

# Pomeroy's Portrait: Revisionist Renegade

By Simoun Riple [Amado Guerrero/Jose Maria Sison]

Spokesperson

Southern Mindanao Chapter (KM)

April 22, 1972

[From: <http://www.philippinerevolution.net/documents/pomeroy-s-portrait-revisionist-renegade>  
(downloaded on Feb. 10, 2013) The document as it appears there is very poorly edited, but  
only obvious typos (dozens of them!) have been corrected here.]

## *Publication Note*

Revolutionary School of Mao Tse Tung Thought  
Communist Party of the Philippines

Pomeroy's Portrait: Revisionist Renegade is a compilation of six critical essays written by Chairman Amado Guerrero to defend the universal theory of Marxism-Leninism and the proletarian revolutionary line of the Communist Party of the Philippines and to combat a wide assortment of opportunist and revisionist ideas spewed out in six books by the counter-revolutionary renegade and scab William J. Pomeroy.

All these critical essays were initially published in separate special issues of Ang Bayan, official publication of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Philippines. To make the present book, Chairman Amado Guerrero has made certain modifications on the original texts and titles of the essays.

It is clear why sharp attention has been given to Pomeroy. He has been the most valuable among the Lava revisionist renegades in spreading in the Philippines and abroad counter-revolutionary revisionist ideas. His writings have been published and circulated by the Soviet, American and Philippine revisionist renegades.

Pomeroy is liable to have spread noxious ideas more than the Lavas themselves, the dynastic chieftains of the Philippine revisionist renegades, whose writings are sparse and crude. As a matter of fact, his writings are often quoted and cited by the Lava revisionist renegades who look up to him as some sort of ideological authority.

Among the Lava revisionist renegades, Pomeroy enjoys today the status of being the most trusted agent of Soviet social-imperialism. Under the cover of revisionist phrasemongering, he also exercises his role as a special agent of U.S. imperialism. There is ample proof to show that he has been an undercover agent of U.S. imperialism, with the specific task of sabotaging the Philippine revolutionary movement.

His counter-revolutionary record is well-known in the Philippines. He collaborated with the notorious anti-communist Luis Taruc in writing the “autobiography” of betrayal, *Born of the People*. Under the pretext of gathering material for this book, he gathered intelligence data for U.S. imperialism. At the same time, he glorified Taruc in a sleek maneuver to spread counter-revolutionary ideas and the black line of capitulationism. To keep himself planted in the old merger party, he followed the Jose-Jesus Lava clique in its shifts from Right opportunism to “Left” opportunism.

After giving himself up to the enemy in the course of Operation “Four Roses” in 1952, he spent time in prison only to be part of the reactionary government’s campaign to break the spirit of political prisoners and sponge for information that filtered in from the revolutionary mass movement. He wrote in prison the first draft of the pessimistic book, *The Forest*, despite the objections of others. It was upon the intercession of the U.S. government that he was released from prison in late 1961, a decade ahead of the release of those who had been sentenced like him to life imprisonment at the least. His release was in line with the U.S. imperialist support for the splitting activities of the Khrushchov revisionist renegade clique in the international communist movement. His ability to write opportunist trash qualified him for a new task from his U.S. imperialist master.

Soon after his release, he started to perform his job of churning out revisionist propaganda. He put out *The Forest* (1963) and *Guerrilla Warfare and Counter-Guerrilla Warfare* (1964) to futilely impugn the validity of Chairman Mao’s theory of people’s war for the Philippines and other countries. Posing as a repentant “Left” opportunist, he sought to promote the counter-revolutionary line of “peaceful coexistence, peaceful transition and peaceful competition” of the Khrushchov revisionist renegades.

Adapting himself to the full growth of opportunism into imperialism in the Soviet Union, he tacked himself to the Brezhnev revisionist renegade clique. He wrote *Half a Century of Socialism* (1967) in praise of the all-round restoration of capitalism in the Soviet Union and in denigration of the October Revolution and the great communist leaders. He subsequently arranged *Guerrilla Warfare and Marxism* (1968), a compilation of excerpts of Marxist and anti-Marxist writings (including his own), on which he superimposed his revisionist commentaries. In the book he tries once more to impugn the theory of people’s war.

Shamelessly exposing himself totally as a direct agent of U.S imperialism, besides being a direct agent of Soviet social-imperialism, he put out *American Neo-Colonialism* (1970) the purpose of which is not to expose U.S. neo-colonialism but to use the term “neo-colonialism” as the equivalent of Kautsky’s theory of “supra-imperialism” and then to whitewash the American colonial record of violence and greed in the Philippines from the turn of the century to 1964.

A critical study of Pomeroy’s books provides us a clear understanding of the anti-Marxist and anti-Leninist character of the Lava revisionist renegades and sharpens our understanding of the universal theory of Marxism-Leninism Mao Tsetung Thought. It helps to develop further our ability to grasp the proletarian revolutionary line and frustrate the attempts of the Soviet

revisionist renegades and their local agents to subvert and sabotage the Philippine revolution, the Filipino peoples' struggle for national liberation and democracy.

## **A Work of Two Renegades**

*(“This essay originally appeared in the Ang Bayan special issue of November 1, 1971.”)*

*Born of the People* is the joint work of two renegades, Luis M. Taruc and William J. Pomeroy. Though presented as the autobiography of Taruc, this book was actually written by the hack and U.S. imperialist agent Pomeroy as his way of sneaking not only into the ranks of the Philippine revolutionary mass movement for a certain period but also into the leading organs of the old merger party of the Communist Party of the Philippines and the Socialist Party.

Elder comrades can testify today that after Pomeroy collected data for his book in Central Luzon in 1949 the enemy was able to conduct precision raids on places that he had visited. It was precisely because of certain suspicions of the Lavas themselves about him that it was decided that he would be “kept in camp” in Southern Luzon in 1950.

To read the *Born of the People* is to discover the ideological roots of the development of Taruc into an out-and-out anti-communist and the counter-revolutionary role of Pomeroy even long before he wrote later out-and-out revisionist works.

*Born of the People* has been disclaimed by its “author” Luis Taruc. In this regard, he has acclaimed the anti-communist book *He Who Rides the Tiger*, another “autobiography” written for him by the hack and C.I.A. agent Douglas Hyde. Pomeroy is left holding the trash. No one is surprised, however, that in sham pride he continues to hold it up as “the history of the revolutionary movement” more than the biography of a single person.

Such apologia is idle. The book itself presents its central character Taruc as saying:

A history of the Huk alone would be my biography, and if any of my comrades read these pages, I know that they would also say: “Look, there is my biography, too.”

Indeed, throughout the book Pomeroy spruces up Taruc as the “paragon” of the HUKBALAHAP and the entire revolutionary movement in the Philippines. What a shameless calumny against the heroic Red fighters and the revolutionary masses!

Pomeroy can never wash his hands of being Taruc's hack. As late as 1963, the revisionist author in *The Forest* would still praise Taruc in superlative terms:

Instead of writing a history, I wrote his “autobiography”, calling it *Born of the People*. I tried to put into that book not only Luis but the Filipino peasantry and the Filipino people in general,

struggling to be wholly free of colonialism. For a man like Luis, a leader like Luis, was truly born of the lives and struggle of the peasantry of Pampanga, and I saw him as a symbol.

It is the task of this criticism to show that even at the writing of *Born of the People* both the real author and the fake author were already bent on promoting erroneous ideas to the detriment of proletarian revolutionary leadership and the revolutionary mass movement. Such erroneous ideas are in black and white in the book.

## **I. The World Outlook Of Taruc And Pomeroy**

*Born of the People* features personal anecdotes that reveal and play up the anti-Marxist and anti-Leninist viewpoint of both Taruc and Pomeroy. One of these runs as follows:

He [Lope de la Rosa] told me that workers and peasants would be the makers of the new society. "When you get power," I asked, "how will you achieve the new society?" I thought that his objective sounded good, but the man and his companions astounded me. They talked about building a new society, but they were mostly semi-literate men who could hardly read. They had one copy of Marx's *Capital* but none of them could read it, so they had buried it.

The two renegades, Taruc and Pomeroy, find so much delight in satirizing the workers and peasants and in "burying" Marxism. They disregard the fact that the Communist Party, composed of the most advanced elements of the proletariat, exists precisely to translate Marxism into the language of the masses and, more importantly, into concrete revolutionary practice. What are these two scoundrels really driving at? Pomeroy lets Taruc speak out:

I had not read Marx, or anything about Marxism, so I used quotations from the Bible to defend my arguments. Strip from the ideas and preachings of Christ the cloak of mysticism placed over them by the church, and you really have many of ideas of socialism.

Even during his "bona fide" days, Taruc was already a hidden agent of "Christian socialism" within the old merger party! He preferred to translate Marxism into the pious words of the Bible and of Christ. And he found in Pomeroy a good partner in promoting his poisonous ideas repugnant to Marxism-Leninism.

Regarding theory, Chairman Mao teaches us: "It is necessary to master Marxist theory and apply it, master it for the sole purpose of applying it." Regarding attitude towards the masses, Chairman Mao also teaches us:

The masses are the real heroes, while we ourselves are often childish and ignorant and without this understanding it is impossible to acquire even the most rudimentary knowledge.

Trying to make the masses look absurd because they themselves cannot read *Das Kapital* is itself an absurdity of the most vulgar kind. This is a denial of the necessity of revolutionary theory in a revolutionary movement and also necessary role of the leadership exercised by the Party.

The bourgeois egocentrism of Luis Taruc is irrepressible. Pomeroy plays on it as he picks out for special mention the incident when even as a small boy Luis Taruc wrote his name on a train only “so that it would ride across the country for every one to see”. His desire is not for revolution but for fame.

Taruc has an inveterate contempt for the peasant masses. Though born of a peasant father, he has set his mind on leaving the ranks of the peasants and joining the bourgeoisie through school. He recounts: “I told my father that I did not have the temperament for a peasant, . . . and that I wanted to continue school.” So, he prates: “The degree was the thing, the honor was the goal; it lifted a man above the sweaty mass.” His childhood ambitions are apparently fulfilled now that he has become a well-paid touter of anti-communism. Even as he claim in his book to have already “the conviction that my class was all-important”, he still harps on the theme of class conciliation in his narration of his love affairs that centers on his having married a rich girl despite his being a poor boy. Repeatedly he pours out the sickening line that there is such a thing as love that transcends class struggle and class hatred.

He is also extremely delighted to picture himself as a lady-killer. Thus, he narrates how he and Casto Alejandrino made a “midnight picnic” with two young girls young enough to be their children. Pomeroy presents this incident as a “relief” for his hero in a period of crisis—in a period of massacres perpetrated by the enemy. It is used as an occasion for Taruc to hanker for “holidays” — “to relax among the natural beauties of my home”.

Taruc prattles:

The ominous atmosphere that hung over Central Luzon produced another effect on me: it made me extremely sensitive to the peaceful beauties in the countryside and in the lives of the people.

In the face of death in prison, Taruc considers his “love for wife” ahead of everything else. When it is his wife who dies of illness, he describes her death “a greater personal tragedy than the war with all its horrors and brought to me”.

Taruc considers as praiseworthy “caution” the toadying behavior of Jesus Lava before his Japanese captors after the March raid of 1943 and for contrast he considers as “recklessness” the act of resistance shown by two heroic comrades who refused to kowtow to their fascist captors. Taking pride in the philosophy of survival and the spirit of capitulations, he praises the alacrity which Lava showed in accepting the “regimentation course” of the Japanese fascists and in teaching a Japanese officer how to play the piano. Taruc cannot cite any other example to really prove how revolutionaries can outwit the enemy.

Born of the People denounces the pro-Japanese collaborators. But consistency is lost when Taruc finds pleasure in narrating how the HUKBALAHAP leader Casto Alejandrino enjoyed himself playing cards with the top pro-Japanese collaborators and winning so much money from them in the Iwahig Penal Colony. Does it help to develop a correct and resolute attitude towards the struggle to pick out such events for representation of the revolutionary mass movement?

Pomeroy builds up Taruc as a “hero” to the extent of slandering the masses. The latter boasts in connection with an enemy campaign of “encirclement and suppression” in Mount Arayat in 1947:

To the men who were desperate and almost ready to surrender I spoke passionately, myself burning with thirst and heat. I exhorted them to remember our principles. I promised them all the cold drinks if they could stick it out.

In the book, Taruc is so cocksure that his thirsty men would have surrendered had he not preached about principles and made the banal promise of cold drinks and a big meal.

Taruc takes pride in the style of oversuspiciousness in inner Party relations and in the style of always assuming that all other people are always lying. Thus, he praises Casto Alejandrino for introducing into the old merger party “his sway of probing for the motivations behind an act or a position”. Alejandrino is supposed to have always asked in the course of a criticism and self-criticism sessions; “I have heard your good reason, now what is your real reason?” This can be nothing but a method to put an honest fellow at a loss and make a liar insist on his lie. The tricks of the bourgeois psychiatrist are no substitute for the Marxist-Leninist method of getting to the facts and analyzing them. But Taruc triumphantly exclaims. “The good reason and the real reason became the measuring rod for the criticism and self-criticism which we developed in the Huk.” The Lavas, Tarucs and Alejandrinos are so fond of deception, of making their “propaganda line” at odds with their “true line”, that they always suspect other in the old merger party of being guilty of deception.

## **II. The “Military Leadership” Of Luis Taruc**

A certain circumstance is strikingly reflected by the writing of *Born of the People*. At the time that the U.S. imperialists and the local reactionaries were systematically trumpeting Luis Taruc as the “supremo” (supreme leader) in their press, William Pomeroy crept into the old merger party in order to promote the sinister idea that it was Taruc who led and represented the revolutionary mass movement. In the book, the role of the Party is obscured and comes in only as some kind of afterthought secondary to the personality of the “military leader”. Posing as a theoretician at that, Pomeroy was quite effective in spreading the imperialist intrigue and bourgeois idea that the political leadership of a proletarian revolutionary party is secondary to “military leadership”.

Putting the gun in command of the Party, Pomeroy states: “the core of the people’s resistance was the people’s army...” This runs counter to Chairman Mao’s teaching that “the force at the core leading our cause forward is the Communist Party”.

Yet on the conduct of armed struggle, Taruc cannot offer anything to prove his “military leadership”. What he does is to cast doubts on the universal value of Chairman Mao’s teachings of people’s war which are based on vast revolutionary experience under the guidance of Marxism-Leninism. Pomeroy’s straw figure prates:

We wanted to fight, but the question of how to go about it was at first obscure. The Chinese guerrilla movement, we knew, had been enormously successful, but in China the country was better adapted to guerrilla warfare. China had vast distances to hide an army and to provide space for maneuvering. There, large-scale fighting could be undertaken, towns and whole regions liberated; in our case we had a tiny area, easily reached by overwhelming Japanese reinforcements. In China there was an established base, from which guerrilla forces radiated; we did not even have a base.

In saying that China because of its vastness is better suited to guerrilla warfare, Taruc actually means to say that the Philippines because of its smallness is less suited to guerrilla warfare. Thus, he rails against the fact that the HUKBALAHAP had a tiny area to maneuver in against larger Japanese military forces. He narrates the successful converging attack on the small area of Mount Arayat by Japanese troops only with the view of presenting how “hopeless and desperate” is guerrilla warfare in the Philippines. His attention is not to show the peculiarities or different tactics of guerrilla warfare in the Philippines but to obfuscate the basic principles tested and proven correct in the Chinese revolutionary experience.

Taruc has no right to complain at all that the Philippines is too tiny a place for the revolutionary forces to fight a militarily far superior enemy because he and his cohorts in the first place did not care to dispose cadres and fighters beyond a limited part of Southern Luzon in order to lead and build the nationwide guerrilla warfare that did develop during the war of resistance. By default of the Lavas and Tarucs, guerrilla warfare outside Central Luzon came under the counter-revolutionary command of the USAFFE. In a semi-feudal country like the Philippines, there is no choice for revolutionaries in initiating armed struggle against the far superior enemy force but to wage guerrilla warfare. At the inception of people’s war, positional regular warfare or strategically decisive engagements in which the stake of the entire revolutionary movement is involved or city uprisings without rural base areas to rely on is the fool’s choice. Nowhere else but in the countryside can guerrilla warfare be developed and the people’s army be built by stages and have sufficient area for maneuver while gathering strength. The fact that the country is small, archipelagic, narrow and detached by sea from friendly countries only supports the line that guerrilla warfare has to be developed and expanded on a nationwide scale.

Contrary to Taruc’s idealist assumption that the Red army and the base areas in China dropped from the sky or grew spontaneously from the wide expanses of China, these grew from small to big and were tempered through a long period of struggle under the correct leadership of the Communist Party and Chairman Mao. At the beginning of the war of resistance against the Japanese fascists, the Red army was always several times outnumbered by well-equipped millions of enemy troops and the Red base areas were always far smaller than the White areas. One must have the correct class standpoint and also an acute sense of proportion to see the applicability of the universal principles of Marxism-Leninism to the concrete conditions of the Philippines. The strength and maneuverability of the Red army in the countryside always depend basically on how well the proletarian revolutionary party has aroused and mobilized the peasant masses. It must be well kept in mind at no time before or during the war of resistance was the old merger party ever able to carry out agrarian revolution or a land reform programme on a broad scale and in a profound manner in order to get the closest support of the peasant masses. The

consideration of geographic characteristics is secondary to the all-important question of revolutionary politics. In the course of enemy campaigns of “encirclement and suppression”, the intensity of armed struggle in a small country like the Philippines is comparable to that in a specific part of a big country like China. At the same time, it is always difficult even for a large enemy force to saturate the countryside of a semi-colonial and semi-feudal country.

Taruc admits that he and his cohorts had the outlook of the roving rebel band when he brags: “We did not even have a base.” Mount Arayat was really some kind of a “base” but it was dated before the Japanese March raid of 1943. After the March raid, the entire idea of developing base areas was lost among the Lavas and Tarucs. They split up the “squadrons” (each numbering 100 men or more) of the HUKBALAHAP into tiny groups of three to five men and ordered their absolute dispersal; it would turn out later in late 1944 that only the fighting units which did not follow the order managed to survive. Even today, both the Lavas and Tarucs still insist that it impossible to develop base areas in the Philippines, Then, what is the point in the first place or trying and hoping to liberate the entire country from the reactionaries and consolidate it as revolutionaries are determined to make the entire country no less a base of the revolution. In preparation for nationwide victory, we have no recourse but to develop rural base areas as the embryo of the political power that we shall exercise on a nationwide scale. At this stage, we cannot open guerrilla zones and fight well in them without developing guerrilla base areas. What we simply mean is that we cannot last long in unreliable and unconsolidated areas. Guerrilla bases are the reliable rears for guerrilla zones. The former and the latter interact with each other in the same manner that consolidation and expansion interact with each other.

On the basis of the quotation that we have just made from the joint book of Pomeroy and Taruc, we can easily see why the Tarucs and Lavas failed to really develop the people’s armed strength on a sound foundation during the war of resistance and why they continuously pinned their hopes on the U.S invasions forces for the “liberation” of the Filipino people from the Japanese fascists. We can easily see why in a period following World War II the Lavas and Tarucs went on to dissolve the people’s army under the black banner of Rightism only to resort to a “Left” line when their bourgeois political ambitions were frustrated. Then, under conditions of military defeat, the Lavas and Tarucs would shift back to capitulationism and liquidationism and the Taruc-Sumulong gangster clique would emerge as a Lavaite by-product to carry out roving rebel activities and gangsterism.

### **III. Taruc As A Major Representative Of The Old Merger Party**

Luis M. Taruc was a major representative of the old merger party of the Communist Party of the Philippines and the Socialist Party. Next only to the Lavas, he represented most the wholesale entry of unremoulded petty-bourgeois elements into the old merger party; he had succeeded in raising himself from the status of a poor peasant’s son to that of a college student and then an independent tailor. After Pedro Abad Santos, he also represented most the motley members of the Socialist Party. For a certain period, from 1938 to 1954, he would compete with the Lavas for the distinctions of being the worst saboteur of the revolutionary mass movement.

The creation of the old merger party in 1938 was directly masterminded by the now-notorious anti-communist Earl Browder who was then general secretary of a Communist Party of the U.S.A. Vicente Lava was the principal local agent who promoted the Browderite revisionist slogan "Communism is twentieth century Americanism". The influence of this slogan runs through *Born of the People*. There is not a single word of praise for Comrade Stalin written in the book. But Taruc and Pomeroy are ecstatic about Roosevelt's leadership. They babble:

We had always referred to the Americans as our allies, and had sincerely believed that under the leadership of Roosevelt the American nation would help usher in a new era of world peace and democracy.

Taruc and Pomeroy proudly recount the fact that immediately prior to the war of anti-Japanese resistance, the old merger party kowtowed to the puppet chieftain Quezon and the U.S. High Commissioner Sayre by submitting a memorandum which stated the following: "The Communist Party pledges loyalty to the governments of the Philippines and the United States."

The book of national betrayal goes further self-righteously: "In all matters and all forms of public relations the Huk was free to conduct itself as it wished on the basis of loyalty to the Constitution and to the allied cause." This is puppetry to U.S. imperialism no different from Quezon's. It shuns the principle of unity and struggle in the anti-fascist united front and surrenders without compunction the independence and initiative of the proletariat and its party.

During the anti-Japanese war of resistance, the slogans of "anti-Japanese above all" and "Everything for the anti-Japanese struggle" were adopted by the old merger party to mean all-aliance and no struggle with U.S. imperialism and the anti-Japanese reactionaries. Taruc reveals:

In the interest of the broadest kind of unity, we adopted the slogan: "Anti-Japanese above all". That meant exactly what it said. We would forego an independent struggle for separate working class demands. To show our good faith we dissolved the AMT and KPMP,\* the peasant organizations.

To pursue the national struggle is not to forego the class struggle; to do otherwise is to betray the proletariat and the people. To dissolve peasant organizations under the pretext of "the broadest kind of unity" is to fawn in the most treacherous manner on the U.S. imperialists and their reactionary stooges.

The "promise of independence" by U.S. imperialism was never questioned but on the contrary accepted and supported blindly by the old merger party. Even as units of the People's army and the Barrio United Defense Corps ("government" at the village level) were established in the course of the war of resistance, the Lavas and Tarucs whipped up an orientation of subservience to their colonial masters. Taruc states:

Our objective in setting up a people's democratic government was not designed to contradict the government-in-exile in Washington. We looked upon Quezon, Osmena and their cabinet as our government.

There is too much panegyric for the ghost of the U.S. military officer Thorpe who during the early part of the war had merely promised to give arms to the HUKBALAHAP in Central Luzon. Taruc moans:

We felt the loss of Thorpe very deeply. He was that rare type of American officer who was not entirely blinded by the glitter of his brass. If he lived he might have been a deterrent to the reactionary policies that developed later in the guerrilla forces under American influence.

Anderson, another U.S. military officer, also receives lavish praise for “tolerating” HUKBALAHAP units in Southern Luzon. To him goes the credit of sponsoring an aborted trip of Jesus Lava to Australia via a U.S. submarine. Taruc and Pomeroy rail that had Lava been able to take the submarine (which did not actually wait for him) he would have been able to report to the U.S. Command and to MacArthur himself and thus improve the chances of the treacherous policy of all-alliance and no-struggle towards U.S. imperialism.

In the book, Taruc and Pomeroy cannot fathom the counter-revolutionary dual policy of U.S. imperialism and cannot see through the “good” American officers whose work merely complemented the more brazen work of the “bad” American officers. Thorpe and Anderson essentially acted as military agents of U.S. imperialism during the war despite their pretensions of sympathy for the HUKBALAHAP.

Taruc and Pomeroy obscure the fact that it is in the nature of U.S. imperialism and the local reactionaries to raise hell for the people’s army whenever they have a chance to. Even as they reveal anti-communist onslaughts by USAFFE units during the war, the two scoundrels refuse to clarify the relationship between unity and struggle in a united front in the concrete conditions of World War II which required temporary alliance with U.S. imperialism and the reactionaries who opposed Japanese imperialism. Passing comment on a bloody act of betrayal perpetrated against a HUKBALAHAP unit by a combined force of the USAFFE and pro-Japanese Philippine Constabulary, they babble: “That encounter stripped bare an ugly cancer that had begun to grow in the anti-Japanese struggle, the cancer of partisan politics.” It is silly to prate about the “cancer of partisan politics” as if it were possible for the reactionaries or the revolutionaries to “transcend” partisanship and politics; the point is for revolutionaries to be sure about their own partisanship and politics.

Taruc and Pomeroy deliberately refuse to draw obvious lessons from the experience of carrying out a united front policy during the war of resistance. Among these lessons should be a recognition of the need to build a strong Marxist-Leninist party, a strong people’s army that the party leads and a people’s government based in the countryside and having a united front character, altogether capable of confronting the return of U.S. imperialism and the Commonwealth government at a new and higher stage of the revolutionary struggle. In carrying out the united front policy, we make it a point as Chairman Mao teaches us to “make use of contradictions, win over the many, oppose the few and crush the enemies one by one” rather than be confused by the dual nature of certain temporary allies or surrender our independence and initiative to them.

The wartime “retreat for defense” policy gave away initiative to the USAFFE forces all over the country and weakened the revolutionary movement from within. This was a policy of disintegration and passive defense and was no different from the “lie-low” policy of the USAFFE which banked on the return of U.S. imperialism. After the defeat of the Japanese fascists and their puppets, the old merger party would not be prepared to oppose the aggressive return of U.S. imperialism and the Commonwealth government.

While the book reports that the Central Committee conference of September 1944 did away with the “retreat for defense” policy, it does not report that this same conference presumed that U.S. imperialism would grant real independence, decided to wage parliamentary struggle as the principal form of struggle and designed the Democratic Alliance as the principal form of organization for bourgeois parliamentarism. Thus, upon the return of U.S. imperialism and the puppet Commonwealth government, the old merger party would raise the slogan “Long live our American allies and long live the Commonwealth government!” Taruc raves:

The invasion of Leyte by the American army on October 20, 1944 struck the first gong of doom for the Japanese in the Philippines. We were jubilant. We issued special editions of the Hukbalahap and the Katubusan ng Bayan to celebrate the occasion.

The joint authors actually insist that the “all-out offensive” carried out by the HUKBALAHAP in late October 1944 was made possible not by the preceding years of people’s struggle but by the impending return of U.S. imperialism.

The old merger party relied so much on Roosevelt. Taruc describes Roosevelt’s death in the following shameless manner:

It was the bitterest blow that our hopes for a democratic peace had received. We were certain that Roosevelt, proponent of the Four Freedom had not sanctioned the MacArthur brand of fascism in the Philippines.

What obsequiousness to U.S. imperialism! During the war of resistance, however, even MacArthur was someone to rely on for the Tarucs and Lavas. Was not Jesus Lava all set to take a submarine bound for Australia in order to report “everything” to MacArthur?

When after the war MacArthur and Macnutt kept on harping on a “re-examination” of the U.S. pledge to “grant independence” to the Philippines, Taruc and his kind could only have the ability wish that Roosevelt should have lived forever as their final resort. They would not be satisfied with having Harold Ickes for a “defender”; they wished to have a bigger Yankee brother and they wasted a lot of tears on the name of Roosevelt. Taruc and his kind in the old merger party were alien to Chairman Mao’s principle of “maintaining independence and keeping the initiative in our own hands and relying on our own efforts”.

## **IV. The Capitulationist Line Of The Lavas And Tarucs**

Upon the return of U.S. imperialism and the puppet Commonwealth government in 1945, the old merger party unilaterally disarmed the HUKBALAHAP, converted it into a veterans' organization, and whipped up the slogan of "peace and democracy". In response, the U.S. imperialist and their puppets conducted mass arrests and massacres against the old merger party and the HUKBALAHAP. Despite all these, Taruc and his kind persisted on the line of capitulation and insisted on jostling for official positions in the reactionary government.

The U.S. imperialist also resorted to buying-off tactics. At one point, Taruc appears to be critical of the "Banal Regiment" (a unit of the HUKBALAHAP) for going the way of mercenaries, receiving "backpay" from the U.S. imperialist and becoming integrated into the puppet ranks. But at another, point, he whitewashes the treachery by claiming that the mercenaries did not know any better. He goes as far as to state: "Banal's motivation, I believe, were not opportunist, nor did opportunism influence many of the men who followed him."

Furthermore, Taruc admits that he himself worked for "backpay" for the HUKBALAHAP and submitted Huk rosters to the enemy for the purpose. These rosters were subsequently used as blacklists by the enemy for persecuting and murdering Party cadres and HUKBALAHAP fighters. To prettify his own deed of betrayal, Taruc rails: "Now, however, with many Huk families destitute and with a need for funds to rebuild people's organizations as part of our peaceful legal struggle, we decided to apply for backpay." The name of the people is invoked to attacked the people.

Born of the People admits the undeniable truth that the HUKBALAHAP fighters and the masses, though abandoned to their own devices by the old merger party, spontaneously defended themselves from imperialist and puppet depredations. But Taruc and Pomeroy always bring to the fore the erroneous idea that the people were "Tired of War" and that it was apt for the leaders of the old merger party to run for elective positions under the Democratic Alliance.

Taruc and his kind based themselves on the propositions that "the Huk is not anti-commonwealth government" and that they "recognize President Osmena as the legal president of the Commonwealth and the Commonwealth Constitution as the legal constitution of the Philippines". Subsequently, issues were so formulated in the old merger party and in the Democratic Alliance that their rank and file were made to choose only between the Nacionalista Party Osmena and the newly-founded Liberal Party of Roxas in the 1946 elections.

A vote for Osmena was interpreted as a vote for "independence" on July 4, 1946 and a vote for Roxas as a vote for the "postponement" of independence as proposed by MacArthur and McNutt. Thus, the old merger party threw in its support for Osmena. Along this line, it was converted into a minor electoral organization helping the Nacionalista Party directly in a common effort with the Liberal Party and U.S. imperialism to put up the farce that is the present puppet republic. The revolutionary role of a proletarian party in the struggle for national liberation was cast away. Taruc and Pomeroy still assert in the book: "A victory for Osmena might have placed the nation on the road to real independence and real democracy." What great faith they have in a

reactionary politician! they also ask rhetorically: “Could the betrayal have been avoided?” and they proceed to answer themselves:

Yes it could have been if Osmena had taken up the challenges and had carried the fight to the people. Instead, he allowed the rights and the strength of the people to be curtailed at every turn.

So much hope indeed pinned on Osmena by the sham revolutionaries. They relied on him as their messiah.

Yet as soon as Roxas won, the Tarucs and Lavas hurried to support him in his anti-communist “pacification plan” which had been designed to destroy the old merger party and the HUKBALAHAP. They did so with the vain hope of cajoling him into granting some concessions. They did so with the main selfish purpose of trying to reverse the ouster of six Democratic Alliance congressmen (including Luis Taruc and Jesus Lava) from their seats.

Leading officials of the old merger party and the HUKBALAHAP went around shamelessly campaigning for the people to lay down and register their arms, enter their names in the enemy’s rolls and accept the cantonment of troops in their barrios. This Lava-Taruc act of betrayal resulted in the assassination of revolutionary cadres and countless abuses on the people, including massacres. This capitulations to the evil scheme of Roxas was no different from the submission of Huk rosters to the U.S. authorities in exchange for “backpay”.

The Lavas and Tarucs put forward to Roxas five terms for a “democratic peace”, each of which implied abandonment of the revolutionary struggle and acceptance of the authority of the enemy:

1. Immediate enforcement of the Bill of Rights, especially the right to assemble, freedom from arbitrary arrest, ending of cruel and unjust punishment, trial by unprejudiced judges.
2. Dismissal of all charges against Huks, MPs and civilian guards alike growing out of events of the previous five months.
3. Replacement of fascist-minded officials in municipal and provincial governments and military commands in provinces affected by agrarian unrest.
4. Restoration of all Democratic Alliance congressmen to their seats.
5. The implementation of Roxas’ own land reform program, beginning with a fool-proof crop distribution law and leading towards eventual abolition of tenancy.

These terms were to be the agenda of negotiations between the Roxas puppet regime and the old merger party after Taruc and his kind complied with the “pacification plan”. The traitor Taruc went about Central Luzon trying to douse the revolutionary spirit of the people, asking them to “curb their hot tempers” and to “maintain patience and discipline”. Always taking pride in counter- revolution, Taruc admits in the book:

I explained in detail the promises of the government to enforce the laws and the Constitution and (even though I myself distrusted the motivations of Roxas) I admonished the people to act on the good faith of the government.

What a sell-out! He admits having tried to mislead the people into trusting the evil that he himself could not trust. And he demanded the reactionary laws and constitution to be enforced against the people.

How do Pomeroy and Taruc try to cover up the patent treason of the Lavas and Tarucs? They prattle:

The demoralization that prevailed among large sections of the people was caused by their natural desire for peace and security after the difficult years of the Japanese occupation. Although they did not trust the demagoguery of Roxas, many of them wanted to believe it. Many were even willing to accept the peace of slaves, just as long as it was peace.

What a callous regard for the people! They invoke the “natural desire for peace and security” and they describe the people as “willing to accept the peace of slaves”.

But Taruc and Pomeroy always unwittingly slap their own faces. They state somewhere else in the book:

In the bivouacs, in the swamps, forests and mountains, where the reassembled Huk squadrons were staying to avoid encounters [as per instructions of Taruc and his kind], I found the soldiers extremely bitter. Their experience in three years of fighting against the Japanese and the puppets had made them militant and ready to leap to the defense of their families and rights. They told me that they did not feel like always running away, that they were not cowards and that they wanted to fight.

What is the attitude of Taruc towards all these? Once more he makes an admission:

I counseled them to fall back upon their iron discipline, and to allow themselves to be drawn into trouble only when it meant actually to save their lives. They discussed it and agreed. To me the most outstanding feature of that whole period was not the encounters that did occur, but the encounters that did not occur due to the admirable restraint of the Huk soldier.

Here it is extremely evident that Taruc and Pomeroy take pride in capitulationism, promote the erroneous idea of passive defense, picture the people as being docile and prettify docility as discipline.

Nothing came out of the “pacification plan” and “negotiations” of the Roxas puppet regime and the old merger party. From the beginning to the end, Roxas would not be satisfied with anything less than the “total extermination of communists”, including the Lavas and Tarucs. Only when their own lives were already in clear danger did the Lavas and Tarucs take the posture of leading the revolutionary masses in armed struggle. They had to fall back on the people whom they had readily slandered as “willing to accept the peace of the slave”.

As soon as Quirino became the puppet chieftain in 1948 following the untimely death of Roxas, he sent out feelers to Luis Taruc and his kind that they could enter into a negotiation and an

agreement on “surrender and amnesty” with him. Incurable capitulationists that they were, the Lavas and Tarucs were too willing to fall into Quirino’s political trap despite the people’s clamor for revolutionary armed struggle. Taruc took the limelight as a fool for once more agreeing to the “surrender and registration” of HUKBALAHAP fighters.

Taruc and his kind once more recognized the authority and the “superior” political position of the enemy. Once more they agreed to updating the blacklists of the enemy. They were required to order the surrender and registration of the HUKBALAHAP fighters. They had not learned the lessons of principle and practice from the submission of Huk rosters to the U.S. Veterans Administration or from the “pacification plan” of the Roxas puppet regime.

Taruc tries to lessen his counter-reactionary crime by confessing:

We made two serious mistakes in our negotiations with Quirino. We allowed ourselves to be put in the position of accepting an amnesty proclamation from him without challenging its implication that we were the guilty party. Secondly, we kept too much in the background the basic consideration of struggle against U.S. imperialism.

A true revolutionary would not even raise the questions of guilt under the rules of the enemy. It is because the revolutionary cause is just and must always be pursued towards its triumph. Everything is prejudiced when the enemy is made out to appear as indulgent and kind by the same persons who pose as the leaders of the revolutions.

Taruc rails:

Peace depended entirely upon Quirino’s implementation of his promises, which failed to develop. During the period of truce the PCs and civilian guards continued to raid and terrorize, and ambushed our soldiers on several occasions. Huks and PKMs were told directly by civilian guards and the PCs: “Now we know who you are. We will take care of you later.”

Once more nothing came out of a false peace. The Quirino puppet regime should be condemned for its sanguinary perfidy. But the Lavas and Tarucs should as well be condemned for their incurable capitulationism, for repeatedly leading people into the slaughterhouse.

In their desire to accommodate their selfish interests and seek rotten compromises with the U.S. imperialists and reactionaries, the Lavas and Tarucs could easily forget how the Filipino people had been able to gain standing and become a considerable force through the HUKBALAHAP. The scoundrels made it a habit to oppose the truth of Chairman Mao’s teaching that “political power grows out of the barrel of a gun.”

It is important to pay close attention to the orientation of Taruc in entering bourgeois electioneering as a candidate for the puppet congress in 1946. He states:

I was going to school again. This time it was the school of politics. In our country it has been a special business. People train for it from the time that they are young men. In the universities

they make their contacts and become skilled in the game of classroom politics. That is what happens in a colonial country, where politics is usually a doorway to quick wealth through graft and corruption, a system fostered by the dominating foreigners because it enables them to by political vigor of the nation. The word “politician” was so de-based that it meant “cheater” and “demagogue” to the masses.

What a self-revealing statement from a “student”! He wanted to learn “politics” from the reactionaries. Indeed, he was bent on picking up the tricks of the trade of the reactionary politicians until he, together with other Democratic Alliance politicians, was summarily ousted from the puppet congress. Taruc and Pomeroy together in the book speak of politics without differentiating between revolutionary politics. Completely blind to the political struggle of the revolutionary masses, the two scoundrels define “politics” as “a special sort of occupation under imperialism made attractive by the opportunities for politicians to enrich themselves through corruption”. These pretenders to Marxism in yesteryears have a narrow understanding of politics and they reduce it to counter-revolutionary politics.

Capitulationism is glorified in *Born of the People*. It is prettified as some kind of “good faith” and “sincerity” on the part of the revolutionary mass movement towards U.S. imperialism and its reactionary stooges. It is nothing but a manifestation of the historical idealism of fake communists. It contravenes the fundamental principles of Marxism-Leninism. It is the sure mark of the Right opportunism that the Lavas and Tarucs have bequeathed to the modern revisionists in the Philippines.

*Born of the People* is a book of national betrayal from beginning to end. It tries to prettify such national betrayers as the Lavas and Tarucs. But it futilely does so. It only succeeds in unwittingly presenting the true face of national betrayers. Never truly relying on revolutionary work and on the strength of the revolutionary masses, the Lavas and Tarucs always pin their fondest hopes on U.S. imperialism and its reactionary stooges. When confronted with Japanese fascism, they pin their fondest hopes on U.S. imperialism and the Commonwealth government. When confronted with the onslaughts of the USAFFE, they pine for the return of Gen. MacArthur or even for the ghost of Thorpe. When confronted with the dirty maneuvers of Truman, MacArthur and McNutt, they wish Roosevelt were alive and Harold Ickes were kept in office. When confronted with the puppet Manuel Roxas, they think they can rely most on Osmena. When Roxas gets to be president, they toady up to him until he comes close to strangling them. When Quirino gets to be president, they readily accept terms of surrender and amnesty.

*Born of the People* is a record of the grave political mistakes of the Tarucs and Lavas that sabotaged and subverted the revolutionary mass movement from within. It was published in 1953 even as in the previous year Taruc had already openly degenerated into a shameless anti-communist. But worst, the revisionist Pomeroy today still wants to salvage it as a truthful historical account of the revolutionary mass movement. It can only promote Right opportunism and modern revisionism. Once and for all, it must be cast away into the garbage heap of the history.

NOTES

*\* The AMT was the Aguman ding Maldang Tagapagobra (League fo Poor Laborers) while the KPMP was the Kapisanang Pambansa ng mga Magbubukid sa Pilipinas (National Peasant Union of the Philippines).*

## **A Forest Nightmare**

*(This essay originally appeared in the Ang Bayan special issue of November 1, 1971 under the title “Pomeroy’s Forest Nightmare”.)*

The Forest is a “personal history” of a special agent of U.S. imperialism who at the same time serves as a hack of Soviet modern revisionism. It is admittedly a subjectivist piece of work, harping on the theme of bourgeois pessimism and misrepresenting revolutionary struggle as a nightmare.

The vile purpose of William J. Pomeroy in writing the book is to frighten people away from armed revolution and to convince them that it is hopeless. He employs the cheap method of posing himself as a tragic hero against the forest and makes the forest loom larger as his enemy than U.S. imperialism, feudalism and bureaucrat capitalism.

It is convenient for Pomeroy to write on his own narrow experience under the Jose-Jesus Lava leadership from April 1950 to April 1952 in his malicious scheme to draw a bleak picture and a dark prospect for the Philippine revolution and whip up erroneous and counter-revolutionary ideas. Though published in 1963, The Forest absolutely fails to shed light on the “Left” opportunism of the Jose-Jesus Lava leadership and the subsequent Right opportunism of the Jesus Lava leadership since 1955. Pomeroy goes as far as to single out the Lavas, Luis Taruc and even Sumulong for praise.

While a true proletarian revolutionary would make a clear Marxist-Leninist analysis and summing-up of historical events in order to illumine the road of revolutionary struggle, Pomeroy would rather wallow in the muck of bourgeois pessimism, set himself up as a “tragic hero” in a Greek drama, express disdain for the Filipino people and obscure the causes of failure in the revolutionary movement. The Party document of rectification, “Rectify Error and Rebuild the Party”, has long ago shed light on the period of the revolutionary struggle about which The Forest tries to spread poisonous ideas.

## **I. The Theme Of Bourgeois Pessimism**

It is of utmost importance to recall the words of Chairman Mao Tsetung regarding the counter-revolutionary revisionist “theory of human nature”:

There is only human nature in the concrete, no human nature in the abstract. In class society there is only human nature of a class character; there is no human nature above classes. We uphold the human nature of the proletariat and of the masses of the people, while the landlord

and bourgeois classes uphold the the human nature of their own classes, only they do not say but make it out to be the only human nature in existence.

Pomeroy opposes the proletarian revolutionary class standpoint. In doing so, he cowers behind such pious expressions of bourgeois humanism as “love of man”, “dignity of all” and “brotherhood of all”. Grandiosely, he babbles:

We stand together in the love of man, enriched by it, adding to it our own little glory;... I have always been guided by the love of man; it is the love of man that beats in my pulse.... I realize that there cannot be mutual respect until the dignity of all is established. The road to the brotherhood of man lies through the struggle for the achievement of the dignity of each.

All this preaching is calculated to slur over and obscure the national and class struggle. It actually leads to a mockery of the Filipino proletariat and people. The scoundrel bleats:

A theory exists that misery breeds revolts, but that is true most often when misery follows from a loss of what one has had. But when one has known nothing for four hundred years, it crushes, subdues, becomes a pattern of life. The few who revolt are butchered; the amok is shot down in the street. The many squat in the floor of a hut look out with lackluster eyes at the will of God.

This bourgeois pessimist view attacks dialectical materialism and denies that the internal law of motion of things impels them to move forward and change. It rejects the ascendance of the new and progressive forces and the obliteration of the old and reactionary forces. It runs counter to the correct view that history is a spiraling process. It dismisses as “nothing” the revolutionary tradition and struggles of the Filipino people. It slanderously compares the revolutionary masses to a crazed fanatic (an “amok”) and describes them as too few while those “who look out at the will of God” are too many.

Chairman Mao teaches us: “We should rid our ranks of all impotent thinking. All views that overestimate the strength of the enemy and underestimate the strength of the people are wrong.”

Devoid of any revolutionary class perspective, Pomeroy sinks to the lowest depths of fatalism and defeatism: “Here in the primeval forest, I have never felt so overwhelmingly that human insignificance. Life means nothing in this geological immensity.” The anti-communist scoundrels always find it rewarding to make a whine of despair: “... a time of grimness has come into our lives. I have been touched with fatalism. I think I am going to die in the forest...”

In the entire book, what Pomeroy poses as the main contradiction in the Philippine society is that between man (represented by him) and nature (the forest). He lashes out at the rain: “The rain. It is the enemy that follows us forever, striking upon all the trails and besieging every hut.” Here is a sham revolutionary who hates and does not appreciate tropical forest and rain as advantageous conditions for fighting the real enemy. In the most critical situation, he soliloquizes; “What is the forest now, a friend or an enemy?”

What makes the forest a ghastly enemy for Pomeroy is that the squads balutan (porters) are prevented by the enemy from bringing in canned goods and rice bought from the town market to the camp. Instead of making a political analysis of the plight he is in together with others, he lets loose a ceaseless verbal barrage of abuse against the forest and plays up above all the problem of survival against nature. Yet he is in a tropical forest with a variety of edible flora and fauna and fringed with coconut groves; and he also treads upon rivers which breed fish snails. The primitive Dumagats whom Pomeroy comes across actually have more ingenuity and foresight than the entire Jesus Lava leadership on the problem of physical survival.

Pomeroy contends in keeping with his bourgeois humanism:

The forest is a strange place for freedom to live. Wherever one would turn there is the wall of trees. It is a wall to all sides and a wall above, shutting out the sky. In the open world there were horizons; here the only horizon is in the heart.

He regrets having ever joined the revolutionary struggle and being imprisoned by the forest. He hankers for the enemy bases, "the open world where there are horizons".

Let us scan his kind of "horizon in the heart". Even before he experiences any hardship from any offensive, he expresses resentment against the forest. As soon as he steps into the forest, he is discomfited by his new shoes getting wet. Subsequently, the most trivial and pathetic resentments are elevated to the level of "tragic grandeur" for the self-centered author. The mud, the tiny leeches and ants and the actual or imagined falling of trees and branches are perennial torture for the sham hero. When he contracts athlete's foot (alipunga), he raises it with stupendous efforts to the level of a major tragedy.

Pomeroy is obsessed with interpreting all things of the forest as symbols of death and decay. He flies into a fantasy:

Behind our hut is an ancient leaning tree, covered with the pustules of decay. Some of its limbs have broken off, the hollow stumps lifted in mute agony. It leans so far, there above us, that one would think that it is in the very act of falling upon us and smothering us in its black limbs and in its crawling moist dust.

Pomeroy always strains to create an atmosphere of gloom. He bleats:

We lie there in the damp darkness, with the odor of dank vegetation in our nostrils, hearing legions of frogs singing the elegy of the night, and we are filled for the first time with the quiet despair of the lost.

The forest is filled with mist and the bushes loom around me, loom out of it with the arms of the drowning.... I think that we are all ghosts in a phantom forest.

These are the words of delirium that the anti-communist Pomeroy uses to misrepresent revolutionary thinking in the face of hardship. These serve nothing but to whip up fear of revolution.

The jeremiads of Pomeroy are a ceaseless and utterly sickening. He chatters: "I do not think of a destination; I only think of the next spot to place a foot." He weeps: "On what circle of hell are we doomed to wander?"

We find no relief in the author's few moments of euphoria such as when he compares himself to Robin Hood in Sherwood Forest or when he paints a love scene between him and Celia in a creek. There is also no relief in his bourgeois comparisons, say, between the womenfolk in the forest with James Joyce's washerwomen in the twilight by the River Liffy. All these serve to reinforce his theme of bourgeois pessimism.

When an expansion group leaves the forest camp, Pomeroy feels that "something has somehow gone out of our lives". Such can only be the feeling of a hidden traitor who does not consider expansion as an extension of the revolutionary struggle. At the first alarm for evacuation that he experiences, he confesses that the mere sight of the emergency packs make him feel more helpless and more helpless and more impotent than the report of the danger. "The first thin wire of uncertainty has been touched in our hearts", he wails. At the sight of the enemy observation plane, he shakes in his pants and makes a craven report: "As long as it is there we lie and hold our breaths, as if our breathing could be heard." This is taking melodrama too far.

When he asks a Red fighter why he has joined the revolution, he leads the discussion into how one's selfish interest can be served. He plays up the spirit of self-interest rather than the revolutionary spirit serving the people. In trying to draw a picture of discipline in the camps, he lays emphasis on the coercive administrative measures against misdemeanors he is extremely proud of the fact that for minor infractions of rules comrades are treated like enemies and subjected to needless humiliation or even the death penalty. He completely assails the idea that rectification is essentially class education. In too many sections of the book, he sharpens on the "unreliability" of the Red fighters and people in the face of the enemy offensive.

Pomeroy has absolutely no faith in the victory of the Philippine revolution. At parting with comrades, he readily refers darkly to them: "The lit faces of all those whom we may never see again." And he is too proud to claim: "See you in Muntinglupa, we call to each other." This is the extreme reverse of previous "Left" opportunist words of parting among the Lavaites: "See you in Malacanang."

Summing up his kind of participation in the Philippines revolutionary movement, he declares:

When Celia and I passed beyond the open and comprehended world to enter the unknown forest, it was without any sense of being cut adrift, because we felt part of a great movement that had direction and goal, and every trails and the goal began to be blocked that we felt the forest loom around us and had the sensation that we were cutting paths blindly through it.

Now in this remote and unknown region, where every intersection of rivers poses an unanswered question, this group of ours is the epitome of our struggle, lost and driven into unknown courses.

Surrender to the enemy is the end of Pomeroy's bourgeois pessimism. He reports on his own craven surrender to the enemy:

I give a great shout from behind the tree. The firing above slackens and I hear voices calling me to come out. I do not know what will happen but I step out from behind the tree. It is the last tree in the forest for me.

He curses the revolutionary armed struggle: "Strange blind struggle in the forest." And he commends the enemy; "The army men come to watch me curiously. "It is odd: most of them are friendly and decent, officers and enlisted men alike." Here Pomeroy gives himself away.

Against bourgeois pessimism, Chairman Mao teaches us: "Be resolute, fear no sacrifice and surmount every difficulty to win victory." We must maintain our revolutionary optimism and our will to fight and win. Chairman Mao combats capitulationism in the following terms:

This army has an indomitable spirit and is determined to vanquish all enemies and never to yield. No matter what the difficulties and hardships are, so long as a single man remains, he will fight on.

## **II. The Purely Military Viewpoint**

William J. Pomeroy does not question but upholds the purely military viewpoint that prevailed in the old merger party under the Jose-Jesus Lava leadership. He sometimes appears to be critical of the errors of this leadership. But that is only because he cannot help mention the facts of defeat to promote his time of bourgeois pessimism. Thus, he goes as far as to say: "We have been living in a fool's paradise."

On his own account Pomeroy refers to the Communist Party as merely the "political wing" of a military organization. The central leadership of the old merger party is considered as merely the executive body of the political wing of the Hukbong Mapagpalaya ng Bayan. The regional Party committee is considered as merely the political wing of the regional army command. Pomeroy puts the military in command, instead of politics. He denies the absolute leadership of a proletarian revolutionary party over a genuine people's army.

Regarding the relationship between the Party and the people's army, Chairman Mao point out: "The Party commands the gun and the gun must never be allowed to command the Party." He further teaches us:

If there is to be a revolution, there must be a revolutionary party. Without the revolutionary party, without a party built on the Marxist-Leninist revolutionary theory, and in the Marxist-Leninist revolutionary style, it is impossible to lead the working class and the broad masses of the people in defeating imperialism and its running dogs.

At a point that he seems to recognize the need for centralized political guidance in the revolutionary struggle, Pomeroy describes the Party as a commandist organization “separate from the armed forces but protected by it”. By way of trying to prove that the Communist Party is a surplusage in the revolutionary movement, he boasts that many HMB commanders are not Party members and that in towns near the forest camp there is not a single Party member though these are “solidly pro-Huk, up to and including town officials”. On our part, we say that without clear and correct Party leadership a military organization and the localities can never be consolidated. Mr. Pomeroy’s experience demonstrates the truth of this statement.

Chairman Mao teaches us:

A well-disciplined Party armed with the theory of Marxism-Leninism, using the method of self-criticism and linked with the masses of the people; an army under the leadership of such Party; a united front of all revolutionary classes and all revolutionary groups under the leadership of such a Party — these are the three main weapons with which we have defeated the enemy.

Though the flimsiest of circumstances are dealt with by Pomeroy, he avoids a thorough ideological and political analysis of the errors of the Jose-Jesus Lava leadership. He would rather deal at great length with the “revolutionary solution to the sex problem”, the “dialectics of love”, the “strategy and tactics of courtship”, and his love-making with Celia. On the arrest of the “Politburo In” or the Secretariat in Manila in October 1950, he can only conjecture superficially that it may be the first result of enemy infiltration, carelessness or laxity of security. He fails to inquire thoroughly into the subjectivism and “Left” opportunism of the Jose Lava leadership and, therefore, lets down every valid reason for writing the book.

At the most, he is willing to admit only that the cause of the defeat under the Jose-Jesus Lava leadership is “the very low technological level of the people’s army”. With sarcasm, he goes on to say:

It is on par with the half-primitive methods that the average peasant uses to work his farm. It is a matter of fact that could, of course, be overcome, if the knowledge were supplied. However, in the entire Philippine national liberation movement there is not one military leader of any professional caliber.

Here Pomeroy puts weapons ahead of politics and external factor ahead of internal factors.

Expressing awe for the army and disdain for the Red fighters, he rails: “some of the best minds from American military academies are out here meeting their match from untrained peasants”; and “...the enemy has the advantage in firepower and modern weapons”. The bourgeois militarist mentality of Pomeroy is consistent: *The people’s army has no chance against the military superiority of the enemy since the military is more important than politics and the peasants are inferior to U.S.-trained officers.*

In writing about the February-March 1950 conference of the central committee of the old merger party, Pomeroy fails to present anything — his own or that of the conference — which can shed

light on the disastrous line and policies taken by the Jose Lava leadership or a new line of new policies that can carry the revolutionary movement forward. The decisions of the conference carry on the false assumptions of the Jose Lava leadership against a protracted people's war and, therefore, involve basically the continuance of a wrong line and wrong policies.

There is no concrete analysis of the situation, particularly of the balance of forces in the struggle. There is no grasp of the ideological, political and organizational strength of the revolutionary forces and there is also no grasp of the need to develop through a protracted period of time the people's armed struggle. Under these circumstances, it is not possible to set forth the correct tasks concerning the building of the Party, people's army, united front, mass organizations and organs of political power. The conference calls for the "regularization" of guerrilla units but it hitches this to the illusion of quick military victory in the absence of the fundamental criticism of the "Left" opportunism of the Jose Lava leadership. On the basis of the wrong notion that the enemy is to collapse on its own, Pomeroy and his fellow Lavaites put too much reliance on the success or failure of their "boycott" policy towards the reactionary elections of November 1951. It is posited that if this electoral farce is more fraudulent and terroristic than the one in 1949 then the people will spontaneously abandon the enemy and join the people's army to overthrow the state within the short period of time. Essentially, the Jesus Lava leadership continues the error of the Jose Lava leadership in onesidely setting a timetable for quick military victory within two years.

Pomeroy and his Lavaite cohorts are unaware all along that they themselves have been isolated in the forest as a result of the disastrous "Left" opportunist line and policies of the Jose-Jesus Lava leadership. Even their leaflets calling for boycott of the reactionary elections cannot be distributed in those parts of the country previously reached by the people's army. The "solidly pro-Huk areas" have suddenly turned hollow because in the first place the factors of consolidation have not been properly attended to.

The Forest itself is a testimony to the fact that to launch the Sta. Cruz raid on August 26, 1950 there is extreme over-extension of the people's army. The forest camp is left with no security detail at all since the raid entails the participation of every fighter from the camp. In the course of the raid, putschist acts like unnecessary burning and the killing of an enemy officer who offers to surrender his men are perpetrated for lack of time to withdraw. The raiders are short of time because they have to withdraw to distant points over extremely unreliable areas.

When the enemy launches its own offensive against the forest camp, it inevitably turns out that political work has not been well carried out among the people in the surrounding areas and even within the camp itself. It turns out that the forest camp is relying mainly on physical concealment and not on a well-consolidated base. District organizing committees disintegrate in a day; food supplies are either seized or poisoned and allowed to pass through by the enemy. Within the camp itself, harsh punishments are the order of the day to maintain "discipline". Pomeroy misjudges and cannot trust even his own guard.

On January 1951 the enemy succeeds in penetrating the forest camp, first the cluster of huts of the Education Department and Jesus Lava's hut where the stocks of food for the entire camp are

seized. From then on, the problem of supply and communications becomes extremely acute. Yet after the February-March conference, the Secretariat with a personnel of 200 men and women, including a handful of armed guards, is set up in the forest. This soon becomes a definite and isolated target for intensified enemy operations.

Pomeroy acknowledges the fact that food for the forest camp comprises canned goods and rice bought from the town market. This is true especially after the enemy destruction of the “kaingins” (forest clearings). The forest camp has been supported almost wholly by funds taken from town raids and the gangster-like activities of “economic struggle” units which include robbery on ordinary bus and train passengers. It is anomalous that there is not a system of collecting grain contributions or even buying rice directly from the peasants instead of from the town market. Grain tax cannot be collected from the peasants because in the first place the old merger party has failed to carry out agrarian revolution or land reform and has also failed to lead production campaigns for support of the people’s army.

Mustering all dishonesty, Jesus Lava contends in his Camp Crame article “Paglilinaw sa ‘Philippine Crisis’” (Clarification on “Philippine Crisis”) that the HMB under his leadership has never had its supply and communication line cut off by the enemy. Pomeroy’s *The Forest* can be slapped on his face. The Secretariat precisely had to break up because its large personnel would starve if not physically wiped out by the enemy offensive. The book deals mainly with panic and blind flight through the forest and sheer struggle for physical survival in the absence of a wide and strong political base to rely on.

In the notorious Lavaite style, Pomeroy makes self-contradicting statements. He implies at the early part of his book that upon the ascendance of the Jose-Jesus Lava leadership in 1948 the old merger party becomes “well organized” and has “clear strategic and tactical aims”. But the whole book shows the opposite.

However, Pomeroy does not hold the Jose-Jesus Lava leadership responsible for any serious errors and for the defeat. He blames “men for their individual weaknesses”! He prates:

When the tide of struggle is running our way, individual weaknesses are submerged in the flood of high spirits; when the enemy is strong and the tide is not our way, these weaknesses emerge and turn men into slimy things that scuttle for the safety on the exposed shoreline.

What a flimsy cover for the colossal errors of the Jose-Jesus Lava leadership.

A true scoundrel, Pomeroy blames the people. And he combines self-adulation with condemnation of the people. He boasts:

We had thought that the people moved at our pace, to the rapid click of the mimeograph machine. We had thought that the morale and discipline in this camp was the morale and discipline everywhere. We had thought that by the leaders setting a high tempo we could set the tempo of the revolution.

Pomeroy considers himself and his ilk as having properly done their part. But the people do not respond, so, he resorts to an ugly metaphor:

We are like those who lean over a deep well and drop pebbles into its interior, waiting to hear the far hollow echo of then striking water. When the sound comes back to us it is a strange echo, like the lost cry of someone drowning in that depth.

To Pomeroy, it is not the Jose-Jesus Lava leadership but the people that are guilty of opportunism. He says so in an unsubtle manner.:

Some of the Huks are bitter about the people. The people, they say, are opportunistic. When we are with them they are friendly to us; when the enemy is with them they were friendly to the enemy... They are flesh and blood and they suffer much. We are in the forest, where we can hide and fight, but they are naked to suppression. They are helpless before abuse, and who can stand up to abuse and robbery month after month.

An unmitigated agent of counter-revolution, Pomeroy refuses to recognize that the people themselves are the motive force of revolution and the real makers of history. Referring to the people, particularly to the peasant masses, Chairman Mao teaches us; “Every revolutionary party and every revolutionary comrade will be put to the test, accepted or rejected as they decide.” It is foolish to ever assume that a party or an army can take care of itself and fight without the people. It is always the bounden duty of the Party leadership to arouse, organize and mobilize the people for revolution. It is foolish to imagine oneself as a messiah of the people and then to fret that the people refuse to be saved when in the first place the correct line and correct policies are not taken to mobilize and serve them.

To the very end, Pomeroy insults the Filipino people. He rants:

No one looks at me, comrade of the dead. For these people life has resumed its inexorable ways. They have seen many troops and captives. So many waves of conquest and of oppression have passed over this land that they have been numbed by it. I think how people learn to live with tragedy.

Mr. Pomeroy, we say that the broad masses of the people — especially the oppressed workers and peasants — will keep on rising until victory is theirs. They will march from victory to victory under the leadership and under the great red banner of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tsetung Thought.

In opposition to the obscurantism of a revisionist scoundrel, we take heed from Chairman Mao who teaches us:

...The rectification movement is a “widespread movement of Marxist education”. Rectification means the whole Party studying Marxism through criticism and self-criticism. We can certainly learn more about Marxism in the course of the rectification movement.

In his epilogue, Pomeroy is most concerned about his “end of the thread”; his reunion with his wife Celia. It must be recalled that these two were pardoned in 1961, so many years ahead of others who had also received jail sentences similar to theirs for political rebellion. Pomeroy vociferously claims that it was a worldwide letter-writing campaign for amnesty that compelled Malacanang to release them from prison. But the truth was that the U.S embassy interceded for their release. It was obvious then that Pomeroy had finished one more tour of duty for U.S imperialism. Pomeroy pretends in the epilogue of his book that he is still under persecution by U.S authorities who “refuse” to have him reunited with his Filipino wife. The case as flimsy as his trying to get an exemption from the U.S. McCarran Act so that Pomeroy and Celia can be reunited in the United States. But then such an exemption would blatantly unmask a special agent of U.S. imperialism and would prejudice a continuing sinister mission assigned to him. No one is fooled as Pomeroy and Celia are now united in London, enjoying the patronage of both U.S. imperialism and Soviet social-imperialism.

Today, William J. Pomeroy continues to perform counter-revolutionary work. The Forest is basically an effort to make use of the “Left” opportunism of the Jose-Jesus Lava leadership as an excuse for whipping up Right opportunism and modern revisionism to subvert the resurgent revolutionary mass movement in the Philippines. Unfortunately for the revisionist scoundrel, however, the Communist Party of the Philippines has correctly rebuilt itself under the guidance of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tsetung Thought and has always stood firmly against every overt and subtle attempt to becloud the horizon. Chairman Mao has pointed out:

The world is progressing, the future is bright and no one can change this general trend of history. We should carry on constant propaganda among the people on the fact of world progress and the bright future ahead so that they will build their confidence in victory.

## **Counter-guerrilla views**

*(This essay originally appeared in the Ang Bayan special issue of June 1, 1971 under the title “The Counter-Guerrilla Views of the Revisionist Pomeroy”.)*

The small book Guerrilla and Counter-Guerrilla Warfare is essentially a presentation of the counter-revolutionary and counter-guerrilla views of the revisionist William J. Pomeroy, an American G.I. adventurer who has turned into a political and book-selling capital the short period that he spent with the “Left” opportunist leaders of the old merger party of the Communist Party and the Socialist Party in Manila and the Sierra Madre.

In the style of a repentant adventurer turned capitulationist, Pomeroy takes all pains in trying to downgrade armed struggle, particularly guerrilla warfare, as a revolutionary weapon; use the “Left” opportunist errors of the Jose Lava leadership to justify Right opportunism and modern revisionism; slander the great communist leaders and omit Chairman Mao Tsetung on the subject of armed struggle; preach “peaceful coexistence, peaceful transition and peaceful competition” as the general line of the world revolution and insist on unprincipled accommodation with U.S. imperialism.

Like his Lava revisionist colleagues in the Philippines today, Pomeroy takes the style of giving faint praise or lip service to what he considers the “partial necessity” of armed struggle but only to carry out sinister aim of disarming the reader, putting him the state of ambivalence and stupor and laying him open for sly or overt counter-revolutionary prattle that assails the essence of Marxism, the doctrine of revolutionary violence against the bourgeois state machinery.

Let us analyze Pomeroy’s book. We have the advantage of doing so in the light of the seven years since the book came out in print in 1964 on the eve of Khrushchov’s downfall from his revisionist throne.

## **I. On Armed Struggle and “Peaceful Transition”**

At the very outset, Pomeroy asserts that “to most people” war in the modern world is a matter of nuclear conflict, involving long-range guided missiles, hydrogen bombs, and all the push-button paraphernalia of modern weaponry. To the revisionists, we say that man is superior to the weapons that he has created and that Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tsetung Thought is our spiritual atom bomb which, as it is grasped by hundreds of millions of people of the world over, is truly a material force capable of destroying U.S. imperialism, modern revisionism and all reaction. According to Chairman Mao: “Weapons are an important factor in war, but not the decisive factor; it is people not things that are decisive.”

Pomeroy’s assertion about nuclear conflict and nuclear weapons is a mere preparation for claiming that Soviet modern revisionism as in a classic military confrontation is pinning down the main forces of imperialism at the center and making it possible for flank attacks to be launched by the people in colonial areas. It is absurd for one to claim that Soviet modern revisionism has ever performed such a function.

The truth is that since the revisionist traitor Khrushchov put the Soviet Union on the capitalist road, U.S. imperialism has been able to move its main forces of aggression to Asia, especially Vietnam and the whole of Indochina. Under the Brezhnev revisionist gang, the Soviet social-imperialists themselves have invaded Czechoslovakia, deployed troops against “fraternal” countries in Eastern Europe and the People’s Republic of Mongolia, and launched bloody acts of aggressions against the People’s Republic of China.

Pomeroy takes the stance of advising and preaching to U.S. imperialism. He insists that essentially the situation of U.S. imperialism in the world today is not a military problem, however much U.S. imperialism seeks to picture it and to treat it as such. So he advises U.S. imperialism not to do so, as not to stimulate an even more determined revolutionary efforts by the people.

Pomeroy implies that since the pressures felt by U.S. imperialism from all sides come from economic and political contradictions in the organization of its system, only “economic and political solutions” (exclusive of military force) should be employed by U.S. imperialism. He avers that only in the advanced stage of the people’s revolution does the problem of U.S. imperialism become a military problem. All this revisionist chatter about separating the military

problem from the economic and political problem of U.S. imperialism is calculated to obscure the aggressive nature of U.S. imperialism.

After starting with a number of false premises, Pomeroy exclaims in the falsetto of the revisionist trickster that “at no time in history in any revolutionary period, have armed methods been the only or the preferred means to bring about changes and liberation”. As he elaborates on the subject of armed struggle, he quarrels with imaginary opponents who would use armed methods exclusive of other methods. But his treacherous point is to obscure the fundamental Marxist-Leninist truth that the counter-revolutionary state can be overthrown only by armed force.

He refers to the forces of revolution in oppressed countries as “invariably preferring peaceful means for correcting economic and political inequalities”. He insists that revolutionaries take up arms when peaceful means are “exhausted”, but what he is more eager to convey is that counter-revolutionaries “take up arms with reluctance, usually after being provoked into it”.

This revisionist imbecile is not seeking to confuse anyone, certainly not U.S. imperialism and its stooges, but the revolutionary masses. But he fails. True revolutionaries will not simply prefer peace; they prepare for and, whenever conditions permit, wage armed struggle. They do not confuse the desire for peace with the real necessity and principle of armed revolution. And they are not merely provoked to fight, they take full initiative in fighting. It is sheer stupidity to picture revolutionaries as passive or desperate before the counter-revolutionary state and before the aggressive nature of U.S. imperialism.

All of Pomeroy’s confusion results from his main thesis:

The present historical period, to a great extent than any in the past, is making it possible for oppressed people to emerge into freedom in a variety of ways, of which armed struggle is but one.

This is nothing but a cheap denial and whitewashing of the counter-revolutionary bloody crimes of U.S. imperialism against the oppressed peoples. Khrushchovite revisionism which in previous years whined about “a world without weapons, without armed forces and without wars” has provided the state capitalist basis for the full emergence of social-imperialism under the Brezhnev revisionist gang. Since the sixties, U.S. imperialism and Soviet social-imperialism have competed in unleashing counter-revolutionary violence. The proletarian revolutionaries of the world remain firm in recognizing and fighting the violent nature of imperialism and its stooges.

Pomeroy elaborates on his revisionist thesis:

In this respect, the present historical period which is one of general transition to socialism and of the breaking up of the colonial system of imperialism, is capable, as time goes on, of proving somewhat different from the preceding great historical change from feudalism to capitalism. The latter was marked by waves of armed revolution, civil wars, and national wars, conducted by the rising capitalist class to attain power. In the present period, the forces for socialism aim for a

classless society without war, and seek to prevent the ruling capitalists from turning to the reactionary weapon of violence to maintain themselves and their systems.

The formulation that the general transition from capitalism is peaceful was first formally raised in 1956 by Khrushchov in the anti-Stalin 20th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union in violation of the Marxism-Leninism. Pomeroy merely echoes his now-gone revolutionist master. This fake communist, an agent of counter-revolution, tries to turn Marxism-Leninism upside down and considers armed struggle as having been outmoded. Making no distinction between revolutionary violence and counter-revolutionary violence, he condemns violence in the abstract as “a reactionary weapon”.

Pomeroy stated further:

This feature of the great transition from one social system to another that is going on at present in the world contributes to the many forms of revolutionary struggle that are possible to exist side by side today: political, economic, ideological, parliamentary, non-violent resistance, mass demonstration, general strike as well as wars for national liberation. While each form of struggle is shaped by the historical conditions and by the class relationship and alliances within a country, it is also molded by the relationships of the major capitalist and socialist countries internationally.

Pomeroy should not try to fool anyone by downgrading armed struggle as being “only one among a variety of ways”. The fact is that armed struggle is one of the two forms or aspect of struggle, the other one of which is parliamentary or peaceful struggle. It does not help him to obfuscate the two aspects of the struggle by enumerating several particular forms of peaceful struggle. As mind you, when you employ armed struggle as the principal form of struggle in the countryside of a semi-colonial and semi-feudal country we use peaceful or legal struggle as our secondary form of struggle to advance the armed struggle. As a matter of fact, the peaceful form of struggle is the principal form of struggle in the cities of a semi-colonial and semi-feudal country like the Philippines before the the final seizure of the cities. It would be futile and putschist to bank on city uprisings without coordination with a people’s army that has triumphantly matured in the countryside and is already capable of winning victory in the cities.

Armed struggle is being waged without let-up in the world’s countryside of Asia, Africa and Latin America. The victories being achieved here, such as those of the Indochinese people, gravely weakening U.S. imperialism and are tremendously helping the proletariat and people in the cities of the world to advance their revolutionary cause. In turn, the revolutionary mass movement in imperialist countries is helping the armed struggle in the world’s countryside. We should grasp the dialectical relationship and forward movement of the revolutionary forces in both cities and countryside of the world.

The Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution in Socialist China has served the revolutionary armed struggle raging throughout the world. The revolutionization of the hundreds of millions of Chinese people has resulted in far greater support than before for the revolutionary armed struggle of the oppressed peoples. Following proletarian internationalism as the general line of

its foreign policy, the People's Republic of China is splendidly performing its task of supporting the revolutionary forces of the world morally and materially. It is the powerful rear of the great war of resistance of the Indochinese people against U.S. imperialist aggression. The struggle of the Indochinese people is today's focus of armed revolution in the world.

In their struggle for liberation, the oppressed peoples are opposed not only by U.S. imperialism but also by Soviet social-imperialism. In Indochina today, for instance Soviet social-imperialism supports the Lon Nol puppet government of U.S. imperialism in Cambodia and continues to sabotage the struggle of the Vietnamese and Laotian peoples covertly and overtly. When Pomeroy speaks of a particular form of struggle being "molded by the relationships of the major capitalist and socialist countries", he means the bargaining and collusion perpetrated by U.S. imperialism and Soviet modern revisionism over the heads of the people fighting for national liberation and people's democracy.

Pomeroy cannot mislead the people into believing Soviet modern revisionism and its stooges as in any way representing the main world forces for liberation. Instead of thwarting imperialist plans for a major war of aggression, Soviet modern revisionism itself has taken the road of social-imperialism and has had frictions with U.S. imperialism only insofar as they always try to grab each other's spheres of influence. But they are not united in opposing the revolutionary movement of the people and in preaching capitulation and the peace of subjugation according to their respective designs.

Since the counter-revolutionary book of Pomeroy was published in 1964, so much has happened to render it more clearly as pack of lies. The fundamental differences between Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tsetung Thought and modern revisionism have clearly emerged. In the present period of the Brezhnev gang, Khrushchov's pretense for peace has utterly become the violence of the Soviet bureaucrat monopoly bourgeoisie against the people, revolution, communism and China. All the way from Khrushchov to the present period, modern revisionism has meant shameless collusions with U.S. imperialism in acts of brigandage and subversion of the people's will.

Pomeroy claims that thanks to Soviet modern revisionism, leaders in a score of countries in Asia and Africa like India, Ghana and Nigeria have been able to maneuver for "freedom" without armed struggle. He claims further that armed control or armed intervention by imperialism have been removed from these countries. He even suggests that from their given status in 1964, these countries could develop towards "socialism". What revisionist trash this Pomeroy is capable of concocting!

India is not genuinely free and is under the oppression and exploitation of U.S. imperialism, Soviet social imperialism and the Indian comprador-bureaucrat bourgeoisie and landlord class. The U.S.-inspired coup d'état against the Kwame Nkrumah government is an unmistakable proof for the opposite of what Pomeroy is prating about. Nigeria has been the hapless victim of the savage intervention of British-U.S. imperialism and Soviet social-imperialism. Pomeroy has merely exposed himself as an agent of counter-revolution by foolishly giving examples to support his revisionist thesis.

Pomeroy claims that “popular armed struggle has had its origin in the outlawing of trade unions and peasant unions that have sought to gain for workers and peasants a greater share of the superprofits that imperialist extract from their labor”. He implies that if the ruling classes allow the legal existence of trade unions and peasant unions there can be no more basis for armed revolution. He also misrepresents the workers and peasants as wishing merely to have “a greater share of the imperialist super-profits”. All this superficiality is calculated to attack the fundamental principles of Marxism that have inspired the working people to wage revolutionary armed struggle.

In his book’s very first chapter entitled “Why Guerrilla Warfare”, Pomeroy keeps on trying to dissuade the people from waging armed struggle. In his final paragraph to this chapter, he admits the fact that guerrilla warfare has had a greatly expanded application in the period and seems to endorse guerrilla warfare, especially when he refers to it as the most effective means for an initially unarmed people. But again he manages to put in something dissuasive for small countries which runs to the effect that guerrilla warfare is a form of struggle “that is fitted to large underdeveloped areas; where advanced mechanized equipment can be least advantageously used”. This is nothing but a repetition of an old notion he has long shared with Luis Taruc.

In his May 20th Statement (1970) Chairman Mao teaches us:

Innumerable facts prove that a just cause enjoys abundant support while an unjust cause finds little support. A weak nation can defeat a strong, a small nation can defeat a big. The people of a small nation can certainly defeat aggression by a big country, if only they dare to rise in struggle, dare to take up arms and grasp in their own hands the destiny of their country. This is a law of history.

## **II. On The Jose-Jesus Lava Leadership**

The chapter on the “The Philippine Model” occupies a central position in Pomeroy’s nine-chapter book. Here, he makes certain self-damning admissions which confirm facts cited by the document of rectification, “Rectify Errors and Rebuild the Party”, of the Communist Party of the Philippines.

It is our task to debunk Pomeroy’s muddle-headed apologia for the basic errors of the Lavas. The method of doing so is simply to expose the contradicting statement; the confusion in the posing of problems; the failure to distinguish strategy from tactics; and the placing of principal stress on secondary matters.

What makes Pomeroy’s writings dangerous to the revolutionary movement in the present period is that these use the “Left” opportunism of the Jose Lava leadership to justify Right opportunism. At present, the Lavaites appear to be too willing to repudiate the errors of the Jose Lava leadership but only to endorse the Right opportunism and modern revisionism of Jesus Lava and William J. Pomeroy. They deliberately confuse the meaning of the “Left” opportunism to exculpate the Jose-Jesus Lava leadership from it and to attack through the method of

misrepresentation the Communist Party of the Philippines and the New People's Army on the Question of armed struggle.

The revisionist Pomeroy states that after World War II "there was no organized insurrectionary effort with the clearest strategic and tactical aims in the Philippines, as did occur elsewhere in Asia". He confirms that the HUKBALAHAP that had fought a guerrilla war against Japanese occupation was disbanded after the war and its cadres and members shifted to "legal forms of parliamentary and economic struggle".

But to apologize for the craven desire of the Tarucs and Lavas to gain official ranks in the puppet reactionary government during that time, Pomeroy declares:

The Huk movement had to take into account the fact that its organization was limited to half a dozen provinces on the island of Luzon while American-influenced guerrilla forces existed elsewhere. Furthermore, there had been a legislated promise of independence by the United States to occur in 1946, and a strong puppet political organization was ready to reassume control of the country backed by U.S. troops and American controlled Filipino armed forces.

Pomeroy blames the masses, not the Lavas and Tarucs for the "movement" becoming unprepared against the return of U.S. imperialism to the Philippines. Such unpreparedness is presented as the excuse for the disbanding of the HUKBALAHAP and the immersion of the Lavas and Tarucs in the business of bourgeois parliamentarism. Pomeroy completely obscures the fact that these scoundrels failed to pursue correctly the policy of unity and struggle in the wartime anti-fascist alliance; promoted the erroneous "retreat for defense"; neglected to forewarn the people of the return of U.S. imperialism and the feudal exploiters; and failed to build up a firm democratic basis for resisting the return of these monsters.

Pomeroy arrogantly states that the "Huk masses" had "a tendency of illusion to regard the American army as an ally". This revisionist scoundrel needs to be reminded that before, during and after the anti-fascist war of resistance it was the Lavas and Tarucs who took the stand that U.S. imperialism would truly grant independence to the Filipino people. (Pomeroy would even now speak approvingly of the Anti-Imperialist League" in the United States "for helping to secure legislation in the American congress that put the Philippines on the road of self-rule". What "self-rule" is he talking about?)

Pomeroy contradicts himself by admitting that in the face of mailed-fist blows the Huk armed forces regrouped and fought, spontaneously and virtually without central guidance; and that the Communist Party was at this time disorganized, without unity on strategy and tactics and with no clear perspective for the period ahead. During a period of constant and spreading armed struggle from mid-1948, the leaders of the "movement" were brazenly assisting the counter-revolutionary puppet state in its campaign of "pacification" and begging for the "restoration of the former state of democratic rights, such as they were".

In an attempt to prettify the Jose Lava leadership, Pomeroy claims that "a more clearly-oriented leadership" was chosen in May 1948 and that a program of struggle with "definite liberation

aims” was adopted. Again contradicting himself, Pomeroy admits that “the effort was made to employ the expanding strength of the Huks as a lever to attain a democratic peace, for the resumption of parliamentary struggle”. The Lavas and Tarucs preoccupied themselves with begging the reactionary government to adopt a “pro-nationalist, anti-imperialist line”, instead of clarifying and promoting the correct strategy and tactics of people’s war.

Thus, in June 1948 the more-clearly-oriented leadership" permitted Luis Taruc to haggle publicly with the Quirino puppet regime over the sale of the revolution. Pomeroy acclaims this treachery towards the revolutionary masses as the victory for the Huk movement. He is elated that the Huk movement maneuvered for accepted an amnesty from the new president".

Pomeroy admits further that although “an armed struggle and an expansion policy” was pursued by the Huk leadership throughout 1948 and 1949, it still did not give up the “the possibility of a democratic settlement”. According to him, it had hoped that its support for the Nacionalista Party and its candidate Jose P. Laurel in the 1949 elections would result in a “peaceful nationalist-oriented agreement”.

It is obvious by Pomeroy’s own words that the Lavas and Tarucs consistently acted as the political representatives of the bourgeoisie within the revolutionary movement and within the old merger party no less. Only after being frustrated in their own bourgeois political ambitions did they seize formal leadership in the old merger party from more barefaced Rightists like Pedro Castro and Jorge Frianeza. They consistently tried to use the revolutionary mass movement in maneuvering for concessions from an enemy far more clever than they were in the game of duplicity.

Pomeroy confesses:

At anytime up to this point 1948 the American imperialists and their landlord-comprador allies in the Philippines could have attained peace without a radical change in the social system and without a tremendous waste of more lives and resources, merely by lifting the policies of suppressions.

Unwittingly, Pomeroy is hereby revealing that had the enemy been willing to grant concessions to the Lavas and Tarucs and allowed them to enjoy these in peace, the revolutionary armed struggle could have been cut short and the enemy could have had his peace too.

Pomeroy states that in January 1950, after three years of suppression and resistance, the Huk movement declared the existence of a “revolutionary situation”. He puts forward the muddle-headed view that “the Huk movement passed over from defensive tactics and the tactics of reconciliation to tactics of the offensive”. Here we notice that Pomeroy either does not know what he is talking about or he is deliberately trying to confuse his readers.

What is meant by “revolutionary situation” coming about only in 1950? Obviously, Pomeroy has some quaint definition of this term, a definition that denies the concrete conditions of a semi-colonial and semi-feudal country where the oppressed masses had started to do battle with the

reactionaries even before 1950. At any rate, he uses the term to mean that in 1950 upon the formal declaration of a “revolutionary situation” by the Lavas and Tarucs the situation was already ripe enough for a people’s army of no more than five thousand troops to go on a “strategic offensive” in order to achieve the strategic aim of seizing political power on a nationwide scale within the extremely short period of two years. What he means by passing from “defensive tactics and the tactics of reconciliation” to “tactics of the offensive” is leaping from conducting parliamentary struggle as the principal form of struggle and engaging in Right opportunist capitulationist activity to taking the “Left” opportunist line of doing away with a protracted people’s war and immediately launching a “strategic offensive” to liberate the country in a jiffy. The impetuosity of the Lavas and Tarucs is characteristic of unremoulded petty bourgeois who sneak into a proletarian party. Bourgeois or petty-bourgeois subjectivism gives rise to sudden shifts from Right opportunism and “Left” opportunism.

We have numbskulls pretending to be Marxist-Leninists before us. There was no basis yet for a strategic offensive in 1950. The balance of forces then was such that the revolutionary movement was still in the stage of strategic defensive and of tactical offensives as it was before 1950. To wage guerilla warfare and fight on exterior lines within interior lines is to fight in the best possible way we can in a semi-colonial and semi-feudal country, destroy the militarily superior enemy piece by piece in the expanses of the countryside and gain the protracted time necessary for arousing and mobilizing the broad masses of the people on a nationwide scale, deepening the agrarian revolution and the anti-imperialist struggle and building all the basic weapons of the revolution. If only these pretenders to being revolutionaries had studied the works of Chairman Mao and the concrete conditions of the Philippines, they would have known what to do and would not have gambled away the small armed strength of the revolutionary movement.

Pomeroy makes two clashing statements that are both calculated to minimize and obscure the strategic and tactical responsibilities of the Jose Lava leadership:

- 1) The principal factor in the setback of the Huk movement was the ruthless military suppression, carried out in with vast quantities of U.S. military aid, by an army equipped, trained and supervised by an American military advisory group.
- 2) The Huk movement suffered its setback, in the main, because of its own tactical faults; it was due less to the strength and policies of the forces of suppression.

Like any other liar, Pomeroy is bound to be caught with his own words.

The Jose Lava leadership was responsible for strategic errors, not merely tactical errors. These strategic errors played into the hands of an enemy with superior military force. It is futile for Pomeroy to insist that armed struggle of an “insurrectionary nature” was “unavoidable”. It is more futile for him to put in the qualification that such should have been coupled with “phases of legal struggle”. He gives a distorted interpretation of protracted people’s war by suggesting that it should have been carried out as a minor adjunct of legal struggle.

It should be made clear to all that based on the given strength of the revolutionary armed forces and the entire revolutionary movement in the period following World War II, the policy of strategic defensive and tactical offensive, with annihilation taking the principal role, should have been carried out before and after 1950. At all times, legal mass struggle in cities and towns should have been carried out to support the revolutionary armed struggle. The policy of the united front should have been applied in the conduct of the armed and legal forms of struggle and it should have been used to serve the armed struggle.

It is petty-minded of Pomeroy to claim that the errors in theory and strategy of the Lava leadership were caused “to a great extent” by the “comparative isolation” (geographic) of the Philippine national liberation movement. He prates that only one or two of its leaders (that includes him, the pompous ass, of course) had ever been outside of the Philippines to share the experiences and lessons of other struggles in other countries. Instead of admitting that the theoretical works of Chairman Mao had reached the Philippines and had been arrogantly dismissed by the Lavas and Tarucs as inapplicable, Pomeroy prefers to make an outrageous lie and says that “not a single theoretical work by any Marxist or non-Marxist authority on guerrilla struggle was in the possession of the Huk movement.”

The truth is the theoretical works of Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin and Mao Tsetung had reached the Philippines even before the outbreak of World War II. Furthermore, after World War II, there was already the military experience of the Filipino people and the HUKBALAHAP to analyze and sum up. Instead, the Lavas and Tarucs were bent on welcoming the U.S. imperialists and, therefore also the landlords, as early as September 1944 even as the “retreat for defense” policy was being repudiated. When armed struggle by the revolutionary masses grew irresistibly, the Jose Lava leadership sabotaged it by using the 90-week Master Training Schedule of the U.S. Army and Pomeroy’s G.I. wisdom as the principal guide.

It is utterly ludicrous to dismiss the debacle of October 1950, the capture of the entire principal leadership of the old merger party in Manila as nothing but the result of “overconfidence, carelessness and faulty security measures of the national liberation movement”. All the local revisionist renegades must be sharply told that such a debacle was the result of the colossal and stupid error, the deliberate opposition to Marxism-Leninism by the general representatives of the bourgeoisie within the old merger party. Even now, this kind of stupidity is being repeated by the revisionist renegades. That the Jose Lava leadership maintained itself in a location (Manila) where it was least able to protect itself was the result of errors in theory and strategy.

Obsessed with the business of emphasizing the secondary to obscure the principal causes of the failure of the Jose Lava leadership and subsequently of the Jesus Lava leadership, Pomeroy claims that there was “not even one leader with anything approaching a grasp of over-all military theory of the elements of strategy and tactics affecting the Philippine situation”; that the “lack of military leadership was equaled by the poor quality of arms in the hands of the Huks and of guerrilla technology”; and that “no aid of any kind, whether in the form of arms funds or training facilities, were available from outside the Philippines”.

Pomeroy is really dead set on misleading the Filipino people and all revolutionaries. He is in search of outstanding generals schools in bourgeois military academies and fails to see how a truly revolutionary party of the proletariat gets the best out of its Marxist-Leninist theory and practice and produces its own leaders in the course of revolutionary struggle. He deprecates the “poor quality” of arms that had been seized during the anti-fascist war of resistance and that could be seized further from enemy. He is greatly dissatisfied that the people’s army was armed with machine guns and Browning automatic rifles. What does he want? Planes and tanks for the people’s army right away? Perhaps, he also wants to have atomic bombs inasmuch as he makes the hyperbolic lie that the people’s army did not have even grenades (which it had).

Pomeroy feels sorry that the workers and peasants were armed chiefly with courage. Was that not a fine thing? If this political power were handled well, it could have produced the technicians of skill, the radio system, the means of communications, the explosives and all the rest that Pomeroy merely prayed for. The principal error of the Lavas and Tarucs was their purely military viewpoint and putschism.

Pomeroy bewails the fact that no foreign aid came for the Philippine national liberation movement. He writes that there were no groups of committees to inform the world of what was happening or to rally international support. Pomeroy has an utterly distorted view of the great principle of the proletarian internationalism. The revolutionary mass movement of the Philippines then as now continues to be assisted with more than the handouts he asks for. The universal theory of Marxism-Leninism is certainly of great assistance to a truly revolutionary movement. The revolutionary struggles of other peoples against U.S. imperialism are always of great assistance to the Filipino people.

Pomeroy was the “foreign adviser” not only to the Jose Lava leadership but also to the Jesus Lava leadership. He provided “theoretical support” for the policy of “protracted war with the elements of attrition” adopted by the Jesus Lava leadership in the February-March 1951 emergency Central Committee conference. Nothing came out of this policy as it failed to rectify and as a matter of fact prolonged the “Left” opportunism of the Jose Lava leadership. According to Pomeroy, Jesus Lava leadership eventually had to make “a shift of tactics” in 1955 “that finally recognized the necessity of armed struggle and legal struggle tactics”. What is actually meant here is the promotion of the line of protracted legal struggle and roving rebel outlook among the remnants of the people’s army that later degenerated to become the Taruc-Sumulong gangster clique.

Pomeroy keeps on using the term “tactics” to refer to every stage of revolutionary mass movement under the Lavas. It appears that the leadership of the Lavaites was always bereft of any definite strategic line. Certainly they always had some kind of strategic line and strategic errors, too. As a matter of fact, the strategic line and errors of the Lavas and the Lavaites were more than enough to consign them to the garbage heap of the history.

As if the Lavaite bourgeois leadership is something invincible, Pomeroy makes believe that the resurgence of the revolutionary movement in the 1960s was the result of the protracted legal struggle led by Jesus Lava. Everyone knows that by 1960, there was not a single Party branch

under the one-man leadership of Jesus Lava. The persistent armed struggle in the countryside and the revolutionary mass movement in the city were carried out without his leadership. Between 1955 and 1964, Jesus Lava performed the followings “feats” of protracted legal struggle: flight from the countryside, political isolation in his room, his policy of liquidating the Party and finally his surrender to the reactionary government. In 1963-64, the Taruc-Sumulong gangster clique brazenly started to impose its own kind of counter-revolutionary leadership over the people’s guerrillas in Central Luzon without Jesus Lava raising any kind of protest.

### **III. On The Great Communist Leaders**

To sugar-coat his counter-revolutionary statements, Pomeroy acknowledges the fact that as early as 1849 Marx said:

A nation, fighting for its liberty, ought not to adhere rigidly to the accepted rules of warfare. Mass uprisings, revolutionary methods, guerrilla bands everywhere; such are the only means by which a small nation can hope to maintain itself against an adversary superior in numbers and equipment. By their use weaker force can overcome its stronger and better organized opponents.

A full hundred years after in 1949, the correctness of the theory and practice of people’s war was conclusively proven upon the victory of the Chinese revolution under the proletarian revolutionary leadership of Chairman Mao Tsetung. What is amazing about a book purporting to discuss guerrilla and counter-guerrilla warfare is that it completely omits and disregards Chairman Mao’s theory of people’s war and his unprecedentedly vast experience in leading and winning a people’s war. It is only at one point in Pomeroy’s book and in his chapter on “guerrilla warfare” in American history that Pomeroy refers to Chairman Mao in passing as having George Washington for a “forerunner”.

Pomeroy has no intention at all of discussing guerrilla warfare as revolutionary weapon. For that would require an extensive discussion of Chairman Mao’s theory and practice of people’s war. Even in his discussion of American history, he is more interested in bringing out the unsavory about past guerrilla warfare than presenting guerrilla warfare as positive method of people’s resistance in the present era. He slanders the people waging wars of national liberation by saying that “their pattern of struggle” has been that resorted to by the American Committee of Safety 199 years ago which used methods of terror such as house-burning; tarring and feathering; mutilation and the like.

Pomeroy writes at length about the U.S. counter-insurgency program in his book. And he admits that since 1961, in particular, the U.S. armed forces have been increasingly readied and employed for counter-guerrilla warfare against the oppressed people of the world. he denounces the U.S. “special forces” for being guided by what he termed the “French theory of suppression”, “Nazi theory” and the “British experience”. But he fails all throughout the book to show how guerrilla warfare can defeat counter-guerrilla warfare. In the context of his sermon for “peaceful co-existence” and accommodation with U.S. imperialism, his “expose” of the U.S. counter-insurgency program is actually calculated to blackmail the oppressed peoples rather than prepare them for resolute revolutionary armed struggle.

Pomeroy's omission of Chairman Mao becomes more blatant in his chapter devoted to Communists and guerrilla warfare. It merely reveals Pomeroy's counter-revolutionary aims. The omission of Chairman Mao is therefore understandable. Pomeroy mentions or quotes from Marx, Engels and Lenin but only to give a distorted view of them. For this he deserves our contempt.

The revisionist Pomeroy is obsessed with promoting the idea that violence, particularly guerrilla warfare, is something to be shunned. In the style of a mock defender of Communists, he says:

It has been charged by the advocates of repressive "special forces" that guerrilla warfare has been "taken over" by the Communists "for their purposes"; or other words, that Communists are putting an ancient form of warfare to reprehensive use.... The imperialists seek to create two impressions with this charge: to link Communists with violence in the achievement of their ends, and to make it seem that all armed struggle are communist-"instigated".

Mr. Revisionist, we Communists have no need for your sham defense and apologies. We are always proud and ready to employ revolutionary violence against counter-revolutionary violence. What we could be ashamed of and oppose vigorously are illusions that in an oppressive society our revolutionary ends could be achieved basically by peaceful means. In this 100th year of the Paris Commune, we recall the only "correction" made by Marx and Engels in the Communist Manifesto; such correction was noted down in the preface to the 1972 German edition of this great document:

... One thing especially was proved by the Commune, viz. that "the working class cannot simply lay hold of the ready-made state machinery and wield it for its own purposes"....

It is necessary to break up, smash the ready-made state machinery. So that no one may be misled by the revisionist, it is necessary for all Communists to read and re-read Lenin's State and Revolution. The reactionary classes will never surrender their power voluntarily. And so, it is best to hold on to the Marxist-Leninist line on the question of violence.

Recognition of the need for revolutionary violence against counter-revolutionary violence has always been the dividing line between the Marxist revolutionaries and the opportunists. It was the dividing line between Leninism and the Second International; it spelled the differences between the revolutionary triumph of the Bolsheviks in the October Revolution and the slavish servitude of the revisionists and opportunists to imperialism. The victory of the Chinese revolution again proved the truth that "Political power grows of the barrel of a gun."

Knowing no bounds for his counter-revolutionary views, Pomeroy makes a brazen lie, a misrepresentation of Marx and Engels. He states:

The setbacks given to mass insurrectionary struggles in the middle period of the 19th century when capitalism was consolidating itself, led to a major shift of tactics by the Second International to electoral struggles by the working class parties. This was endorsed by Marx and Engels.

We notice here that the modern revisionism to which Pomeroy adheres is the forebear of the classical revisionism of the Kautskys and Bernsteins whom the great Lenin constantly and thoroughly assailed in defense of Marxism. Pomeroy has the most condemnable temerity to besmirch the names of Marx and Engels through sheer prevarication by claiming that these two great founders of communism indorsed the revisionist line of the Second International. Marx died in 1883, some six years before the founding of the Second International. How could he have made any endorsement? While alive, Engels always upheld the Marxist doctrine of revolutionary violence. It is very pertinent to cite how he stood firm against the revisionists. In 1895, he wrote an introduction to Marx's *The Class Struggles in France* in which he reaffirmed the Marxist doctrine of revolutionary violence. Before this could be published, the leadership urged him to tone down the "over-revolutionary" spirit of the work and make it "more prudent". He subjected the indecisive position of the party's leadership and its efforts to act exclusively within the framework of legality to scathing criticism. However, he agreed to delete or rewrite certain passages. At any rate, the abridged introduction retained its revolutionary standpoint. But subsequently, the revisionist scoundrels of the Second International tried on the basis of this to misrepresent Engels as a defender of "peaceful seizure of power" and as a worshipper of "legality quand meme (at any price)". Filled with indignation, he had the original introduction published in full in the *Neue Zeit*.

Pomeroy acknowledges the fact that in 1918 Lenin states:

... violence will cover a world historical period a whole era of wars of the most various kinds — imperialist war, civil wars within the country, the interweaving of the former with the latter, national wars, the emancipation of the nationalities crushed by the imperialist and by various combinations of the imperialist powers which will inevitably form various alliances with each other in the era of vast state-capitalist and military trusts and syndicates. This is an era of tremendous collapses, of wholesale military decisions of a violent nature, of crisis. It has already begun, we see it clearly — it is only the beginning.

Then, in the guise of "clarifying Lenin and presenting the forces of socialism as basically "peaceful", Pomeroy turns to opposing the truth of Lenin's statement, which accurately describes the world now and for some time still to come. Pomeroy babbles:

These remarks by Lenin have frequently been quoted out of context, in an attempt to prove Communist predilection for violence. The violence that he predicted, however, clearly has its source in the forces of imperialism and not in the forces of socialism. This is actually an assessment of an historical period during which a lone socialist was surrounded by aggressive imperialist powers eager to destroy it, but torn among themselves by uncontrollable rivalries. It was a period spanned by two world wars that arose out of these rivalries, a period featured by the brutal class violence of fascism, all of which underscored the correctness of Lenin's estimate.

Lenin's statement is clear enough. There is nothing for Pomeroy to "clarify". But the point of Pomeroy is not to clarify but to pose Lenin's statement as bearing no more truth, as having lost its validity in what Pomeroy thinks is a "new" historical period. The revisionist scoundrel further babbles:

This [Lenin's statement] was, however, an estimate of an historical period that has now evolved into a new period, the major feature of which is the acceptance of the socialist system by many countries and its growth in conjunction with other powerful forces that tend to curtail and restrain the resource of capitalism to violence as a means of solving its problems.

What a beautiful picture of imperialism Pomeroy wishes to draw! He imagines imperialism as now becoming "restrained" in its use of violence and he asks us to be kind to this monster. Here is one fool that would deny the fact that in 1964, when his book went to press, U.S. imperialism was flagrantly engaged in military intervention under the fancy name of "special warfare" in Vietnam and was set on sending in U.S. aggressor troops in large numbers. That is to cite only the most glaring of so many violent adventures of U.S. imperialism.

In the style of a counter-revolutionary pretending to be a revolutionary, Pomeroy uses Lenin to attack Lenin and has the temerity to say: "Lenin, whose constant emphasis was on the 'concrete analysis of concrete conditions', would have been the first to have recognized a new situation." Pomeroy's "new situation" is supposed to permit "peaceful transition".

Always contradicting himself, Pomeroy cannot deny at one point what he calls the "proliferation" of popular guerrilla movements since world war II. But he is quick to say that "neither communist-led nor non-communist-led liberation movements view it as anything but a stage in the tactics of contending with imperialist domination". What a belittling phrase, this "stage in the tactics"! In this regard, he also insists that the peaceful forms of struggle are at par with, if not superior to, armed struggle in the following words:

As previously pointed out, political mass movements, utilizing peaceful or generally peaceful forms of struggle, together with the operation of world factors that often inhibit imperialism from resorting to open intervention or aggression, have been instrumental in an equal number of cases in gaining independence for once-colonial areas.

Pomeroy repeatedly contends that Communist have been among the first to acknowledge that "independence" and "popular programs" can be achieved by peaceful means. He tries to support this view by saying:

In Korea, in Laos, and as proposed in Vietnam, they have readily turned from armed struggle to armed truces and negotiations to realize popular national objectives. In the recent Philippine struggle, from its beginning to end, three Huk leaders made known their readiness to negotiate and to arrive at a democratic peace. Communists have never been wedded to armed means even, when these means have been undertaken through no other alternative, have been ready to terminate them whenever the possibility has arisen of gaining end by avoiding unnecessary losses.

It is peculiar of Pomeroy to dish up the untruth by compounding issues. But let us take one by one the issues he raises. The truce in Korea marked the victory of the Democratic Republic of the Korea in defending itself and failure of U.S. imperialism in its war of aggression. The revolutionary attitude held by the Korean revolutionary leadership and people towards the truce

is still to be prepared not only to defend the north but also to liberate the south by every necessary and possible means so as to reunify the Korean fatherland. With regard to Laos, the facts have clearly shown that the Laotian people are ceaselessly holding their ground through armed struggle and are now coordinating with the two other Indochinese peoples in a revolutionary war of resistance against U.S. imperialism. With regard to Vietnam, we state the obvious to Pomeroy, that the Paris talks cannot formally bring peace to Vietnam without basic reference to the resounding military victories not only of the Vietnamese people but also of the entire Indochinese peoples in the expanded U.S. war of aggression. Pomeroy should take note that the Paris talks has not stopped U.S. imperialism from expanding its war of aggression under the “Nixon doctrine”; it would be disastrous for the Indochinese people to turn away from armed struggle before they can win complete victory and complete independence in the battlefield. Any negotiated settlement will merely reflect the outcome of people’s war.

Pomeroy is thoroughly shameless when he tries to use the opportunism of the Lavas and the Pomeroyes as a model for communists. True Communists, not the fake ones like the Lavas and Pomeroyes, know their Marxist-Leninist theory of state and revolution. Pomeroy cannot be allowed to misrepresent Communists as imbeciles like him who would throw away their arms whenever the enemy offers to make a cheap bargaining agreement. The opportunist errors of the Lavas and Tarucs have already been discarded by the Communist Party of the Philippines. The party is determined to root out all the poisonous weeds spread by the opportunist leaders of the old merger party.

In his revisionist renegade line, Pomeroy believes that the imperialists’ “knowledge of guerrilla warfare” may well be “the great deterrents of aggression in the future”. We tell him that the enemy will always try to know guerrilla warfare in order to set its own counter-guerrilla warfare. What is most convincing to the enemy is his actual defeat. To rebuff Pomeroy and his imperialist matters, we quote from Chairman Mao:

Make trouble, fail, make trouble again, fail again... till their doom; that is the logic of the imperialist and all reactionaries the world over in dealing with the people’s cause, and they will never go against this logic. This is a Marxist law. When we say that “imperialism is ferocious”, we mean that its nature will never change, that the imperialist will never lay down their butcher knives, that they will never become Buddhas till their doom.

Fight, fail, fight again, fail again ... till their victory; that is the logic of the people, and they too will never go against this logic. This is another Marxist law. The Russian people’s liberation revolution followed this law, and so has the Chinese people’s revolution.

## **IV. On “Peaceful Coexistence” And Accommodation With U.S. Imperialism**

After distorting and opposing the revolutionary statement of the great communist leaders, Pomeroy makes a quotation from Khrushchov calculated to make this revisionist buffoon look like a grandiloquent advocate of revolutionary armed struggle among the oppressed peoples. But

Pomeroy echoes from him all the lies about “peaceful coexistence” being the general line of the world revolution.

It was during the 22nd Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union in 1961 that the general line of “peaceful coexistence” was formally systematized by the Khrushchov revisionist in violation of Marxism-Leninism. The main content of this erroneous line was “peaceful coexistence”, “peaceful competition” and “peaceful transition”. In addition, the dictatorship of the proletariat and the party of the proletariat were misrepresented in bourgeois populist terms as the “state of the whole people” and the “party of the whole people”, respectively. The erroneous general line of “peaceful coexistence” was drawn to oppose proletarian internationalism as the most fundamental principles in the external relations of socialist countries and Marxist-Leninist parties. It was drawn to distort the Leninist policy of peaceful coexistence in the relations between socialist countries and other countries with different social systems.

The People’s Republic of China has consistently placed the policy of peaceful coexistence in its correct Leninist context. It is one of the three aspects of a proletarian foreign policy and ranks third after such aspects as the development of relations of friendship, mutual assistance and cooperation with socialist countries on the principle of proletarian internationalism and support and assistance for the revolutionary struggles of all the oppressed people and nations. The policy of peaceful coexistence is as good as it serves to strengthen the socialist countries and the revolutionary movements in various countries. It has also been put by China on the basis of the Five Principles of a) mutual respect for territorial integrity and sovereignty, b) mutual non-aggression, c) mutual non-interference in each other’s internal affairs, d) equality and mutual benefit, and e) peaceful coexistence.

According to Pomeroy, the concept of “peaceful coexistence” is based on the “realities” of the world in transition from capitalism to socialism. There are four “realities” which he keeps harping on in his entire book.

First, the people of the world have been confronted by imperialism “with the imminence of history’s most terrible form of violence, nuclear war”. In this regard, Pomeroy pictures the Soviet revisionists as the savior of the world for having nuclear power. They are made to appear as having brought U.S. imperialism to the “realization that it cannot expand a suppressive war without risking a total war of nuclear annihilation”. Thus, the Soviet Union and the United States, because they are both nuclear superpowers, are supposed to be able to decide between themselves alone the fate of mankind of the destiny of every people, nation and country. We have explained before that it is not weapons that decide history but people aroused and mobilized under correct revolutionary theoretical and practical guidance. U.S. imperialism and Soviet modern revisionism have consistently tried to monopolize nuclear weapons so as to blackmail the people and advance their respective imperialist interests.

Second, “the aggressive nature of U.S. imperialism is changing”. In support of this revisionist contention. Pomeroy claims that U.S. imperialism has a “peace-loving wing” (which he sometimes calls “realistic”) and a “war mongering wing” (which he sometimes calls “aggressive”) among its policy-makers. He claims that the Khrushchovite line of “peaceful

coexistence” is favored by a definite section of the bourgeoisie of the developed countries, which takes a sober view of the relationship of forces and of the dire consequences of modern war". Our view is that the general line of “peaceful coexistence” serves U.S. imperialist aggression and puts hope on the big bourgeoisie in the United States rather than on the American people.

Third, “almost all newly independent countries” (like India, Ghana, etc.) are taking a “policy of non-alignment” endorsing the idea of "peaceful coexistence and giving “full attention to peaceful economic and social development”. In this regard, the Soviet Union is supposed to have opened for these countries “the paths to non-capitalist development in peace”. Our view is that these paths have been specially suited for the oppression and exploitation of the people by U.S. imperialism, Soviet social-imperialism and the local reactionaries in Asia, Africa, and Latin America.

Fourth, the “peace movement” in various countries is making U.S. imperialism “less aggressive”. In this regard, Pomeroy shows what kind of “peace movement” he has in mind. According to him, it is one which endorses Johnson’s slogan, “war on poverty”; which begs for “civil rights” instead of exposing and opposing the imperialist state; and which considers the “test ban” treaty (a flimsy camouflage for strategic nuclear stockpiles) a part of the campaign for peace and disarmament as much as the demand for the withdrawal of U.S. troops from Vietnam. Our view is that the militant masses of workers, peasants, youth and intellectuals now engaged in various forms of anti- imperialist protest can certainly laugh at the shallowness of the revisionist Pomeroy.

Concerning Khrushchov’s policy on Cuba in late 1962, Pomeroy writes: The stand of the Soviet Union in this instance, placing itself resolutely on the side of Cuba with its missile strength, halted the mounting campaign of imperialist intervention on Cuba and contributed greatly to impressing upon American imperialism the permanence of the Cuban revolution.

It is convenient for Pomeroy to forget that it was the revolutionary unity and courage of the Cuban people that isolated and destroyed the U.S. invasionary force at Playa Giron and that served notice to U.S. imperialism that any other invasion would meet the same fate. It is also convenient for Pomeroy to forget that Khrushchov was adventurist in putting up nuclear missiles in Cuba and was capitulationist in withdrawing these as soon as the U.S. imperialist chieftain Kennedy made counter-threats against the Soviet Union. The revisionist buffoon capitulated to U.S. imperialism to the extent of agreeing to the latter’s demand for “inspection” of Cuban territory in contravention of the sovereignty of the Cuban people. In the final analysis, it was the revolutionary unity of the Cuban people that stopped U.S. imperialism from the gravest acts of aggression.

In commenting upon the level of U.S. military intervention in South Vietnam in 1964, Pomeroy would rather imagine that his “forces of peace” are compelling or persuading U.S. imperialism to retreat than present the actual balance of forces and the victories of the revolutionary forces over a series of counter-insurgency plans of U.S. imperialism. Also, he would rather engage in word-play on that he imagines as the “aggressive sectors” and “peaceful sectors” of U.S. imperialism than analyze Johnson’s scheme of aggression and the basic character of U.S. imperialism.

Pomeroy dishonestly tries to spread the belief that “the imperialists are forced more and more toward abandonment of preparation for a major war”. Now that the Vietnam war has expanded into the Indochinese war, we can definitely laugh with derision at Pomeroy’s convoluted analysis below:

... the expressed desire of the more rabid wing of American imperialism, of winning in South Vietnam by spreading the war to all the liberated countries of Asia, is a realization of the tremendous encouragement given the people of the South Vietnam by the victories of the socialist countries and the national liberation movement elsewhere. At the same time, the inability of American imperialism to carry out such a scheme is evidence of the strength of the forces of peace that make imperialism hesitate to embark on such aggression.

It is best to be guided by Chairman Mao’s teaching: “With regard to the question of war, there are but two possibilities: One is that war will give rise to revolution and the other is that a revolution will prevent war.” In his solemn May 20th Statement, Chairman Mao declares: “The danger of a new world war still exists and the people of all countries must get prepared. But revolution is the main trend in the world today.”

Lenin also pointed out long ago that imperialism means war “... imperialist wars are absolutely inevitable under such an economic system as long as private property in the means of production exists.” Lenin further pointed out: “Imperialist war is the eve of a socialist revolution.” These scientific theses are by no means out of date. It is utterly counter-revolutionary for Pomeroy to insist that the transition from capitalism to socialism is peaceful.

Pomeroy’s *Guerrilla and Counter-Guerrilla Warfare* is a pack of revisionist lies all leading to the counter-revolutionary idea that the revolutionary forces should seek unprincipled accommodation with U.S. imperialism. This idea is most clearly expressed in the book’s final paragraph:

An adjustment by United States imperialism to the realities that confront it in all parts of a world that is undergoing the drastic changes that accompany the transition from capitalism to socialism would increase the possibility of that transition to be accomplished in a relatively peaceful manner. The struggle between colonialists and anti-colonialists, between the imperialists and anti-imperialists between imperialism and the forces of socialism would continue bitterly on all fronts, but the likelihood would be greater that it would involve other forms of struggle, less costly and more peaceful, than the guerrilla warfare that has featured the contemporary period.

The title of Pomeroy’s book should have been “The Counter-Guerrilla Views of a ‘Revisionist Renegade’”. Pomeroy is against guerrilla warfare and is for “other forms of struggle less costly and more peaceful”.

Pomeroy believes that U.S. imperialism can be persuaded to act against its own nature and interests on that basis of “realities”. He claims that in the past 20 years (since 1944) history has provided imperialism with “all necessary lessons in regard to colonial liberation movements” to become peaceful. He cites France and Britain as having been “compelled to swallow these bitter

truths and in number of instances have abandoned attempts to suppress liberation movements when the cost has become too great and when more extensive losses were threatened”.

So, Pomeroy wishes U.S. imperialism to take the path of France and Britain. But he confuses his wishes for the nature of things. As it is in the nature of U.S. imperialism to race with France and Britain towards becoming peaceful? And is to be accepted now that the two latter imperialist countries have lost their own violent nature? Peoples directly oppressed by these countries would certainly protest Pomeroy’s presumptions. With regard to U.S. imperialism, it is clearly common knowledge that it has stepped into the shoes of Hitlerite Germany and fascist Japan since the end of the World War II. For Pomeroy to insist that the aggressive nature of the U.S. imperialism has changed or that it is no longer the No. 1 enemy of the people of the world and the main pillar of the world capitalism and world reaction is to attack everything positive in the 1957 Moscow Declaration and the 1960 Moscow Statement (two documents from which he quotes only to embellish a few pages of his book).

It is idle for Pomeroy to contrapose the “neo-colonial technique of dollar diplomacy” and the aggressive policy of gunboat diplomacy” only to drive in the silly point the U.S. imperialism has a “peaceful nature”. It is also idle for him to prate about the development of a marked differentiation of the policy within the upper political circles of American leadership” only to cover up the essential nature of U.S. imperialism. The Fulbrights, Mansfields and “the growing number of imperialists for whom they speak” do not make aggressive U.S. imperialism any less aggressive. In employing different tactics, the imperialists and reactionaries always proceed from their counter-revolutionary nature and needs. Revolutionaries should see through the counter-revolutionary dual tactics of the enemy, counteract them tit for tat and make use of contradictions in his ranks to advance fundamental revolutionary interests. Working out an accommodation with U.S. imperialism under the revisionist terms proposed by Pomeroy can only lead to bargaining away of principles.

It is utterly wrong and treacherous for Pomeroy to insist on the following:

Whatever the orientation of the “realistic” sectors among the imperialists, any shift from armed suppression and intervention to negotiation and accommodation with liberation forces can only be viewed as defeat for aggressive imperialism and its attempts to reverse revolutionary changes in the world by means of force. It would mean that, in the effort to save themselves from a complete debacle, the imperialists would be compelled to adopt certain of the positions advocated the by the present-day peace movement, a tendency that would strengthen the movement for peace and democracy in the United States and would give a major setback to the ultra-reactionary war-making wing of imperialism.

The modern revisionists always make quite a ruckus distinguishing between the “realistic” and “war-making” wings of U.S. imperialism. Revolutionaries the world over have long seen this hairsplitting as trick to conceal the aggressive nature of U.S. imperialism and to water down the main world contradictions between the oppressed peoples and imperialism. Pomeroy overrates his “present-day peace movement” only to show how “reasonable” is U.S. imperialism and how

unreasonable are the armed revolutionaries. The kind of negotiation and accommodation with U.S. imperialism that Pomeroy is trying to promote is treachery to the revolutionary masses.

As far as we are concerned, U.S. imperialism has daily stepped up its arms expansion and war preparations and has never stopped to commit aggression, intervention, subversion and sabotage.

Pomeroy exposes himself as an agent of U.S. imperialism in saying the following:

The question of whether the peoples of the world who have long suffered under colonial conditions will gain their freedom and will maintain it by peaceful means depends largely on the attitude of the imperialists, in particular the imperialists of the United States.

Only the revisionist agents of U.S. imperialism will depend “largely” on the attitude of U.S. imperialism on the question of gaining freedom. Full initiative must always be in the hands of the revolutionary movement. The masses must be determined in employing revolutionary violence to overthrow their oppressors and exploiters. “Peaceful means” will not liberate any oppressed people from the clutches of imperialism.

The attitude of the people and all revolutionaries towards U.S. imperialism and all reactionaries is best expressed by Chairman Mao:

All reactionaries are paper tigers. In appearance, the reactionaries are terrifying, but in reality they are not so powerful. From a long-term point of view, it is not the reactionaries but the people who are really powerful.

Chairman Mao further said:

Riding roughshod everywhere, U.S. imperialism has made itself the enemy of the people of the world and has increasingly isolated itself. Those who refuse to be enslaved will never be cowed by the atom bombs and hydrogen bombs in the hands of the U.S. imperialists. The raging tide of the people of the world against the U.S. aggressors is irresistible. Their struggle against U.S. and its lackeys will assuredly win still greater victories.

## **Anti-Marxism and Eclecticism**

*(This essay originally appeared in the Ang Bayan special issue of June 15, 1971 under the title “The Anti-Marxism and Eclecticism of the Revisionist Pomeroy”.)*

Guerrilla Warfare and Marxism is mainly a collection of excerpts from diverse authors. It is edited by William J. Pomeroy who avows as the central aim of the book:

... to make clear Marxist-Leninist principles and attitudes in regard to armed struggle, showing how they have emerged in the course of over a century of extremely varied circumstances, and showing how, in the light of a new experiences, they may be used to define the issues of controversy that have arisen out of contemporary armed struggles.

A quick look at the table of contents, at the authors' names and number of pages endowed upon each would immediately show that the book title and the avowed central aim of the editor are misleading and that the editor is utterly dishonest, without any sense of proportion and antagonistic to Marxism and revolutionary guerrilla warfare. By the eclectic choice and arrangement of excerpts, which include so many outrightly anti-communist ones, Pomeroy presents a distorted picture of Marxism and all revolutionary armed struggle.

Decking himself out as some kind of a Marxist arbiter and a revolutionary veteran, Pomeroy endows himself with an unduly great amount of space in the book. He gives a long general introduction and some section introductions, all of which spell out his anti-Marxist standpoint and principal interest of attacking Comrade Mao Tsetung and his Marxist-Leninist theory of people's war. Having no regret for serving once as the hack of the anti-communist traitors Luis Taruc, he includes in his collection an excerpt from the counter-revolutionary and egocentric *Born of the People* and boastfully acknowledges authorship of it. He also includes an excerpt from Jorge Maravilla (Pomeroy himself) on the Philippine revolutionary struggle, particularly on the 1950 debacle of the Jose-Jesus Lava leadership.

Marx, Engels, Lenin and Mao combined have less space than Pomeroy's ramblings. Pomeroy and his fellow writers for the revisionist *World Marxist Review* (like Enrique Lister of Spain, Zizis Zografos of Greece, Bashir Hadj Ali of Algeria, Juan Rodrigues of Venezuela, Alberto Gomez of Colombia, Jose Manuel Fortuny of Guatemala, Jose Cuello and Asdrubal Dominguez of the Dominican Republic and Luis Corvalan of Chile) hog the way and have more to say than all of Marx, Engels, Lenin, Mao Tsetung and Ho Chi Minh combined. To Pomeroy, Stalin has absolutely nothing to say about the Civil War and the anti-fascist Great Patriotic War although Tito and some lesser personalities like I. Minz and A. Fyodorov are allowed some say on armed struggle in the Soviet Union. Definitely, the revisionist Pomeroy is an ideological swindler who would use a few pages from the great communist leaders only as wrappings for rotten goods. All throughout his compilation, he preoccupies himself with the central aim of brazenly or slyly impugning the universal value of Comrade Mao Tsetung's theory and practice of people's war. Unlike his other counter-revisionist book, *Guerrilla and Counter-Guerrilla Warfare*, Pomeroy frequently mentions Comrade Mao Tsetung, the Lenin of the present era, but only to picture him as merely as one among a motley of personalities, which include Kwame Nkrumah, Regis Debray, Ernesto "Che" Guevarra, Pomeroy himself and his revisionist confreres.

*Guerrilla Warfare and Marxism* is peace of ersats. It suffices for the time being to have this critique concentrate on Pomeroy's counter-revolutionary revisionist statements to expose the general character of the book and the counter-revolutionary purpose of Pomeroy in making the compilation. However, all comrades are enjoined to study critically every excerpt incorporated and also to get into its theoretical and historical context.

## **I. Marxism-Leninism And The Question Of Armed Struggle**

To deny the revolutionary essence of Marxism-Leninism, which is to say armed overthrow of the reactionary state and the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat, the counter-

revolutionary revisionist Pomeroy declares that it would be a “grotesque distortion” if Marxism-Leninism is “equated” with violence and armed methods.

To develop his thesis that Marxism-Leninism is essentially a peaceful effort to change society, he sets up and quarrels with his own straw figures as those “few people” who would take arms without mass support and without a “revolutionary situation”. It would seem that he insists on mass support for armed revolution. Indeed, every revolutionary undertaking in order to win; we oppose adventurism even as we oppose capitulationism. But what Pomeroy actually calls for throughout the world is a protracted legal struggle that avoids armed struggle as much as the reactionaries are “willing” to tolerate that legal struggle. At the core of this revisionist line is the stand that the transition from capitalism to socialism is peaceful and that the aggressive nature of imperialism is changing. He is also repeatedly rubs in the treacherous point that to wage armed struggle in any country is to negate and abandon political work that brings about mass support. We must tell him that in the concrete semi-colonial and semi-feudal conditions of the Philippines mass mobilization and mass support in extensive areas in the countryside have been brought about in the course of armed struggle. On an unprecedented scale, political work which encompasses the building of the Party, people’s army, local organs of political power and mass organizations is being carried out. It is impossible for the Filipino proletariat to lead the peasantry and win it over as its main force overthrowing the reactionary state without engaging in armed struggle, agrarian revolution and base building.

The central aim of Pomeroy in his general introduction and sections introductions and in the manner by which he has edited and arranged his compilation of excerpts is to obscure the revolutionary essence of Marxism-Leninism; deny the advance of Marxism-Leninism to the new and higher stage of Mao Tsetung Thought; muddle the basic characteristics of the present era; oppose outrightly the theory of people’s war when he can no longer obscure it; refuse to give living definition of revolutionary situation in the period following World War II, especially with regard to countries in the world’s countryside; and always in consonance with his revisionist line condemn in overt and covert ways every armed undertaking of the oppressed masses.

In misrepresenting Marxism-Leninism as some kind of bourgeois pacifism, Pomeroy goes to the extent of claiming that Marx and Engels had no definite understanding of the word “force” when they said in 1847 in the Communist Manifesto that the ends of Communists “can be attained only by the forcible overthrow of all existing social conditions” Pomeroy states:

Force... in their view — as in the view of outstanding Marxist who have followed them — encompassed the great variety of forms that working class struggles take: mass demonstration, general strikes, and even the relatively passive boycott, as well as armed uprisings (and in particular, combinations of all these).

Bogged down in bourgeois idealism, this revisionist renegade is incapable of Marxist analysis and is always gives to “combining two into one” by babbling mysteriously about “great variety of forms” and “combinations of all these”.

Like all revisionist renegade, Pomeroy deliberately avoids laying out and considering fully the two basic aspects of the revolutionary struggle, and armed struggle and parliamentary or peaceful struggle. These two aspects of revolutionary struggle must be employed at the same time and can be correctly coordinated only by being able to distinguish the principal form from the secondary form in the Philippine revolution, for instance. It is characteristic of Pomeroy to dissolve the importance of armed struggle (which has its own variety of particular forms) mechanistically mentioning so many forms of parliamentary struggle or by attacking straw figures whom he would arbitrarily picture of waging armed struggle exclusive of the various forms of parliamentary struggle.

We must tell Pomeroy that in the Philippines we are waging armed struggle as the main forms of struggle and we are at the same time employing the parliamentary form of struggle as the secondary. The Communist Party of the Philippines is today's vanguard in the waging of both forms of revolutionary struggle whereas the Lava revisionist renegades for whom Pomeroy speaks abroad are far behind the revolutionary movement in the cities or in the countryside and are always gesticulating and cursing the masses in words echoing those of the U.S. imperialists and the reactionaries.

We Filipino Communists recognize, as genuine Marxists have always done, that among oppressed peoples armed struggle is in the final analysis the most important form of revolutionary struggle and certainly more important than parliamentary struggle. We need to remind Pomeroy that Marx and Engels saw even more clearly in the experience of the Paris Commune of 1871 the necessity of smashing and breaking the bourgeois state machinery and establishing the dictatorship of the proletariat.

What sets scientific socialism apart from utopian socialism and sham socialism of every kind is Marx's theory of the dictatorship of the proletariat. Marx and Engels devoted their lives to the clarification of this theory and to painstaking efforts towards the realization of this theory. In 1852, Marx said:

Long before me historians had described the historical development of this class struggle and bourgeois economist the economic anatomy of the classes. What I did that was new was to prove: 1) that the existences of classes is only bound up with particular historical phases in the development of production, 2) that class struggle leads to the dictatorship of the proletariat, 3) that this dictatorship itself only constitutes the transition to the abolition of all classes and to a classless society.

After Marx and Engels, the great Lenin brought Marxism to a new and higher stage by developing further the theory and practice of the proletarian revolution and proletarian dictatorship in the era of imperialism. He triumphantly led the armed seizure of political power by the Bolsheviks in the October Revolution in 1917 and established the first socialist state. Because of his clear grasp of the revolutionary essence of Marxism, Lenin was able to take a full advantage of the favorable conditions for armed revolution created by the first inter-imperialist war. Leninism emerged clearly in the bitter defense of Marxism against the revisionism of

Pomeroy's forefathers in the Second International who turned more rotten as imperialism become more aggressive.

The October Revolution marked the triumph and correctness of Leninism as a definite stage in the development of Marxism. It changed the world revolution completely by giving it a proletarian character and it made clear and feasible the socialist future of the armed revolutions of all oppressed peoples led by the proletariat a great breach was made on the imperialist front in the West. The proletarian dictatorship in the Soviet Union immediately stood the acid test of the Civil War of War Against Intervention and subsequently the anti-fascist Great Patriotic War led by Comrade Stalin. In these great wars, the Soviet people under the great leadership of the Party of Lenin defended the socialist fatherland by waging armed resistance against imperialist aggression.

Taking the road opened by the Paris Commune and further extended by the October Revolution, the Chinese proletariat and people led by Comrade Mao Tsetung launched a protracted people's war, defeated their enemies and made a great breach on the imperialist front in the East. Comrade Mao's correct theory and victorious practice of people's war constituted another great contribution to the treasury of Marxism-Leninism. By this contribution, the Marxist-Leninist theory of proletarian dictatorship has been tremendously enriched and raised to a new and higher level. To all oppressed nations, big and small, in the world's countryside, Comrade Mao Tsetung showed how people's war can be conducted against big imperialist powers.

The Chinese revolution changed further the character of the world revolution by making fuller its proletarian character. As Lenin linked the socialist revolution in the West to the national democratic revolution in the East to the socialist revolution in the West. In the conduct of seizing political power in their respective countries, the methods employed by Lenin and Mao Tsetung complemented each other. In smashing the enemy, one moved from the cities to the countryside and the other moved from the countryside to the cities.

As a result of the World War II, the world situation changed drastically. As a result of the disaster suffered by world capitalism and the emergence of a series of socialist countries to take their destinies into their own hands by taking up arms, especially in the world's countryside of Asia, Africa, and Latin America. The imperialist countries headed by U.S. imperialism have had to face an ever-increasing number of oppressed peoples daring to fight them. The oppressed peoples of Asia, Africa, and Latin America have steadily advanced in their revolutionary struggles as their leadership have increasingly adhered to Chairman Mao's theory of people's war and strategic line of encircling the cities from the countryside.

Even as more and more oppressed peoples in Asia, Africa and Latin America are grasping Chairman Mao's Theory of people's war so that the world countryside now surrounds the cities of the world, the evil winds of modern revisionism blows the tries to sway the oppressed peoples of the world from armed revolution. In the guise of attacking one person, that of the great Marxist-Leninist Stalin, Khrushchov betrayed and attacked the Party of Lenin, put the Soviet Union on the capitalist road, disrupted the international communist movement, changed the red color of some other countries and bargained away principles to U.S. imperialism. After

Khrushchov, the Brezhnev gang has gone on to promote modern revisionism and to perpetrate the most barbarous acts of social-fascism and social-imperialism.

Confronted with the problem of preventing the restoration of capitalism in a socialist society, Comrade Mao Tsetung forward the theory of continuing revolution under the dictatorship of the proletariat and personally initiated and led the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution, it become clear to Marxist-Leninist the world over that Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tsetung Thought is the clear demarcation line between genuine Marxist-Leninists and sham Marxist-Leninists. Mao Tsetung Thought has been lofted as the Marxism-Leninism of the present era when imperialism is heading for total collapse and socialism marching toward world victory.

The Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution is bitter mass struggle waged by the proletariat against the bourgeoisie in a socialist society. It has resulted in the consolidation of the dictatorship of the proletariat and the overthrow of the incorrigible capitalist-roaders headed by China's Khrushchov, Liu Shao-chi. China has become the strongest bulwark of socialism, ensuring the total collapse of imperialism and the worldwide victory of socialism. It provides powerful support to all the armed revolutions being waged by the oppressed nations and peoples. It serves the main trend of the world today which is revolution. The consolidation of socialism in China is of immense benefit not only to the Chinese people but also to the people of the whole world. The hundreds of millions of Chinese people are now more than ever prepared for any eventuality even as they can give ever more powerful support to the armed revolution of oppressed peoples.

Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tsetung Thought firmly stands for revolutionary violence. In the more than one hundred years from Marx to Mao Tsetung, revolutionary violence has remained the essence of Marxism in both theory and practice. Chairman Mao teaches us:

The seizure of power by armed force, the settlement of the issue by war, is the central task and the highest form of revolution. This Marxist-Leninist principle of revolutions holds good universally, for China and for all countries.

## **II. The Universal Significance Of Chairman Mao's Theory Of People's War**

Chairman Mao's theory of people's war is summed up from twenty-two continues years of people's war in a vast country like China. It was a war passing through the Agrarian Revolutionary War, the War of Resistance Against Japan and the people's War of Liberation against the U.S.-Chiang clique. The protraction in time and the vastness of scale of this people's war, contending with the most powerful imperialist and puppet armies and encompassing the widest yet the most particular circumstances, are unprecedented in the entire history of mankind of the international communist movement. The laws summed up from this war cannot be belittled. the whole range of strategy and tactics of the people's war formulated by Chairman Mao fulfills Engels' profound prediction that: "The emancipation of the proletariat, in its turn, will have its specific expression in military affairs and create its specific, new military method."

Only a counter-revolutionary idealist will fail to see the universal significance of the victory of people's war in China and the fact that it has profoundly acted upon world reality. The vastness of China cannot be considered a particularity that separates or isolates the Chinese revolution from other revolutionary struggles in terms of theory and practice. There are those who superficially think that Chairman Mao's theory of people's war applied only on a vast country like China and who also talk as if this country were not composed of many parts, from which the most complex problems arose and were solved by Chairman Mao's theory of people's war and the rich practical experience in which it is based. Genuine Marxist-Leninists the world over have accepted it as an important component of today's Marxism-Leninism and are accordingly being guided by it in making revolution.

After World War II, oppressed nations and peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America have continued to take the road of armed revolution on a long term basis. Most of those waging armed struggle in the world's countryside are applying Chairman Mao's strategic line of encircling the cities from the countryside. Taken together, the peoples fighting for national liberation and democracy in colonies and semi-colonies help the proletariat in the cities of the world anti-imperialist struggle, the Vietnamese, Cambodian and Laotian peoples have helped bring about a situation in the United States and other capitalist countries in which increasingly large masses of the people rise up to fight the evil of U.S. imperialism. The crisis of imperialism, particularly of its main pillar the United States, has been caused in a big and fundamental way by the victories of people's war.

That the people of Asia, Africa and Latin America can wage armed struggle without having to wait for the "revolutionary situation" suited for a city insurrection in capitalist countries is a confirmation of Lenin's theory of imperialism's uneven development which has been amplified correctly in theory and in practice by Chairman Mao. The weakest links of imperialist power are found in the countryside of the world just as they are also to be found in the countryside of a semi-colonial and semi-feudal country. This countryside provides the peoples with a vastly greater area for maneuver and cannot be occupied by the enemy as thoroughly as he would the cities, especially in the stage of his strategic offensive. Until the situation is ripe for their seizure, the cities are the well-secured centers of the political and economic power of the enemy.

Chairman Mao teaches us:

Since China's key cities have long been occupied by the powerful imperialist and their reactionary Chinese allies, it is imperative for the revolutionary ranks to turn the backward villages into advanced, consolidated base areas, into great military, political, economic and cultural bastions of the revolution from which to fight their vicious enemies who are using the cities for attacks on the rural districts, and in this way gradually to achieve the complete victory of the revolution through protracted fighting; it is imperative for them to do so if they do not wish to compromise with imperialism and its lackeys but are determined to fight on, and if they intend to build up and temper their forces, and avoid decisive battles with a powerful enemy while their own strength is inadequate.

The revisionist pipsqueak Pomeroy has the temerity to claim that Chairman Mao's theory of people's war lacks universal significance and that the Chinese revolution does not even qualify as an "Asian model". He says outright:

In fact, successfully conducted guerrilla war has rarely pursued such a pattern [of setting up liberated areas and surrounding the cities from the countryside], contrary to the belief widely held, and to the claim of Chinese leaders themselves that it constitutes a model.

He also attacks Chairman Mao's theory of people's war as being "in conflict with the fundamental concept of internationalism in Marxist-Leninist theory because, according to him, it dismisses the "alliance of the socialist countries and of the working class" and revolutionary forces in the capitalist countries with the national liberation movements in the colonial and neo-colonial countries. Becoming more vicious in his vituperation, he babbles that the un-Marxist generalizations" of Chairman Mao's theory and strategic line become more "emphasized" when expanded into an international principle. He boasts mendaciously that Chairman Mao's theory of people's war has been "dissipated" in Vietnam by the three-way unity of liberation movements, the socialist countries, and the revolutionary and progressive movements in the capitalist countries".

In contending that the Chinese revolution has no universal significance, Pomeroy dogmatizes that the October revolution is the only universal model of armed revolution. He goes so far as to oppose in an absolute way the October Revolution to the Chinese Revolution, Lenin to Mao Tsetung and Leninism to Mao Tsetung Thought instead of recognizing the continuity and distinction between stages of development. The great Lenin should be turning in his grave; his name is being used against Marxism-Leninism by a revisionist scoundrel.

The anti-Marxist and anti-Leninist Pomeroy wants to kill the vitality of the Marxism-Leninism, its continuous theoretical and practical development. In reducing the meaning of the "revolutionary situation" to condition like those attending the October Revolution, conditions that permitted the immediate seizure of cities in an imperialist country after a period of protracted legal struggle, he completely negates the fact that the world proletarian revolution has been fought on varying conditions, undergone distinct stages of development and has wrought changes in the world such that a revolutionary situations exists in the whole continents of Asia, Africa and Latin America after World War II and that the world revolutionary situation has never been better. Favorable conditions for the revolution have so arisen in the world's countryside that small and weak countries here and wage and persist in protracted people's war so long as they adhere to Chairman Mao's theory and strategic line.

There is one basic difference to recognize in considering the revolutionary situation in the cities of the world and in the world's countryside. In the cities of the world, when the revolutionary forces decide to launch armed struggle, failure to seize the cities within the shortest possible time can be disastrous for the revolutionary forces. Here protraction in the legal struggle as the principal form of struggle is necessary and alright so long as ideological and political work is conducted to prepare the proletariat for the armed seizure of power. However, in the world's countryside where the people undergo multiple oppression by imperialism and local reaction,

revolutionary forces have the advantage of being able to engage in protracted people's war in the wide expanses of the countryside. This is in keeping with Lenin's theory of imperialism's uneven development and the Marxist-Leninist method of attacking the enemy at his weakest points. The proletarian revolution in the cities of the world hinges on the national democratic revolution in the world's countryside in the clear sense that the armed struggle in the world's countryside will certainly help to hasten the ripening of the revolutionary situation in the cities of the world.

Pomeroy is so insanely against the universal significance of the Chinese revolution that he denies its significance even to the Asian peoples. He argues that the Chinese revolution is not even an "Asian model" (a fancy term of the bourgeois academicians) by discussing the "particular conditions" and the "variegated forms" of armed struggles in Asia only to break these off from each other and from the Chinese revolution absolutely. By employing the empiricist method of analysis, this counter-revolutionary idealist tries to deprive the various armed struggles outside China of their own universal significance. By trying to isolate the Chinese revolution, Pomeroy also tries to isolate the revolutionary movement in every country and raises the black banner of chauvinism rather than advocate the integration of Marxist-Leninist theory and the concrete conditions of the country. Any criticism of the dogmatism is sham when it is used as a camouflage for pushing empiricism forward. The empiricism of Pomeroy easily leads to attempt to deprive even the October Revolution of its universal significance though at a certain times he poses to be dogmatic in insisting that city insurrections be the principal form of armed struggle in Asia, Africa and Latin America.

Consistent with his counter-revolutionary revisionist standpoint, Pomeroy distorts Vietnamese history. He dishes up the tale that the Vietnamese national liberation forces led Comrade Ho Chi Minh suddenly dropped from the skies and descended upon Hanoi to establish the Democratic Republic of Vietnam by city uprising. The truth is that these revolutionary forces had to gather strength among the people in the countryside before they could launch any insurrection in cities held by the Japanese fascists. Such strength developed mainly among the peasant masses still had to undergo the test of armed aggression by the French colonialists and their allies after the seizure of the Hanoi. Even now the Vietnamese people and the entire Indochinese people rely mainly on their strength in the countryside to resist U.S. imperialism, the biggest and fiercest imperialist aggressor.

The influence of Chairman Mao is very evident in the following words of Vo Nguyen Giap:

While the working class is the class leading the revolution, the peasantry is the main force of the revolution, full of anti-imperialist and anti-feudal spirit. Moreover, in waging the Resistance War, we relied on the countryside to build our bases from which to launch guerrilla warfare in order to encircle the enemy in the towns and eventually arrive at liberating the towns.

In trying to dismiss Chairman Mao's theory and strategic line as being only "one of those things" and having no worthwhile significance in the whole of Asia, Africa and Latin America, Pomeroy takes pride in a lot of wrong things, makes the most outright anti-communist statements and in the style of an intriguer considers as superior to a victorious and well-consolidated revolution

those armed struggles still in progress and in fact guided by Chairman Mao's strategic line of encircling the cities from the countryside. Pomeroy expresses satisfaction that the Jose-Jesus Lava leadership did not use in 1950 the teachings of Chairman Mao on the people's war even as he admits (what else can he do but admit) that this "Left" opportunist leadership failed. But, fool that he is, he expresses belief that there should have been more violations of Chairman Mao's theory of people's war for that particular armed struggle to have been won. He even contends that the Jose-Jesus Lava leadership would have been successful had the Communist Party not taken a prominent role in the armed struggle. He considers as exemplary the fact that Marxism-Leninism and the Communist Party were not in command of the armed struggles in Algeria and Cuba.

With regard to Africa, Pomeroy states

... Historically-evolved conditions in most African countries do not permit the rise of the working class party, with an absence of a proletariat and worker-peasant alliance or radicalized petty bourgeois groups from the leadership that does not come out of such conditions.

Pomeroy wishes to create an image of an Africa completely isolated from modern civilization, notwithstanding the long period that this continent has been subjected to imperialist domination. Another thing that he does to negate the Chinese revolution and Chairman Mao is to imply that the African peoples have nothing to learn from them. As a matter of fact, he would even at the present stage rather rate higher Amilcar Cabral of the Partido Africano da Independencia da Guine e Cabo Verde and Eduardo Mondlane of FRELIMO than the leaders of revolutions already triumphant under clear Marxist-Leninist leadership and already on the path of socialist revolution.

Pomeroy tries to impugn the correct ideas of Chairman Mao that guided the Chinese revolution from the victory to victory as being "un-Marxist". Only a counter-revolutionary idealist would deny the victories of the national democratic revolution and socialist revolution in China under the leadership of Chairman Mao. Let us examine a bit of thinking that this revisionist fool makes on Chinese history. Wishing to reverse what is already a verdict of Chinese history, Pomeroy states in reference to the urban uprisings of 1927 in China:

... These were failures not because the principles of a revolution with urban insurrection playing a key role were not applicable to China, but because of the uneven development of the Chinese Revolution and of its worker-peasant alliance and because of departures from insurrectionary principles (the Canton Commune, for example, had a closer affinity to the Paris Commune than to the October insurrections in Petrograd and Moscow).

This revisionist fool absolutely disregards the semi-colonial and semi-feudal conditions of China then though he pretends to recognize the law of uneven development at work on the side of the revolutionary forces. He insists that the city insurrections were alright in China then had the October Revolution, not to the Paris Commune, been dogmatically imitated. However, he does not bother to explain what were those differences between the Paris Commune and the October insurrections, which differences are presumed by him to be more important than those between

the capitalist countries and semi-colonial and semi-feudal countries. The error of the urban uprisings in China in 1927 was in fighting to the end in the cities and in relying on foreign support. They were correct only insofar as they signaled armed resistance to the Kuomintang reactionaries. The road to the countryside and to the Ching-kang mountains, was correctly shown by Chairman Mao.

To belittle the self-reliant revolutionary efforts of the Chinese people in defeating the Japanese imperialism and then the Kuomintang reactionaries, he considers as “a significant factor” in the final victorious offensive launched by the Chinese Red Army the military equipment supposedly turned over by the Soviet Red Army from the Japanese imperialists in Manchuria. Yet he completely discounts the fact that, though there was coordination between the Chinese Red Army in Manchuria, the main support for military victories was the painstaking mass work and long-term armed struggle waged by the Chinese people in the area. It needs also to be pointed out that armaments captured from the Japanese imperialist were largely turned over to the Kuomintang. Under the correct leadership of Chairman Mao, the Chinese people on their own self-reliant efforts, independence and initiative were able to liberate both the north and the south of their country.

Because he expects that every people fighting for national liberation should be dependent mainly on foreign material assistance, Pomeroy makes the contention that Chairman Mao’s theory of people’s war is lacking in internationalism. The propagation of a correct theory and the taking of anti-imperialist policies and actions by a socialist country like China constitutes an important support for the oppressed peoples of the world. Also, China has performed well its duty of extending material support to various revolutionary movements and anti-imperialist countries. But China has always stood firm on the principle that the people can liberate themselves by relying mainly on themselves. With regard to the Vietnamese revolutionary struggle against the U.S. war of aggression, China is a reliable rear base and is consistently providing tremendous amounts of necessary support for the Vietnamese people. On the other hand, the Soviet revisionist renegades give mere token support to Vietnam only to use it as basis for making bargains with U.S. imperialism over the heads of the Vietnamese people, for sabotaging the Vietnamese revolution and for the sowing intrigues in revolutionary ranks. China has no use for what Pomeroy calls an “alliance of socialist countries”, an expression for mixing up genuine socialist countries and sham socialist countries, to support the Vietnamese struggle. The bilateral relations between China and Vietnam is good enough for each one to perform its internationalist duty.

Now that the U.S. war of aggression in Vietnam has expanded into one covering the whole of Indochina, we find the pretensions of Soviet social-imperialism totally dissipated, not Chairman Mao’s theory of people’s war and strategic line of encircling the cities from the countryside. Soviet socialist imperialism brazenly supports the U.S.-Lon Nol reactionary clique in Cambodia, condones U.S. aggressions against the Laotian people and continues to give mere token and sham support for the Democratic Republic of Vietnam. As previously pointed out, Soviet social-imperialism wishes to make use of the Indochinese war of resistance against U.S. aggression and for national salvation basically for striking bargains with U.S. imperialism. But the Indochinese

people are ever more firmly united to fight for their own liberation against the U.S. imperialist aggressors and their reactionary stooges.

### **III. Guerrilla Warfare Raised To The Level Of Marxist-Leninist Theory And Strategy**

In the early period of the Agrarian Revolutionary War of the Second Revolutionary Civil War, Chairman Mao laid the basic tactics of guerrilla warfare as follows: “The enemy advances, we retreat; the enemy camps, we harass; the enemy tires, we attack; the enemy retreats, we pursue.” Guerrilla war tactics were further developed during the War of Resistance Against Japan. As a matter of fact, guerrilla warfare as a whole was raised to the level of strategy. In the extended stage of strategic stalemate in the war of resistance, guerrilla warfare played the role in arousing the broad masses of the people on a nationwide scale and in fighting the militarily superior enemy. It played the decisive role in the multiplication, tempering and maturation of the fighting units that could subsequently be raised to the level of regular mobile forces in the later period of the war of resistance and during the Third Revolutionary Civil War. In the rich experience of the people’s war in China, we can draw the universal lesson that guerrilla warfare does not only prepare for but also serves as constant auxiliary for regular mobile warfare.

Having been raised to the level of Marxist-Leninist theory and strategy by Chairman Mao, guerrilla warfare has become a powerful revolutionary weapon in the hands of oppressed peoples who have to contend with far stronger and better equipped modern armies of imperialism and the reactionaries. By the large, guerrilla warfare has ceased to be something that can be used with success by revolutionaries and reactionaries “alike”.

What now determines the basic character of guerrilla warfare in this epoch is its employment by revolutionary forces in the world’s countryside. The U.S. counter-guerrilla tactics, banditry or any attempt at guerrilla warfare without its integration with the building of the revolutionary party, united front, rural base areas, mass organizations and organs of democratic political power is bound to fail in the face of genuine revolutionary guerrilla warfare in line with Chairman Mao’s theory of people’s war.

Guerrilla warfare became on an unprecedented world scale the weapon of the oppressed nations and downtrodden masses during and after World War II. In the Philippines, however, the Jose-Jesus Lava leadership of the old merger party failed to use it well. Failing to recognize and master the Marxist-Leninist character given to guerrilla warfare by Comrade Mao Tsetung, this opportunist leadership adopted in 1950 the “Left” opportunist line of “quick military victory” and ordered small guerrilla units, with a total troop strength of no more than five thousand, to take the “strategic offensive” against the enemy. Under the slogan of “all-out armed struggle”, this leadership did not pay attention to the step-by-step building of the Party, people’s army and the united front; and to the step-by-step raising of the level of armed struggle on the basis of the agrarian revolution and the building of revolutionary bases.

Going by his brief and narrow experience with the Jose-Jesus Lava leadership, Pomeroy always strains to express disdain for guerrilla warfare. He goes so far as to invoke the names of Marx and Engels in an attempt to preclude guerrilla warfare from the range of strategy and tactics available to the proletariat and its revolutionary party, especially in the world's countryside. He writes:

... Although Marx and Engels approved of guerrilla warfare as a form of popular struggle, neither of them tended to link it with working class tactics of gaining the power, which were thought of it in terms of insurrection in which the organized masses of the people would be brought into play in decisive action at decisive moments.

Pomeroy presents himself in a dogmatic posture as one being for the use of urban insurrection alone in revolutionary armed struggle. But behind this posture is his calculation that since urban insurrection is not immediately possible for the people in colonies and semi-colonies then he can insist that they should not all engage in parliamentary struggle as the sole or main form of struggle for a protracted and indefinite period of time. This what we call "Left" in form but Right in substance. Completely unmasking himself, he contends:

The prominence of armed struggle in liberation movements in many countries should not obscure the fact that independence from imperialist rule has been gained in a large number of cases by other means, including general strikes, mass demonstrations and political organization and agitation that has made popular sentiment undeniably clear.

He goes so far to consider as having peacefully and truly become independent those countries whose "independence" has been "granted" by the imperialists or is the result of compromises between the imperialist countries and the local bourgeoisie, especially those elements that are or that are to become big comprador-bureaucrats. Pomeroy puts himself into ridicule by engaging in this mendacity and also by resorting to some futile juggling of terms: "In these independent states the revolutionary or liberation process may not have been completed by the act of independence alone... He also considers of "great satisfaction to Marxists" for countries to have no Marxist-Leninist leadership and to take "non-capitalist paths" ruled by U.S. imperialism, Soviet social-imperialism and local comprador-bureaucrat capitalism.

Pomeroy wants to paint a large picture of defeat for the oppressed peoples of the world. By sheer verbiage, he wishes to convince everyone that the temporary defeats in some countries far outweigh the large and solid victories of people's war in China and other countries. He also disregards the fact that where temporary defeats are suffered the revolutionary forces can always strive to recover and persist in revolutionary armed struggle until victory is won. He babbles:

The spectacular success of the guerrilla warfare in a number of liberation struggles — especially in China, Vietnam, Algeria and Cuba — has tended to gloss over the fact that several major guerrilla struggles were defeated in the same period, the most important being Malaya, the Philippines, Greece, Burma and Kenya, while serious setbacks, at the least, have been given to guerrilla attempts launched in the Congo, Peru, Bolivia, and elsewhere. It is quite evident from

this that broad and universal generalizations about the efficacy of armed struggle or guerrilla tactics cannot safely be made.

The safe generalization that Pomeroy obviously wants to make is that armed counter-revolution and bourgeois pacifism are efficacious.

Pomeroy pictures the revolutionary forces are being passive, lacking in initiative and merely waiting to be compelled to wage armed struggle. He prates:

Every liberation movement has preferred to use peaceful, legal means to win freedom. These popular movements, denied such means of expressing themselves and met by an increasing use of violence by the desperate and crumbling imperialist system, have literally been compelled to adopt violent methods to gain popular ends.

He wants “preparations for armed struggle” to be done only when “all other doors to legal, peaceful ways of effecting change have been slammed shut” — when “warranted by the behavior of the reactionary class forces”. To further support his revisionist stands, Pomeroy takes advantage of the patent failure of Ernesto “Che” Guevarra and Regis Debray to serve up the “Cuban model” as the “universal model” for armed revolution surpassing the Chinese revolution. He gloats over the failure of the Latin American Organization of Solidarity (OLAS) to promote the “Cuban model” and also that of Guevarra and Debray in their Bolivian adventure which did not attend correctly to the task of Party building, united front building and mass work as the necessary support for the armed struggle. Ostensibly to overwhelm the excerpts from Castro, Guevarra and Debray, those excerpts from the counter-revolutionary revisionists JuanRodriguez, Alberto Gomez, Jose Manuel Fortuny, Jose Cuello and Asdrubal Dominguez and Luis Corvalan are made to hog the entire section on Latin America.

These Latin American revisionists and Right opportunists give support to Pomeroy’s idealist and opportunist line of “combining all forms of struggle” without giving the attention to the principal form of struggle and to the strategic aim of seizing political power; beating up the straw figure that is “all-out armed struggle” or “guerrilla movement alone”; supporting the “lesser evil”, oftentimes the puppet clique in power which is rapidly being isolated; and laying the principal stress on urban peaceful struggle for the sake of urban uprisings in the future and of concessions from the reactionaries in the meantime.

In attacking guerrilla warfare as a revolutionary method, Pomeroy wants the revolutionary forces in the world’s countryside to vacillate between hoping indefinitely for city insurrections based on the imagined conditions similar to the revolutionary situation in the October Revolution and starting guerrilla warfare only on the basis of a “revolutionary situation” that Pomeroy wants to sound mysterious about. At any rate, his consistent view is to have mass movements engage in protracted peaceful and legal struggle. In this regard, he has excessive praise for such revisionist parties and revisionist writers as those represented in the section on Latin America in his compilation. He pictures them as being for armed struggle but anyhow as being still in the stage of preparing indefinitely for it peacefully or in the stage of withdrawing from previous armed

struggles. He evaluates his revisionist colleagues as of higher worth than the great revolutionary leaders of, say, China and Indochina.

Why does Pomeroy advocate protracted peaceful struggle in opposition to Chairman Mao's theory of protracted people's war in the world's countryside? He makes that since U.S. imperialism is capable of recognizing "realities" (particularly the superpower maneuvers of the Soviet Union and the peaceful mass movements) its aggressive nature will eventually change. He chatters:

Popular armed struggles of today have been shaped largely by the imperialist tactics of violence, and the forms of struggle in the coming period will be affected to a considerable extent by the degree to which imperialism is forced to recognize the realities in the changed balance of power. Some revolutionaries would contend that American imperialism is rigidly incapable of acknowledging such a fact or of doing anything to meet it other than what it is doing today. However, a Marxist-Leninist, while today for any form of struggle, must also be prepared for the complexity of change.

By that "complexity of change" (a mystifying phrase denoting the incapability of "dividing one into two"), Pomeroy contends that U.S. imperialism will change its nature.

Pomeroy completely exposes himself as an agent of U.S. imperialism. He mocks what he calls the "apocalyptic vision" that imperialism and capitalism are being besieged and smothered in a mounting crescendo of guerrilla wars. He insinuates that those who hold the view that the world revolutionary situation is excellent are not Marxist-Leninists and are swayed by "emotion and temperament". He claims as having a static essence" the general formulation that imperialism and the capitalist system as whole are in a state of crisis and that the present epoch is a positive vitality that he can imagine and wishes to render the revolutionary forces to become static before such a moribund and decadent monster. He disagrees with the view that now is the era of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tsetung Thought, when imperialism is heading for total collapse and socialism is marching towards worldwide victory. He consistently refers to the particularity of certain countries as an empiricist would with the mechanistic end of the separating the particular from the general or universal.

Crudely taking sides with U.S. imperialism, Pomeroy argues that the revolutionaries have only themselves to blame for waging armed struggle whenever U.S. imperialism attempts to crush them militarily. He rails threateningly that "those who become overly committed to ideas of armed struggle" will surely become the destroyed or forced to difficult retreats. He boasts of the power of U.S. imperialism in the following manner: "Imperialist counter-insurgency operations have been designed especially to take advantage of this type of error." Sweepingly, he calls armed struggle "this type of error".

He boasts of the advanced military technology of imperialism and tries to blackmail the people with its supposed efficacy in suppressing movements. He quacks:

Attempts by imperialism in the contemporary period to suppress revolutionary movements by using the most advanced military technology — helicopters, napalm, chemical warfare, electronic devices — bear comparison with the use of then-new military developments to drive revolutionary movements off the streets in the time of Marx and Engels, over 100 years ago.

Resorting to nuclear blackmail in an oblique manner, Pomeroy also poses as one extremely concerned about U.S. imperialism being forced by revolutionary armed struggles to start an atomic war. He jabbars:

The changes could bring an atomic conflict between the socialism and imperialism — a type of armed struggle that the socialist countries and the communist movement internationally seek to prevent because of the catastrophic effect it would have on mankind in general.

While Pomeroy would like to frighten the people with the military technology and nuclear weapons of the U.S. imperialism, he would also like them to believe that the world capitalist system would soon be left undefended by any capitalist power and that U.S. imperialism itself, the chief defender of such a system, is just about to abandon its role of gendarme out of sheer sympathy for mass struggles to find no more use for armed struggle, particularly guerrilla warfare. He prates:

French and British imperialism have already been forced in this direction and American imperialism, with divisions in its ranks over the cost of wars of suppression, is not immune from it.

He prates further:

It is unreal ... to contend that it [police role of U.S. imperialism] cannot be altered by mass struggle against it, and it is obvious that in each of the possibilities of changes in the world situation a diversity of forms of struggle would present themselves to revolutionary movements, of which guerrilla warfare would only be one.

Next only to Pomeroy as a brazen supporter of U.S. imperialism in the compilation is Henry Winston of the revisionist renegade Communist Party of the United States of America who preaches to the Afro-American people to those their militancy, love the Uncle Toms and peacefully demand additional black representation on all levels of the imperialist state. Like Pomeroy, Winston warns the Afro-American people to stop their “terrorism” and “provocations” lest the white supremacists crush them. To him Pomeroy gives the privilege of putting the final touch on this book.

## **IV. Once More On The Question Of Armed Struggle In The Philippines**

Pomeroy admits that during the World War II the old merger party of the Communist Party and the Socialist Party acquired arms and experience in guerrilla warfare and that at the close of the

war the leadership abandoned armed struggle in order to engage in peaceful forms of organization and struggle. The armed struggle continued in a spontaneous way; it developed during the 1946-48 period without the planning and initiative of the leadership of the old merger party. The people used the arms which they had retained in the spirit of self-defense because even before the end of the war of resistance against Japanese fascism U.S. army personnel and their cohorts had already subjected them to persecution and armed attacks.

The Lavas and Tarucs formally adopted the policy of armed struggle in May 1948 only after finding themselves rebuffed in their bid to gain official seats in the bourgeois reactionary government. Even when this policy was already supposed to be implemented, the Lavas and Tarucs continuously maneuvered for accommodation in the reactionary government and were willing to end the armed struggle in return. We can easily cite events which prove this point. These were the amnesty agreement with the Quirino puppet regime in June 1948; the presentation of an obsequious memorandum by the old merger party to an anti-communist committee in the reactionary congress in December 1948; and the support given to the presidential bid of Laurel in 1949 in the vain hope that the Nacionalista Party would give concessions to the Lavas and Tarucs. All of these were consistent with the policy of the Lavas and Tarucs that had been adopted as early as September 1944 and implemented thereafter to welcome the return of U.S. imperialism and the Osmena puppet regime and have the old merger party engage in parliamentary struggle under the Democratic Alliance.

Pomeroy proudly states that the leadership of the old merger party followed “its own path”, departing from the road of the Chinese revolution. He admits though that Chinese comrades “introduced Chinese Red Army ideas into the Huk organization” according to him, the Lavas and Tarucs followed their own path, governed by the Filipino peasant social structure, by the Philippine terrain and geographical conditions, and by Philippine historical, economic and political conditions”. Sounding righteous about this path, Pomeroy boasts that the Lavas and Tarucs never found use even in 1950 for “the Chinese pattern” of setting up base areas and encircling the cities from the countryside. He puts in the gratuitous opinion that “in fact, successfully conducted guerrilla war was rarely pursued such pattern, contrary to the belief widely held, and the claim of the Chinese leaders themselves that it constitute a model”. He considers as correct and positive the guerrillaism, the roving rebel tactics, and in 1950 the impetuous desire of the Lavas and Tarucs to seize power in the cities within two years.

On a fool takes pride in failure. Only an anti-Marxist counter- revolutionary can regard the violation of the correct Marxist-Leninist teachings, particularly Chairman Mao’s theory of people’s war and strategic line, as the very proof for the “incorrectness” and “untruth” of what is correct and truthful. Have the Lavas and Tarucs won victory or persisted in revolutionary struggle by deliberately refusing to establish base areas and to take the line of encircling the cities from the countryside? No! Whereas Pomeroy admits that the Lavas and Tarucs violated the theory of people’s war and failed to win victory or even persist in armed struggle, Pomeroy insists like the anti-Marxist counter-revolutionary fool that he is that there should have been more violations of the theory. What he obviously hankers for is more failure.

The defeat of the 1950 “all-out armed struggle” policy of the Jose Lava leadership is explained by Pomeroy in terms that completely disregard Chairman Mao’s theory of people’s war and that violate fundamental principles of Marxism-Leninism. He gives four reasons for the defeat: 1) The Party was incorrect in concluding that the imperialist and their allies were in an irrecoverable situation and that they could “no longer rule in the old way”. 2) The Party put almost all emphasis and cadres into the armed struggle, to the neglect of allies unprepared for armed struggle; proclaimed the principle of “the hegemony of the party over the revolution”; failed to project and build a united front against U.S. imperialism; and failed to side with the Liberal Party against Magsaysay. 3) The Party become careless in its security measures. 4) The Philippine national liberation struggle was physically isolated from international allies.

Let us analyze the reasons one by one.

1) Pomeroy still shares the same opinion as that held by the Jose-Jesus Lava leadership in 1950 that the “Left” opportunist line of quick military victory in two years’ time is suitable in a semi-colonial and semi-feudal countries like the Philippines. He faults the Lavas only for choosing the wrong moment for adopting and implementing such policy. What would appear to constitute as the correct moment for Pomeroy is when the imperialist crisis reaches such an extent that the imperialist and their allies are in an “irrecoverable situation” and “could no longer rule in the old way”, Thus, he faults the Lavas for overestimating the “extent of imperialist crisis”. According to Pomeroy, the imperialist and a wide range of maneuver, as it was not necessary for them to use American troops in the Philippines, and the people were susceptible to promises of “reform”. In other words, Pomeroy wishes the Lavaite opportunist to have waited indefinitely for the imminent, if not total, collapse of imperialism in its home ground before setting out on armed struggle.

Ideologically, Pomeroy is a Lavaite revisionist through and through. He harps on the same subjectivism that led the Jose-Jesus Lava leadership to rely mainly on external conditions in conducting armed struggle in a "Left" opportunist way. The difference is that whereas in 1950 the external conditions were expected to cause a “quick military victory” in the Philippines, nowadays these are expected by the Pomeroy and the Lavas to justify a protracted peaceful struggle. This revisionist line is being harped on at a time that U.S. imperialism is in a crisis worse than before and the world revolutionary situation had never been more excellent. In recalling 1950, Pomeroy states categorically that it was a “vain hope” that the “impact of guerrilla struggle” would help to drive the imperialists and their allies into crisis.

2) It was, indeed wrong and adventurist that “all-out armed struggle” was waged in a manner that almost all cadres were taken away from legal struggle and that the united front was not well taken care of. Though Pomeroy seems capable of mentioning facts, he always tries to make misrepresentations and wrong prescriptions. At the core of these is his notion that to engage in armed struggle is necessarily to forgo political work, legal struggle and the united front. The error of “Left” opportunism committed by the Jose-Jesus Lava leadership, including Pomeroy, is clearly explained in the light of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tsetung Thought in the basic documents of the re-established Communist Party of the Philippines.

Not satisfied with his outright opposition to Chairman Mao's theory of people's war and strategic line of encircling the cities from the countryside, Pomeroy brazenly goes against the general line that the Philippine revolution is a new-democratic revolution led by the proletariat and its revolutionary party. He identifies the mere use of the phrase "new-democratic revolution" (which was not actually carried out) and the proclamation of the principle of the "hegemony of the party over the revolution" as the cause of the Lavaite failure to build a united front and to find the forms of struggle by which broader masses of the people could be drawn into action. According to him, these frightened and antagonized the "nationalist bourgeoisie" and forced it to ally itself with the rabid imperialist agent Magsaysay. He suggested that some mysterious kind of peaceful maneuver instead of armed struggle should have been undertaken to fight Magsaysay in 1951 and 1953. Even now he would rather imagine that the reactionaries were not all bent on carrying through to the end their own strategic offensive against the Lava "Left" opportunists.

3) Pomeroy can really bring down a house in laughter by identifying "careless security measures" as one of the four major reasons for the defeat of the entire revolutionary movement. Effects should not be considered the causes. The disintegration of the highest leading organ of the old merger party caused by the enemy raids of October 1950 in Manila cannot be fully explained without reference to serious violations of Marxist-Leninist theory and strategy.

4) The "physical isolation" of the Philippine national liberation struggle cannot be a major reaction for the failure of the Lavas. The geographic condition of the Philippines did not change during the World War II and yet the people managed to wage a war of resistance successfully for several years against the Japanese fascists and their puppet troops.

The anti-Marxist and anti-Leninist line of the Lavas, Tarucs and Pomeroy in ideology, politics, organization and armed struggle caused the defeat of the revolutionary mass movement in the early 1950's. In this regard, it is always important to analyze and sum up our revolutionary experience in the light of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tsetung Thought. If the Lavas, Tarucs and Pomeroy ignored Chairman Mao's theory of the people's war and suffered disastrous defeat, it becomes more necessary for us to make a living study and application of this proven theory instead of continuing to oppose it as the Lavaites do in empty arrogance.

Even now Pomeroy continues to be a publicist of the Lava revisionist renegades abroad. Resorting to the most malicious falsehood, he tries to misrepresent abroad the Provisional Political Bureau that prepared the re-establishment of the Communist Party of the Philippines on the theoretical foundation of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tsetung Thought as "trying to put out calls for a return" by the national liberation movement to "all-out armed struggle" in the style of the Jose-Jesus Lava leadership in 1950.

Pomeroy openly supports the Lava revisionist renegades. As acknowledged by him, the bogus communist party of these renegades put out a statement in the Information Bulletin of the Czechoslovak revisionist party in attacking the May Day 1967 Statement of the Provisional Political Bureau of the Communist Party of the Philippines and seeking in a futile manner to refute the line that the outlawed situation of the Party is the result of counter-revolution and that armed struggle is the only method by which the reactionary state can be overthrown.

Pomeroy must be told that the Communist Party of the Philippines is today indefatigably making a living study and application of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tsetung Thought in accordance with Philippines conditions, rebuilding itself in the process, waging armed struggle in the countryside and creating revolutionary bases among the peasant masses and rapidly developing a united front based on the worker-peasant alliance, which basic alliance is linked with such progressive strata of the local bourgeoisie as the urban petty bourgeoisie and the national bourgeoisie.

The Communist Party of the Philippine today leading the New People's Army and fighting a tit-for-tat struggle against the enemy. On the other hand, the Lava revisionist renegades have made themselves notorious by becoming cheap enemy informers and fascist gangsters in operating the notorious Briones-Diwa-Pasion bandit gang. Put to shame and deprived of initiative in the countryside by the New People's Army led by the Party, the Lava revisionist renegades have gone to the extent of colluding with the Task Force Lawin and with special terror squads of the Marcos fascist puppet clique and other criminal activities in Central Luzon.

Though Pomeroy has always boasted that the Lava revisionist renegades have conducted parliamentary struggle as the main form of struggle since 1956, in conjunction with the worldwide campaign of modern revisionism, they are isolated from and shunned by the revolutionary mass movement raging in Greater Manila and other urban areas, provincial capitals and towns. They have made themselves notorious as the most filthy-mouthed slanderers of the Communist Party of the Philippines, the New People's Army, the revolutionary leaders and the broad masses of the people. They are always trying to be the most clever by word imperialism, and deed in giving support to imperialism, Soviet social-imperialism, the Marcos fascist puppet clique and the landlord class.

The Lava revisionist renegades have busied themselves using the Movement for the Advancement of Nacionalism, the Malayang Samahang Magsasaka, the Congress of Trade Unions of the Philippines, the Kilusan, the Bertrand Russel Peace Foundations (Phil.), Inc., and the Malayang Pagkakaisa ng Kabataang Pilipino in attacking the Communist Party of the Philippines and the New People's Army and trying to mislead the people. These Lavaite outfits are mere paper organizations whose membership is redundant. These have been useful for the Lava revisionist renegades in begging for concessions from the reactionaries and in maintaining their bureaucratic interests within their own clique and within the reactionary government.

Just as Soviet modern revisionism is a passing phase of imperialism, the revisionism of the Lavaites is likewise a passing phase of foreign and feudal domination in the Philippines. The Lava revisionist renegades have done much service to the Philippine revolution in acting as negative examples for the proletarian revolutionaries of today. Though they now talk more and more brazenly in the style of the Marcoses, Tarucs, Lacsinas, Manglapuses and other reactionaries, the Lavaites have for quite some time now served to sharpen the revolutionaries' understanding of the most clever form of ideology and activity that seeks to sabotage and subvert the revolutionary mass movement. With the Lavaites around, the Party and the people have deepened their understanding that to oppose imperialism it is necessary to oppose opportunism and revisionism.

## **IV. Once More On The Question Of Armed Struggle In The Philippines**

Pomeroy admits that during the World War II the old merger party of the Communist Party and the Socialist Party acquired arms and experience in guerrilla warfare and that at the close of the war the leadership abandoned armed struggle in order to engage in peaceful forms of organization and struggle. The armed struggle continued in a spontaneous way; it developed during the 1946-48 period without the planning and initiative of the leadership of the old merger party. The people used the arms which they had retained in the spirit of self-defense because even before the end of the war of resistance against Japanese fascism U.S. army personnel and their cohorts had already subjected them to persecution and armed attacks.

The Lavas and Tarucs formally adopted the policy of armed struggle in May 1948 only after finding themselves rebuffed in their bid to gain official seats in the bourgeois reactionary government. Even when this policy was already supposed to be implemented, the Lavas and Tarucs continuously maneuvered for accommodation in the reactionary government and were willing to end the armed struggle in return. We can easily cite events which prove this point. These were the amnesty agreement with the Quirino puppet regime in June 1948; the presentation of an obsequious memorandum by the old merger party to an anti-communist committee in the reactionary congress in December 1948; and the support given to the presidential bid of Laurel in 1949 in the vain hope that the Nacionalista Party would give concessions to the Lavas and Tarucs. All of these were consistent with the policy of the Lavas and Tarucs that had been adopted as early as September 1944 and implemented thereafter to welcome the return of U.S. imperialism and the Osmena puppet regime and have the old merger party engage in parliamentary struggle under the Democratic Alliance.

Pomeroy proudly states that the leadership of the old merger party followed “its own path”, departing from the road of the Chinese revolution. He admits though that Chinese comrades “introduced Chinese Red Army ideas into the Huk organization” according to him, the Lavas and Tarucs followed their own path, governed by the Filipino peasant social structure, by the Philippine terrain and geographical conditions, and by Philippine historical, economic and political conditions”. Sounding righteous about this path, Pomeroy boasts that the Lavas and Tarucs never found use even in 1950 for “the Chinese pattern” of setting up base areas and encircling the cities from the countryside. He puts in the gratuitous opinion that “in fact, successfully conducted guerrilla war was rarely pursued such pattern, contrary to the belief widely held, and the claim of the Chinese leaders themselves that it constitute a model”. He considers as correct and positive the guerrillaism, the roving rebel tactics, and in 1950 the impetuous desire of the Lavas and Tarucs to seize power in the cities within two years.

On a fool takes pride in failure. Only an anti-Marxist counter- revolutionary can regard the violation of the correct Marxist-Leninist teachings, particularly Chairman Mao’s theory of people’s war and strategic line, as the very proof for the “incorrectness” and “untruth” of what is correct and truthful. Have the Lavas and Tarucs won victory or persisted in revolutionary struggle by deliberately refusing to establish base areas and to take the line of encircling the

cities from the countryside? No! Whereas Pomeroy admits that the Lavas and Tarucs violated the theory of people's war and failed to win victory or even persist in armed struggle, Pomeroy insists like the anti-Marxist counter-revolutionary fool that he is that there should have been more violations of the theory. What he obviously hankers for is more failure.

The defeat of the 1950 "all-out armed struggle" policy of the Jose Lava leadership is explained by Pomeroy in terms that completely disregard Chairman Mao's theory of people's war and that violate fundamental principles of Marxism-Leninism. He gives four reasons for the defeat: 1) The Party was incorrect in concluding that the imperialist and their allies were in an irrecoverable situation and that they could "no longer rule in the old way". 2) The Party put almost all emphasis and cadres into the armed struggle, to the neglect of allies unprepared for armed struggle; proclaimed the principle of "the hegemony of the party over the revolution"; failed to project and build a united front against U.S. imperialism; and failed to side with the Liberal Party against Magsaysay. 3) The Party become careless in its security measures. 4) The Philippine national liberation struggle was physically isolated from international allies.

Let us analyze the reasons one by one.

1) Pomeroy still shares the same opinion as that held by the Jose-Jesus Lava leadership in 1950 that the "Left" opportunist line of quick military victory in two years' time is suitable in a semi-colonial and semi-feudal countries like the Philippines. He faults the Lavas only for choosing the wrong moment for adopting and implementing such policy. What would appear to constitute as the correct moment for Pomeroy is when the imperialist crisis reaches such an extent that the imperialist and their allies are in an "irrecoverable situation" and "could no longer rule in the old way". Thus, he faults the Lavas for overestimating the "extent of imperialist crisis". According to Pomeroy, the imperialist and a wide range of maneuver, as it was not necessary for them to use American troops in the Philippines, and the people were susceptible to promises of "reform". In other words, Pomeroy wishes the Lavaite opportunist to have waited indefinitely for the imminent, if not total, collapse of imperialism in its home ground before setting out on armed struggle.

Ideologically, Pomeroy is a Lavaite revisionist through and through. He harps on the same subjectivism that led the Jose-Jesus Lava leadership to rely mainly on external conditions in conducting armed struggle in a "Left" opportunist way. The difference is that whereas in 1950 the external conditions were expected to cause a "quick military victory" in the Philippines, nowadays these are expected by the Pomeroyes and the Lavas to justify a protracted peaceful struggle. This revisionist line is being harped on at a time that U.S. imperialism is in a crisis worse than before and the world revolutionary situation had never been more excellent. In recalling 1950, Pomeroy states categorically that it was a "vain hope" that the "impact of guerrilla struggle" would help to drive the imperialists and their allies into crisis.

2) It was, indeed wrong and adventurist that "all-out armed struggle" was waged in a manner that almost all cadres were taken away from legal struggle and that the united front was not well taken care of. Though Pomeroy seems capable of mentioning facts, he always tries to make misrepresentations and wrong prescriptions. At the core of these is his notion that to engage in

armed struggle is necessarily to forgo political work, legal struggle and the united front. The error of “Left” opportunism committed by the Jose-Jesus Lava leadership, including Pomeroy, is clearly explained in the light of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tsetung Thought in the basic documents of the re-established Communist Party of the Philippines.

Not satisfied with his outright opposition to Chairman Mao’s theory of people’s war and strategic line of encircling the cities from the countryside, Pomeroy brazenly goes against the general line that the Philippine revolution is a new-democratic revolution led by the proletariat and its revolutionary party. He identifies the mere use of the phrase “new-democratic revolution” (which was not actually carried out) and the proclamation of the principle of the “hegemony of the party over the revolution” as the cause of the Lavaite failure to build a united front and to find the forms of struggle by which broader masses of the people could be drawn into action. According to him, these frightened and antagonized the “nationalist bourgeoisie” and forced it to ally itself with the rabid imperialist agent Magsaysay. He suggest that some mysterious kind of peaceful maneuver instead of armed struggle should have been undertaken to fight Magsaysay in 1951 and 1953. Even now he would rather imagine that the reactionaries were not all bent on carrying through to the end their own strategic offensive against the Lava “Left” opportunists.

3) Pomeroy can really bring down a house in laughter by identifying “careless security measures” as one of the four major reasons for the defeat of the entire revolutionary movement. Effects should not be considered the causes. The disintegration of the highest leading organ of the old merger party caused by the enemy raids of October 1950 in Manila cannot be fully explained without reference to serious violations of Marxist-Leninist theory and strategy.

4) The “physical isolation” of the Philippine national liberation struggle cannot be a major reaction for the failure of the Lavas. The geographic condition of the Philippines did not change during the World War II and yet the people managed to wage a war of resistance successfully for several years against the Japanese fascists and their puppet troops.

The anti-Marxist and anti-Leninist line of the Lavas, Tarucs and Pomeroy in ideology, politics, organization and armed struggle caused the defeat of the revolutionary mass movement in the early 1950’s. In this regard, it is always important to analyze and sum up our revolutionary experience in the light of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tsetung Thought. If the Lavas, Tarucs and Pomeroy ignored Chairman Mao’s theory of the people’s war and suffered disastrous defeat, it becomes more necessary for us to make a living study and application of this proven theory instead of continuing to oppose it as the Lavaites do in empty arrogance.

Even now Pomeroy continues to be a publicist of the Lava revisionist renegades abroad. Resorting to the most malicious falsehood, he tries to misrepresent abroad the Provisional Political Bureau that prepared the re-establishment of the Communist Party of the Philippines on the theoretical foundation of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tsetung Thought as “trying to put out calls for a return” by the national liberation movement to “all-out armed struggle” in the style of the Jose-Jesus Lava leadership in 1950.

Pomeroy openly supports the Lava revisionist renegades. As acknowledged by him, the bogus communist party of these renegades put out a statement in the Information Bulletin of the Czechoslovak revisionist party in attacking the May Day 1967 Statement of the Provisional Political Bureau of the Communist Party of the Philippines and seeking in a futile manner to refute the line that the outlawed situation of the Party is the result of counter-revolution and that armed struggle is the only method by which the reactionary state can be overthrown.

Pomeroy must be told that the Communist Party of the Philippines is today indefatigably making a living study and application of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tsetung Thought in accordance with Philippines conditions, rebuilding itself in the process, waging armed struggle in the countryside and creating revolutionary bases among the peasant masses and rapidly developing a united front based on the worker-peasant alliance, which basic alliance is linked with such progressive strata of the local bourgeoisie as the urban petty bourgeoisie and the national bourgeoisie.

The Communist Party of the Philippine today leading the New People's Army and fighting a tit-for-tat struggle against the enemy. On the other hand, the Lava revisionist renegades have made themselves notorious by becoming cheap enemy informers and fascist gangsters in operating the notorious Briones-Diwa-Pasion bandit gang. Put to shame and deprived of initiative in the countryside by the New People's Army led by the Party, the Lava revisionist renegades have gone to the extent of colluding with the Task Force Lawin and with special terror squads of the Marcos fascist puppet clique and other criminal activities in Central Luzon.

Though Pomeroy has always boasted that the Lava revisionist renegades have conducted parliamentary struggle as the main form of struggle since 1956, in conjunction with the worldwide campaign of modern revisionism, they are isolated from and shunned by the revolutionary mass movement raging in Greater Manila and other urban areas, provincial capitals and towns. They have made themselves notorious as the most filthy-mouthed slanderers of the Communist Party of the Philippines, the New People's Army, the revolutionary leaders and the broad masses of the people. They are always trying to be the most clever by word imperialism, and deed in giving support to imperialism, Soviet social-imperialism, the Marcos fascist puppet clique and the landlord class.

The Lava revisionist renegades have busied themselves using the Movement for the Advancement of Nacionalism, the Malayang Samahang Magsasaka, the Congress of Trade Unions of the Philippines, the Kilusan, the Bertrand Russel Peace Foundations (Phil.), Inc., and the Malayang Pagkakaisa ng Kabataang Pilipino in attacking the Communist Party of the Philippines and the New People's Army and trying to mislead the people. These Lavaite outfits are mere paper organizations whose membership is redundant. These have been useful for the Lava revisionist renegades in begging for concessions from the reactionaries and in maintaining their bureaucratic interests within their own clique and within the reactionary government.

Just as Soviet modern revisionism is a passing phase of imperialism, the revisionism of the Lavaites is likewise a passing phase of foreign and feudal domination in the Philippines. The Lava revisionist renegades have done much service to the Philippine revolution in acting as negative examples for the proletarian revolutionaries of today. Though they now talk more and

more brazenly in the style of the Marcoses, Tarucs, Lacsinas, Manglapuses and other reactionaries, the Lavaites have for quite some time now served to sharpen the revolutionaries' understanding of the most clever form of ideology and activity that seeks to sabotage and subvert the revolutionary mass movement. With the Lavaites around, the Party and the people have deepened their understanding that to oppose imperialism it is necessary to oppose opportunism and revisionism.

## **Apologia for Soviet Revisionism**

*(This essay originally appeared in the Ang Bayan special issue of November 30, 1971 under the title "Pomeroy's Apologia for Soviet Revisionism".)*

Half a Century of Socialism (Soviet Life in the Sixties) unfolds the role of William J. Pomeroy as both an agent of Soviet modern revisionism and U.S. imperialism. This book pretends to celebrate the 50th anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution but in fact it celebrates the betrayal of Marxism-Leninism and the all-round restoration of capitalism in the homeland of the great Lenin. It heaps all kinds of empty praise for the 20th and 22nd Congress of the revisionist Communist Party of the Soviet Union and for the 23rd Congress and the plenary sessions of the CPSU Central Committee from 1965 to 1967 by which Brezhnev and his revisionist gang have outdone Khrushchov in bringing about the all-round restoration of the capitalism in the Soviet Union.

Speaking from a bourgeois reactionary and idealist viewpoint, Pomeroy disparages dialectical materialism, the law of contradiction and class analysis as "oversimplification". In no uncertain terms, he rails: "A revolutionary who is prone to see everything in two-toned contrasts is disconcerted in meeting a capitalist who might be a decent person or a fellow revolutionary who might be unscrupulous". What a counter-revolutionary way of summing up reality! His sinister purpose sticks out: it is to attack the revolutionary proletariat and praise the counter-revolutionary bourgeoisie to the heavens.

Himself involved in the class struggle on the side of the bourgeois, he dishes up his own "two-toned contrasts" in a revisionist manner well-echoed from his Soviet Revisionist masters. He raves: "The hammer and sickle were an apt symbol in the time of Lenin". And he hastens to counterpose: "Today's symbols are the computer, the transistor and atomic ring." He slanders Lenin and Stalin as the paragons of "backwardness" and vents his spite on the dictatorship of the proletariat. He pays high tribute to his current revisionist renegade masters Brezhnev and Kosygin as the paragons of "technical progress" and describes in the most glowing terms the fascist dictatorship of the Soviet monopoly bureaucrat bourgeoisie.

Pomeroy prates that the difference between what he calls the past (the time of Lenin and Stalin) and the present (the time of his Soviet revisionist masters) lies in the "advance of techniques". This is to cover up the betrayal of Leninism and the peaceful evolution of the proletarian dictatorship into a bourgeois dictatorship through the machinations of such usurpers as Khrushchov the Second. In the process, he also manages to throw in flimsily-disguised praise for the international big bourgeoisie. He states:

People in the developed countries are fully aware of the differences in their present lives and outlooks from those of their forebears at the turn of the century or in the 1920's. They look back with superior smiles at what are considered to be rather primitive times. If this can be true under capitalism, which tends to resist change, it is much more true under socialism which has transformed the condition of living in a much more rapid and thoroughgoing manner.

The trick in Pomeroy's sophistry is simple. He puts technique and politics, and compares socialism with capitalism mainly on the basis of techniques. People in the capitalist countries are made out to appear as enjoying the bounties of technical progress in the same manner that people in the Soviet Union are supposed to be enjoying the same things now. The end of this line of misrepresentation is to "look back with superior smiles" at the "primitive times" of Lenin and Stalin. But can the Soviet revisionist renegades really do this? It is most interesting to look at how rotten Soviet society has become after the betrayal of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

Pomeroy opposes to its very core the October Revolution and impugns its historical necessity in the advance of the world proletarian revolution. He goes so far as to state that "it would be wrong to say that socialist revolutions elsewhere would have been impossible without the prior existence of the Soviet Union". The October Revolution of 1917 is a historical fact and no genuine revolutionary ever doubts its necessary value to all succeeding socialist revolutions. It verified and brought to reality the theory of proletarian revolution and proletarian dictatorship, and became the cornerstone of the world proletarian revolution. Its salvoes brought Marxism-Leninism to the people of the world. Therefore, it is idle historical idealism for Pomeroy to prate that socialist revolution would be possible even without the October Revolution.

## **I. On The Proletarian Dictatorship**

Marx wrote:

Between capitalist and communist society lies the period of the revolutionary transformation of the one into the other. There corresponds to this also a political transition period in which the state can be nothing but the revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat.

Under the guidance of Marxism and on the basis of the great practice of the dictatorship of the proletariat in the Soviet Union, Lenin clearly pointed out:

The transition from capitalism to communism represents an entire historical epoch. Until his epoch has terminated, the exploiters inevitably cherish the hope of restoration, and this hope is converted into attempts at restoration.

In this regard, therefore, he repeatedly stressed: "The dictatorship of the proletariat is essential."

Under the guidance of Marxism-Leninism and on the basis of the historical experience of the dictatorship of the proletariat in China and abroad, Chairman Mao has stated even more explicitly:

Socialist society covers a considerably long historical period. In the historical period of socialism, there are still classes, class contradictions and class struggle, there is a struggle between the socialist road and the capitalist road, and there is the danger of capitalist restoration. Our instruments of dictatorship must be strengthened, not weakened.

Learning from the historical experience of the Soviet Union and other revisionist countries, Chairman Mao has put forward the theory of continuing revolution under the dictatorship of the proletariat and led the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution to prevent the restoration of capitalism in a socialist society. These recent theoretical and practical contributions of Chairman Mao signaled by his famous work *On the Correct Handling of Contradictions Among the People* as far back as 1957 have brought the theory and practice of Marxism-Leninism to a completely new and higher stage. All these are in keeping with the Marxist-Leninist view that in a socialist society, lasting for an entire historical epoch, classes, class contradictions and class struggle persists.

What does Pomeroy say in opposition to the kernel of the theory and practice of Marxism-Leninism, which is the dictatorship of the proletariat? He says:

... opposing class have ceased to exist in the Soviet Union and that what prevails is a “state of the whole people”. In other words, the dictatorship of the proletariat is no longer thought of as the instrument to suppress counter-revolutionary tendencies within the country, but as instrument directed solely against enemies from outside.

This is unadulterated Khrushchov and Brezhnevism.

Long before the blatant counter-revolutionary coup d'état launched by Khrushchov, the capitalist-roaders in the Soviet Union had insisted that there were no more classes, class contradictions and class struggle. (Comrade Stalin himself expressed too early in 1936 the view that there was no more class struggle in the Soviet Union but he rectified this wrong view in 1952.) It has turned out that to stop or obscure the waging of revolutionary class struggle is to allow the representatives of the bourgeoisie to sneak into the state and party of the proletariat, usurp leadership and restore capitalism. Not to put proletarian politics in command of everything consciously and vigorously is to allow bourgeois politics to take over in a socialist society. There are vestigial, latent and hidden agents of the big bourgeois (egged on by the imperialist policy of peaceful evolution) who are ready to spring into counter-revolutionary action under the cover of the technicism and economism whenever the proletarian dictatorship lets down its vigilance and its determination to continue the revolution.

After the restoration of capitalism through peaceful evolution, the anti-Marxist and anti-Leninist openly flaunt the theory of “state of the whole people” and “party of the whole people” in order to denote the dissolution of the dictatorship of the proletariat and the party of the proletariat, respectively. A dictatorship of the new bourgeoisie such as those of Khrushchov and of Brezhnev is set up. It is no surprise, therefore, that the anti-communist scoundrel Pomeroy now admits that his Soviet revisionist masters no longer think of the dictatorship of the proletariat as

the instrument for suppressing counter-revolutionary tendencies within the country. State power for them is itself the instrument for counter-revolution.

Throughout Pomeroy's book, it is clear that the kind of "people" who are now living it up in capitalist style in the Soviet Union belong to the bourgeoisie. They converted the socialist economy into state monopoly capitalism. They rob the state treasury centrally and in various enterprises and farms, live in a kind of luxury imitative of the bourgeoisie in the West, squander the social wealth accumulated for decades through the hard work of the Soviet laboring people and intensify oppression and exploitation in order to raise their profits. A monopoly bureaucrat bourgeoisie lords over the state and Party, operates the means of production as capitalist enterprises and poison education and culture to suit its capitalist ends. The Soviet neo-bourgeoisie rides roughshod over the Soviet proletariat, the people of various countries, especially a number of East European countries and the Mongolian People's Republic.

Pomeroy refers to the "dictatorship of the proletariat" as an instrument "solely against enemies from outside". However, it is noteworthy that he does not make a single attack, not even a sham one against U.S. imperialism in his concluding chapter which is most concentrated way of presenting the revisionist view of the transition from socialism to communism. On the other hand, there is no let-up in his vicious but futile diatribes against the Lenin of the preset era, Chairman Mao, and what he stands for — the world proletarian revolution in the present era, the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution, the Chinese proletariat and people and the Chinese Communist Party. So it is clear that the arms expansion and war preparations being conducted by the Soviet revisionist rulers are meant to be used against China, communism, the people and revolution.

The revisionist Pomeroy regards the question of political power, the dictatorship of the proletariat, as a mere short spell and as a mere preliminary after which it is all economic constructions that counts. So he chatters:

If a Communist cadre is asked about the romanticism of what he is doing, he will most likely reply that the exciting struggle for power was only the initial struggle, the beginning of problems after which the hard weary work begins....

We say that the struggle for power does not cease after the seizure of power, that economic constructions does not make the struggle for power a thing of the past. The class struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie continues in the entire historical epoch of the socialism. It is imperative for the proletariat to continue the revolution, take command of everything and consolidate its class dictatorship.

Pomeroy falls deeper into self-contradiction in the following prattle:

After decades of highly centralized dictatorship of the proletariat that was necessary to push through and to protect socialist construction, there is now the problem of broadening democratic participation in all phases of life....

He seems to recognize here the necessity of the dictatorship of the proletariat in pushing through and protecting socialist construction. But his main interest now is to make this dictatorship appear as the strait jacket of democracy. He denies the fact that the dictatorship of the proletariat, while suppressing the people's enemies, created during the time of Lenin and Stalin the broadest democracy among the workers, peasants and revolutionary. He prates: "An efficiently-run socialist enterprise may possess much greater revolutionary potential than the largest of demonstrations..." Only a counter-revolutionary will lay aside proletarian policies or subordinate it to economic work. Chairman Mao teaches us: "Political work is the lifeblood of all economic work."

The 20th Congress of the CPSU is ecstatically hailed by Pomeroy as the starting point of "democracy" in the Soviet Union. This was the black congress in 1956 in which the modern revisionists launched a surprise attack, a counter-revolutionary coup, against the dictatorship of the proletariat and which tried to spread throughout the world the poisonous revisionist ideas of "parliamentary road", "peaceful transitions" and class collaboration with U.S. imperialism. Khrushchov worked out his revisionist purposes under the cover of "combating the personality cult of Stalin".

Chairman Mao made a timely criticism of the Soviet revisionist renegades, when he sharply pointed out:

I think that there are two "swords": One is Lenin and the other Stalin. The sword of Stalin has now been abandoned by the Russians.... As for the sword of Lenin, has it too now been abandoned to a certain extent by some leaders of the Soviet Union? In my view, it has been abandoned to a considerable extent. Is the October Revolution still valid? Can it still be the example for all countries? Khrushchov's report at the 20th Congress of the CPSU says it is possible to gain political power by the parliamentary road, that is to say, it is no longer necessary for all countries to learn from the October Revolution. Once this gate is opened, Leninism by and large is thrown out.

In keeping with the anti-Marxist and anti-Leninist stand of the 20th Congress, Pomeroy takes any act or attitude having the character of "combating the personality cult of Stalin" as "democratic". The entire historical epoch preceding the counter-revolution of the Soviet revisionist renegade clique is completely negated by him through the simple trick of heaping all blame on Comrade Stalin, the leading representative of the proletariat after Lenin and before the usurpation of power by the revisionist rascals. Like his Soviet revisionist masters, he does not have the least respect for the Marxist-Leninist theory of classes, masses, parties and leaders. The complete negation of Comrade Stalin is nothing but a vicious attack on the great leader of the dictatorship of the proletariat and the international communist movement for nearly thirty years. The logic of the revisionist renegades would subject even Lenin to the filthiest calumny for being the great and venerated leader of the Soviet and world proletariat and for having the ruthlessly combated the counter-revolutionaries.

What Pomeroy considers "democracy" is the bourgeois coup d'tat executed by his Soviet revisionist masters, the widespread fascist purges carried out in all the Party and government

organizations, from the higher to the lower echelons, and the replacement of proletarian cadres in leading positions by the bourgeois intelligentsia and the worst dregs of Soviet society. Nearly 70 per cent of the CPSU Central Committee members elected at the 22nd Congress in 1961. This big purge at the top reflected the bigger purges below. The 22nd Congress systematized the Khrushchov revisionist programme of “three peacefuls” (peaceful coexistence”, “peaceful competition” and “peaceful transition”) and “two wholes” (“party of the whole people” and “state of the whole people”). By the time of the 23rd Congress in 1966, nearly 60 per cent of the CPSU Central Committee members elected in the 20th Congress were purged. The 23rd Congress sanctified the “new system” or “economic reform” which was first approved in the September 1965 plenum of the Brezhnev-led CPSU Central Committee and which further pushed the full-scale restoration of capitalism.

Pomeroy considers it “impressive” that all kinds of ogres have crept out of their holes in the Soviet Union. He is extremely elated that in Soviet elections the revisionist-dominated Communist Party has lost prestige and out-and-out counter-revolutionaries are being voted into office; that bourgeois managers are in control over the means of production and are skimming the cream of the social wealth with their high salaries and allowances, big bonuses and other special privileges; and that a bourgeois intelligentsia is imitating what is most decadent in Western bourgeois culture under the guise of “internationalism”. He hails the entire rigmarole as “liberal atmosphere” and as the “broadening of democracy”.

In pursuit of What Pomeroy calls “socialist legality”, the Soviet revisionist renegades have sent genuine Communists in great numbers to mental hospitals, prisons and concentration camps since the liquidation of the proletarian dictatorship by Khrushchov. Outright assassinations have occurred. Tanks and armored cars have been dispatched to suppress the resistance of the revolutionary masses of various nationalities against the oppressive revisionist rule. The Soviet army has been indoctrinated with revisionist ideology and revolutionary elements have been purged. Fascist laws and decrees such as the “regulations of the work of people’s control”, “amendments to the basic principles of the criminal code”, “law on the basic principles of the corrective-labour legislation” and “regulations on preliminary detention” have proliferated. The police and spies have greatly increased in number and have run berserk. The army, the police, the prisons and courts are relentlessly used to enforce the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie against the Soviet people. Under the Brezhnev revisionist renegade clique, social-fascism, social-militarism, and Great-Russian chauvinism have become even more vicious than during the time of Khrushchov.

Pomeroy actually equates “democracy” with bureaucratism and pictures it as a “guided process” “through channels” designed by the revisionist renegade clique. The revolutionary mass movement is anathema to him. Thus, he states:

The overcoming of Stalinism and the expansion of democracy have been astonishing. The implication of the present economic reform, with its predicted effects on bureaucratic tendencies, is that it will lead to extensive changes. Such processes have not been reflected in mass struggles among the Soviet people.

Pomeroy admits that the anti-Stalin campaign of vilification and the “economic reform” have never been reflected in mass struggles but merely imposed on the masses.

Under the Brezhnev revisionist renegade clique, Soviet social-imperialism has fully emerged to invade the territory of other countries and abuse other peoples. It has exacerbated its new tsarist and colonial rule over a number of East European countries and the Mongolian People’s Republic. It has invaded the Czechoslovakia and abused the people there. It cannot tolerate the slightest difference of opinion with the leadership of other revisionist countries and is wont to using the Warsaw Pact and COMECON to threaten and blackmail other countries. Also, it has not relented in its efforts to sabotage and subvert the People’s Republic of Albania. It has repeatedly made aggressive incursions on Chinese territory and has tried to outdo the old tsars. In various other parts of the world, especially in Asia, Africa and Latin America, it has always tried to collude with or outbid U.S. imperialism in exploiting and oppressing the people.

## **II. On The All-Round Restoration Of Capitalism**

The great Lenin said: “Politics cannot but have precedence over economics. To argue differently means forgetting the ABC of Marxism.” And Chairman Mao reiterates their Marxist-Leninist view: “Ideology and politics are the commander, the soul in everything. Economic and technical work are bound to go wrong if we in the least slacken our ideological and political work.” In a socialist society, therefore, all proletarian revolutionaries are duty-bound to follow his teaching: “Grasp revolution, promote production”

It is utterly wrong to make production take the place of revolution or put the former in command of the latter. Thus, it is a desecration for Pomeroy and his Soviet revisionist masters to “celebrate” the 50th anniversary of the Great October Revolution in the following spirit:

There are red banners and mass demonstrations on occasion, but mainly for the holiday; they are not for making the demands but for celebrating progress measured in the organizational report, the statistical table, the computer... Today’s revolution goes on in the workshop and laboratory.

This is bourgeois philistinism, pure and simple!

It is in this spirit that Pomeroy claims the Soviet Union to be the “most advanced socialist country” and to be “on a level higher, more complex and further developed than those reached by its brothers of the new society”. What he considers as the “greatest significance” of the 50th year of the Soviet Union is that “a new communist society of abundance for all is on the immediate program of the present generation” and that “industry is now gearing itself to pour out the abundance that can satisfy the increasingly sophisticated wants and desires of the people”. All because of “new techniques”, he boasts that there is already “superabundance” in the Soviet Union. He prates:

What typically troubles people in the Soviet Union now is not where to find the next pound of potatoes but where to find the newest model television, while the line for trousers is in the process of being replaced by the waiting list for an automobile.

But is this the truth?

Within his own book, Pomeroy fails to be consistent with his lies and slaps his own face repeatedly. He reports that in his land of “superabundance” he saw several streets beggars and these were not supposed to shake his faith in the socialist label tacked by his Soviet revisionist masters on their system. While he argues for the putting of principal stress on private ownership of cars as a material incentive, he reports that the public transport system is gravely inadequate and inefficient throughout the Soviet Union. While he argues for putting principal stress on private ownership of flats and villas as material incentive, he reports that there are long waiting lists for accommodation in public tenements, that residents in overcrowded tenements are grouchy, that there are those who collect high rent privately and that blackmarketing of construction materials is spawned by private construction. While he argues for the expansion of private plots and personal subsidiary husbandry, he cites specific data proving that these have been attended to at the expense of the collective farms. While he boasts that there has been no shortage in the basic commodities as potatoes and trousers, he reports that Khrushchov was cast away by his successors on account of agricultural shortages that included potato and cotton. He also testifies that there are long queues and bitter wranglings over scarce goods at department store in such show-window cities as Moscow and Leningrad.

There is certainly no superabundance for the Soviet people. Those who enjoy the “superabundance” touted by Pomeroy belong to the privileged bourgeois stratum. They are the “managers”, “experts” and “professionals” who plunder the social wealth of the Soviet Union. They have high incomes that are ten, a hundred or even a thousand times more than the income of the average worker. As Pomeroy himself confesses, they are the ones who can afford to buy the automobiles manufactured by Fiat and Renault and also to buy their own flats so that they can be saved from the “inconvenience” suffered by the masses.

Under the present circumstances in the Soviet Union, it is simply preposterous for Pomeroy and his revisionist masters to peddle the hope that within ten years (1967-77) passenger transport will be free and rent will no longer be collected. Big promises are made by the Brezhnev revisionist renegade clique obviously in order to blame failure later on their signboard of socialism and further justify the brazen restoration of capitalism. Khrushchov in his own time made big promises about “building the material and technical foundation of communism”. When he failed to fulfill these promises, his successors went on to accelerate the restoration of capitalism in the style of further drinking poison to quench thirst.

Let us sample the rotten and selfish bourgeois arguments of Pomeroy. Regarding the private ownership of cars: “Anyone who has been embedded in the rush-hour Moscow metro crowds can appreciate the urge to buy car on the part of a commuting resident in a remote district.”  
Regarding the private ownership of flats:

One of the advantages in owning a flat is that it can be remodeled or partitioned to the owner’s liking, whereas in government housing permission for this must be obtained from the authorities. The greatest impulse in buying a lot, however, is that new living space can be obtained faster in this way; normally people wait for a long period on a list for new public housing.

It is not clear that the Soviet privileged bourgeois stratum lives it up at the expense of the Soviet people?

The “increasingly sophisticated wants and desires” of the privileged bourgeois stratum, as Pomeroy himself picturesquely describes them, include the adoption of the miniskirt, the imitation of American jazz in the youth cafes and the approximation of the latest styles and colors in London and New York by the house of Modes in Moscow. Of course, these quiddities of the West are mere indicators of the gross luxury and decadence that characterize the high living enjoyed by the privileged bourgeois stratum. Pomeroy calls these “progress”.

In an attempt to distort the Marxist-Leninist criticism that the Soviet privileged bourgeois stratum exploits the Soviet working people, Pomeroy claims that it is the "increase in living standards and in material well-being “denigrated” as capitalism by Marxist-Leninists. Childishly, he tries to counter Chairman Mao’s criticism of the restoration of capitalism by referring to the fact that he ate sumptuous food at the residence of a friend if his who obviously belongs to the privileged bourgeois stratum. The profits of capitalism are, indeed, enjoyed by this privileged bourgeois stratum. The Soviet masses, on the other hand, suffer increasing impoverishment, unemployment, rising prices, shortages of supplies, shoddy goods and the like.

What the Soviet modern revisionists mean by “merging personal interest and public interest” is all too clear. It is the imposition of the personal interests of a few, the privileged bourgeois stratum, on the interests of the people.

Pomeroy actually makes brazen attacks on Marxism-Leninism, particularly dialectical materialism, when he pontificates: “The contrasting of personal and social interests, attempts to treat the personal interest as something incompatible with the ideals of the revolution, all this is opposed to the principles of socialism.” There is a contradiction between self-interest and public interest. To deny this contradiction is to cover up self-interest and push modern revisionism forward.

Thus, it is important to always remember that as we serve people, we must fight self and repudiate revisionism. True Communists are unselfish and their concern is always to serve the people. They will always see to it that the people are first assured of their basic necessities and the general level of livelihood is constantly raised, with no wide gaps between the cadre and the average worker. Centralized planning by the proletariat is used in a socialist society essentially to see to it that as production is raised. In the people’s livelihood is better assured and is far better than in the Soviet Union despite the latter’s claim of “technical superiority”.

Let us go into the concrete meaning of a certain statement made by Brezhnev at the 23rd Congress of the CPSU:

The slow development of the agriculture was due to a violation of the economic laws of production, neglect of the material incentives and of the correct combination of public and personal interests.

Khrushchov is hereby blamed by his successor for not expanding the private plots fast enough and for not developing the private economy in agriculture fast enough. In this regard, Pomeroy reports:

During the premiership of Khrushchov (who has been criticized for disregard of the economic sciences) there were severe restrictions on cultivation of private plots by those belonging to collective farms. The restriction were eliminated after the ouster of Khrushchov.

Pomeroy also faults the collectivization carried out by the great proletarian founders of the first socialist state. He fails:

“Backwardness” in agriculture is not wholly due to the willful neglect of economic laws. The great difficulty in the collectivization that began almost four decades ago was that the mechanization essential to the process was not sufficiently available, while the peasantry, still rooted in the age-old backwardness of small-holding cultivation, was not technologically prepared for the new system.

The modern revisionists put mechanization and technique ahead of politics and cooperation and collectivization. They adhere to the theory of “productive forces” — the theory of fostering capitalism on the pretext of waiting for machines. And yet even as they boast of a high technological level now, they rapidly revert to a kulak economy in agriculture and destroy the basis of socialist agriculture. They attack the establishment of Chinese communes in the same spirit that they have wrecked socialist agriculture in the Soviet Union. It is well to remember that there would have been no basis for rapid industrialization in China and had there been no firm and consistent raising of the levels of agricultural cooperation and had there been no effective repudiation of Liu Shao-chi’s own adherence to the theory of “productive forces”.

Soviet modern revisionism has brought down the living standards and reduced the material well-being of Soviet people. Disastrous economic results followed Khrushchov’s treacherous act of raising to a state policy the imitation of the techniques of capitalist management in the United States. But, instead of discarding that rotten policy, the Brezhnev revisionist renegade clique has blamed Khrushchov only for not outdoing himself in elaborating on and implementing the capitalist techniques of management. The revisionist programme of the 22nd Congress of the CPSU is a common ground for the Khrushchov-Brezhnev revisionist renegades. Its essence is the restoration of capitalism. That is what the Brezhnev revisionist renegade clique calls “following the scientific laws of economic”. And in this regard, Pomeroy arrogantly repeats a reactionary statement from Pravda: “But the fact that a law leads to consequences undesirable to us does not stop its being a law and a law cannot be declared ineffective, just because people ignore it.” This is a bourgeois metaphysical statement which runs counter to the Marxist-Leninist law that the people are the motive force of history. What impudence!

The Brezhnev revisionist renegade clique gets the most lavish praise from Pomeroy for making a “profound adjustment” in the Soviet economic system since 1965. This is the “new economic system”, otherwise called “economic reform” which establishes in a legal form the capitalist principle of profit for the benefit of the oligarchy of the big monopoly bureaucrats and the

privileged bourgeois stratum, all at the expense of the Soviet working people. Its new feature is supposed to be the provision of material incentives, such as bonuses and other pay increases, for profitable management in an enterprise. It dictates the practice of capitalist management in all fields of the Soviet economy and it sanctifies the bonus as a "moral stimulus". It involves the complete disruption of the socialist relations of production and the thorough breaking up of the socialist economic base. The socialist economic system of unified economic planning by the state is abolished in favor of the anarchy of enterprises and farms operated on the basis of profit-seeking.

In this regard, Pomeroy gloats: "Planning and distribution in the previous condition of scarcity is not the same as planning and distribution in a growing condition of abundance." He blathers:

It is at the level of the industrial enterprise that material incentives are being given their greatest emphasis. Hard economic facts have shown that centralized planning and the quota system of production at this stage of development do not enable the fullest efficient use of the plant and equipment. These aims, it is felt, can be more completely achieved by linking the personal interest of the worker with what he is producing, i.e. by tying added income to efficient and good work.

This statement is in line with Kosygin's statement in 1965:

The present-day scientific and technical revolution advances to the fore such problems as technical standards, quality, reliability of goods and their effective use. It is precisely these factors that are today the focus of peaceful economic competition between socialist and capitalist countries.

Pomeroy gives the following as "the two main steps that comprise the heart of economic reform": "giving of much greater degree of responsibility to the individual enterprise for planning, for production, for the introduction of new technology, for the accumulation and use of profits, and for arranging the sale of its products"; and greater emphasis on material incentives for workers in order to increase their efficiency and their output"

"Much greater degrees of responsibility to the individual enterprises" actually means further disintegrating and fragmenting the Soviet economy and reinforcing the overlord position of bourgeois managers and directors in individual enterprises. "Greater emphasis on material incentives for workers" actually means allowing the bourgeois managers and directors to treat the workers as wage slaves and get for themselves the profits of the enterprises. Pomeroy himself observes:

The expansion of the enterprises' rights and the strengthening of economic stimulation can give rise to parochial tendencies, to setting the interests of the enterprise against the interests of society, and even to money-grubbing...

Pomeroy also quotes Soviet "experts" Oleg Yun, who states:

The new system of industrial management and planning substantially extends the right of factory managers... in the sphere of planning, capital construction and repairs, introduction of more advanced technology and up-to-date techniques, material and technical supplies, marketing of finished goods, finance, labor and wages, etc.

The “new economic system” gives the enterprise the authority to “own, use and dispose of” all property; to sell “surplus” equipment, means of transport, raw materials, materials and fuel; to let the premises, warehouses, equipment and means of transport which are “temporarily not in use”; to write off on their own initiative “obsolete” assets; to use “funds at their disposal” for capital construction that is “outside the plan”. There is a wide ground for nefarious manipulation of assets. Managers even sell for profit such means of production as machine tools, hoists, generators, locomotives and seamless tubes which are supposed to be state property. Soviet enterprises make profits on each other. Means of production and raw materials are also finding their way into private enterprises.

The managers are given the power to fix or change the wages, grades and bonuses for the workers and staff, to recruit or lay off workers and mete out punishment to them, and to decide at will the structure and personnel of the enterprises. The ensuing results is the emergence of a grave problem of unemployment in the Soviet Union. Unemployment has developed on a large scale for two reasons: an enterprise goes bankrupt and is dissolved or workers are laid off or classified as apprentices to allow the managers and directors to claim bigger profits for themselves. In short, the enterprise of socialist ownership have been turned into capitalist undertakings by the privileged bourgeois stratum, and broad sections of working people in industry and agriculture have turned into wage slaves who have to sell their labor power. In the face of the grave problem of unemployment in the Soviet Union, Pomeroy can only shamelessly make the false claim that there is even labor shortage there.

Class polarization has been aggravated as a result of the “economic reform”. The leaders of industrial enterprises, “state farms” and commercial establishments draw high pay and bonuses which are scandalously several times more than those of the workers; enjoy high allowances and other special privileges; and indulge in unlawful practices such as manipulation of accounts, speculation, blackmarketing and underground enterprises. They grossly abuse their power, and exploits and oppress the working people.

The enterprises are willing to produce only what they individually deem to be profitable, thus causing economic dislocation and gross disproportion in the overall development of the economy and shortages in basic commodities, raw materials and spare parts. Enterprise engaged in the same line of production compete with each other. To exact high profits, they keep on raising prices. They also raise profits covertly by using inferior materials, thus turning out goods of every poor quality.

Though there is anarchy in the relationship of Soviet enterprises due to capitalist competition, there is inevitably the trend towards accumulation and concentration. Small and weak enterprises are drawn by big and strong enterprises into large-scale amalgamations in order to bring the principle of profit into full play and give maximum profits to the monopoly bureaucrat

bourgeoisie. The amalgamations become independent business accounting units and become real monopolies. The new economic system" harps on the autonomy of individual business enterprises only because it aims to destroy the principle of unified socialist planning and build up the kind of centralization demanded by state monopoly capitalism. An example of a huge monopoly enterprise in the Soviet Union today is the Ministry of Investments and Automation Tools, an independent business accounting ministry.

“Economic reform” in the countryside has brought about a private economy — a kulak economy. Socialist restrictions on private plots and private livestock have been removed. Pomeroy himself unwittingly provides us some 1966 data (though these are watered down, they are still very revealing) which show the anti-socialist course in agriculture. According to him, “personal subsidiary husbandry” involved only “three per cent” of the country’s cultivated land yet it accounted for about “17 per cent” of the national agricultural production. Within this total figure are: 60 per cent of the national potato crop, 40 per cent of the national crop of green vegetables, 40 per cent of the national production of dressed meat, 39 per cent of the national milk production and 68 per cent of the national egg production. With his twisted anti-socialist logic, Pomeroy argues that the private plots and private livestock should be enlarged because they have produced so much. This is supposed to be in compliance with the “scientific laws of economics”. He completely disregards the fact that the collective and state farms have been neglected in favor of the private plots.

Every household is ordinarily allowed a private plot of one-half hectare and to own cattle and other livestock. Collective farms are allowed to provide machinery to individual members to till their private plots, transport facilities to market their products, pastures for their private livestock and loans for purchasing more livestock. While it appears that the private tillers and owners of livestock stand to gain much, they are eventually manipulated by a few private merchants in the course of free competition. The leaders of state and collective farms easily assure themselves of the status of kulaks and merchants by allotting larger private plots to themselves, employing hired laborers to till them and resorting to every trick within their power.

Going farther, the Brezhnev revisionist renegade clique has turned over state and collective farms to “field teams” composed of only one to three households which arrange production independently, employ hired laborers and do their own accounting. Nationalized lands have also been distributed to “teams” for long-term lease and private cultivation. Those state and collective farms which still formally present themselves as such have been completely put on a capitalist basis. The leaders of these farms have a free hand in production, marketing, competition, hiring of laborers and appropriating profits for themselves. As the state demands an ever increasing quota of produce (especially grain) to be sold to itself, the leaders always manage to pass on the burden to the peasant masses and farm workers.

To support what actually amounts to private ownership of agricultural land, the Soviet revisionist renegades have lifted all restrictions on the prices of agricultural produce and livestock products in the free markets. Capitalist free markets have been created on a large scale and free competitions operates rampantly to the satisfaction of big private merchants. Large free markets with modern facilities and hotels for private merchants have been constructed at huge costs.

Industrial products and even means of production are also peddled in these free markets. Agricultural and industrial commodities not available in the “state stores” could be bought at the free markets at high prices. Commodities produced by underground factories are also sold here. The “state stores” have also turned to profit-seeking and free competition. A state of confusion reigns in the entire commercial sector at the expense of the people.

To build “communism”, the Soviet revisionist renegades have turned to seeking aid from foreign monopoly groups. Brezhnev has turned into reality Khrushchov’s wish “to accept credits from the devil himself”. It has gotten loans from American, French, Italian, and Japanese monopoly capitalist combines. It has begged for loans from West Germany by bartering away the sovereign interests of the German Democratic Republic. It has invited Japan into Siberia and has to sold out Soviet natural resources in the process. It is shockingly shameless for a country that claims to be “socialist” to beg for loans from entities defeated during World War II. According to Pomeroy himself, the Soviet Union puts “considerable emphasis” on the importation of the consumer goods from the imperialist countries despite its claims to superabundance.

On the basis of the all-round restoration of capitalism, the Soviet Union has become social-imperialist, exploiting and reducing a number of East European countries and the Mongolian People’s Republic into its colonies. These colonies have been turned by Soviet social-imperialism into orchards, subsidiary processing shops, sources of raw materials, fields of investments and dumping ground for Soviet industrial products. Brezhnev has aggravated Khrushchov’s policy of the “international division of labor” which dictates on the members of the COMECON to serve the needs of Soviet monopoly bureaucrat capitalism.

The claws of Soviet social-imperialism have also extended far into other countries in Asia, Africa and Latin America. It pretends to extend long-term loans at a nominal interest rate of two-and-a-half per cent. But in fact it delivers shoddy goods that are overpriced. Soviet social-imperialism is also a big munitions merchant, which arbitrary prices the arms and ammunition it sells to various countries and thereby extracts huge profits. To India and United Arab Republic, it delivers to the weapons of the better quality than those it has delivered to the Democratic Republic of Vietnam simply because these countries pay hard currency or pay in kind with local commodities that are greatly underpriced.

In line with its social-imperialist and social-fascist character, the Soviet Union has steadily engaged in social-imperialism. Its economic activity is more and more geared to arms expansion and war preparations. It would rather produce guns than butter. The 1970 military budget of the Soviet Union is 100 per cent higher than its 1966 military budget. Though the income of the Soviet people is only 60 per cent of the income of the American people, the Soviet Union spends annually for its war machine an amount comparable to the annual U.S. military expenditures.

The overall economic situation in the Soviet Union was bad enough in 1967, when Pomeroy wrote his book. But it has become even worse in succeeding years as a result of the “new economic system” or “economic reform” pushed by the Brezhnev revisionist renegade clique. Under the leadership of Stalin, Soviet industry used to develop at a high speed. Taking for example the 1950-53 period, the average annual rate of growth of Soviet industry stood at 16 per

cent. But this dropped to 9.6 per cent during the nine years following the 20th Congress of the CPSU in 1956 under Khrushchov. This further dropped to 8.5. per cent during the five years since Brezhnev assumed power in 1965. Despite the boastful claims of Pomeroy and his Soviet revisionist masters about the “higher level of techniques” of today, the growth rates of labor productivity have consistently gone down in the Soviet Union.

The shortage of industrial products has become more and more acute because of the disproportionate development of production in various branches. The Soviet revisionist renegades admits that the variety of steel products in 1970 could meet only half of the actual needs and that many departments in need of steel products could not get them. Great difficulties also attended the supply of fuel for public utilities and domestic use. Nearly all the union republics suffered from shortage of building materials and parts. Work came to a standstill in many factories for lack of raw materials.

Brezhnev has done worse than Khrushchov in the field of agriculture. Based on the doctored statistics officially released by the revisionist renegades themselves, the per capita grain output in the Soviet Union in the 1965-69 period was 16 kilograms less than in 1964, the year of Khrushchov’s downfall; the per capita cotton output — the main economic crop — stagnated in 1969; the per capita output of potatoes, vegetables, etc, seriously fell. The situation in animal husbandry was even worse. The per capita head of oxen, pigs and sheep went down sharply at the end of 1969 as compared with that at the end of 1915. Without enough supply of vegetables and beef, Brezhnev certainly cannot make “goulash” communism as Khrushchov before him was not able to.

The 1966-70 “five-year economic plan” of Brezhnev revisionist renegade clique fell far below its already low targets. Instead of raising the living standards of the people. it has merely raised their costs of living. Basic commodities. including bread, salt and matchsticks, are in short supply, have poor quality and are highly priced in the Soviet Union. It is absolutely foolish for Pomeroy to imagine “superabundance” or hope for it with the use of capitalist methods by his Soviet revisionist masters. The Soviet working people are suffering the heavily; and the root of their suffering is the all-round restoration of capitalism by the Khrushchov-Brezhnev revisionist renegades.

### **III. On The Question Of Superstructure**

Chairman Mao Tsetung is the Lenin of the present era. He has inherited, defended and developed Marxism-Leninism with genius, creatively and comprehensively, and has brought it to a higher and completely new stage, Mao Tsetung Thought. To him we owe the invincible ideological weapon that makes certain the total collapse of imperialism and the worldwide victory of socialism.

Upon the rise of modern revisionism and the restoration of capitalism in the Soviet Union and other socialist countries, the imperialist and their running dogs were gleeful and congratulated themselves for their view that a dictatorship of the proletariat can be peacefully eroded through a number of generations. But Chairman Mao has come forward and brought forth the key to the

solution of the problem of the restoration of capitalism in a socialist society after analyzing and summing up the historical experience of socialist countries. He has put forward the theory of continuing revolution under the dictatorship of the proletariat and has successfully put it into practice through the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution.

The Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution is a great revolutionary mass movement under the leadership of the proletariat for seizing the superstructure and making it conform to the socialist economic base. It has resulted in the overthrow of Party persons in authority taking the capitalist road, consolidated the dictatorship of the proletariat in China and tempered the People's Republic of China to become bulwark of socialism in the world. In the process of this unprecedented epoch-making revolution, successors of the revolution have come forward to frustrate the hopes of the imperialist and the social-imperialists for a restoration of capitalism in China.

For all these, the Soviet revisionist renegades and their hack Pomeroy hate Chairman Mao and everything that he stands for. They have a grain fright for their own inevitable doom in the hands of the revolutionary masses. They would utter anything as they try to seek comfort from their shadows. Thus, Pomeroy describes the Great Proletarian Revolution as "based on an effort to build socialism and communism on 'a very low level'". They describe modern revisionism, the restoration of capitalism and putting material incentives in command of everything as being "on a higher level".

Pomeroy further tries to misinterpret the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution:

The occurrence, during the proletarian cultural revolution, of indiscriminately rejecting and even destroying the literature, art and other cultural forms of the past, caused one of the most disturbed reactions among the Soviet people I met, who ascribed the behavior among to extreme nationalism. It is generally asserted to me that the Red Guards, who carried this out had seriously damaged the image of socialism and of communist behavior in the eyes of the world.

The main current and outcome of the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution were excellent. The ghost and monster were swept away positions of dominance in the superstructure. But in the main there was no "indiscriminate rejections and destructions" of the literature, art and cultural forms of the past. Traditional and foreign forms that can serve the present revolutionary needs of China and the proletariat were given correct revolutionary content, as splendidly evident in the literary and art models that emerged in the course of the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution. Even those things of the past that are definitely not proletarian in character were preserved in their isolated places to serve as negative examples. With regard to the Red Guards, they constitute a great mass movement that has heightened the revolutionary spirit of serving the people among the youth, that has tempered the youth in revolutionary struggles under the leadership of the proletariat and that has trained hundreds of millions of youth as successors in the revolution. The imperialists and the Social-imperialist have been most disappointed with the Red Guards because their emergence has served to explode the sinister hope that modern revisionism would take over China as it did the Soviet Union upon the coming of the "third or fourth generation".

As fools who never discard their worn-out tricks, the Soviet revisionist renegades with through Pomeroy to discredit Chairman Mao and everything that he stands for in the same manner they have tried to discredit the great Marxist-Leninist Comrade Stalin. They harp on what they call the “personality cult” and the “the harmful effects of Stalinism”.

The revisionist renegades are as absurd as “mayflies plotting to topple a giant tree” as they try to picture the universal theory of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tsetung Thought as a mere expression of the “nationalist outlook”. This theory encompasses the new-democratic revolution and socialist revolution and guarantees the transition and socialism and communism. In taking the great contributions of Chairman Mao to the stage of Leninism alone, no genuine revolutionary would ever fail to give him due respect as great leader of the world proletariat.

Much as he would want to present in his book a culture “on a higher level” in the present system dominated by the Soviet monopoly bureaucrat capitalist, Pomeroy merely succeeds in presenting a degenerate bourgeois culture whose best claims in Pomeroy’s own terms are to “liberalism”, “Western influence” and even to “mysticism”. He misrepresents this as the fruit of the “50-year cultural revolution”. Thus, he slanders the October Revolution even as he pretends to commemorate it with his book.

He is extremely happy to observe that “the trend to liberalism has been set” and hails the Pravda editorial (January 27, 1967) “indicating that the forces of liberalization were gradually prevailing”. Swaggering with his bourgeois ideology, he raves: “An emotional, or romantic, acceptance of Marxism... had contributed to the blindness that had enabled the phenomenon of Stalinism to go uncorrected for so long.” Here it is clear that the “anti-Stalinism” of the Soviet revisionist renegades is actually a pretext for their anti-Marxism and anti-Leninism.

These anti-communist scoundrels often pretend to honor Lenin and to invoke his name. But as Lenin once said:

It has always been the case in history that after the death of revolutionary leaders who were popular among the oppressed classes, their enemies have attempt to appropriate their names so as to deceive the oppressed classes.

In essence, the revisionist renegades use the name of Lenin to attack Lenin and refer to Leninism only to attack Leninism.

Pomeroy refers to such bourgeois degenerates as Boris Pasternak, Alexander Solzhenitsyn, Yevgeny Yevtushenko, Anatoly Zhigulin, Bulat Okujava, Andrei Voznesensky and the like as the cream of the Soviet literature in what he calls a “50-year cultural revolution”. He considers as their principal qualification their being “anti-Stalinist”. And he trumpets at the same time the theory of literature for literature’s sake. He raves:

He who is ready to criticize must also be ready for the give and take of the process, although it should be expected that criticism of literature be kept within the literary framework.

“Criticism of literature within the literary framework” denies the political character of every literary work. Chairman Mao teaches us:

In the world today all culture, all literature and art belong to definite classes and are geared to definite political lines. There is no such thing as art for art’s sake, art that stands above classes, art that is detached from or independent of politics. Proletarian literature and art are part of the whole proletarian revolutionary cause; they are, as Lenin said, cogs and wheels in the whole revolutionary machine.

Pomeroy pays the highest tribute to Andrei Voznesensky whom he touts as “the best poet to emerge from the current literary ferment”. He reports that they agreed in their talk that the 20th Congress “had contributed to a great release of expression”. The revisionist scoundrel Pomeroy at the same time endorses what Voznesensky calls a “resurgence of the age-old mysticism in the Russian soul that is found in much of our literature”.

He is glad that the Sinyavsky-Daniel case has become rallying point within the Soviet Writers’ Union for further “liberalization”. He considers as “conservative” the lip-service given by the Brezhnev to the “principle” of partisanship in art and literature and the class approach in assessing all matters in the cultural sphere”.

Twisting Lenin’s statement that “Marxism is an example of how communism arose out of the sum total of human knowledge”, Pomeroy seeks to equate it with Brezhnev’s statement that “the tasks of the Komsomol is to help the younger generation... to enrich their memory with the knowledge of all the values created by mankind.” And in this regard, he praises the revisionist elements among the Soviet youth for having the “the broadest interest in the Western literature” which is “never a contradiction to what the young people loved in their own”. In whom are they interested most in Western literature? Hemingway, Salinger, John Updike, Kafka, Beckett and Ionesco! Pomeroy tries to pass off bourgeois cosmopolitanism for proletarian internationalism.

He is happy to report that Shelley and Byron are being quoted and interpreted “solely in the light of being defenders of the British working class” in the Soviet secondary schools. He approves of Hemingway as the favorite author of the revisionist elements among the Soviet youth and lauds this bourgeois defeatist author for “the courage of his heroes, his preoccupation with good and noble impulses in people” and the “moral tone of his distinctions” He also approves of John Steinbeck as another “favorite author”. He praises John Steinbeck’s *Grapes of Wrath* and *Winter of Our Discontent* for “preaching protest against violence”. A true Marxist-Leninist can easily see the essence of Steinbeck as a bourgeois literary pessimist, at most interested in exposure but terrified by revolutionary violence. There is no surprise at all that this anti-communist scoundrel today rabidly supports the U.S. war of aggression in Vietnam. One who is against revolutionary violence easily turns into one supporting counter-revolutionary violence.

By way of countering any agreement that Soviet revisionist intellectuals are too much engrossed in Western bourgeois literature, Pomeroy makes a defense that merely exposes further the counter-revolutionary character of his Soviet revisionist colleagues as well as his own. He states:

A fierce respect for the great figures of Russian literature and art is to be found among the Soviet intellectuals, and this is in sense one of the best defenses against Western subversion, Pushkin, Tolstoy, Gogol, Chekov, even Dostoevski, are turned to for cultural sustenance.

Pomeroy completely neglects to pay even lip-service to the great proletarian revolutionary writer, Maxim Gorky. It is condemnable that he and his fellow revisionist renegades can turn for succor and sustenance only to bourgeois-feudal masters of art and literature. These anti-Marxist and anti-Leninist find nothing noteworthy or praiseworthy about the cultural achievements of the Soviet proletariat. They can only appreciate those things in the superstructure that denigrate the dictatorship of the proletariat and that support the restoration of capitalism in the Soviet Union. Thus, such bourgeois degenerates as Ilya Ehrenburg and Mikhail Sholokhov have officially become literary favorites of the Khrushchov-Brezhnev revisionist renegades as well as of U.S. imperialism.

Though at certain points Pomeroy seems to deny that the Soviet revisionist renegades are under the heavy influence of Western bourgeois culture, he cannot avoid citing even the grossest manifestations of such influence, as the blackmarketing youth who ask him if he has foreign goods to sell or the youth who shows interest in dope. He is glad that what he regards as the cream of the Soviet youth, in fancy Western-style get-up, twist to the tune of American jazz in the Kremlin Palace of Congresses. He raves:

The best Soviet jazz orchestras, like the jazz '64 and the jazz '65 groups, are superb musicians who have distilled the very best in Western jazz and are applying it to Russian folk strains.

He states:

Young people see their interest in such cultural aspects as being in line with their internationalism, and not as an anti-Soviet attitude. They feel that any restrictions on such interests are a departure from the internationalism their organizations advocate.

Modern revisionism has arisen in the Soviet Union as a result of the failure to seize the superstructure from the bourgeois and also as a result of vigorous attempts of imperialism to push in its ideological influence. Because culture is the concentrated expression or reflection of politics and economic, Soviet culture — as Pomeroy himself reports and praises — is a testimony to the all-round restoration of capitalism in the Soviet Union.

It is clear that before this all-round restoration of capitalism the counter-revolutionaries bred their ranks within the superstructure. They did not immediately seize political power by force of arms or openly convert the socialized means of production into private ones. What they did was to sneak into the Party, the government, the army and the various spheres of culture and gradually turn these into their instruments. Concentrating on ideological, they worked from within until conditions were ripe. In this regard, Chairman Mao teaches us:

To overthrow a political power, it is always necessary first of all to create public opinion, to do work in the ideological sphere. This is true for the revolutionary class as well as for the counter-revolutionary class.

Regarding the question of struggle in the superstructure in a socialist society, Chairman Mao has pointed out:

We have won basic victory in transforming the ownership of the means of production, but we have not yet won complete victory on the political and ideological fronts. In the ideological field, the question of who will win in the struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeois has not been really settled yet. We still have to wage a protracted struggle against bourgeois and petty-bourgeois ideology. It is wrong not to understand this and to give up ideological struggle. All erroneous ideas, all poisonous weeds, all ghosts and monsters, must be subjected to criticism; in no circumstance should they be allowed to spread unchecked.

It will take a fairly long period of time to decide the issue in the ideological struggle between socialism and capitalism. The reason is that the influence of the bourgeoisie and of the intellectuals who came from the old society will remain in our country for a long time to come, and so will their class ideology. If this is not sufficiently understood, or is not understood at all, the gravest mistakes will be made and the necessity of waging the struggle in the ideological field will be ignored.

#### **IV. On “Peaceful Coexistence” And Social-Imperialism**

From the Khrushchov to Brezhnev, the foreign policy of the Soviet Union had reflected the all-round restoration of capitalism. Though the Soviet revisionist rulers pay lip-service to proletarian internationalism, they actually betray the interests of the world proletariat and all oppressed peoples for the benefit of the international bourgeoisie, particularly of the Soviet monopoly bourgeoisie. Since the sixties, a full-blown Soviet social-imperialism (with state monopoly capitalism as its base) has joined U.S. imperialism to become one of the two main enemies of the world proletarian revolution. It has become the principal accomplice of U.S. imperialism in counter-revolution and has always tried to outbid U.S. imperialism in counter-revolution.

The anti-Stalin campaign launched by Khrushchov formally marked the inception of the bourgeois foreign policy by the Soviet Union. In itself the campaign had the motive and effect of causing a serious disruption and split within the international communist movement. Under the banner of anti-Stalinism, the modern revisionist and Right opportunist crept out of their holes in all Communist Parties and in socialist states and acted to seize control over these, succeeding in so many cases. The sudden complete negation of Comrade Stalin constituted a surprise attack on the international communist movement which had always held him in high esteem as a great leader and teacher of the Soviet people and world proletariat. Refusing to be taken in by the anti-communist stand taken by Khrushchov, the Chinese Communist Party, the Albanian Party Labour and other Marxist-Leninist parties stood their ground.

Putting forward the line of “peaceful transition” and the “parliamentary road”, the 20th Congress of the CPSU opposed the Marxist-Leninist theory on the state and revolution. It was loudly proclaimed by the Soviet betrayers of Lenin and Stalin that the transition from capitalism to socialism had become peaceful and the aggressive nature of U.S. imperialism was already changing and becoming tractable and that Communist Parties in countries dominated by reactionary regimes could get power through elections and the parliamentary road. The historical experience and lessons of the world proletariat were covered up by the modern revisionists. The old merger party of the Communist Party of the Philippines and the Socialist Party for one was taken in by the revisionist line through the instrumentality of the Lava revisionist renegades who promptly heeded the call for betrayal made by Khrushchov.

Khrushchov and his fellow revisionist renegades, including Brezhnev and Kosygin, knew no bounds in their betrayal of Leninism. They raised “peaceful coexistence” to the level of a general line and elaborated it into the three “peacefuls” and the two “wholes”. They touted the agreements with U.S. imperialism to monopolize nuclear weapons as the key to world peace. Even as they sang duets about “peace”, the Soviet Union and the United States engaged in arms expansion and war preparations against the people and acted as superpowers colluding and contending with each other as their respective self-interests dictated, at the expense of the peoples of the world.

Pomeroy misrepresents as “putting nationalist interests ahead of the struggle for peace and for the unity of all revolutionary forces against imperialism” China’s resistance to the sanctification of the nuclear monopoly by the superpowers and to the imperialist privilege of nuclear blackmail. After all the “disarmament” treaties (such as the “nuclear test ban treaty” and the non-proliferation treaty”) signed by the Soviet Union with the United States, how far have these gone toward complete nuclear disarmament? Not an inch.

Absolutely contradicting the principle of proletarian internationalism, the Soviet revisionist renegades gave way on matters of principle to the U.S. imperialists. A short while before his visit to Eisenhower in 1959, Khrushchov arbitrarily tore up the Chinese-Soviet agreement on nuclear cooperation and took sides with the Indian reactionaries who provoked an armed conflict with China and belligerently encroached on Chinese territory. While in the United States, he made buffoonish counter-revolutionary statements like “even capitalists can join the communist movement” and “communism is beef plus goulash”. After his U.S. visit, he went to China and asked the Chinese leadership to accept the U.S. “two China” policy and the U.S. occupation of Taiwans, to release U.S. agents and spies who had been arrested during the Korean War and to change attitude towards Eisenhower because of his supposed peaceful nature.

China rebuffed all these ridiculous demands of Khrushchov even as he resorted to economic blackmail. After completely failing to get what wanted, he eventually tried to sabotage the Great Leap Forward and take advantage of the imperialist blockade and natural calamities that had created difficulties in China. Without prior consultations with the Chinese leaders, he ordered the sudden total withdrawal of Soviet experts in clear violations of the Sino-Soviet Treaty of Mutual Aid and paid heed to China’s demands that the case be reconsidered and the experts be returned.

But Pomeroy now wishes to depict this as “gradual withdrawal” resulting from “differences over the observance of economic laws” He prates:

Differences over the observance of economic laws appear to have been the cause of the gradual withdrawal from China of Soviet technicians whose recommendations were ignored or overruled.

The real cause was that Khrushchov was so maddened by the refusal of the Chinese Communist Party to follow the revisionist line that he pounded on, the dictates of his great-power chauvinism, his capitulation to U.S. imperialism and his scheme to turn to China into an economic appendage of the Soviet Union. After the withdrawal of Soviet “aid”, it was discovered to the great relief of the Chinese people that the grossly-designed Soviet goods and Soviet technical services were extremely overpriced and payments in the form of Chinese products were in effect underpriced. It was also discovered that the Soviet Union had relabelled and resold West German goods to China at great profit.

It is utterly ridiculous, therefore, for Pomeroy to rave that “the Chinese people would have had no need to carry out economic construction by depriving themselves of the prime necessities, as was earlier the case of the Soviet people, if the leaders of China conducted a policy of all-round cooperation within the framework of the socialist community.” Despite all attempts at sabotage by the Soviet revisionist renegades and their Chinese agents like Liu Shao-chi, the Great Leap Forward triumphed in the end and proved correct Chairman Mao’s line of “going all out aiming high and achieving greater, faster and more economical results in building socialism” and of “maintaining independence and keeping the initiative in our own hands and relying on our own efforts”.

What “socialist community” is Pomeroy talking about? The Soviet Union imposes fetter upon fetter on its so-called fraternal countries. Under the Council of Mutual Economic Assistance, it uses its overload position to force these countries to have their national economies serve as the markets, subsidiary workshops, orchards, vegetables garden and ranches for the making of superprofits by the Soviet revisionist renegades, Under the Warsaw Treaty Organization, it employs the most brutal methods to keep these countries under control and stations massive numbers of troops there. The “socialist community” is nothing but the colonial empire of Soviet social-imperialism.

The Brezhnev revisionist renegade clique has pursued basically Khrushchov’s foreign policy and carried it to the extreme through the most brazen acts of aggression against its colonial dependencies as well as against the People’s Republic of China. It has invaded Czechoslovakia with hundreds of thousands of foreign troops under its command and put up a puppet government at bayonet point. It has stationed several Soviet divisions in the Mongolian People’s Republic and has moved millions of troops to the Sino-Soviet borders. It has repeatedly made nuclear threats against China island and the Tiehlikti area. It is overstretching itself on a scale even larger than what the old tsars aspired for.

It is under the exponents and practitioners of Khrushchovism without Khrushchov that Soviet modern revisionism has emerged full-blown as social-imperialism. Lenin defined this social-imperialism as “socialism in words. imperialism in deeds, the growth of opportunism into imperialism”. Once the political power of the proletariat is usurped by a revisionist clique, a socialist state either turns into social-imperialism, as in the case of the Soviet Union, or is reduced into a dependency or colony, as in the case of Czechoslovakia, the Mongolian People’s Republic and other revisionist countries. In having the state power in their hands, the modern revisionists of the Khrushchov-Brezhnev type are far more dangerous and vicious than the classical revisionists of the Kautsky-Bernstein type. These sham anti-imperialist but real imperialist of today can report to the most brutal measures and deceptive tricks against the people.

Under the banner of social-imperialism, the Soviet revisionist renegades have laid out a number of “theories” to make the “Brezhnev doctrine”.

First, there is the theory of “limited sovereignty”. It means that the Soviet Union holds the “supreme sovereignty” which is “unlimited” while the sovereignty of other countries is “limited”. The so-called interests of socialism that are to be safeguarded are nothing but the interests of Soviet social-imperialism.

Second, the theory of “international dictatorship”. It means that the Soviet Union can engage in military intervention in or military occupation of a number of East European countries and the Mongolian People’s Republic. The Warsaw Pact is nothing but a bludgeon of Soviet social-imperialism; the signboard of “aid to a fraternal country” is raised merely to ensure a puppet government as in Czechoslovakia.

Third, the theory of “socialist community”. It means the colonial empire with the Soviet Union as the metropolitan state and the lesser revisionist countries as the colonies. The metropolitan state and its colonies are supposed to be “inseparable”.

Fourth, the theory of “international division of Labor”. It means that a number of East European countries and the Mongolian People’s Republic as well as all countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America should specialize in “traditional exports commodities” that suit the Soviet Union. The Soviet Union is supposed to expand its colonial spheres of influence in order to get raw materials from backward countries at great profit for itself.

Fifth, the theory that “our interests are involved”. It means that since the Soviet Union is a “superpower” it is entitled to meddle in the affairs of every other country and make bargains with the other superpower, U.S. imperialism, against the people. The Soviet social-imperialist are repeatedly embarked on “gunboat diplomacy” under this theory.

In its relations with countries in Asia, Africa and Latin America, Soviet social-imperialism has always sought to exercise the political control and extorts superprofits through its “aid”. It pretends to extend loans at low interest rates but overprices the goods and technical services that it gives. Payment for these is made mainly in the form of raw materials which are in effect

greatly underpriced. The Soviet Union also acts as a munitions merchant and sets an arbitrary price for the military material that it delivers. It is very instructive to study closely how the Soviet Union has taken advantage of India, Egypt, Indonesia and other countries.

Completely opposing the principle of proletarian internationalism, the Soviet Union has extended far more military aid to the Indian reactionaries than the United States has done. The arms supplied to India have been repeatedly used in chauvinist and expansionist acts of aggression against China and Pakistan. The Soviet Union also continues its economic and military “aid” for the Indonesian fascist who have butchered at least one million of the Indonesian people, including hundreds of thousands of Communists. Because it has more interest than the United States in the opening of the Suez Canal, it strikes bargains with U.S. imperialism and Israeli Zionism and ceaselessly maneuvers for a “political settlement” behind the backs of the Palestinian and Arab peoples.

Pomeroy tries to create a picture of all-out support by the Soviet revisionist renegades for the Vietnamese people’s revolutionary struggle for national liberation and national salvation against U.S. imperialism. He conveniently forgets to cite the fact that Khrushchov never wanted to support the Vietnamese revolutionary struggle. But what Pomeroy wants to impress on others now is that the Brezhnev revisionist renegade clique is giving billions of roubles worth of “aid”. It needs to be pointed out that the Soviet revisionist renegades have always had the bad habit of drawing up bloated and falsified figures to deceive the Soviet people concerning “aid” to Vietnam.

The Soviet revisionist policy on Vietnam is one of sham support and real betrayal. In fact, the Soviet Union has given more “aid”, including more powerful military equipment to certain governments. The real purpose of the Soviet “aid” to Vietnam is only to be able to make use of the Vietnam war as a leverage for cheap bargains with U.S. imperialism and as a medium for introducing intrigues among revolutionary forces. At one stage, the Soviet Union even had the temerity to demand that China allow it to have its own air corridors and military bases in China under the pretext of wanting to transport its own “aid” to Vietnam. Of course, China rebuffed this demand inasmuch as Soviet “aid” to Vietnam had always passed unimpeded through China. After the rebuff, the Soviet revisionist renegades whipped up the rumor that China did not want Soviet “aid” to pass through China.

The Brezhnev revisionist renegades have repeatedly raised the slogan of “united action” and “united anti-imperialist struggle” on the U.S. war of aggression in Vietnam. But their aim is merely to shake off their isolation arising from their counter-revolutionary actions and slander the revolutionary forces that are isolating them. If their aim were really to support Vietnam, they can always make use of bilateral agreements. But their aim is to make trouble among the revolutionary forces and to put into question the undeniable fact that China is the closest, strongest and most reliable rear not only of the Vietnamese people but also of the entire Indochinese people. As the U.S. war of aggression has expanded throughout Indochina, China has emerged as the most powerful supporter of the revolutionary struggle of the Vietnamese, Cambodian and Laotian peoples; and the Soviet Union as the most sham supporter, always angling for an opportunity to strike a bargain with U.S. imperialism.

There is also both collusion and contention in the relationship between Soviet social-imperialism and U.S. imperialism. There are two “superpower” agreed on opposing revolution, the people, China and communism. At the same time, it is in their imperialist nature to struggle for a redivision of the world. Each has its own hegemonic schemes. The only difference between them is that one covers up its imperialist nature by spouting slogans of anti-imperialism, as sufficiently manifested by Pomeroy’s own posturings.

It is an important and necessary to study thoroughly Soviet social-imperialism and every attempt of the local revisionist renegades to promote modern revisionism in the Philippines. Therefore, William J. Pomeroy’s *Half a Century of Socialism* cannot pass unnoticed. Our study should sharpen our understanding of Marxism-Leninism and revolutionary politics, improve our current work and style in fighting for people’s democracy and provide us with a clear view of the future — socialism.

Chairman Mao has provided us with the theory of continuing revolution under the dictatorship of the proletariat and has shown us in practice how to prevent the restoration of capitalism in a socialist society. An antidote to opportunism at its worst and to social-imperialism has been found. That is Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tsetung Thought, the revolutionary theory of the proletariat in the present era when imperialism is heading for total collapse and socialism is marching toward worldwide victory.

Within the Soviet Union, the revisionist renegades are doomed to failure. Chairman Mao has pointed out:

The Soviet Union was the first socialist state and the Communist Party of the Soviet Union was created by Lenin. Although the leadership of the Soviet party and state has now been usurped by revisionists, I would advise comrades to remain firm in the conviction that the masses of the Soviet people and of the Party members and cadres are good, that they desire revolution and that revisionist rule will not last long.

Chairman Mao has also pointed out:

Working hand in glove, Soviet revisionism and U.S. imperialism have done so many foul and evil things that the revolutionary people the world over will not let them go unpunished. The people of all countries are rising. A new historical period of struggle against U.S. imperialism and Soviet modern revisionism has begun.

The counter-revolutionary collusion between U.S. imperialism and Soviet social-imperialism against the people, communism and China has its own limits. In deepening crisis of world imperialism, the struggle among imperialist powers for redividing the world will intensify and hasten their own doom. Like U.S. imperialism, Soviet social-imperialism is over-extending itself. As it overstretches, its crisis at home will inevitably worsen. It is setting on a volcano. The Soviet proletariat and people of various nationalities will in due time rise to overthrow the monopoly bureaucrat bourgeoisie and all its retinue of revisionist renegades. Social-imperialism is nothing but a passing phase in the downward course of imperialism.

Chairman Mao has urged us:

People of the world, unite and oppose the war of aggression launched by any imperialism or social-imperialism, especially one in which atom bombs are used as weapons! If such a war breaks out, the people of the world should use revolutionary war to eliminate the war of aggression, and preparations should be made right now!

## **Apologia for U.S. Imperialism**

*(This essay originally appeared in the Ang Bayan special issue of November 15, 1971 under the title "Pomeroy's Apologia for U.S imperialism".)*

American Neo-colonialism is an attempt to confuse readers about the nature and development of U.S. imperialism with worn-out social democratic arguments. This book is an apologia for U.S. imperialism, particularly for the direct U.S. colonial rule in the Philippines from 1899 to 1946. It is an incontrovertible proof of the author's role as an agent of U.S. imperialism.

Pomeroy's thesis is that the colonial possession of the Philippines was unnecessary and unprofitable for U.S. imperialism. In maintaining this thesis, he employs the method of jumbling sham anti-imperialist statements, wishful thinking and prevarication against historical facts to futilely impugn Lenin's theory on imperialism and whitewash the exploitation and oppression inflicted by U.S. imperialism on the people.

Despite its title, the book does not go at length into any direct discussion of neo-colonialism. As a matter of fact, it deals mainly with the beginnings of U.S. direct colonial rule in the Philippines and with the differences of opinion in U.S. imperialist circles regarding the Philippine colony. It is only towards the end of the book that Pomeroy leaps over to 1970 with certain generalizations derived from an empiricist and lopsided view of events at the turn of the century. He presents the Philippines as an example of a country, colonized to become profitable for a time and then semi-colonized to become profitable for an indefinite period of time for U.S. imperialism.

The revisionist scoundrel observe that U.S. imperialism has consistently fashioned "non-aggressive neo-colonial techniques" which prove to be more profitable than direct colonial domination. he maliciously equates the term "neo-colonialism" to Kautsky's "supra-imperialism" a "phase when wars shall cease", "a phase of the joint exploitation of the world by internationally united finance capital".

The book strains to show the background of this "neo-colonialism" by tracing the contradictions in the ranks of the U.S. imperialists themselves: between the "aggressive expansionists" and the "reluctant expansionists" or between "military authority" and "civil authority". The purpose of the revisionist scoundrel is not to expose and oppose the counter-revolutionary dual tactics of an inherently aggressive and bloodsucking imperialist power. It is to peddle the false idea that contradictions in the ranks of the U.S. imperialists themselves are principal to all other contradictions and that all international developments results essentially from the wishes of the imperialists themselves, not from the struggle between revolution and counter-revolution nor

between aggression and counter-aggression. It is to peddle the false idea that U.S. imperialism ultimately becomes peaceful due to the “sensibleness” of certain imperialists and that aggression and colonial rule are merely the “preferred policy” of some imperialists which is “reluctantly” adopted at certain periods.

What is deliberately slurred over is the fact that it is in the nature of U.S. monopoly capitalism to seize colonies, spheres of influence, sources of raw materials, markets, markets and field of investments, as much as is it can. As did Kautsky, Pomeroy substitutes the question of form for the question of substance in his ridiculous posture of seeking light from the imperialists themselves, particularly from the “reluctant” and “non-militarist” ones like Jacob Schurman or Andrew Carnegie. On the basis of his obscurantist presumptions, he claims:

There is reason to believe that if the policy advocated by Jacob Schurman and others early in 1899 had been followed, the tragedy of a cruel war of suppression that extended over the better part of a decade might have been avoided.

Chairman Mao teaches us:

The only ones who crave war and do not want peace are certain monopoly capitalist groups in a handful of capitalist countries which depend on aggression their profits.

The great Lenin said:

Domination, and the violence that is associated with it, such are the relationship that are typical of the “latest phase of capitalist development”; that is what inevitably had to result, from the formation of all-powerful economic monopolies.

To lose sight of the aggressive and bloodsucking nature of U.S. imperialism is to fall for its wiles. It is to deny the unremitting colonial ambitions of U.S. imperialism during the last seven decades and the intensified imperialist wars of aggression in the present epoch when the imperialist powers do not only wrangle among themselves for economic advantage but also have to face the tidal wave of socialist and new-democratic revolutions that deprive them of areas for exploitation.

Chairman Mao has pointed out:

Make trouble, fail, make trouble again, fail again ... till their doom; that is the logic of the imperialist and all reactionaries the world over in dealing with the people’s cause, and they will never go against this logic. This is a Marxist law. When we say “imperialism is ferocious”, we mean that its nature will never change, that the imperialist will never lay down their butcher knives, that they will never become Buddhas, till their doom.

Fight, fail, fight again, fail again, fight again... till their victory; that is the logic of the people, and they too will never go against this logic. This is another Marxist law. The Russian people’s revolution followed this law, and so has the Chinese people’s revolution.

# **I. On The Seizure And Retention Of The Philippines As A U.S. Colony**

In giving the briefest possible definition of imperialism, the great Lenin called it the monopoly stage of capitalism. What he considered as most important in such a definition is on the hand that finance capital is the bank capital of a few very big monopolist banks, merged with the capital of the monopolist combines of industrialists; and, on the other hand, that the division of the world is the transition from a colony policy which has extended without hindrance to territories unseized by any capitalist power, to a colonial policy of monopolist possession of the territory of the world which has been completely divided up.

The development of pre-monopoly capitalism, in which free competition was predominant, reached its limits in the 1860s and 1870s. After this period, the tremendous “boom” in colonial conquests began and the struggle for the territorial division of the world became necessary for the imperialist powers. Lenin pointed out:

There was inevitably ushered in the era of monopoly possession of colonies and, consequently, of particularly intense struggle for the division and redivision of the world....

The Spanish-American War of 1898 was the first imperialist war with the objective of redividing the world. The seizure of the Philippines as a colony was part and parcel of the drive of rapidly developing imperialist power to expand its economic territory. The revisionists of Pomeroy’s type peddle today the false idea that U.S. imperialism basically does not want colonies. But Lenin pointed out a long time ago that imperialism does not shirk from seizing colonies. It is an incontrovertible fact of history that the Philippines was seized as a colony together with others by U.S. imperialism. He said:

To the numerous “old” motives of colonial policy, finance capital has added the struggle for the sources of raw materials, for the export of capital, for spheres of influence, i.e., for spheres for profitable deals, concessions, monopoly profits and so, economic territory in general.

But Pomeroy denies in a roundabout way the purposes of U.S. imperialism. He snidely describes “the contention that the home market and the home investments field within the United States were becoming saturated and that the only outlet for American products and accumulated capital lay overseas” as “one of the main arguments of the apologists for the imperialist expansion”. Here he considers as one and the same in intention a Marxist-Leninist contention and the monopoly capitalist’s own statement of interest. However, the two may coincide with respect to reflecting the objective reality of imperialism.

He seeks to repudiate the Marxist-Leninist contention that the capitalist crisis of overproduction has resulted in imperialist expansionism by the monopolies by simply calling it as “one of the main arguments of the apologists for imperialist expansion”. He argues that U.S. imperialism at the turn of the century could have even foregone actions that brought it out of its homegrounds, especially such an action as the conquest and retention of the Philippines as a colony. He insists

that the U.S. monopolies were capable of unlimited internal expansion inasmuch as, according to him, the U.S. home market and investment fields prospered and expanded as time passed, due to advances in technology and opening new fields of production as well as due to “structural reforms” in the capitalist system, particularly the “anti-trust” measures and the use of a high tariff policy. He blabbers.

Its [U.S. capitalism] internal market and investment field, capable of great expansion, tempered its drive into foreign markets; the use of a high tariff wall to protect that home market played a more salient role than the acquisition of colonies, colonial markets and resources.

Lenin pointed out:

Bourgeois scholars and publicists usually come out in defense of imperialism in a somewhat veiled form; they obscure its complete domination and its deep-going roots, strive to push specific and secondary details into the forefront and do their very best to distract attention from essentials by means of absolutely ridiculous schemes for “reform”, such as police supervision of the trust or banks, etc.

Pomeroy takes after Kautsky in arguing that “reforms” took place to counteract monopoly practices and to “increase the consuming capacity of the people”. What a fond apology for U.S. imperialism!

It is instructive to recall that Pomeroy’s knight in shining armor, the sham anti-imperialist Andrew Carnegie, moved out of the Anti-Imperialist League because of his compelling interests in the U.S. Steel Corporation, a giant trust. This trust used its accumulated capital for drawing a high rate of profit at home and also a still higher rate of profit abroad, especially in colonies and semi-colonies. Profit is the rule and the logic of trusts and the imperialist state. And the U.S. imperialist will always try to be where they can make higher profits. Advances in technology, opening new fields of production and “structural reforms” are to the imperialists mere conditions for further exploiting and oppressing the people at home and abroad, than for restraining imperialist greed and violence. It is silly of Pomeroy to think otherwise.

Lenin also pointed out:

Of course, the bourgeois reformists, and among them particularly the present-day adherents of Kautsky, try to belittle the importance of the facts... by arguing that raw materials “could be” obtained in the open market without a “costly and dangerous” colonial policy; and that the supply of raw materials “could be” increased enormously by “simply” improving conditions in agriculture in general. But such arguments become an apology for imperialism, an attempt to paint it in bright colors, because they ignore the principal nature of the latest stage of capitalism: monopolies.

Pomeroy minimizes the actual role of the dominant U.S. monopolies behind the conquest and retention of the Philippines as a colony and constantly maximizes the role of domestic U.S. agricultural interests (especially beet sugar, tobacco and dairy) in opposing the acquisition or

retention of colonies. He underrates the U.S. monopolies and overrates the domestic U.S. agricultural interests. For instance, he easily reaches the absurd point of making the U.S. sugar beet interests appear more powerful than the U.S. sugar trust that was expansively interested in the Philippine sugar. In the relationship between the industrial monopolies and agricultural interests in general, the latter has been subordinate to the former.

Throughout the book, Pomeroy is preoccupied with creating the illusion that the U.S. imperialists were never totally and firmly interested in seizing and holding on to the Philippines as a colony. He believed that the “distinctive feature” of U.S. imperialism is that it would rather not have colonies. And this regard, he falls into a self-contradicting statement:

The reason why the Philippine was retained for nearly fifty years despite the relatively early rejection of traditional colonialism in theory was the fact of continuing strength and pressure of the colonialist forces.

The root cause of Pomeroy’s dilemma is his failure to relate the economics of U.S. imperialism to its politics. He denies the profitability of colonies and thus cannot give full account for the fact of extended colonial domination. In effect, he makes a claim that U.S. imperialism is not what it is. Lenin said of Kaustsky:

The essence of the matter is that Kautsky detaches the politics of imperialism from its economics, speaks of annexations as being a policy “preferred” by finance capital, and opposes to it another bourgeois policy which, he alleges, is possible on this very same basis of finance capital. It follows, then, that monopolies in economics are compatible with non-monopolistic, non-violent, non-annexationist methods in politics. It follows then that the territorial division of the world, which was completed precisely during the epoch of finance capital, and which constitutes the basis of the present peculiar forms of rivalry between the biggest capitalist states, is compatible with a non-imperialist policy. The result is a slurring over and a blunting of the most profound contradictions of the latest stage of capitalism, instead of an exposure of their depth; the result is reformism instead of Marxism.

By sheer prevarication, Pomeroy praises U.S. imperialism for having risen to be the No. 1 imperialist power through two inter-imperialist world wars “with only a minimum of participation in the outright seizure of colonies” and for “escaping entangling alliances in Europe and Asia”. He even states emphatically:

The issue of the American colonial system was settled, and the continuation of the Philippine colony during that time (1916) was anachronism in American imperialist policy. In the opinion of many, the 20 years\* between the passage of the Jones Act and the final grant of independence was an unnecessary period of delay.

Pomeroy deliberately obscures the fact that U.S. capitalism relieved itself of the crisis of overproduction during the early decades of the twentieth century through its expansionist activities. In the familiar fashion of imperialist apologist, he minimizes total U.S. investments abroad then as having been no more than one-tenth of U.S. wealth and U.S. foreign trade as not

having exceeded 12 per cent of the U.S. gross national product. To rub in the lie that U.S. imperialism was never so dependent on its overseas investments and trade, he compares these to those of British imperialism at its peak in 1914 when a quarter of its wealth were in foreign investments and its foreign trade approximated a quarter of its gross national product.

To minimize the imperialist role of the United States in Asia, he states that the U.S. monopolies had far more trade and investments in Europe, Canada and Latin America. Finally coming to the Philippines, he dismisses U.S. trade and investments here as nothing but a minor part (about thirty per cent) of those in the whole of Asia, with Japan alone absorbing half of the total.

The twisted logic behind Pomeroy's statistical references is that since U.S. trade and investments in the Philippines comprised a small and "negligible" part of far bigger international totals it followed that U.S. monopolies were not so much of imperialists in the Philippines. Pomeroy is like the landlord who believes that the more tenants he exploits the less he exploits each tenant and that the more methods of exploitation he employs the less exploitative does each method become.

It is foolish to belittle U.S. trade and investments in the Philippines by stating that U.S. imperialism did more "colonizing" in Europe. Such sophistry can only be worthy of a dolt. Within the Philippines, U.S. imperialism raked in superprofits in trade and investments and thoroughly subjected the Filipino people to colonial domination. With regard to U.S. investments in Europe, it is relevant to recall the words of Lenin:

... 1) the fact that the world is already divided up obliges those contemplating a redivision to reach out of every kind of territory, and 2) an essential feature of imperialism is the rivalry between several great powers in striving for hegemony, i.e., for the conquest of territory, not so much directly for themselves as to weaken the adversary and undermine his hegemony.

Lenin warned against the empiricist method of studying imperialism:

Simply to compare colonies with non-colonies, one imperialism with another imperialism, one semi-colony or colony with all the countries, is to evade and to obscure the very essence of the question.

World War I and World War II all preceded by rapacious maneuverings of the the imperialist powers to get into each other's home grounds, aside from wrangling over their respective colonial and semi-colonial areas of exploitation and oppression. The two wars occurred to redivide the world by force of arms precisely because the imperialist powers could not settle their differences through peaceful methods. As an integral part of the world capitalism, U.S. imperialism always became involved in these wars. After each war, the division of economic territory changed with U.S. imperialism consistently expanding its own economic territory. Lenin said:

The epoch of the latest stage of capitalism shows us that certain relations between capitalist combines grow up, based on the economic division of the world; while parallel to and in

connection with it, certain relations grow up between political combines, between states, on the basis of the territorial division of the world, of the struggle for colonies, of the “struggle for economic territory”.

The Philippine had been seized by the United States in order to turn the Pacific Ocean into an “American lake” and to have a base for its late-comer “open-door” policy on China, a policy of trying to have a share of a vast economic territory to which other imperialist powers had prior claims. But Pomeroy denies the strategic value of the Philippines in the U.S. imperialist scheme; he goes as far as to say that the colonial possession of the Philippines was more of a liability than an asset in Asia for U.S. imperialism. He calls it an “aggravation” of a policy of “weakness”. He considers the “open-door” policy of “weakness” rather than a convenient shibboleth for a rising imperialist power in its vigorous attempt to cut into China and Asia in general.

Pomeroy depicts U.S. imperialism as a much frustrated weakling that could easily be bullied by Japan even during the first two decades of the twentieth century. He completely obscures the close alliance of British and U.S. imperialism in Asia and the fact that Japan was a debtor nation to the United States. It was with the indulgence of U.S. and British imperialism that Japan seized Korea and spheres of influence in China. But Pomeroy insists that even the as early as 1916 U.S. imperialism was already so terrified by the Japanese victory over the Russian in 1905 and also by the Japanese seizure of all the special privileges of Germany in China during the World War I that it was eager to withdraw from its Philippine colony or maintain “unprovocative” presence there. In the entire book, Pomeroy actually gives more weight to the pressure of Japan on the United States than to unceasing demands of the Filipino people for independence as a factor for compelling the United States to pledge sham independence for the Philippines. He states:

As usual, the display of power by Japan had its effect on American attitudes towards the Philippines. It undoubtedly hastened the moves to make a promise of independence to the Philippines, on grounds that it showed unaggressive intent by the United States in Asia, thus removing an excuse for Japan to adopt any hostile posture towards U.S. presence in the Philippines.

Pomeroy states further:

The reason for the failure of American imperialist forces to follow through on their initial plunge into Asia lay in at least two aspects of their situation. One was the unwillingness to mobilize sufficient capital to throw into China to compete with and wrest market and investment areas from the other imperialist powers on the scene; other easier areas of penetration of a less openly colonial nature were available. The other was the fact that the American government and its other was the fact that the American government and its machinery was not yet prepared to serve imperialist aims by contending with powerful rivals in Asia in the sphere of force.

It is preposterous for one to expect U.S. imperialism to export surplus capital evenly and regularly throughout the world and then to claim when it does otherwise that it is not yet prepared to serve imperialist aims. It is in the nature of modern imperialism to make the most uneven and spasmodic kind of development at home and abroad. Lenin said:

The capitalist divide the world, not out of any particular malice, but because the degree of concentration which has been reached forces them to adopt this method in order to obtain profits. And they divide it “in proportion to capital”, in “proportion to strength”, because there cannot be any other method of division under commodity production and capitalism. But strength varies with the degree of economic and political development. In order to understand what is taking place, it is necessary to know what questions are settled by the changes in strength.

Pomeroy, the revisionist scoundrel, would say anything to whitewash the colonial record of U.S. imperialism in Asia. He tries to muddle up what is already clear history. Only a fool and traitor will write an entire book only to maintain the preposterous thesis that U.S. imperialism was unwilling to seize market and investment areas in the Philippines and China and that its government was not prepared to serve imperialist aims at the turn of the century.

## **II. A False Balance Sheet Of U.S. Imperialism In The Philippines**

Referring to colonies, the great Lenin unequivocally stated:

In these backward countries, profits are usually high, for capital is scarce, the price of land is relatively low, wages are low, raw materials are cheap

He also said:

Of course, finance capital finds most “convenient”, and is able to extract the greatest profit from such a subjection as involves the loss of the political independence of the subjected countries and peoples.

Colonial possession alone gives the monopolies complete guarantee against all contingencies in the struggle with competitors, including the contingency that the latter will defend themselves by means of a law establishing a state monopoly. The more capitalism is developed, the more strongly the shortage of raw materials is felt, the more intense the competitions and the hunt for sources of raw materials throughout the whole world, the more desperate is the struggle for the acquisition of colonies.

He also pointed out that finance capital is interested not only in the already discovered sources of raw materials but also in potential sources, because present-day technical development is extremely rapid, and land which is useless today may be improved tomorrow. This also applies to prospecting for minerals, to new methods of processing of and utilizing raw materials, etc., etc. Hence the inevitable striving of finance capital to enlarge its spheres of influence and even its actual territory.

It is utterly ridiculous to expect as did Kautsky that imperialism would rely on the “open market” for its raw materials. Certainly, it became more advantageous than during the Spanish colonial era for U.S. imperialism to hold the Philippines as its own colony and get the raw materials

without having to comply with Spanish laws. The U.S. imperialists would have laughed at Kautsky's pontification that "peaceful democracy", rather than military occupation, would have opened Egypt more rapidly to British trade had it been Dewey sailed into Manila Bay.

To draw a picture of U.S. traders not getting anywhere in the Philippine colony, Pomeroy deals at length with the initial advantages of the British in the import of cotton goods, export of hemp and shipping during the ten-year period of transition (1899-1909) under the Treaty of Paris. He deliberately obscures the unquestioned commercial and investment supremacy of U.S. companies following the Payne-Aldrich Act of 1909 which instituted "free trade" between the Philippines and the United States and allowed the latter to manipulate the tariffs against foreign competitors. It is well to recall that even before the outbreak of the Spanish-American War, U.S. commercial houses had already had a considerable share of Philippine trade, especially in sugar. Yet Pomeroy makes it appear that only after the U.S. conquest of the Philippines could only the American booze dealers make money in the Philippines, not on the colonized people but on the U.S. troops themselves.

Contrary to what Lenin has shown as the self-interest of imperialism, Pomeroy pictures the Philippine colony as having been more of a "major headache" for U.S. imperialism than the object of economic plunder. He emphatically claims that the U.S. monopolist were "reluctant clients", hesitant on investing in the Philippines and failing to invest as much as had been expected of them, because of supposed difficulties. He regards the Organic Act of 1902 as consisting of "anti-monopoly restrictions" rather than as a legal instrument by which the U.S. colonial government could start to grant franchises, recognize mining claims and sell or lease land to the Yankee plunderers.

Pomeroy misrepresent a short period of initial U.S. investments (1902 and thereabouts) as representing the entire period of direct U.S. colonial rule. He considers it too discouraging as it was "expensive" for the U.S. imperialists to engage in the improvement of public works and communications. He does not consider that these were not only favorable for U.S. business and military operations in the Philippines but were also paid for by taxes exacted from the colonized people. Bondholding for provincial and municipal improvements fetched huge profits for U.S. bondholders. U.S. companies exacted huge profits from supply and engineering contracts. Yet Pomeroy arbitrarily cites the "losses" suffered by the operation of railroads in Cebu and Panay as a major cause for "diminished interests" in the Philippine colony. He does not consider that the U.S. monopolies made profits on the building of these particular railroads and he covers up the tremendously profitable U.S. takeover, expansion and operation of the Manila Railroad Company.

The counter-revolutionary idea of Pomeroy that runs through his entire book is that colonization of the Philippines merely caused economic "difficulties" instead of advantages for U.S. imperialism and that such "difficulties" always pressed on U.S. imperialism to leave the Philippines to a "stable government" of Filipino puppets. In his own peculiar way, he preaches Kautsky's ideas of "peaceful democracy" as a better method for the capitalist countries to gain economic advantage. He maliciously puts aside the irresponsible demands of the Filipino people

for national independence and democracy which the U.S. imperialist and the local puppet demagogues always tried to preempt in their shady compromises on “Philippine independence”.

To cover up the extent of exploitation by U.S. imperialism in the Philippines, Pomeroy turns himself into an accounting cheat and trots out a false balance sheet. He estimates that military costs of conquest, suppression, fortification and garrison maintenance totaled at least \$500 million by the time the Tydings-McDuffie Act was passed by the U.S. Congress in 1934. He prates that this amount does not include what he calls the “incalculable” expenditure in reconquering the islands and “rehabilitating” them as a result of World War II. He argues that such military costs were not exceeded by profits in U.S. trade and investments in the Philippines.

He claims if a 20 per cent rate of profit is conceded to U.S. goods, as forecast by merchants in advance of the Payne-Aldrich Act, U.S. manufacturers and merchants earned \$160 million\*\* from the U.S.-Philippine trade during the first three decades of U.S. colonial rule. He calls it as “generous estimate” for them to have earned \$200 million during the said period, even if such invisibles as insurance and freight charges were included. He bewails that Philippine exports to the United States exceeded imports of U.S. goods by nearly \$400 million\*\*\* (up to 1927, \$1.2 billion as against \$900.1 million). He regrets that on the overall U.S. profits were “more than over-balanced by far” by the amount of duties waived on Philippine products entering the United States under the “free trade” terms of the Payne-Aldrich Act. On the basis of his inane and erratic computations, Pomeroy concludes that the U.S. imperialist incurred losses rather than profits in the U.S.-Philippine trade. Yet, he states that “to some extent”, which he does not care to spell out in figures, earnings from Philippine exports went to U.S. investment interests in the islands, in the refining of raw sugar, in manufacture of coconut products and in commercial handling. He claims, however, that the greater amount represented a payment by American taxpayers to “Filipino producers” well in excess of U.S. trade profits.

Pomeroy contends that the total amount of profit remitted from all investments over the period of direct U.S. colonial rule could hardly have made up the trade gap, let alone repaid the military costs. He regards the level of U.S. investments as low, a little more than \$200 million at the time of the Tydings-McDuffie Law. According to him, a considerable part of the amount was accounted for by savings and reinvestments of profits. Though Pomeroy admits that huge returns were made on original investments, he insists that the total amount of profits remitted did not countervail the “imbalance of military expenditures and trade”.

In looking at the military costs of seizing and holding on to the Philippines, Pomeroy completely obscures the fact that such were not at all borne by the U.S. monopolies. On the other hand, the U.S. monopolies profited immediately and in a long-term way from the colonial conquest of the Philippines. The costs of U.S. military aggression were imposed on the American people as well as on the people that were the victim of aggression and colonial domination. After their conquest, the Filipino people were compelled to pay the taxes necessary to defray U.S. military expenditures and to maintain the Philippines as a colony. With regard to U.S. military expenditures incurred in World War II, it is obvious that the U.S. monopolies profited tremendously and unprecedentedly from military production and was consequently able to

assume the position of No. 1 imperialist power through aggression, intervention and subversion in various countries.

It is extremely shallow and absurd for Pomeroy to assume that the U.S. traders could make profits only on U.S. goods imported into the Philippines. They handled directly a considerable part of the Philippine exports crops. It is certainly not enough to compare the declared values of imports and exports to measure the profits derived by the U.S. imperialists. And to claim that the U.S. traders had a measly 20 per cent rate of profit on imported U.S. goods is to tell an outright lie. What is most important in weighing how much the U.S. imperialist (not only the U.S. traders) profited from U.S.-Philippine trade is to consider that cheap raw materials were exchanged for U.S. finished products and were destined to be processed by U.S. industries. The U.S. imperialist and the comprador-landlords in essence exploited the Filipino toiling masses by making them produce raw materials at extremely low wage rates and by making them buy U.S. finished products at extremely high prices. As a result, the Philippines remained a narrow colonial and agrarian economy, unable to freely take the road of self-reliance and industrialization and always subject to manipulation by U.S. imperialism.

The records of the Bureau of Census and Statistics show that the book value of U.S. private investments in the Philippines before the outbreak of World War II amounted to P537 million or \$268.5 million. Book value in the records of the colonial government cannot tell the whole story. But Pomeroy overdoes his role as an apologist of U.S. imperialism by calling this level of U.S. investments “low” and then leaping to the conclusion that these did not make much profit or were not enough to exceed military expenditures and “losses” in trade. We need to stress the fact that even with so little capital invested in colonies and semi-colonies tremendous profits could be made and remitted annually to U.S. stockholders. But like his U.S. imperialist masters, Pomeroy would not divulge figures regarding this. The rate of profit for U.S. subsidiaries in colonies and semi-colonies is several times higher than that in the United States and other capitalist countries. Only a very tiny part of annual earnings is reinvested and accumulated from year to year. It is superficial for one to pay attention only to the magnitude of U.S. investments in the Philippines and then consider it as inconsequential because it is so much less than U.S. investments in Western Europe or Canada. U.S. investments in other capitalist countries are huge because it takes that much to squeeze into a relatively constricted field and to have a significant say on economic and political policies of those countries. What Pomeroy belittles as “small” U.S. investments is within the Philippines big and strategic capital capable of drawing superprofits and controlling the entire country.

In this case of Meralco, for instance, its original capitalization in 1901 was only \$2.0 million. Sixty years later, the majority stocks would be sold to Philippine combine for \$50 million. The growth of the investments is striking enough. But what would be more striking is the tremendous amount of dividends remitted to U.S. stockholders in sixty years. Pomeroy conveniently does not divulge this. This is not even reckon with the profits made on Meralco by its mother and aunt companies on various accounts. General Electric Company did not make hay on Meralco without the U.S. Steel Corporation, the U.S. oil interests, the U.S. banks and other related U.S. businesses doing the same on this Philippine enterprise.

Referring to the monopolies in capitalist countries, Lenin observed:

The export of capital, one of the most essential economic bases of imperialism, still more completely isolates the rentiers from production and sets the seal of parasitism on the whole country that lives by exploiting the labor of several overseas countries and colonies.

By insisting that the colonial possession of the Philippines by U.S. imperialism was “not a paying” venture, Pomeroy actually whitewash U.S. imperialism and denies its bloodsucking activities. It is our view that U.S. imperialism profited greatly from its colonial possession of the Philippines. It is to argue against historical truth and to prettify U.S. imperialism to maintain the thesis that it successfully colonized the Philippines only to suffer business losses.

Totally discounting the U.S. monopolies behind the U.S. colonial regime in the Philippines, Pomeroy goes as far as to state:

U.S. business interests, including prominent industrial circles, were unwilling to share the tax and inflationary burden arising from military and administrative costs in acquiring, maintaining and defending a colonial empire.

Though he refers to a “relative minority of overseas traders and investors” as the beneficiary of the colonial regime, he does not qualify these as the top U.S. monopolies that determine U.S. policies. It is one-sided and inane to imply that the tax and inflationary burden in imperialist ventures is shouldered solely or mainly by the “U.S. business interests, including prominent industrial circles”. It is shouldered by the American people, mainly the proletariat. Besides, the Filipino people under the U.S. colonial government had to shoulder the military and administrative costs in the absence of continuously effective revolutionary resistance.

An agent of U.S. imperialism through and through, Pomeroy finds one more occasion

An agent of U.S. imperialism through and through, Pomeroy finds one more occasion to praise the political system in the United States when he claims that “even the more aggressive commercial and investment groups that had favored seizure of colonies had reason to doubt the practicality of colonial possessions” and were in favor of abandoning the Philippine colony because “they had to contend with the fact of the U.S. Congress having authority over affairs and laws in colonies”. “Corporations and individuals desiring to exploit such areas found their activities subject to the pressures and investigations of a variety of domestic influences, reformist and protectionist”, he adds. He pontificates:

Congressional prerogatives were less when it came to non-colonial areas of investment and trade; operations of a neo-colonialism were far less apt to come under scrutiny.

What Pomeroy would like others to believe is that the U.S. Congress and the colonial laws were not at all in favor of the U.S. monopolies over and above the debates that transpire from time to time in any bourgeois talking shop.

Knowing no bounds for his sinister role, Pomeroy presents the U.S. Congress as a positive channel for the Filipino people. He chatters:

The post-independence events in the Philippines following 1946—the the brutal suppression with American assistance of the Huk national liberation movement and its support, the wholesale corruption of Filipino politics, the unbridled looting of the “independent” economy, the evasion of the one-time strictly-watched land laws, the crimes committed by U.S. military base personnel, the moral decay of Philippine society arising from frustrated development would have all produced major scandals and investigations of occurring under direct American rule.

Mr. Pomeroy should be told to his face that U.S. congressional investigations over U.S. activities abroad are still frequently carried on and such are done as before not to lessen or curtail imperialist interests but to give support to them. As before, the U.S. Congress is still a chamber of the U.S. monopolies.

American Neo-Colonialism is a bourgeois reformist defense of the U.S. colonial record in the Philippines and of what Pomeroy calls "welfare state at home " and “neo-colonialism abroad”, both of which he refers to as “twin supports of the contemporary imperialist framework”. Rather than present the continuity and increasing virulence of the aggressive, expansionist and exploitative character of U.S. imperialism, it tries vainly to resuscitate the old fallacious claims of U.S. imperialism to “isolationism” and to “altruism” or “benevolence”. While it strains to show the “anti-colonial side” of U.S. imperialism and the “economic losses” of the U.S. monopolies in maintaining a colony, it obscures the oppressed and exploited condition of the Filipino people and the revolutionary tradition and role that they have carried on against colonial domination.

The annexation of the Philippines was an essential manifestation of the U.S. imperialism. This was necessary for U.S. imperialism to satisfy its inherent cravings for superprofits and expansion, to impose its power and influence not only in the Philippines but also in China and the whole of Asia. Now as before, U.S. imperialism continues to make use of the Philippines as an important base for its aggressive, expansionist and exploitative activities. The Filipino people, however, will in the end make U.S. imperialism (including puppetry to it) a truly losing proposition in the Philippines through the revolutionary struggle for national liberation and people’s democracy. Lenin laid bare the moribund and decadent character of imperialism a long time ago.

Pomeroy deliberately refuses to give full weight to the more deceptive yet more violent depredations of U.S. imperialism after World War II as an outgrowth of its earlier depredations and as a further unfolding of its unchanging aggressive and bloodsucking nature. He goes to every length to show that after the colonial conquest of the Philippines, U.S. imperialism steadily moved away from “traditional colonialism”, particularly the seizure of colonies. Thus, he is at a loss when confronted with the increase of U.S. military bases and colonies (South Korea, South Vietnam, Okinawa, Taiwan and others) and with such U.S. wars of aggression as in Korea and currently in Indochina in what he prefers to call the “neo-colonial” stage of U.S. imperialism. What Lenin said of Kautsky could be said of Pomeroy:

Instead of showing the living connection between periods of imperialist peace and periods of imperialist war, Kautsky presents the workers with a lifeless abstraction in order to reconcile them to their lifeless leaders.

In looking at the contemporary period, Pomeroy cannot look beyond a “repetition” of debates within imperialist ranks. He states:

When an analysis of the contemporary period is made, it will bear a market resemblance to the period of debate over imperialist policy following the Spanish-American War. (Clashes between military and civil concepts of policy, authority and administration have also occurred in a repeated pattern, the MacArthur-Truman dispute in the Korean War, the “hawk” and “dove” antagonism in the Vietnam War, and the frequent Pentagon-State Department rifts being much like echoes of the Otis-Schurman and MacArthur-Taft differences during the Philippine conquest.)

The optimism of Pomeroy is an opportunist one and it lies in placing hopes mainly on the “peace-lovers” among the U.S. imperialist policy-makers. It means falling for the more aggressive and more deceptive “Nixon doctrine” of today, for instance.

What Pomeroy construes as a “new feature” of “neo-colonialism, is nothing but what Lenin had called usury imperialism, an old method for dominating other countries, exporting surplus capital, extorting superprofits and securing materials. Inasmuch as the Philippines has become a semi-colony since 1946, its nature as a debtor nation has indeed become increasingly evident. Pomeroy chooses to call usury imperialism as “non-aggressive neo-colonial technique” and arbitrarily sets aside the fact that this has been made possible by the aggressive nature of U.S. imperialism and the historical imperialist domination of the Philippines. It is also certain that U.S. imperialism will never allow its practice of usury on the Philippines to stop without the victory of revolutionary armed struggle against its persistent military bases and armed puppets.

While the conclusion of Pomeroy is that U.S. imperialism will continue to put “reemphasis on indirect neo-colonial methods” and to fashion “more subtle techniques of neo-colonialism” to prolong its life without any foreseeable end, we busy ourselves with raising the ideological and political consciousness and organized strength of the Filipino people in order to deal deadly blows against U.S. imperialism and all its running dogs. In this regard, we make a criticism and repudiation of Pomeroy’s American Neo-Colonialism in line with Lenin’s dictum:

“... The fight against imperialism is a sham and humbug unless it is inseparably bound up with the fight against opportunism.”

Chairman Mao teaches us:

... Imperialism and all reactionaries, looked at in essence, from a long-term point of view, from a strategic point of view, must be seen for what they are—paper tigers. On this we should build our strategic thinking. On the other hand, they are also living tigers, iron tigers, real tigers which can devour people. On this we should build our tactical thinking.

Imperialism will not last long because it always does evil things. It persists in grooming and supporting reactionaries in all countries who are against the people, it has forcibly seized many colonies and semi-colonies and many military bases, and it threatens the peace with atomic war. Thus, forced by imperialism to do so, more than 90 per cent of the people of the world are rising or will rise up in struggle against it. Yet imperialism is still alive, still running amuck in Asia, Africa, and Latin America. In the West, imperialism is still oppressing the people at home. This situation must change. It is the task of the people of the whole world to put an end to the aggression and oppression perpetrated by imperialism, and chiefly by U.S. imperialism.

---

### *NOTES*

- Thirty years is the gap between 1916 and 1946.
- The amount should be \$180 million, which is 20 per cent of \$900 million.
- The amount should be about \$300 million, Repeatedly Pomeroy bungles his arithmetic.