactures and Philippine raw materials as well as from the direct and indirect US investments in the Philippines. In the process, the US imperialists turned the Philippine economy from feudal to semifeudal.

US imperialism did not have to eliminate feudalism. It merely super-imposed the

imperialist mode of exploitation to change the total complexion of the social economy to semifeudal. In an attempt to appease the people's hatred of the landed estates owned by the foreign religious orders, the US colonial government expropriated some of them for redistribution to the peasants. But the peasants could not afford to complete the payments for the redistribution. The land eventually fell into the hands of the landlord class.

The US colonial government lifted the feudal restrictions on the physical movement of peasants. This enabled peasants to open land in frontier areas or to seek jobs in urban areas, public works and mines. Bureaucrats and landlords enticed peasants to make their homesteads in frontier areas but ultimately they claimed and registered the land as their own. Merchant usurers also followed the peasants into frontier areas and eventually became landlords.

The US colonial rule differed significantly from that of the Spanish by taking superprofits from a far greater flow of manufactured imports and raw material exports, from the chronic Philippines need to take loans to cover its trade deficits, from new schemes of over-consumption and from the far greater inflow of direct foreign investments. The US opened the mines, expanded the plantations for raw-material export production and established a few factories manufacturing consumer products from locally available raw materials. The roads, bridges, ports and other means of transport and communications were improved for the growing domestic and foreign trade. The system of public and private schools was developed to produce professionals and technicians for the expanded bureaucracy and business enterprises.

In the semifeudal economy and society, the joint class rule of the big compradors and landlords (one percent of the population) arose and replaced the singular dominance of the landlord class in the feudal period of previous centuries. The intermediate social strata of middle bourgeois and urban petty bourgeoisie expanded and would ultimately come to 1 and 8 percent, respectively. From a few percentage points of the population, the working class grew to 15 percent of it. The peasantry descended from a feudal high of about 90 percent to its current semifeudal level of about 75 percent.

The US economic domination of the Philippines was interrupted by the Japanese invasion and occupation during World War II. Japan's imperialist character and war of aggression prevented it from making credible its slogan of "Greater East Asia co-prosperity". The Japanese aggressors wrought havoc and destruction on

the lives, communities and properties of Filipinos. In the course of recapturing the Philippines, especially in its haste to oust the Japanese through massive bombardment, the US added to and aggravated the destruction of lives and properties. US war damage payments were made mainly to the US corporations for reestablishing US economic domination of the Philippines.

The US not only retained the property rights of US corporations and citizens through the Treaty of General Relations before the grant of nominal independence to the Philippines in 1946 but also imposed on the supposedly independent Philippine state the so-called Parity Amendment in the Philippine Constitution. This amendment allowed US corporations and citizens to have the same rights as Filipinos in owning public utilities and exploiting natural resources. Furthermore, through the Laurel-Langley Agreement, the US extracted from the Philippines the privilege of owning and operating all kinds of businesses without restriction.

A civil war broke out in the Philippines between the reactionary forces of foreign and feudal domination and the revolutionary forces of national liberation and democracy in 1948. The demand for national industrialization and land reform became so strong that the reactionary authorities had to fake land reform in the form of land resettlement programs and token expropriation of landed estates as well as to feign national industrialization in the form of import-substitution manufacturing which was in fact reassembly and repackaging operations dependent on licensing, financing, technical and marketing agreements with US corporations.

The Philippine economy went from bad to worse when the Marcos regime went on a spending and borrowing spree to build infrastructure and conspicuous tourist facilities and opted for the so-called export-oriented manufacturing in export-processing zones and for the export of labor in the absence of real industrial development for generating local employment. Export-oriented manufacturing is a far worse kind of pseudo-industrialization than the import-substitution manufacturing. It overprices the imported components and underprices the exported semi-manufactures to the benefit of the corporations involved. Workers are mostly categorized as casuals, apprentices or learners. They are paid substandard wages and are deprived of job security. Their trade union and other democratic rights are curtailed.

To this day, export-oriented manufacturing is misrepresented as industrial

development. It has been greatly set back by the Asian financial crisis of 1997 and the global financial meltdown of 2007-08. The reassembly and export of semi-conductors and other products have plunged. What has become glossier than export-oriented manufacturing is the bubble in office and residential towers and upscale tourist enclaves, which is now about to pop because of the growing flight of portfolio investments.

All regimes since the time of the puppet president Ramos have gone into a mad frenzy of opening the entire country to foreign mining companies that ruin agriculture and the environment, preempt future industrialization and take mineral ores out of the country without paying the commensurate taxes.

Philippine economic policy has always been dictated by US imperialism. In the time of Marcos, the World Bank was active in pushing a Keynesian policy of undertaking public works to promote raw-material production and the colonial exchange of raw material exports and manufactured imports and thereby diverting resources and foreign loans from what should be a line of national industrialization. The first Aquino regime drew the Philippines further away from national industrialization by following the US-dictated policy of neoliberalism and carrying out trade liberalization at the expense of local industry and even agriculture. The Ramos regime followed up the anti-industrialization policy by channeling huge resources and foreign loans to upscale private construction and tourist facilities.

Altogether the post-Marcos regimes have been bound to exporting raw materials and labor and have been trapped within the framework of the imperialist policy of neoliberal globalization under the so-called Washington Consensus of the IMF, the World Bank (especially its private investment arm IFC) and the WTO (including its GATT predecessor). The US has used these multilateral agencies to push the liberalization of trade and investments, privatization of public assets, deregulation of social and environmental protections and the denationalization of underdeveloped economies such as the Philippines. Like their imperialist masters, the puppet regimes in the Philippines have clung to the neoliberal policy because it suits their greed; they believe that they can always shift the burden of crisis to the people and they still await a more powerful revolutionary mass movement to challenge them.

Under the general auspices of the WTO and the proliferation of bilateral and multilateral free trade agreements with the US and other imperialist powers, the

Philippines is prevented from upholding economic sovereignty, conserving its national patrimony for the benefit of the Filipino people and undertaking national industrialization and land reform. The Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation, the Trans Pacific Partnership Agreement and ASEAN Economic Community are frameworks for binding the Philippines to the imperialist system of plunder and particularly to its neoliberal policy of unbridled monopoly capitalist greed.

In the face of the continuing plunder of the Philippines by US imperialism, enjoying the collaboration of the local exploiting classes of big compradors and landlords, the Filipino people and their revolutionary forces are committed to fighting for national liberation and democracy, realizing social justice, conserving their national patrimony and carrying out a program of development through national industrialization and land reform. They can end the underdevelopment of the Philippines only by destroying the exploitative system of big compradors and landlords subservient to US imperialism and thereby releasing the patriotic and progressive forces to undertake genuine development and achieve social justice.

III. The creation and formation of the puppet leadership class

Even while it carried out its war of aggression against the Filipino people, the US sought to entice leaders of the Philippine revolutionary government to surrender. This caused a split within the Aguinaldo Cabinet, between the revolutionary members like Apolinario Mabini and Antonio Luna and the capitulationists like Pardo de Tavera, Paterno and Buencamino. But the revolutionary mass movement was too strong to be derailed by the capitulationists, who were ridiculed as asimilistas and Sajonistas.

The US aggressors carried out a brutal war of conquest to serve the interests of US monopoly capitalism. But hypocritically they declared that they came to the Philippines to “civilize” and “Christianize” the people, after more than three centuries of Spanish colonial rule and Roman Catholic proselytization. They also claimed to have no interest in possessing the Philippines but rather simply in teaching democracy and self-government to the Filipinos, despite the success of the Filipinos in exercising democracy by building a revolutionary government and army and defeating Spanish colonialism.

They touted Jeffersonian democracy to embellish the image of modern

imperialism. With this, they were confident of being able to coopt the bourgeois liberals leading the Philippine revolution. The Filipino bourgeois liberals derived their political enlightenment from the study of bourgeois liberalism in Europe. They did not arise as the offshoot of a manufacturing bourgeoisie as in Europe. In fact, they were the children of landlords, colonial bureaucrats and merchants.

The US calculated that it could rely on a growing number of political collaborators by developing the semifeudal economy of the big compradors and landlords, using both the Philippine educational system and the pensionado system of sending native scholars to US universities to promote a pro-US colonial mentality and by expanding the bureaucracy and businesses to accommodate those produced by the schools.

After his capture in 1901, President Aguinaldo was threatened with death and coaxed by his US captors to issue a Peace Manifesto calling on the revolutionary forces to surrender. The leaders who turned against the revolution were given positions at various levels of the US colonial government and were encouraged to form in 1901 the Partido Federal to serve the colonial regime and to help it to discourage and suppress the revolutionary resistance of the people. Those who continued to wage revolutionary resistance were subjected to a series of draconian laws and were made to suffer torture and death by hanging and other means. Several years after the formal end of the Filipino-American War, the US issued in 1907 the Flag Law prohibiting the Filipino people from even displaying the Philippine flag. The Filipino people continued to be subjected to massacres, arbitrary detention and torture, food blockades and internment in concentration camps.

When the US calculated that it had sufficiently broken the armed revolutionary movement and had trained a sufficiently large corps of puppet politicians and professionals, it allowed the Nacionalista Party to exist and call for immediate, absolute and complete national independence. The Nacionalista Party was a reformist party, committed to demanding national independence only by legal and peaceful means and sending missions to Washington to plead for an eventual grant of independence.

Consequent to the inspiration of the victorious Great October Revolution in 1917 and the dire colonial and social conditions, the modern trade union movement which started in 1902 became relatively stronger and the basis for the establishment of the Communist Party of the Philippine Islands in 1930. The US

immediately tried to suppress this party by trumping up charges of sedition against the leaders. When the Great Depression worsened social conditions in the Philippines in the 1930s and the danger of fascism was running high, the rise of the broad antifascist Popular Front paved the way for the release of communist leaders from prisons and internal exile.

By 1935 the US was ready to establish the Commonwealth government as a transition to a semicolonial status for the Philippines. It approved the Philippine Constitution as framed by Filipino politicians and promised the grant of national independence by 1946. The Japanese imperialists and fascists invaded and occupied the Philippines from 1941 to 1945 and pretended to be even more generous than US imperialism by swiftly granting nominal independence to a puppet Philippine republic. In the course of the interimperialist war, the Communist Party was able to build a people's army against Japan (Hukbalahap), local organs of political power and a powerful mass movement that confiscated land from the landlords.

During World War II, the US kept a Commonwealth government in exile in Washington and directed from Australia the Filipino guerrilla forces, which swore loyalty to the US Army Forces in the Far East. It was able to recover the Philippines in 1945 and grant national independence in 1946 to a group of Filipino puppets headed by Manuel Roxas who had broken away from the Nacionalista Party and formed the Liberal Party. Thus, the Philippines became a semicolony run by puppets who served US imperialism and the local exploiting classes of big compradors and landlords.

The US and the local exploiting classes provoked the revolutionary resistance of the people by making impositions on them in violation of national independence and the national patrimony, by nullifying land reform and other social gains made by the anti-Japan revolutionary movement and by carrying out brutal campaigns of military suppression. The backbone of the armed revolutionary movement was broken in the early 1950s. But it succeeded in calling attention to the dire semicolonial and semifeudal conditions and the need for a democratic revolution led by the working class.

It seemed as if the phony democracy of the big comprador-landlord oligarchs could go on forever as a game of musical chairs between the Nacionalista and Liberal parties, with each party trying to replace the other in periodic elections that they monopolized. The two parties were a duopoly patterned after that of the

Republican and Democratic parties in US. But the chronic crisis of Philippine society kept on worsening, exposing the inability of every regime to solve the crisis, pointing to the need for a revolution but also tempting a president like Marcos to carry out a counterrevolution.

The Communist Party of the Philippines was reestablished in 1968 as the advanced detachment of the working class under the guidance of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought (or Maoism). It rectified the errors and shortcomings of the previous revolutionary movement. It put forward the general line of people's democratic revolution through protracted people's war. It considered the peasantry as the main force of the revolution in combination with the proletariat. The basic worker-peasant alliance linked itself with the urban petty bourgeoisie as a revolutionary force and further with the middle bourgeoisie against the joint class dictatorship of the big compradors and landlords.

Upon the instigation of the US, Marcos launched a fascist dictatorship under the pretext of "saving the republic and building a new society" in 1972. He sought to destroy the armed revolutionary movements of the Filipino and Moro people. He succeeded only to inflame the resistance of the broad masses of the people. Eventually, the people totally discredited, isolated and overthrew the fascist regime. Even Marcos' US imperialist master turned against him when it became indubitably clear that he was more of a liability than an asset. Fearing that the revolutionary forces could grow strong enough to overthrow the entire ruling system, the US and the local exploiting classes decided to junk Marcos and go back to the old track of pseudo-democratic regimes.

The pseudo-democratic regimes, from that of Cory Aquino to her son Benigno III, have proven to be utterly servile to US imperialism, exploitative and oppressive, corrupt and brutal. They have imposed on the Filipino people the policies of neocolonialism and neoliberalism and have inflicted extremely terrible suffering on the people. A multiplicity of reactionary parties has not proven any better than the duopoly of the Nacionalista and Liberal parties or the one-party rule of Marcos. Bureaucratic capitalism has grown worse since the Marcos dictatorship. Thus, the Filipino people and their revolutionary forces have become ever more determined to overthrow the entire ruling system and consequently end US domination in order to fully realize national and social liberation.

IV. The persistence of the colonial mentality

From the very start of its colonial rule in the Philippines, US imperialism was determined to dominate and control the Filipino people culturally aside from militarily, economically and politically. It sought to capture the hearts and minds of the people by misrepresenting itself as beneficent and altruistic and making the people forget about the extreme brutality of the US war of aggression through political propaganda and through the educational and cultural system. Thus, it dramatized the arrival of hundreds of American teachers on the ship Thomas and the conversion of some US troops to school teachers in pacified areas.

The US imperialists misrepresented themselves as far more gentle and kind than the Spanish colonialists whom they demonized. And yet they cleverly forged a compromise between their own cultural imperialism and the feudalism of the dominant Roman Catholic Church. The US controlled the expanding public school system and allowed the church and its religious orders to control in the main the private educational system. It propagated a conservative and pro-imperialist kind of liberalism, while the religio-sectarian schools continued religious instruction and accepted the new colonial dispensation. The US suppressed the expression of patriotism and anti-imperialism by political and mass leaders, by journalists, creative writers, artists and teachers.

A pro-US kind of colonial mentality supplanted the previous pro-Spanish version among those educated in the schools under the US colonial regime. The US colonial authorities established the pensionado system, providing scholarships to bright students for higher studies in various fields in the US. When the pensionados returned, they propagated their adulation of the US and were assured of promotions in the educational system, bureaucracy, business and professions. The supplanting of Spanish by English as the principal linguistic medium in the schools and in government guaranteed the predominance of a pro-US colonial mentality.

But such colonial mentality could never obliterate the patriotism and revolutionary aspirations of the Filipino people. In so many ways, the people demanded national independence and democracy and condemned the US colonial regime. Formations of the working people and the intelligentsia persevered in upholding and propagating patriotic and progressive ideas and sentiments. They were reinforced and revitalized by the establishment of the

Communist Party of the Philippine Islands which was avowedly guided by Marxism-Leninism and which demanded a national, scientific and mass culture.

The influences of the Great October Revolution and the revolutionary movements in China, Spain, Germany, US and elsewhere reached the Philippines, especially when the Great Depression worsened and fascist and antifascist movements arose in various parts of the world. The US colonial authorities tried to combine anti-communism with a colonial mentality to discourage the patriotic and progressive forces. But they failed because the economic and social crisis was worsening and the threat of fascism moved the people towards the struggle for national independence, democratic rights and social justice.

During their occupation of the Philippines from 1942 to 1945, the Japanese imperialists tried to ape the US imperialists by using the schools, mass media, puppet organizations such as the KALIBAPI, the Japanese language, and other cultural vehicles to impose on the people the most colonial aspect of their culture, including their fascist ideas and practices that carried markedly feudal vestiges — even their body language (e.g., deep bowing to show respect or submission). This aroused patriotic anger among the Filipino people. To keep them away from Japanese indoctrination, many Filipinos did not send their children to the Japanese-controlled public schools.

After their reconquest of the Philippines in 1946, the US imperialists misrepresented themselves as liberators of the Filipino people even as they were clearly reestablishing their military, economic, political and cultural dominance. They showed signs of wishing to postpone the granting of nominal independence, unless their unjust impositions were accepted. They were confronted by the old merger of the Communist and Socialist parties that had led the People's Army against Japan and by a broad Democratic Alliance of patriotic and progressive forces that demanded national independence and resisted the imperialist impositions.

Subsequent to the US grant of nominal independence in 1946, making the Philippine ruling system semicolonial, the US tried to perpetuate a pro-US colonial mentality among the Filipinos and combine it with anti-communism. It used the dominant political parties, the schools, the mass media, the churches, the movies, pop music and stage entertainment to tout the US as the defender of democracy or distract the people from the cause of national and social liberation

in the Philippines and from following the advancing forces of national liberation and socialism abroad.

The political ideas and sentiments generated by the duopoly of the Liberal and Nacionalista parties were pro-imperialist and reactionary. The higher political and educational authorities directed the school administrators and teachers to adopt the curricula and syllabi that they had approved. The US granted scholarships under the Fulbright and Smith-Mundt programs to maintain its influence in key universities and the entire educational system. It also used conferences, seminars and travel grants to promote pro-imperialist and anti-communist ideas and sentiments among academics, journalists, creative writers, artists, trade unionists and other people.

The Central Intelligence Agency became most notorious, through its front foundations (Asia Foundation, PEN and Congress for Cultural Freedom), in funding and manipulating cultural organizations and activities along the pro-imperialist and anti-communist line as a major part of the US-instigated Cold War. The reactionary authorities in state and religious schools were also notorious in trying to prevent the study of the works of the intellectual and political leaders of the old democratic revolution and to oppose the speeches and writings of contemporary anti-imperialists like Claro Mayo Recto.

When the mass organizations that espoused the new democratic revolution grew in strength in the 1960s and early 1970s, the US foreign aid and educational agencies and private US foundations like those of Ford and Rockefeller intensified their interference in the educational and cultural field in the Philippines. After declaring martial law in 1972, Marcos established draconian control over mass media and cultural channels, and deepened the propaganda of his fascist dictatorship through the educational system with its censored curricula and syllabi. The fascist regime and the US also started to use the World Bank to fund so-called reforms to align education to US policies.

The post-Marcos regimes have propagated anti-national and anti-democratic ideas and sentiments along the neocolonial and neoliberal line. US cultural imperialism has become even more pronounced. While one regime after another has increasingly channeled public funds to foreign debt servicing, bureaucratic corruption and military campaigns of suppression, all have reduced appropriations for state colleges and universities in order to press them to raise tuition fees and seek assistance from the private sector and US and foreign

entities.

The US and other imperialist governmental agencies and private foundations fund and direct nongovernmental or so-called civil society organizations to subvert educational and cultural institutions and attack the cultural, educational and other works of the people's national democratic movement. US agencies like the US Agency for International Development (USAID), the National Endowment of Democracy (NED), the US Institute of Peace and the like are well known for funding groups engaged in subverting and attacking the endeavors and aspirations of the Filipino people for national and social liberation.

More than ever the Filipino people and their revolutionary forces demand and struggle for a national scientific and mass culture and education. The cadres and mass activists are propagating this patriotic and progressive type of culture and education and contributing creatively to its advance even in the schools and other cultural institutions of the ruling system. But certainly they are most effective in the mass movement, in the people's army and in the rural areas governed by the people's democratic government.

V. The national liberation struggle

The Filipino people and their revolutionary forces persevere in the struggle for national liberation and democracy under the leadership of the working class and its advanced detachment, the Communist Party of the Philippines. It is precisely through the revolutionary struggle that they build their strength to overthrow the ruling system and to establish a people's democratic state system. They are prepared to fight US imperialism as it escalates its military intervention and proceeds to a full scale war of aggression.

Both US imperialism and the ruling system of big compradors and landlords cannot persist forever in the Philippines. By their own unbridled greed and terrorism under the auspices of neocolonialism and neoliberalism, they increasingly expose their unjust character and bankruptcy and drive the people to intensify their struggle for national and social liberation. After winning the new democratic revolution, the Filipino people can proceed to the socialist stage of the Philippine revolution. The betrayal of socialism by the modern revisionists since the late 1950s, culminating in their full restoration of capitalism in their respective countries from 1989 to 1991, led to the full sway of neocolonialism in

the underdeveloped countries and neoliberalism in the entire world capitalist system. Since 2007-2008 when the US and other imperialist powers were hit hard by an economic and financial crisis comparable to that of the Great Depression, the conditions of exploitation and oppression have worsened as if without end, but have at the same time driven the broad masses of the people to wage resistance.

US imperialism has undermined its position as the sole superpower by becoming overdrawn to high tech military production and wars of aggression, by making China a major partner in neoliberal globalization, by relying on cheap Chinese labor to produce consumer goods, by undercutting manufacturing and employment in the US, by accelerating the financialization of the US economy and by becoming a debtor to China, Japan and a host of other countries. The full entry of China and Russia into the ranks of big capitalist powers has not strengthened the world capitalist system but has made it more cramped and more prone to the intensification of interimperialist contradictions. Until the first decade of the 21st century, China and Russia have been acquiescent to the US engaging in wars of aggression, as in Iraq and Afghanistan. But subsequently, they have become wary of US expansionism and have formed the Shanghai Cooperation Organization (SCO) to countervail the growing aggressiveness of the US and NATO. They have also promoted the BRICS as an economic bloc to serve as counterfoil to US arrogance in economic, trade and financial matters. The interimperialist contradictions are still apparently far from breaking out into direct or indirect war between any of the big capitalist powers, notwithstanding their involvement in civil strife, such as that in Syria and Ukraine.

In East Asia, China has moved from being the sponsor of the Chinese comprador big bourgeoisie collaborating with US and other multinational firms in sweatshop operations and private construction to being a rising industrial capitalist power, involving the nationalist collaboration of both state and private monopoly capitalism. But China is still avoiding being a full imperialist power that uses aggression to grab both economic and political territory. Even in UN peacekeeping missions, it prefers to contribute police advisors rather than military troops.

In maritime disputes over the South China Sea, China is conspicuously overreaching and potentially violent. But so far it has not engaged in any act of aggression for the purpose of subjugating any country. The submission by the Philippines of its maritime dispute with China to the International Tribunal on

the Law of the Sea is a peaceful act and could be a peaceful way of resolving the said maritime dispute and similar disputes. A situation in which China can always insist on indisputable sovereignty over 90 percent of the South China Sea is more fraught with violence.

The reactionary Aquino regime has boasted that the US will protect the Philippines from China and this is why it has allowed the US to have military bases, troops, facilities, war materiel (tanks, warships and attack planes) and even nuclear weapons on Philippine territory under the new Enhanced Defense Cooperation Agreement, in flagrant violation of the 1987 constitution. But in fact, the US has declared neutrality between the Philippines and China over their maritime dispute. It is deliberately maintaining a dual policy of cooperation and contention towards China. It is mindful that it has far more economic, trade, financial and security interests in China than in the Philippines. Even the Aquino ruling clique has lucrative relations with Chinese mining, construction, export-processing and marketing firms.

In the meantime, the long running provocative thrust of neoconservative policy to make the US dominant in the entire 21st century and use a broad spectrum approach to put down any imperialist rival. The more recent provocations resulting from the US pivot to Asia against China and the US-EU-NATO expansion into the Ukraine against Russia have pushed China and Russia to sign on May 21, 2014 a 30-year US\$400 billion natural gas agreement. This agreement solidifies the alliance of China and Russia against the hegemonic schemes of the US and is at the center of the most pertinent economic, financial and trade agreements and is concomitant to a greatly increased security alliance and cooperation between the two giant neighbors. The struggle for a redivision of the world among the great capitalist powers is steadily developing; it is only a matter of time before the huge earthquakes break out and serve as prelude to an unprecedented rise of anti-imperialist and socialist movements.

The Filipino people and the revolutionary forces have to grasp the complexity of the world capitalist system today and study how to make use of opportunities presented by interimperialist contradictions as did the Bolsheviks when there was no preceding socialist country to aid them. They must resolutely raise the level of their revolutionary consciousness and fighting capabilities. They must be determined to win the people's democratic revolution and proceed to the socialist revolution. They must be prepared to confront and counter the No. 1 imperialist enemy at every stage.

They can be confident that the turmoil of the world capitalist system, wracked by protracted, intensifying and widening crisis, marks the eve of renewed anti-imperialist and proletarian revolutions on a global scale. They must rely primarily on themselves in waging revolution as they have done successfully for so long, and intensify their efforts to win the solidarity and support of other peoples and revolutionary movements to take advantage of the worsening global crisis, inter-imperialist contradictions and the rise and spread of anti-imperialist and proletarian revolutions on a global scale.

VI. The crimes of US imperialism and its puppets

US imperialism must be held accountable. When we speak of US imperialism, we refer to the US federal state and its various agencies, the corporations and banks which are impelled by monopoly capitalism to engage in aggression and plunder. For the purpose of putting on trial US imperialism and its puppets, the people must be aware of the comprehensive range of crimes for which they are culpable: US imperialism must be held accountable. When we speak of US imperialism, we refer to the US federal state and its various agencies, the corporations and banks which are impelled by monopoly capitalism to engage in aggression and plunder.

1. The genocidal killing of 1.5 Filipinos, amounting to 20 percent of the Philippine population of 7 million, is a horrendous crime. This was the brutal way by which US imperialism violated the national sovereignty of the Filipino and destroyed the Philippine republic.
2. The direct colonial occupation of the Philippines from 1902 to 1946, except for the interregnum of US occupation from 1942 to 1945, entailed the oppression and exploitation of the Filipino people. The people were taxed by the colonial state to pay for the costs of US aggression and colonial occupation.
3. The US monopoly capitalists extracted superprofits from the Philippine colony by plundering its natural resources, subjecting the workers to inhumanly low wages in public works and in US enterprises, promoting the unequal exchange of raw-material exports and manufactured imports and subjecting the country to debt peonage to US banks.
4. The US used the Philippines as a launching base for aggression against China and for getting a piece of the Chinese melon in the colonial game. This started

the criminal use of US military bases in the Philippines for aggression against the neighboring countries of the Philippines, especially after World War II, against China, Vietnam, Laos, Cambodia and Indonesia.

5. The US engaged in cultural imperialism and perpetuated a colonial mentality. It imposed on the people not only the English language but also pro-imperialist ideas and values that obscured the blood debts of the US and misrepresented the exploitation of the people as beneficial. It bent the feudal and medieval belief system of the dominant Catholic church to serve the interests of US monopoly capitalism.

6. The US trained the bureaucrats, politicians and professionals to be servile to US imperialist power and to use the language of pro-imperialist liberal democracy to deceive the people. It was most responsible for promoting bureaucrat capitalism. It taught the children of the exploiting classes and the urban petty bourgeois to seek and hold power and mass private wealth through bureaucratic corruption.

7. The US has fostered the comprador big bourgeoisie as its principal trading and financial agents in the country. This class is responsible for ensuring raw material production for export and for importing foreign manufactures and distributing them in the country. The US has also retained the landlord class for the purpose of controlling food production and agricultural production for export.

8. When the US pretended to grant independence in the Philippines in 1946, it was sure of being able to rely on its puppets: the big compradors and landlords and bureaucrat capitalists. Since then it has retained control over the economy, the politics, the culture, security and diplomatic relations of the Philippines.

9. The US is culpable for the semicolonial system of exploitation, underdevelopment and rampant poverty. The daily violence of exploitation has caused the untimely death of many more Filipinos than those 1.5 million killed from 1899 to 1913.

10. To this day, the US provides arms, indoctrination, training and strategic planning to the military and police forces of the reactionary state and is culpable for military campaigns of suppression and the gross and systematic human rights violations. It has forces of military intervention in the Philippines and uses these

to dominate the Philippines and threaten neighboring countries under the US pretext of a permanent war on terrorism and the US strategic policy of pivot to East Asia.

US imperialism maintains hegemony over the Philippines because it is assisted by the big compradors, landlords and bureaucrat capitalists. These reactionary puppets are complicit with the US in grave crimes against the Filipino people and they take their own initiatives to oppress and exploit the people.

Statement on China-Philippine Exploration Deal

August 1, 2018

The Filipino people and all national and democratic forces should be alert to the China-Philippine exploration deal announced by DFA secretary Cayetano and should demand that the terms of the deal be made known immediately to the public.

What is exactly the 60 percent for the Philippines and 40 percent for China? Do these percentages pertain to ownership, costs of exploration and development and/or production sharing with the Chinese oil exploration and development company deciding what is true or fictional values of production?

But there are more important prejudicial questions to be answered about Philippine sovereignty and sovereign rights over the exclusive economic zone (EEZ) and extended continental shelf (ECS) in the West Philippine Sea and about the legal victory of the Philippines before the Permanent Court of Arbitration in The Hague in accordance with the UN Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS).

We need to get clear answers to such questions in view of the traitorous and cowardly policy of the Duterte regime regarding the West Philippine Sea and the previous bad experience of the Philippines in engaging with China in joint seismic undertaking or exploration during the Arroyo regime. We should recall that China never shared fully with the Philippines the essential findings and technical data from such exploration. Then it became more aggressive in claiming the West Philippine Sea and building artificial islands.

The reason why China became interested in building artificial islands as military

bases in the Spratlys is not because the Aquino regime filed the Philippine case before the ITLOS in accordance with the UN Convention on the Law of the Sea but because the Arroyo regime made the stupid and grave error of entering into a joint agreement on seismic undertaking with China to explore the oil and gas resources under the West Philippine Sea.

When the Chinese discovered that the oil and gas resources were abundant, they did not share the essential findings and all technical data with the Philippines and became more determined to lay claim over the entire West Philippine Sea and build more artificial islands. Vietnam backed out of the joint seismic undertaking when it noticed that China would monopolize the results of the exploration.

The next big mistake is about to be made by the Duterte regime and will be the most outrageous one. To suit the traitorous and corrupt cabal of Duterte, Arroyo and Enrique Razon who holds 75 percent of the concession area around Reed Bank, the Philippines is once more entering into a joint agreement on seismic undertaking with China, without the assertion or premise of Philippine sovereignty and sovereign rights and without reference to the legal victory of the Philippines before the Permanent Court of Arbitration in The Hague on July 12, 2016.

Especially under the prodding of House Speaker Arroyo and the tycoon Razon, the Duterte regime is more than ever determined to sell out Philippine sovereignty and the trillions of dollars worth of oil and gas resources under the West Philippine Sea in exchange for a few billions worth of Chinese loans for building overpriced infrastructure projects at high interest rates.

Panting like dogs after finder's fees and commissions, Duterte and his fellow corrupt officials play stupid and keep on saying that the West Philippine Sea and the Philippine EEZ and ECS are still under dispute by the baseless Chinese claims and that the conclusive and final judgment of the Permanent Court of Arbitration amounts to nothing or is an empty victory.

Duterte and his fellow corrupt officials are so brave and merciless against the Filipino people but behave so cowardly before China by repeating ad nauseum that the the only choice that the Philippines has is to go to war against China or submit to the baseless Chinese claim of sovereignty over the West Philippine Sea.

If they were not so stupid and cowardly, they can make telling and far-reaching diplomatic protests and can file several court cases under international law to demand respect for the already won legal victory of the Philippines and for compensation for the damages to the marine environment features that belong to the Philippines.

Author's Preface to Strengthen the People's Struggle against Imperialism and Reaction

I thank the editor and the International Network of Philippine Studies for publishing *Strengthen the People's Struggle against Imperialism and Reaction*, Volume 5, thus completing the book series, *The People's Struggle against Oppression and Exploitation: Selected Writings: 2009-2015*. This volume is a selection of my writings from 2014 to 2015, a period of crisis, social unrest and political turmoil in the Philippines and the world. As the founding chairman of the Communist Party of the Philippines (CPP) and as Chief Political Consultant of the National Democratic Front of the Philippines (NDFP) in peace negotiations with the Government of the Republic of the Philippines (GRP), I was expected or sometimes obliged to speak or write on major Philippine issues from a patriotic and progressive viewpoint in line with the new-democratic revolution.

As Chairperson of the International League of Peoples' Struggle (ILPS) I was required to take initiative in stating the anti-imperialist and democratic position of the League on global issues for the benefit of its International Coordinating Committee, global region committees, national chapters and more than 200 member-organizations in five continents. The contents of *Strengthen the People's Struggle against Imperialism and Reaction* include essays (articles and speeches), statements, interviews and messages to various people's organizations and institutions. They are arranged chronologically. But they are interconnected and cohere in connection with major events and issues in the peoples' struggles against US imperialism and local reaction in the Philippines and abroad.

The book contains essays that describe the context of the history and circumstances of the Filipino people's struggle for national liberation and democracy. It examines the implications and consequences of the resurgence of the national democratic movement since the 1960s and the EDSA uprising that

overthrew the Marcos fascist dictatorship in 1986. And it focuses on the situation and prospects of the people's struggle against the US-Aquino regime, characterized as a big comprador-landlord regime servile to US imperialism.

The general line of national democratic revolution is explained by a number of articles on the persistent semicolonial and semifeudal conditions and the latest conditions dictated by the US-imposed neoliberal economic policy regime, on the people's mass struggles for national and social liberation and on the new-democratic revolution through protracted people's war.

The roles of various classes and sectors in the people's struggle are defined by the essays, statements and messages to the working class, peasantry, the indigenous people, youth, women, teachers, cultural workers and other professionals. I take the opportunity to urge various people's organizations to intensify and raise their struggle to a new and higher level. I share with them my experiences and my continuing study of how to arouse, organize and mobilize the masses.

In a paper I delivered to students and some faculty members in Development Studies at the University of Utrecht, I examine the role of activism in Philippine development. I discuss how the mass movement has endeavored to demand national industrialization and agrarian reform and basic social and economic reforms to solve the problems of underdevelopment, mass poverty, unemployment, low incomes and lack of social services. I also present how the revolutionary forces and the mass movement are undertaking reforms to alleviate these dire conditions.

The book contains a major essay on revolutionary art and literature in the Philippines from the 1960s to the present, which explains comprehensively how far the Filipino artists and creative writers have carried forward the revolutionary struggles and demands of the people. The essay was serialized in the Philippine Collegian for the benefit of the students of the University of the Philippines.

In several articles published in major Philippine and foreign publications, I analyze how the US under the Obama regime has tightened its grip on the Philippines by collaborating with Japan, by carrying out a strategic pivot to Asia, by imposing the Enhanced Defense Cooperation Agreement on the Philippines and by using the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation to push the neoliberal offensive further.

While the US remains dominant in the Philippines, China has tried to transgress Philippine sovereign rights over the West Philippine Sea. Several articles explain the maritime dispute between the Philippines and China, the Philippine case filed against China before the International Tribunal on the Law of the Sea (ITLOS) and the Arbitral Tribunal and the relations of the Philippines with the US and China regarding the issue.

Despite the revolutionary necessity of people's war, the NDFP in representation of 18 revolutionary organizations (including the Communist Party of the Philippines and the New People's Army), has shown willingness to engage in peace negotiations with the GRP. In connection with these peace negotiations, I have gone as far as to dialogue with senior officers of the reactionary armed forces who are graduate students of the National Defense College of the GRP.

Several articles explain how GRP President Aquino and his OPAPP secretary Deles sabotaged the peace negotiations by violating existing agreements, preconditioning the peace negotiations with the capitulation and pacification of the revolutionary forces and the people and preventing comprehensive agreements on social, economic and political reforms to address the roots of the armed conflict and lay the basis of a just and lasting peace.

The book pays serious attention to the Filipino migrant workers. It exposes and denounces the myth of migration as a way for development. It urges the migrant workers to fight commercialization and enslavement and to strengthen Migrante International. Filipino migrant workers are vulnerable: they are discriminated against, they take jobs far below their education and training, receive lower wages than the locals in the host country and are deprived of basic trade union and democratic rights.

The Filipino migrant workers are more than ten million or ten percent of the entire Philippine population or 20 percent of our national work force. It is necessary for them to develop solidarity with the local people and other migrants in the host countries in order to obtain better wage and living conditions. It is likewise necessary for them to gain the solidarity and support of other peoples of the world for the Filipino people's struggle for national and social liberation. The book calls for international solidarity.

The International League of Peoples' Struggle has become the biggest international organization of its kind, a combination of people's organizations

engaged in anti-imperialist and democratic struggle. Filipino and overseas Filipino mass organizations are active here and engage in international solidarity and mutual support through unity, coordination and cooperation with people's organizations in various other countries.

As ILPS Chairperson, I give an overview of ILPS work and call for a socially just world, strengthen the people's solidarity and intensify the struggle against imperialist plunder, crisis and war. By teleconference, I delivered the keynote address at the Fifth International Assembly of ILPS which was held in Manila on November 15-16, 2015.

Strengthen the People's Struggle against Imperialism and Reaction relates the Philippines to the world in several articles on the international situation and the role of the Philippine Revolution in the world proletarian revolution, on the CPP, Maoism, new democratic revolution, China and the current world order. It takes up such problems as climate change and nuclear weapons as the result of imperialism and as threats to human survival.

Complementing the expressions condemning US imperialism are expressions of solidarity and support extended to peoples suffering brutal forms of attacks by imperialism and local reactionaries and waging anti-imperialist and democratic struggles, as in Venezuela, Ukraine, Palestine, Kurdistan, Iraq, Libya, Syria, Afghanistan, Somali, Sudan, Congo and other countries.

The US and NATO allies are held criminally responsible for the surge of refugees to Europe from the Middle East and Africa due to the combination of super-exploitation, wars of aggression and climate change resulting from the plunder of the environment. The US CIA and the Israeli Mossad are condemned for organizing terrorist jihad groups like Daesh and Al-Nusra that engage in senseless killings and other depredations.

In messages to various ILPS member-organizations in the Philippines and abroad, I present the situation upon which they act and exhort them to advance their political and organizational work in order to strengthen themselves and mobilize more people to advance the revolutionary cause for the benefit of a certain oppressed class or sector and for the benefit of the broad masses of the people.

In the book, I do not deal only with large issues but I relate myself to

personalities of significance. These include the living and departed heroes. I pay the highest tribute to such martyrs as Comrade Leoncio Pitao (Ka Parago) of Mindanao and Comrade Recca Monte of Northern Luzon. I honor Comrade Primo Rivera (Tang Prime) and others who made sacrifices and devoted their lives to the revolutionary service of the people.

I praise Benito and Wilma Tiamzon for being resolute and effective leaders of the Communist Party of the Philippines, Luis Jalandoni for his long revolutionary dedication and role in the peace negotiations and Prof. Judy Taguiwalo for her rich revolutionary experience and patriotic and progressive academic service. I acknowledge the contributions of the departed ally Alejandro Lichauco, the economist, in espousing anti-imperialism and economic nationalism.

I honor comrades and friends abroad who have fought for greater freedom, equality and social justice in their particular fields, such as the political leader Irene Fernandez with whom I worked in the International League of Peoples' Struggle and the playwright and poet Amiri Baraka with whom I became a friend while participating in the same poetry festivals.

In closing, I urge you to read Strengthen the People's Struggle against Imperialism and Reaction in order to understand the major events and issues in the years 2014 and 2015 in connection with the historical background and with the years from 2016 onwards.

It is of course outrageous that today the Filipino people and other peoples of the world are living under worse conditions. But these are the result of the grave crisis and rotting of the domestic ruling system and the world capitalist system and are pushing the people to struggle harder against imperialism and all reaction in order to achieve national liberation, democracy and socialism.

We are confident that the worsening crisis of the world capitalist system, the escalation of oppression and exploitation and the relentlessness of aggressive wars are resulting in greater people's resistance and will eventually bring about the resurgence of revolutionary movements on an unprecedented global scale.

Jose Maria Sison

Utrecht, Netherlands

August 10, 2018

How Chinese Loans Become Unrepayable

November 21, 2018

It is not only the interest charge of 2 percent to 6 percent that makes Chinese loans for infrastructure projects ultimately too burdensome and unrepayable. More importantly, it is the overpricing of the various parts and aspects of these projects that make these loans unrepayable.

The Chinese construction companies can at will overprice everything: the designs, the engineering services, the use of equipment, the supply of construction materials, the contracting of Chinese labor and so on. The overpricing carries the much bigger hidden interest on the loans. The huge overprice allows payoffs to regime officials and translates into unrepayable amortization of principal and interest payment.

What the Chinese imperialists practise is similar to the swindle that Soviet social imperialism used to impose on socialist China in the latter half of the 1950s. There was token or no interest at all charged on projects undertaken by the Soviet Union in China but the overprice made bigger profit than any open interest rate.

In contracts with Chinese banks and construction companies, there are provisions for the conversion of unpaid debts to Chinese equity as well as takeover of structures that the Chinese companies have built. These are well exposed in Sri Lanka, Pakistan, Maldives, Kenya and elsewhere. Mahatir Mohamad, Malaysian prime minister, has publicly warned against the loan shark operations of China.

Always hungry for natural resources to feed its industries, China is also

notorious for holding as collateral the natural resources of its debt-enslaved client-states. Thus it has required the Duterte regime to become an open traitor by practically exchanging Philippine sovereign rights over the West Philippine Sea and an estimated US\$60 trillion worth of oil, gas and other resources in lopsided exchange for the few billions of dollars worth of high interest loans for overpriced infrastructure projects.

By allowing China to be a partner and co-owner of joint undertakings to explore and exploit the energy resources in the West Philippine Sea, the Philippines is made to fall silent on and give up its sovereign rights and allow Chinese corporations to explore and exploit oil, gas and other resources, with Chinese corporations monopolizing the findings of explorations and the accounting of costs and outcomes in exploration and exploitation.

Under the traitorous and stupid Duterte regime, the Philippines submits to China's requirement of giving up sovereign rights and natural patrimony not only by falling for a swindling debt trap but also simultaneously by accepting legal and political provisions that economic and trade and loan agreements are to be governed by and construed in accordance with Chinese laws and that any dispute with the Philippines on the terms of contracts is to be settled through arbitration by the China International Economic and Trade Arbitration Commission. These provisions overrule any Philippine silence or equivocation about the sovereign rights in the West Philippine Sea.

The Chinese debt trap will be sufficient to convert the Philippines into a Chinese debt colony. But the accumulated Philippine debt from its traditional bilateral and multilateral creditors (US, Japan, World Bank, IMF and so on) will automatically increase as a result of the quantitative tightening (increased interest rate) already initiated by the US Federal Bank to counter the excessive US public debt incurred during the period of quantitative easing (low interest regime).

The only reason that Duterte and his cronies are jumping into the Chinese debt trap and the current treasonous act of surrendering sovereign rights and national patrimony to China is because they privately gain from contract shares and finder's fees and they have apparently already received payoffs in advance in the form of the loans and accommodations already granted by Chinese banks and companies to Dennis Uy, Duterte's frontman and bagman.

False Choices on the Basis of Simpleton Arguments

November 22, 2018

The tyrant Duterte and his followers keep on dumbing down the Filipino people. To have their way on major issues, they always put forward false choices on the basis of simpleton arguments that are grossly contrary to facts. They argue that the Philippines has no choice but to engage China and its companies in exploring and exploiting the oil and gas resources in the West Philippine Sea because the Philippines has no expertise in such field.

This is a blatantly false choice against the sovereign rights of the Filipino people because the Philippines as owner of the resources can choose to muster its own experts and hire any of so many oil exploration and exploitation companies in Europe and which do not belong to any country, like China, that seeks to usurp ownership of the West Philippine Sea.

There are plenty of oil and gas exploration and exploitation companies in Europe from which the Philippines can choose the best possible in terms of accepting Philippine sovereign ownership of the resources and enjoy the protection of international law, and the international community of nations and even the implied NATO to checkmate any Chinese threat of aggression.

By stating the above, I have disposed of another simpleton argument of Duterte and his followers that the Philippines has to give up its legal victory in the Permanent Arbitration Court in accordance with the UNCLOS and let China do what it pleases because to assert Philippine sovereign rights over the natural resources in the West Philippine Sea would invite an aggressive attack from China.

Duterte and his followers make obviously simpleton arguments that are in fact treasonous and cowardly but are also blatantly indicative of self-interest and corruption in dealing with China and the Chinese banks and companies. They are apparently already enjoying payoffs in advance. In campaigning for the presidency, Duterte denounced his predecessors as protectors of the illegal drug trade and being guilty of all forms of corruption and he touted himself as the absolute enemy of illegal drugs and corruption.

It turns out that Duterte and his own son and son-in-law are the biggest protectors and smugglers in the illegal drug trade. It is fair to say that he has become the supreme drug overlord. The drug problem has worsened under the Duterte regime. Duterte has ordered the mass murder of street-level drug addicts but he is protecting the druglords.

As regards corruption, the Office of the President is at the peak of a hierarchy of corruption among civilian and military officials. Duterte has shamelessly exposed himself as in cahoots with the biggest Luzon-based plunderers, like the Marcos, Arroyo and Estrada families, which helped him win the elections with money and their bailiwick votes.

And, of course, there can be no bigger corruption than the treasonous sell-out of the sovereign rights of the Filipino people over the oil, gas and other resources in the West Philippine Sea. These resources, if not sold out could fund the industrial development of the Philippines as the NDFP proposes in its draft of the Comprehensive Agreement on Social and Economic Reforms.

Instead of engaging in peace negotiations with the NDFP in order to arrive at social, economic and political reforms to lay the basis for a just and lasting peace, Duterte and his followers use the argument that they must carry out a purely military solution because the NDFP refuses to surrender to the tyrannical, traitorous, brutal, corrupt and mendacious Duterte regime.

Duterte and his followers condemn the unitary form of government as the cause of all evils in the Philippines and they propose federalism as the solution to all problems. But in fact, they are pushing for a bogus kind of federalism, which allows Duterte to institutionalize a fascist dictatorship ala Marcos, concentrate all powers in his hands and handpick his regional agents among the warlords and dynasties in the regions and provinces.

The Anticolonial Resistance in the Philippines

Interview by Jacob Bodden

September 15, 2019

1. Although The Philippines is independent in name, in what way would you consider The Philippines semicolony and semifeudal?

JMS: The US granted nominal independence to the Philippines on July 4, 1946 and allowed the political representatives of the local exploiting classes of big compradors and landlords to take charge of administration from national level downwards. But to keep the Philippines as a semicolony, the US required the puppet politicians to co-sign the US-RP Treaty of General Relations which upheld US property rights in the Philippines, kept the US military bases, put foreign relations of the Philippines under the supervision of the US State Department, and so on. Further on, after the grant of nominal independence, the US rammed through the Philippine Congress the enactment of the Parity Amendment to give US corporations and citizens equal rights like Filipinos to exploit natural resources, operate public utilities and all types of businesses.

The Philippines has been kept semifeudal by having the landlords dominate agricultural land in the countryside and the comprador big bourgeoisie dominate the cities. The most powerful and wealthiest kind of Filipino bourgeoisie has a comprador character, a trading and financial agent of US imperialism. There is no national industrialization occurring and no land reform to finally breakdown the feudal base of the economy. Since the first decade of the 20th century, the US has maintained the semifeudal economy by promoting mining and plantations for export-crops, allowing some manufacturing or semimanufacturing short of establishing heavy and basic industries and favoring the importation of finished

manufactures in a lopsided trade, which gives rise to heavy foreign indebtedness of the Philippines.

2. In what way is the current revolutionary struggle a continuation of the 1896 revolution?

JMS: The current revolution is a continuation of the 1896 revolution because it still aims to realize full national independence and people's democracy. But the difference is that it is now led by the working class, no longer by the liberal bourgeoisie, and has a socialist perspective. The industrial proletariat has expanded to some significant extent from some 5 percent to 16 percent since 1896. But it still has to base itself on a worker-peasant alliance in order to wage revolution. The revolution is being consciously waged in the context of the era of modern imperialism and proletarian revolution.

3. What are the most important differences between the anticolonial resistance against Spain and the US, and the current revolutionary struggle?

JMS: The most important differences are in the change of class leadership in the revolution from the liberal bourgeoisie to the proletariat, the change of proportions of classes in society due to the shift from feudal to semifeudal society and the world context of modern imperialism and proletarian revolution has been significantly affected after World War II by neocolonialism, anti-communism, social democracy, modern revisionism, neoliberalism and neoconservative line of ceaseless wars. But the revolutionary forces and people in the Philippines and in the world are fighting back. We are now in transition to a period of global resurgence of the revolutionary forces.

4. In 1916 the United States declared by law that they had to work together with the Filipino people to become independent. Why did the US do this?

JMS: Nationalist agitation and agrarian unrest continued. Thus, the US promised independence after "tutelage in self-government" and allowed Filipino officials to go on Independence missions to Washington to plead for independence. It was a way of letting off steam. And the US also targeted the landed estates of the Spanish religious estates for land reform, although the ultimate beneficiaries were Filipino landlords because the poor tenants could not afford the redistribution price of land.

Chinese Imperialist Motivations and Initiatives in Relation to US and other Imperialist Powers

Keynote Message to the Study Conference: Defending Sovereignty by ILPS Commission 6

October 26, 2019

First, let me thank Ka Paeng (Rafael Mariano) and the ILPS Commission 6 for inviting me to deliver this keynote message.

I convey warmest greetings of solidarity to all participants in this study conference titled, “Defending Sovereignty” and focusing on China as a rising imperialist power. We are all united in the anti-imperialist and democratic struggles of the peoples of the world.

I am aware that your conference includes representatives of nongovernmental groups and peoples from countries like Pakistan, India, Malaysia, Sri Lanka, Laos, Myanmar, Cambodia, Indonesia and the Philippines. You are all concerned with the growing tentacles of Chinese monopoly capitalism.

China takes the road of capitalism and imperialism

Soon after the death of the great Mao in 1976, the capitalist roaders headed by Deng Xiaoping were able to stage a coup to overthrow the proletariat in China. The proletarian revolutionaries in the Central Committee and lower organs of the Communist Party of China were arrested and imprisoned. The revolutionary committees created by the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution (GPCR) were dissolved.

In quick succession, the GPCR was proclaimed a complete disaster, the capitalist roaders took over the state enterprises, dismantled the commune system, privatized the rural industries and allowed the old big bourgeoisie and new private entrepreneurs to access funds from state banks. On the basis of socialist construction that it had previously attained, the Chinese economy became monopoly capitalist, with the state sector leading the private sector.

Deng's policy of capitalist reforms and opening up to the world capitalist system was adopted and enforced in 1978. The US conceded consumer manufacturing to China and provided low-end technology for the sweat shops. In the 1980s, China exported a huge amount of consumer manufactures mainly to the US and relied on foreign investments and trade surpluses as key factor for the development of China's capitalist economic and financial system.

This ultimately resulted in corruption in the private acquisition of public land and grants of state loans and other business privileges and inflation of food prices as the amount of food needed by the construction boom and manufacturing soared. Thus corruption and inflation were raised as main economic issues in the mass uprisings of the youth and workers at Tiananmen Square in Beijing and in many cities of China in 1989.

By the end of the 1980s, China had built up both state and private capitalism by extracting enormous profits from Chinese cheap labor. The state sector assured itself of resources for achieving economic and strategic goals and the private sector developed rapidly with loans and cheap raw materials from the state sector. China's GDP grew at a rapid rate but the per capita income of the Chinese people remained low in comparison to other industrial capitalist countries.

From being the world's biggest creditor at the beginning of the 1980s, the US dropped to being the biggest debtor at the end of the decade. It undermined its own economy by outsourcing consumer manufacturing. Though China increased its own public debt, it became a major creditor of the US by using a part of its export income to buy US securities.

The ratio of China's population to agricultural land is quite high and remains problematic. China must feed 20 per cent of the world's population on 7 per cent of the world's agricultural land. To aggravate the dismantling of the commune system, rapid industrialization and real estate development have also chewed up agricultural land. But China has been able to use its income from manufactured

exports to make food imports and to lease or purchase land abroad in order to cover its food deficit.

Since the 1980s, China had become a major partner of the US in neoliberal globalization. But in the 1990s and thereafter, it would become the main US partner. It became a far more willing partner of the US and host of foreign investments after the 1989 mass uprising. The US was also encouraged to promote capitalism in former socialist countries after the collapse of the Soviet Union in 1991.

It coaxed China to join the World Trade Organization (WTO) and further privatize state-owned enterprises in exchange for increased US investments, technology transfer and further trade accommodations. China complied with the US demands to a satisfactory extent. It reduced the number of state corporations in relation to private corporations but the former continued to dominate the economic sectors vital to strategic economic and security goals.

The US allowed China to have its way in its economic development inasmuch as the US was confidently concentrating on the production of big items, financializing its economy and riding high on its high-tech boom in the entire decade of 1990s. Concerned with the expansionism of the NATO, China and Russia set up the Shanghai Cooperation Organization in 2001 as an economic, political and security alliance.

However, they consented to the wars of aggression by the coalition forces headed by the US against Iraq in 1991 as well as in March 2003 to December 2011 even as the US boasted of its neoconservative policy of full-spectrum dominance in the 21st century. Nevertheless, they set up the BRICS in 2010 as an economic bloc to counter the most adverse policies of the US-controlled multilateral agencies and take advantage of the US preoccupation with wars in the Middle East.

Even as it enjoyed the position of being the winner of the Cold War and sole superpower, the US continued its strategic decline by spending trillions of dollars on wars of aggression (Afghanistan, Iraq, Yugoslavia and elsewhere) and suffering a series of economic setbacks, including the crisis of overproduction in high-tech goods in 2000 and the mortgage meltdown of 2006 which led to the global financial crisis of 2008.

Since 2008, the US strategic decline has accelerated in the prolonged stagnation of the US and global economy. Although the US remains the strongest imperialist power, it has slid down to a multipolar world. By being able to manipulate its two-tier economy, China continued its economic rise despite the 2008 financial crisis, as in the aftermath of the Asian financial crisis in 1997, when China benefited from the decline of the so-called Asian tigers.

By 2013, China launched the Belt and Road Initiative (BRI) to serve as the outlet for its surplus capital and for its own overproduction of steel and construction equipment. The BRI has been touted as a trillion dollar project which aims to put at least half of global trade within its ambit. In fact, the Asian Infrastructure Investment Bank (AIIB) started with a capitalization of US\$ 100 billion.

But soon in 2015 the prolonged global depression began to adversely affect the Chinese economy. The Chinese stock market crashed, wiping out more than 30 percent of assets. Japanese and other foreign investments were leaving China in significant amounts. And the Chinese economic growth rate slowed down. According to the International Finance Institute (IFI), China's total debt (state, corporate and household) has leaped to the level of 303 per cent of GDP as of July 17, 2019 amid the trade war with the US and the economic slowdown.

C. Growing US-China contention

As early as during the time of Obama, the US became openly wary of the economic and military rise of China. Thus it undertook the policy of strategic pivot to East Asia in order to increase its air and naval assets in the region. But the pivot has been slowed down by the US failure to extricate itself from the "ceaseless wars" in the Middle East.

However, Trump has preferred to make a futile side show in East Asia by repeatedly threatening the Democratic People's Republic of Korea. Eventually, he has confronted China with maintaining a two-tier economy, manipulating its currency and stealing technology and has proceeded to raise tariffs on Chinese exports to the US, impose restrictions on technology transfers to China and increase US air and naval patrols in the South China Sea.

By raising tariffs on Chinese exports, the US is trying to cut down China's trade surplus, its foreign exchange reserves and surplus capital for self-development

and for taking advantage of other countries (especially those within the BRI ambit) with high-interest loans and overpriced infrastructure projects, which are difficult or impossible to repay and put debtor countries in danger of becoming debt colonies.

The loan and infrastructure contracts outrightly violate national sovereignty with provisions requiring that disputes are subject to arbitration by Chinese courts, that the supplies come exclusively from China, that the labor force be 40 to 60 percent Chinese and that upon failure to repay the loans these are convertible to equity or 99-year Chinese control over project, land and the natural resources.

The negotiations with China of loans and infrastructure projects are usually done under the cover of confidentiality, thus allowing corrupt deals between the bureaucrats of the borrowing country and the multiplicity of Chinese state and private corporations responsible for the delivery of construction materials, equipment and all sorts of services.

In the current trade war between the US and China, the former is putting up tariff barriers against the manufactured exports of the latter which in turn has retaliated by drastically reducing its import US food products. We can therefore expect China to strive for increasing its access to agricultural lands in underdeveloped countries by leasing them, acquiring them by outright purchases or through loan defaults by borrower countries and deploying corporations to exploit land and natural resources abroad. Your panel discussions can deal in detail with particular projects in several countries.

To counter China's export of capital through bilateral loans and loans by China-controlled AIIB, the US is putting up the US International Development Finance Corporation (USIDFC) with US\$ 60 billion capitalization to augment the loan capabilities of the Asian Development Bank (ADB) and the World Bank. It is creating space for those over-burdened by Chinese loans to engage in debtors' revolt someday.

By imposing restrictions on technology transfers to China, the US is trying to stop the scientific and technological advance of China. But China has already gained so much from the technology transfers and the exchange of science and technology experts and students for a long period of time and has even improved on the previous technology for purposes of civil and military production. China's military production has increased tremendously, although the US still has the

upper hand in higher volume and quality of its own weapons for the purpose of aggression.

The US and China are now generally at par in being able to use science and technology to raise the social character and efficiency of the means of production. This leads to worse crises of overproduction due to the private monopoly character of the system of appropriation, especially under the neoliberal policy regime. Higher levels of abusing finance capital can be used. But the global debt has already become a big bubble of more than US\$ 247 trillion which is equivalent to 320 per cent of Global GDP as of 2019, according to the IFI.

By asserting the right of free navigation in the South China Sea, the US is protecting its own imperialist interests as well as exposing China's imperialist interests in building and militarizing artificial islands within the exclusive economic zone (EEC) of the Philippines. Through its puppet assets in the Philippine reactionary armed forces, it has also successfully pressured the Duterte regime to allow it to establish a military base in Palawan in order to confront the militarized artificial islands in the West Philippine Sea.

In violation of the UN Convention of the Law of the Sea and the pertinent final judgment of the Permanent Arbitration Court in 2016, China is claiming 90 percent of the South China as its own property and using it as the area for displaying its growing military power. It has also established an overseas military base in Djibouti and is using the BRI gradually to acquire bases for its ground, air and naval forces and access the markets and natural resources of client-countries.

China has more than enough weapons to defend itself and maintain a peaceful economic rise. But it is increasingly driven by ultra-nationalist sentiments and interimperialist contradictions to increase military production and to gear itself up for the struggle to redivide the world. The building and militarization of the artificial islands in the Philippine EEC and the overseas military base in Djibouti are signal events manifesting the belligerent imperialist character of China and challenging US military power directly.

After more than 40 years of cooperation with China, the US strategists consider it timely to undermine and stop China's economic and military rise. In an already multipolar world, where other imperialist powers are also at play for their own

interests, the US objective may not succeed on a straight line. But insofar as they can collide directly, the US and China can become involved in a process of mutual debilitation under conditions of ever worsening global economic crises.

The contradictions between the US and China as well as among all imperialist powers are intensifying. They are resulting in in crisis and wars to the detriment of the peoples of the world. But the people are at the same time driven to carry out anti-imperialist and democratic struggles in order to achieve national and social liberation. We can expect the resurgence of national liberation and socialist movements and revolutions in the forthcoming years and decades.
Thank you.

On the Filipino People's Revolutionary Struggle for National and Social Liberation

New Year's Message

January 1, 2020

The evil forces of US imperialism and local reaction are escalating the oppression and exploitation of the Filipino people with the use of neoliberalism and state terrorism. They make the people suffer but goad them to fight back and aim for revolutionary change. Under the leadership of the Communist Party of the Philippines, the Filipino people are engaged in the new democratic revolution against the semicolonial and ruling system, now chiefly represented by the Duterte regime.

This regime is traitorous, tyrannical, genocidal, corrupt and mendacious. It has tried and failed to intimidate and deceive the people and suppress their revolutionary forces. But it has succeeded in further inciting them to wage all forms of revolutionary struggle, especially people's war. Once more I congratulate the Filipino people for their victories in their revolutionary struggle for national and social liberation.

By offering peace negotiations to the revolutionary movement, Duterte has the burden of proving that he is willing to change the anti-national and anti-democratic character of his regime and to make agreements on social, economic and political reforms to address the roots of the civil war and lay the basis for a just peace. He can only delude himself by boasting that the revolutionary movement has no choice but to surrender or be destroyed.

He is now in the lame duck years of his term and his grievous crimes are weighing down heavily on him and his entire regime. He is increasingly being isolated by his own crimes and by a broad united front of patriotic and progressive forces. The broad masses of the people detest his regime for imposing extreme and intolerable oppression and exploitation on them and are desirous of rising up against his reign of terror and greed.

The Duterte regime cannot save itself from a disgraceful end by depending on US or Chinese imperialism or on both. These imperialist powers have no interest in the Philippines but to gain hegemony. The US wants to retain its overall hegemony and China takes advantage of the corrupt character of the Duterte regime to gain strategic footholds in the West Philippine Sea and in the entire Philippine archipelago.

The two imperialist powers are now locked in an escalating struggle for a redivision of the world to the detriment of the people of the world. The crisis of the world capitalist system continues to worsen and to generate the conditions for the resurgence of the anti-imperialist movements of peoples and for the world proletarian-socialist revolution. The strategic decline of US imperialism has led to its cut-throat competition with Chinese imperialism.

The Filipino people and their revolutionary forces (the Communist Party of the Philippines, the New People's Army, the National Democratic Front of the Philippines, the mass organizations and the local organs of political power) are highly confident that they will continue to gain strength and advance amidst the crises of the world capitalist system and the domestic ruling system of big compradors, landlords and bureaucrat capitalists.

They are certain that they will win greater victories in the new year and advance the people's democratic revolution with a socialist perspective. They enjoy the solidarity and abundant support of the peoples of the world. Their revolutionary victories are not only for their own benefit but also for the anti-imperialist and socialist movements of the proletariat and peoples of the world.

Long live the Filipino people and their revolutionary forces!

Advance the people's democratic revolution towards socialism!

Long live the anti-imperialist solidarity of peoples

and proletarian internationalism!

On Fil-Am Friendship Day: USA as Fake Friend

Tsikahan with Tito Jo

Questions from host Anghelo Godino

July 1, 2020

1. Could you elaborate more in detail to the younger generation why there are two (important) dates 6/12 and 7/4 to remember? What is the difference between the two of them?

JMS: June 12, 1898 was the date when Aguinaldo proclaimed the national independence of the Philippines and signaled the uprisings that toppled Spanish colonialism on a national scale. But there was an expression in the proclamation that depreciated its value. It described Philippine independence as being “under the protection of the mighty and noble USA”, manifesting the willingness of Aguinaldo to make the Philippines a protectorate. So many of our people prefer August 23, 1896 as the day of independence for the old democratic revolution when Andres Bonifacio declared national independence and started the armed revolution against the Spanish colonial regime.

July 4, 1946 was the date when Manuel Roxas declared national independence and inaugurated the Republic of the Philippines. But this independence was fake or grossly incomplete, preconditioned by the US-RP Treaty of General Relations which made the Philippines a semicolony of the US and the “republic” a puppet one no different from the fake independence bestowed by Japan to the Philippine during the Japanese Occupation. The treaty retained the US military bases, the property rights of US corporations and citizens and US control of Philippine

trade and diplomatic relations.

The full independence of the Philippines in the new democratic revolution is still to be decided by the revolutionary party of the proletariat. It could be the date when the current armed revolution started or when the Guide for Establishing the People's Democratic Government or best of all when the armed revolution will achieve nationwide victory with the overthrow of the counterrevolutionary state of the big compradors, landlords and bureaucrat capitalists in the cities.

By the way, the Kabataang Makabayan used to make ceremonial declarations of independence on the birthday of Andres Bonifacio from 1964 onward.

2. Why are we still celebrating on July 4 and calling it Philippine-American Friendship Day?

JMS: It is actually the counterrevolutionary semicolonial state that is celebrating July 4 as Philippine-American Friendship Day. It was worse when the same semicolonial state and puppet republic celebrated July 4 as the Philippine day of independence. The celebration of July 4 as Philippine-American Friendship Day signifies the continuing subservience of the semicolonial state to US imperialism.

3. Why don't we celebrate the Philippine-American Friendship Day publicly?

JMS: The Filipino people and the revolutionary forces do not celebrate Philippine-American Friendship Day in the same servile spirit and fashion that the Philippine semicolonial state does. But there is no problem for Filipinos and Filipino organizations to convey greetings of solidarity to their American counterparts who value the day as their independence day.

4. Why do NDs say that the Philippines is still not free from the US?

JMS: As I have earlier pointed out, US continues to dominate the Philippines as a semicolony. It has done so since the preconditioning of the grant of national independence with the US-RP Treaty of General Relations. It has encumbered the Philippines with more treaties, agreements and arrangements that subordinate the Philippines as a semicolony or neocolony to US imperialism economically, politically, militarily and culturally.

5. They say the analysis of ND activists about the imperialist countries are

already outdated. There is no imperialism any more but rather a multipolar world, is it true? Is it also true that US is no longer a super power?

JMS: It is not true that imperialism has gone out of existence and that the US is no longer an imperialist superpower. Imperialism or monopoly capitalism exists in the US and several other industrial capitalist countries. The use of such terms as unipolar, bipolar and multipolar world is anchored on the existence of imperialism. For instance, when there was the Cold War between the two superpowers, US imperialism and Soviet social imperialism, the world was described as bipolar by political analysts. When the Soviet Union collapsed in 1991, the US was referred to as the sole super power in a unipolar world.

Since the financial crash of 2008, the term multipolar world has become more than ever frequently used, with the US manifesting a more pronounced strategic decline because of its worsening economic crisis and the heavy costs of its overseas military bases and endless wars of aggression and at the same time with China and Russia rising as new imperialist powers and forming blocs of countries independent of the US, such as the BRICS and the Shanghai Cooperation Organization.

Despite its accelerated strategic decline, the US is still an imperialist superpower and maintains high-tech military superiority over other imperialist powers. Since 2018 US imperialism has become more wary of Chinese imperialism and accuses China of unfair economic, financial and trade practices and stealing technology from the US and becoming an economic and military rival of the US. The interimperialist contradictions between the US and China are sharpening. Thus, certain political analysts say that a new Cold War has arisen and that there is a return to the bipolar world.

5. Tito, Duterte had PhP275B to supposedly provide financial assistance to the marginalized and unemployed due to COVID-19, but throughout his press conferences he keeps on saying that he doesn't have money any more. The Philippines now has PhP7-8T international debt, where is Duterte using all his money? How is the Philippines going to pay for this?

JMS: Duterte has used the Covid-19 pandemic to escalate the repressive measures and human rights violations against the Filipino people, butcher people in the guerrilla fronts of the revolutionary movement, deprive the people of livelihood, medical care, food assistance and forms of relief and steal hundreds

of billions of pesos or trillions from the public treasury, private company donations and loans and grants from abroad by faking receipts of purchases of medical supplies and overpricing them.

Duterte has bankrupted the Philippine economy and his own government. The bankruptcy is so deep-going that there is no way the Philippine government can pay back the mountains of foreign debt. He cannot pay for the loans by taking more foreign loans indefinitely because the world capitalist system is now in a severe crisis far worse than the Great Depression of the 1930s. The IMF, the World Bank and the OECD have already issued estimates that the global GDP will dive by as much 4.9 percent to 6 percent. The impact will be worst on the underdeveloped and debt-laden countries like the Philippines.

6. There are videos circulating in the internet that the Philippines is surrounded by US and Chinese warships, is there a truth in it? How dangerous is it for the country?

JMS: It is true that the US and China are making shows of strength in the South China Sea. China has made the provocations by intensifying its activities to assert its false claims, fortify its positions and further encroach on the sovereign and maritime rights of the Southeast countries under international law and the UN Convention on the Law of the Sea. Thus, the Southeast Asian governments, with the exception of the Duterte regime, have protested and the US has demonstrated support for them and asserted freedom of navigation in the South China Sea.

The US and China are calculating and calibrating their moves, which are essentially demonstrations of naval and air power in the Asia-Pacific region. The US high-tech military might is far superior to that China but the US will not attack China because this has enough nuclear power to destroy the US and the US wants to mobilize first the anger of the Southeast Asian countries against its imperialist rival. China is also afraid to attack the US naval fleet in the South China Sea and the Pacific because it will surely be destroyed by US military power and is in fact trying hard to counter the impact of its deteriorating relations with the US.

7. Should Duterte or the Philippines — for this matter, start siding with China instead of US to defeat US?

JMS: It is wrong and traitorous for Duterte to allow Chinese imperialism to build and militarize artificial islands in the exclusive economic zone of the Philippines in the West Philippine Sea, take control over the rich marine and mineral resources in the West Philippine Sea and take over the Scarborough or Pagan Shoal.

The Filipino people's struggle for full national independence is chiefly directed against US imperialism but it does not allow Chinese imperialism to violate the sovereign rights of the Filipino people. Fighting Spanish colonialism was never a license for surrendering the country to US imperialism. The revolutionary movement must be consistent in fighting imperialism, whether it is that of the US or China.

8. There is certainly going to be a war in the West Philippine Sea and Duterte is the first to blame, he is not just compromising the safety of the Filipino people but also the neighboring ASEAN countries. How will this affect the already stale relationship of Duterte with the international community? Is it too late to stop this war? What should we do to stop this?

JMS: As I have already explained, there is no certainty of war breaking out in the South China Sea between the US and China at least within the next few years. You cannot blame Duterte for a war that has not yet burst out. We can hold Duterte accountable for allowing and encouraging China to take over the West Philippine Sea in violation of Philippine sovereign rights, the UNCLOS and the 2016 judgment of the Permanent Arbitration Court in favor of the Philippines against China and also for failing to unite with the other ASEAN countries in opposing China's illegal claim over 90 percent of the South China Sea.

You can hold Duterte accountable for being a traitor and a complete moron. He has failed to bring charges against China before the UN and appropriate courts for violating the sovereign rights of the Philippines, illegally occupying the artificial islands in the West Philippines and damaging the marine environment; and demand payment for rent and damages to the environment in the same manner as the US was required to pay for damages when its boat damaged a part of the Tubbataha Reef. The Philippines can actually sue China in the US and other countries where it has assets to pay for obligations and damages.

But the worst stupidity of Duterte is to allow China to prevent the Philippines

from exploring and exploiting the oil, gas and other mineral resources in the exclusive economic zone of the Philippines in the West Philippine Sea. These resources are worth several tens of trillions of US\$ (the estimated value of the oil and gas resources is at least US\$26 trillion and that of the marine resources is at least US\$1.5 trillion) which could save the Philippines from underdevelopment and the humiliation of being the eternal beggar of foreign loans from the imperialist powers.

9. It might be hard to believe that Duterte is treading on dangerous waters because of the ongoing tension and the provocation between US and China, thus, can you explain why Duterte is doing this? Why is he putting the lives of the millions of Filipino people in danger?

JMS: Duterte is criminally responsible for allowing and encouraging China to assert its false claim of owning more than 90 percent of the South China Sea and to take over the West Philippine Sea as its own sovereign property. Because of this, he is also responsible for aiding and abetting the Chinese acts of aggression against the Philippines and other ASEAN countries and for creating a situation in which the US comes into play as defender of the right to free navigation and supporter of the sovereign rights of the ASEAN countries against the Chinese acts of aggression.

10. How is this commotion, affecting the livelihood of the fisher folks in these areas? We've seen that in the past and even up to today, in the thick of the pandemic, the fisher folks are being bullied by the Chinese fishing vessels, prohibited to make a living inside our territories. In the thick of the pandemic, the fisher folks are facing demolition and reclamation. How is this new international situation going to affect them?

JMS: I agree with you that in the past and even until today, in the thick of the pandemic, the Filipino fisher folks are being rammed and bullied by the Chinese fishing vessels and prohibited to make a living inside the West Philippine Sea. The fisher folks are facing demolition and reclamation projects in the interest of the Chinese criminal triads engaged in operating casinos and in drug smuggling.

I do not mind if the US uses its naval fleet to stop China from committing acts of aggression in the West Philippine Sea and occupying the artificial islands. The US should also stop continuing to support Duterte just because he made a promise to Trump in 2017 that he would terminate the peace negotiations with

the NDFP and destroy the armed revolution through sheer military force.

Duterte cannot stay a day longer in power if the US assets within the reactionary armed forces agree to withdraw military support from him. It is still a puzzle why the pro-US generals in the AFP and PNP continue to support Duterte despite China taking control over the national power grid and telecommunications and putting cell towers in military camps in contradiction with the Enhanced Defense Cooperation Agreement which allows the US to have its own bases within the AFP military camps.

11. On July 12, 2016, Permanent Court of Arbitration ruled in favor of the Philippines, so what is China still doing in our sovereign waters? Why did Duterte allow the invasion of the Philippines by China? What should the PCA or the international community do?

JMS: I have already pointed out that Duterte is a traitor and complete moron for failing to uphold the 2016 judgment of the Permanent Court of Arbitration in favor of the Philippines against China. Instead, he has condoned and emboldened China to occupy, build and militarize the artificial islands and control the waters that belong to the Philippines. The Philippine can charge China for the violation of Philippine sovereign rights and demand compensation for illegal occupation and damage to the marine environment before the appropriate courts, especially in countries where China has assets that can pay for obligations and damages.

12. Any message to the youth in Europe and in the Philippines?

JMS: I call on the Anakbayan and the entire Filipino youth in Europe and in the Philippines to intensify their common efforts to fight and oust the Duterte regime of butchers and crooks. They must carry out the Oust Duterte movement with the framework of the Filipino people revolutionary struggle for national and social liberation.

Of course, Anakbayan and the Filipino youth in the Philippines have the magnitude and the most potential for intensifying all forms of revolutionary struggle not only for changing the reactionary ruling clique but also for making significant advances in the new democratic revolution against the semicolonial and semifeudal ruling system. They contribute to the advance of the anti-imperialist and democratic struggles of the youth and people of the world and

need international solidarity and support.

Anakbayan and the Filipino youth in Europe and elsewhere abroad have the special role and duty of speaking freely and availing of the high-tech means of immediate communication to support and coordinate with the Anakbayan and the Filipino youth in real time and at the same time gain the international solidarity and support of the youth of the world for the struggle of the Filipino youth and people for full national independence and democratic rights against foreign monopoly capitalism and the local exploiting classes now chiefly represented by the traitorous, tyrannical, murderous and plundering ruling clique headed by Duterte.

Initial Q & A on Chapter 2 of Philippine Society and Revolution

Webinar series of the ND Online School conducted by Anakbayan-Europa

Questions from Anghelo Godino

June 21, 2020

1. The Philippines has three basic problems: imperialism, feudalism, and bureaucrat capitalism. Let's start with imperialism. What is it? How did it develop to be a problem of the Philippines? Why is it a problem?

JMS: Imperialism is monopoly capitalism. It is the highest and final stage of capitalism. It dominates the economy in the industrial capitalist countries. It involves the merger of industrial and bank capital to form the financial oligarchy that is very parasitic. It exports not only surplus goods but more importantly surplus capital in the form of direct investments and loans.

It uses combines of monopoly corporations as cartels and syndicates within particular imperialist countries and within one bloc of imperialist countries against another bloc. It is the motive force of the imperialist countries in their competition to obtain sources of cheap raw materials, markets of surplus goods, fields of investments and spheres of influence. Such a competition involves a struggle for a redivision of the world, leading to wars of varying scales.

US imperialism engaged Spanish colonialism in a war starting in 1898 in order to grab the colonies of the latter in Puerto Rico, Cuba, and the Philippines. Then

in its Treaty of Paris with Spain on December 10, the US bought the Philippines from Spain and proceeded to wage a war of aggression against the Filipino people who had earlier declared national independence on June 12, 1898, liberated the whole country except the walled inner city of Manila (Intramuros) and basically defeated Spanish colonialism.

US imperialism became a problem to the Philippines and the Filipino people because it violated their national sovereignty by waging a war of aggression that killed at least 1.5 million Filipinos, suppressed all patriotic and popular forms of resistance and turned the Philippines into a colony for exploitation. The US took superprofits from the Philippines as a source of cheap raw materials, as market for surplus goods, as field of investment and as a base for US participation in the partitioning of China for exploitation by several imperialist powers.

The US ruled the Philippines as a colony from 1902 onward. It trained Filipino politicians to become US puppets and also allowed them to serve the local exploiting classes of big compradors and landlords. During its direct colonial rule, the US developed a semifeudal economy in which the biggest Filipino landlords owning haciendas for producing crops for export became big compradors by becoming the chief trading and financial agents of the US monopoly firms. Most prominent examples of such big comprador-landlords were the Roxas, Ayala, Zobel and Soriano families of Spanish ancestry. Eduardo Cojuangco is a more recent prominent example of the big comprador-landlords.

2. What are the ways that it was able to take a firm hold of the material base or the economy of the Philippine society?

JMS: First, US imperialism succeeded with its war of aggression by using superior military might and taking advantage of the incompetent leadership and the lack of correct strategy and tactics of the Aguinaldo government. At the same time, the US complemented its superiority in military weaponry with the deceptive policy of “benevolent assimilation” and the false promise of self-rule in order to generate capitulationism within the Aguinaldo government and among the landlords who occupied key positions or had great influence in the localities.

US imperialism cleverly induced the landlords to withdraw support from the revolution and to convert them into puppet leaders at various levels of the bureaucracy and society. The landlord class became the political and economic

base of US imperialism in imposing itself on the entire Filipino nation and making the Philippines a US colony for decades until the Japanese fascists came to occupy the Philippines during World War II.

During its direct colonial rule, the US steered the feudal economy towards promoting the role and operations of the big comprador- landlord class in a semifeudal economy by expanding the production of agricultural, timber and mineral products for export in exchange for imported manufactures. The expanded financing and trading operations stimulated the growth of the comprador big bourgeoisie as a distinct class.

3. Please give some examples of unequal treaties that ensured US control of the Philippines after its so-called independence in 1946. Are these treaties still relevant today?

JMS: On the very day that US pretended to grant independence to the Philippines on July 4, 1946, it required the Philippine government to sign the US-RP Treaty of General Relations, which provided for US control of Philippine foreign policy, continuance of the US military bases in the Philippines and the perpetuation of the property rights of US corporations and citizens.

Under the Bell Trade Act of 1946, the US continued to control foreign trade of the Philippines. The Philippine Constitution was also amended in 1946 in order to allow US corporations and citizens to have rights equal to those of the Filipinos in owning operating businesses in the Philippines. That was the infamous Parity Amendment. The Quirino-Foster Agreement was signed in 1949 to ensure that the US retained control and influence in the Philippine bureaucracy. The US-RP Military Bases Agreement was signed in 1947 to further ensure the continuance of the military bases for 99 years.

The US-RP Military Assistance Agreement was also signed in 1947 to ensure that US control of reactionary armed forces of the Philippines by making them dependent on US military indoctrination, planning, training, intelligence, military supplies and so on. The US- RP Mutual Defense Treaty was signed in 1951 to further bind the Philippines as a puppet state of the US. Further the Philippines became a key member the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization (SEATO), a regional military alliance which the US controlled and used for wars of aggression in Southeast Asia.

The aforesaid treaties are still relevant today because they laid the foundation and built the structure and mechanisms of US economic and military hegemony over the Philippines even as new treaties and agreements have taken their place of earlier treaties and agreements.

The Laurel-Langley Agreement of 1955 amended the Bell Trade Act and expired in 1974. But the US continues to control the Philippine economy with the dominant position of US monopoly banks and firms in direct investments and under the US-controlled agencies like the IMF, World Bank and WTO.

The SEATO was dissolved in 1977 and the US-RP Military Bases Agreement expired in 1991. But a series of agreements have served to perpetuate US military control of the Philippines, including continued direct military presence and use of military facilities within the national territory. I refer to the Mutual Logistics Support Agreement, the Visiting Forces Agreement of 1998 and the Enhanced Development Cooperation Agreement of 2014.

4. Does the US still have a monopoly control of the Philippines? How about other countries, for example China?

JMS: The US monopoly capitalism is still dominant in the Philippines if you take into account all US interests in the form of direct investments, loans and foreign trade on a bilateral basis as well as US control of Philippine economic policy and patterns of investments directly and through the multilateral agencies like IMF, World Bank and WTO. Aside from being No. 1 imperialist power in control of the Philippine economy, US imperialism has military dominance over the Philippines and the armed apparatuses of the reactionary state. China is merely an upstart in this regard, although it has made a dramatic aggression in the West Philippine Sea by building and militarizing artificial islands.

Japan has served as the secondary partner of the US in dominating the Philippine economy. It remains the biggest “official development assistance” lender but it is still second to the US in terms of investment. China has become the Philippines’ top trading partner, serving as destination of Philippine mineral and semi-manufacture exports, especially after it became the giant manufacturing platform of the US-dominated global value chains in the wake of the Asian financial crisis of 1997. Chinese state loans in Duterte’s Build Build Build program are just 17percent of the indicative amount of the flagship projects. Japan still accounts for the largest.

China has had the distinct advantage in having Filipino-Chinese big compradors in the Philippines collaborating with Chinese monopoly banks and firms. But they are more focused on trading and expanding their market share than on gaining control over the Philippine financial system, although China has also made key investments, such as in the national power grid and telecommunications. Certainly, China has benefited from serving as the main partner of the US in carrying out the neoliberal policy of imperialist globalization in the Philippines and on a global scale for several decades already.

But the long-time partnership of the US and China is now breaking up. Let us see how the increasing contradictions between the two since 2018 will affect their respective standing and operations in the Philippine economy. Let us also consider how such contradictions and the overall worsening crisis of the world capitalist system would adversely affect the economic and trade relations among the US, China and the Philippines.

5. What is feudalism? What are the social conditions that exist in the Philippines that prove feudalism is present there? What are the forms of feudal and semifeudal exploitation that farmers suffer from?

JMS: Feudalism is a mode of production whereby a few landlords own under torrens title or effectively control (under tax declaration, homestead, logging and mining concessions and lease agreements with government corporations) vast tracts of land and the big number of peasants who do not own land have to work as tenants and have to pay rent to the landlords in kind or cash at exorbitant rates and other varying terms. Some landlords have also adopted some amount of mechanization in plantations for export crops and big livestock or aquaculture farms producing for domestic consumption and export and have hired farm workers at subhuman wages on a year-round basis and on a seasonal basis.

The feudal form of exploitation is mainly and basically the payment of rent to the landlords by the tenants. It co-exists with such semifeudal forms of exploitation as hiring farm workers at subhuman wage levels by hacienda owners and rich peasants and the traditional practice of usury by merchants, rich peasants and landlords and the rampant practice of underpricing the farmers' produce and overpricing their inputs and consumption goods. The latter practice has been worsening due to import liberalization and pass-on consumption taxes. There are also relatively more recent forms of semifeudal exploitation such as lopsided contract-growing arrangements with trading companies and so-called

“community- based forest management agreements” wherein the land is supposedly owned by small farmers or the entire community.

The landed assets of the landlords are of far lesser value now than the capital assets of the big compradors and big comprador-landlords based in the cities. The output value of Philippine agriculture is grossly understated due to customary landlord evasion of taxes and consumption by most peasants of what they retain after paying rent.

Even then, the landlords still constitute the most numerous and widespread exploiting class in the country. And the poor and middle peasants who often double as farm workers and non-farm odd jobbers are still the most numerous exploited class in the Philippines. The Philippines is not yet an industrially developed country and the industrial proletariat is still far smaller than the peasantry.

In looking at the entire Philippine economy, it is no longer a feudal economy but a semifeudal one in which the comprador big bourgeoisie is the more dominant exploiting class than the landlord class although many of the big compradors are also landlords because they continue to acquire land, using it as guarantees or collateral for loans, as source of agricultural surplus for capital accumulation and as an instrument of speculation, especially in real estate development.

In terms of the value of their assets in finance, trade, services and some amount of import-dependent manufacturing, the big compradors are more wealthy and far more politically powerful on a national scale than the landlords who are mostly stuck in the localities, exploiting tenants and engaging in municipal-level merchant-usury operations. Unlike the more numerous landlords who depend mainly on land rent, the big compradors enjoy high liquidity for business and political operations at the national center of power because they own the big banks and trading companies.

But as a distinct class, the landlords continue to carry a high degree of national clout because they have organizations for lobbying purposes and they are still a decisive factor in the elections of local government executives and representatives of the Lower House. They get themselves elected, entrench themselves in power with the captive votes of tenants and farm workers and with a bodyguard force or private army to complement the police and military. Thus, quite a number of them are known as local tyrants and warlords. And they are a

still major factor in deciding who is the president and who are the senators.

6. Is feudalism a necessary ground for imperialism?

JMS: In the classical development of capitalism in the industrial capitalist countries, the agricultural surplus provided by feudal lords and then by capitalist farms, was a major factor of capital accumulation and industrial development. Ultimately, there was a political and economic clash between the rising manufacturing bourgeoisie and the feudal lords, resulting in the liberal democratic revolution and land reform, as in the French revolution. The full development of capitalism involves the liquidation of feudalism, even when a constitutional monarchy remains as a vestige of feudalism, as in England.

But there is a difference between the previous development of free competition to monopoly capitalism in imperialist countries on the one hand and the imperialist power dealing with feudalism in colonies, semicolonies and dependent countries on the other hand. In these dominated countries, the imperialist power is more interested in extracting superprofits from extractive operations and the backward or less developed economic conditions than developing them to become industrial capitalist countries themselves.

Imperialism is against the comprehensive industrial development of a colony, semicolony or even a dependent country with some amount of manufacturing. It is happier that the dominated country remains poor and ever willing to sell cheap raw materials from its natural resources, serve as the market for imported commodities and take direct investments and loans for natural-resource exploitation rather than for industrial development in the client-state. Thus, imperialism is happy with the persistence of feudal and semifeudal conditions here.

But the commodity system, development of some amount of manufacturing and foreign trade have also unavoidably arisen and eroded feudalism and resulted in semifeudalism and the rise of the comprador big bourgeoisie as the class more dominant than the landlord class. In the Philippines, the US carried out some amount of land reform to respond to land hunger, wean away the peasant masses from the old democratic revolution (which was led by ilustrados from landlord, merchant and bureaucratic families) and break up feudal controls to allow peasants to become resettlers, hacienda workers and mining workers. At any rate, the erosion of feudalism in the Philippines has fallen far short of the

complete dissolution of feudalism because of the absence of genuine land reform and national industrialization.

7. What is the meaning of bureaucrat capitalism? How are the big bureaucrats in the Philippines?

JMS: In the simplest way, one can say that bureaucrat capitalism is the use of high public office for self-enrichment. But it can be more amply defined as a form of capitalism in which the highest public officials use their government powers and control of government agencies and enterprises, public funds and natural resources in the public domain to serve their capital accumulation in collaboration with their families and cronies in the private sector as already accomplished big compradors or wannabe big compradors.

In the history and current circumstances of the Philippines, the accumulation of great wealth in land or capital has been enabled by family members occupying high government positions and using their bureaucratic power to the advantage of their families and cronies. They personally benefit from the grant of concessions to exploiters of natural resources in the public domain, alienation of public land, franchises for the operation of public utilities, contracts in infrastructure building and related speculation in real estate, purchase contracts of the government, loans from state banks and insurance systems, endless perks and privileges through multiple positions and directorships in fund-rich government corporations, and so on and so forth.

In the Philippines, the highest and most powerful bureaucrat capitalists, including the president and some of his cabinet members, are big compradors in public office because the semifeudal economic conditions and imperialist domination prevent them from becoming industrial capitalists. Contrary to the notion of the revisionists that Marcos used his political power to promote national industrialization, all the enterprises that he and his cronies grabbed or built were big comprador enterprises dependent on imported equipment, construction materials, components and consumer manufactures as well as agricultural production and mining for export.

8. Is it possible to eliminate graft and corruption under the current system in the Philippines?

JMS: It is impossible to eliminate graft and corruption under the current system

of government in the Philippines. Many of the standard modus operandi of corrupt bureaucrats I have mentioned are brazenly facilitated, legalized, and institutionalized throughout the bureaucracy, through countless links with the foreign monopoly capitalists and the local exploiting classes and various pork barrel mechanisms, political dynasties, widespread nepotism, and bribery of all kinds to satisfy or silence subordinates or even intrasystemic critics and oppositionists.

It is in the very nature of the ruling system of big compradors, landlords and high bureaucrats to help each other out in exploiting the broad masses of the people. Defenders of the ruling system argue that high officials can be restrained from graft and corruption because of the freedom of the people to criticize the misconduct of officials, there are rival political parties that criticize each other and there is a check-and-balance system among the three branches of government.

But we know too well how the ruling clique arises from generally friendly and peaceful competition during elections where groups of the exploiting classes finance their respective groups or parties of their political agents who vie for elective state offices during the elections. Whichever political party or group wins, the elected officials and their campaign financiers conspire to favor themselves and satisfy their drive for more wealth through the abuse of power and exploitation of the working people.

The acts of graft and corruption involving the violation or circumvention of the law or even the legalization of what is illegal and immoral can be restrained to some extent and within a certain period by criticisms from the opposition party that has loyalty to the ruling system and expects to take its own turn at engaging in graft and corruption. But very often, the competing factions of government officials can compromise among themselves and take their shares of the bureaucratic loot at the expense of the people. Even the biggest plunderers already convicted and in prison know how to pay for their freedom and proceed to gain more power and wealth.

9. What does it mean when you state that bureaucrat capitalism is the basis of local fascism?

JMS: Bureaucrat capitalists are already in power. More than any other section of the capitalist class they are in the best position to take initiative in acquiring

despotic powers in fascist dictatorship in order to protect the wealth that they have already accumulated and to increase it further through the exercise of said powers. The only restraint on a president from becoming a fascist dictator is the potentially effective resistance of the people, opposition within government, from the churches and other powerful institutions and nonapproval and probable disapproval from the imperialist master.

In the semicolonial history of the Philippines, presidents have stayed in power according to the constitutionally-set term of office. But Marcos, the chief bureaucrat capitalist, dared to become a fascist dictator from 1972 to 1986. Ultimately, he would be overthrown by a convergence of diverse political forces.

But before he was overthrown, US imperialism consistently supported him for a long a time, at least up to 1983 and allowed the US-controlled reactionary armed forces the fascist dictatorship because he favored and assisted US economic and military interests. The US junked Marcos only after he made himself more of a liability than an asset to US interests when the broad masses of the people kept on rising up against him, especially in the years of 1983 to 1986.

Now, Duterte is imitating Marcos and is trying to become a fascist dictator. He is trying to retain US support for himself by promising to destroy the armed revolutionary movement of the people and make charter change to give US and other foreign companies unlimited rights of ownership of Philippine land, natural resources, public utilities and all other businesses. He has pushed his political minions in Congress to pass bills for amending and making the 1987 constitution anti-national and anti-democratic and for carrying out unlimited state terrorism that trashes the Bill of Rights.

Because he is physically, mentally and morally deranged, he has become overdependent on retired and military officers, keeps on militarizing the government and threatens to yield power to the military if he cannot keep it. He has been pampering his favorite generals with the rewards of bureaucrat capitalism and with impunity for the bloody crimes that he orders them to commit. He is promoting bureaucrat capitalist ambitions among the generals and setting the stage for the possible rise of a fascist military bureaucrat capitalism similar to that of Suharto in Indonesia.

The example of Marcos succeeding in imposing a full-blown fascist dictatorship on the Filipino people shows that this can be done again in view of the

persistence of imperialist domination and the exploiting classes, the impunity that has been enjoyed by the Marcos family and its cronies, the rapidly worsening crisis of the ruling system, the brazen campaigns of state terrorism and warlordism of provincial and regional ruling dynasties collaborating with the Duterte dynasty. But their problem is that the revolutionary movement of the people has grown much stronger nationwide than during the time of Marcos fascist dictatorship.

10. What is the basis of a semifeudal, semicolonial society? How do the three basic problems combine to create this kind of society?

JMS: The Philippines is semicolonial because while it has nominal independence and the trappings of that, US imperialism continues to dominate the country politically, militarily economically and culturally and violate the national sovereignty and independence of the Filipino people. Now the Duterte regime has practically surrendered to another imperialist power China the sovereign rights of the Filipino people over the West Philippine Sea and is eager to make the Philippines a debt vassal of China.

The Philippines is semifeudal because the comprador big bourgeoisie is the chief ruling class and no longer a purely landlord class as in the 19th century. It acts as the principal economic, financial and trading agent of US imperialism, profits most from such role even as it is still involved in the ownership and operation of farms for export crops and supports the landlord class as its closest ally, especially in the provinces outside the major urban areas.

I think that we have already sufficiently discussed how each of imperialism, feudalism and bureaucrat capitalism look after their respective distinct interests and at the same time collaborate with each other to keep the kind of semicolonial state and semifeudal economy that they can use to oppress and exploit the toiling masses of workers and peasants and the middle social strata.

11. How can this kind of society stay in place for decades? Is it possible to change it?

JMS: The ruling system is already rotting. Its chronic crisis is rapidly worsening. That is why the current ruling clique is desperate and knows no solution to social problems but to escalate the oppression and exploitation of the people. It has terminated the peace negotiations with the NDFP because it wants to scapegoat

the CPP and NPA for fully realizing his scheme of fascist dictatorship.

A ruling system becomes more oppressive and exploitative before it can be overthrown by the armed revolution. But it can stay for as long as the revolutionary forces of the Filipino people (the revolutionary party of the proletariat, the people's army, the mass organizations and organs of political power) are not yet strong enough to overthrow the reactionary state and achieve the victory of the people's democratic revolution.

Fortunately for the Filipino people, their revolutionary forces keep on growing in strength and advancing nationwide. They are strongest and most secure from enemy attacks in more than 110 guerrilla fronts. Conditions for them to achieve greater victories are favorable because of the worsening chronic crisis of the Philippine ruling system and the world capitalist system. The worsening crisis has been generated by neoliberal greed, state terrorism, fascism and wars of aggression. It inflicts more suffering on the people but it weakens the ruling system and drives the people to fight and win victory in the revolution.

The Covid-19 pandemic has exposed the worst forms of oppression and exploitation under the ruling systems in the Philippines and the world and has contributed significantly to aggravation of the crisis of the world capitalist system to a point that this crisis will be even worse than the Great Depression and will have far-reaching consequences, such as the intensified struggle between revolutionary and counterrevolution.

Ultimately, the crisis conditions will generate the resolute and militant forces and movements to carry forward the anti-imperialist and democratic revolutionary struggles of the people for socialism. The people's revolutionary movement in the Philippines will certainly advance with greater strides towards the final resolution of the three basic problems of the Filipino people and the building of a truly independent, democratic, socially just, progressive, prosperous and peaceful Philippines.

Preface to On the GRP-NDFP Peace Negotiations

This book, *On the GRP-NDFP Peace Negotiations*, spans the years 1986 to 2022. It reflects the role that I have played in exploring and realizing the peace negotiations. It carries the essays, statements and interviews related to the tremendous odds, explorations, preparations, the forging of agreements, frustrations and advances. I hope that this book can further enlighten and inspire the people, the advocates of a just peace and the contending parties to work for a just and lasting peace in the Philippines.

Before the GRP-NDFP peace negotiations

Since the 1960s, when the national democratic movement resurged in the Philippines, the Filipino people have clamored for full national independence, democracy, social justice, economic development through genuine land reform and national industrialization, expansion of social services, a patriotic and progressive culture, international solidarity and independent foreign policy for peace and development.

The patriotic and democratic forces and people identified US imperialism, domestic feudalism and bureaucrat capitalism as the three basic problems afflicting the semicolonial and semifeudal ruling system, causing its chronic socioeconomic, cultural and political crisis and inflicting a high rate of unemployment, low incomes, inflated prices of basic goods and services, lack or dearth of social services and mass poverty. The reactionary government of big compradors, landlords and high bureaucrat capitalists did not solve the aforesaid problems but proceeded to exploit and oppress the people.

In response to the problems, which require the revolutionary solution, the Communist Party of the Philippines (CPP) was reestablished on December 26, 1968 and it organized the New People's Army (NPA) on March 29, 1969 in order to wage a protracted people's war for realizing the program for people's democratic revolution with a socialist perspective. Since then, the armed revolution has grown in strength nationwide.

The CPP is in all provinces of the Philippines and has more than 150,000

members. The NPA is in more than 110 guerrilla fronts in more than 90 percent of the provinces. The full-time guerrilla fighters are in the thousands and are augmented by the people's militia in tens of thousands and the self-defense corps in hundreds of thousands. The activists of the revolutionary mass organizations and alliances of workers, peasants and other classes and sectors are in the millions. And the local organs of political power, which constitute the people's democratic government, administer more millions of people.

In all the years that Marcos was in power until 1986, he did not find it necessary to negotiate peace with the revolutionary forces led by the CPP. He was afflicted with overweening arrogance, did not care about the basic problems of the people and underestimated the strength and potential of the revolutionary movement. Instead, he coddled the puny revisionist party which was isolated from the people and subservient to the fascist dictatorship.

The CPP did not find it necessary to negotiate peace with the Marcos regime. It concentrated its efforts on arousing, organizing and mobilizing the people to wage revolution. The legal national democratic movement, the intrasystemic opposition and the armed revolution grew in strength, pressured the US and the local reactionary classes to junk Marcos and caused the downfall of his fascist dictatorship.

The peace negotiations after the Marcos dictatorship

The first of the post-Marcos regime was headed by President Cory Aquino. She released all political prisoners and expressed interest in peace negotiations with the CPP. The CPP responded with the offer that the National Democratic Front (NDF) would represent all the revolutionary forces in the peace negotiations and that steps would have to be undertaken to terminate the US-RP Military Bases Agreement.

Under pressure of coup threats from the Enrile-led Reform the Armed Forces Movement (RAM), Aquino reduced her offer of peace negotiations to ceasefire negotiations aimed at forging a 60-day ceasefire agreement during which the agenda for peace negotiations would be agreed upon. A ceasefire agreement was signed by the Government of the Republic of the Philippines (GRP) and the National Democratic Front of the Philippines on November 26, 1986. But the ceasefire agreement broke down due to the Mendiola massacre of peasants on January 23, 1987. And on February 7, 1987 the Aquino regime unsheathed the

sword of war against the people's armed revolution, instead of investigating the pro-Marcos saboteurs among her palace guards.

Within the years of 1988 to 1990, Aquino sent emissaries to Utrecht in order to explore the possibility of holding peace negotiations. The most important emissary was Rep. Jose V. Yap who was chairman of the Congressional Committee on National Defense. An agreement to conduct peace negotiations in The Netherlands was made but could not be realized because Aquino became frightened by the Noble military uprising in northern Mindanao.

Upon becoming president in 1992, Ramos took the initiative of releasing all political prisoners and nullifying the Anti-Subversion Law but he made the charge of simple rebellion a nonbailable capital offense. He sent Speaker Jose de Venecia and Rep. Jose V. Yap to The Netherlands to explore the holding of peace negotiations. The NDFP agreed to negotiate a framework agreement for peace negotiations. On September 1, 1992, the GRP and NDFP chief representatives, respectively Rep. Yap and Luis Jalandoni signed The Hague Joint Declaration, setting the aims and purposes, guiding principles, substantive agenda and basic methods for making agreements.

The formal opening of the GRP-NDFP peace negotiations could not be held until June 26, 1995 because on the same day Ramos issued Executive Order No. 19, he self-contradictorily created the National Unification Commission supposedly to try "localized peace negotiations" first with certain renegade groups that had split from the NPA. Despite the three-year disruption, the GRP-NDFP peace negotiations produced the following: Joint Agreement on Safety and Immunity Guarantees (JASIG), Joint Agreement on the Ground Rules of the Formal Meetings, Joint Agreement on the Sequence, Formation and Operationalization of Reciprocal Working Committees (RWCs) and the Comprehensive Agreement on Respect for Human Rights and International Humanitarian Law (CARHRIHL).

Ramos was unable to sign the CARHRIHL but President Joseph Estrada was able to sign it on August 7, , 1998. When AFP General Victor Obillo was captured by the NPA in Mindanao, Estrada took offense and terminated the peace negotiations on May 30, 1999 despite the offer of the NDFP to release the general. The legal national democratic movement concentrated on generating mass actions against Estrada and succeeded in ousting him from power mainly on issues of corruption.

President Gloria M. Arroyo went through the motions of resuming the peace negotiations by reaffirming all the previous agreements. After a few sessions of the negotiating panels within a few months in 2001, she suspended indefinitely the peace negotiations upon the advice of her Cabinet's security cluster which wanted to concentrate on the military campaign of suppression (Oplan Bantay Laya I, II and III). After becoming president in 2010, Benigno Aquino III delayed the resumption of peace negotiations until 2011 and then lost interest in these in favor of the military campaign of suppression (Oplan Bayanihan).

After the sparse sessions in the peace negotiations during the time of Estrada, Arroyo and Aquino, Duterte proclaimed himself as the first "Left" and "socialist" president, eager to make peace with the NDFP and form a coalition government with it. But alas he was just pretending and tried to knock out the NDFP with a few gangster tricks like releasing only 22 political prisoners instead of more more than 400, appointing certain progressives to his Cabinet as "representatives of the CPP" without permission of the CPP; and demanding that the people's democratic government give up its vital function of taxation.

In less than a year of being president, Duterte openly included the armed revolution as a target of his military campaign against the Maute group (Dawlah Islamiyah) in May 2017. Soon enough, he issued a torrent of proclamations to render the GRP-NDFP peace negotiations impossible. These included the Proclamation No. 360 terminating the peace negotiations on November 23, 2017, Proclamation 374 designating the CPP and NPA as "terrorist" organizations on December 5, 2017, Executive Order No. 70 creating the National Task Force-ELCAC on December 4, 2018, Proclamation No. 374 declaring the CPP and NPA as "terrorist" organizations on December 5, 2017 and Republic Act No. 10168, or the Anti-Terror Act (ATA) on July 3, 2020.

The ATA creates the Anti-Terror Council as a Board of Inquisition, criminalizes a wide range of democratic acts, designates organizations and individuals as "terrorist" and subjects suspects to indefinite detention that allows other forms of arbitrary punishment, including torture and summary execution. The NDFP has been designated as a terrorist organization since last year under ATA, with the clear malicious intent to disable it from playing a role in peace negotiations. NDFP negotiators and consultants have also been designated "terrorist" despite the safety and immunity guarantees under JASIG. Worst of all, sixteen of them (unarmed, at home and mostly in their seventies) have been tortured and murdered by the Duterte death squads.

From the beginning of his presidential term, Duterte launched an all-out war campaign under the cover of continuing Aquino's Oplan Bayanihan in 2016 until his own Oplan Kapayapaan in January 2017. From month to month, he urged the reactionary armed forces and police to do the most brutal acts, such as bombing rural communities (especially of indigenous people), mass murder of suspects, shooting suspected women guerrillas in the vagina and all kinds of barbarities similar to those committed in the bogus war on illegal drugs.

After the termination of the peace negotiations in 2017, he pretended to engage in "localized peace negotiations" which was calculated to bait and trap rebel suspects, their friends and relatives in murder schemes with promises of cash, jobs, homes and lots. But it turned out that the so-called Enhanced Comprehensive Local Integration Program (E-CLIP), Community Support Program and Barangay Development Program (BDP) were nothing but rackets to serve the corruption of high bureaucrats headed by Duterte and by a few favorite generals.

The most unreasonable and most counterrevolutionary among officials of the reactionary state are those who claim that the biggest problem of the people is the resistance of the people to oppression and exploitation and not the three problems of US imperialism, domestic feudalism and bureaucrat capitalism, that the GRP-NDFP peace negotiations have run for decades since 1986 or 1992 and not only for a few months under each one of the post-Marcos regime and that there is no need to share credit with the NDFP if the GRP takes the initiative to solve the problems of national and class oppression and exploitation.

In fact, if the reactionary state of big compradors and landlords runs against its class nature and defies the dictates of foreign monopoly capitalism, the Filipino people and their revolutionary forces would certainly applaud the miracle, approve it and support it. But such miracles do not occur by any amount of prayers, wishful thinking and false promises.

Prospects for GRP-NDFP peace negotiations

All opposition presidential candidates running against the Marcos-Duterte tandem in the 2022 elections promised to resume the GRP-NDFP peace negotiations. But all made enough qualification to their promises in order to evade fulfilling them and allow them to conform to the dictates of US imperialism and concrete orders from pro-US officers of the reactionary armed.

At any rate, whoever shall be the top puppet of US imperialism will have to face a far worse crisis of the semicolonial and semifeudal ruling system.

The revolutionary forces of the Filipino people have demonstrated that with or without GRP-NDFP peace negotiations they can take advantage of the ever worsening crisis of the ruling system in order to preserve their strength and grow further in strength and respond resolutely and vigorously to the demand of the people for revolutionary change. While still small and weak, the armed revolution grew in strength by leaps and bounds against the repressive rule of Marcos, including 14 years of fascist dictatorship. And even during the post-Marcos regimes, when campaigns of military suppression continued, the armed revolution for national and social liberation advanced.

Nevertheless, the NDFP and all other revolutionary forces have shown interest in peace negotiations when honest third-party advocates of a just peace and enlightened elements in the GRP offer peace negotiations as a just, reasonable and feasible way to address the basic problems of the people and arrive at the solutions in the form of basic reforms for the benefit of the people. At the least, the revolutionary forces of the people have the ample opportunity to explain and propagate their program for a new democratic revolution in the course of peace negotiations despite the usual attempts of reactionaries to sow confusion among the people and the revolutionaries..

The best circumstances for peace negotiations are when the armed revolution is about to complete its general offensive and gives a chance to the final holdouts of the enemy the chance to exchange prisoners of war and surrender to the people's side; or short of achieving complete victory in the civil war there is an agreement to engage in truce and national unity for independence, democracy, genuine land reform and national industrialization or confront and fight against a far worse reactionary enemy or a foreign aggressor.

Without the aforesaid circumstances, the broad masses of the Filipino people need to pursue their new democratic revolution until they end the semicolonial and semi-feudal ruling system through a protracted people's war. They have learned a lot of experience, lessons and skills from fighting their enemy self-reliantly and without cross-border advantages as in mainland Asia. And the conditions for ever greater victories are being generated by the escalating contradictions among the imperialist powers, between capital and labor in imperialist countries, between the imperialist countries and the oppressed

peoples and nations and between the imperialist powers and countries assertive of national independence, democracy and socialist programs and aspirations.

Before I close this preface, let me consider the possibility that through peace negotiations the GRP and NDFP agree to cease and desist from trying to destroy each other and decide to take the road of national unity and reconciliation, full national independence, democracy, social justice and economic development through genuine land reform and national industrialization and expansion of social services by using as the key the availment of certain natural resources (marine and mineral) that the Philippines has in abundance in the West Philippine Sea (aside from the x nodule in Benham Rise), instead of allowing or emboldening China as one more imperialist power to violate the national sovereignty of the Filipino people, the UN Convention on the Law of the Sea and the 2016 judgment of the Permanent Arbitration Commission in favor of the Philippines against China.

Fisheries in the West Philippine Sea

According to geopolitical analyst Robert D. Kaplan, in his 2014 book, fish stocks in the West Philippine Sea could amount to a tenth of the global landed catch. Another groundbreaking in 2017 estimated the total value of the Philippines' marine resources. As early as 2007 it was estimated to be US\$966.59 billion, or close to US\$1 trillion in the exclusive economic zone. At the exchange rate in that year, it was P44.61 trillion or nearly 6.5 times the Philippine GDP then. If the estimate extends to the marine resources in the extended continental shelf, it easily US\$1.5 trillion, or PhP69.24 trillion. That's 10 times the GDP in 2007.

But the Chinese intruders, using the technology of industrial fishing and fleets of fishing boats, have been robbing the Filipino people of their marine resources. They have encroached upon even Scarborough Shoal and have been preventing Filipino fishermen from the central lagoon and vicinity of the shoal. The traitor Duterte has publicly admitted in a state of the nation of address that he has a "verbal" deal with China to allow the Chinese to fish in Recto Bank (Reed Bank), which is within the Exclusive Economic Zone.

Such a deal is patently unconstitutional and grossly unfair to the Filipino people because Recto Bank covers an area of 8,660 sq km or 58 times as large as Scarborough Shoal. That is 14 times the size of the national capital region of

Metro Manila. In this regard, former Supreme Court Senior Justice Antonio T. Carpio has warned that the Chinese can “very quickly” deplete fish stocks in Recto Bank, instead of the Philippine fishing industry being able to serve the needs of the Filipino people as well those of the Chinese and other peoples and in the process avail of the net earnings for Philippine economic development.

The Chinese fishing fleets and trawlers have not only prevented the Filipino fishermen from fishing from their own fishing grounds but have also inflicted catastrophic damage to the coral reefs in the course of constructing artificial islands in the the West Philippine Sea. The seriously damaged reefs extend to 550 hectares in Panatag Shoal and 1,300 hectares in the Spratlys. Marine scientists estimate that such damage costs the Philippines at least P33.1 billion a year. The destruction of the coral reefs makes fish reproduction harder on top of the excessive fishing of various marine life, including sea turtles and giant clams.

Bajo de Masinloc is an integral part of the Philippine territory. It is part of the Municipality of Masinloc, Province of Zambales. It is a chain of reefs and rocks about 124 nautical miles (NM) from the nearest coast of Luzon and 472 NM from the nearest coast of China. It is within the 200 NM Exclusive Economic Zone and 200 NM Continental Shelf of the Philippines. One of the earliest known and most accurate maps of the area, named Carta Hydrographica y Chorographica De Las Yslas Filipinas by Fr. Pedro Murillo Velarde, S.J., and published in 1734, included Bajo de Masinloc as part of Zambales.

In 1792, another map drawn by the Alejandro Malaspina expedition and published in 1808 in Madrid, Spain, also showed Bajo de Masinloc as part of Philippine territory. It showed the route of the Malaspina expedition to and around the shoal. It was reproduced in the Atlas of the 1939 Philippine Census. The Mapa General, Islas Filipinas, Observatorio de Manila published in 1990 by the US Coast and Geodetic Survey, also included Bajo de Masinloc as part of the Philippines.

Oil and gas in the West Philippine Sea

The mineral wealth of the Filipino people in terms of oil and gas in the the West Philippine Sea is so many times far bigger than in terms of marine life. According to Kaplan’s book, Asia’s Cauldron, there are about 7 billion barrels of oil and 900 trillion cubic feet of natural gas proven to lie beneath the WPS.

Some estimates even go as high as 130 billion barrels of oil, making the Philippines second only to Saudi Arabia in terms of oil reserves. Justice Carpio has also noted that methanol – an alternative biofuel abundant in the WPS can fuel China’s economy for 130 years. Certainly, a small portion of these resources can serve the Philippines’ energy needs and propel its comprehensive economic development.

The patriotic and development-oriented Retired Brig. Gen. Eldon G. Nemenzo, former deputy commander of the 3rd Air Division of the Philippine Air Force (PAF), made a thorough research in his thesis when he took the advanced course at the Command and Staff College of the PAF in Villamor Air Base, Pasay City. He commented on the vast oil reserves of the Philippines found in various parts of the archipelago, specifically the Reed Bank, the largest of them all, and the Mischief Reef in the Spratly Islands or the Kalayaan Island Group (KIG) in the following manner: “The Philippines is like a blind beggar sitting on a mountain of gold. Within the country’s 200-mile Exclusive Economic Zone (EEZ) are potential recoverable hydrocarbon deposits worth an estimated US\$26.3 trillion. This is more than enough to lift the country from the centuries-long morass of poverty and underdevelopment”.

In his research, Nemenzo further discovered that the amount of hydrocarbon deposits in the country could be more than US\$26.3 trillion in value, as indicated by the recent discovery of oil reserves in the Sulu-Celebes Sea which is also within Philippine territory. His conclusions are supported by findings from other sources, including a report by China’s Ministry of Geology and Mineral Resources, that the oil deposits in the Spratlys could reach 17.1 billion barrels. This surpasses the 13 billion barrels of oil deposits of Kuwait, one of the world’s top oil producers. Aside from oil and natural gas, minerals and polymetals such as combinations of gold, silver, iron and nickel are found under the West Philippine Sea.

Because of the recent findings about the oil and natural gas being abundant in the West Philippine Sea, the US has become more determined to hold on to the Philippines as a semicolony and influence under which the general run of bureaucrat capitalists these natural resources should be subordinated to the US oil monopoly interests and not come under the control of the patriotic and democratic forces in order to serve and advance the national and social liberation of the Filipino people. Also driven by its own monopoly capitalist interests, China has adopted a policy of violating Philippine national sovereignty and

territory.

It aims to grab from the Filipino people 531,000 square kilometers of maritime area on the basis of its illegal nine-dash line which violates the UNCLOS. Such space is 77 percent larger the Philippine total land area. It covers 80 percent of the Philippines Exclusive Economic Zone, including the whole of Recto Bank and part of the Malampaya gas field. At the same time, it encroaches on all of the extended continental shelf of the Philippines.

It is unfortunate for the Filipino people that the incumbent Philippine president Duterte has manifested a predisposition to betray and sell out their sovereign rights, which are spelled out by the 1987 Constitution and the 2016 arbitral tribunal ruling. He has offered to China a prospective 60-40 oil and gas exploration deal in exchange for graft-laden loans for infrastructure projects. This offer follows a related memorandum of understanding previously signed between Manila and Beijing. Driven all along along by sheer treason, corruption and unabashed cowardice, Duterte has refused to demand the withdrawal of China from the islands it has made and militarized in the West Philippine Sea and just compensation for unpaid rent and damage to the marine environment.

The GRP-NDFP peace negotiations can serve as a process for making comprehensive agreements on social, economic and political reforms to address and solve the basic problems at the root of the armed conflict and to enable the rise of a patriotic and democratic leadership to unite the people, administer the natural and social wealth of the people, raise the resources for genuine land reform and national industrialization and accomplish the development of the Philippine economy. We should take into account that the Royal Norwegian government, the third party facilitator, has a common interest with the Filipino people in the success of the peace process and has the expertise for developing energy sources in the WPS.

The patriotic leaders, scientists and technologists of the Filipino people must be in charge of extracting and processing the natural resources of the Philippines, engaging the local and foreign companies with the necessary expertise and preventing the foreign monopoly control and super-exploitation by US and Chinese firms and banks. Otherwise the extraction of such natural resources even if in abundance will not serve the interests of the Filipino people but will continue to perpetuate the state of underdevelopment, unemployment, depressed incomes and mass poverty in the Philippines.

Jose Maria Sison

Utrecht, The Netherlands

May 10, 2022