

DRAFT

Book 1: For Justice, Socialism and Peace

Table of Contents

1. Sorting Out Contradictions in Iraq	2
2. Let Aquino Regime and its US Imperialist Masters Answer for their Gross Crimes Against the Filipino People	9
3. Two Articles on The People's Struggle for a Just Peace	16
a. History and Circumstances Relevant to the Question of Peace	17
b. The NDF Framework in Contrast with the GRP Framework	66
4. Message to the International Congress against the World Economic Summit	96
5. On the Petty Bourgeoisie and the Future of Socialism	108
6. On the Question of Revolutionary Violence	116
7. Message to the Symposium on MaoZedong Thought in the Philippines	138
8. The Critical and Creative Tasks of the Rectification Movement in the Communist Party of the Philippines	145
9. Socialism and the New World Order	167
10. An Update: Qualitatively Unchanged Conditions	210
11. Technology and Poverty from the Viewpoint of the Third World	229
12. Strengthen the Alliance for Human Rights in the National Democratic Movement	238

1.

SORTING OUT CONTRADICTIONS PERTAINING TO IRAQ

10 February 1991

We take into account all major contradictions in the history and circumstances of any country under study. We follow the changes in the political situation, sort out the contradictions at every given period or stage and determine the principal and secondary contradictions.

It is important to grasp the principal contradiction at any given period because it is in the consideration of this that right and wrong is determined and the people are rallied and mobilized to uphold and fight for what is right, without losing sight of the secondary contradictions.

Those who view Iraq from the outside and take the moral and political stand for peace against the U.S. war of aggression against Iraq are correct.

They see clearly that the avowed interest of the United States and its capitalist allies in the war to "liberate" Kuwait is actually the imposition of a pro-imperialist, pro-Zionist and anti-Arab security scheme and the imperialist control of the oil resources and economy in the Persian Gulf and the Middle East.

1. The Main Contradiction Involving the United States and Iraq.

The brutal U.S.-led aggression against Iraq pushes into the forefront the contradiction between the United States and Iraq as

the main one without any doubt and pushes into a secondary position the issue or claim of Iraqi aggression against Kuwait.

The main objective of U.S. aggression is not simply to reclaim Kuwait as a client state and restore to power the royal Al Sabah family but to aggrandize U.S. security and oil interests, including the subjugation of Iraq and control of its oil resources.

The brutality of the U.S. war of aggression against Iraq exceeds by far all the claims against the Saddam regime and contravenes even the original mandate from the U.N. Security Council. The United States uses the name of the United Nations and the specific resolutions regarding Kuwait in order to carry out the U.S. imperialist agenda.

The U.S. imperialist agenda is now fully exposed as the United States and its capitalist allies seek to destroy Iraq, wantonly killing the people and wrecking civil structures and facilities; and openly talk about the spoils they expect to take for themselves. The U.S. objectives are to install a puppet regime in Iraq; rake up profits from oil resources, costs of the war, reconstruction and renewed military sales; and strengthen in the Middle East a system of regional security serving U.S. and Zionist interests against the Palestinian and Arab people.

In the period before the Iraqi troops entered Kuwait, the U.S. and other capitalist powers directly pressured Iraq to veer away from an anti-Zionist, pro-Palestinian and pro-Arab line and used the Al Sabah regime in Kuwait to put the economic squeeze on Iraq. Thus, Iraq was pushed to raise economic claims of equity against the royal regime and historical claim over Kuwait; and eventually sent troops to take over Kuwait.

With reference to Iraq, there are at least three major political terms: the Iraqi people, Iraq as a nation state and the current regime of Saddam. In whatever manner one may regard Saddam Hussein or his regime, one must recognize the Iraqi

people and Iraq the nation-state as entities whose legitimate sovereign rights have been so barbarically violated by the United States and its allies.

Creatures of the Western mass media are carried away or confused by the propaganda against Saddam the leader or his regime. Since the onset of U.S. war of aggression against Iraq, it has become strikingly clear that President Bush has a better claim than Saddam to being a Hitler. Not only is he at the head of an imperialist state and his rhetoric about a "new world order" starkly reminiscent of Hitler's "new order" but the U.S. "blitzkrieg" is destroying the lives of millions of Iraqi people directly and indirectly as well as Iraq as an independent nation-state.

2. The Contradiction Involving Kuwait.

As the evil factor in the current main contradiction between the United States and Iraq, the U.S. war of aggression has affected and transformed the issue of Kuwait. There is now basically a war between Iraq and the United States over Kuwait. If the United States wins the war, that it will certainly exercise far more control over Kuwait than ever before under the guise of recovering costs of the war and providing further protection.

Where before it could be asserted that Kuwait is a legitimate nation-state recognized in the United Nations and the Arab League, the U.S. war of aggression serves to underscore the counter-assertion of Iraq that Kuwait is a British creation and an Anglo-American client and reinforces the historical claim over Kuwait as a part of Iraq.

The struggle of Iraq and the martyrdom of the Iraqi people in the current U.S. war of aggression pay the price for the return of Kuwait to Iraq. This fact and line of thought will continue,

whether the U.S. war of aggression against Iraq will succeed or not.

What was previously regarded in the U.N. Security Council as a case of unwarranted Iraqi aggression against Kuwait over questions involving borders; the Rumaila oilfield; mutual financial obligations; and overproduction and underpricing of oil has become a case of the United States seeking to impose control over Iraq and Kuwait and further entrenching U.S. domination of the Gulf states and the Middle East under the pretext of liberating Kuwait.

3. Iraq's Contradictions with Other Countries.

3a. Iraq's contradiction with Zionist Israel are a direct part of those between the United States and Iraq. As a matter of fact, the firm stand taken by Iraq against Zionist Israel in favor of the Palestinian and Arab peoples have motivated the U.S. and other capitalist powers to take a hostile attitude towards Iraq before and during the Gulf crisis over the issue of Kuwait.

3b. Iraq's current contradictions with Saudi Arabia and other Gulf states have been conditioned by their close affinity with Kuwaiti royal interests and their subservience to U.S. and other imperialist forces; and those with the Egyptian and Syrian regimes have been conditioned by the economic and financial needs of these two regimes and by previous political differences over the issue of Zionist Israel and Palestine.

The Egyptian regime has long been ensnared in the Camp David accords; and is constantly in want of U.S. economic and military assistance. Deprived of Soviet assistance, the Syrian regime has become attracted to assistance from the United States, Saudi Arabia and the Gulf emirates. But the people of Egypt and Syria, as in the rest of the Arab world, are supportive of Iraq and the Iraqi people against U.S. imperialism and Israeli Zionism.

3c. In promoting the Iran-Iraq war, Western officialdom and mass media celebrated the Saddam regime as a secular modernizing and democratizing one against the so-called fundamentalist Khomeini regime. In the course and aftermath of the war, however, Iraq has built a military and industrial capability that has not fallen into line with U.S. security and economic interests. Thus, the Saddam regime has become the *bete noir* of Western propaganda.

Iraq's contradiction with Iran has come down from the level of war since the peace settlement of 1988. Despite the painful costs of the Iran-Iraq war, when the U.S. and other capitalist powers sided with Iraq, the people of Iraq as well as increasing sections of the Iranian government are now unequivocally supporting Iraq in the struggle against the Great Satan in Washington.

They are consistently opposing U.S. imperialism and cannot but sympathize with a neighboring people and country being mercilessly destroyed by the Great Satan. They can see that a defeat of Iraq by the United States would bring the imperialist monster to their doorsteps, although the prevailing Iranian authorities consider a weakened but undefeated Iraq as a much lessened danger to them.

4. Contradictions within Iraq.

Within Iraq, there are social and political (including ethnic) contradictions. These are now muted by the U.S. war of aggression. Patriotic and religious (Shiite, Sunnite, Christian and otherwise) sentiments prevail in Iraq against the U.S. war of aggression.

U.S. and British airplanes, missiles and bombs are literally muffling the internal contradictions in Iraq and are indiscriminately killing both Kurds and non-Kurds at a rate higher than the Saddam regime has been accused of killing Kurds

who seek national self-determination and whom the regime in turn accuses of seeking to dismember a U.N. member-state such as Iraq.

Kurds who support the Iraqi government as well as those who do not cannot but condemn the U.S. war of aggression which is unjustly massacring people of whatever political, ethnic or religious affiliation and ruining their means of life on a wide scale.

In a given period such as the current one in Iraq, in which the main contradiction is one between the United States and Iraq, all other contradictions pertaining to Iraq fall into a secondary position and are drastically affected.

Even while we use Iraq as a focal point of reference, the U.S. war of aggression against Iraq is a major imperialist action against the Palestinian and Arab people and against other peoples in the world who oppose imperialist and neocolonial domination.

The United States presumes itself to be the chief maker and policeman of a "new world order". This presumption must be denounced and resisted because it runs against the national sovereignty and well-being of the peoples of the world and against the cause of world peace.

The United States must not be allowed to pass itself off as the champion of freedom; and camouflage its imperialist agenda. The resistance of Iraq and the Iraqi people against U.S. imperialism is a signal event. It comes at a time when it seems that the United States can have its way without effective resistance; and put under its unchallenged sway the South and the East through neocolonial economic and financial manipulation and high-tech military blackmail and aggression.

Iraq and the Iraqi people are playing the heroic role of daring to fight and win against U.S. imperialism; and to inflict serious

wounds on it even as this monster cannot as yet be defeated. Their anti-imperialist resistance will inspire the countries and peoples now under imperialist and neocolonial domination and under exploitation in the glut of raw material products, the deterioration of the terms of trade, misdirected resources, superprofit-taking and the crushing debt burden.

Constructive Proposal

There can be a broad antiwar and anti-imperialist movement focusing on the main contradiction between the United States and Iraq and at the same time allowing the different views of participants on various secondary issues.

Those outside of Iraq who advocate peace and wish to stop the war can truly take the moral and political high ground by adopting the following line of thought and action:

1. Condemn the U.S.-led war of aggression against Iraq and expose the imperialist security and oil interests behind the war; and support Iraq and the Iraqi people in their anti-imperialist and anti-Zionist struggle.
2. Demand the implementation of all U.N. resolutions regarding the Middle East in their chronological order (giving priority to the just cause of the Palestinian people) and encourage all the states and peoples in the Middle East to settle differences in an equitable manner and to ward off the hegemony of the United States and other capitalist powers taking advantage of such differences; and
3. Oppose the misuse of the United Nations by the imperialist powers and the presumption of the United States that it is the chief maker and policeman of a "new world order", in which the United States is unopposed in its drive to control countries and peoples through economic and financial neocolonial

manipulation and through high-tech military suppression against recalcitrants.

2.

**LET AQUINO REGIME AND ITS U.S. IMPERIALIST
MASTERS ANSWER FOR THEIR GROSS CRIMES
AGAINST THE FILIPINO PEOPLE**

February 11, 1991

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

In addition, the Aquino regime recently agreed to still another set of IMF impositions in exchange for more loans which it hopes will revive the moribund national economy. The so-called Economic Stabilization Plan (ESP), submitted by the regime to the IMF in obedience to the latter's wishes, was so secret that its text was denied even to the president and members of the Philippine Senate. From experience, however, we know that the usual IMF impositions include the maintenance of the export-oriented economy, the devaluation of the Philippine peso, the freezing of wages, new and higher taxes, higher power and water rates, tax holidays for foreign investors, and the lowering or removal of tariff walls for the easier dumping of U.S. and other capitalist countries' surplus products on the Philippine market.

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

Criminal disregard for the people's welfare

It is general knowledge that Filipino men and women have been forced to seek employment abroad -- on Philippine government sponsorship -- because of the bankruptcy of the

semicolonial and semifeudal system which President Aquino upholds and nurtures.

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

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

There are an estimated 650,000 Filipino workers in the Middle East, almost 400,000 of them in Saudi Arabia alone, driven to seek livelihood there as a result of a 50-percent unemployment and underemployment rate at home. As early as last December and early January, when U.S. imperialism was already undertaking all-out preparations to launch its war of aggression in the Gulf, concerned citizens were already urgently appealing that the imperilled Filipino workers be repatriated home.

The Aquino regime not only rejected these proposals but continued to send an average of 500 workers every day to the Middle East, even as other countries were already evacuating their citizens from the danger areas. The Aquino regime deliberately tried to minimize the dangers confronting the Filipino workers, mendaciously trying to give the impression

that it had drawn up contingency plans to evacuate them should war break out.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

* * *

3.

Two Articles on The People's Struggle for a Just Peace

June 1991

The main reason for the defeat of the armed revolutionary movement in the early fifties was the Left opportunist or adventurist line of quick military victory in two years time, exaggerating the spontaneous character of the masses due to the social crisis and not paying attention to the balance of forces and the need for painstaking mass work to lay the ground for social revolution and to counteract the military superiority of the enemy forces. But the deceptive "peace" approaches to local leaders of the revolutionary movement by U.S. and reactionary agents augmented and complemented the heavy military onslaughts of the blatant enemy in the entire strategy to defeat the revolutionary forces.

Revolutionaries determined to carry out the objectives of the national democratic revolution can logically and legitimately consider peace negotiations as a way of pushing forward the aforesaid objectives, in the same way that the other side considers the same peace negotiations as a way of pushing forward its own objectives. Inevitably, the struggle across the table reflects first of all the struggle in the battlefield and then influence further developments in the battlefield.

The sincerity of the NDF ... is to be measured by its steadfastness in defending and upholding the people's interests, its firmness of principles even while making policy adjustments to achieve certain specific anti-imperialist (e.g., the immediate removal of U.S. military bases) and democratic (e.g., genuine and thoroughgoing land reform) demands, and its vigilance in frustrating every scheme to undermine the gains and achievements of the revolutionary movement and the people.

History and Circumstances Relevant to the Question of Peace May 10, 1991

A just and lasting peace is possible only if the Filipino people's demand for national liberation and democracy is satisfied. It is the outcome of the people's revolutionary struggle. It goes without saying that the national democratic revolution is at once the struggle for a just and lasting peace. The strategic line of this revolution which is to complete the struggle for national liberation and democracy, is the same strategic line that the NDF has to pursue in seeking a just and lasting peace.

There can be no other strategic line. To say that the NDF does not have such a line in seeking peace negotiations is to suggest another line or to confuse the line. To engage in peace negotiations, without addressing the roots of the armed conflict and without seeking substantial satisfaction of the people's demands for national liberation and democracy, is to create confusion and even fall into capitulation.

Peace negotiations may be conducted before the total victory of the national democratic revolution. If the success of these involve the truce agreement of the two contending sides in the civil war, for the purpose of uniting against a common foe or against a certain set of problems, there is a mutual adjustment of policies. But the NDF is not obliged to give up its firm revolutionary principles. Neither can the GRP be expected to change its counter-revolutionary principles.

Peace negotiations constitute only one of the forms of struggle in the overall struggle for a just and lasting peace. They may arise only because in the first place there is an armed conflict to deal with. They reflect and yet interact with the balance of strength in the battlefield. To obscure or to underrate the relationship of the battlefield to the negotiating table is to fly into fantasy, unless the "realistic" objective is to capitulate.

Peace negotiations do not always necessarily arise between the two sides in a civil war. That they may arise depends on the strength and willingness of the two warring sides and on the concrete situation. An incumbent state power can refuse to negotiate peace because it thinks it can beat the opposite side in the battlefield. However, it is always willing to negotiate if the other side wishes to capitulate or can be tricked into capitulation. It can also use peace rhetoric in order to misrepresent itself as the just and reasonable side, split the ranks of the armed opposition and mislead the people.

It is known in history that quite a number of regimes have refused to negotiate seriously even when they are desperate or when they are about to be defeated. Even in such a case, the revolutionary movement must show that its position is just and reasonable, that it seeks a just and lasting peace, in order to gain more popular support at home and abroad and to isolate and defeat the side that stands for the violence of an oppressive and exploitative system.

Before undertaking peace negotiations, it is necessary for the Philippine revolutionary movement to study both the relevant historical experience and current circumstances in order to understand profoundly and pursue correctly the struggle for a just and lasting peace.

The Philippines has a deep and rich experience with regard to various types of armed conflict and peace negotiations. It is useful to review this experience and learn from it. We can only point to the most significant and relevant historical events.

I. Peace Negotiations in Philippine History

In precolonial times, the disparate communities in the Philippines engaged in trade and cultural interaction as well as in wars. Wars were settled either through the victory of one side and the defeat of the other or were negotiated through the

mediation of a third party in the course of war or in its aftermath.

The peace process of the precolonial past can still be observed in certain areas which are not tightly integrated into the social and legal system dominant in the country. The revolutionary movement has understood this kind of peace process in the hinterlands and has often acted as the third party to assist in the peacemaking between conflicting communities and unite them against the Manila-based and the local forces of oppression and exploitation.

For instance, in the mountain provinces of Northern Luzon, the tradition of the bodong (peace pact) has been adopted by the revolutionary forces to settle tribal or communal armed conflicts and has acquired a national and democratic orientation.

Pacification by Spanish Colonialism

In the conquest of the Philippines, the Spanish colonialists used the divide-and-rule policy. They engaged in blood compacts and alliances wherever they could, and pacified one community in order to conscript troops to augment the few foreign troops needed to conquer and subjugate another community.

In the conduct of pacification, the Spanish colonial troops used armed force or threatened the use of it in order to suppress or discourage the resistance of the natives. The Spanish priests had the special function of persuading the natives that it was better to submit to than to resist colonial rule.

The sword-and-cross combination worked effectively while the native indios were still lacking in national consciousness. The Moros, the Igorots and other tribes could resist longer because of definite factors which favored resistance, like Islam as the rallying point of the Moros and the spontaneous tendency

of the Igorots to unite against the uninvited foreigners and lowlanders and use their mountainous terrain to their advantage. The Sulu sultanate accepted Spanish colonial garrisons only in the middle of the nineteenth century. Some Igorot communities were subjugated only in the last quarter of the nineteenth century.

The concept of local dialogues and community-based peace espoused by General Fidel Ramos through his peace and order councils or by the Coalition for Peace under the slogan of "zones of peace and zones of life" harks back to the pacification of the Philippine islands by Spanish colonialism. The colonial use of this concept of pacification is a much earlier tactic than that of denying the armed revolutionary movement of its mass base as in the U.S. conquest of the Philippines and the use of "strategic hamlets" in the Vietnam war.

In the course of the protracted war between the Spaniards and the Moros through the centuries, there were interludes of peace negotiations and truce agreements. The Moros had the strength and dignity of being able to go into these because of their determined armed resistance. They were always ready to fight against the threat of total conquest.

The Pact of Biak-na-bato

Following the outbreak of the Philippine Revolution of 1896, the Spanish colonialists used both armed force and peace negotiations to end the Aguinaldo-led armed resistance of the Filipino people. As a result of the efforts of Pedro Paterno as intermediary, the first negotiations between the colonial power and the Philippine armed revolution led to the capitulation and exile of Aguinaldo and other leaders of the revolution under the Pact of Biak-na-bato in 1897.

In resuming the armed revolution against Spanish colonial power, the Filipino revolutionaries engaged in negotiations and cooperation with the United States. Subsequently, the U.S. negotiated them out of advantageous positions in the siege of Intramuros and secretly negotiated with Spain the surrender of the Spanish forces to the U.S. Eventually, the Treaty of Paris of December 10, 1898, was forged strictly between the U.S. and Spain.

In the course of the Filipino-American War, which started in early 1899, the U.S. offered "peace" and "benevolent assimilation" to the Philippine revolutionary government. The "peace" offer induced a split within the Cabinet of the Philippine revolutionary government, resulting in the replacement of the Mabini Cabinet by the Paterno Cabinet and ultimately in the assassination of General Antonio Luna, the commanding general of the revolutionary army.

In conquering the Philippines and imposing its colonial rule on the people, the U.S. combined the use of superior military force to crush the armed revolutionary forces and localized "peace" dialogues and agreements (with the assistance of the reactionary clergy) to recruit the local gentry into the service of U.S. domination. The localized "peace" dialogues and agreements were always crowned with local elections dominated by the local gentry.

While it was preoccupied with quelling the revolutionary forces in Luzon, the U.S. went so far as to make a peace agreement, the Kiram-Bates Agreement of 1899, with the Sulu sultanate. After Luzon and Visayas were in the main pacified, it was the turn of the Moro people to be brutally conquered.

Upon the intercession of Dr. Dominador Gomez, Macario Sakay of the Filipino Republic placed himself and his forces in the hands of U.S. colonial authorities in 1906 after an informal peace agreement. After a brief period of being feted and

escorted by enemy troops, Sakay and his colleagues were tried and punished for "banditry."

The Neocolonial Compromise

In Philippine history so far, the most successful negotiations regarding the fate of the entire Philippines have been those between the U.S. government and the puppet legislative officials from the Nacionalista Party on the subject of changing the colonial status of the Philippines to a semicolonial or neocolonial one. Thus, in 1935 the Philippine Constitution and the transitional Commonwealth government and in 1946 the proclamation of nominal independence became possible.

To make the neocolonial compromise, the Nacionalista Party did not have to lead a people's army and conduct a people's war. Nationalist rhetoric, peaceful campaigns and missions to Washington looked sufficient. But in fact, the U.S. took into account the revolutionary history and potential of the Filipino people and mass agitation for independence as well as the conditions of social unrest in the Philippines, in the U.S. and in the world at large due to the great depression, the rise of fascist regimes and the need for an antifascist popular front in the thirties.

What is important for the colonialists, in agreeing to a neocolonial compromise, is that they retain their property rights and control of security forces even as national administration is handed over to the natives.

It was in the latter half of the thirties that President Quezon informally negotiated with Crisanto Evangelista and other detained leaders of the Communist Party for the legalization of the CP and cooperation in a "program of social justice" and in the antifascist struggle. With no objection from the U.S. authorities, the representative of the Communist Party of the

USA prodded Quezon to release the imprisoned CP leaders in 1936 and 1937.

Towards the outbreak of World War II, the merger party of the Communist Party and Socialist Party pledged its loyalty to the Commonwealth government and pleaded for the arming of the people against the imminent threat of Japanese invasion. The puppet government refused to arm the people.

The Japanese "Peace" Offer

In imposing its rule on the Philippines from 1942 onwards the Japanese fascists negotiated "peace" with all the available pre-war pro-U.S. officials to shift their loyalty to Japan. If the pro-U.S. officials were not available for one reason or another, the new foreign rulers recruited their own political puppets from the local exploiting classes.

After the arrest of the principal leaders of the CP-SP merger party in early 1942, the Japanese fascists sent out Guillermo Capadocia from prison to contact the other CP-SP merger party leaders for peace negotiations on the condition that his failure to return before the deadline would mean the execution of the imprisoned party chairman Crisanto Evangelista and the general secretary of the party Pedro Abad Santos.

Capadocia was arrested by the Manila-Rizal command of the Hukbalahap and was tried and subjected to disciplinary action by the CP-SP merger party for agreeing to be the messenger of the Japanese fascists. His failure to return to prison sealed the martyrdom of Evangelista and Abad Santos.

In the course of the resistance against Japan, the CP-SP merger party was able to build a people's army, the Hukbalahap. But even before the landing of the U.S. troops in late 1944, the CP-SP merger party decided to opt for parliamentary struggle and to convert the Hukbalahap into a veterans'

organization. This domestic political line would be reinforced by the international line of peace and democracy proclaimed by the Soviet Union and the international communist movement.

Once More Pax Americana

In reconquering the Philippines in 1945, the U.S. reinstalled its pre-war officials or set up provisional officials wherever the former were no longer available. It put into prison local officials installed by the revolutionary forces in Central Luzon.

Informally, Sergio Osmeña, the last president of the Commonwealth, accommodated the CP-SP merger party in the arena of parliamentary struggle and agreed to the alliance of his Nacionalista Party and the Democratic Alliance in 1946 elections, notwithstanding the bloody actions already being undertaken by U.S. and local reactionaries against the Hukbalahap and the progressive movement.

After his electoral victory, Manuel Roxas as first president of the puppet republic was able to extract from the right opportunist leadership of the CP-SP merger party a commitment to surrender Hukbalahap arms and register Hukbalahap fighters. But the massive anticommunist campaign of terror against the people and the people's army continued and the members of the Democratic Alliance elected to Congress were unseated in order to pave the way for the legislative approval of the Parity Amendment and other unequal agreements between the U.S. and the Philippines. Nevertheless, through various devices, the merger party continued to plead for peace negotiations and forward peace proposals to the reactionary government.

The Quirino-Taruc Peace Agreement

Under President Elpidio Quirino in 1948, the reactionary government showed interest in negotiating with the revolutionary movement. The main negotiator of the government was Judge Antonio Quirino, brother of the President. With the approval of the leadership of the CP-SP merger party but without correct and clear explanations to the rank and file of the revolutionary mass movement, the commander of the Hukbalahap Luis Taruc engaged in peace negotiations in Hukbalahap territory with the Quirino government. An agreement was made on amnesty, surrender of arms and renewed registration of Hukbalahap fighters and reinstatement in Congress of the ousted congressmen from the Democratic Alliance.

The objectives of the CP-SP leadership in allowing Taruc to do what he did were to make propaganda and to try the road of parliamentary struggle. Undermining the stand and will of the revolutionary forces, Taruc and his kind put themselves above the armed conflict and premised the desire for peace on the claim that the people were tired of war and its costs.

The CP-SP merger party also presented in 1948 to the Committee on Un-Filipino Activities of the Philippine House of Representatives a memorandum reiterating support to the Constitution of the reactionary government and declaring that the new democratic revolution would have a capitalist basis.

While the amnesty agreement was in effect, the troops and secret agents of the Philippine Constabulary could mingle with the fighters of the Hukbalahap and enjoyed safe conduct in the Huk-controlled barrios of Central Luzon. Large numbers of cadres of the underground became exposed as they surfaced and facilitated the surrender of arms and the registration of Hukbalahap fighters.

After a short period of only two months, the amnesty agreement was broken as the Philippine military started to kill leaders of the revolutionary movement. Among those killed was the principal leader of the peasant movement, Juan Feleo

who was under constant escort and surveillance by the Philippine constabulary. The demonstrated bad faith of the Quirino regime and its U.S. master was a powerful motive for the declaration of "all-out armed struggle" by the CP-SP merger party in 1950.

Localized "Peace" Approaches

Even after the failure of the Quirino-Taruc amnesty and truce agreement, Filipino assets of the U.S. Central Intelligence Agency like Manuel Manahan and Colonel Osmundo Mondoñedo (who belonged to the outfit of Colonel Edward Lansdale) systematically approached local revolutionary leaders and local commanders of the Hukbong Mapagpalaya ng Bayan (new name for Hukbalahap adopted in 1950) to offer localized peace and personal concessions to their family members, including jobs and scholarships for their children.

Because the role of Taruc in negotiating with the Quirino regime was never correctly and properly explained to them, field commanders of the HMB and local leaders of the revolutionary movement were susceptible to approaches by enemy agents masquerading as men of peace and goodwill. A number of them made separate deals from a narrow localist or even personal viewpoint.

The main reason for the defeat of the armed revolutionary movement in the early fifties was the Left opportunist or adventurist line of quick military victory in two years time, exaggerating the spontaneous character of the masses due to the social crisis and not paying attention to the balance of forces and the need for painstaking mass work to lay the ground for social revolution and to counteract the military superiority of the enemy forces. But the deceptive "peace" approaches to local leaders of the revolutionary movement by U.S. and reactionary agents augmented and

complemented the heavy military onslaughts of the blatant enemy in the entire strategy to defeat the revolutionary forces.

After the crushing defeat of the armed revolutionary movement, no basis whatsoever was left for any kind of peace negotiations for a long time. In 1957, the Garcia regime enacted the Anti-Subversion Law (drafted during the earlier Magsaysay regime by the American Jesuit priest Father Weiss and the U.S. embassy political officers), which gave the ultimatum to leaders of the Communist Party and related organizations to surrender and seek amnesty within six months or else face the death penalty.

Peace through Revolutionary Struggle

With regard to the Communist Party of the Philippines, reestablished in 1968, the Marcos regime never saw the need to go through the motion of seeking peace negotiations with it. Instead, the regime always tried to destroy it outright. What the regime found more appropriate was to secure the formal surrender of the Lava revisionist group in 1974 and to give it paltry concessions in the vain hope of using it for intelligence and propaganda purposes against the Communist Party of the Philippines, New People's Army and the National Democratic Front.

The Lava revisionist group surrendered its firearms and registered its personnel with the GRP. In exchange, the GRP granted legality to the group, recruited some members into the Constabulary Security Unit and conceded to other members homestead rights on the slope of the Sierra Madre in eastern Bulacan. The Lava group murdered at least 25 members who resisted its line of capitulation.

Since the beginning, the Communist Party of the Philippines has always regarded its program for a people's democratic revolution as the strategic line and political basis for

a just and lasting peace. Despite the all-out determination of the Marcos regime to destroy the armed revolutionary movement, which Marcos had pointed to as the principal reason for declaring martial law in 1972, the CPP in its sixth anniversary statement in 1974 declared that there could be a truce if the regime was willing to come to a mutually satisfactory agreement sufficiently beneficial to the people in terms of national independence and democracy. At the same time, so as not to confuse its own ranks, the CPP described the possibility as a remote one.

As it has proceeded from the very beginning, the armed revolutionary movement has always championed and promoted a just peace, especially wherever it and the people can exercise revolutionary power and can therefore undertake campaigns of social benefit. The armed propaganda teams and other units of the people's army have always espoused and helped build a social life that is productive and just and that is peaceful, quiet and tranquil against the depredations of the ruling system and the bad elements in local communities.

The armed revolutionary movement led by the Communist Party of the Philippines builds people's democratic power in the rural areas even as reactionary state power is still entrenched in the cities. Such a democratic power defends the people, enables them to make the all-round progress that is possible and fights for a just peace. Such a power rejects the very idea that a just peace consists of laying down the arms of the people and seeking accommodation in the violent ruling system of oppression and exploitation.

The local units and leaders of the revolutionary movement have had a long experience in effecting peace and working relationships with allies since the beginning of the revolutionary movement. These have not involved the movement giving up people and territory to GRP authority under any guise.

There is certainly a qualitative difference between the peace instituted in localities by the people's organs of democratic power and the "community-based peace" which the GRP and the Rightwing advocates of pacification are pushing in order to remove the revolutionary forces from localities and put the people under the sway of their oppressors and exploiters.

The Tripoli Agreement

The most conspicuous peace negotiations carried out by the Marcos regime were with the Moro National Liberation Front (MNLF) in Tripoli, Libya in 1976. The Manila-based regime was compelled to negotiate with the MNLF and to negotiate abroad because the latter was waging an armed struggle of such a magnitude as to tie down in Moro land one third of the total combat strength of the Armed Forces of the Philippines at that time. The Libyan government acted as the third party.

There was a give-and-take in the Tripoli Agreement. In the first provision of this agreement, the MNLF submitted to the principle that the Moro question was within the framework of Philippine national sovereignty and territorial integrity. At the same time, the MNLF gained recognition for its status of belligerency, especially among the Islamic states.

The biggest practical gain made by the Marcos regime was in inducing the highest MNLF officials, local MNLF commanders and units to expose themselves in displays of strength before the eyes of the AFP during prolonged ceasefire. Consequently, the political agents of Marcos were able to offer material concessions to specific MNLF officials and commanders and their families and persuade them to leave the MNLF. Since the Tripoli Agreement, the MNLF has been weakened by breakaways and desertions.

Peace Overtures of Marcos

The first significant instance that the Marcos regime brought up the subject of peace negotiations with the Philippine armed revolutionary movement was when Marcos did so with this writer when he was presented as a captive on November 10, 1977. He told this writer that armed struggle was passé and that national unity and reconciliation could be negotiated and agreed upon between the regime and the revolutionary movement.

Conscious of the bad example of Aguinaldo in issuing a capitulationist statement to the revolutionary forces and the people after his capture by the U.S. army at the beginning of the century, this writer replied to Marcos that he was no longer in a position to represent the revolutionary movement upon his capture and that the automatic loss of position upon capture by the enemy is a protection of the movement against the bad example of Aguinaldo.

But this writer also told Marcos that the latter could always get in touch with him about anything beneficial to the people like he did with his captive Senator Benigno Aquino; and reminded him of historical examples of the highest authorities talking with political prisoners, like Quezon with Crisanto Evangelista in 1935 and 1936; Sukarno with D.N. Aidit in 1951; and Khan with Bhutto in the early seventies. This writer also reminded him of the French consulting with Ben Bella and the British with Jomo Kenyatta in prison. However, it was made absolutely clear that the active leaders of the revolutionary movement made the decisions on the question of war and peace.

Notwithstanding the physical torture this writer was put through from November 13 to 18, 1977 and his being shackled to a cot in solitary confinement, a series of Marcos emissaries from the military came to his isolation cell from late November 1977 onwards, to discuss the possibility of peace negotiations and, of course, to try also to fish for information. The very first

of them was a ranking security consultant of Marcos, a supposedly retired military officer, who had been most instrumental in the surrender agreement between the Marcos regime and the Lava group. He never returned but the second emissary, also a senior military officer, was the one most persistent.

The premises of the emissaries were constant: there could be a peace agreement, in fact an agreement of surrender, if the revolutionary armed movement renounced violence and surrendered its arms. The premises of this writer were also constant: the movement might be willing to consider agreeing to a truce if there were basic anti-imperialist and democratic reforms.

When Marcos announced the elections for the Interim Batasang Pambansa in February 1978, the second emissary came to the cell of this writer to offer his removal from solitary confinement and from his chains in exchange for a public statement endorsing the elections and expressing an intention to run as candidate for a seat in the sham parliament. The example of Benigno Aquino and other political detainees were cited. But this writer refused.

Conference of Detainees

The emissary made the rounds of the principal political prisoners, including Bernabe Buscayno, Jose Luneta, Satur Ocampo and this writer in 1978. Came November 1978, they were allowed to confer. All of them understood that they were in no position to negotiate with the regime, that they were only being consulted by the enemy and that, if Ocampo and Luneta had been given temporary release, they would be able to communicate to the movement what the regime wished to communicate.

Valuable knowledge and experience were gained by talking to the emissaries of Marcos from 1977 onwards. The strategy and tactics of those in power in talking about peace were clear and sharpened the sense of those political detainees approached of what could be the strategy and tactics of the movement. There is a lot of difference between the reading of the history of the Philippines and other countries on the one hand and actually conversing with reactionaries who talk "peace" on the other hand.

In all discussions with the "peace" emissary of Marcos, the aforementioned political detainees held the moral high ground in expressing their opinions which can be distilled in the following manner:

The free and active leaders of the revolutionary movement make the decisions. There can be no giving up of revolutionary principles although there can be a mutual adjustment of policies to achieve a truce and not the capitulation of any side. The constant principled point is to satisfy the people's demands for national liberation and democracy. Following the precedent of talks between the Philippine government and the MNLF in Tripoli, Libya, the venue of peace negotiations should be abroad. Besides bilateral peace talks between the GRP and NDF, a council for national reconciliation and unity may be considered.

Somehow, one of the political detainees was able to have a comprehensive exchange of information and ideas with the active leadership of the revolutionary movement about the approaches of the regime. For the first time in the history of the reestablished CPP, there was a serious effort to consider and clarify under what terms the movement could negotiate with its enemy. The movement ultimately decided that conditions were not yet ripe to engage in any kind of negotiations.

Calls for Peace

In the eighties, before the assassination of Benigno Aquino, former president Diosdado Macapagal, Lorenzo M. Tañada, Jose W. Diokno and this writer issued public statements proposing at various instances a peaceful settlement of the armed conflict, but always with the big IF, if the people's national and democratic interests were to be served. The statements were in accordance with the national and democratic interests of the people and were correctly done more to expose the antinational and antidemocratic character of the regime than anything else in view of the regime's own objective of seeking the capitulation of the opposition forces.

After the assassination of Benigno Aquino and the rise of popular outrage against the fascist regime, no one of national significance could seriously entertain the idea of reconciliation and unity with the forces of Marcos. By then, Marcos was completely hemmed in by the popular outrage, the U.S. pressures and other factors which converged on him.

The kind of peace proposals then being made by various leaders opposed to the Marcos regime was meant to broaden and strengthen the united front against the fascist regime and was supposed to be realized after the fall of Marcos.

It was in this spirit that Aquino supporters made contacts and cooperated with the progressive underground and aboveground organizations and the widow Corazon Aquino visited political prisoners in Bicutan to make a dramatic expression of support for them. She advocated their release and ceasefire with the armed revolutionary movement upon the end of the fascist regime.

Through public statements, the revolutionary movement and this writer, in his personal capacity, encouraged the idea of a broad united front of democratic forces to overthrow the

fascist regime, satisfy the people's demands for national freedom and democracy and thereby to work for a just and lasting peace. In her campaign speeches in 1986, Aquino pledged to release all political prisoners and to negotiate a ceasefire with the revolutionary movement.

GRP-NDF Peace Talks during the Aquino Regime

Soon after assuming power on February 25, 1986, GRP President Aquino fulfilled her pledge to release the political prisoners of the fallen Marcos regime. This was considered as both an act of her gratitude to the national democratic movement and a signal for negotiating a ceasefire. At the same time, Aquino retained Juan Ponce Enrile as her defense minister and General Fidel Ramos as AFP chief of staff.

In March 1986, NDF spokesman Antonio Zumel announced in a press conference the willingness of the NDF to dialogue with the Aquino regime on a possible ceasefire between the AFP and NPA.

This writer delivered a speech on the "Conditions for a Ceasefire" on March 29, 1986 before the Santa Mesa Heights Rotary Club. He demanded (1) further unilateral acts of goodwill on the part of the new regime; and (2) further substantial changes mutually agreed upon by the GRP and the revolutionary movement, in order to pave the way for a ceasefire.

In her speech at the graduation exercises of the University of the Philippines in April 1986, President Aquino expressed her desire for a negotiated ceasefire. The NDF and NPA issued statements, responding affirmatively.

The formation of the National Reconciliation Commission was announced in a newspaper report. Chairmanship of the commission was reportedly offered to but refused by

Lorenzo M. Tañada. It was also trial-ballooned in the press that the job was going to be offered to this writer. But he was never formally approached and he never had the chance to refuse it on the ground of propriety.

At any rate, the Jesuits, especially Fr. Bienvenido Niebres, and Defense undersecretary General Rafael Ilet tried to push the formation of the National Reconciliation Commission and undertook a series of consultations with Bernabe Buscayno, former commander-in-chief of the New People's Army, from April to June 1986.

But it would be the feelers of the Aquino regime through Executive Secretary Joker Arroyo and the late Jose W. Diokno, chairman of the Philippine human rights committee, that would be seriously entertained by the revolutionary movement. Fidel Agcaoili, the secretary general of SELDA (the association of former political detainees of the Marcos regime), played a key role in the preliminary communications between the presidential palace and the underground.

The NDF as Peace Negotiator

Among the GRP officials, General Ramos kept on insisting that the Communist Party of the Philippines should be the one to face the Government of the Republic of the Philippines in negotiations. But the decision in the revolutionary movement was that it should be the National Democratic Front. It was made clear that all member-organizations of the NDF, including the CPP and NPA, could sign the authorization for the NDF to negotiate and make agreements.

In early June 1986, at the Singapore seminar on Philippine trends sponsored by the Institute of Southeast Asian Studies, this writer essayed to make a comprehensive estimate of the CPP's view on a possible peace process and

related matters. As in previous speeches and press interviews in Manila, he made clear that there could be a just and lasting peace only if the basic demands of the people for national liberation and democracy were to be substantially met; and that if the GRP really desired a ceasefire all that it had to do was to end the strategic offensive of the AFP, pull back the troops to the barracks, disband the paramilitary forces and put the police under the local executive officials who were appointees of the new regime.

Also in June, the GRP and NDF announced that they had engaged in discreet preliminary talks and were ready to form their negotiating panels. The GRP stated that no representative of the military would sit in its panel, although this panel would consult with the Armed Forces of the Philippines.

The NDF Peace Framework

In July 1986, the leaders of the revolutionary movement were able to fully discuss and formulate its framework for peace negotiations; and to appoint the members of the negotiating panel and related personnel. The framework included the principles guiding the NDF negotiating panel; the agenda consisting of exchange of views on the experience of the Filipino people since 1972, the issues of democracy and national sovereignty, the question of temporary ceasefire, and the terms and methods for realizing the truce; safety and immunity guarantees; the time scale of negotiations; the alternate venues; the procedures and technical requirements of the talks; and other related matters.

Some of the basic decisions were the following:

1. The fundamental principles and strategic line of the NDF in peace negotiations are all in the program of the national democratic revolution. The roots of the armed conflict are to be addressed and the satisfaction of the basic demands of the

people for national liberation and democracy is to be sought up to a certain level that allows an adjustment of policy and a truce.

a. The substantive issues to be put in the agenda came under the headings of antifascism (civil liberties and human rights), antifeudalism (land reform) and anti-imperialism (national independence in questions of economic policy, foreign military bases, etc.).

b. Coming ahead of these issues in the agenda was to be the discussion and agreement on the experience of the Filipino people since 1972 so that a common ground of facts could be established, the objectives of negotiations could be made clear, the demands on each side of the negotiations could be put within reasonable context and no mechanical quid pro quos could be demanded at the expense of the revolutionary movement, especially with regard to the question of armed forces.

2. Regarding nationwide ceasefire, it could be agreed to at anytime only if the Aquino regime at the minimum would call the troops back to the barracks, dismantle the paramilitary forces and put the police under the local executive officials or at the maximum would also make an executive declaration ordering the dismantling of the U.S. military bases on or before their expiry date in 1991, in accordance with her own signature on the Declaration of Unity on December 26, 1984.

When someone suggested that localized peace talks and ceasefires could relieve guerrilla fronts under attack, it was made clear that such localized peace talks and ceasefires could not be allowed because these were calculated to confuse and fragment the revolutionary movement. It was stressed that guerrilla fronts under heavy onslaughts by the AFP were to be relieved by NPA offensives in other areas and not by seeking localized ceasefires.

3. The alternate venues were supposed to be mainly in the countryside and secondarily in Metro Manila although in the latter place there would be a strong information office. Safety and immunity guarantees for the negotiators and related personnel were clarified and were supposed to be on a mutual and reciprocal basis. It was also made clear that the share of publicity to be expected from the bourgeois mass media was not worth the exposure of cadres to the AFP and would be overwhelmed anyway by the amount of publicity to be given to the GRP.

Modifications During Negotiations

The foregoing NDF framework for peace negotiations underwent modifications by the leadership of the revolutionary movement during the actual course of negotiations because the other side, the GRP, had its own framework. The GRP panel was obsessed with ceasefire. Ceasefire first, then matters like affirmation of the GRP constitution, general amnesty, legalization of the CPP and other underground forces, rehabilitation of rebel returnees and surrender of NPA personnel and arms could be discussed. These were the items in the agenda which the GRP insisted upon.

In deference to the head of the GRP negotiating panel, former Senator Jose W. Diokno, who was not in good health, the ceasefire talks between the GRP and NDF panels proceeded from August onwards in Metro Manila at the great risk of surveillance and sabotage by the Armed Forces of the Philippines and at the probable expense of the NDF panel, the underground and aboveground allies on whom the panel was relying.

It is worthwhile to compare the technical conduct of the pre-ceasefire talks and the talks during the ceasefire in 1986 and 1987 with that of negotiations towards the Pact of Biak-na-bato of 1897 and those towards the Quirino-Taruc

Agreement of 1948. In the latter two cases, negotiations were held in the countryside and the security of the negotiators were in the hands of the revolutionary forces.

The talks became narrowly known as ceasefire talks in the bourgeois mass media. Moreover, the reactionaries pushed the line that ceasefire meant the surrender of arms and that sincerity of the NDF was to be measured along this line. In the days towards the visit of Aquino to the U.S., the GRP panel pressed hard that an unconditional 30-day ceasefire be declared as a kind of send-off gift for her to impress the U.S. authorities in Washington. The NDF did not give in to this demand.

In her speech before the U.S. Congress in September 1986, Aquino declared that she was engaged in ceasefire talks so as to gain the moral high ground for subsequently unsheathing the sword of war. While Aquino cultivated the image of being the champion of human rights and peace, her big comprador-landlord regime sought to consolidate its power and the reactionary armed forces launched large offensives against the NPA in five regions of the country and quietly organized and trained the vigilante groups.

In September 1986, CPP leader Rodolfo Salas, his wife and his driver were arrested. The NDF accused the GRP of bad faith in arresting Salas, who was described as an NDF consultant in the peace process. The NDF suspended the pre-ceasefire talks. After three weeks, however, these talks were resumed.

In an effort to push the talks forward, the NDF presented on November 1, 1986 the proposal for one hundred days of peace. The suggestion for a prolonged ceasefire was accompanied by another for "the formation of counterpart negotiating panels of the NDF and GRP on the regional and/or provincial levels." These two suggestions in the same proposal had the potential of undermining and fragmenting the

revolutionary movement. But, fortunately, these were not realized.

In quick response to the kidnapping and brutal murder of Rolando Olalia, chairman of Partido ng Bayan (PnB) and the Kilusang Mayo Uno (KMU) and vice chairman of Bayan on November 13, 1986, the NDF announced the suspension of its negotiations with the GRP. Members of the NDF panel attended the huge Olalia funeral march of one million people.

On November 22, the coup plot "Oplan God Save the Queen" was reported to have been completely defeated by the Aquino regime. Defense minister Enrile was replaced by the deputy defense minister General Rafael Ileteo.

The GRP and NDF panels announced that they would sign the two memoranda of agreement concerning the ceasefire and the safety and immunity guarantees on the birth anniversary of Benigno Aquino, November 27.

The explanation for the NDF's quick resumption of the talks was that the anti-Aquino Reform the Armed Forces Movement (RAM) had been the one responsible for the Olalia murder and Oplan "God Save the Queen" and that Aquino had resolved to remove defense minister Enrile from his office upon the demand of the progressive forces.

The Two-Month Ceasefire

The Memorandum of Agreement for a Preliminary Ceasefire (MAPC) and the Memorandum of Agreement on Safety and Immunity Guarantees (MASIG) were signed on schedule, to be effective for 60 days, from December 10, 1986 to February 8, 1987. Ceasefire had been agreed upon before a substantive agenda could be agreed upon. The understanding was that the ceasefire would provide the atmosphere for setting the agenda for peace negotiations and negotiating the substantive issues.

The MAPC co-signed by the GRP and NDF stated: "This agreement, the preliminary ceasefire agreement, and any other subsequent agreement, or any provision or provisions thereof shall not invest the NDF with the status of belligerency under the laws of war."

The NDF status of belligerency is not something invested by any document but acquired through revolutionary armed struggle and the building of democratic political power. On the other hand, the pre-ceasefire negotiations, the co-signing of the documents and the ceasefire implied recognition by GRP of the NDF's status of belligerency.

In negotiating sessions during the ceasefire period, the GRP panel insisted that the NDF submit to the GRP Constitution as the legal and political frame for negotiations and then such matters as general amnesty, rehabilitation, legalization of underground organizations and the surrender of arms, could be subsequently discussed. The NDF correctly and successfully resisted the GRP line of asking the NDF to capitulate.

By insisting that the NDF must first submit itself to the GRP Constitution as the legal and political frame of negotiations, the GRP panel was in principle and in effect killing the peace process and thus fended off the demand of the NDF panel that substantive issues such as those in the NDF list be put into the agenda. For the NDF to submit to the GRP Constitution would be to render the peace talks unnecessary, because then the NDF would accept GRP authority, its institutions and processes as the way to deal with the basic demands of the people.

On December 23, 1986, the NDF through its chairman Andres Macias issued the "Agenda for a Just and Enduring Peace" which declared the four guideposts for settling the armed conflict: (1) the complete dismantling of the vestiges of the Marcos fascist dictatorship and full protection of basic democratic and human

rights; (2) the full promotion of the people's welfare and livelihood; (3) the assertion of national dignity and sovereignty; and (4) the adoption of concrete guarantees for durable peace.

Within December 1986, the revolutionary movement decided to let the NDF negotiating panel make the most out of the ceasefire by pressing for the discussion of substantive issues. And in view of the refusal of the GRP to take up the substantive issues and in consideration of certain valid criticisms, the revolutionary movement decided not to extend or renew the ceasefire agreement.

What had been expected as negotiations to set and cover a comprehensive range of substantive issues was further frustrated by the GRP when its panel declared that it could no longer assure its own safety and the NDF panel's in the face of death threats from certain military groups.

Sabotage of Ceasefire Agreement

In fact, in a clear act of perfidy and sabotage of the negotiations, General Ramos issued "Guidelines," ordering the AFP units to disarm, arrest, detain and charge in court all armed NPA members they could surveil and encounter. This was in direct contravention of the safety and immunity guarantees and specifically the agreement of the GRP and NDF panels that violations of the ceasefire agreement by any member or unit of both the AFP and NPA would be subject to the discipline of the army concerned. The NDF panel filed a formal protest to President Aquino but she took no action.

On January 22, 1987, peasants and their urban supporters who were demonstrating in front of the presidential palace were brutally fired upon by presidential guards and additional military and police units, massacring at least 13 demonstrators and seriously injuring hundreds. That was the last straw. The NDF panel and all their personnel decided to return to the

underground, although the ceasefire was still to last up to February 8, 1987.

A week after the massacre, hundreds of thousands of the people marched to the presidential palace to protest, notwithstanding the pleas of presidential subalterns against the holding of the march.

During the ceasefire period, the NDF panel engaged in consultations with the people and organizations from various walks of life and generated mass actions all over the country. Some underground cadres and NPA units appeared in public places for press coverage and visited their relatives and friends in a relaxed manner.

Post-Ceasefire Evaluation

In breaking off from the peace negotiations and declaring the end of the ceasefire according to schedule, the NDF issued on February 7, 1987 a statement, "We Cannot Betray the People's Trust," reaffirming its revolutionary principles and its determination to seek a just and lasting peace on the basis of addressing the roots of the armed conflict and arriving at the solutions to the basic problems of the Filipino people. The NDF also reiterated its policy commitment to engage in a new round of peace talks upon this basis at anytime.

Despite the untenability of the ceasefire, agents of the GRP and the pro-Aquino Jesuits tried to coax the NDF to extend or renew the ceasefire agreement. They failed.

The GRP actually sought not only to consolidate the position of the new ruling clique and make it look good as a champion of peace and human rights but also to do harm to the revolutionary movement by trying to deceive, split, discredit and induce it to surface for surveillance and punitive action. The GRP failed to split the revolutionary movement.

After the GRP-NDF negotiations broke down, Generals Iletto and Ramos were boasting to the press that the AFP intelligence services had increased their surveillance stocks by 25 percent during the ceasefire. The ceasefire brought to a high point the laxity of some revolutionary personnel which had been inspired by the euphoria over the downfall of the Marcos regime. The precision enemy raids and arrests from 1987 onwards and earlier with the arrest of Rodolfo Salas and his driver (who had also driven for Satur Ocampo during the pre-ceasefire talks) were definitely the result of effective surveillance.

In the aftermath of the ceasefire, a press monitoring group sponsored by the Catholic Bishops Conference of the Philippines made a quantitative analysis of how much space in seven major Manila newspapers were allocated to the major players in the ceasefire drama. The GRP (including the GRP panel, civil and military officials) got the overwhelming amount of space. The much lesser amount of space given to the NDF was not always necessarily favorable to the NDF cause.

The Sword of War

On February 28, Aquino unleashed a Marcos-type propaganda campaign, calling on the Red fighters of the NPA to surrender their firearms in exchange for amnesty, financial reward and jobs.

In March, the NDF offered a new round of talks, provided the roots of the armed conflict were addressed. But the GRP falsely claimed that it was holding negotiations with regional and local NPA commanders.

At the graduation exercises of the Philippine Military Academy on March 22, Aquino unsheathed the "sword of war" and declared her total war policy. The GRP and AFP touted the "peace and order councils" and the vigilante groups. The

massacres increased in different parts of the country, especially in the countryside. And the U.S. authorities in Manila and Washington boasted of increased military aid to the GRP.

Aquino formed the National Peace Commission under Administrative Order No. 2 to pursue the aim of effecting the pacification and capitulation of the armed revolutionary movement.

In 1987, the NDF declared its adherence to Protocol II of the Geneva Convention and challenged the GRP to comply with the terms of this protocol which it had signed.

Notwithstanding the bellicosity of the GRP, the NDF still offered the reopening of talks to the Aquino regime on October 13. In the humanitarian spirit of the season, the NDF unilaterally declared a ceasefire on December 24-26 and December 31-January 1, 1987. The GRP grudgingly followed suit.

In the entirety of 1988, there was no significant move of any kind from either the GRP or NDF towards peace negotiations. Instead, there was an intensification of the armed conflict and the exchange of fierce words.

Aquino incited the AFP to carry out her total war policy and to crush the NPA before the end of her term. The NDF exposed her as unwilling to engage in peace talks because of U.S. dictation, particularly from the Pentagon and State Department. The NPA delivered telling blows on the AFP in 1988 as in the previous year.

In an editorial of *Liberation*, the NDF official publication, a proposal was made that the NDF joined up with all other willing political forces to create the conditions for a just and lasting peace and to compel the Aquino regime to negotiate.

Third Party Initiatives

In December 1988, the Coalition for Peace organized a forum on peace to which the NDF was invited. The NDF refused to attend not only because CfP could not assure the NDF representatives of their safety in Manila but essentially because the forum was strongly slanted against the NDF's concept of a just and lasting peace. However, the NDF expressed interest in a proposal made by International Alert for an agreement between the GRP and NDF on a code of conduct for the combatants.

The CfP has been trying to present itself as a domestic third party wishing to revive the peace process in the Philippines between the GRP and NDF. Its favorite interest, however, is to promote its concept of and campaign for local dialogues and zones of peace/zones of life even without and prior to the GRP-NDF negotiations at the appropriate national level. As a matter of fact, all experiments of the CfP on zones of peace/life have proven to be devices to support the GRP authority and displace the NDF and the NPA from local areas.

The concept of zones of peace/life is similar to the concept of peace and order councils promoted by General Ramos under Oplan Mamamayan during the time of Marcos and subsequently under Aquino. It seeks to mobilize the local respectables (especially reactionary politicians, businessmen, landlords and conservative clergy) and create public opinion against the armed revolutionary movement and "restore trust and confidence" in the GRP, including its perpetuation of the violence of oppression and exploitation.

In 1989 the concept of a forum for representatives of the GRP, NDF and MNLF to air their respective views on the terms and methods of resolving the armed conflict was initiated within the National Council of Churches of the Philippines (NCCP). This was supposed to be held abroad and sponsored by international Christian organizations, especially the World

Council of Churches, the Christian Conference of Asia and the Catholic Institute of International Relations on an ecumenical basis.

The concept was further developed from one of a one-shot international forum regarding the peace process to one of a long-term program to promote and assist the peace process, especially in the international arena. This concept has gained the support of several international organizations, including the World Council of Churches, which has provided valuable assistance to peace processes in different parts of the world.

Renewed Peace Efforts

In February 1989, through its chief international representative Luis Jalandoni, the NDF expressed willingness to start a new round of peace talks if the Aquino regime made an executive proclamation against the renewal of the bases agreement with the U.S. on or before September 16, 1991. In response, Aquino set the surrender of arms by the NPA as precondition to peace talks.

In April, the NDF through spokesman Satur Ocampo announced that the NDF would declare a unilateral ceasefire and enter into negotiations with the GRP if President Aquino issued an executive declaration to dismantle the U.S. military bases and prevent their extension. Ocampo reiterated the same point in July 1989. But the arrogant reply of Aquino was that she did not take cues from the NDF. Shortly afterwards, former NDF negotiators Ocampo and Carolina Malay were arrested in Manila while they were pursuing a new initiative for a peace process.

In August 1989, an emissary of a group interested in peace negotiations and counting the membership of a close associate of President Aquino came to the Netherlands to explore the possibility of a new round of peace talks between the GRP and

NDF. He consulted with this writer and talked appropriately with Luis Jalandoni, chief international representative of the NDF. The latter readily agreed to talks about peace talks abroad. But the GRP backed out of these as a result of the serious coup attempt in December 1989.

In January 1990, President Aquino launched the "Decade for Peace" (1990-2000) in a meeting at the presidential palace, with representatives from church and other conservative organizations attending. The idea of pacification was promoted.

On February 27, the NDF wrote Senator Wigberto Tañada a letter reiterating its offer of a unilateral ceasefire in exchange for Aquino's commitment to dismantle the U.S. military bases. Tañada requested Aquino to initiate a "national forum for peace." She turned down the offer.

Within the first quarter of the year, representatives of certain organizations initiated efforts to conceptualize a framework for a peace process and to realize such formations as the People's Caucus and the Multisectoral Peace Advocates.

Separately, the National Peace Conference (NPC) under the auspices of the Catholic Bishops' Conference of the Philippines (CBCP) and the Peace Desk of the protestant National Council of Churches of the Philippines (NCCP) also started efforts to promote the peace process in the Philippines. Such efforts have been welcomed by the NDF, provided these are even-handed and are not slanted towards the GRP. Representatives of peace advocates from the religious sector have exchanged views with NDF representatives.

In collaboration with foreign organizations, especially International Alert, the CfP attempted to organize a forum in Hongkong in July 1990. But this forum was aborted because, contrary to a previous agreement, the GRP refused to have the interface with the NDF. The NDF was also critical of the fact that

participants so-called in the forum were being chosen solely and lopsidedly by CfP in favor of the GRP. And they were supposed to evaluate the GRP and NDF positions.

But in the Philippines, a dialogue was held in lieu of the forum and was participated in by GRP and NDF representatives on July 20. Because this meeting was held shortly after a strong earthquake causing devastation over large areas in Northern Luzon, NDF representatives committed the NDF to a unilateral ceasefire in earthquake-devastated areas on humanitarian grounds. Within 24 hours, the General Command of the NPA announced that the NPA would take a defensive posture and abstain from launching offensives in the aforesaid areas, would participate in relief work and would not interfere with the relief work of others.

The GRP did not express willingness to dialogue with the NDF and did not reciprocate the unilateral ceasefire of the NDF until after some weeks, and only after the Philippine Senate, former President Macapagal, Justice Cecilia Muñoz-Palma, church leaders and several respected organizations urged Aquino to declare a ceasefire and engage the NDF and other political forces in a dialogue. In September, the NPA ended its ceasefire and held the GRP responsible for duplicity by pursuing offensive operations against the NPA and the people in guerrilla fronts in the quake-devastated areas.

Multisectoral Peace Advocates

From this meeting would emerge the Multisectoral Peace Advocates (MSPA). Although progressive elements like Senator Wigberto Tañada and Dr. Maria Serena Diokno are prominently here, there are representatives of conservative organizations with a pro-GRP orientation, like the Coalition for Peace, that have a strong presence here.

The MSPA has put forward a framework for a peace process and has been conversing with Cluster E of the Aquino Cabinet (the cluster in charge of national security matters) for the purpose of promoting the settlement of armed conflicts and bilateral peace talks between the GRP and NDF.

The NDF has welcomed the domestic third party initiative of MSPA and has expressed appreciation for its views (1) that the roots of the armed conflict must be addressed and (2) that the GRP-NDF bilateral peace talks may be held abroad, if necessary. At the same time, the NDF objects to certain points in the MSPA framework.

1. Conscious of its national revolutionary status, the NDF refuses to be regarded as being at par with RAM, SFP and YOU (mutinous forces within the AFP) or even with the MNLF (scope limited to Moro people and land). The NDF is a nationwide alliance of patriotic and progressive forces, carrying out a national democratic revolution, with organs of political power and a well-disciplined people's army and in control of considerable portions of the Philippine population and territory. It is engaged in a civil war with the GRP and not in a mere insurgency. It is a belligerent force and not a mere insurgent force.

2. True to its revolutionary principles, the NDF does not accept the GRP Constitution as the sole and onesided legal and political frame of negotiations and refuses to be drawn at the outset to the line of "restoring trust and confidence in GRP." Neither does the NDF demand that the GRP submit itself to the NDF Constitution and Program. Instead, the NDF proposes such mutually acceptable principles as national sovereignty, democracy, social justice and the like and the agreements still to be made as the legal and political frame of negotiations.

3. The NDF is opposed to the scheme of any particular organization or institution, posing as third force morally

superior to the contending parties in the civil war and claiming the people for itself, to focus on areas where the NDF and its member-organizations (especially the New People's Army) as well as people's organs of political power exist; seek to push out or paralyze these popular entities; picture the NPA as a force unwanted by the people as the AFP; but in fact to uphold the political authority of the GRP. Proposals for "localized peace dialogues," "localized ceasefires," "community-based peace" and "zones of peace, zones of life" are calculated to undermine and fragment the revolutionary movement and run counter to the proposal for GRP-NDF bilateral peace talks at the national level.

4. The NDF does not agree to the surrender of arms as the bias or predetermined objective of the peace process. The substantive issues, addressing the roots of the armed conflict, must first be tackled. In the meantime, with regard to the question of ending the armed conflict, it may simply be put in the agenda by referring to armed forces and redistribution thereof. To effect the end of hostilities, there are several possibilities, including a lasting truce.

5. With regard to the question of ceasefire, it cannot be taken up until after discussion and agreement on the substantive issues, unless such ceasefire be on a humanitarian ground for a limited period of time or in connection with the dismantling of the U.S. military bases. Ceasefire on humanitarian grounds is best clarified in a full agreement on human rights.

On its own ground and understanding of a just and lasting peace and upon the stimulus of a broad array of peace advocates in the Philippines and abroad, the CPP as the leading party in the revolutionary movement and the NDF as the united front organization have further developed their own framework for a peace process.

This framework has been developed in line with the national democratic program, taking into account new conditions and lessons learned from the 1986-87 pre-ceasefire talks and ceasefire period.

In response to an invitation from the NDF, a close associate of President Aquino met with NDF vice chairman for international affairs Luis Jalandoni in Singapore on September 23-24, 1990. There was no substantial result from this meeting, except a show of goodwill between the two sides.

First Meeting with Yap

The first serious emissary of the GRP to seek an audience with the NDF and show readiness to talk concretely about the peace process was Rep. Jose Yap, chairman of the national defense committee of the Philippine house of representatives and close political associate of President Aquino. He came to Amsterdam, Netherlands on September 26, 1990, consulted with this writer and sought his help as a consultant for the peace process. Subsequently, Yap met with Luis Jalandoni, NDF vice chairman for international affairs, and Byron Bocar, NDF international representative, from September 27 to 29.

Other members of the Yap mission were his advisors Horacio Morales, president of the Philippine Rural Reconstruction Movement, and Atty. Romeo Capulong, chairman of the Ecumenical Movement for Justice and Peace. This writer had the privilege of being consulted by both the Yap mission and the NDF officials.

Rep. Yap and the NDF representatives agreed to work for certain measures to improve the atmosphere for GRP-NDF bilateral negotiations. These measures included the review of cases of political prisoners and their release in accordance with respect for the right to bail and the eventual repeal of the Marcos PD 1866 which negates the right to bail in many cases.

Most important of all, the letter of Manuel Romero, NDF chairperson dated September 20, 1990, comprehensively unfolding the NDF's strategic view of the peace process, was given to Rep. Yap for delivery to President Aquino. In addition, upon the request of Yap, the NDF also sent to Aquino the aide memoire of NDF vice chairman Jalandoni on the lessons from the 1986-87 peace talks.

The NDF Peace Framework

The NDF framework for the peace process includes the following points:

1. A new round of peace talks can be started at anytime, without any substantive precondition that is unilaterally beneficial or costly to any side. The NDF is willing to form a negotiating panel simultaneously with the GRP at anytime.
2. Safety and immunity guarantees are agreed upon and co-signed by the two sides or are issued by one to the other side on a mutual and reciprocal basis to enable the free and unhampered movement of the members and related personnel of the negotiating panels.
3. To create a favorable atmosphere for negotiations, the NDF expects the GRP in accordance with its own Constitution and laws to do the following as a matter of course: respect the right to bail, repeal PD 1886, review cases of political detainees and release said detainees on the basis of their right to bail or by dropping charges. A number of the released detainees will participate in the negotiations, either as members or support personnel of the NDF negotiating panel and working groups.

Also to create a favorable atmosphere, NDF will declare a unilateral ceasefire if the GRP in accordance with its own Constitution and the principle of national sovereignty and

territorial integrity bans the U.S. military bases and troops on or before September 16, 1991.

4. The legal and political frame of the peace negotiations is constituted by the mutually acceptable principles of national sovereignty, democracy and social justice and by the agreements still to be made through the negotiations. Neither should the GRP insist on its Constitution as the sole and onesided legal and political frame nor the NDF on its own Constitution and Program.

5. The substantive agenda of comprehensive peace negotiations includes the following:

- a. A preliminary mutual understanding on the objectives of the negotiations and the basic problems of the people.
- b. Mutual respect for human rights and international humanitarian law.
- c. Social and economic reforms.
- d. Political, constitutional and electoral reforms.
- e. Armed forces and redispotion thereof.

6. Notwithstanding its willingness to forge agreements on a wide range of issues, the NDF seeks as immediate minimum goal an agreement with the GRP on human rights and international humanitarian law and on the mechanisms and processes to ensure respect for these.

Such an agreement should be able to stand whether the armed conflict continues or a peace settlement is ultimately made. This agreement is immediately demanded by the Filipino people and all domestic and international organizations concerned with human rights.

7. A quarter of a year can be devoted to each of the major items in the substantive agenda for negotiations and agreement, as enumerated under No. 5 above. The time frame can be

accelerated with the employment and assistance of working groups per item, which shall prepare in advance the working drafts of the negotiating panels.

8. The peace negotiations must be held at a mutually agreed place abroad in order to assure safety and convenience. In this connection, lessons must be learned from the pre-ceasefire talks and ceasefire period in 1986-87. The GRP has repeatedly held peace talks with the MNLF abroad. It is the common practice for parties in armed conflicts to hold peace talks abroad.

9. At best, a state or interstate entity or the UN Secretary General can provide the good offices or act as intermediary in the peace talks. Such a third party can assume the role of a witness, observer, good office or intermediary. At the least, for a start, any respectable international nongovernmental organization or appropriate UN agency may be a facilitator of the peace talks.

10. The broad array of peace advocates in the Philippines is recognized by the NDF as a moral force for a just and lasting peace, as a forum and medium of national consensus and as a resource base for assisting the peace process.

On October 3, 1990, Jalandoni, Yap and this writer as a consultant in the peace process issued parallel and similar press statements regarding their respective roles and what was accomplished in the Amsterdam talks. The three of them expressed optimism about the prospects of peace talks.

Peace Advocates: Right, Middle and Left

On October 5, 1990, the NDF National Council issued the "Message to the Advocates of a Just Peace," affirming the NDF position on the peace process and the need to address the roots of the armed conflict and criticizing those who seek the pacification of the revolutionary movement. In a letter to Senator Tañada and other members of the MSPA dated November 5, NDF

chairman Romero reiterated the position of the NDF and reaffirmed the valuable role of the peace advocates.

There is a broad array of peace advocates inside and outside of the MSPA in the legal arena. They are not a homogeneous lot. They include the Right, Middle and Left. The Right concurs with the basic premises of the GRP rather than with those of the NDF. The Left concurs with those of the NDF rather than with those of the GRP. At the same time, there is the Middle trying to be the honest broker, operating according to principles and general terms which do not offend any of the basic negotiating parties, the GRP and NDF.

So far, the Right wing "peace" advocates have been the most articulate and active in putting forward a comprehensive framework for the pacification of the revolutionary forces calling on them to submit to the GRP Constitution, to restore trust and confidence in GRP, to beg for accommodation and paltry concessions, abandon the people in one locality after another under the slogan of zones of peace/life and to surrender arms.

So far, the legal progressive forces (Left and Middle) have concentrated on the general call for addressing the roots of the armed conflict and have not yet put forward a comprehensive framework for a peace process, comparable to that of the Right. Thus, the Right has gained some initiative in swaying some elements of the Middle and even the Left.

In the Philippines, the united front for addressing the roots of the armed conflict and for a just and lasting peace was broadened through a meeting of advocates for a just peace on October 6 and a multisectoral conference called the People's Caucus on October 13-14. This issued the declaration, "Assert the People's Sovereign Will: Ensure and Work for the Supremacy of Genuine Democratic Coalition Rule." This carried the signatures of GRP legislators, religious, academicians and concerned individuals and church groups,

coalitions and alliances, people's organizations and other political and social groups and institutions.

On October 19-21, the National Peace Conference was convened, with 200 participants from 17 sectoral groups headed by former President Diosdado Macapagal. Because of the strong presence of the Catholic Bishops Conference of the Philippines, businessmen and executive officials of the GRP, this formation of "peace advocates" has a far more conservative complexion than the People's Caucus headed by Senator Wigberto Tañada.

The NDF has rejected the importunings of the Right "peace" advocates for the pacification of the revolutionary forces and has been waiting for the legal progressive forces (Left and Middle) to unite, take initiative and put forward their own peace proposals towards a just and lasting peace. The broad array of genuine peace advocates can serve as a strong moral force to compel the GRP to negotiate, as a forum and medium of national consensus and as a resource base for assisting the peace process.

The Substantive Agenda

In further support and elaboration of NDF chairman Romero's letter to Aquino dated September 20, 1990, Jalandoni, the NDF vice chairman for international affairs, delivered the speech, "Sovereignty and Peace: Options and Alternatives for the Philippine Revolutionary Movement" on November 17, 1990, on the occasion of the tenth anniversary of the trial of the Marcos regime by the Permanent People's Tribunal. He went into detail about the substantive agenda proposed by the NDF.

Hereunder is the outline of the substantive agenda of the NDF.

1. Agreement on Human Rights and Humanitarian Law

- a. Respect for and compliance with Protocol II of the Geneva Conventions and other international humanitarian laws.
- b. End of the government's total war policy, investigation and prosecution of human rights violations, and indemnification of the victims, including return of internal refugees to their domicile.
- c. Repeal of all repressive laws and reversal of the Supreme Court ruling on warrantless arrest.
- d. Safe conduct for the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) and all other medical personnel across battle lines and contested areas.
- e. Respect for personnel and facilities of schools, medical profession, religious institutions and places of worship, voluntary evacuation centers and development projects of genuine NGOs.
- f. Exchange of prisoners, preferably thru a UN agency or the ICRC.
- g. Occasional local ceasefires of definite brief duration on humanitarian grounds (natural disasters and medical reasons) approved by national authorities of both the NDF and GRP (not by local authorities);
- h. A mechanism and process to ensure compliance with the agreement, the exchange of complaints and monitoring.

2. Agreement on Socio-Economic Reforms

- a. Guidance by the International Covenant on Economic and Social Rights.
- b. A genuine and thoroughgoing agrarian reform.
- c. A policy of national industrialization, with strong incentives to local entrepreneurs and restrictions on foreign multinational firms.
- d. Freedom from foreign debt through cancellation of fraudulent debts, moratorium on payments, debt cap, rescheduling and other measures.

e. Rechanneling of funds from debt service payments and military spending to social services and genuine development programs.

f. Urban reform plan, which stops rendering people homeless and which provides low-cost housing for the poor and assistance for means of livelihood.

g. Strict measures to stop the degradation of the environment and to protect and promote a healthy environment.

3. Agreement on Political, Constitutional and Electoral Reforms

a. Guidance by the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the UN Covenant on Political and Civil Rights.

b. Guarantees to basic human and democratic rights of the people, especially the workers and peasants, in accordance with mutually acceptable principles and provisions of the Constitution and other laws of the GRP and those of the NDF.

c. Abrogation of unequal agreements and treaties, especially the Military Bases Agreement, Military Assistance Agreement and the Mutual Defense Pact with the U.S.

d. Immediate removal of U.S. bases and a program of baselands conversion.

e. Respect for the right to self-determination of the Bangsa Moro, Cordillera and other indigenous peoples.

f. Electoral reforms to take away undue advantages of political parties of the comprador and landlord classes and provide for genuine democratic pluralism, allowing a fair chance for political parties representing the workers, peasants and the middle class.

g. A mechanism like a Council of National Unity to ensure the implementation of political, constitutional and electoral reforms and the holding of free and fair elections as well as the economic and social reforms agreed upon.

4. Agreement on the Armed Forces and the Redisposition thereof

- a. Removal of U.S. control over the Armed Forces of the Philippines (AFP).
- b. Reorientation, reorganization, and reduction of the AFP.
- c. Demobilization of AFP units and disbanding of paramilitary forces and private armies.
- d. Mutual general amnesty.
- e. Status of the New People's Army.
- f. Lasting truce.

Second Meeting with Yap

In late November 1990, the Yap mission came for the second time to Amsterdam, Netherlands. Yap reported on actions undertaken by President Aquino and consultations with defense secretary Ramos and AFP chief of staff de Villa but did not carry with him any formal written reply from President Aquino to the letter of NDF chairman Romero.

Instead, he brought with him the framework for peace drafted by the Department of National Defense and Armed Forces of the Philippines for the Government of the Republic of the Philippines. This is not a framework for peace negotiations but for killing the peace process by demanding at the very outset the surrender of the NDF to the Constitution of the GRP and ultimately the liquidation of the NPA and surrender of NPA arms.

The NDF did not take offense at the lack of a formal written response from Aquino but noted in strong terms that the DND/AFP cannot deal directly with the NDF and bypass the political authority of the GRP. According to a later report from MSPA, Cluster E of the Aquino Cabinet confirmed the framework of the DND/AFP as that of the GRP.

Hereunder are verbatim extracts from the GRP framework:

Statement of General Principles:

1.1 The supremacy of the GRP Constitution as the fundamental law of the land and the basis for national peace and progress must be accepted by all. No one may be allowed to violate the fundamental law of the land. The Supreme Court is the sole and final arbiter on questions of constitutionality. The Constitution recognizes the right of political forces to lawfully compete for the political leadership of the country. The use of force and violence to achieve political ends must be renounced.

1.2 Peace is of paramount importance to the well being of the people and the country's political, economic and social development. The current internal conflict can be resolved through a peace process. All paths towards peace must be explored. Peace must be given a chance.

1.3 There must only be one authorized and recognized armed forces of the country. All other organized armed groups must be deemed illegal and are to be disbanded.

Agenda for the Peace Process:

The agenda for the peace process shall be limited to relevant issues that can be resolved within the mandate of the parties concerned. Principal agenda items shall be composed of the following:

1. Suspension of hostilities in mutually agreed upon specified prioritized areas.
2. Amnesty for insurgents.
3. Laying down of arms.
4. Disbanding of the NPA.
5. Safe return of insurgents to a peaceful and productive life.
6. Government assistance to and protection of insurgent returnees.
7. Legalization of the CPP.
8. Treatment of NPA "hold outs."

Phases of the Peace Process:

The phasing of the peace process is a vital dimension of the framework. The peace process shall proceed along the following:

1. Initiation of peace process through exploratory talks between the government and peace advocates (MSPA).
2. Establishment of formal mechanism for the peace process.
3. Formalization of Agreements.
4. Implementation of Agreements.
5. Monitoring and evaluation of substantive compliance.
6. Treatment of violations and sanctions against violators.

Obstruction by General Ramos

At any rate, certain tentative agreements were still made by the NDF representatives with Rep. Yap regarding the possible release of political prisoners and mutual ceasefire in the humanitarian spirit of Christmas and New Year; and the formation of the human rights working groups of the GRP and NDF which were to lay the groundwork for negotiations and agreement on human rights and international humanitarian law.

The tentative agreement on mutual ceasefire in the humanitarian spirit of Christmas and New Year would be carried out, with changes towards a shorter duration of three days per occasion. But the release of political prisoners and the formation of negotiating panels and working groups on human rights were not fulfilled according to the agreed time frame.

In the name of DND and AFP, General Ramos has been obstructing the peace process. President Aquino and Cluster E on national security of the Aquino cabinet have gone along with General Ramos whenever he takes an adverse initiative to

sabotage the peace process. He is reported to be consulting with U.S. authorities and following their orders.

Subsequent to the last Yap mission to Amsterdam, the GRP has limited itself to dealing with the MSPA in accordance with the DND-AFP line that the GRP must first talk with the MSPA and only after agreements have been made between the two can the NDF deal with the prior agreements made between the GRP and MSPA. In other words, a device is being used in which the bilateral peace talks between the GRP and NDF are being blocked.

Taking advantage of the nonviolence pact among the reactionary parties and the growing fever over the 1992 elections, the GRP has cut down talks even with the MSPA.

It is clear once again that the GRP uses the show of willingness to talk with the NDF only as a tactical ploy for trying to cope with the worsening crisis, to douse social unrest and to blunt the offensives of the revolutionary movement.

Nevertheless, the NDF has remained firm on its comprehensive framework, which adheres to revolutionary principles and has the flexibility of adjusting policy to allow negotiations and agreements with the GRP, for the benefit of the people along the national and democratic line.

The National Democratic Line

Like any strategic line, the national democratic line in the entire peace process and in any concrete peace negotiations contains and permits certain tactical lines which serve the strategic line. It is always possible to work out a truce agreement or even an agreement of alliance between two adversaries in order to confront a bigger adversary of the nation like U.S. imperialism or solve certain crucial problems.

As a revolutionary force, the NDF can be expected to reject any proposal for surrender but can always be expected to consider any proposal for truce and alliance if predicated on the national and democratic rights and interests of the people and on a popular struggle against common adversaries and common problems.

It is noteworthy that Senator Juan Ponce Enrile (defense minister/secretary under Marcos and Aquino) seems to have a better and more positive understanding of the NDF's strategic line than President Aquino or General Ramos. Enrile was quoted by the press as saying that if he would be president of the GRP he would engage the NDF in a truce and coalition government for three years and would not require the NPA to surrender arms. Of course, especially because of his background, it remains to be seen whether he means what he says.

At whatever rate the GRP shows interest or loss of it in the peace process at any point, the NDF can persevere in taking a just and reasonable stand on behalf of the people in seeking to inspire a broad united front for national liberation and democracy and in working in the international arena for recognition of the NDF as the legitimate representative of the revolutionary forces and people.

Confidence of the NDF

Whichever conservative party or clique of reactionaries is in power in Manila, the NDF can be expected to be ready to negotiate a just and lasting peace in accordance with the national democratic line. A common resolve to address the roots of the armed conflict and face a common foe or confront certain problems; and a truce and realignment of forces along the national democratic line can be the initial stage in the process of attaining a just and lasting peace.

Abroad, through the efforts of the National Democratic Front, the European Parliament approved on December 13, 1990 a resolution endorsing the bilateral peace talks of the GRP and NDF. For the first time, no less than an interstate entity, the parliament of the European Community, recognized the NDF and put it on an equal footing with the GRP. There are also specific states which have been approached by the NDF and have agreed to offer their good offices to both the GRP and the NDF.

At the same time, respected international organizations and institutions are expressing support for the just and reasonable peace framework of the NDF and are extending moral and material support for its realization and for the NDF as a legitimate political force, representative of the ever growing number of people militantly engaged in carrying out a national democratic revolution and building a new kind of government.

The NDF is confident that in due time the growing strength of the revolutionary forces and people, the worsening crisis of the Philippine ruling system and the moral forces of domestic and world public opinion would compel the GRP to engage the NDF in peace negotiations.#

The NDF Framework in Contrast with the GRP Framework May 15, 1991

Upholding its revolutionary principles and recognizing its own strength and the ever worsening crisis of the ruling system, the Philippine revolutionary movement through the National Democratic Front (NDF) has amply demonstrated its willingness and readiness to engage in bilateral peace negotiations with the GRP.

NDF Chairman Manuel Romero sent to the GRP President Aquino the letter dated 20 September 1990, defining the NDF framework for peace negotiations. To this day, she has failed to make a formal written reply. Intransigently, the GRP insists that the NDF must submit to the GRP Constitution and surrender the arms of the armed revolutionary movement.

It is completely the responsibility of the GRP that the peace process desired by the Filipino people and the organized revolutionary forces has been obstructed and prevented from progressing. While the NDF desires a just and lasting peace on the basis of satisfying the national and democratic demands of the people, the GRP simply wants the pacification of the revolutionary forces and the people to win by peace rhetoric what it cannot win by force of arms and thus preserve the ever violent system of oppression and exploitation.

Contrary to the claim of certain quarters, the NDF and the revolutionary forces through their documents and their practice have made clear that they have a consistent strategy for the peace process and that they do not view the process as a mere tactical ploy. It is the intention of this article to demonstrate the sincerity and seriousness of the revolutionary movement in pursuing the peace process.

1. The Struggle for a Just and Lasting Peace

Since its very beginning and long before the GRP paid any lip service to the need for a peace process, the Philippine revolutionary movement has always been committed to the struggle for a just and lasting peace in the most comprehensive and strategic way.

The struggle for national liberation and democracy against U.S. imperialism and local reactionary classes is a struggle for a just and lasting peace because it strives to solve the fundamental problems of the nation and people, fight and defeat the violence of oppression and exploitation and bring about the basis for a just and lasting peace.

The strategic line of national democratic revolution is the NDF's strategic line for a just and lasting peace. There is no other strategic line. To claim the absence of it or to replace it is to confuse the people and the revolutionary forces.

The struggle for a just peace entails as many specific forms of struggle as does the national democratic revolution. These include all legal and illegal forms of struggle. Among these forms of struggle is armed struggle, the principal form of struggle because it settles the question of power which is the principal question in any revolution. No social revolution is possible without the prior change of political power.

There can be no peace negotiations between the GRP and NDF if in the first place there is no armed conflict between them. It is only when there is an armed resistance of a certain level of strength that the incumbent reactionary state starts to consider whether it should seek peace negotiations or not.

The struggle for a just peace cannot be narrowed down to peace negotiations between the GRP and NDF. Peace negotiations are only one of the specific forms of the struggle in the

constant and comprehensive struggle for national liberation and democracy and, therefore, for a just and lasting peace.

Even as the NDF is willing to negotiate, there can be no guarantee at anytime that peace negotiations with the GRP would occur. In history, oppressive regimes either negotiate at some point or refuse to do so to the very end.

Since the very beginning, the revolutionary movement led by the Party has created the conditions for a just peace in the areas where organs of people's democratic power are established. The people undertake campaigns to benefit themselves within the context of the national democratic revolution.

In contrast with the strategic view of the NDF that the national democratic revolution is the way to a just and lasting peace, the GRP has for its strategic view the preservation of the oppressive and exploitative system and the defeat and pacification of the revolutionary forces.

Thus, the GRP demands first of all the submission of the NDF to the GRP Constitution and as soon as possible the liquidation of the New People's Army and the surrender of its arms.

What the GRP has been demanding or angling for is not a peace process but a process of surrender. If the NDF were to accept the terms of such a process of surrender, then the GRP would engage in talks with the NDF without delay or hesitation.

In sharp contrast, the NDF has manifested its just and reasonable position by declaring that although the optimum condition for a just and lasting peace is the total victory of the people in their national democratic revolution the NDF is willing to engage in peace talks for several important reasons, including the promotion of national independence and democracy and a number of basic reforms, immediately beneficial to the people.

It is possible to engage in peace talks and probably work out a truce in the end in order to face common problems and carry out basic social reforms; or to fight a common foe and fulfill the people's aspirations for complete national independence.

The revolutionary movement keeps to its fundamental principles and its strategic national democratic line. But in the sphere of policy, it can make readjustments and expects the other side to do likewise. There has to be a mutual adjustment of policy regarding the armed conflict and related issues.

It takes the two basic parties in the armed conflict to agree on a truce and what national social purpose is to be served. Even if the peace talks were to fail, then the people can see who has the just and reasonable position.

One may call as merely tactical any one reason or any series of reasons provided for peace talks that falls short of the strategic goal. But the strategy and tactics of the revolutionary movement or any other force are inseparable from each other. The strategy consists of tactics; and the tactics constitute and serve the strategy. It is wrong to say that the revolutionary movement has only a tactical view of peace negotiations.

Peace negotiations are an important form of struggle in the constant and comprehensive strategic struggle for a just and lasting peace. These are also the form of struggle which refers most directly to a peace agreement, if the other side is willing to engage in peace negotiations. The significance of peace negotiations can change from one period to another.

Revolutionaries determined to carry out the objectives of the national democratic revolution can logically and legitimately consider peace negotiations as a way of pushing forward the aforesaid objectives, in the same way that the other side considers the same peace negotiations as a way of pushing

forward its own objectives. Inevitably, the struggle across the table reflects first of all the struggle in the battlefield and then influence further developments in the battlefield.

But revolutionaries can also see that short of winning total victory in the revolution it is possible to engage in peace talks towards a truce in order to undertake a common struggle against a common national foe or to try to solve in common the fundamental national and social problems. At one time, the GRP may be interested in talks. At another time, it may not be.

With or without peace negotiations, the revolutionary forces and the people firmly fight for a just and lasting peace through the stages and phases of the national democratic revolution.

2. Character of the Armed Conflict and the Basic Conflicting Parties

The armed conflict between the GRP and NDF is a civil war. It is an armed conflict between two belligerent forces. One is the incumbent government centrally seated in Manila; and the other is a revolutionary movement, with absolutely clear features that qualify it as a belligerent force under the laws of war.

As a belligerent force, the NDF has a demonstrated national political leadership over a considerable part of the population and territory of the Philippines; has effective command over a sizeable people's army; and comprehensively performs functions of government through local organs of political power which may be summarily called the people's revolutionary government.

The NDF has the capability to exercise the rights and obligations of a belligerent force under the laws of war within its ample jurisdiction. The two-month ceasefire in 1986-87 proved beyond doubt that the NDF has effective political leadership and command over revolutionary forces nationwide.

The NDF is a belligerent force in a civil war and not a mere insurgent force engaged in unlawful armed actions against a lawful and duly-constituted authority. In fact, the GRP has already recognized the NDF's status of belligerency by engaging the NDF in pre-ceasefire negotiations, co-signing the memoranda of agreement and the 60-day ceasefire in 1986 and 1987.

The GRP and the bourgeois mass media keep on calling the NDF an insurgent force in order to propagate the lie that it has no belligerency status. To be an insurgent is to be criminally liable for rebellion under the Philippine penal system. It is a slightly better status than banditry or ordinary criminality but short of belligerency status under the laws of war.

The NDF or the armed revolutionary movement is not a mere police problem, which insurgency is. The fact is that all the regular services of the Armed Forces of the Philippines have been engaged in a strategic offensive against the NDF and NPA for a long time (for more than 22 years) and to no avail. Instead, the revolutionary forces keep on growing.

In July 1986, the revolutionary forces had the choice of allowing the Communist Party of the Philippines as the leading party or the NDF as the united front organization to represent them in negotiations. They chose the NDF.

It is perfectly a legitimate objective for the NDF to seek recognition of its status of belligerency. This proceeds from the fact that it has the status of belligerency. It wants the GRP and AFP to conform to and be accountable under the laws of war. The recognition of the NDF's status of belligerency may arise from GRP-NDF bilateral negotiations and from the involvement of a state or interstate entity as third party in the negotiations.

The European Parliament resolution, dated December 13, 1990, endorses the Philippine peace process, mentions in the same

breath the GRP and NDF as parties to the armed conflict and in effect puts the NDF on an equal footing with the GRP. This is a step forward in the international recognition of the NDF's status of belligerency.

In the Memorandum of Agreement for a Preliminary Ceasefire co-signed by the GRP and NDF representatives on November 27, 1986, there is an attempt by GRP to preempt the recognition of the NDF's status of belligerency with the provision which runs as follows: "This agreement, the preliminary ceasefire agreement, and any other subsequent agreement, or any provision or provisions thereof shall not invest the NDF with the status of belligerency under the laws of war."

But the status of belligerency cannot be vested or preempted by the document. It is something acquired through the people's revolutionary struggle and the building of their democratic political power.

When it comes to the NDF, the GRP is extremely cautious about any action or statement that could explicitly mean a recognition of the NDF status of belligerency. But in the Tripoli Agreement in 1976, the MNLF clearly gained the recognition of its status of belligerency by virtue of the mediation of Libya. At the same time, MNLF submitted to the first provision of the agreement which declared that the settlement of the Moro question was within the framework of Philippine national sovereignty and territorial integrity.

The MNLF retreated from its previous assertion of Moro national independence but gained the recognition for its status of belligerency through the mediation of Libya in the Tripoli Agreement and the continuing mediation of the Organization of Islamic Conference.

The GRP is afraid of the recognition of the NDF's status of belligerency because it does not want the NDF to hold it

responsible under the laws of war and does not want the NDF to relate to and transact business with other states, without the GRP being able to charge such states for interference in Philippine affairs. The MNLF has enjoyed relations with Islamic states, without the GRP being able to accuse these of interference.

The character of the armed conflict between the GRP and NDF as a civil war can be further clarified by reference to the fact that it is an armed conflict between political forces domestic to the Philippines and that it is not yet a national war against foreign aggression, although U.S. intervention in favor of the GRP is escalating on the side of the GRP and has the potential of escalating further to the level of aggression.

At the moment in the Philippines, the two basic forces in the nationwide civil war are the GRP and NDF and should therefore be the two basic parties in peace negotiations. They can have equal footing as belligerent forces.

Recently, a notion was propagated that there could be multilateral peace talks among the GRP, NDF, MNLF, RAM, SFP and YOU in order to settle the armed conflicts in the Philippines.

There are points of principle that make multilateral peace talks impossible, whether these be formal talks seeking binding agreements or these be a mere forum for ventilation of views without seeking any binding agreement.

The only nationwide civil war going on in the Philippines now is between the GRP and NDF. Definitely, RAM, SFP and YOU cannot be put on an equal footing with the NDF. They are mutinous forces of the GRP, specifically AFP. They are the internal problems of the GRP.

The MNLF is of a higher political category than these mutinous forces of the GRP. They enjoy recognition of the status of

belligerency accorded by the GRP and by a number of Islamic states. But the population and territory claimed by the MNLF is limited to the Moro population and Moro land. So, there lies the big difference between the NDF and MNLF.

In fact, the GRP has repeatedly admitted that on a national scale and in terms of revolutionary challenge, the NDF is the most "serious threat" to the GRP. The NDF is therefore the force that GRP must talk to in any serious bilateral negotiations about peace in the Philippines.

3. Talks About Peace Talks

To begin with, the GRP and NDF positions are diametrically opposed to each other comprehensively, strategically and on many crucial issues. That is why there is an armed conflict between them. There is a bitter struggle between revolution and counterrevolution because of fundamental national and social issues.

Preliminary talks about bilateral peace talks between the GRP and NDF are therefore important. These can try to thresh out a framework of peace negotiations which can be accepted by the two warring sides. It is more fruitful to engage in formal bilateral talks if there is a prior agreement on the objectives, the legal and political frame, agenda, timetable, venue, procedures and other matters. However, the NDF has expressed willingness to form a negotiating panel simultaneously with the GRP and let these two panels complete and firm up what may otherwise be threshed out in preliminary talks.

Before any formal meetings of the two panels, there must be written agreement, reached in preliminary talks, on the safety and immunity guarantees for the members and related personnel of the negotiating panels of the GRP and NDF. These guarantees are agreed upon on a mutual and reciprocal basis and are

strengthened by the good offices of a foreign state or interstate agency.

So far, there has yet been no serious peace talks, with a substantive agenda, between the GRP and NDF. Setting the agenda involves a struggle. The agenda desired by each side in negotiations carries its strategic and tactical objectives.

The two-month ceasefire of 1986-87 was supposed to have been undertaken in order to create a favorable atmosphere for peace talks and to provide the conditions for an agreement on a substantive agenda.

Before the ceasefire, the GRP panel had refused to agree with the NDF panel on a substantive agenda. The former simply wanted a ceasefire and wished to accomplish certain one-sided objectives through such a ceasefire. And during the ceasefire, it parried and refused any legal and political frame and any agenda other than its own.

The GRP was responsible for the failure to set a substantive agenda. It insisted that the NDF should first of all submit itself to the GRP Constitution. Had the NDF done so, then the very idea of peace negotiations would have been killed instantly. Because a submission to the GRP Constitution would mean NDF surrender to the principle that the so-called duly-constituted authorities of the GRP had the superior authority and jurisdiction over any agenda.

The GRP declared that it was willing to discuss with the NDF only such matters as modes of surrender of firearms, general amnesty, rehabilitation and legalization of underground forces after submission to the GRP Constitution.

On its part, the NDF stood firmly for a substantive agenda, encompassing items most demanded by the people, under the

headings of human rights, democratization and national independence.

Aside from trying to effect the capitulation of the NDF in principle and in fact, the GRP tried to use the ceasefire in 1986-87 to break the momentum of the armed revolutionary movement, cause the revolutionaries to split and induce them to go out into the open for surveillance and eventual punitive action.

In the preliminary talks about peace talks between the Yap mission of the GRP and the representatives of the NDF in September 1990, the NDF made concrete proposals for creating a favorable atmosphere for peace negotiations and for a comprehensive substantive agenda. These are contained in the 20 September 1990 letter of NDF Chairman Manuel Romero to the GRP President Aquino.

GRP President Aquino has not formally replied in writing to this letter and has not taken any step to get the GRP-NDF bilateral peace talks started, notwithstanding the second meeting of the Yap mission and the NDF in November 1990. Instead, the DND-AFP has taken all the initiative to determine the GRP position and to offer nothing but a framework of arrogant unilateral assertions and wishful thinking for the process of NDF surrender.

The NDF has made clear that it is ready to form a negotiating panel anytime and as soon as the GRP forms its own. Without any substantive precondition beneficial or costly to any side, the two negotiating panels can meet in order to discuss and agree on their substantive agenda and all procedural matters.

In so many ways, the GRP has made it appear to the NDF that Cluster E of the Aquino Cabinet, the Department of National Defense and the Armed Forces of the Philippines are opposed to any peace negotiations outside of the framework unilaterally decided by the GRP.

The GRP has refused the NDF proposal for the GRP to act according to its own avowed commitment to Philippine national sovereignty and democracy and to create a favorable atmosphere for peace negotiations by dismantling the U.S. military bases and respecting the right of political detainees to bail and dropping charges which run counter to this right.

The GRP has also refused the NDF proposal that separately and simultaneously they announce the formation of the negotiating panels and the working groups on human rights, irrespective of whatever rate the GRP can act on the proposal to improve the atmosphere for peace negotiations.

The Yap mission to the NDF has been relatively the most serious and the most willing to go into concrete discussions and tentative agreements. But there are rabidly reactionary elements in the Aquino regime, especially among the military who are opposed to serious GRP-NDF peace negotiations. Thus, the preliminary talks about peace talks have not yet resulted in formal peace negotiations.

It is becoming obvious that the Aquino regime engaged in peace rhetoric for a certain period in the latter half of 1990 in a vain attempt to prevent the broad range of opposition forces from uniting, preempt the revolutionary mass movement and break out from the isolation caused by the virulently worsening crisis of the ruling system.

Even the Multisectoral Peace Advocates (MSPA), which tries to be a domestic third party between GRP and NDF and whose framework concurs on several points with that of the GRP, has observed a reduced interest on the part of Cluster E (part of the Aquino cabinet in charge of national security) in discussing the peace process.

On April 5, 1990 the NDF met with MSPA representatives Senator Wigberto Tañada and Dr. Maria Serena Diokno and discussed with them fully and extensively the NDF framework for peace negotiations. The NDF also expressed its view on the role of the domestic third party and expressed appreciation as well as criticism of various points in the MSPA framework.

4. On the Question of Violence and Ceasefire

Whether or not there is armed resistance by the people and the revolutionary forces, the violence of oppression and exploitation is the full responsibility of the oppressors and exploiters ruling the people and the country.

The response of the people to the violence of the ruling system is armed revolution. Not satisfied with the violence inherent in their system, the oppressors and exploiters have escalated their violence in the vain hope of suppressing the armed revolution.

The NDF condemns the violent ruling system and the ongoing "total war" policy of the U.S.-supported Aquino regime. The NDF cannot allow itself to be maneuvered into a position of being pictured as equally violent and equally responsible as the GRP for the armed conflict or even worse as an insurgent or bandit force without popular support and without a just and reasonable cause for armed resistance.

It is unreasonable for anyone to demand in the name of peace that the NDF show its "sincerity" in wishing peace negotiations by unilaterally ending the armed resistance of the revolutionary forces and the people or by agreeing to any ceasefire outside of humanitarian considerations for limited periods of time and outside the commitment to declare a ceasefire in connection with the dismantling of the U.S. military bases.

The sincerity of the NDF in this regard is to be measured by its steadfastness in defending and upholding the people's interests, its firmness of principles even while making policy adjustments to achieve certain specific anti-imperialist (e.g., the immediate removal of U.S. military bases) and democratic (e.g., genuine and thoroughgoing land reform) demands, and its vigilance in frustrating every scheme to undermine the gains and achievements of the revolutionary movement and the people.

In a speech in Singapore in June 1986 and in further statements, this writer observed that the New People's Army was still in the stage of strategic defensive and the Armed Forces of the Philippines was in the stage of strategic offensive; and that if the GRP had been truly interested in the drastic reduction of the armed conflict it could order the AFP troops to desist from launching offensive operations and to go back to their barracks and could also disarm and disband the paramilitary and warlord gangs.

This writer thinks that his views in 1986 are still valid today. The burden of responsibility for reducing the armed conflict lies on the part of the GRP and its military instrument, the AFP. As soon as they desist from carrying out onslaughts against the people and the guerrilla fronts, there would be a dramatic reduction of the armed conflict. Consequently, the GRP would even be able to save on military expenditures and reallocate its resources towards nonmilitary activities.

The NDF has made known to the public that it is willing to agree with the GRP on the mechanisms and processes of undertaking ceasefires on the basis of humanitarian considerations, for limited periods of time, that are defined in a formal agreement on human rights and international humanitarian law.

But the NDF has also made known that it will not repeat the error of going into any protracted ceasefire (two months subject to extension or renewal as in the 1986-87 period) before a

substantive agenda is agreed upon. Neither can the NDF be expected to go into such protracted ceasefire upon an agreement merely on the substantive agenda still to be taken up item by item in negotiations.

The only exception made by the NDF is its commitment to declare a unilateral ceasefire upon the dismantling of the U.S. military bases. The political ground is patriotism and the promotion of national independence.

In case the U.S. military bases are dismantled, the NDF can be expected to declare a unilateral ceasefire and at the same time demand that the GRP reciprocate its patriotic goodwill. It is logical that the NDF will not allow itself to be destroyed by its own unilateral ceasefire but will expect the GRP to hold back its own armed forces and move towards peace negotiations.

Aside from temporary ceasefires for reasons already explained, the NDF is interested in a lasting truce that is the result of mutually satisfactory agreements which substantially benefit the people in accordance with the national democratic line. The NDF is vigilantly against proposals for ceasefires, local or nationwide, which are outside of those reasons already clarified.

The NDF is also opposed to the proposal and propaganda that so-called community-based peace (like "zones of peace, zones of life") should be undertaken by GRP and pro-GRP entities posing as third party. The NDF regards this as calculated to preempt and undercut bilateral GRP-NDF peace talks at the national level and to take away people and areas from the revolutionary movement under the pretense of excluding both the AFP and NPA but in fact retaining GRP authority and supporting the AFP in such areas.

Even if mutually agreed upon for a good reason, any protracted ceasefire is more advantageous to the GRP and AFP and potentially more damaging to the revolutionary movement.

During ceasefires, there will inevitably be accusations and counteraccusations of ceasefire violations. The NDF and NPA can suffer not only from the propaganda assaults but also from straining to verify the truth or falsity of the enemy claims. At the same time, the NDF will be exerting strenuous efforts to counteract the ceasefire violations of the enemy and collect the information regarding these.

The ceasefire can also be GRP's way of inducing revolutionary personnel to relax and expose themselves to surveillance for punitive operations; of weakening the revolutionary will; and of introducing dissensions within revolutionary ranks.

The NDF has to take seriously the lessons from the pre-ceasefire talks and ceasefire in 1986-87. AFP intelligence raised its surveillance stocks by twenty five percent, according to Generals Iletto and Ramos. The line of showing the "human face" of the NDF not only to the bourgeois mass media and the general public beyond the revolutionary mass base but also to covert operatives of the enemy could produce bitter consequences.

The NDF has also to consider seriously how the MNLF has split several times, weakened and lost personnel politically and militarily as a result of the Tripoli Agreement and the ceasefires that transpired under the Marcos and the Aquino regimes.

The GRP, especially AFP, is always obsessed with ceasefires, without satisfying the requirements for a just and lasting peace, because it expects to thereby damage the NDF and benefit from them more than the NDF can. The GRP and AFP officials are feigning whenever they say that the NDF gains more from ceasefires than the GRP does.

5. The Legal and Political Frame of Negotiations

In demanding that the NDF submit itself to the GRP Constitution as the legal and political frame of negotiations, the GRP

instantly kills the very idea of bilateral peace negotiations with the NDF and prevents them from starting. The demand has been made by the GRP in preliminary talks about peace talks between GRP and NDF representatives.

The NDF has objected to the unreasonable character of the demand but has not retaliated by demanding that the GRP submit itself to the Constitution and Program of the NDF.

Instead, with utmost reasonableness, the NDF has proposed that the legal and political frame be one of adherence to mutually acceptable principles such as Philippine national sovereignty, democratization, respect for human right, social justice and the like; and an open-mindedness towards the agreements that are still to be made in the peace process.

If the GRP is insistent on a reference to the GRP Constitution, then an equal reference must also be made to the NDF Constitution and Program in the preamble of any agreement to be made. The key point is to refer to the mutually acceptable principles and provisions in the basic documents of the GRP and NDF.

Per item in the substantive agenda, there may be pertinent treaties, covenants, protocols and other international legal instruments which have been signed by the GRP. These can provide valuable guidance in the negotiations.

The preliminary talks about peace talks can do a lot to clear the way for the formal bilateral talks. But in its sincere desire to start the formal talks, the NDF has repeatedly declared that it is willing to form its negotiating panel as soon as the GRP is willing to do the same. The GRP and NDF negotiating panels can meet as soon as possible and start the negotiations even prior to a mutually agreed legal and political frame of peace negotiations.

The two negotiating panels can discuss and work out what would be the mutually satisfactory legal and political frame. The formation of the negotiating panels and the opening of formal negotiations should not be prevented by the intransigent demand of the GRP that the NDF must first submit itself to the GRP Constitution.

Before the two panels tackle the substantive agenda, they can agree not only on the mutually acceptable guiding principles and objectives but also on the historical facts and current circumstances which make the peace negotiations necessary and desirable.

6. The Substantive Agenda

The NDF has proposed four major items in the substantive agenda of peace negotiations. These are: (a) respect for human rights and international humanitarian law; (b) social and economic reforms; (c) constitutional, political and electoral reforms; and (d) the end of hostilities and redistribution of armed forces.

Regarding respect for human rights and international humanitarian law, there can be an agreement that binds both the GRP and NDF and their respective armed forces, whether the armed conflict continues or whether there will ultimately be a comprehensive peace settlement. This agreement should be the minimum goal to be achieved immediately even as peace negotiations are aimed at the maximum goal of comprehensive peace settlement.

More important than any abstract reaffirmation of the principles and provisions of domestic and international laws, the agreement to be made by the GRP and NDF should create the mechanisms and processes for promoting and protecting human rights; investigating, trying and punishing human rights

violations on both sides; and indemnifying the victims and their survivors.

The two sides should be able to verify compliance with the laws on human rights; exchange complaints on human rights violations; define certain categories of persons, facilities and sites which should not be targeted by any military operations; declare ceasefire of limited duration on humanitarian grounds; effect the exchange of prisoners of war; and so on.

The agreement on human rights and international humanitarian law should be so framed and worded that it can either be the preparation for the lasting truce or the way to promote respect for human rights even if the civil war cannot as yet be ended.

Regarding social and economic reforms, the GRP and NDF should make an agreement which can effect economic emancipation, national industrialization, genuine and thoroughgoing land reform, the improvement of the people's livelihood, freedom from the crushing debt burden, the expansion and improvement of the educational system and the protection and healthy utilization of natural resources.

There can be some crucial provisions in the agreement which are effective in solving the social and economic malaise. There may at the same time be other problems which can be dealt with in general terms in the agreement but which will have to be dealt with in detail consequent to the realization of constitutional, political and electoral reforms.

Regarding constitutional, political and electoral reforms, the GRP and NDF should make an agreement which can end foreign domination and the monopoly of political power by the political representatives of exploiting classes of the big bourgeoisie and landlord class and allow the empowerment and greater freedom of the broad masses of the people.

The political parties, movements and organizations of the basic exploited classes and the middle social strata must have a fair chance in electoral struggle; acquire the guarantees of representation in elective and appointive positions; and fully enjoy democratic rights free from coercion and punitive actions by antinational and antidemocratic forces.

There must be a Council of National Unity to direct the enactment and implementation of constitutional, political and electoral reforms until such time that a new set of leaders are elected under the reforms.

Regarding the armed forces and the redistribution thereof, the GRP and NDF can make an agreement more easily if all the aforementioned agreements are made. The NDF knows what policy to take regarding its armed strength if the roots of the armed conflict are addressed first to the satisfaction of the oppressed and exploited people.

The NDF can agree to a lasting truce but never to the liquidation of the NPA and the surrender of its arms. Any framework of peace negotiations which requires the surrender of NPA arms is totally unacceptable to the NDF. This is not the only option there is. The NDF is not also demanding that the AFP liquidate itself and surrender its arms to the NDF and NPA.

Even former defense secretary Enrile has apparently seen the light when he proposes that were he to become president he would invite the Left, Middle and Right to a coalition government and would be satisfied with a truce with the armed revolutionary movement for three years and not require the liquidation of the NPA and the surrender of NPA arms.

The concept of a lasting truce is worthy of discussion and realization. But the surrender of any side is considered preposterous by the NDF at this specific time.

It is better to first discuss and agree on the substantive issues, redounding to the benefit of the people in accordance with their national and democratic rights and interests, than to ram through the bias of any side for the surrender of arms by the other side.

7. Time Frame of Negotiations

The NDF has told the GRP that, as far as the NDF is concerned, the peace negotiations can be as short as one year, a quarter of a year per major item in the agenda.

Indeed, the time frame of negotiations can only be as short as the time it takes for both the GRP and NDF to come to terms in accordance with the national and democratic demands of the Filipino people.

The peace negotiations can be accelerated by the formation of working groups by the GRP and NDF for the different major items in the substantive agenda. These working groups of the GRP and NDF can undertake research, make tentative agreements and draft in advance the agreements to be made; and thus provide effective assistance to the negotiating panels.

In November 1990, the Yap mission agreed tentatively with the NDF representatives that the negotiating panels and the human rights working groups of the GRP and NDF could be formed in December 1990 or in January 1991. But General Ramos prevented the realization of the agreement by interposing that the negotiating panels should not yet be formed and that there would only be one working committee on human rights to consist of three members from the GRP and one from the NDF and that the GRP decides who should be the NDF representative.

It is absurd of General Ramos to propose that the NDF subordinate itself in any way or degree to any single committee constituted and dominated by the GRP.

In the formal GRP framework for peace negotiations, drafted by the department of national defense and approved by Cluster E, the GRP indicates no time frame for peace negotiations.

Instead, it indicates two kinds of time frame for a process of surrender. First, the NDF can surrender immediately and directly to the GRP. Second, the GRP can talk first with "peace advocates" regarding the terms of surrender; and subsequently the NDF can approach the "peace advocates" and either take or refuse the terms of surrender. In effect, the GRP seeks to use the "peace advocates" as a buffer to delay or frustrate direct bilateral peace negotiations.

Because the GRP insists on its absurd framework, the peace negotiations cannot start at all.

8. Venue of the Negotiations

The NDF has declared that negotiations must be held abroad in view of the lessons learned from the pre-ceasefire talks and ceasefire in the 1986-1987 period.

It is definitely clear that if talks were held in Metro Manila or in the countryside, the AFP intelligence services would surely surveil the NDF negotiating panel, its technical and other personnel and supporters and facilities for punitive operations.

The talks would be vulnerable to attack and sabotage by military, police or vigilante groups belonging to the AFP and GRP and antagonistic to the peace process.

The arrest of NDF consultant Rodolfo Salas and his companions in September 1986; the murder of Rolando Olalia,

chairman of the Kilusang Mayo Uno in November 1986; the guidelines of General Ramos for the arrest of and other punitive actions against the NDF during the 1986-87 ceasefire; the Mendiola massacre of peasants and other people in January 1987; the admitted surveillance of NDF personnel and supporters by the AFP during the ceasefire; and the numerous arrests of NDF personnel and supporters after the ceasefire are the incontestable factual arguments against peace talks being held in the Philippines.

Practically all peace negotiations of the same nature as those possibly between the GRP and NDF have been held in foreign venues. Talks abroad have been more safe and convenient. In fact, GRP representatives have already held preliminary meetings with NDF representatives abroad in Italy, Singapore and the Netherlands.

The GRP has repeatedly negotiated with the MNLF in the Middle East; and has made it possible for the latter to acquire recognition for its status of belligerency. There is no reason why the GRP cannot negotiate with the NDF abroad. The GRP is being unreasonable whenever it insists that having a foreign venue for peace negotiations with the NDF is not possible.

The European Parliament and a number of states are willing to provide the venue for the peace negotiations, as soon as the GRP agrees. Such a venue will certainly be more safe and convenient for both sides of the negotiations.

The free movement of the members and related personnel of the NDF negotiating panel from the Philippines to the foreign venue and in foreign countries can be covered by the safety and immunity guarantees and by the good offices of the foreign third party.

9. The Foreign Third Party

The foreign third party may be a state or interstate entity or agency thereof which assumes a formal role in the peace negotiations as a witness, observer, good office, intermediary and mediator.

The witness is one who signs as such on any agreement made between the two negotiating parties. The observer can give his opinions and signs as such on any agreement made. The good offices mean the assistance of the go-between in making the peace negotiations possible.

The intermediary can give proposals to both sides and each of the negotiating parties on the basis of what he has gathered from the negotiations and consultations. The mediator can arbitrate the negotiations.

The NDF has been seeking the good offices of a state or interstate agency as the foreign third party in bilateral peace negotiations with the GRP. Such a foreign third party can also become the intermediary.

The European Parliament and a number of states have already indicated their willingness to become third party and to provide good offices. But the GRP must agree.

The third party does not only provide the safe and convenient venue and other material forms of assistance but also exercises a moral influence that encourages serious talks and concrete agreements for a just and lasting peace.

There can be another type of foreign third party. This may be any nongovernmental organization or institution which assists the peace process in any appropriate way.

Even before GRP-NDF peace negotiations can occur abroad, the NDF has gained support for these from people's organizations, respected parties and institutions, states and interstate organizations; and has thereby gained recognition for the sincere desire of the NDF for a peace process.

The European Parliament resolution dated December 13, 1990 endorsing bilateral peace negotiations between the GRP and NDF and the agreement of certain states to provide good offices are a step forward in the NDF's drive to draw the GRP to the negotiating table and seek recognition for its status of belligerency and its struggle for a just and lasting peace.

10. The Domestic Third Party of Peace Advocates

The Multisectoral Peace Advocates (MSPA) headed by Sen. Wigberto Tañada has been the most active and most prominent in seeking to promote the bilateral peace talks of the GRP and NDF.

There are organizations represented in the MSPA like the Coalition for Peace, the National Peace Conference sponsored by the Catholic Bishop's Conference of the Philippines, Association of Major Religious Superiors of the Philippines, the National Council of Churches of the Philippines and so on. The People Caucus also has representatives in the MSPA.

The MSPA has put forward a framework for the peace process. The NDF welcomes the proposals for addressing the roots of the armed conflict to make a just and lasting peace and for a foreign venue of peace negotiations; and considers the proposal for ceasefire upon agreement on a substantive agenda as a positive although insufficient departure from the kind of ceasefire (prior to substantive agenda) in the 1986-87 period.

But at the same time, the NDF takes exceptions to the MSPA premises of upholding the GRP Constitution, restoring trust

and confidence in the GRP, localized peace dialogues, community-based peace ("zones of peace/zones of life") and surrender of the New People's Army. These are being pushed by Rightwing advocates of pacification within MSPA.

The NDF recognizes that there is a broad array of peace advocates, inside and outside of MSPA and the People's Caucus. They are linked by an avowed commitment to address the roots of the armed conflict and thereby pave the way for a just and lasting peace. They are not homogeneous but are heterogeneous even when they belong to the same organizations, alliances or caucuses.

The broad array of peace advocates ranges from Left through Middle to the Right. The Left has the basic points in agreement with the NDF and the Right has those in agreement with the GRP. The Middle has some points of agreement with the NDF and other points with the GRP and tries to use principles and general terms which are not offensive to any side. The points of differences between the GRP and NDF positions and therefore of the pro-GRP and pro-NDF positions are clear enough in this paper.

The NDF is alert and opposed to the Right wing which espouses and supports basically the position of the GRP and seeks to turn the people against the armed revolutionary movement and deprive it of people and territory zone by zone.

The NDF regards the Left and Middle peace advocates as helpful in building a national consensus and a broad united front for a just and lasting peace through the solution of the basic national and social problems of the people and in possibly acting as a facilitator and resource base in the peace process.

11. Some Examples of Peace Negotiations Abroad

If the revolutionary forces (represented by the NDF) are resolute in carrying through to the end the national democratic revolution of a new type, it is worthwhile to study the peace negotiations undertaken by the Chinese Communist Party with the Kuomintang for a truce and a united front between them in the war of resistance against Japan; and once more those in Chungking in 1945. The pertinent articles of Mao Tsetung can be enlightening.

It is also worthwhile to study the experience of the Vietnamese in peace negotiations in Geneva in 1954 and those from the late sixties to 1972 in Paris. Each time the Vietnamese knew how to work for an agreement beneficial to their revolutionary side and never missed the correct relationship between the negotiating table and the battlefield.

All the national liberation movements, which have achieved a high degree of national independence and anti-imperialism through revolutionary armed struggle, provide good lessons to the Philippine revolutionary movement on the question of war and peace. But, of course, it is also useful to recognize the historical instances when colonial powers grant nominal independence to colonies as in the Philippines and elsewhere.

There are also examples of prolonged or frozen peace processes. These are resolved after decades, such as the one in Namibia. There are those still to be resolved even after so long, such as those involving Palestine and South Africa. The peace process depends on the balance of strength between the contending forces and related factors.

The Sandinista National Liberation Front (FSLN) seized political power without having to undertake any peace negotiations with the Somoza regime. Then, it would provide the unique example of an anti-imperialist government negotiating itself out of power under the pressure of U.S. antagonism and Soviet decrease of support.

The Farabundo Marti National Liberation Front (FMLN) has been able to gain politically from peace negotiations but is taking risks and changing attitudes in the backwash of the FSLN fall from power. The political retreat of FSLN was the main prize sought by the U.S. when it allowed the El Salvador government to negotiate with FMLN. The NDF can critically learn from the El Salvador government-FMLN peace negotiations.

We are reminded of Quezon and the Nacionalista Party negotiating with the U.S. in the thirties as we witness Nelson Mandela and the ANC negotiate within South Africa and without a people's army actively waging a people's war. The African National Congress (ANC) is in the stage of opposing colonialism and racism and seeking modus vivendi with the ruling South African white reactionaries who insist on retaining their property rights and control over security forces.

Quezon and the Nacionalista Party were able to obtain the Philippine Constitution of 1935 and establish the Philippine armed forces; and yielded to the property rights of U.S. citizens and corporations. They could successfully negotiate for nominal Philippine independence in the Philippines and U.S., without a people's army behind them but by taking advantage of the revolutionary history and potential of the Filipino people; their growing clamor for national independence; the social unrest due to the U.S. economic depression; and the international antifascist current running high.

The revolutionary struggle now being waged by the Filipino people is beyond the stage of neocolonial compromise. It is a national democratic revolution of a new type, with a socialist perspective. Rated in the history of the Filipino people or in comparison with many revolutionary movements abroad and notwithstanding tremendous odds, shortcomings and being in the strategic defensive stage for more than twenty-two years, the

new democratic revolution in the Philippines has made great achievements in laying the basis for a just and lasting peace.

These achievements are due to a self-reliant protracted people's war and the successful building of Red political power. However, there is still much to do in gaining international support and recognition for the status of belligerency for the revolutionary movement represented by the NDF. There is still much more to do in achieving total victory in the Philippines.

12. Perspective on the Struggle for a Just and Lasting Peace

The chances are currently dim for bilateral peace negotiations between the GRP and NDF to occur before the end of the current term of the Aquino regime. More than ever General Ramos is determined to obstruct and prevent any progress towards peace negotiations. His position has been undermined within the Aquino regime but not to the point that he and his likes in the Armed Forces of the Philippines cannot block peace negotiations.

Notwithstanding the current obstacles to peace negotiations, the NDF is more than ever pursuing the struggle for a just and lasting peace because it is pursuing the national democratic revolution and waging all possible forms of struggle.

The further advance of the national democratic revolution might someday compel or induce the GRP to agree to negotiate with the NDF. Whether peace negotiations are still possible or no longer possible under the Aquino regime, the NDF continues to firm up the framework and prepare the personnel for peace negotiations. This preparedness will someday serve the NDF in good stead.

As the peace negotiations do not occur due to the intransigence of the GRP, the NDF gains time to strengthen its fighting and negotiating position, broaden the united front and gain further international recognition for the NDF's status of belligerency

and international support for the people's demand for a just and lasting peace.

4.

MESSAGE TO THE INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS AGAINST THE WORLD ECONOMIC SUMMIT

[file date: 01.09.92]

I am deeply pleased to be invited to the International Congress Against the World Economic Summit. And I wish to thank the organizers of the congress.

It is regrettable that I cannot come because the Dutch authorities refuse to give me a laissez passer. As an asylum-seeker in the Netherlands, I have experienced what kind of democracy the class rule of the big bourgeoisie allows.

In the bourgeois world, there is so much media hype against the ways of the Stasi. But in fact, my application for political asylum has been denied twice on the basis of intelligence reports that my lawyer and I cannot look at. The third and final denial in the Netherlands will prompt a further appeal to the European court.

The Manila authorities subjected me to torture, solitary confinement, prolonged illegal detention and other acts of persecution. And they have cancelled my passport without due process since 1988 and have offered the prize money of one million pesos for my head, dead or alive, since 1989. And yet the Dutch authorities claim that I cannot be granted asylum because the Manila authorities want me for prosecution and not for persecution. This is what I call word play against the reality of persecution.

Now, I cannot come to Munich even after applying for a laissez passer long before this congress. There is a wall of official silence against my application for this permit to travel. I am told only informally that the right to travel, free

speech and other liberties can be negated to prevent me from attending a congress that opposes a sacred thing like the G-7 Summit.

So much for explaining my inability to come to the congress against my will. However, no one can stop me from sending you this message and from requesting a compatriot to participate in your discussions.

The International Congress

Obviously, the challenge that you are making to the G-7 Summit is seriously being taken in view of the fact that bourgeois governments have been obstructing your work and the participation of people from various countries.

At any rate, you have succeeded in convening the congress. I congratulate you wholeheartedly and wish you further success. I hereby convey my warmest regards to all participants.

The congress is highly significant. The people of the world look up to it as an effort to make a critical comprehension and analysis of and militant opposition to several major events unleashed in this year by the world's chief exploiters and oppressors for the purpose of making propaganda and further rationalizing the exploitation and oppression of the people of the world.

I refer to the bourgeois celebration of the quintennial anniversary of the Columbus expedition, the attempt of the worst plunderers of the world's human and natural resources, the main polluters of the world, to misrepresent themselves as the champions of ecology and development and of course the latest G-7 Summit, which is a grand cabal to exact more profits from the blood and sweat of the people.

The congress is made more significant by your determination to promote and help bring about lines of communication and a common understanding among the peoples of the world in the developed countries and in the client-states or neocolonies, against imperialism and neocolonialism and their reactionary agents.

The Filipino people and all progressive forces in the Philippines are in solidarity with you. They share with you the common understanding of the capitalist process of oppression and exploitation; and the common resolve to struggle against these.

They regard the Columbus expedition as the start of the process of bloody conquest and colonization, augmenting the primitive accumulation of capital in Europe and laying the foundation for modern imperialism and neocolonialism. The Filipino people have been subjected to this process and cry out for liberation from the colonial legacy and all the rigors of neocolonial subjugation.

They reject the misrepresentation of the last 500 years as a period of the West civilizing and developing the world. They condemn colonialism, slavery, feudalism, racism, the degradation of entire peoples and the women, clericalism and the destruction of entire cultures and all the current evils of monopoly capitalism and neocolonialism. They celebrate the unceasing resistance of the people of the Americas and farther afield, with whom they have the common experience of suffering and struggle for justice and freedom.

The Filipino people are united with all the peoples in the world in taking a common stand against the capitalist despoliation of the human and natural resources. Inherent to their anti-imperialist stand is the protection and the wise and healthy utilization of the environment. Like all victims of imperialist plunder, the Filipino people have contempt for the crocodile tears of the big bourgeoisie at the Earth Summit.

They are vigilant and opposed to the notion that the issue of ecology is decided by the worst plunderers and destroyers of the environment, that economic development is all decided by these hypocrites and deceivers and that environmental protection is a matter of the poor and underdeveloped countries begging for funds from the unconscionable extractors of superprofits.

The G-7 Summit aims to override the growing contradictions among its members by agreements to widen and intensify the exploitation and oppression of the people of the world. It is therefore appropriate to denounce it where it is held, both through the indoor discussions of the Congress and through a militant mass action.

The Group of Seven

The Group of Seven is the most despicable combination of countries that has plotted and acted against the people in the entire history of mankind. In the last two decades, they have aggravated underdevelopment and poverty in the third world countries as well as directly and indirectly in the bureaucrat capitalist-ruled countries, which labelled themselves as socialist.

Individually and collectively, directly and through multilateral agencies like the IMF and World Bank, they have imposed on other countries economic and political policies which impoverish and humiliate the people. They have propelled the ever deteriorating terms of trade against the producers of raw materials and slightly-processed goods. They have plunged all these into indebtedness and they are now earning more from debt service than from dividends on productive investment.

And now that they are confronted with the problem of a prolonged world recession and are afflicted with internal contradictions and contradictions among themselves, they seek

to devise more cruel and more deceptive ways of exploiting the peoples of the world, including those in capitalist countries.

The internationalization of capital has limits after all. These have been obvious since more than a decade ago when there was a shift from neo-Keynesianism to monetarist policy. The large shift of policy and all the economic restructuring done have only deepened the capitalist crisis of overproduction. The more the Group of Seven strains to solve the fundamental problems of capitalism at the greater expense of the people, the greater is the resistance that can arise.

There has been no end to the fact that all the client-states of the Group of Seven have been overburdened by foreign debt, the most conspicuous manifestation of their economic travail. Coming on top of the utter bankruptcy of most third world and East European countries at the end of the seventies has been the continued abuse of the international credit system by no less than the United States and by further lending to such new loan-clients as China, India and the Soviet Union in that chronological order in the eighties.

But from 1989 to 1991, the Group of Seven and the entire world capitalist system appeared to be triumphant over so-called socialism. So long as bureaucrat capitalism is misconstrued as socialism, capitalism can make the empty boast that it has prevailed over socialism and seems to make a big gain through an ideological offensive against revolutionary forces.

But in fact, the restoration of capitalism had gone on since the fifties in the former Soviet Union and Eastern Europe. Now that the socialist mask is off the face of bureaucrat capitalism, the Group of Seven is expected to assume full responsibility for all the economic mess in the aforementioned countries and to ante up the loans with no certainty of payback. But driven by

its obsessive greed, the Group of Seven prefers to dump finished goods on the client-states and de-industrialize them.

Also in the 1989-91 period, specifically in the year of 1991, the U.S.-led global capitalist alliance was able to demonstrate its hightech military power, murder 300,000 Iraqi people and devastate Iraq. Since then, there has been much gloating over the supposedly unchallenged hegemony of the U.S. and over the supposed overcoming of the Vietnam syndrome.

But in fact, the Gulf war has exposed the limits of the neocolonialist techniques of economic and financial manipulation and political dictation as well as the persistence of the violent and aggressive nature of imperialism which comes to the fore whenever necessary. A client-state like Iraq became unwieldy in the hands of the U.S. because of the high costs of the Iran-Iraq war and Iraq's own assertion of national interest against the imperialist oil interests. Consequently, the U.S. and other capitalist powers shifted from the superficial civility of neocolonialism to the violence of imperialism.

Major Contradictions in the World

In this year, we are in full view of several major contradictions in the world which are becoming more and more conspicuous.

First, all major capitalist powers like the U.S., Germany and Japan are individually in serious economic trouble.

The U.S. continues to be overburdened by its huge budgetary and trade deficits due to military overspending and by overconsumption. Germany has a serious case of indigestion; the costs for absorbing East Germany are exceedingly heavy. The recent bursting of the financial bubble in the Tokyo stock market shows how Japan is so vulnerable to shifts in U.S. economic policy.

In each capitalist country, the tax burden is increasing, the wage level is always being pressed down and social benefits are being cut back. The big bourgeoisie is already springing out racism and neo-fascism in order to augment the traditional bourgeois parties in the attempt to confuse the people.

Second, the contradictions within the Group of Seven and among all the capitalist countries are intensifying. The controversial issues are in all fields: industrial policy, finance, trade, spheres of influence and security matters. The continuing strategic decline of the U.S. is being taken advantage of by its capitalist competitors.

The U.S. wants to reduce the costs of its war machinery and revive its industrial competitiveness. Thus, both Germany and Japan are being pushed to build up their war machineries and aggressive capability and to engage in overseas military involvement under the banners of the UN and the old as well as new regional and bilateral alliances.

The emergence of new armed conflicts, the continuance of old ones and, of course, the inevitable rise of the people's armed resistance to imperialism and client-states on a widescale are now the main concern of the strategic planning by the capitalist powers which are cooking up various forms of military combinations in the wake of the disintegration of the Soviet Union.

Third, the contradictions between the capitalist powers and the client-states exist even as for the time being it looks like the hegemony of the U.S. as well as that of the U.S.-led alliance is difficult or impossible for any country to challenge.

As the crisis of the world capitalist system worsens and social unrest and resistance of the people are engendered, every reactionary ruling clique in the client-states is unstable and is vulnerable to an armed opposition even within the ruling system.

In fact, we see the ever increasing use of violence in the change of regimes in Asia, Africa, and Latin America. And we will see more and more of this in Eastern Europe and in the former Soviet Union. The illusion of democratization and peace under the aegis of imperialism and with the drumbeating by the pro-imperialist petty bourgeoisie is already giving way to more repressive regimes and further on to popular resistance.

Fourth, the contradictions between the people of all the client-states and the capitalist powers are bound to intensify because the basic social problems are being aggravated and the domestic ruling classes are increasingly afflicted by the violent competition for power on the basis of a dwindling socio-economic base for mutual accommodation.

The increasing possibility of successful armed revolutions led by the working class party arises from the widespread social unrest and turmoil that continue to occur in several countries and continents at the same time.

There are still proletarian revolutionary parties like the Communist Party of the Philippines, which are determined to win an armed revolution and carry out socialist revolution as the consequences of a new democratic revolution. The former Soviet Union and Eastern Europe are not getting as much manna as previously expected from the gods of capitalism and are in fact being de-industrialized. They are in social turmoil and have become hotbeds of ethnic conflicts, coup d'etats and civil wars. The political and economic chaos can ultimately lead to the reemergence of armed revolution.

Fifth, the contradiction between the big bourgeoisie on the one hand and the proletariat and people on the other is bound to intensify as the competition among the capitalist powers intensify upon a dwindling world capitalist market.

The capitalist crisis of overproduction is actually being accelerated by high technology and by the shrinkage of the world market due to the penury and indebtedness of the client states. In the rush to become more efficient and more profitable, the monopoly capitalist firms are now disemploying both blue collars and white collar, with the latter becoming more and more vulnerable to replacement by computers, and are forcing smaller firms into mergers and bankruptcies.

At the moment, the crisis within the advanced capitalist countries is not yet acute enough to cause any uprising. That is because the monopoly bourgeoisie can still exploit the client-states. Widespread discontent can arise if the recession becomes a depression and the depression that has long been with most client-states generates armed resistance and social upheavals.

The Philippine Revolutionary Struggle

There can be no debate whatsoever that the chronic domestic crisis of the semicolonial and semifeudal society in the Philippines is ever worsening and providing the fertile ground for the protracted people's war during the last twenty three years.

This domestic crisis arises from the exploitative nature of the economy and the joint class dictatorship of the comprador big bourgeoisie and the landlord class and is of course generated by the world crisis of capitalism.

The extraction of superprofits from the Philippines by the U.S., Japanese, German and other multinational firms, the huge budgetary and trade deficits and the crushing foreign and domestic public debt are ceaseless in impoverishing the people and making their lives miserable. These incite the people to join the armed revolution.

In their ideological offensive, the imperialists have been trying to demoralize the people and the revolutionary forces in

the Philippines by insisting that the movement for national liberation and democracy is hopeless because the world capitalist system is now without any strong socialist challenge and that the collapse of so-called socialism in Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union have made anti-imperialist and socialist movements helpless and pointless.

The response of the Filipino people and the revolutionary forces is as follows:

1. Like the rest of the people of the third world, the Filipino people have always been under capitalist domination since a long time ago. They have no choice but to fight imperialism and all reaction if they are to hope for any better life.

2. It has been demonstrated in history that genuine revolutionary parties of the proletariat have successfully carried out new democratic revolutions and undertaken socialist revolutions. The great theoretical challenge for proletarian revolutionaries is how to prevent the undermining and betrayal of socialism and continue the socialist revolution after some decades.

3. The ruling parties and regimes that disintegrated in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe have been anti-socialist for several decades even as they masqueraded as communist and socialist. In fact, the nomenclatura and apparatchiks continue to prey on the people as barefaced bourgeois, using bureaucratic privileges and doing more private business than ever.

4. In those countries, where bureaucrat capitalism has sought to further strengthen private capitalism by privatizing public assets, the economy and social life in all other respects have further deteriorated. The current conditions of these unabashed client-states of the Group of Seven are a further indictment of capitalism.

5. The ever worsening crisis of the world capitalist system is now clearly pointing to the rise of revolutionary resistance on an unprecedentedly wide scale sooner than later.

The domestic crisis in the Philippines is not all there is to favor the armed revolution. The crisis of the world capitalist system continues to worsen and favor the armed revolution in the Philippines.

A new element in the crisis in the Philippines is the current ascendance of a military figure (General Ramos) to the presidency of the Manila government on the basis of a fraudulent claim on less than a quarter of the electoral vote. He is a notorious puppet of the U.S. and butcher of the Filipino people.

Under the Marcos regime he was the chief planner and implementor of repression. And under the Aquino regime he pushed the U.S.-instigated total war policy. He has represented the continuity of the fascist military organization and he now represents the militarization of the ruling political system, from top to bottom. This is a manifestation of the deterioration and desperation of the ruling system.

As Filipino revolutionaries say, "This fascist brute has a long record of trying and failing to suppress the revolutionary movement. It is easier to fight and beat such an enemy with his fangs immediately showing than one with lipstick." The new regime is expected to escalate armed counterrevolution and human rights violations but it shall have a lesser capability to deceive the people than Mrs. Aquino even as he is also known as a psywar expert.

The perseverance of the revolutionary forces in armed struggle guarantees the continuance of the general tendency of the ruling system to disintegrate. Economic and political resources of the reactionaries from within and from outside the Philippines for maintaining bureaucratic operations and suppressing the armed

revolution are dwindling. The very obstinacy of every ruling clique in carrying out armed counterrevolution has become self-defeating.

The factionalization of the ruling classes and the reactionary armed forces is continuing. The resources for accommodation among political and military factions of the ruling system are more than ever limited. In fact, the entire ruling system has no way to solve its all-round bankruptcy.

The Filipino people are more than ever determined to strengthen their revolutionary forces. They are building their leading proletarian party, their people's army, their mass organizations, their united front and their organs of political power. These forces are growing in strength and advancing through the rhythm of expansion and consolidation; and are in the process of steadily supplanting the power of the imperialists and reactionaries in more and more areas in the Philippines.

At present, the armed revolution that is now going on in the Philippines is in the forefront of the revolutionary movement of the peoples of the world. The Communist Party of the Philippines, the New People's Army and the National Democratic Front are holding high the torch of armed revolution as social turmoil is now spreading in the world and the people are urged by the ever deteriorating conditions to take the road of revolutionary resistance.

I hope that the Filipino compatriot who will participate in the discussions in the forum will be able to shed more light on the content of this message and learn from the exchange of information and views with the other participants in the congress. Thank you.

* * *

5.

ON THE PETTY BOURGEOISIE AND THE FUTURE OF SOCIALISM

7 November 1992

Let me take up only two important questions:

1. What is the single most important class basis for the betrayal of socialism in the Soviet Union?
2. What is the future of socialism?

A. The Petty Bourgeoisie as the Class Basis for the Betrayal of Socialism

1. The petty bourgeoisie is the lowest stratum and most numerous part of the bourgeoisie. It possesses the intellectual, professional and technical capabilities utilized by the big bourgeoisie for the functioning of capitalism. The urban petty bourgeoisie, which receives the crumbs from the table of the big bourgeoisie, must be won over by the proletariat in order to disable and defeat the big bourgeoisie. Its capabilities must be put into the service of the revolution if the proletariat is to win victory.
2. The revolutionary party of the proletariat cannot strengthen itself, cannot seize power and cannot build socialism if it fails to win over the petty bourgeoisie in society and if it does not recruit into the Party those elements of petty bourgeois origin and socioeconomic status who are willing to remould themselves into proletarian revolutionaries and render service to the proletariat and people.
3. Availing themselves of their facility in learning Marxist-Leninist theory or book knowledge, the intelligentsia are usually able to gain membership in a proletarian revolutionary party in greater proportion than their part of the population and the part

of the proletariat. Marxist-Leninists have to consider the proper proportioning of Party members according to their class origins and status, with the objective of making sure that Party members of worker and peasant status are dominant within the proletarian party. At any rate, whatever is the proportion of party members of petty bourgeois origin and socioeconomic status, there are those who become genuine proletarian revolutionaries and there are others who fail to become so despite their nominal Party membership.

4. Even at its best, the proletarian revolutionary party contains a certain amount of unremoulded petty bourgeois and a certain degree of petty bourgeois thinking. The unremoulded petty bourgeois is the social base of subjectivist and opportunist errors which are either put under restraint, rectification and repudiation or allowed to thrive in a party that is bound to degenerate and disintegrate.

5. In Soviet history, the Left Opposition headed by Trotsky and the Right Opposition headed by Bukharin were petty bourgeois currents of thought within the Soviet party. At the same time, there were the old petty bourgeois retained in the reorganized state bureaucracy and in the economy under the New Economic Policy and the members of the old exploiting big bourgeois and landlord classes that lost properties but not their ideas and influence in society, which tended to conjoin with petty bourgeois thinking and even with the traditional social psychology of the politically backward section of the masses.

6. When it was prematurely declared in 1936 that there were no more exploiting classes and no more class struggle in Soviet society, except the one intensifying between the Soviet people and the external enemy, the tendency of the new intelligentsia and bureaucracy to become petty bourgeois was glossed over and allowed to grow. Thus, the petty bourgeoisie grew and proliferated within the ruling party and the state. Stalin himself observed that the most dangerous bureaucrat was the one that

carried the title of communist but was not at all a genuine communist.

7. The petty bourgeoisie was generated by the dulled proletarian revolutionary stand and the waning sense of class struggle between the proletariat and bourgeoisie within Soviet society. It became the social base for bureaucratism, the repressiveness of the state security agencies and eventually the rise of modern revisionism and the bureaucrat monopoly bourgeoisie to a predominant position. The bureaucrat monopoly bourgeoisie overthrew the proletariat in 1956 and converted socialism into state monopoly capitalism and social imperialism.

8. The petty bourgeoisification of the class consciousness of the new intelligentsia and the bureaucracy (most of whom were already children of the working people) was accompanied by the abolition of the communist minimum (salaries of communists equivalent to the average of workers' wages) and communist maximum (equivalent to the highest wage of skilled workers) and upward adjustment in the salaries of communist cadres equal to the level of salaries received by noncommunist professionals and technical experts (three times larger than those previously received by communist cadres). Communist bureaucrats in the party, state, public institutions and mass organizations, managers, engineers and technicians in state enterprises and collectives and personnel of academic, research and cultural institutions received privileges extra to their salaries. In the latter thirties, they started to get an overly large portion of the social product for their consumption.

9. In the undermining of socialism and restoration of capitalism, the petty bourgeoisie used two hands. One hand committed acts of arbitrariness and the other hand went for an egoistic sense of freedom. One hand reached out for higher rungs in the bureaucratic ladder and the other flailed against bureaucratism.

One hand pretended to uphold socialism which was already state monopoly capitalism and the other hand demanded the free marketplace of goods, services and ideas amidst bureaucratic corruption and privateering. In the end, the new bourgeoisie within and outside the ruling party and state agreed openly on the premises of anticommunism.

10. The standard of living of the petty bourgeoisie is something to aim for as a general level of development, especially in countries where socialism has to rise from a low economic and technological level. In the course of socialist advance, the contradictions between physical and mental labor and between urban and rural life are resolved by uplifting the workers and peasants economically, socially and culturally. What is wrong is when the intelligentsia and bureaucracy become or remain petty bourgeois, instead of becoming proletarian in world outlook, and proceed to accumulate privileges and perks at the expense of the general level of socialist development and adopt the ideas and policies to restore capitalism and the bourgeois class dictatorship.

B. The Future of Socialism

1. The basic teachings of Marx and Engels about capitalism and scientific socialism, those of Lenin and Stalin about modern imperialism and classical revisionism and about the socialist revolution and construction and those of Mao about imperialism, neocolonialism and modern revisionism and about socialist revolution and construction and continuing revolution under proletarian dictatorship through cultural revolution have been proven correct in two ways: first by the great victories of socialist revolution and construction; and second by the disastrous conduct and consequences of the betrayal of socialism by the ideology of modern revisionism and the actual restoration of capitalism. Therefore, all Marxist-Leninist parties and organizations that now exist and will arise can be better armed

than ever before with the correct principles and practical lessons to build socialism.

2. Mao's critique of modern revisionism and his theory of continuing revolution under proletarian dictatorship and combatting modern revisionism through proletarian cultural revolution to prevent the restoration of capitalism until imperialism is defeated and communism becomes possible deserve special attention. Without these, it would only be now that the Marxist-Leninist would be groping for the ideas about continuing the socialist revolution and preventing the restoration of capitalism through peaceful evolution. The Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution was defeated at a certain point in time after succeeding, like the Paris Commune, but it is a great indispensable source of theoretical and practical lessons.

3. The disintegration of the revisionist ruling parties and the sham socialist regimes and the collapse of the Soviet Union demonstrate so clearly that these have resulted from a certain sequence of events: the premature declaration of the end of class struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie within socialist society; the conversion of the new intelligentsia and bureaucracy into a huge mass of petty bourgeoisie; the role of this new petty bourgeoisie as the social base for the rise of bureaucratism, modern revisionism and the bureaucrat monopoly bourgeoisie; and the adoption of political, economic and cultural policies of so-called reforms to restore capitalism and ultimately to disintegrate the revisionist ruling party and regime.

4. The worst evils of capitalism now afflict the former Soviet republics. The class dictatorship of the bourgeoisie is now riding roughshod over the people and exacting a heavy toll on them in the form of unbridled bureaucratic corruption, privatization or closure of enterprises, mass unemployment, breakdown of production, soaring inflation, civil wars, ethnic conflicts, fascist currents, rampant criminality and so on. The very worst of the big bourgeoisie is still to come. But in the

course of the worsening of the situation, the revolutionary proletariat and people can recover their bearings and uphold the Marxist-Leninist legacy of Lenin and Stalin and wage the socialist revolution anew.

5. A special word on the great mass of petty bourgeois in the former Soviet bloc countries is called for. While they were the social base for the rise of the monopoly bureaucrat bourgeoisie, their social conditions conspicuously deteriorated, especially since the late seventies. These would deteriorate without cease from the second half of the Brezhnev period to the Gorbachov period through the current period. The worsening conditions of the petty bourgeoisie in the former Soviet bloc countries are similar to those in the general run of third world countries. Their illusions of enjoying more material comforts and freedom under capitalism are proven false.

6. The social turmoil and the disintegration of the revisionist ruling parties and regimes in the 1989-1991 period were part of the crisis of the world capitalist system. The Soviet Union was a social imperialist and neocolonial power vis a vis other countries under its control. But in fact it had become vulnerable to the manipulation of superior industrial capitalist powers, especially West Germany. The countries of Eastern Europe had fallen into the position of being like the countries of the third world, with overconsuming exploiters, deteriorating terms of trade and ever mounting debt burden, and had been subject to the manipulation of both Soviet and Western neocolonialism. But the longrunning depression of the East and South of the world has been recoiling upon the major industrial capitalist countries also in the 1989-1991 period and onwards.

7. The ongoing crisis of the world capitalist system is a crisis of overproduction. The production of surplus industrial and agricultural goods is now coming on top of a long-depressed South and East of the world, which had earlier suffered from

the overproduction of raw materials and deteriorating terms of trade for these and are reeling from mounting deficits and foreign debt. The crisis of overproduction has been accelerated by the unprecedented internationalization of capital since the end of World War II and by the application of high technology in the production of surplus manufactures and raw materials which cannot be disposed of profitably. Now, there is a depression of the world market as a result of the overproduction and the massive amount of bad debts. Overconsumption by the US has made it the biggest deficit-spender and the biggest debtor-country. The tighter integration of such huge markets as those of China, India and the Soviet Union in the world capitalist system in the eighties have only served to aggravate the crisis of overproduction.

8. Contradictions are intensifying between the capitalist powers and their client regimes on the one hand and the oppressed peoples and nations, among the industrial capitalist countries over questions about investment, trade, monetary, credit and military policies and between the monopoly bourgeoisie on the one hand and the proletariat and people in capitalist countries and throughout the world. Because of the falling rates of profit and the depression of the world economy, the capitalist powers tend to consolidate their national and regional positions. They tend to redivide the world and move towards a multipolar world.

9. Social turmoil is already raging in so many countries on an unprecedentedly wide scale and is taking the form of civil wars, protracted armed struggle, general strikes, one coup after another, mass uprisings and the like. These result from the depression of economies, the massive unemployment, inflation, the harsh austerity measures and social cutbacks, wider impoverishment, hunger and disease. There is gloom and disarray in the world capitalist system so soon after the euphoria and gloating over the so-called triumph of capitalism over socialism. Exactly at the point of unprecedented success in

the employment of neocolonial methods, capitalism is in a dismal, turbulent and desperate situation.

10. We are on the eve of social revolution on a global scale. Under the present world conditions, the Marxist-Leninist parties and organizations can arise and further strengthen themselves by taking advantage of the worsening crisis of the world capitalist system and by creating out of the widening and intensifying social turbulence a new and higher level of revolutionary struggle for national liberation, democracy and socialism against imperialism and all reaction.

6.

ON THE QUESTION OF REVOLUTIONARY VIOLENCE¹

February, 1993

Comrades and Friends,

First of all, let me convey my warmest greetings to the leadership and the entire membership of the LFS. I congratulate all of you for holding the lecture series on the Philippine crisis and revolution. I am deeply pleased and honored to participate in this lecture series and to speak before you right now.

The geographic distance makes no gap between us. The electronic means of communication instantly connect us. But most important of all, we have the fastest line of communication because we have an immediate basis^e for common understanding.

We adhere to the same general line of pursuing the people's revolutionary struggle for national liberation and democracy against the US, Japanese and other foreign monopoly capitalists and the local exploiting classes of big compradors and landlords.

Introduction to the Subject

The subject assigned to me is of crucial theoretical and practical importance. Before you can begin to become revolutionaries, you must in the first place recognize why there is the need for revolutionary violence. There are the priorly existing conditions of oppression and exploitation and the priorly established system of violence called the state. You must reckon and contend with these facts if you are for social revolution.

As a student of social science like you, I urge you to form yourselves into the teams in order to conduct social investigation

¹ Speech Prepared for the lectures on Crisis and Revolution, sponsored by the League of Filipino Students

and mass work among the workers and peasants and find out for yourselves whether they are suffering from intolerable oppression and exploitation and whether there is an urgent need for revolutionary violence. Best of all, you can decide to serve the people all your lives and devote yourselves to their revolutionary struggle.

In any exploitative society, whether slave, feudal or bourgeois, the state is the highest form of political organization, whose class character is determined by the dominant exploiting class and is used by it to coerce other classes into submission.

In the history of civilization there is yet no example of one form of exploitative class society being replaced by a higher form of class society always unleashes counterrevolutionary violence against the newly rising progressive class and the people who demand revolutionary change. Therefore, the new social system can arise only upon the victory of the armed revolution waged by the upcoming ruling class and the rest of the people.

In the course of waging revolution against the feudal order, the bourgeois recognized forthrightly the need for revolutionary violence and actively used it to seize political power. And after becoming the ruling class, it would use the power of the state to put under its control the proletariat and rest of the people and suppress any revolutionary movement initiated by the proletariat.

In reacting to the proletariat's revolutionary ideas and actions, the bourgeoisie, its ideologues, propagandists and politicians, gloss over the historical fact that the bourgeoisie itself has gained political power through revolutionary violence and has kept his power against the proletariat through counterrevolutionary violence. However, the bourgeoisie misrepresents the state as supraclass or as a nonclass product of voluntary social contract or constitution-making among the people, thus misrepresenting its own exploiting class interests as those of the entire people in the abstract. There is in effect a continuing mystification of the state

as a creation of the heavens or as the realization of the self-development of thought.

In an exploitative class society, the state is essentially an instrument of class coercion, of class dictatorship, in the hands of the dominant exploiting class. It consists of the army, police, courts and prisons. These are employed by the ruling class to enjoy the freedom to exploit the ruled classes and to pretend using solely the means of suasion, like the schools, the mass media, the church and other institutions, the electoral competition, the legislative process and so on to keep the social order.

The reactionary state employs its coercive apparatuses against individuals, organizations, classes and the people that raise basic revolutionary demands and participate in a revolutionary movement against the fundamentals of the ruling system. You must recognize that when the legal democratic movement of the workers, peasants and youth resurged in the Philippines in the 1960s, there was an escalation of efforts on the part of the US and the Manila government to use force against it.

And when the Communist Party of the Philippines was reestablished and the New People's Army came into existence because militants in the mass movement recognized the need for the revolutionary armed struggle, the reactionary state began to undertake the brutal campaigns of suppression. It would rather use counterrevolutionary violence than undertake basic reforms to meet the basic revolutionary demands of the people. A state that violently reacts to the revolutionary demands of the people is ripe for overthrow by armed revolution.

In the history of mankind, the bourgeois state of monopoly capitalism is the worst kind of revolutionary state. In addition to serving as the instrument for the domestic exploitation of the proletariat, for the extraction of surplus labor, it engages in imperialist domination of other peoples in order to draw

superprofits and debt service payments. The 20th century is drenched with the blood of the people because of the violence unleashed by the imperialist states against them in colonies and semi-colonies and in the two world wars among the imperialist powers themselves. The cold war between the US imperialism and Soviet social-imperialism also exacted a heavy toll on the people.

There has been an imperialist ideological offensive which drums up the idea among others that social revolution is possible without the violent overthrow of the reactionary ruling class and that armed revolution is counterproductive. This idea runs counter to the revolutionary idea that only consequent to the seizure of political power by the most progressive class in a given historical epoch is it possible to carry out social revolution.

In the bourgeois and imperialist ideological offensive of 1989-1991, the neoliberals and the social-democrats misrepresented the French Revolution of 1789 as an unnecessary exercise and not as the necessary way by which the bourgeoisie made its historic triumph over feudal rule, to pave the way for the political preeminence of industrial capitalism. And the disintegration of the revisionist ruling parties and regimes was misrepresented as the fall of socialism. It was in fact the culmination of the peaceful evolution of socialism through bureaucrat capitalism to undisguised capitalism. This process has been relatively nonviolent as it involves protracted degeneration from a higher form to a lower form of society.

The counterrevolutionary ideas of neoliberalism, populism and social democracy currently being espoused by unremoulded petty bourgeois elements are sterile and ineffectual in the Philippine situation. The semicolonial and semifeudal ruling system in the Philippines is so rotten and its chronic crisis is worsening so rapidly that no argument and no effective countermeasure can be made by the reactionaries against the ongoing revolution of the

people led by the proletariat and guided by the theory of Marxism-Leninism.

There can be no alleviation of the domestic crisis of the ruling system. This arises from the fundamentals of an agrarian, preindustrial and semifeudal Philippine economy that is an appendage of the world capitalist system. The domestic crisis is part of the longrunning depression in most of the third world countries and in the former Soviet bloc countries due to the lopsided economic investments favoring the industrial capitalist countries, the deteriorating terms of trade and the mounting debt burden.

Following the neocolonial internationalization of capital, the depression of the underdeveloped or the less developed countries has recoiled upon the major industrial capitalist which are now in a state of prolonged recession, if not depression. The drive of the monopoly firms to increase their productivity and their rates of profit through the application of high technology is deepening and aggravating the crisis of overproduction in the world capitalist system.

There is now a new world disorder. There is social turmoil in many third world countries, in the former Soviet bloc countries and in the major industrial capitalist countries. We are once more on the eve of social revolution in several countries and several continents. We are entering a new period of revolutionary struggle in the world. The international environment for the Philippine armed revolution is increasingly favorable.

Revolutionary and Counterrevolutionary Violence in Philippine History

It is an iron law of history that oppression and exploitation engenders resistance. Philippine history and current circumstances provide ample proof of this truth. One period in Philippines history is significantly and radically different from

another as a result of violent developments. The social condition of the people in every period is determined by what kind of economy and political power is holding sway and is the outcome of the balance and struggle of the forces of armed revolution and armed reaction.

Spanish colonialism conquered the Philippines by force of arms in the 16th century. Inasmuch as the native inhabitants were in disparate patriarchal slave and tribal societies in the archipelago, the conquistadores could apply divide-and-rule tactics over the native people and conscripted native troops in one area to augment the Spanish troops and quell the resistance of the people in other areas.

In more than 300 years of colonial rule, Spain systematically used the sword to impose its rule on the people and build a colonial and feudal society. It had to have a nationwide centralized system of administration for the purpose of oppressing and exploiting the people. Unwittingly, the colonizers drove the colonized people to perceive ultimately a common enemy and to unite in resistance to oppression and exploitation.

Since the 16th century, there had been sporadic and spontaneous outbreaks of violent popular resistance of varying geographic and time scales. Although these were quelled by the colonizers, there was a cumulation of the violent struggles of the people and a cumulation of anticolonial, antichrist and antifeudal national consciousness.

The qualitative leap occurred in 1896 when under the flag of the Katipunan the Philippine revolution broke out. These demand was for national independence from Spain and the social emancipation of the peasants from the feudal rule of the religious orders that were the biggest landowners.

The qualitative leap was not only one from a long cumulative train of spontaneous uprisings to a nationally conscious and

nationwide revolution against colonial rule but it was also one from the reformism of Jose Rizal and the propagandists to the line of armed revolution of Andres Bonifacio and the Katipunans.

Anyway, the Philippine revolution of 1896 was of the old democratic type, bourgeois liberal in ideology and led by the nascent bourgeoisie. The lasting value of this revolution was that it bequeathed to us a revolutionary sense of nationhood and democracy.

Without this legacy made sacred by the blood of our forefathers, without the just violence of the Filipino nation against the prior unjust violence of the foreign oppressors, we as a people would be in a much lesser position than we are today in the community of nations. As a matter of fact, we are proud to claim the honor of being the first nation to liberate itself from colonialism in Asia.

After our victory over Spanish colonialism, the US could intervene successfully and could conquer the Philippines because of superior military force and the inadequacies in the ideology and strategy and tactics of the Philippine revolutionary government and army.

In the course of the Filipino-American war, which started in 1899, the US aggressors killed off nearly one-tenth of the Filipino people, through combat, massacres, forced relocations, food blockades and other forms of barbarities. At the same time, the US used the slogan of benevolent assimilation and peace negotiations in order to split the ranks of the revolutionaries.

The liberal ideology of the leadership of the revolution could be coopted by a modern imperialist power. The latter also used the slogans of liberalism and ladled out concessions to the leaders who were inclined to compromise with the enemy and betray the revolution. After all, a modern imperialist power like the US was in a better position than the old type Spanish colonialism to

concede to the reformist demands previously submitted to the Spanish parliament before the start of the armed revolution.

As a result of its successful war of aggression, the US was able to put the Philippines under its own colonial rule and begin converting the Philippines into a semifeudal society, dominated by the resident or native comprador big bourgeoisie and a landlord class subservient to the new colonial order.

The comprador big bourgeoisie grew from the expanding trade with the industrial capitalist countries. It teamed up with the landlord class. The peasantry would quantitatively decrease from more than 90 percent of the population towards 80 percent. And the industrial proletariat would emerge in significant number as one more basic exploited class. The middle social strata of the urban petty bourgeoisie and middle bourgeoisie would also increase as never before in the 19th century.

The problems of foreign and feudal domination persisted. Thus, there would be violent uprisings in every decade. In 1930, the CPP was established to engage in legal struggle but was soon suppressed by the US colonial authorities. The class struggle between the proletariat and the big bourgeoisie and between the peasantry and the landlord class intensified as the world depression worsened and the interimperialist war loomed.

In early 1942, the Philippines came under occupation by the invasionary forces of fascist Japan. On March 29, 1942, the merger party of the CPP and the Socialist Party formed the People's Army Against Japan (Hukbalahap or Hukbo ng Bayan Laban sa Hapon).

In conjunction with the armed struggle against Japan, the revolutionary movement was able to establish Red political power and carry out land reform in Central Luzon. Were it not for the Right opportunist retreat-for-defense policy, which weakened guerilla warfare by absolutely dispersing small armed teams of

three to five men the revolutionary forces would have won greater victories.

At any rate, armed struggle was waged and solid mass organizing was done. The people gained political power in the barrios and carried out land reform and social reforms. Towards the end of the Japanese occupation, the revolutionary forces took advantage of the concentration of the Japanese troops in the Cordillera and went on a general offensive in Central Luzon. They were able to seize power in the municipal centers of several provinces in Central Luzon.

In the process of reconquering the Philippines after WW2, the US military forces, together with the pro-US guerilla forces, the pro-Japan Constabulary troops and the landlord-organized civilian guards, suppressed the revolutionary forces through massacres and other forms of barbarities and reinstated landlord power over Central Luzon.

The US proceeded to grant nominal independence to the Philippines and thus turned it into a semicolony or a neocolony. The joint class dictatorship of the landlord class was installed nationwide. The politicians of the two exploiting classes became directly responsible for the national administration of the Philippines.

But the US made sure that it retained property rights, military bases and control over the Armed Forces of the Philippines by making it dependent on the US for strategic planning, indoctrination, officer training, supplies and so on.

The leadership of the merger party of the Communist and Socialist parties had prevented the Hukbalahap from continuing the revolutionary armed struggle with the right opportunist line of “peace and democracy” and welcoming the return of the US forces and the Commonwealth government. Because of the relentless bloody assaults on the revolutionary forces and the

people and the unseating of legislators belonging to the Democratic Alliance, the Hukbalahap was converted in 1950 into the People's Liberation Army (Hukbong Mapagpalaya ng Bayan). The Jose Lava leadership of the old merger party declared all-out armed struggle against the US-Quirino regime.

However, the strategic line of the armed struggle was "Left" opportunist. It called for a quick military victory in two years' time on the basis of a total HMB armed force of only 3000 riflemen deployed mainly along the Sierra Madre. There was no consideration of the need to do painstaking mass work and to accumulate armed strength over a long period of time. The crisis of the ruling system was expected to participate in the uprisings.

Within months after the successful first wave of HMB offensives in August 1950, the merger party of the Communist and Socialist parties and the HMB main forces were being smashed by the US-directed and US-supplied Armed Forces of the Philippines, which had fielded 30 battalion combat teams in Central and Southern Luzon and an efficient intelligence network in Manila. The defeat of the armed revolution made the entire decade of the 1950s one of extreme reaction, whipped up by McCarthyism and the cold war.

It took nearly two decades before the revolutionary armed struggle could resume. A few months after its reestablishment on the theoretical foundation of Marxism-Leninism and Mao Zedong Thought on December 26, 1968, the Communist Party of the Philippines formed the New People's Army on March 29, 1969.

The CPP correctly analyzed Philippine society as semicolonial and semifeudal and, correspondingly, the Philippine revolution as national democratic of a new type, under working class leadership. The proletariat was recognized as being in basic alliance with the peasantry, in further alliance with the urban petty bourgeoisie and still further with the national bourgeoisie.

All these patriotic classes were ranged against the reactionary classes of big comprador and landlords. The Philippine revolution was set forth as a process to be realized in two stages: national democratic and socialist.

The protracted people's war is made possible by the chronic crisis of the semicolonial and semifeudal system, by the proletarian revolutionary leadership guided by Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought, by the peasant majority of the population and their democratic demand for land reform and by the favorable tropical terrain. The revolutionary organs of political power can be created in the countryside even while the reactionary state is still entrenched in the cities.

Even before the Marcos ruling clique declared martial law in 1972, the armed forces of the counterrevolutionary state of big compradors and landlords were already engaged in the most brutal campaigns of suppression.

One after the other, Task Force Lawin and Task Force Saranay, each in division strength, were deployed against a few hundreds of fighters of the NPA in the second district of Tarlac from 1969 onward and in Isabela from 1971 onward.

But the Party and the NPA engaged in guerilla warfare with an ever widening and deepening mass base. When the enemy forces concentrated on one area, they had difficulties in occupying the target areas and the adjoining ones and they gave up far wider areas beyond.

The NPA has therefore deliberately expanded and consolidated its mass base in the countryside on a nationwide scale in order to have the widest room for maneuver. The most successful deployment of the NPA has always involved the existence of a center of gravity in relative concentration (no more than one-third of total armed strength) and many more units dispersed for mass work (at least two-thirds of the total armed force).

Martial law from 1972 to 1986 has proven futile in trying to destroy the armed revolutionary movement. It merely incited a greater number of the people to fight back. The shift to the pseudodemocratic regime of Aquino has also proven to be ineffective in suppressing the armed revolution. General Ramos is the consistent prominent figure in all the failures of the reactionaries to suppress the armed revolution.

Today, the total NPA armed force nationwide is equivalent to several brigades or more than a score of batallions or several scores of companies or hundreds of platoons or so many hundreds of squads.

The NPA is in about 60 guerilla fronts in substantial portions of about 60 provinces or in several hundreds of municipalities or in at least 10,000 barrios. A guerilla front is built out of a number of guerilla zones. A guerilla zone has roughly the size of a municipality.

The NPA can victoriously carry out the revolutionary armed struggle, only as it is supported by the organs of political power, the mass organizations and the local Party branches and is augmented by the local militia units and self-defense units.

The NPA would have become a much stronger force in the 1990s and up to the present, were it not for the “Left” opportunist errors of militarism and insurrectionism which have played into the hands of the AFP and undermined the revolutionary mass base.

You must already be aware of the movement launched by the Communist Party of the Philippines within its ranks to reaffirm basic Marxist-Leninist principles, rectify errors and further strengthen all the revolutionary forces. This movement is expected to raise higher the fighting will and capabilities of the CPP and the people. The CPP recognizes the need for revolutionary violence in order to overthrow the oppressive and

exploitative ruling system and install a new social system in which the people enjoy national independence, democracy, social justice, material and cultural progress and peace.

Character and Direction of the Ramos Regime

The Ramos regime is fundamentally similar to the Marcos and Aquino regimes and to their predecessors since 1946. It is the principal political agency of the semicolonial and semifeudal ruling system in the current period. It has a big comprador-landlord character subservient to the US, Japanese and other foreign monopoly capitalists. General Ramos is the current chief representative of the local exploiting classes and top running dog of US imperialism.

Militarization and Total War Policy

At the same time, he and his clique have certain peculiarities. Their key men are retired and active military officers. They represent the increasing militarization of the ruling system. General Ramos was the military hatchet man of Marcos and, subsequently, Aquino. Now he is his own president. He and his ilk are at the pinnacle of reactionary power. They have more license than ever before to carry out military plans against the revolutionary forces and the people.

In terms of background and service record, General Ramos is a long-running dog of the US. He graduated from West Point. He served in the Korean war and in the Vietnam war and specialized in intelligence work and psywar before he became the chief of the Philippine Constabulary, the most brutal and notorious military service. He was one of the so-called "Rolex 12", the conspirational group under Marcos that planned and launched martial law in 1972.

Even before the proclamation of martial law, he had directed the campaigns of suppression against the revolutionary forces and

initiated the formation of paramilitary and vigilante groups. When he became chief of staff of the AFP under Marcos, he launched Oplan Mamamayan as a comprehensive plan seeking to assault and destroy the revolutionary forces as well as wage psywar campaigns through “peace and order” councils.

Under US direction, Ramos collaborated with Enrile in order to form a faction called the Reform the AFP Movement (RAM) to oppose and overthrow the Marcos-Ver faction. Under the Aquino regime, he pushed hard the “total war” policy and the US-instigated “low intensity conflict” scheme in his capacity as chief of staff of the armed forces and then as defense secretary. He was practically the president for military affairs. Although he became the target of anti-Aquino and anti-Ramos military factions, he was able to take personal advantage of the factionalization of the reactionary armed forces and the coup attempts against the Aquino regime.

General Ramos offers no solution to the basic problems of the Filipino people. He has adopted policies aggravating these basic problems. His “total war” policy continues to wreak havoc on the lives of the people. Since his coming to power, he has escalated the military campaigns of suppression against the revolutionary forces and the people.

The master plan Lumbat Bitag II has fully deployed all the six divisions of the Armed Forces of the Philippines and the revolutionary movement. They are pursuing a war of quick decision (strategic offensive and gradual constriction). There is less use now of the so-called special operations teams (SOTs) but an increased use of bombardments from the air and from the ground by artillery fire in order to massacre the people, destroy their homes and farms and force their evacuation. So-called base-denial and search-and-destroy operations are rampant.

General Ramos has completely no remorse over the more than two million people turned into refugees by his total war policy

and over the thousands of victims of massacres, warrantless arrests and seizures of property, torture and extrajudicial killings since the start of the Aquino regime in 1986.

The military obsession of the Ramos regime is made most obvious by the fact that for the first year of its rule, the military budget has been increased by 20 percent to P31.2 billion. In comparison, the budget for health and education have been decreased by 51 percent and 20 percent respectively. The appropriation for the CAFGU is P1.78 billion or P5 million per day and the number of CAFGU personnel is being increased from 60 thousand to 80 thousand. The budget for intelligence services has also been increased to P392 million. Daily military expenditures is P88 million, excluding those camouflaged under departments other than the department of national defense.

The reactionary armed forces are the main component of the reactionary state and at the same time remain the puppet and mercenary force in the US. The United States has all the levers for controlling the AFP. Although the US has withdrawn its forces from military facilities in the Philippines, they retain access to these and have the core personnel in these under the guise of advisors, liaison officers and technical experts. The military facilities are now maintained mainly at Philippine expense. The US has reduced its financial and military grants and military sales credits are enough to make the reactionary armed forces dependent on the US.

The US and the Philippine reactionary forces are collaborating in the conduct of the “total war” policy. This involves not only the provision of equipment and other supplies but also strategic and tactical advise, technical support and the feeding of intelligence and reconaissance data from the Pentagon and the CIA.

The Socioeconomic Crisis of the Ruling System

The socioeconomic and political crisis of the ruling system is bound to deepen and aggravate under the US-Ramos regime.

Together with the total war policy, all other policies already stated by General Ramos can only exacerbate the crisis of the system and the suffering of the people.

The IMF and the World Bank dictate economic policies on the US-Ramos regime as in previous regimes. These favor the foreign monopoly capitalists and the local exploiting classes at the expense of the broad masses of the people. General Ramos has already acceded to more investment privileges for foreign monopoly capitalists and accepted all foreign debt obligations, including the fraudulent loans.

General Ramos wants to turn the Philippines into an economic “tiger” like Hongkong and Singapore reexporting low-value added products and he believes that this can be achieved by further pressing down wage levels. But he disregards the fact that there is already a glut of reexports from the so-called economic “tigers” in the face of the recessionary trend in the industrial capitalist countries.

All major industrial capitalist countries, especially the United States, are reducing consumption. They are consolidating their financial positions nationally and regionally and are holding back on investing and lending money to third world countries like the Philippines because of the huge ocean of unpaid debts from such countries. In the current crisis of overproduction, the winning monopoly firms are trying to further increase their rates of profit in their home grounds by adopting high technology and throwing workers out of their jobs.

Undermining the financial position of the Philippines, General Ramos has announced that foreign monopoly firms and the big comprador landlords can – without any limitation – retain their foreign exchange earnings abroad. The worsening economic situation is likely to adversely affect the foreign exchange earnings of contract labor which has been the biggest dollar earner. The terms of trade for Philippine raw-material exports and reexports continue to deteriorate.

The Ramos regime is running out of means to service the foreign debt. There is no debt cap. Getting new loans to service or pay old debts has been exhausted since a long time ago. And during the entire period of the Aquino regime, local public borrowing to pay for foreign debt stands at US\$29 billion, despite the fact that from 1986 to the end of 1991, more than that amount was paid in foreign debt service.

General Ramos is not even pretending to be concerned about the land problem, which involves the peasant majority of the population. He has expressed his lack of interest by announcing that he would raise the land retention limit to 50 hectares, thus excluding at least 95 percent of all landlords from the pretended coverage of the bogus land reform program of the previous regimes.

His regime has agreed to the proposal of extending 99-year lease on land to foreigners and to that one of exempting Mindanao from the coverage of “land reform” in the next thirty years in order to accommodate fifteen “industrial estates”.

Because of the nonsolution and aggravation of the land problem, it is clear that the ground for people’s war remains exceedingly fertile. It is the armed revolutionary movement led by the CPP that is responding to the demand of the peasantry for land reform. At the moment, the minimum land reform program is being carried out on a wide scale by the revolutionary forces. This includes rent reduction, control of interest rates, improving farm wages, raising prices of farm products and raising production in agriculture and sideline occupations. Eighty percent of the peasantry are landless and they expect the maximum land reform program of the revolutionary movement to ultimately satisfy their hunger for land.

Eighty percent of the people live below the poverty line according to the latest data. Unemployment is running high. At

least 50 percent of the labor power in the Philippines is unemployed. Inflation is soaring. Production continues to break down. Basic producer and consumer goods are in short supply. Basic services are inadequate and are breaking down. There is environmental disaster due to imperialist plunder and pollution. There is lack of relief from the series of natural calamities that have struck the Philippines.

The Political Crisis and Peace Pretense of the Regime

General Ramos is a minority president. Even his claim to having gotten 23.5 percent of the vote is under question. Thus, since the start of his regime he has adopted tactics in order to expand and consolidate his political base. At this point in time, he has approached the Marcos, Eduardo Cojuangco, Enrile and other reactionary groups for reconciliation and he has made shady deals with them, including the retention of their ill-gotten wealth and new business privileges.

Following the Pentagon's orders and serving his own selfish interests, Ramos has made it a major policy to reconcile and work out compromises with the anti-Ramos military factions. So far, he has reconciled with them to an extent that the underground leaders and members of the Rebolusyonyong Aluansang Makabansa, Soldiers of the Filipino People and Young Officers' Union have agreed to surface. As a result, these factions are in a better position to expand and consolidate their following within the AFP.

It looks like that so far the Ramos regime is succeeding in consolidating its position. But in a short to come, when the revolutionary armed struggle and the legal democratic movement rise to a new and higher level because of the ever worsening crisis, the contradictions among the political and military factions within the ruling system will once more burst out as never before.

Related to his drive to consolidate his political position and to make his regime appear evenhanded in dealing with all types of opposition, he has taken the posture of being willing to enter into peace negotiations with the NDF. He has no illusions that there will ever be an agreement for a just and lasting peace. But he calculates that he can gain certain advantages from going through the motions of seeking peace negotiations with the NDF.

In an attempt to make himself credible about his willingness to negotiate peace, he has undertaken certain “confidence-building” measures. While in the process of releasing all detainees belonging to the anti-Ramos military factions, he has released proportionately fewer Left political detainees and far more slowly. He has repealed Republic Act 1700 (Antisubversion Law) but he retains all the oppressive laws like those making political offenses criminal and nonbailable and allowing warrantless arrests and seizure of properties. The violation of human rights in the informal ways of the military, paramilitary and vigilante groups continues unabated.

There is sophistication in the peace pretense of the US-Ramos regime. Hypothetically, the regime is willing to go all the way to peace negotiations and agreements, using the El Salvador model. At every step towards formal peace negotiations, the regime seeks to undermine first the position of the NDF through the total war policy and its complement of psywar schemes. The objective is to liquidate the revolutionary armed struggle.

The Ramos regime has already gone so far as to approve mutually with the NDF the Joint Declaration, co-signed by the GRP and the NDF representatives in The Hague in September 1992. The declaration has put the NDF and the GRP on an equal footing and set forth a mutually acceptable substantive agenda. But it also gives the peace pretense of Ramos a semblance of seriousness, which is useful in its psywar scheme.

The National Unification Commission has been created to peddle the old line of amnesty and rehabilitation to surrenderees. It is also a revival of the old “peace and order” councils under Oplan Mamamayan. It seeks to round up and mobilize leaders of the reactionary government, the churches, big business, the landed gentry and nongovernmental organizations at various territorial levels to campaign for the regime’s line of pacification to isolate the armed revolutionary movement under the pretext of engaging in consultations; to entice local cadres and commanders of the armed revolutionary movement to surface and capitulate; and to split the revolutionary movement.

Another related move undertaken by the Ramos regime is to recruit some renegades and use them to attack no less than the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Philippines and its major decisions, especially the rectification movement which is meant to correct the errors made by these renegades and further strengthen the revolutionary movement.

The peace pretense of the US- Ramos regime is meant not only to consolidate its political position to enable it to run government in a civil manner. It is intended to disarm and let down the guard of the progressive legal forces, the underground revolutionary forces and the entire people. The US-Ramos regime is already preparing for a return to undisguised military fascist rule. The regime is anticipating the worsening of the crisis and knows no other way to rule other than in the manner of using open terror. Both houses of Congress are now under the overwhelming control of the Ramos ruling clique. A proposal to change the form of government through constitutional amendment is now underway to pave the way for a situation in which the Marcos-style president can revert to despotic rule in a false transition from an old form to a new form of government.

The legal progressive forces should expand and intensify the anti-imperialist, antifeudal and antifascist movement and combat the antinational and antidemocratic schemes of the US-Ramos

regime. They should not entrap the issues within the narrow framework of wishful thinking or prospecting for a peace settlement with the regime. And they should keep their Left position and not be drawn to the position of “third force” between the GRP and the NDF.

Conclusion of the Discussion

Let me now raise the question which is suppose to be the focus of my discussion. Is there a need for revolutionary violence?

The objective social conditions – the fundamental character and the chronic crisis of the semicolonial and semifeudal ruling system – have persisted and worsened since the time that the armed revolutionary movement was resumed in 1969 by the Communist Party of the Philippines. If you ask the revolutionary forces and the people themselves, they will certainly answer that there are even greater reasons now to persevere in the revolutionary armed struggle and win greater victories in the national democratic revolution.

They can also point to the fact that the US-Ramos regime is not offering anything to address the root causes of the civil war. It is in fact carrying out policies that deepen and aggravate the basic social problems. Indeed, it would be incomprehensible and shameful for the revolutionaries to capitulate to a regime that is escalating its total war and yet is weakening due to dwindling resources for feeding its own corruption and undertaking its brutal campaigns of suppression. Considering the background and the current circumstances of the present regime, there is no bigger inciting factor to armed revolution than the character and direction of the regime.

Despite its fullest and best possible deployment in the field, the reactionary armed forces can concentrate on onlu nine out of the sixtty geurilla fronts of the New People’s Army. In the face of this, the New People’s Army can win greater victories by

carrying out people's war through extensive and intensive guerilla warfare with an ever widening and deepening mass base.

In coordination with the revolutionary forces in the countryside, the legal democratic movement based in the urban areas can also expand and intensify their efforts at arousing, organizing and mobilizing the people along the national democratic line of all the burning issues.

If the aim is to seize political power and consequently make social revolution, the main form of revolutionary struggle is the armed struggle. Although in this context the legal struggle is secondary, it is important and indispensable because it combines with the armed struggle to win over millions upon millions of the people to the revolutionary cause.

Without the development of the legal democratic movement in the urban areas, especially that of the working class and the urban petty bourgeoisie, the revolutionary armed struggle that is still based in the countryside can be isolated in political and technical terms and cannot be benefited by a continuous supply of cadres from the urban areas.

I can very well understand the acute need of the revolutionary forces in the countryside for coordination with those in the cities and for more cadres to be dispatched to the countryside from the cities. While people's war now requires that the people's army encircles the cities from the countryside, there is always a great demand for cadres to go to the countryside before political power can be seized in the cities.

Thank you.

7.

**MESSAGE TO THE SYMPOSIUM ON MAO ZEDONG
THOUGHT CELEBRATING THE 100TH BIRTH
ANNIVERSARY OF MAO ZEDONG IN THE
PHILIPPINES**

September 3, 1993

I wish to express my warmest greetings of solidarity with all the participants in today's seminar on Mao Zedong Thought and with the Center for Nationalist Studies, the Institute for Alternative Studies and the League of Filipino Student that have organized this symposium in advance celebration of the 100th birth anniversary of Mao Zedong.

Through the proletarian revolutionary cadres, Mao Zedong has provided immeasurable inspiration to the anti-imperialist and antifeudal mass movement in the Philippines since the early sixties. Since December 26, 1968, the Communist Party of the Philippines has adopted Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought as its theoretical guide and has integrated it with the concrete practice of the Philippine revolution.

As a result, the Filipino people's democratic revolution under the leadership of the proletariat has won great victories. There has been dual political power in the Philippines. While the counterrevolutionary state is still well entrenched in urban areas, revolutionary organs of political power have arisen in the countryside. They have been created by the Party, the New People's Army, the National Democratic Front, the mass organizations and the broad masses of the people.

But deviations from Mao Zedong Thought have resulted in serious setbacks since the middle of the 1980s. Once more Mao Zedong Thought is resolutely being upheld as the guide to the rectification movement being carried out by the Communist

Party of the Philippines in order to overcome grave errors and shortcomings, strengthen the Party and the revolutionary mass movement and raise the people's revolutionary struggle to a new and higher level.

The great contributions of Mao to the revolutionary theory and practice of the proletariat do not consist only of his teachings on the new democratic revolution and the theory and strategic line of people's war in a semicolonial and semifeudal country and on socialist revolution and construction, consequent to the basic completion of the national democratic revolution upon the seizure of political power.

The great contributions of Mao Zedong to the three components of Marxism, i.e., materialist philosophy, political economy and scientific socialism, bring us up to a new and higher level of understanding social revolution from the new democratic stage to the socialist stage and further on to the stage of communism.

The greatest contribution of Mao Zedong to the development of Marxism-Leninism is the theory and practice of continuing revolution under proletarian dictatorship in order to combat revisionism, prevent the restoration of capitalism and consolidate socialism for an entire historical epoch up to the point that imperialism is defeated on a world scale and communism becomes possible.

Those who can comprehend the full range of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought can see that the anti-imperialist and socialist movement is bound to resurge in an unprecedented way. The objective conditions for social revolution have become exceedingly favorable on an unprecedentedly wide scale. These include the disintegration of the revisionist ruling parties and regimes, the basic exhaustion of neocolonialism and the retrogression of the capitalist world to the worst forms of oppression and exploitation, the far worsened crisis of

capitalism due to superexploitation and high technology and the widening scale of social turmoil in all continents of the world.

You can observe in the Philippines and abroad that it is the Maoists who have the scientific basis and the confidence of persevering in the revolutionary cause of the proletariat, confront the growing monsters churned out by the rampaging crisis of monopoly capitalism and fight for what they foresee as a bright socialist future. It is those who adhere to Mao Zedong Thought who can answer the question of how to keep socialism after it is won. They are in the best position to learn from Mao's theory and practice of continuing revolution and from the disintegration of the revisionist ruling parties and regimes.

The sharpest of the ideologues of capitalism have started to worry that upon the discredit of modern revisionism, social democracy and other pseudoprogressive ideologies there is fertile ground for Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought to reemerge as a formidable revolutionary force and replace the so-called "moderate" opposition to imperialism which used to undermine and block the way of the revolutionary forces led by the proletariat in various countries.

In the history of the modern world, the revolutionary theory and practice of the proletariat comes later than the petty bourgeois enlightenment and petty bourgeois subordination to the big bourgeoisie. But there are in the Philippines today petty bourgeois subjectivists and opportunists of the Rightist variety who imagine themselves to be superior to Marxism-Leninism by mocking at it as outdated and by misrepresenting the bourgeois ideology of modern revisionism and the practice of restoring capitalism and bourgeois class dictatorship as the renewal and democratization of socialism.

These few anti-Marxists and antiproletarians among the unremoulded urban petty bourgeoisie try to dish up as new and fresh such stale ideas as populism, liberalism, social democracy

and anarchism as well as the most blatant anticommunist ideas of Trotsky, Khrushchov and Gorbachov. Under the signboard of "democracy" and "anti-Stalinism", they have combined with the militarists, insurrectionists and criminal gangsters who have swung from an ultra-Left posture to a Rightist position, after committing not only grave ideological, political and organizational errors but also criminal offenses violative of civil liberties and human rights.

There is now a hodgepodge of petty-bourgeois anticommunists seeking to discredit and destroy the Communist Party of the Philippines under the slogan of "pluralism". They demagogically take a free ride on the imperialist ideological offensive. They have adopted the anticommunist, anti-Stalin and anti-Mao slogans of the cold war as their own. And they have gone into an anticommunist alliance, which specializes in Red-baiting legal activists and shouting the slogan of "Oust the Stalinists." They wish to liquidate the armed revolution and seek convergences with the U.S.-Ramos regime. What a spectacle of intellectual backwardness and retrogression!

Among the detractors of Marxism-Leninism and the Communist Party of the Philippines, there are hired psywar and intelligence agents of the U.S. and local reactionaries. It would be pure naivete on our part not to be aware of the scheme of the U.S. and the Ramos regime to seek the destruction of the CPP and the revolutionary mass movement by every foul means, including the attempt to destroy them from within through ideological, political and organizational liquidation of the working class leadership in the two-stage Philippine revolution.

It is of crucial importance to study and apply Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought. It is necessary to be armed with this revolutionary theory in order to be able to fight effectively not only the barefaced enemy but also his special agents who seek to destroy the CPP and the revolutionary mass movement from the flanks. Mao Zedong Thought is the scientific theory that provides

us with the comprehensive and profound understanding of the past, the present and the future on the scale of the Philippines and the world.

To refuse or oppose learning from Mao Zedong Thought is to accept the rule of the big bourgeoisie, even if one is self-satisfied to be in some small petty bourgeois creek or in the morass of religious fantasy. The proletarian revolutionaries can never accept oppression and exploitation, especially when it becomes intolerably worse, as in the current period domestically and internationally. And of course, they choose the revolutionary theory that can guide the revolutionary mass movement not only in overthrowing the foreign and local oppressors and exploiters but also in creating a new social system and preempting those who try to restore capitalism and bourgeois class dictatorship.

Today, the armed revolutionary movement of the Filipino people for national liberation and democracy is at the forefront of the struggle of the proletariat and the people of the world against imperialism, neocolonialism, modern revisionism and all reaction. That is because the vanguard force of this movement is well endowed with the legacy of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought. The Communist Party of the Philippines has successfully led the Filipino people in marching from an old period to a new period of revolutionary struggle in the world, a period in which the upcoming revolutionary movements have to be guided by Mao Zedong Thought in order to win and consolidate victory.

The CPP has some special importance in the world today. It is holding high the banner of Mao Zedong Thought, carrying out an armed revolution and demonstrating to the oppressed and exploited peoples of the world an example which the imperialists and reactionaries wish to extinguish. That is why all kinds of violence and deception are being used by the counterrevolutionary forces.

In closing, may I congratulate you for having the revolutionary wisdom and militancy in undertaking this symposium on Mao Zedong Thought. You come well ahead of the International Seminar on Mao Zedong Thought which will be held on November 6 and 7 in Germany.

This seminar is being organized under the auspices of the Center for Social Studies, which I chair, the Workers' Education Center and other organizations. May I invite you to attend this seminar and, if you cannot come due to financial constraints, please read and study its forthcoming Declaration on Mao Zedong Thought and the other papers that it shall issue.

Thank you for giving me this opportunity to extend to you this message of solidarity. I wish you the utmost success in your present seminar and in your further seminars on Mao Zedong Thought.

8.

THE CRITICAL AND CREATIVE TASKS
OF THE RECTIFICATION MOVEMENT
IN THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF THE PHILIPPINES

Speech of Jose Maria Sison
On the 25th anniversary of its reestablishment
26 December 1993

Comrades and Friends,

Twenty-five years ago, on December 26, 1968, the Communist Party of the Philippines was reestablished under the theoretical guidance of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought. Since then, the Party has won great ideological, political and organizational victories through the integration of the revolutionary theory of the proletariat with the concrete practice of the Philippine revolution. In the entire history of the Filipino people, the Party has stood as the most formidable revolutionary force, deeply rooted among the masses of the working people and the most developed on a nationwide scale.

As one of those who founded the Party, I am exceedingly happy that it has proven itself as the advance detachment of the working class and as the leading force of the entire Filipino people in their revolutionary struggle for national liberation and democracy against foreign monopoly capitalism, domestic feudalism and bureaucrat capitalism.

The great victories of the Party would not be possible without the hard work, struggle and sacrifices of the Party cadres and members and all the people who have joined and supported them in the course of the revolutionary struggle. We owe the most to the revolutionary martyrs. Amidst this celebration, we pause for a moment to pay our highest and deepest respect to them.

We celebrate today not only the accumulation of the victories of the Party in general but also in particular the resounding victory of the current rectification movement within the Party. We offer all these victories to the memory of Comrade Mao Zedong, the great communist thinker, leader and fighter whose 100th birth anniversary coincides with the 25th anniversary of the Party.

I propose to discuss with you today the critical and creative tasks of the rectification movement. This is in accordance with the theme of this meeting of celebration and, of course, with the common recognition that the rectification movement is of crucial importance to the Party and the entire revolutionary movement in the motherland.

Historical and Current Context of the Rectification Movement

First, let me present the historical and current context in which this rectification movement has arisen and has developed. It would be one-sided for us only to celebrate the great victories against the blatant enemy and not to consider the errors and shortcomings which have lessened the victories and which have even caused a big setback, especially in the period from 1984 to 1989.

The point is to rectify those errors and shortcomings in order to unite the Party and the people along the correct revolutionary line and raise higher their fighting will and capabilities against the enemy, the US-Ramos clique. This clique currently represents the ruling system of the comprador big bourgeoisie and the landlord class, the exploiting classes servile to the foreign monopoly capitalists.

The rectification movement is an important method for strengthening a revolutionary party, for combating and overcoming errors and shortcomings that weaken it, especially

those of a major character that have accumulated for sometime. If not for the first great rectification movement which preceded and coincided with the reestablishment of the Party, the Party would not have laid a solid foundation for its development and would not have successfully developed in consequence. We can observe that the current second great rectification movement is yielding excellent results.

As you know, the Party grew in strength and advanced cumulatively from year to year since its reestablishment in 1968 up to 1984, registering the most rapid growth from 1981 to 1984. Then in 1985, there was a drastic decline in the rate of growth. And this proceeded to negative growth rates in several respects, especially with respect to mass base, until 1989 when the proletarian revolutionaries started to effectively arrest the rapid rate of decline and make partial corrections and adjustments in accordance with the principles and methods clarified as early as 1988 in a review of Party history. In 1990 the erroneous line of "strategic counteroffensive" and "regularization" was criticized and withdrawn.

Notwithstanding the undeniably gross setback from 1984 onward, the Party and the revolutionary movement are still so many times far bigger than their small and modest proportions in 1968. The Party started with a few scores of members who had studied Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought and had a mass following of some thousands organized since the onset of the 1960s mainly through the legal democratic movement. Now, the Party has a membership of several tens of thousands and leads the New People's Army with thousands of Red fighters, a mass base of millions under organs of political power and in mass organizations of workers, peasants, fishermen, youth, women, professionals and other people.

What is excellent about the current situation of the Party is that a comprehensive and thoroughgoing rectification movement has been carried out since last year and is being

vigorously carried out by all of the seventeen regional Party organizations. The Party rank and file are enthusiastically participating in the rectification movement, which in the first place an increasing number of them have demanded since the early 1980s, in opposition to the opportunists. At every level, the organs and organizations of the Party are summing up revolutionary experience, conducting criticism and self-criticism and carrying out the revolutionary tasks in accordance with the rectification documents and other decisions issued by the 10th plenum of the Central Committee.

The Party cadres and members are loyal to the Party Constitution and Program and to the Party and its Central Committee and support the rectification movement. They are recruiting several times a greater number of new Party members from the revolutionary mass movement than the paltry number of those temporarily or permanently led astray by the long-running and recent spate of slander and intrigues spread by the opportunists.

There is no cost but a great benefit to the Party in the departure of the opportunists and fictitious communists from the Party. Allowing the incorrigible and the worst opportunists to remain in the Party, commit the most destructive errors and crimes and spread degeneration have inflicted a heavier cost on the Party and the revolutionary movement than their desperate and futile attacks in the course of their recent departure from the Party. The expulsion of such opportunists is beneficial to the Party and the revolutionary movement.

The unity of the Party is strong and the Central Committee and its Political Bureau and Executive Committee are firmly leading the Party. There is neither a split nor a mass purge in the Party. In nearly two years of the rectification movement, from the beginning of 1992 to the end of 1993, only two central staff organ have been reconstituted and another dissolved, and three out the seventeen regional Party committees have been

reconstituted in order to deal organizationally with splittist and liquidationist activities.

The "Left" opportunist exponents of urban insurrectionism and military adventurism and the Right opportunist exponents of liquidationism, reformism and capitulationism are a measly few. They were basically defeated in the middle of 1991 through the process of democratic centralism in the Party. But in late 1991 they started to make loud noises outside the Party by publicly circulating gossip and slander articles against the Party and the central leadership. They tried but failed to stop the rectification movement by threatening to split the Party and by spreading fear about a mass purge worse than Kampanyang Ahos, for which some of the chief opportunists were criminally responsible in 1985-86 in Mindanao.

They have unwittingly helped the rectification movement by putting themselves out of the Party and publicly attacking it, by adopting anticommunist slogans and thereby exposing themselves as blatant counterrevolutionary Rightists, by openly going over to the side of the U.S.-Ramos clique and openly collaborating with the intelligence and psywar agencies of this regime as well as with corrupt trade union leaders, the Lava revisionist renegades, some foreign-funded NGO bureaucrats, the bourgeois populists, the pro-imperialist liberals, the Christian democrats and the Trotskyites.

The counterrevolutionary Rightists are hitching a ride on the wagon of the imperialist ideological and political offensive. Their favorite anticommunist line is to hold Comrade Stalin responsible for the very anti-Stalin character of the modern revisionism that undermined and ultimately destroyed what Stalin had built and defended. By using anti-Stalin slogans, the counterrevolutionary Rightists demagogically misrepresent themselves as champions of democracy in the bourgeois press. But among them are the principal criminals in bloody witchhunts like Kampanyang Ahos which trampled on the basic rights of

Party members, Red fighters and allies and murdered hundreds upon hundreds of them on the basis of mere suspicion as deep penetration agents.

Any revolutionary party of the proletariat somehow and to some extent reflects at any given time the contradictions of the society in which it exists. The law of uneven development operates within the party as a whole and in its parts. There is the constant problem of remoulding Party members of urban-petty bourgeois background and current lifestyle. There is always some ground in a communist party for subjectivism and opportunism to arise. Thus, there is always a two-line struggle between the proletarian revolutionaries and the purveyors of the bourgeois influence within a communist party even at its best.

From 1968 to 1977, those individuals wittingly or unwittingly carrying and pushing the bourgeois influence were generally spontaneous and disparate. Major errors and shortcomings were promptly criticized. But from 1978 there arose certain individuals in central leading and staff organs systematically propagating ideological eclecticism and opposing the Marxist-Leninist analysis of Philippine society. Spurred by petty-bourgeois impetuosity and by the rapid growth of the revolutionary movement resulting from the implementation of the line set by *Our Urgent Tasks* they sought a rationale for a leap in the armed struggle from the early substage to the advance substage of the strategic defensive without fulfilling the comprehensive requirements of the people's war. Others, unremoulded bourgeois populists and Christian democrats who had slipped into the Party, sought a rationale for liquidating the Party or subordinating it to bourgeois politicians opposed to the U.S.-Marcos regime and falling back on bourgeois reformism.

From 1980 onwards, certain high Party officials started to spread systematically a line running counter to, undermining and interfering with the correct line and process of developing the revolutionary movement. Opportunism principally took a "Left"

form with the line of the "strategic counteroffensive" and "regularization" in 1980 and farther on, the line of combining military adventurism and urban insurrectionism in 1982. Secondarily, opportunism took a a blatant Rightist form with the line of liquidating the Party and replacing it with the "New Katipunan", a formal united front organization as the center of the revolution in 1980.

Even as the wrong lines overlapped with it, the correct line continued to guide the majority of Party cadres and members and to result in the rapid growth of revolutionary forces from 1981 to 1984, especially because of the rapid worsening of the crisis of the ruling system. Such basic and major documents of the Party as the *Guide for Party Cadres and Members (1968)*, *Philippine Society and Revolution (1970)*, *Specific Characteristics of Our People's War (1974)* and *Our Urgent Tasks (1976)* had drawn the correct ideological, political and organizational line and would prevent the wrong lines from taking over the Party completely.

The most devastating effects of the wrong line of combining military adventurism and urban insurrectionism in Mindanao became indubitably clear in the gross setbacks of the prematurely and rapidly formed companies of the people's army in 1984 and the anti-informer hysteria and Kampanyang Ahos in 1985-86. The wrong line and its results (including the bloody witchhunt called Kampanyang Ahos) were not properly examined, criticized and repudiated. Instead, the wrong line was pushed even more vigorously on a nationwide scale. From 1985 onward militarism grew strong as the NPA "General Command" started to break out of the absolute leadership of the Party and ran ahead in pushing the "strategic counteroffensive" and "regularization" through a series of military conferences.

The great victories and rapid growth of the revolutionary movement from 1981 to 1984 were never due to the wrong lines but were due to the solid foundation laid by the first great rectification movement, the correct line set by the Party at its

reestablishment in 1968 and carried out continuously by the proletarian revolutionaries and by the rapid aggravation of the chronic crisis of the ruling system. Thus, notwithstanding the spread of the wrong lines from 1980 to 1989, the proletarian revolutionaries had a strong basis to stand on in asserting themselves with the support of the people against the wrong lines, arrest the decline of revolutionary strength and carry out the second great rectification movement.

If you wish to know more about the rectification movement, I suggest that you read the issues of *Rebolusyon*, which contain "Reaffirm Our Basic Principles and Rectify Errors", "General Review of Important Events and Decisions, 1980-1991", "Stand for Socialism Against Modern Revisionism"; the Party anniversary statements from 1988 to 1993; and the rectification documents formulated by Party leading organs at various levels before and after the Central Committee's 10th Plenum.

The Critical and Creative Tasks of the Rectification Movement

Let me now provide you with an understanding of the critical and creative tasks of the rectification movement. In doing so, I am guided by the ten points guiding the rectification movement.

1. Uphold the theory and practice of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought!

The rectification movement is first of all a movement of theoretical education in Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought. It stresses the integration of the revolutionary theory of the proletariat with concrete revolutionary practice. It promotes the study and application of the basic Marxist-Leninist principles and raises to the level of Marxist-Leninist theory the rich revolutionary experience of the Communist Party of the

Philippines and the revolutionary mass movement. It seeks to develop the Marxist-Leninist stand, viewpoint and method of the revolutionary proletariat. Party cadres and members must learn to grasp the law of contradiction and handle it well in class analysis and revolutionary struggle.

The rectification movement criticizes and combats the subjectivism that has given rise to the "Left" and Right opportunist errors that have in turn caused great damage to the party and the revolutionary movement. It repudiates the eclecticism, empiricism and dogmatism that have afflicted the Party for a considerably long period of time. It combats the depreciation of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought and of the Philippine revolution, the deviations from the antirevisionist line through the adoption of Brezhnevite and Gorbachovite revisionism, the depreciation of the two-stage Philippine revolution through the uncritical adulation of movements without proletarian revolutionary leadership and the dishonest practice of quoting the great Lenin out of context to attack the line of the Party.

The rectification movement points out that theoretical education within the Party is necessary and that political education on the national democratic revolution is not enough. It seeks to revive, improve and propagate three levels of Party education: basic, intermediate and advanced. The study materials include both the works of the great communist thinkers and leaders and the most important documents of the Party that pursue the correct revolutionary line. The materials are reproduced and circulated for reading and study in advance of the formal study courses. All Party organs and units are urged to undertake social investigation, summings-up, criticism and self-criticism and the definition of tasks along the Marxist-Leninist line.

2. Pursue the antirevisionist line consistently!

It is of crucial importance to pursue the antirevisionist line consistently. Although modern revisionism has been discredited through the collapse of the Soviet Union and the Soviet revisionist party and the accomplished disintegration of revisionist ruling parties and regimes in some countries and the continuing degeneration of those in other countries, the exponents of modern revisionism, neo-revisionism and social democracy are still trying to extend their influence by combining with the ideological and political offensive of the imperialists and their retinue of anticommunist petty bourgeois camp followers in misrepresenting modern revisionism of the last more than three decades as "flawed socialism" or "Stalinism".

The rectification movement criticizes and repudiates all the deviations from the antirevisionist line. The first major deviation started in the early 1980s and involved the subjectivist expectation that the Soviet Union and its allies would provide military and financial assistance in order to accelerate the victory of the Philippine revolution. This opportunism took the appearance of being Left but the content was Rightist because it led to the Party's shift to regard the CPSU and similar parties as no longer revisionists, the Soviet Union as no longer social imperialist and the satellites as no longer neocolonies of Soviet social imperialism. The second major deviation infected some key cadres in the late 1980s. They adopted and spread Gorbachovite revisionism in certain parts of the Party. Ultimately, the worst of these opportunists would become like Gorbachov, blatant anticommunist, using anti-Stalin slogans to attack the Party.

In the education movement in Marxism-Leninism, the studies include the critique of modern revisionism and Mao Zedong's theory and practice of continuing revolution under proletarian leadership in order to consolidate socialism, combat modern revisionism and prevent the restoration of capitalism. The Party is promoting its comprehensive

stand for socialism against modern revisionism and is clarifying the bright future of socialism and communism against monopoly capitalism.

3. Confront the semifeudal and semicolonial character of Philippine society!

The persistence of the semicolonial and semifeudal character of Philippine society is obvious. This is a society ruled by the comprador big bourgeoisie and the landlord class in the service of foreign monopoly capitalism. It has an economy that is agrarian and without basic industries. Its import-dependent low value-added manufacturing either for domestic consumption or reexport is ailing and breaking down.

The rectification movement repudiates and rectifies the line pushed by the "Left" and Right opportunists since the late 1970s, crediting the U.S.-Marcos regime, the IMF-World Bank and the foreign multinational firms with having industrialized and urbanized the Philippines to the extent, as the opportunists claimed, that the theory and strategic line of protracted people's war had become outdated and needed refinements, adjustments and innovations. The misrepresentation of Philippine society laid the basis for the "Left" opportunist line of the "strategic counteroffensive" and "regularization" combining urban insurrectionism and military adventurism; as well as the Right opportunist line of urban-based reformism. Now, both types of opportunists have exposed themselves as counterrevolutionary Rightists, endorsing the scheme of the U.S.-Ramos ruling clique to suppress the revolutionary movement and to make the Philippines a "newly industrializing country" before the year 2000. It is now clear that after all the U.S.-Marcos ruling clique never industrialized the Philippines. The opportunists are now betting on the U.S.-Ramos clique to achieve industrialization.

It is absolutely necessary to describe correctly the character of Philippine society because it lays the ground for

what is the correct general line for the revolutionary movement. The chronic crisis of the semicolonial and semifeudal society like that of the Philippines calls for the strategic line of protracted people's war. The rectification movement is promoting the study of the continuous social analysis done by the Party from the years 1968-1970, through 1982, to the present in direct opposition to the false claims of the purveyors of official development theory, dependent capitalism, revisionism and so on.

4. Carry out the general line of new democratic revolution!

The general line of new-democratic revolution aims to complete the Filipino people's struggle for national liberation and democracy. It is new because it is under the leadership of the proletariat and no longer the bourgeoisie. It is the first stage of the Philippine revolution, leading to the next stage of socialist revolution. The revolutionary forces required to achieve the first stage are the same forces that can begin the socialist revolution under the leadership of the working class.

The rectification movement criticizes and repudiates the opportunist line of subordinating the proletariat to the bourgeoisie. The opportunists had been trying to weaken the class leadership of the proletariat by using petty-bourgeois arguments to preserve and enlarge the interests of the big bourgeoisie and landlord class. They elaborated and diluted the national-democratic program and pushed the idea of setting up a so-called national-democratic state and a national-democratic economy after the seizure of political power by the revolutionary forces.

The revolutionary class line of the Party is to uphold the class leadership of the proletariat, rely mainly on the worker-peasant alliance, win over the urban petty bourgeoisie to become a basic revolutionary force and further win over the middle bourgeoisie to become a positive force of the revolution and take advantage of the contradictions among the big bourgeois and landlord reactionaries in order to isolate and destroy the power of

the most reactionary faction at every given time. Upon the seizure of political power, the new democratic revolution is basically completed and the socialist revolution can begin.

5. Build the Party as the vanguard force
of the proletariat and the people!

In this era of modern imperialism and proletarian revolution, the working class is indubitably the most productive and most progressive force in the Philippines and in the world. This is the class defined by the objective conditions and by its long history of revolutionary struggle to lead the new-democratic and socialist stages of the Philippine revolution. The advance detachment of the proletariat is the Communist Party of the Philippines. It is the leading force of both the proletariat and the entire Filipino people in the new-democratic revolution, within the context of a world proletarian-socialist revolution rather than a world bourgeois capitalist revolution.

The rectification movement completely rejects the notion that the revolutionary struggle for national liberation and democracy against imperialism, feudalism and bureaucrat capitalism can be won without the class leadership of the proletariat. Such a notion runs counter to the petty bourgeoisie's history of cooptation, the middle bourgeoisie's dual character, flabbiness and lack of basic industries, and the close collusion of the comprador big bourgeoisie and the landlord class with the imperialists in the oppression and exploitation of the Filipino people. It also runs counter to the recent history and current circumstances which show that the national democratic movement has become a strong force because of the proven, tested and continuing class leadership of the working class through its vanguard party, the Communist Party of the Philippines. The rectification movement condemns those opportunists who have become exponents of bourgeois pluralism and Gorbachovite anticommunism, rabid opponents of the

vanguard role of the working class and special psywar agents of the bourgeoisie and the current ruling system.

The rectification movement asserts the principle of vanguard role of the proletariat through the Communist Party of the Philippines. That key cadres of the Party could in the past degenerate to the point of attacking the vanguard role of the working class serves to underscore a serious lack of ideological and political education within the Party. The rectification movement therefore seeks to further strengthen the Party comprehensively in ideology, politics and organization so that it can continue to be the advance detachment of the leading class in the Philippine revolution.

6. Wage the protracted people's war and carry out extensive and intensive guerrilla warfare based on an ever widening and deepening mass base!

The theory and strategic line of protracted people's war means that the people's army must encircle the cities from the countryside and accumulate strength in the countryside until it can seize political power in the cities. The protracted people's war is the revolutionary process of seizing power along the new-democratic line. It is a revolutionary mass undertaking. In the course of people's war, the Party builds the worker-peasant alliance. It carries out land reform and builds the mass base in the form of mass organizations and the organs of political power. The people's army cannot preserve and accumulate strength without the strong foundation in the people's participation and support, realized through painstaking mass work and solid mass organizing. The people's army itself is an armed mass organization under the absolute leadership of the Party.

The rectification movement vigorously opposes and condemns the "Left" opportunist line of combining military adventurism and urban insurrectionism. This has caused the worst damage to the Party and the revolutionary movement in their entire history. This put the prematurely enlarged military

formations in an isolated and passive position and caused the drastic reduction of the mass base and the big diminution of armed tactical offensives. This made the Party and the revolutionary movement vulnerable to the enemy's strategic offensive and tactics of gradual constriction. This led to the urban-basing of the "general command" of the people's army and the notion of depending on foreign military assistance, misrepresenting it as the crucial factor that without it there is either retrogression or stagnation of the revolutionary movement. This also led to barbarities like bloody witchhunts and gangsterism. The incorrigible "Left" opportunists have been frustrated and have swung not only to a Right opportunist position but worst of all to a position of becoming counterrevolutionary agents of the US-Ramos regime.

As a result of the rectification movement, there is now a redeployment of the forces of the people's army. There is an appropriate size of the center of gravity involving no more than thirty percent of the total number of Red fighters in every guerrilla front. The overwhelming majority of the Red fighters are now deployed on a wider scale in order to operate in a greater number of municipalities and do painstaking mass work, expanding and consolidating the mass base. Extensive areas temporarily lost are now being recovered and new areas are being opened in the expansion of revolutionary work. The current line is to conduct intensive and extensive guerrilla warfare on the basis of an ever widening and deepening mass base. The Party is putting into effect the minimum land reform program and mass base building on a far wider scale. It is coordinating the rural-based armed struggle as the principal form of struggle and the urban-based legal democratic mass movement as the secondary but important and indispensable form of struggle. The urban Party organizations are now determined to send more Party cadres and members to the countryside.

7. Pursue the revolutionary class line in the united front!

The revolutionary class line in the united front is no different from the class line of the entire new democratic revolution as previously defined. It is possible to pursue the united front with or without any organizational form. Fortunately, the Party has plenty of experience in building formal united front organizations legally and illegally. There are the alliances based on class and sectoral interests or on certain important issues in the legal democratic movement. There has also been the underground National Democratic Front since 1973. The most important of all the alliances is the basic one between the working class and the peasantry. To build this alliance the Party has pursued the antifeudal class line in which the proletariat relies mainly on the poor, lower-middle peasants and farm workers, win over the rest of the middle peasants, neutralize the rich peasants, take advantage of the contradictions between enlightened and evil gentry in order to isolate and destroy the power of the despotic gentry. Since 1969, this class line has been followed in building organs of political power in the countryside.

The rectification movement vigorously condemns and opposes the attempt of the former "Left" and Right opportunists within the Party who are now openly counterrevolutionary Rightists to liquidate the class leadership of the proletariat and destroy the basic worker-peasant alliance which is the foundation of the revolutionary united front. The rectification movement criticizes and repudiates the series of Right opportunist attempts to liquidate the leading role of the working class in the united front, starting with the 1980 concept of the "vanguard front" to replace the vanguard party, proceeding to the 1985 and 1987 decisions to convert the NDF into a "federation" or "confederation" in which the Party is made to relinquish its role as center of the revolution and further proceeding to the 1990 attempt to convert the NDF into a confused federation of member-organizations and of individuals, in which the Party gives up its leading role in the revolution and its independence

and initiative and is subordinated through a voting system to a ready-made majority of petty-bourgeois groups and individuals that imposes on it a program of bourgeois nationalism, pluralism and mixed economy.

The rectification movement is applying the Party's clarification of the distinct roles and correct relationship of the Party, the New People's Army and the National Democratic Front along the correct revolutionary class line. It is stressing the principle of upholding the working class leadership in the united front. On behalf of the proletariat and the entire people, the Party wields the revolutionary armed struggle and the united front as the weapons of the revolutionary movement. It maintains its independence and initiative in any kind of united front arrangement and is for the rule of consensus among allied organizations rather than a system of voting in which the nonproletarian groups have a ready-made majority.

8. Follow the principle of democratic centralism!

Democratic centralism is the basic organizational principle of the Party. It is centralism based on democracy and democracy based on centralized leadership. I need not restate here all the provisions of the Party Constitution regarding democratic centralism. Let me point out however that democratic centralism is not just about the democratic and collective process of decisionmaking. Were it simply so, there would be no difference between the Party and a business or even a religious corporation. The essence of centralism in the Party is the commitment to the basic Marxist-Leninist principles and policies that are clearly stated in the Party Constitution and Program. Democracy is the method by which the essence of centralism is integrated with the concrete practice of the revolution, and by which the dialectical relationship or interaction is realized between the central leadership and the general membership of the Party through the elected representative organs of leadership.

The rectification movement opposes and repudiates such notions as the following: that education in the basic principles of the Party constitutes "fundamentalism" (whatever that means), that there must be "democratic pluralism" instead of democratic centralism and that anticommunists can become Party members, that the evaluation of Party members is "inquisition", that anti-Party factions, their "caucuses" and "autonomous groups" are permissible, and that public attacks against the Party by those who claim to be Party members are beyond the ambit of Party discipline and are legitimate and democratic. Since early 1992 and even earlier on a smaller scale, ultrademocracy has been whipped up by both former "Left" and Right opportunist elements. The Party combats both bureaucratism and ultrademocracy. Each one is a one-sided malignance; one simply dictates from above and the other is anarchy or the tyranny of the mob. Those who are now counterrevolutionary Rightists had been the worst practitioners of these in the entire history of the Party.

In the rectification movement, the Party explains thoroughly the meaning of democratic centralism. It demonstrates how the rectification documents have been arrived at, how they have been decided, how they are being implemented and how they are being further enriched. All lower Party organs and organizations are encouraged to make further summings-up and criticism and self-criticism. All Party cadres and members are encouraged to participate in decisionmaking and to engage in criticism and self-criticism. There are the bounds of discipline and within these bounds there is inner-Party democracy to make sure that discipline is well-informed and enlightened. The Party must always be concerned about the unity, solidity and security of the Party as a necessity in the revolutionary struggle. Within the Party there is a dialectical relationship between discipline and freedom.

9. Look forward to the socialist revolution!

There is no point in making the national-democratic revolution now if there is no socialist perspective. In the first place, the national-democratic revolution cannot be won if the factors that make for socialist revolution do not prevail in the course of the national-democratic revolution. The factors for bringing the people to the stage of socialist revolution are the class leadership of the proletariat through the Party, the people's army as the main component of state power under the absolute leadership of the Party, the proletarian class dictatorship at the core of the people's democratic form of government and the basic revolutionary alliance of the working class and the peasantry as the foundation of the united front. In brief, there is power in the hands of the working class and its revolutionary party to start the socialist transformation. Upon the seizure of political power nationwide, the national-democratic revolution shall have been basically completed and the socialist revolution can begin. The socialist sector of state enterprises and cooperatives shall be instituted even as there are transitory concessions to the owner-cultivators of land and the petty and middle bourgeoisie.

In view of the collapse of the revisionist ruling parties and regimes in some countries and the continuing degeneration of these in other countries, the rectification movement criticizes and condemns modern revisionism and upholds socialism. It combats the ideological and political offensive of the imperialists and the reactionaries who misrepresent socialism to mislead the people. It is absolutely necessary for the Party to study the processes and victories of the two-stage revolutions in the history of the international communist movement and the undermining and reversal of these by modern revisionism in the light of Mao's theory of continuing revolution under proletarian dictatorship. Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought gives us the scientific basis and optimism for winning the struggle against monopoly capitalism and reaction and for attaining socialism and ultimately communism.

The theoretical education promoted by the rectification movement necessarily extends to the understanding that national-democratic and socialist revolutions will surely resurge and that Mao's theory and practice of continuing revolution under proletarian dictatorship is a great resource for consolidating socialism, combating revisionism and preventing the restoration of capitalism the next time that socialist societies arise once more on a wider scale on the face of the earth.

10. Carry out the Philippine revolution
in the spirit of proletarian internationalism!

The new-democratic revolution in the Philippines is now at the forefront of the revolutionary struggle of the proletariat and people of the world against imperialism, modern revisionism and reaction. It is one of the few revolutionary movements now that are led by a Marxist-Leninist party, have some significant strength and, most important of all, are engaged in the revolutionary armed process of overthrowing the imperialists and the local reactionaries. The Philippine revolution has a signal role in upholding the torch of armed revolution while a more widespread armed revolution in the world is still to come. The Party is aware of its internationalist duty in leading the armed revolution. This is something to be proud of. But this is also something that calls for hard work and the spirit of self-sacrifice and modesty in the face of tremendous odds and the growing attempts of the imperialists and reactionaries to focus on the Philippine revolution in order to destroy it.

The rectification movement condemns and repudiates the counterrevolutionary line that the Filipino people are getting tired of their own resistance to the ceaseless violence of imperialist and class oppression and exploitation and that the CPP and the NDF must follow what is globally trendy and fashionable, which is capitulation to the enemy. Frustrated in pushing their line of combining military adventurism and urban insurrectionism and getting foreign military assistance and financial assistance, the

principal "Left" opportunists of the past have become counterrevolutionary Rightists and are the most active in spreading the noxious line of capitulationism and reformism. They are now aligned with the long-time principal Right opportunists who have long exposed themselves as anticommunists all along and who have had the least knowledge about the creation of Red political power in the countryside. These counterrevolutionary Rightists are getting funds from the U.S.-Ramos ruling clique and from foreign funding agencies to spread their line of anticommunism, anti-Stalinism, reformism and capitulationism.

To perform its internationalist duty most effectively, the Party continues to strengthen itself, wage protracted people's war and build the mass organizations and organs of political power self-reliantly. There is no way that the enemy can destroy the revolutionary movement because of the worsening crisis of the domestic ruling system and the world capitalist system. At the same time, the Party is actively cooperating with other Marxist-Leninist parties and pre-party formations in the world to propagate the theory and practice of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought and with all other entities that are opposed to imperialism and all reaction to bring about the resurgence of the anti-imperialist and socialist movement on a global scale.

Concluding Remarks

The rectification movement is consolidating the ranks of the Party and is infusing the core and the entirety of the revolutionary mass movement with an ever stronger revolutionary resolve and vigor. All honest cadres and members of the Communist Party of the Philippines are eager to raise the level of their revolutionary consciousness and militance through the rectification movement and the revolutionary struggle, while only a few incorrigible elements have brought themselves out of the Party in order to attack it from the outside along a blatantly anticommunist line.

We can be confident that the Party and the entire revolutionary movement will become ever stronger as a result of the second great rectification movement. We wish all the cadres and members of the Party and all the revolutionary masses under their leadership to win ever greater victories. The crisis of both the domestic ruling system and the world capitalist system are daily worsening. The objective conditions are favorable for strengthening the subjective forces of the Philippine revolution and for delivering effective blows on the counterrevolutionaries. The Communist Party of the Philippines will win ever greater victories.

Long live the Communist Party of the Philippines!

Long live the proletariat and people of the Philippines!

Long live proletarian internationalism!

Socialism and the New World Order²

28 September 1994

First of all, let me convey to all the conference participants and guests my warmest greetings of solidarity.

I am deeply pleased to be invited as the main speaker. In this regard, I wish to thank the Student Christian Movement and its leadership for the invitation.

I congratulate you for convening the conference and for your choice of theme. You are confronting the reality of a new world disorder that has resulted from the ravages of the global capitalist crisis, neocolonialism and the revisionist betrayal of socialism. And you are taking as a challenge the struggle for socialism against imperialism.

I propose to perform my role as speaker by posing a series of questions on the subject, socialism and the new world order, and trying to answer each of them.

There are four parts in my presentation. Part I consists of preliminary questions. Part II is about the basic principles and achievements of socialism. Part III is about modern revisionism and the theory of continuing revolution under proletarian dictatorship. Part IV is about the capitalist crisis of overproduction and the new world disorder.

I hope that my contribution to your conference is helpful enough in your effort to inform and enlighten yourselves on so important a subject.

I. Preliminary Questions

² Contribution to the Conference on Socialism and the New World Order

1. As you well know, the Philippine revolutionary movement continues to be one of the most outstanding armed revolutionary movements led by a communist party. How do we account for this fact?

A.: There is intolerable oppression and exploitation of the Filipino people by the foreign monopolies, big compradors and landlords. Thus, the people are eager to wage armed revolution.

The chronic crisis of the semicolonial and semifeudal ruling system makes possible protracted people's war along the general line of the democratic revolution. This is directed against the three evils of monopoly capitalism, domestic feudalism and bureaucrat capitalism.

The crisis of the ruling system is connected with the crisis of the world capitalist system. The persistent agrarian and semifeudal character of the economy, the extraction of superprofits by the foreign monopolies, the unfavorable terms of trade, the intolerable debt burden and so on weigh heavily on the people.

Having pointed out the favorable conditions for making revolution, let me refer you to the decisive role of the subjective forces. Chief of these forces is the Communist Party of the Philippines. It is guided by Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought and has correctly integrated this with the concrete conditions of the Philippines. Thus, the national-democratic revolution in the Philippines has grown in strength and advanced.

If you wish to know more about the Communist Party of the Philippines and the entire armed revolutionary movement, I advise you to read and study the issues of **Rebolusyon** and **Ang Bayan**.

2. What is the impact of the collapse of the ruling parties and regimes in the former Soviet bloc countries in the years of 1989 to 1991? Are there adverse results? Is there demoralization because help cannot be expected such countries and even the prospect of socialism is probably gone?

A.: The impact is minimal. There are adverse results only among some petty bourgeois progressives who in the first place do not understand the difference between Marxism-Leninism and modern revisionism, between socialism and monopoly bureaucrat capitalism and between proletarian internationalism and Soviet social-imperialism and who therefore are easily swayed by the imperialist ideological and political offensive related to the collapse of the ruling revisionist parties and regimes in the former Soviet bloc.

As far as the Communist Party of the Philippines is concerned, it feels vindicated that it has opposed Soviet modern revisionism and capitalist restoration since the reestablishment of the party in 1968. The Soviet and pro-Soviet parties have never been of help to the CPP and the Philippine revolution.

The pro-Soviet group of the Lavaites and all the Soviet and pro-Soviet parties abroad supported the Marcos dictatorship and opposed the revolutionary forces and the Filipino people. It should be the small inconsequential group of the Lavaites that is most embarrassed and demoralized by the disintegration of the Soviet and pro-Soviet parties and regimes abroad.

3. Can we agree with the view that the end of history has come, with capitalism and liberal democracy as the highest level of human development. Why?

A.: We certainly cannot agree with the view that the end of history has come. Capitalism has developed into monopoly capitalism, state monopoly-capitalism and neocolonialism and is

creating the conditions for its overthrow and the eventual rise of socialism to a new and higher level. Under conditions of monopoly capitalism or imperialism, there can be no liberal democracy but the class dictatorship of the big bourgeoisie.

It is a temporary phenomenon that the United States, Japan and Western Europe have greatly benefited from high technology for superprofits, neocolonialism and the revisionist betrayal of socialism. Even now, the capitalist crisis of overproduction has already created a new world disorder.

The countries subjected for so long to neocolonialism and revisionist betrayal of socialism are in turmoil. The global centers of capitalism are now reeling from a prolonged recession and from what is called jobless growth. Investments are going further into higher technology, are killing jobs and are intensifying cutthroat competition within and among capitalist countries.

The conditions for the eventual resurgence of anti-imperialist and socialist movements are increasingly favorable.

So long as humanity continues to exist, history does not end. It does not end even after the attainment of socialism or even communism.

4. Can we be optimistic about the future and about the history of humanity. What are the current driving forces for historical change against monopoly capitalism?

A.: Within the industrial centers of capitalism, the class struggle between the monopoly bourgeoisie and the working class is intensifying. The still employed and increasingly unemployed blue and white collar workers as well as the well-educated but largely unemployed youth will eventually press for socialism.

At the same time, the expanded number of oppressed nations and peoples in Asia, Africa and Latin America and in the countries where socialism has been betrayed for several decades have no choice now and in the future but to fight for national liberation and democracy against imperialism and reaction and aim for socialism.

5. The socialist future is something arising from current class contradictions. Can we describe what stages of development the working class has gone through in struggling for socialism?

A.: The struggle of the working class for socialism has gone through ups and downs and through twists and turns. But basically this global struggle has gone through three basic historical stages.

First stage is that of Marx and Engels. They laid down the basic principles of scientific socialism in the period of free competition capitalism in the 19th century.

Second stage is that of Lenin and Stalin. They made the first successful socialist revolution and construction in one country and proceeded to inspire socialist revolution in several countries and the national liberation movements in the global era of modern imperialism and proletarian revolution.

Third stage is that of Mao. He inherited the legacy of his great communist predecessors. But his unique contribution is the theory and initial practice of continuing revolution under proletarian dictatorship to combat revisionism, prevent the restoration of capitalism and consolidate socialism. This contribution opens the third stage.

II. Basic Principles and Achievements of Socialism

1. What are the principles of socialism laid down by Marx and Engels? Cite the conditions for the emergence of these principles?

A.: Before Marx and Engels, there were utopian ideas about socialism. They were utopian or impractical because they were based on sheer voluntarism.

Marx and Engels put the basic principles of socialism on a scientific basis by developing the philosophy of dialectical materialism, making a comprehensive critique of the capitalist political economy and showing how socialism can arise from the development and self-defeating career of capitalism.

The capitalist class wields its class dictatorship or state power over the working class and accumulates capital by extracting surplus value from the exploitation of the working class.

There is a contradiction between the social character of largescale machine production and the private mode of appropriation. Consequently, the forces of production can no longer be contained by the capitalist relations of production. The working class wages class struggle against the bourgeoisie and rises up to overthrow it.

To make the socialist revolution, the working class smashes and destroys the state power or class dictatorship of the bourgeoisie and replaces it with the proletarian class dictatorship or workers' state power.

Consequently, the socialist economy can be established and developed, with public ownership of the means of production, central planning, full employment and the constant raising of the cultural and living standard of the people.

The surplus value previously alienated from the working class is allocated for expanding production, raising wages, welfare measures, administration and defense.

2. Have the teachings of Marx and Engels been proven in the industrial capitalist countries? How?

A: Yes, of course. In the industrial capitalist countries, the big division is between the few who are big bourgeois who live on dividends and the more than 75 percent of society who do not live on dividends but on wages and salaries.

Since the time of Marx and Engels, great polarization has occurred. The workers' class struggle has taken the form of the trade union movement and then the proletarian revolutionary parties. The capitalist class has used a variety of political weapons to deceive and suppress the working class. The anti-proletarian forces include those espousing liberal democracy, social democracy, Christian democracy, liberal fascism and so on.

Capitalism has gone into global crises and wars. World War I provided the conditions for the rise of socialism in one country. Russia was a country with a capitalist industrial base although this was surrounded by an ocean of feudalism and medievalism. World War II provided the conditions for the rise of a giant wave of national liberation movements and socialism in several countries.

The current global centers of capitalism have been able to superimpose themselves on the world because of neocolonialism and the revisionist betrayal of socialism. But there is now social turmoil on an unprecedented scale in the world.

3. Lenin who inherited the legacy of Marxism and developed it further to the stage of Leninism. What were his main contributions?

In philosophy, Lenin successfully fought against the bourgeois subjectivists, especially the empiricists, to defend Marxist philosophy. He propounded the theory of uneven development to show that socialism can arise from Russia which was the weakest link in the chain of imperialist countries. In political economy, he critiqued monopoly capitalism or modern imperialism. In the twentieth century, free competition capitalism had grown into monopoly capitalism as the dominant force.

Leninism is Marxism in the era of modern imperialism and proletarian revolution. Lenin showed the way to win the proletarian revolution and build the first socialist state by strengthening the vanguard party of the proletariat and relying on the masses. He successfully fought not only the gross evil of czarism but also classical revisionism and the other more recognizable stripes of bourgeois ideology and politics.

As far as establishing socialism is concerned, Lenin followed the Marxist principle that the socialist state is a class dictatorship of the working class and he nationalized the large industrial enterprises and the land to provide the proletariat with the commanding heights of the economy.

Because of civil war and the foreign interventionist war, during which "war communism" or the ration system was followed, Lenin consequently had to resort to the temporary necessity of the new economic policy which was designed to revive the Soviet economy as soon as possible by giving concessions to the petty commodity producers (including the rich peasants and small entrepreneurs) and the traders.

It would fall upon the shoulders of Stalin to carry out the new economic policy (NEP) up to a certain point and then push forward in earnest socialist industrialization and the collectivization of agriculture in 1929.

4. What were the achievements of Stalin in socialist revolution and construction?

He continued Lenin's line of socialist revolution. He united and consolidated the Soviet Union as a socialist country. He stood firmly for the line of socialism in one country and defeated the ultra-Lefist and yet defeatist line of Trotsky that socialism could survive in the Soviet Union only if there would be successful uprisings in western Europe.

After the NEP served its purposes, Stalin pushed forward socialist industrialization and collectivization of agriculture. He stood firmly against the Right opportunist line of Bukharin. If Bukharin had had his way, the bourgeoisie would have grown out of control from the rich peasants, the traders and other bourgeois forces and swamped the proletarian state. Without the prompt advance of socialist revolution and construction, the Soviet Union would have been unable to face subsequently the threats of the bourgeois nationalists and international fascism in the thirties.

After the first five-year economic plan, the cultural and living and cultural standards of the Soviet people were vastly improved. The peasant masses benefited from collectivization and the mechanization which was made possible by the fullscale industrialization. Before the Nazi invasion, the Soviet Union had already established a comprehensive industrial base.

Under Stalin's leadership, great numbers of the children of the working class and peasantry became educated up to the university and graduate levels. The Soviet Union produced the greatest number of research scientists, engineers, doctors of medicine, fulltime writers and artists and so on. Marxism-Leninism, scientific training and socialist realism had the upper hand in the cultural field.

Stalin continued Lenin's general line of proletarian internationalism, promoted the national liberation movements in the colonial and semicolonial countries, defended the Soviet Union and turned the tide against the Nazi invasions and international fascism.

After World War II, Stalin reconstructed socialist industry and agriculture, developed a powerful defense, countered U.S. imperialism in Europe and Asia and inspired and supported the national liberation movements and socialism in several countries.

5. While the achievements of Stalin were great and undeniable, he must have made some serious mistakes in his long period of leadership. What are those serious errors?

A.: The most serious ideological errors of Stalin included his notion that socialism could prevail so long as the productive forces were developing, that there could be a full correspondence between the relations and forces of production and between the mode of production and the superstructure and that there were no more exploiting classes and no more class struggle in the Soviet society, except the intensifying one between the Soviet people and the external enemy (the imperialists and their local agents).

The difference between the contradictions among the people and the contradictions between the people and the enemy was slurred over. There was a great deal of dependence on administrative measures in pushing production, in maintaining social order and in going after those construed as enemies of the people. There was no narrowing of the target in the mass campaigns against the enemy. The security agencies were too powerful. The judicial process and the principle of due process were not rigorously used to narrow the target.

On the soft side of Stalin, he abolished the communist minimum and the communist maximum in the compensation of communists. Communist minimum was equivalent to the

average wage of workers and communist maximum was equivalent to the highest workers' wage. Communist cadres were allowed to get compensation similar to that of the experts bought off from the old regime.

Levels of compensation were raised en masse for the bureaucracy and the new intelligentsia. Concessions were also given to the Russian Orthodox Church and other reactionary institutions in 1939 in the spirit of forging the patriotic unity of the Soviet people against the threat of Nazi invasion.

6. In the period before the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution, what were the achievements of Mao Zedong?

A.: Up to the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution, the achievements of Mao Zedong in carrying out the new democratic revolution through protracted people's war and subsequently in socialist revolution and construction were very much within the stage of Leninism. Mao was the unprecedentedly great master of protracted people's war but the theory and practice of the two-stage revolution was still mainly essentially the achievement of Lenin.

Mao learnt much from Lenin and Stalin in upholding the leadership of the proletariat in the people's democratic state, in taking over the commanding heights of the economy, in adopting transition measures and in carrying out the basic socialist transformation of the economy. He also agreed with Stalin in maintaining the socialist momentum in economic construction.

But he greatly improved on the pioneering example of Stalin in socialist construction by putting forward and carrying out the line of developing heavy and basic industry as the leading factor, agriculture as the base and light industry as the bridge to serve immediate producer and consumer needs. Thus he lightened the load on the peasantry.

The Great Leap Forward, which is much maligned in the West, conformed to this line and was successful in countering the effects of natural calamities, the sabotage by the Soviet revisionists and the continuously running imperialist blockade.

In confronting the revisionist renegades centered in the Soviet Union as well as the opportunists in the Chinese party, Mao made the most comprehensive and most profound critique of modern revisionism. Before he positively put forward the theory of continuing revolution and before he initiated the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution, he had already laid the theoretical ground for these through the critique of modern revisionism.

7. What was the course of development in the countries of Eastern Europe other than the Soviet Union?

A.: These countries were successful for a while in socialist revolution and construction in so far as they followed the teachings of Lenin and Stalin. However, there were inherent weaknesses in the parties that came to power in Eastern Europe. Also, the Khrushchovite influence came too soon to sabotage the course of socialism.

In most East European countries, the ruling parties consisted of a mix-up of communists and social democrats who became communists overnight. Even before the Khrushchovite revisionist influence took effect, the Right opportunist trend was already strong among the former social democrats in the ruling party and the bourgeois nationalists and religious forces in society were likewise strong. There was fertile ground for the Khrushchov influence to thrive on as early as 1956.

Programs of industrialization were adopted and there was a erroneous belief that industrialization would automatically

solve the land problem. Thus, land reform was not seriously carried out. In all East European countries, except Albania, the rich peasants or the rural bourgeoisie continued to be a strong base for generating the bourgeoisie.

Special mention must be made of Yugoslavia. Tito became a bourgeois nationalist and revisionist. He pulled backed from land reform and whipped up workplace egoism under the guise of workers' self-management. He was ahead of Khrushchov in modern revisionism and in fighting Stalin. He went overboard to the side of the imperialists despite his nonalignment rhetoric.

III. Modern Revisionism and the Theory of Continuing Revolution

1. What is revisionism? What are the similarities and differences between classical and modern revisionism? Please elaborate on modern revisionism?

A.: Revisionism is bourgeois ideology masquerading as Marxism and revising the fundamental principles of Marxism. This is the common ground and similarity of classical and modern revisionism.

The fundamental principles pertain to materialist dialectics, class struggle, state and revolution, the nature of imperialism and so on. The essential purpose of revisionism is to replace the proletarian revolutionary line with the bourgeois reactionary line within the ranks of the proletarian revolutionaries.

The most glaring difference between classical and modern revisionism is that the principal exponents of classical revisionism were not in power and were parliamentary tails of the bourgeoisie and supporters of imperialism in the period before World War I and the principal exponents of modern revisionism held state power after World War II and restored capitalism in socialist countries.

More differences can be cited if we relate the ideological revisions to the different concrete circumstances in which the classical and modern revisionists operated.

2. How did the revisionists come to power? When did the modern revisionists start to restore capitalism?

A: Before the revisionists came to power, they existed within the ruling communist party even as the proletarian revolutionary line prevailed. This is true in the case of the Soviet and Chinese parties.

The influence of the old exploiting classes persists in socialist society and is reflected in the communist party. More subtle is the emergence of a new bourgeoisie among the party and state bureaucrats. At first, a new petty bourgeoisie arises among them and generates a line against socialist revolution and construction.

The subjectivists, opportunists and revisionists are bred by conditions internal and external to the ruling communist party. Thus, there is always a two-line struggle, only varying in intensity at various times.

All Marxist-Leninists recognize that there must be a comprehensive, scientific view of things as a precondition for taking the proletarian revolutionary stand, viewpoint and method. But there are those who systematically take a rightist or bourgeois stand, viewpoint and method and capitalize and speculate on that side of the objective reality which serves them.

The mass of new petty bourgeoisie serves as the social base for the rise of the bureaucrat monopoly bourgeoisie. In coming to power, the revisionists at the highest level of the ruling party

and state undertake a series of actions to split the ranks of the proletarian revolutionaries, including a series of coups d'etat.

Upon coming to power, the highest revisionists begin to restore capitalism, become the highest stratum of bureaucrat capitalists. At first, they do not privatize public assets and place these under their names. Their main job is to make revisionist ideas dominant and ideologically to discredit the proletarian revolutionary line through a personalistic line of attack on Stalin as in Soviet Union and on Mao as in China and to adopt and implement policies that destroy the foundation of socialism and restore capitalism.

3. How was modern revisionism promoted as the ruling ideology and how was capitalism first restored by Khrushchov?

A: The ruling modern revisionists in the Soviet Union, from Khrushchov through Brezhnev to Gorbachov consistently preached that the working class had accomplished the historic mission of the working class, that the proletarian class stand and class struggle within Soviet society have become outdated and that it was time to go supraclass and go for universal humanism or for a cosmopolitan civilization which is contemptible of the proletariat and its class struggle.

This revisionist view is an extension and magnification of the 1936 error of considering that exploiting classes and antagonistic class struggle had ceased in the Soviet Union, except the struggle between the Soviet people and the external enemy.

Under the guise of denouncing the personality cult of Stalin, Khrushchov completely negated his achievements and undermined the socialist achievements of the Soviet proletariat and people. He invoked the name of Lenin in order to attack Leninism in essence.

Under the pretext of going supraclass, Khrushchov put forward bourgeois populist slogans which denied the proletarian character of the communist party and state. He preached bourgeois pacifism and said that the transition from capitalism to socialism had become peaceful, that imperialism had changed its aggressive nature, that defeating imperialism was a matter of economic competition, that it was possible to have a world without arms and without wars and that the general line of the international communist movement was peaceful coexistence.

As regards the Soviet economy, Khrushchov invoked the law of value in accordance with Adam Smith, laid aside the critical Marxist theory of surplus value and with the objective of removing labor power and the principal means of production from the sphere of socialist planning and transforming them fully into commodities for buy-and-sell in the market.

To start breaking up the Soviet economy and creating a capitalist economy and market, he dissolved the central planning ministries and pretended to decentralize and bring down the highest level of planning to the regions, promoted factory egoism by making enterprises individually responsible for cost-and-profit accounting, broke up the machine and tractor stations controlled by the working class and made the farm collectives the buyers and direct owners of the machines and tractors, encouraged direct business transactions between enterprises and regions, expanded the private plots of the members of collectives and encouraged petty commodity production in agriculture, services and trade and the free market.

Khrushchov whipped up material incentives and economism and prated about building the material and technical foundation of communism in twenty years exactly when he was breaking

up the socialist economy and laying the basis for the economic rise of the bourgeoisie as private owners of productive assets.

In the cultural sphere, it became fashionable to scorn the achievements of socialism as the works of the demonized Stalin, to look up to the West for higher learning and business management, to either camouflage or flaunt bourgeois ideas against Marxism-Leninism and to go for "universal humanism" and even mysticism against socialist realism.

4. How did Brezhnev push the restoration of capitalism in the Soviet Union? What was the outcome domestically and internationally?

A: Brezhnev, who ruled the Soviet Union for a long period of time, was even more deceptive than Khrushchov. He pretended to rehabilitate the prestige of Stalin but went full blast to restore capitalism, carrying out vigorously what Khrushchov started.

He restored some central planning ministries, to assure the central level of the Soviet state of revenues and the bureaucrat monopoly bourgeoisie of superprofits and accelerate spending for the military-industrial complex engaged in the arms race. In fact, it became impossible to have socialist planning because the state enterprises and collectives were transformed into private fiefdoms and prices of the same commodities varied widely in prices from place to place.

The new economic system of Brezhnev and Kosygin allowed the entire new bourgeoisie to rob the state, to take cuts in the buy-and-sell of the means of production and consumer goods between the Soviet Union and foreign countries, regions and enterprises, to autonomize industrial enterprises and collectives on a far wider scale than during Khrushchov's time and to fire workers in large numbers from their jobs and make

so-called savings on the wage fund in enterprises in order to increase the salaries, bonuses and other perks for the managers.

The revisionists misrepresented the new economic system as similar to the new economic policy of Lenin in the twenties and as the way to socialism. They lied against Lenin by claiming that he meant the new economic policy to be the socialist road itself and not as a transitory measure of concessions to nonsocialist forces.

The bureaucrat capitalists encouraged the increase in number of the privateers in both industry, agriculture and the services and collaborated with them in rechanneling goods from the state to the private sector. Goods were bought cheap from the state enterprises and sold dear to the public. The pilferage which started during Khrushchov's time assumed colossal proportions. The criminal syndicates had connections up to the level of Brezhnev's family.

At the end of the Brezhnev rule, there were already 30 million private capitalists, specialized in collaborating with the bureaucrat capitalists.

Brezhnev was fond of saying that socialism in the Soviet Union was irreversible exactly at the time that he was rapidly restoring capitalism. He prated about proletarian internationalism but engaged in social imperialism and neocolonialism in relations with other countries in the Soviet bloc and in the third world.

The rivalry between the U.S. and the Soviet Union in the cold war gave the latter at certain times the appearance of being anti-imperialist and progressive. But in fact, the Soviet Union engaged in social imperialist aggression as in Czechoslovakia and Afghanistan and in neocolonial methods of exploitation as in Eastern Europe and elsewhere in which it delivered shoddy overpriced equipment on credit and took back underpriced products from the debtor countries.

In the latter part of the '70s, the Soviet economy was already in a state of depression, exhausted by the ravages of bureaucrat monopoly capitalism and the arms race. The Soviet Union which was a neocolonial power was itself prey to the superior neocolonialism of West Germany and the entire West.

5. How did Gorbachov complete the process of capitalist restoration?

A: By the time Gorbachov came to power, the Soviet Union was ripe for an undisguised and much faster restoration of capitalism. The bureaucrat monopoly capitalists were eager to legalize their ill-gotten assets to shed off their socialist masks and to privatize public assets on a full scale.

The catchphrases of "perestroika" and "glasnost" were flimsy and short-term devices for discarding the phony communist party and equally phony socialist facade of the bourgeois class dictatorship and for accelerating the direct privatization of state and party assets.

To mislead the Soviet people, Gorbachov urged them to join private cooperatives patterned after those in Yugoslavia. But the main thing was not to favor the 50 million people who registered as members of such private cooperatives but to create the atmosphere for legalizing the ill-gotten assets of the bureaucrat and private capitalists and pave the way for a vigorous privatization of public assets.

Gorbachov converted the Soviet Union fully into a neocolony of the West. By one indicator, he incurred a foreign debt of 50 billion dollars within a few years on top of the 30 billion dollars incurred by the Brezhnev regime. Then, he proceeded to break up the Soviet bloc and the Soviet Union itself. At the end of his regime and the Soviet Union, he spoke in undiluted anticommunist terms.

I need not speak at length on Gorbachov because there is general recognition that he, together with Yeltsin, Yakovlev and Sheverdnadze, is responsible for the final stage in the restoration of capitalism by the modern revisionists or the bureaucrat monopoly bourgeoisie in the Soviet Union.

6. Can you describe concisely the course of socialism in Yugoslavia, the other East European countries, North Korea and Vietnam?

A: The Tito ruling clique was the first to become revisionist in Eastern Europe. It walked off the socialist road as early as 1948. Tito's economist Kardelij was ahead of Lieberman, Ota Sik and the like in theorizing and working out the economic policy of capitalist restoration under the guise of making socialism more efficient with the help of capitalism [capitalist methods].

Since 1956, when Khrushchov started to destroy socialism in the Soviet Union, the countries that were in the Comecon and Warsaw Pact also started to take the capitalist road. The counterrevolutionary uprisings in Hungary and Poland were crude but signal attempts of the reactionaries to take power and get out of the Warsaw Pact. The revisionists suppressed them but they themselves were out to restore capitalism through peaceful evolution.

The socialist foundation of the East European countries up to 1956 was in the first place still weak. Even if certain countries like Czechoslovakia and East Germany eventually became stronger industrial economies than the rest in Eastern Europe, socialism was more of a facade than a reality because the working class was alienated from the state and from what they produced. The monopoly bureaucrat bourgeoisie appropriated the political power and social economy.

The regimes in Hungary and Poland had a clearly bureaucrat big-comprador character. Mongolia and Bulgaria were the most underdeveloped and were practically the ranch economy and orchard economy of the Soviet Union respectively in the Comecon division of labor.

Romania appeared to be assertively independent of the Soviet Union. But in fact, it became tied to the Western economies as early as the '70s like the other Eastern European countries in the Soviet bloc. As soon as its oil resources were depleted, Romania was in deep economic trouble. Ceausescu was a bourgeois nationalist and a revisionist and appeared good to both China and the West because he tried to maintain independence from the Soviet Union.

By the time that Gorbachov decided to sell off its fraternal countries to the West, he could easily do so. That is an indication of how much of capitalism had developed in these countries and how decisive was the willingness of the Soviet Union to concede defeat. The Soviet troops stood by as the revisionist regimes fell one after the other in Eastern Europe. Gorbachov had already arranged with Bush and Kohl the collapse of the revisionist-ruled regimes.

Albania under Enver Hoxha cut a heroic figure up to sometime in the '70s because it stood defiant of Soviet social imperialism as well as of Chinese modern revisionism which he falsely ascribed to Mao Zedong and not to Deng Xiao Ping and the like. But the scale of Albania is small, was overdependent on the export of copper and hydroelectric power and was vulnerable to capitalist pressure and penetration. The ruling clique there turned blatantly revisionist before it was overthrown.

Vietnam has gone the way of China after the breakup of the Soviet bloc. Cuba was constricted within the Comecon and remained dependent on sugar production. But the communist party and the state have stayed on because of the

political will to defend its national independence and social achievements. In view of the economic scale of Cuba, the odds and threats from U.S. imperialism are tremendous.

North Korea remains now relatively the strongest exponent of national independence and socialism. It has a comprehensive economy and takes pride in self-reliance. Its geographic proximity to China is an advantage against imperialist threats. At the same time, U.S. and Japanese imperialism are doing everything in their power to pressure and induce Korea to make capitalist-oriented reforms.

7. Is China a socialist or capitalist country? If it is capitalist, how has it become so?

A: China has become a capitalist country since the revisionist came to power in 1976. The bureaucrat monopoly bourgeoisie is in power. The all-China and provincial officials of the communist party and state enrich themselves by using their offices in getting kickbacks on business contracts and loans from the state and acquiring shares of stocks and other assets for themselves, their relatives and friends.

Deng Xiaoping returned to the bourgeoisie the capital it had owned and allowed it to enlarge this capital by raiding the state banks and engaging in all kinds of businesses autonomously and in combination with the transnational firms and banks and overseas Chinese capitalists.

The rural industries developed on a widescale during the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution were turned over to the private entrepreneurs under the legal fiction of management lease. The communes have been broken up and the land has been delivered only to a portion of the individual peasant households under the legal fiction of land lease.

The surplus labor has been directed towards construction jobs and work in sweat shops under working and living conditions worse than those in the Philippines. The jobs are unstable. Thus, there is now a floating population of oddjobbers of about 130 million. Unemployment could be as high as 300 million in China.

The foreign and domestic big bourgeoisie has all the right to form its business organizations and hire and fire workers. But the workers are subjected to so-called socialist labor discipline which is actually bourgeois exploitation and are prohibited from organizing their own unions, independent of the official revisionist-controlled unions.

The state enterprises and banks are milking cows of both bureaucrat and private capitalists. Goods and services are bought from the state and delivered cheap to the private capitalists, foreign and domestic. State ownership of major enterprises does not necessarily mean socialism. It is also a tool of bureaucrat capitalism.

State employees amount now only to 19 percent of those employed. This is a glaring indicator of the break-up of socialism in China. Even in post-revisionist Russia, state employees still amount to 52 percent of those employed because the bureaucrat monopoly bourgeoisie cannot privatize or close down all at once the public enterprises.

An overwhelming majority of consumer goods, at least two-thirds, is now produced by the private sector which buys cheap equipment, energy and raw materials from the public sector and yet decries the public sector for being financed by taxes.

Private ownership of the means of production has gone wide and deep. Because labor power and the means of production have been fully re-commodified and because the prices are anarchic, there is no more effective central state planning to develop socialism and serve social needs.

The income structure in China now is similar to that of the United States and the Philippines. The gross income differences show that only a small portion of the population, less than 10 percent, is getting the largess while the rest suffer increasing poverty and misery.

The Chinese economy is now fully integrated with and subordinate to the world capitalist system. It is preoccupied by the most favored nation status and other business accommodations from the United States. It is vulnerable to the current world capitalist crisis of overproduction and to manipulation by the imperialists. The entire pattern of Chinese economic development is already determined by the imperialists and is on the course of neocolonialism. We are witness today how the U.S. officials use economic and political threats to pressure China.

It is only a matter of time that the so-called forces of political liberalization generated by the bourgeois forces of economic liberalization will discard the names and shells of the communist party and state. After all, these are already dominated by the bureaucrat monopoly bourgeoisie.

8. How did the Chinese revisionists revise the fundamental principles of Marxism-Leninism? What were those principles revised in order to undermine and destroy socialism?

A: The Chinese revisionists from Liu Shaoqi to Deng Xiaoping, put forward the idea that building socialism was merely a matter of developing the productive forces and considered the socialist relations of production as backward, that the national-democratic revolution must first be consolidated and the socialist revolution and construction must be restrained and that there was no need for the working class to revolutionize the relations of production and the superstructure to promote the forces of production.

And yet self-contradictorily they prated about the dying out of classes and class struggle even while they promoted the persistence and growth of the influence of the old reactionary classes and the new bourgeoisie in the Party, state and economy in opposition to the line of Lenin and Mao that socialism will last for a whole historical epoch and Mao's correct view that the main contradiction is between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie in socialist society.

To attack the Marxist-Leninist comprehension of the law of value, they went back to Adam Smith, as if Marx had never discovered the theory of surplus value and as if he had never put forward the scientific socialist line that the working class must control and use what they produce in a planned way in order to prevent the bourgeoisie from appropriating this for itself and for using it to dominate the proletariat and the rest of the people.

The Chinese revisionists have caricatured socialism as nothing more than an absolutely egalitarian supply system based on permanent poverty, a pot from which everyone gets his equal rice share irrespective of the quantity and quality of work done, as if there had been no system of wage differentials under Mao, and no possibility of moral incentives and civic sense. They have scorned the people's communes as collective irresponsibility and the restoration of the rich peasants as individual household responsibility.

9. What are the achievements of Mao in developing the theory and practice of scientific socialism? How do you relate his achievements to those of his great predecessors like Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin? If Mao's achievements were so great, how come that his revisionist opponents eventually defeated his line starting from 1976?

An excellent summary of the theoretical and practical achievements of Mao is the General Declaration on Mao

Zedong Thought signed recently by several Marxism-Leninism parties and organizations on the occasion of the 100th birth anniversary of Mao on December 26 last year. These great contributions are in the spheres of materialist philosophy, political economy, social science and strategy and tactics. All these have a bearing on the theory and practice of scientific socialism.

In dialectical materialist philosophy, Mao penetrated and elaborated on the law of the unity of opposites as operating in all things and processes, and explained the dialectical relationship between knowledge and social practice, between the forces of production and the relations of production within the mode of production and between the mode of production and the superstructure.

In political economy, Mao extended the critique of capitalism and imperialism to the critique of neocolonialism and monopoly bureaucrat capitalism in revisionist ruled societies, improved on the pioneering example of Soviet socialism and demonstrated in theory and practice the development of socialist revolution and construction in various stages in the Chinese revolution, going through the stages of the basic socialist transformation of the economy, the Great Leap Forward and the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution.

In strategy and tactics, everyone acknowledges Mao's great mastery in theorizing and practicing the new-democratic revolution through protracted people's war and his subsequent great leadership in socialist revolution and construction against tremendous odds, including a relentless imperialist blockade and revisionist sabotage, up to the Great Leap Forward and the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution. He was a great victor in his own lifetime.

He adhered resolutely to the general line of proletarian internationalism in the international communist movement,

promoted the international united front against imperialism, revisionism and reaction, firmly supported the struggles of the oppressed nations and peoples in Asia, Africa and Latin America and practiced correctly the diplomatic policy of peaceful coexistence.

Mao succeeded in bringing the theory and practice of Marxism to a new and higher stage, that of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought. He made the most comprehensive and most profound critique of modern revisionism and put forward the theory of continuing revolution under proletarian dictatorship in order to combat modern revisionism, prevent the restoration of capitalism and consolidate socialism and carried out the initial practice of this theory through the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution.

It is to the great credit of Mao that he was able to prevent modern revisionism from gaining a dominant position in China for twenty years since 1956 and proceeding further to make the most comprehensive critique of modern revisionism and putting forward the theory and practice of continuing revolution under proletarian dictatorship. This great achievement of Mao is a further development of the fundamental principles of Marxism-Leninism which he inherited from Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin.

In his lifetime Mao won great victories in the struggle against imperialism, revisionism and neocolonialism and for socialist revolution and construction. He waged his revolutionary struggle still under the conditions of the global era of imperialism and proletarian revolution. But he provided the theory and initial practice of combating and defeating revisionism and neocolonialism. It is true that soon after the death of Mao, revisionism and neocolonialism would start to become dominant in China. This regressive development has occurred precisely because of the violation of Mao's theory and practice of continuing revolution under proletarian dictatorship.

Let us remember that Mao had to overcome not only the blatant enemies of the Chinese revolution and the "Left" and Right opportunists and revisionists within the Chinese party and state when the Chinese proletariat won one great victory after another. Mao himself pointed out that the main contradiction between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie in socialist society will take a long historical period and that one cultural revolution such as the one between 1967 to 1976, the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution, would not be enough to finally resolve the contradiction but several cultural revolutions will finally resolve this if the proletarian dictatorship continues to exist.

We must admit that the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution has proven not to be enough to prevent the peaceful evolution from socialism to capitalism. This has already occurred using as factors of retrogression the following: the revisionist bureaucrat bourgeoisie, the remnants of the exploiting classes, the tens of thousands of Chinese students and trainees who came under revisionist influence in the Soviet Union during the '50s, the expatriates Chinese capitalists, the great mass of restored rich peasants and the resurrected big and medium and small entrepreneurs and traders in Chinese society.

The undeniable capitalist restoration in China is precisely now the reason for upholding the theory and practice of Mao Zedong Thought. To misrepresent it, chop it up or to blatantly violate it is to restore capitalism as the Chinese revisionists headed by Deng Xiaoping have already done.

10. Why should Mao Zedong Thought hold any significance, relevance or influence to the theory and practice of scientific socialism despite the restoration of capitalism in China?

A: Scientific socialism is the way out of or the way forward from capitalism. But some people will always raise the point that socialism in so far as it has existed can only lead to

revisionism and the restoration of capitalism. If we were to limit our understanding of the theory and practice of scientific socialism only up to Stalin or even up to the Great Leap Forward of Mao, we would not be able to understand and explain the problem of revisionism and the problem of capitalist restoration within socialist society.

Among the communist leaders, it was Mao Zedong who confronted the problem of revisionism and capitalist restoration and put forward a series of principles and methods for continuing the revolution under proletarian dictatorship in order to combat revisionism, prevent the restoration of capitalism and consolidate socialism. His theory and initial practice of continuing revolution give us the foresight that we can make advances in socialism up to the threshold of communism in addition to the well-proven theory of scientific socialism up to Lenin and Stalin. Every basic proposition that Mao made about modern revisionism has been proven correct. If revisionism can misrepresent itself as Marxism-Leninism, and capitalist restoration as socialism, then socialism can be defeated as in the former Soviet Union, China and elsewhere.

As Lenin pointed out before him, Mao reaffirmed that socialism would take a whole historical epoch contrary to the view of the revisionists that the working class had accomplished its historic mission of building socialism and that socialism was irreversible. He categorically stated that the main contradiction in socialist society was still between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie and that socialism was reversible through peaceful evolution unless the revolutionary proletariat found a way to solve the problem.

And Mao found a solution in his theory of continuing revolution which was initially put into practice in the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution. Guided by materialist dialectics, Mao said that revolutionary politics must be in command of production, that the socialist relations of

production must enhance the forces of production and that the revolutionary proletariat must revolutionize the superstructure in order to enhance the socialist mode of production.

Mao was vigilant towards the vestigial influence of the old exploiting classes and even more so towards the emergence of the new bourgeoisie among the bureaucrats and new intelligentsia. He was always mindful of restricting bourgeois rights in order to keep the socialist direction and advance the socialist revolution and construction. To counter the distancing of one generation after another from revolutionary experience among the youth, he conceived of and initiated the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution as the way for them to gain revolutionary experience and overthrow the capitalist-roaders in the state, party, economy and culture.

Like all his great communist predecessors, Mao was firm about putting revolutionary politics in command, about solving the contradictions between the working class and the peasantry, between urban and rural areas and between manual and mental labor, about preventing gross disparities in income, about the dangers of petty commodity production and about the force of old habits and customs.

In the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution, Mao encouraged the masses to criticize and overthrow party and state officials who were taking the capitalist road. The revolutionary committees arose in factories and communes. The three-in-one combination was formed to make the leadership include the representatives of the party, the masses and the experts. There was the requirement for being Red and expert among cadres and the requirement of mutual supervision between officials and masses. A system was adopted in which directors participated in work and the workers and peasants participated in management. The top-down Soviet system of one-man directorship was junked in favor of collectivity and the mass line.

The Cultural Revolution sought to make Marxism-Leninism to guide to all fields of study and practice, to eradicate all bourgeois, revisionist and reactionary ideas and to make possible the children of the working class and peasantry to reach the university level in great numbers and assume responsibilities in the ruling party and state, without becoming transformed into a new bourgeoisie.

The restoration of capitalism in China does not invalidate the theory and practice of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought but proves that discarding it is a precondition for the restoration of capitalism. The defeat of the Paris Commune of 1871 never invalidated the theory of proletarian revolution and proletarian dictatorship but clarified the basic principles of proletarian revolution and provided the positive and negative lessons for the victory of the Bolshevik Revolution. It is therefore absolutely necessary to study Mao's theory of continuing revolution and learn the lessons from the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution.

IV. The Capitalist Crisis of Overproduction and the New World Disorder

1. What have been the outstanding characteristics of the world capitalist system since World War II up to the present?

A: The major industrial capitalist countries have gone into an unprecedented global integration through multilateral agencies like the IMF, World Bank, GATT, OECD, Group of 7 and the like and have gone into unprecedented global expansion of capital. These have been motivated by lessons learnt from the crisis that led to World War I and World War II and by the scheme to counter the spread of the anti-imperialist and socialist movement after World War II.

The development of high technology has been accelerated in military production and passed on to civil production for the purpose of raking in superprofits. All kinds of public and private financial instruments and devices have been developed, in one part to assist production, in another part to accelerate circulation and consumerism and to fuel corporate speculation in industrial capitalist countries.

Finance capitalism has been developed as never before not only to allow the monopolies to rob public and private savings in industrial capitalist countries but also to undertake neocolonialism for the purposes of dominating the economies and negating the formal political independence of semicolonies and dependent countries. Learning from the methods of Soviet social-imperialism and learning lessons from the futility of the wars of imperialist aggression in the Korean and Vietnam war, the United States and other major industrial capitalist countries have used loan capital in unprecedentedly great amounts, in addition to direct investments, to penetrate and control not only the semicolonies and former colonies of western imperialism but even countries that had become revisionist-ruled but still calling themselves socialist.

The revisionist restoration of capitalism in socialist countries has also been a major and crucial component of the world capitalist system. Even before the collapse of the revisionist regimes in the Soviet-bloc countries, they were already drawn into the world capitalist system. The revisionist betrayal of socialism in the Soviet Union and other countries since 1956 did not only mean the peaceful evolution of socialism to capitalism in those countries but also the co-participation and competition of Soviet Union in neocolonialism, notwithstanding the peaking of cold war rivalry in Brezhnev's time.

2. How did the Soviet Union practise neocolonialism?

A: Since the time of Khrushchov, the Soviet Union pretended to extend loans to other countries at no interest rate or at small fixed interest. But the shoddy equipment delivered was overpriced, thus concealing the actual high interest rates on the loans. The loans were either paid for by products of the industrial equipment delivered or by agricultural products. The products delivered in payment for the loans were underpriced.

The Soviet social imperialists practised this kind of neocolonialism on the other COMECON countries, on China up to the end of the '50s, Egypt until the early '70s, on Angola and several African countries and on India until the collapse of the Soviet Union. Payments in the form of goods were underpriced, thus maximizing the profits from the overpriced delivery of Soviet equipment and fuel. The effects of neocolonialism practised by Soviet social imperialism were no different from those of the one practised by U.S. imperialism. The economic development of the neocolonial client states became retarded and lopsided.

The prevalent notion before was that the main thrust of Soviet assistance was industrial development while that of U.S. assistance was anti-industrial. But the Soviet Union conceived of an international division of labor in which the Soviet Union was the comprehensive economy while the satellite economies concentrated on certain raw material and only on certain aspects of an industry.

While the Soviet Union practised neocolonialism on several countries, the Soviet monopoly bureaucrat bourgeoisie became beaten in the competition at the game of neocolonialism by the economically superior imperialist powers and itself tended to become a neocolonial client state of Western imperialism, especially West Germany.

3. What are the implications of high technology in the class struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie in the industrial capitalist countries and in the world at large?

A: The high technology consisting of the use of computers, robotics and genetic engineering to raise industrial and agricultural productivity should hasten the contradiction between the capitalist relations of production and the forces of production and sharpen the class struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie faster than the old electromechanical and chemical processes. Right now, there is an unprecedented crisis of overproduction. There are large inventories of goods in both industry and agriculture which cannot be sold profitably. Thus there is a prolonged recession in the world capitalist system.

Large numbers of capitalist firms have gone into bankruptcy or into mergers. The winning monopolies are driven to adopt higher technology to assure themselves lower production costs and higher profits. There is now the phenomenon of jobless growth, meaning to say higher investments are being made by the winning monopolies but these are accompanied by layoffs. At any rate, the national economies of the industrial capitalist countries are registering low rates of growth.

There are high unemployment rates in the industrial capitalist countries. The official figures conceal a lot of the unemployment by excluding from the accounting of employment those who stop looking for jobs after a few months, those who are on retraining or on make-work programs, those who are put off on early retirement and those who claim to be self-employed.

To make up for the general tendency of the rate of profit to fall, the bourgeoisie as a whole is more greedily swiping off public and private savings, cutting down social benefits and privatizing sure-profit public utilities. The three strongest centers of capitalism, the United States, Japan and Western

Europe, are engaged in national and regional consolidation, are trying to revive their manufacturing capabilities and reducing their purchase orders of manufactured consumer goods from other countries, have serious problems with their agricultural surpluses are in increasingly sharp competition. The countries that once before depended on high technology equipment without the capability to reproduce this or produce the spare parts are now at the mercy of the major industrial capitalist countries.

The current crisis of overproduction in the centers of world capitalism is preceded by the crisis of overproduction in raw materials, deteriorating terms of trade and intolerable debt burden that have been grievously suffered by countries of the South and East since the '70s. The crisis of the so-called developing countries is curtailing their ability to pay back loans and absorb surplus goods from the industrial capitalist countries. These recoil upon the global centers of capitalism.

4. How do we describe the crisis of the neocolonial countries in Asia, Africa and Latin America?

A: As early as the '70s, the colonial and dependent countries in Asia, Africa and Latin America were already in a state of economic depression because of a crisis of overproduction in raw materials. With the exception of oil up to the second half of the '70s, all raw material products of the third world have been subjected to ever worsening terms of trade.

The chain of events that led to the Gulf war in 1991 involved the oil glut, Iraq's drive to raise resources as a result of its heavy military expenditures in the Iran-Iraq war and of course the U.S. determination to tighten its control over the oil resources in the Middle East.

One glaring indicator of the terrible plight of the third world countries is their exceedingly heavy debt burden. Most of the loans they incurred were for infrastructure building,

enhancement of raw material production, consumption, bureaucratic corruption and military spending. In the period of unbridled consumption in the U.S. and free spending, only a few economies like the tigers of East Asia and some Latin American countries have been able to raise the level of their export-oriented manufacturing.

The economic basis for the social and political turmoil in the South and East of the world consists of lopsided investments, enrichment and overconsumption by a few, superprofit remittances, deteriorating terms of trade, crushing debt burdens, bureaucratic corruption, unemployment, inflation and austerity measures for the people.

5. How do we describe the crisis of the revisionist-ruled countries as part of the crisis of the world capitalist system? Can China avoid the fate of the Soviet Union?

A: The crisis of the revisionist-ruled countries is similar to that of Asia, Africa and Latin America. On the whole, the Soviet Union and its satellite countries in Eastern Europe could produce mainly raw materials for exports. A glut in raw materials was deliberately created in Asia, Africa and Latin America by the major industrial capitalist countries in order to beat the raw material exports of the revisionist-ruled countries. Thus, as early as the second half of the '70s, the revisionist-ruled countries were already in a state of depression so soon after being linked to the Western capitalist countries by foreign loans and so-called export-oriented manufacturing whose products the western economies did not absorb.

The Soviet Union itself got hooked to consumer imports from West Germany for the satisfaction of the new bourgeoisie and eventually could not pay for these. So was the new bourgeoisie of Eastern Europe hooked to consumer imports and yet their exports were restricted by the West. These countries were in the unhappy situation of being taken

advantage of by the neocolonialism of Soviet social-imperialism and Western imperialism.

China is deeply and comprehensively integrated into the world capitalist system. Its pattern of investments and trade are already in the neocolonial mold as a result of the capitalist-oriented reforms and the opening of their economies to the capitalist world.

The development of the Chinese economy is now lopsided with resources serving the foreign and domestic big bourgeoisie and export-oriented manufacturing thriving for a while in the coastal areas while compradorization, refeudalization, bureaucratic corruption, unemployment and inflation are impoverishing the people all over China. The global centers of capitalism, especially the United States and Japan, can manipulate China because of its dependence on them for direct investments, loan capital, trade accommodations and high-technology imports.

The proletariat has been overthrown since 1976. The ruling party and state are in the hands of the bureaucrat monopoly bourgeoisie at the central and provincial levels.

Learning from the peaceful evolution of socialism to capitalism in the Soviet Union, the US strategists recognize that the forces of economic liberalization are promoting and enlarging the forces of political liberalization until it is time for the Chinese revisionists themselves to cast away the shells of the communist party and the socialist facade.

Thus, the United States is already satisfied that the uprisings in more than 80 Chinese cities in 1989 are a far larger signal political event than the Hungarian uprising of 1956 and has relaxed its so-called human-rights or political demands on China on the assumption that the economic liberalization is anyway promoting the forces of political liberalization even

at a faster rate than during the time of the revisionists from 1956 to 1991 in the Soviet Union.

China may not collapse like the Soviet Union but can be something like a turbulent Russia. Even in the long feudal past, China and Russia could have a centralized state over a wide expanse.

6. Is the New World Order the consequence of the crisis of the world capitalist system? Let us describe what is in fact the new world disorder.

A: Certainly, the new world disorder is the result of the crisis of the world capitalist system. In the heartland of capitalism, we are witness today to the rising strike movement of the working class and the protest actions of the youth and other people, to the corruption scandals and discredit of the major political parties of the monopoly bourgeoisie, and the rise of neofascism, racism and the like. The monopoly bourgeoisie is trying to deflect attention from its responsibility for the massive unemployment and other manifestations of the capitalist crisis by generating reactionary currents and by promoting nationalism and interventionism under the guise of humanitarianism in other parts of the world.

The countries formerly ruled by revisionist regimes are suffering from further economic, political, social and moral breakdowns and are now hotbeds of fascism, civil wars, ethnic conflicts, religious fanaticism, the scourge of criminality and so on. Yugoslavia has broken up and in only two years time, more than 250,000 have been killed in the civil war in Bosnia. Czechoslovakia has also broken up. Easily hundreds of thousands have been killed in Tadjikistan, in the Nagorno-Karabakh region, in Georgia and other areas in the Soviet Union.

Russia no less is in danger of breaking up. Centrifugal forces are at work in its various republics and regions. The relationship

between Russia and the Ukraine is volatile and fragile. Substantial Russian minorities in many of the former Soviet republics are in friction with the local population.

The so-called regional conflicts supposedly resolved by the United States and the former Soviet Union continue to flare up. Afghanistan is still a bloody field for various Islamic factions. The armed counterrevolutionaries in Angola and Mozambique continue to wreak havoc. Nicaragua and El Salvador are now hotbeds of social turmoil and armed gangsterism. Of late, the United States is engaged in a military intervention in Haiti once more to create the illusion of installing democracy. Cambodia is still a field of civil war.

In Africa, imperialism has been responsible for the despoliation and for the bloody rivalry of political groups not only in such countries as Angola and Mozambique but also in such countries as Somalia and Rwanda. In the last two countries, the United States is engaged in military intervention under the guise of humanitarianism. In Rwanda, at least half a million people were massacred by the former regime and tens of thousands died of cholera in 1994.

Tens of millions of people are internal and external refugees in Asia, Africa, Latin America and the former Soviet bloc countries. They are victims of both political persecution and economic despoliation.

The oppressed nations and peoples of the world comprise more than 80 percent of the world's population. Even before the collapse of the Soviet Union, so many nationalities were oppressed within the Soviet Union and Soviet bloc. Without any doubt, these have now sunk to the level of the nationalities in the general run of countries in Asia, Africa and Latin America.

Still engaged in the old anticommunist crusade, the United States continues to engage in embargo and military threats

against the People's Democratic Republic of Korea and Cuba. At the same time, the United States is offering inducements for these countries to undertake capitalist oriented reforms. But these countries are trying to hold out along the line of fighting for national independence and socialism.

7. How will the capitalist crisis and the new world disorder proceed? What is the status of the progressive or revolutionary forces in the various parts of the world?

A: The global capitalist crisis and the new world disorder will eventually lead to the resurgence of the anti-imperialist and socialist movement. There are various progressive and revolutionary forces at work in various parts of the world.

In some industrial capitalist countries, there are some small Marxist-Leninist parties while there is yet no significantly large Marxist-Leninist parties. The social-democratic and neorevisionist parties are still operating to engage the more blatant parties of the monopoly bourgeoisie in the game of musical chairs. Progressive movements among the workers and the youth continue to exist. Significant strikes have occurred against the worsening conditions of employment and against social cutbacks.

In the third world today, the most outstanding revolutionary forces are those led by the Communist Party of the Philippines, Khmer Rouge in Cambodia and the Communist Party of Peru (Sendero Luminoso). These forces are keeping alive the flames of the armed revolutionary movement against the counter-revolutionary state. At the same time, there are legal progressive forces in all countries exposing and opposing the impositions of the U.S. and other imperialist powers and their reactionary cohorts.

Special mention should be made about Chinese society. So far some 6,000 worker strikes have occurred during the last two

years against working and living conditions worse than in the Philippines. Hundreds of peasant uprisings occurred against unpaid IOUs and arbitrary levies reminiscent of Koumintang rule. However, it remains to be seen whether there is a party or movement of Marxist-Leninists under the banner of Mao Zedong Thought to fight the revisionists in power.

In the former Soviet-bloc countries, there are various parties which call themselves Marxist-Leninists but it remains to be seen whether they can study and apply the teachings of Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin and Mao. Otherwise, the much bigger neorevisionist and social democratic parties alongside the bourgeois nationalist and other types of more reactionary parties will continue to block them.

Whether we like it or not, the social turmoil occurring all over the world will lead to the resurgence of the anti-imperialist and socialist movement. Oppression engenders revolution. The scale and intensity of the social turmoil is already unprecedented. It is reasonable to expect that in due time the forces of the world proletarian-socialist revolution will rebound and march to a new and higher stage.

8. What about the status and prospects of the revolutionary forces in the Philippines?

A: The revolutionary forces led by the Communist Party of the Philippines are committed to the theory and practice of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought and are at the center of the stage in the struggle between armed revolution and counter-revolution. Their strength is a far cry from their modest beginnings in 1968, despite the serious damage inflicted on them by the Left and Right opportunists.

There is a rectification movement going on to correct previous errors and further strengthen the party and the entire revolutionary mass movement. This rectification movement has

already won resounding success since two years ago and is reinvigorating and further strengthening the party and all other revolutionary forces. The ever worsening crisis of the ruling system as well as the crisis of the world capitalist system serves to guarantee the advance of the armed revolutionary movement.

The Communist Party of the Philippines is determined to complete the ongoing new democratic revolution and to proceed to socialist revolution and construction. It has the advantage of learning from the positive and negative lessons of all previous socialist revolution and construction and of being endowed with Mao's theory and practice of continuing revolution under proletarian dictatorship.

The fact that the Communist Party is engaged in a protracted people's war allows it to make a significant contribution to and be in stride with the resurgence of the anti-imperialist and socialist movement on a world scale. The CPP considers it a matter of internationalist duty to keep on upholding the torch of armed revolution because this serves to inspire other parties and peoples in the world to fight and overcome the long drawn effects of capitalist domination, neocolonialism and revisionist betrayal.

In conclusion, I wish your conference the utmost success in informing and enlightening yourselves about the realities of the world and about the revolutionary road of socialism. But the point, according to Marx, is to change the world. Therefore, I wish that your conference will raise not only your ability to interpret the world or raise higher the level of your revolutionary consciousness but also to raise higher the level of your revolutionary militancy in the people's struggle against imperialism and for a socialist future.

10.

**AN UPDATE: QUALITATIVELY UNCHANGED
CONDITIONS³**

April 1995

I am deeply pleased and grateful that my long interview with Julie, *On the Mode of Production in the Philippines* in 1983, while I was still detained by the Marcos fascist dictatorship, and my series of lectures as research fellow of the Center for Asian Studies of the University of the Philippines, *Philippine Crisis and Revolution*, in April-May 1986 are published together in this volume, *Philippine Economy and Politics*.

Since its congress of reestablishment on December 26, 1968, the Communist Party of the Philippines (CPP) has described Philippine society as semicolonial and semifeudal. The Philippine political system has been semicolonial since 1946, under the indirect rule of U.S. imperialism through the parties and politicians of the local exploiting classes. The Philippine economic system has been semifeudal since the first decade of the 20th century, exploited by the homegrown comprador big bourgeoisie and landlord class in the service of foreign monopoly capitalism.

Correspondent to the semicolonial and semifeudal character of Philippine society, the CPP has put forward the general line of national-democratic revolution through protracted people's war under the leadership of the proletariat. The strategic line of encircling the cities from the countryside and accumulating strength in the countryside until it becomes possible to seize the cities realizes and activates the basic class alliance of the working class and the peasantry.

³Co-author's Introduction to *Philippine Economy and Politics*

In this regard, the CPP has deployed its cadres in the countryside in order to build the people's army and the peasant movement, solve the land problem as the main problem of the democratic revolution and build the people's democratic power even while reactionary state power is still entrenched in the cities.

Responding to the demand of the peasant majority of the people for an agrarian revolution, the antifeudal line is the main component of the general line of national democratic revolution.

On the Question of Semifeudalism

Some opponents of the general line of national democratic revolution pretend to be anti-imperialist and progressive and therefore avoid questioning the description of the Philippine ruling system as semicolonial or neocolonial. But they concentrate on attacking the description of the Philippine economy as semifeudal in order to do away with its precision, confuse the situation and exaggerate "development" or prospects of it under the auspices of the imperialists and the local reactionaries and attack the general line of the national democratic revolution, especially the strategic line of protracted people's war.

The Philippine economy has been called many names -- "free enterprise", "market", "mixed", "developing", "semicapitalist", "dependent-capitalist" and so on. But none of these is more precise than "semifeudal" in denoting the level of development of the productive forces and the relations of production, particularly the retention of the agrarian character of the economy and the shift in terms of socioeconomic relations from the feudal economy of the 19th century under Spanish colonialism to the semifeudal economy of the 20th century under U.S. imperialism. Bourgeois economists adopt their own terminology to stress private ownership of the means of production, the commodity system or the primacy of the market and the promise of development under capitalism. And political

counterrevolutionaries wish to get rid of the term semifeudal to impugn and undermine the general line of national democratic revolution that carries out protracted people's war.

In its entire 20-year period of the rule from 1966, especially during its imposition of fascist dictatorship on the Filipino people from 1972 to 1986, the U.S.-Marcos ruling clique aggravated and deepened the agrarian, preindustrial and semifeudal character of the Philippine social economy. It did not undertake national industrialization and land reform but exacerbated the socioeconomic problems inflicted by foreign monopoly capitalism, domestic feudalism and bureaucrat capitalism.

Under the policy dictates of the U.S. and such multilateral agencies as the IMF and the World Bank, the Marcos regime poured domestic as well as borrowed foreign resources into big comprador operations, bureaucratic corruption and into a rapid military buildup. It made a big portion of agricultural production of staples dependent on imported inputs under the "green revolution", expanded mineral and agricultural raw-material production for export, maintained the infrastructure for the exchange of raw-material exports and manufactured imports and deepened the dependence on imported equipment and inputs.

However, in the late '70s, a handful of subjectivist elements within the CPP started to question and undermine the description of the Philippine economy as semifeudal, agrarian and without basic industries. They cited data on the commodity system, wage relations, the increase of rural and urban oddjobbers and distribution of gross output values. They came to the conclusion that the Philippine economy was no longer semifeudal but "semicapitalist", implying that it was already industrial capitalist without analyzing the kind of industry that existed and the socioeconomic relations.

In effect they credited the Marcos regime for "industrializing" the Philippines. They also exaggerated the extent of the urban population as 40 percent and implied that the purported percentage increase in urban population was due to industrialization and not merely due to the exhaustion of the land frontier in the '60s and the increase of the unemployed and oddjobbers in both rural and urban areas throughout the '70s. Among those who pushed the line that the Philippine economy was no longer semifeudal but was semicapitalist was no less than the chairman then of the central committee of the CPP.

The subjectivists falsely claimed that the Philippines had been industrialized and urbanized to an extent that it was necessary to "modify, adjust and refine" the general line of the national democratic revolution through protracted people's war. In fact, they were undercutting and assailing this general line. They were rationalizing the urban-basing of the CPP central leadership and the concentration of cadres in the cities. They were promoting revisionism by pushing subjectivist and opportunist lines of thinking.

In 1980, the subjectivists pushed distinguishably "Left" and Right opportunist lines of policy. They blamed the founders of the CPP for the supposed inaccuracy of describing the Philippine economy as semifeudal and for the supposed neglect of revolutionary work in the urban areas. They obscured the fact that the proletarian revolutionary cadres of the CPP had been ceaselessly developing the legal democratic movement in the urban areas since the entire decade of the '60s and that it was the open rule of terror of the Marcos regime rather than the antifeudal line of the Party that had required the urban-based legal democratic movement to go underground in the '70s.

Throughout the '80s, the worst of the Left opportunists pushed the line of accelerating the advance of the armed revolution through urban-based armed insurrections, incited by armed city partisans, and through premature enlargement and

"regularization" of units of the people's army. They had contempt for the legal and defensive character of the struggle in the urban areas and for the constant necessity of ever expanding and consolidating the mass base in the urban and rural areas through painstaking mass work.

"Left" opportunism was pushed either under the premature notion of "strategic counteroffensive" or making urban-based insurrections the leading factor in the process of armed revolution. They kept on wishing for an exceptional "conjuncture" of domestic and international factors that would invalidate the strategic line of protracted people's war. They considered as more important the external rather than the internal factors of the revolutionary process and confused the principal and secondary aspects of this process. They took the victorious uprisings in Vietnam in 1945 and in Nicaragua in 1979 out of historical context and cited these as the best models of the Philippine revolution.

At the same time, the Right opportunists pushed the erroneous line that the urban-based legal mass movement was of higher importance than the rural-based armed struggle, and that more people would be attracted to the united front and to the revolution if the leadership would be entrusted to the anti-Marcos section of the reactionaries under the concept of a bourgeois-nationalist "New Katipunan" and that the leadership of the working class and the CPP would have to be concealed, cut down or even liquidated. Under the stimulus of funding from bourgeois and religious agencies in Western Europe, the urban-based Right opportunists produced a considerable amount of bourgeois reformist propaganda and drew as well as withheld CPP cadres from the countryside.

In any communist party, even at its best, there is always an internal basis for the emergence and development of subjectivism and opportunism because of the inflow of petty-bourgeois elements who fail to remould themselves to become

genuine proletarian revolutionaries and because there is the constant impact of influences from outside the Party, either from the social environment in general or from deliberate attempts of the enemy to penetrate and influence the CPP. The dangers of subjectivism and opportunism rise when ideological, political and organizational standards for Party membership are lowered as in certain urban-based units of the CPP and when the antifascist aspect of the revolutionary struggle is cut off from the anti-imperialist and antifeudal aspects.

The communists are always bombarded by the official "development" theory of foreign monopoly capitalism and the local reactionaries. In the absence of or due to the weakening of Marxist-Leninist study, the unremoulded petty-bourgeois elements in the CPP can become impressed with the glossy presentation of "development" programs and projects of the reactionaries, the heavy importation of consumer goods and rapid infrastructure-building financed through deficit-spending and foreign borrowing. Whenever a communist party is ideologically and politically lax, the class enemy can even introduce or recruit in place agents to sow political confusion. In addition, there are those outside the Party who pretend to be Left and progressive, deliberately address themselves to the communists and spread wrong notions about the Philippine economy which in fact assist the counterrevolutionary line of the barefaced enemies of the Philippine revolution.

After the imposition of martial rule on the Philippines, the so-called social-democrats, who are in fact Christian democrats trained for anticommunist work but who deck themselves out as progressive competitors of and alternatives to the communists, circulated the notion that the Marcos regime even if repressive had adopted an excellent economic policy of development under the auspices of the IMF and World Bank. The Lava revisionist group openly capitulated to the Marcos regime and misrepresented it as representative of the national bourgeoisie, as one interested in "noncapitalist development" and as one

trying hard to free itself from a U.S.-dictated policy of "neocolonial industrialization". The flunkies of Soviet social-imperialism presumed that industrialization was a foregone conclusion and that the struggle was only about whether it is foreign-owned or Filipino-owned with Soviet aid.

Those who presumed that the Philippines had become "dependent capitalist" also tried to sow confusion in petty-bourgeois circles about the character of the Philippine economy. They preached that it had become useless to distinguish the Philippine mode of production from the globalization of production in which the effective terms are only the metropolis and the periphery. Among the preachers of "dependent capitalism" were neo-Kautskyites who recycled the theory of ultra-imperialism (unilinear spread of the capitalist mode of production to all countries) and/or the Trotskyites. They babbled that the Philippine economy was no longer semifeudal and that it was no longer valid and important to take into account the distinct Philippine mode of production in the face of the globalization of capital and the metropolis-periphery schema. It was implied that the ground had been taken away from the strategic line of people's war.

A highly placed "development" technocrat of the Marcos regime (now the head of the CIA-instituted Philippine Rural Reconstruction Movement [PRRM]) who had "defected" to the NDF in December 1977 drummed up the line of "reexamining" the Party's analysis that the Philippine economy is semifeudal and influenced some members of the CPP Central Committee. The push for a reexamination was based on superficial observations of the commodity system in agriculture involving types of cash crop such as onions in Bongabon, Nueva Ecija.

In 1978, the criticism and repudiation of modern revisionism wavered within the CPP. There was no Marxist-Leninist criticism and repudiation of the already clear ascendance of the Chinese revisionists headed by Deng in China. Marxism-

Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought became depreciated. Some members of the CPP Central Committee started to float the notion that the Soviet Union and China were similarly socialist and that their socialist economies were being strengthened by capitalist-oriented reforms.

In 1979 Philippine military intelligence officers were telling several prisoners, suspected as high cadres of the CPP, that they could be released from prison immediately if they pledged to push the line that the Philippines was no longer semifeudal and that the Marcos regime had made substantial economic progress under the auspices of the IMF and the World Bank.

In the late '70s, the Filipino assets of U.S. intelligence agencies (CIA and DIA) inserted themselves into and used the U.S.-based Katipunan ng Demokratikong Pilipino (KDP) to question the description of the Philippine economy as semifeudal and push the twisted line of "support the Philippine armed struggle, drop Mao Zedong's theory of people's war and seek the decisive support of the Soviet Union". Soon, the KDP openly attacked the CPP. Some of the KDP activists pretended to remain loyal to the CPP but in fact continued to push such notions as that "export-oriented manufacturing" could be the cutting edge of U.S.-inspired industrialization and that democratization was simply a matter of overthrowing Marcos, without the need for people's war.

By the early '80s, there was already a loud debate in narrow petty-bourgeois circles whether the Philippine economy was semifeudal or not. I responded to the attempts of the opportunist elements within the CPP and pseudo-Left elements outside the CPP to sow confusion regarding the character of the Philippine economy. It so happened that Julie was already out of prison and could relate to me developments in the current debate and bring to me reference materials every weekend. We agreed on the format of an interview by her with me on the Philippine mode of production in order to clarify the essential

character of the Philippine economy and counter the wrong notions about it.

It is of vital importance to publish this interview in this volume in order to bridge the economic analysis in the founding documents of the CPP in 1968 and Amado Guerrero's *Philippine Society and Revolution* in 1970 on the one hand and the current reality and information about the Philippine economy on the other hand and in order to counter the persistent attempts of anti-CPP elements to discredit the Marxist-Leninist analysis of the Philippine economy as semifeudal and undermine the general line of the national democratic revolution through protracted people's war.

The Semifeudal Economy, 1960-90

The Philippine economy continues to have no industries producing basic metals, basic chemicals and capital goods from the local primary production of raw materials. It remains basically agrarian even as it has some kind of floating industry dependent on imported capital goods. The socioeconomic relations are dominated by the comprador big bourgeoisie and the landlord class in the service of foreign monopoly capitalism.

The semifeudal economy is a commodity system that has departed from the feudal economy of self-subsistence but it is one dominated by the comprador big bourgeoisie rather than by a homegrown industrial bourgeoisie. The urban-based comprador big bourgeoisie is in close partnership with the rural-based landlord class. At the same time, the whole semifeudal economy is a neocolonial preindustrial or an agrarian adjunct of the world capitalist system.

Whatever are the current proportions of gross output values and employment in the agriculture, industry and service sectors of the economy, all these are dependent on imported equipment, fuel, other raw materials and manufactured components from abroad.

The latest high-tech tools may be used in any sector but the Philippine economy until now does not produce these tools. Production for local consumption as well as for export has become more import-dependent than ever under the policy of trade liberalization. Agricultural and mineral production for export and low value-added production of semiconductors, garments and toys for reexport have consigned the Philippine economy to chronic foreign trade deficit and ever mounting foreign debt.

In all sectors of the economy, the imported producer and consumer goods count high in the gross output values. Subtracting the value of the import content will reveal the following: the highest net value is still contributed by agricultural and mineral ore production and the rising high payments for the imports. In essence, the imports are paid for in part by export income (mainly from raw-material exports) and in another part by an increasing amount of foreign borrowings.

The export of cheap labor for unskilled work has become a bigger earner of foreign exchange than any of the agricultural, mineral or manufactured exports. However, the income of the overseas contract workers is not large enough to close the foreign trade gap. Practically all of this income goes into consumption. The export of cheap labor is a manifestation of the inability of the economy to employ the huge number of college-educated Filipinos who are driven to take menial jobs abroad.

Under the Aquino and Ramos regimes, like their predecessor Marcos regime, the Philippine reactionary government has rabidly followed the same policies dictated by foreign monopoly capitalism. These have run counter to national industrialization and land reform, aggravated and deepened the agrarian and semifeudal character of the economy and, in the face of international credit difficulties, compelled the state to resort more and more to local public borrowing, privatization of

state assets, increasing the tax burden and attracting short-term speculative foreign capital.

It is instructive to go over some important data from 1960 to 1990 in order to see how much the Philippine economy has undergone degradation. According to official statistics, some 15.4 percent of the labor force was in industry in 1960. This dropped to 15.0 percent in 1990. Within the industrial sector, manufacturing plunged from 12.1 percent share of employment in 1960 to only 9.7 percent in 1990. In 1979, it was supposed to have gone down to 14 percent. The upward fluctuation to 15 percent in 1990 is not believable but is still indicative of retrogression. This is evidence of de-industrialization rather than industrialization. The proportion of employment in manufacturing has become smaller in the period of "export-oriented" manufacturing since the '70s than in the earlier period of "import-substitution" manufacturing in the '50s and '60s.

The share of industry in the gross national product (GNP) is supposed to have risen from 28.5 percent in 1960 to 32.9 percent in 1990. Most of this share of industry (34.3 percent in 1991) is contributed by manufacturing (25.4 percent), construction (5 percent) and utilities (2.5 percent), all of which are import-dependent for equipment, fuel, other raw materials or component parts. Manufacturing of consumer goods accounts for an average of 55 percent in 1985-91, petroleum and coal processing 32.6 percent and local fabrication of imported basic metals, reassembly or fringe-processing of manufactured components and repairs, 10.7 percent.

Eighty percent out of the 76,288 manufacturing firms surveyed recently employ on the average one to nine people and 800 large firms employing more than 200 people and above comprise only one percent and account for half of the total manufacturing labor force. Of the total value in manufacturing, 71.4 percent

is overconcentrated in Metro Manila, Southern Tagalog and Central Luzon.

Employment in agriculture is supposed to have fallen from 61.2 percent in 1960 to only 45.2 percent in 1990 and the share of agriculture in the GNP is supposed to have decreased from 31.1 percent in 1960 to 23.2 percent in 1990. The service sector is supposed to have absorbed mainly the labor force shifting from agriculture, especially in the form of rural and urban oddjobbers who are in fact unemployed or grossly underemployed. Anyhow, "employment" in the service sector is supposed to have risen from 23.5 percent in 1960 to 43 percent in 1993 and the share of the service sector in the GNP from 40.4 percent in 1960 to 43.9 percent in 1990. Surplus agricultural labor, which is the main object of misrepresentation by bourgeois statisticians, still consists mainly of seasonal low-paid farm workers.

The former "Left" and Right opportunists in the CPP who have become outright traitors to the Philippine revolution and the Filipino people have made so much out of their continuing false claim that the Philippines has become far more urbanized than Russia during the Bolshevik revolution or China during the protracted people's war of liberation in order to rationalize the erroneous line of shifting the focus of the revolutionary movement from the rural to the urban areas and basing themselves in the latter even while the people's war is still at the stage of the strategic defensive.

They produce the high figure of at least 40 percent urban population by adding up the population of Metro Manila, the provincial cities, provincial capitals and town centers. By the same measure, the proportion of the urban population in Russia in 1917 and China in 1949 should be far bigger than that in the Philippines. Russia and China have far longer histories of urbanization under feudalism and the development of handicrafts and manufacturing. Moreover, Russia was also radically different from semifeudal China by having basic industries and

an industrial bourgeoisie which was strategically dominant in the economy but politically subordinated to the czarist autocracy.

Out of the total Philippine population of 27,088,000 in 1960, the population of Metro Manila and all provincial cities was 5,370,000 or 19.8 percent, with Metro Manila accounting for 2,460,000 or 9 percent. Out of the total Philippine population of 60,703,000 in 1990, the population of Metro Manila and all the provincial cities was 13,012,000 or 21 percent, with Metro Manila accounting for 7,928,000 or 13 percent.

The increase in city population from 19.8 percent of the total national population in 1960 to 21 percent in 1990 is not really big and does not necessarily mean either real urbanization or industrialization. Only a small portion of the urban population enjoys such amenities as piped-in water and electricity. In fact, the conditions of rural backwardness and poverty are brought into the cities by the huge reserve army of labor (unemployed) coming from the countryside.

Philippine cities are basically centers of operations of the comprador big bourgeoisie and not of an industrial bourgeoisie. The prevalent kind of economic activity in Metro Manila is commercial rather than industrial and in provincial cities there is generally a small area as center of commercial activity. The population outside the small commercial centers in so-called provincial cities is actually rural. The provincial capitals and town centers which are not classified as cities have generally less commerce and less urban amenities than those classified as cities.

The same incorrigible opportunist elements who have unduly credited the Marcos regime for significantly "industrializing" and "urbanizing" the Philippines and who have faulted the CPP for refusing to accept this wrong view are still the same elements who have praised the Aquino regime for "economic recovery" and who have self-contradictorily declared that the Ramos regime is still in the process of making the agrarian

Philippine economy a "newly-industrializing country" by the year 2000. Consistently, they wish the big comprador-landlord regime to industrialize the Philippines in the vain hope of liquidating soon the protracted people's war. Thus, they have shamelessly pushed the line of "seeking convergences" with the "development" program of the Ramos regime, pretending to criticize it up to a certain point but on the whole supporting it.

On the Question of Dictatorship and Democratization

In the upsurge of the broad popular struggle against the Marcos fascist dictatorship from 1983 to 1986, after the outrageous assassination of Benigno Aquino and when the anti-Marcos reactionaries became emboldened to oppose the dictatorship, the "Left" opportunists exaggerated the possibility of winning total victory or taking a major share of political power in the offing through urban insurrections and premature regularization of the NPA and became unmindful of the conspicuous grave loss and weakening of the mass base in the rural areas, starting from 1984, and the occurrence of Kampanyang Aghos in Mindanao, starting from 1985, due to the putschist line.

At the same time, the Right opportunists exaggerated the possibility of winning a major share of political power upon the condition that they prevailed with their bourgeois reformist line. They wished the revolutionary forces to tail after the leadership of the anti-Marcos reactionaries, engage solely or mainly in legal struggle and become mere footstool for the anti-Marcos reactionaries in their rise to power.

The most corrosive line that the Right opportunist elements (under the influence of the Filipino assets of U.S. imperialism) pushed within the CPP was the one presuming that there would be "democratization" and a simple case of expanding the "democratic space" through legal struggle if the Marcos fascist dictatorship had been replaced by another big comprador-landlord clique, especially one headed by the widow of Aquino.

They claimed that with the end of the personal dictatorship or autocracy of Marcos, the ensuing "elite democracy" would still constitute "democratization" open to reform and to conversion into "popular democracy" through reformist legal struggle. The series of dichotomies between dictatorship and democratization and between "elite" and "popular" democracy was meant to obfuscate the persistence of the joint class dictatorship of the big compradors and landlords even after the fall of Marcos in the absence of a successful people's war.

After the fall of Marcos in the manner foretold by the earlier fall of Baby "Doc" Duvalier in Haiti and military juntas in Latin America, through the combination of a big split in the reactionary armed forces and a popular uprising, the Filipino assets of U.S. imperialism and the "Left" and Right opportunists in the CPP combined to declare that the CPP had had nothing to do with the downfall of Marcos, had become marginalized and had suffered a strategic defeat because of its boycott policy in the 1986 snap presidential elections.

They misconstrued democracy as merely the "democratic space" for them within the ruling system in terms of civil and political liberties, claimed that there was no more ground for people's war and deliberately obfuscated the fact that the joint class dictatorship of the comprador big bourgeoisie and the landlord class and the open rule of terror was persistent, despite the flimsy and temporary liberal facade of the Aquino regime. In fact, the Aquino regime retained or made worse the antiworker and antipeasant decrees of Marcos and General Ramos intensified the military campaigns of suppression against the revolutionary forces and the people.

The "Left" opportunist exponents of urban insurrectionism and military adventurism who had been responsible for the consequent grave damage to the rural mass base and for Kampanyang Ahas in Mindanao as early as 1985 also joined

the Filipino assets of U.S. imperialism and the Right opportunists in recriminations against the Party for the boycott policy error and in making misrepresentations about the character, implications, magnitude and consequences of this error. Both "Left" and Right opportunists in effect asserted that the banned revolutionary forces should have participated in the Marcos-staged elections and considered the boycott policy as the Party's biggest error in its entire history.

The most blatant assets of U.S. imperialism compared the Aquino regime to the Magsaysay regime as one effectively undercutting the revolutionary movement by restoring "democratic institutions and processes" and seriously carrying out "land reform" under a U.S.- and World Bank-supported mini-Marshall plan. They boasted that the post-Marcos period was one of democratization through legal institutions and processes, rendering useless and outdated the armed revolution. Since then, they have ceaselessly prated about alternatives (including foreign-funded NGOism, job placements in the reactionary government, electoral politics and the like) to the armed revolution rather than to the oppressive and exploitative ruling system. They conveniently forget the fact that the CPP was reestablished in 1968 and built the NPA in 1969 when Marcos was the glittering display in Washington's "show window of democracy" in Asia and he too was threatening to carry out land reform.

The popdems, socdems, Bisig and the like were all happy to take a ride on the Aquino bandwagon. Even the old line pro-Soviet revisionists wanted to take the ride with them immediately after serving the Marcos regime for a long time. The Right opportunist line within the CPP described the Aquino regime as a "liberal democratic" regime worthy of critical support. The "Left" opportunists responsible for unprecedented damage to the revolutionary movement and for Kampanyang Aho in Mindanao ceaselessly overstated the boycott policy error as the biggest error ever in the history of the CPP in order to cover up

their far graver culpability in Mindanao and elsewhere in the country.

Amidst all the attempts at confusing the revolutionary forces, I delivered the series of lectures on Philippine crisis and revolution at the Asian Studies Center of the University of the Philippines from April to May 1986 in order to clarify the new situation and the big comprador-landlord class character of the U.S.-Aquino regime and update Amado Guerrero's *Philippine Society and Revolution*. The Political Bureau of the Central Committee of the CPP subsequently adopted this series of lectures as basic study material for the Party in 1987 and was able to circulate and promote it in 1988, much to the chagrin of the incorrigible Right opportunists and the "Left" opportunists who were then on the path of turning into blatant Right opportunists, revisionists and even criminal gangsters from year to year.

It is of vital importance to publish again this series of lectures on the Philippine crisis and revolution to demonstrate that all along there has been a timely response to attempts of the agents of U.S. imperialism and the incorrigible opportunists at confusing the ranks of the revolutionaries and the people about the post-Marcos period and to heighten the fighting consciousness of communists and all revolutionary militants.

This series of lectures has upheld the continuing validity and vitality of the national democratic revolution against foreign monopoly capitalism, domestic feudalism and bureaucrat capitalism. It has helped carry over the revolutionary cadres and the masses from the Marcos to the post-Marcos period along the general line of national democratic revolution and to foil the U.S. imperialists, the local exploiting classes and their special agents to destroy or derail the armed revolution.

The Second Great Rectification Movement

The incorrigible "Left" and Right opportunists within the CPP have fully exposed themselves as counterrevolutionary opponents of Marxism-Leninism, the CPP and the national-democratic revolution. They are now shameless bootlickers of the U.S.-Ramos regime and barefaced traitors to the revolutionary cause. Irony of all ironies, they have chosen to expose themselves and act viciously as counterrevolutionaries during the presidency of General Ramos, the continuity man in the open rule of terror under the joint class dictatorship of the comprador big bourgeoisie and the landlord class.

After failing in their vicious attempt to liquidate the CPP from the inside, they continue to specialize in slandering the CPP and the entire revolutionary mass movement. In so many devious ways, they deny the persistence of the joint class dictatorship of the comprador big bourgeoisie and landlord class. They obscure the continuing rule of open terror under the Aquino and the Ramos regimes and claim that human rights violations have been on the decline, despite the brutalities of Lambat Bitag I, II and III and other military campaigns under the "total war" policy or "low-intensity conflict" directed by U.S.imperialism. Having fully exposed themselves as special agents of psychological warfare, they have become more and more ineffective in their attempts to show confusion.

The conjuncture and convergence of the three sectors of neocolonialism (government, big business and foreign-funded NGOs), the false promises of "Philippines 2000" and the escalation of the "total war" policy, the brutal military campaigns and intrigues of "low intensity conflict", the opportunist errors and crimes, the open betrayal by the incorrigible opportunists and revisionists and the anticommunist ideological and political offensive of the imperialists and their local lackeys in connection with the disintegration of the revisionist parties and regimes abroad have failed to break or demoralize the forces of the national-democratic revolution.

Instead, the revolutionary forces have reaffirmed basic revolutionary principles, have drawn strength from their reservoir of ideological, political and organizational accomplishments, have repudiated the errors and crimes of the "Left" and Right opportunists and have raised the fighting will and capabilities of the people. The victory of the Second Great Rectification Movement cannot be fully understood without reading and studying the interview on the Philippine mode of production and the series of lectures on the Philippine crisis and revolution.

These countered the most devious and vicious attacks on the general line of the national democratic revolution in the '80s and laid the ground for the Second Great Rectification Movement. From year to year since 1988, the proletarian revolutionaries in the Central Committee of the CPP increasingly combatted the "Left" and Right opportunist currents until the Second Great Rectification Movement was carried out in a comprehensive and deepgoing way, starting in 1992.

11.

TECHNOLOGY AND POVERTY
FROM THE VIEWPOINT OF THE THIRD WORLD⁴

by **Jose Ma. Sison**

Chairman, International Network for Philippine Studies

The Existing Level of Science and Technology

The existing level of science and technology has the potential of effecting the development of the underdeveloped countries in the third world, up to the level already achieved by the industrial capitalist countries. Unfortunately, there are socioeconomic and political factors which prevent the underdeveloped countries from realizing their right to development.

The biggest irony in the world today is that science and technology can effect industrial development and eliminate poverty but is used by the multinational firms and banks to exploit the people of the world, extract superprofits and debt service from them, deprive them of the boon of development and consign them to worsening levels of poverty.

To accumulate the capital by which to exploit the people of the third world, the monopoly capitalist firms have directly extracted their profits from their employees at the work place and the market and have augmented these profits with subsidies and tax incentives for research and development and with the gold plating of contracts in both military production and civil works at the expense of the public.

There is the widespread but false notion that the monopoly firms and banks have made so much productive investments in the third world countries and transferred so much technology to them that

⁴Lecture at the Faculty of Civil Technique of the Technical University of Delft in the Netherlands, 18 May 1995.

the industries built there take away the jobs from the people in the industrial capitalist countries. Right within the industrial capitalist countries, another false notion is being whipped up that migrant workers have come to take away jobs from the host people.

These wrong notions are deliberately spread in order to confuse the people and obscure the real causes of unemployment and the social malaise in the industrial capitalist countries. These notions are generating chauvinism, neofascism and racism. The truth of the matter is that today the contradiction between the forces of production and the relations of production is rapidly worsening and becoming more acute.

On the one hand, there is the high development of the forces of production, which include high technology (such as the use of microchips, laser, robotics, genetic engineering and maximal use of raw materials) and the high level of education and training of the actual and potential work force. On the other hand, the capitalist relations of production require the supermonopolies to compete effectively and maximize profits by cutting costs — by reducing the use of labor power.

There is now the phenomenon of jobless growth, a result of corporate "re-engineering", to use a current fancy term in the United States. The supermonopolies keep on increasing their constant capital for still higher technology and reducing the variable capital or the fund for wages. In the competition, some companies win, others lose out.

The resulting aggravation of unemployment cuts the effective demand for the goods and services produced. For entire national economies, there is the tendency for the rates of profit to fall and there is the tendency either to overproduce at one time and underproduce at another time. For instance, the increased production and slight recovery made by the industrial capitalist countries in 1994 are leading to unsold inventories and decreased

production in 1995. The high productivity that is made available by science and technology under has relentlessly caused the capitalist crisis of overproduction.

Over the last few decades, there has been the trend towards the overconcentration of investments in the industrial capitalist countries. In 1968, investments in the world were concentrated here to the extent of 69 percent. In 1993, these rose to 83 percent. In fact, there has been a big outflow of capital from the third world countries in the form of remitted superprofits and debt service. The trick of modern imperialism is to invest a little and to take out big profits.

Underdevelopment and poverty in the third world countries have therefore been aggravated and deepened. The monopoly bourgeoisie in the industrial capitalist countries retain the core industrial processes and the most advanced technology and deprive the third world countries of these. Technology transfer is actually limited and lopsided. What have gone to the third world countries are the enhanced technology for raw material production, the fringe processes in export-oriented manufacturing and the latest high-tech goods for consumption, including cars and electronic gadgets.

Under the terms of the World Trade Organization, the industrial capitalist countries and their supermonopolies tighten their control over science and technology under the slogan of protecting "intellectual property rights". Among themselves, the imperialist countries compete bitterly to acquire the latest technology for the purpose of profit-making and they go so far as to engage in industrial espionage against each other. They draw scientists and technologists from the third world and the former Soviet bloc and buy cheaply from them the results of research and development financed by their home countries. The technology and productive equipment made available to the third world countries yield low net value as the foreign monopoly firms take out their superprofits, especially through transfer

pricing. High-tech media and the electronic consumer products have further conditioned the consciousness and consumption tastes of the public. The worst of neocolonial and neoliberal ideas are rampant. Export income and foreign borrowing are wasted on the overconsumption by a few (no more than 10 percent of the population) of high-grade consumer items from the industrial capitalist countries.

In extracting superprofits and debt service from the third world, the foreign monopoly capitalists are the biggest plunderers of human and natural resources and despoilers and polluters of the natural environment. The environmental issue as well as the demand for sustainable development can be seriously addressed only by criticising and repudiating imperialism and by struggling for liberation.

In the scheme of neocolonialism, the general run of third world countries have been victimized by being compelled to engage in the overproduction of raw materials which is subject to ever-deteriorating terms of trade with manufactured imports from abroad to resort to excessive foreign and local borrowing to cover trade and budgetary deficits. There are only a few countries in the third world which have managed to build some basic industries under the auspices of the state. Even in these countries, there are extensive areas where poverty is similar to that in the other third world countries. Such industrial economies as those of South Korea and Taiwan are exceptions in the capitalist world.

More than 60 percent of the people of the world still live under agrarian backwardness. You can see them in the third world where unemployment and poverty are concentrated. Here you find the overwhelming majority of the world's unemployed and underemployed, respectively 120 million and 800 million according to ILO statistics. Eighty percent of the people of the world live below the poverty line. This includes the impoverished people who are nearly ten percent of the total, contributed by the breakdown of production in the former Soviet bloc countries. In

terms of economic retrogression and poverty, many of the former Soviet bloc countries qualify for membership in the third world.

The monopoly bourgeoisie in the industrial capitalist countries can exploit and impoverish the people in the third world because there are the corrupt bureaucrat capitalists, the big compradors and big landlords collaborating with imperialism and performing their own share of exploiting the people.

The Role of the University, Scientists and Technologists

Capitalism has achieved a high level of development in science and technology and social production. But the capitalist class has sought to perpetuate itself by extracting and accumulating surplus value from the proletariat. In the past, colonialism was also a major part of the primitive accumulation of capital in Europe. Now, foreign monopoly capitalism is engaged in the neocolonial economic and financial manipulation of the third world countries to keep its sway.

The worst capitalist crises of overproduction have led to the most bitter competition among capitalist countries and to two inter-imperialist global wars as well as to the U.S.-instigated cold war (the so-called third world war). These crises and wars have resulted in the awesome destruction of productive forces. Science and technology has been utilized in frenzied military production and has resulted in the diversion of social wealth and the destruction of productive forces.

In the current situation, it would seem as if monopoly capitalism can reign over the world forever. But among the global centers of capitalism, the United States, Japan and the European Union, there is at the same time sharpening competition in the world market and their collaboration at the expense of the people of the world. The trade war among them has already begun. But the countries of the third world, which have been continuously the worst afflicted by imperialist exploitation are more and more

exploited and impoverished and are now the main arena of social turmoil in the new world disorder.

The right of the university and its academic constituents, including the teachers, researchers and students, to academic freedom and autonomy must be well understood. It is their right to run their own programs of study and research and to protect them from the undue interferences and political repression from the state as well as from the non-state forces of obscurantism. However, the right entails social responsibility. Academic freedom is not merely a protective mantle for cultivating an egotistic and self-gratifying type of enlightenment and expertise or for undertaking the study, training and research programs approved by the capitalist state and its monopoly firms.

Aside from being the keeper and disseminator of received knowledge, the university promotes the advance of knowledge to a new and higher level for the sake of social progress. It has the obligation to perform critical and creative functions in the contemporary world. Here lies social responsibility that leads to social progress.

Your university is one that focuses on science and technology. But I presume that prior to and simultaneous with your technological training, you have a fair amount of studies in the social sciences. I also suppose that you are well aware that science and technology alone on their own account cannot spread to the advantage of the exploited or the entirety of mankind merely through formal university education, through the partnership or network of universities, through state-financed so-called development programs and projects and through investments of the monopoly firms. Your university is not isolated from the capitalist social context despite assertions of academic freedom and autonomy. The bourgeois mode of thinking that is dominant in society inevitably circulates in or pervades your university at the present time. The monopoly bourgeoisie never ceases to influence the university in the capitalist world. In

addition to the tuition fees paid by the students, funds and other resources are received by the university from the state and from the capitalist firms and certain requirements consistent with the demands of capitalism are attached to these resources.

Academic freedom is best exercised and practised when you perform your critical and creative functions, when you can see through the workings of monopoly capitalism and criticize the capitalist appropriation of science and technology to extract profits, exploit the proletariat and the people, impose neocolonialism on the countries of the third world and relegate the people there to poverty and misery.

Under the current circumstances, academic freedom must protect and serve the university and its constituency in performing the social responsibility of liberating science and technology from the clutches of monopoly capitalism and all reaction. To the exploited and oppressed people, academic freedom would be practically a useless or even harmful abstraction if it is interpreted to mean the imperialist and reactionary control of the university and its functions.

It is your creative function both to raise the level of your scientific knowledge and technological skills and to find ways of putting science and technology in the service of the people in your country and improve their environment and quality of life. It is also your creative function to develop solidarity, mutual understanding and cooperation with the peoples of the third world and your counterparts in science and technology there who aspire for national liberation, democracy and development. So long as the countries of the third world are dominated by foreign monopoly capitalism and by the local exploiting classes, so long as the people have not yet liberated themselves from these, science and technology in the hands of the bourgeoisie do not only prevent development but cause maldevelopment and exacerbate poverty. In fact, there is a relative surplus of university-educated men and women, including scientists and

technologists, in many third world countries. But they cannot be accommodated in the local economy and are compelled to seek employment abroad.

Both economic and political refugees run into hundreds of millions. Their plight involves the violation of human rights as enshrined in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the International Covenants on Civil and Political Rights and Economic, Social and Cultural Rights.

As the crisis of capitalism worsens even in the industrial capitalist countries, you find common cause with the people and your counterparts in the third world against monopoly capitalism and for a world that is free and independent from imperialism and that is socially just and progressive.

At the moment, the rapacity of the big bourgeoisie is becoming more and more obvious in the industrial capitalist countries as unemployment increases, social cutbacks are made, public enterprises are privatized, the wealthy and the monopolies are given tax breaks and public funds are further appropriated for the welfare of private corporations at the expense of the people. I am aware that social benefits for students in the Netherlands have been steadily cut back and that unemployment is staring at many of those who graduate from the university.

There are certain ways by which you can effect solidarity, mutual understanding and cooperation with the people in the third world. These are some of the ways:

You can develop exchange of information and other types of relations with the students and teachers in the third world, especially with their anti-imperialist organizations. In the Philippines, there are the League of Filipino Students and teachers' organizations like CONTEND. There are also the League of Scientists and Technologists in the multisectoral alliance called BAYAN and Science for the People in the underground National Democratic Front. These organizations

stand for a national, scientific and mass culture and for the use of science and technology in national industrialization and land reform under a comprehensive program of national-democratic revolution and with a socialist perspective.

You can demand from your state and university authorities greater autonomy and bigger funding for programs to enable you to go to the third world in order to do research and extend assistance. There your counterparts will welcome you.

You can develop close relations with the students and teachers of the third world who come over here for study and training.

You can demand the expansion of the program of study and training for the benefit of third world students.

You can go to countries in the third world for extended stay in connection with your professional training and expertise. You can be there in cooperation with the people's organizations. In the case of the Philippines, you can start to link up with BAYAN or with the National Democratic Front.

But in any event, you can link up in solidarity with the people and the scientists and technologists of the third world, if you can have a common understanding with them about the nature of monopoly capitalism or imperialism and you sympathize with and support their struggle for national liberation and democracy and development. It is in this struggle that science and technology can be liberated in the third world and can be used to serve the people and lift them from their poverty. #

STRENGTHEN THE ALLIANCE FOR HUMAN RIGHTS IN THE NATIONAL-DEMOCRATIC MOVEMENT⁵

August 17, 1995

Let me express my solidarity with all the human rights organizations and advocates that have agreed to form KARAPATAN. I am happy as you are that you are holding the first national congress with the theme, "Develop our strength, consolidate our ranks, struggle for human rights towards the liberation of the entire people".

The establishment of KARAPATAN is a highly significant event. It comes to further firm up the resolve of the human rights organizations and advocates to persevere in the struggle for national liberation and democracy and therefore to uphold, defend and promote human rights in opposition to foreign monopoly capitalism, feudalism and bureaucrat capitalism as well as their special agents who use the slogan of human rights to attack the national democratic movement.

So long as the semicolonial and semifeudal ruling system persists, the toiling masses of workers and peasants and the middle social strata are exploited and oppressed. Their human rights -- civil and political as well as economic, social and cultural -- are unceasingly violated by the imperialists and the exploiting classes of big compradors and landlords.

There can be an effective advocacy and militant defense of human rights only by knowing who are the violators of human rights and who are the victims and by recognizing that the people themselves can fight for their human rights through the national democratic movement.

⁵ Message to the Alliance for People's Rights (KARAPATAN) Congress

It is necessary to repudiate the handful of elements who pretend to be for human rights but who pose as neutral and are in fact hostile to the national democratic movement. They render a special service to the human rights violators and are therefore shunned by the victims.

A Comprehensive View of Human Rights

Let me try to present the comprehensive position of the national-democratic movement on the issue of human rights in terms of substantive scope and the levels of social reality. In the process, let me contrast this position with that of the imperialists and the local reactionaries.

The substantive scope of human rights covers not only civil and political rights but also the economic, social and cultural rights of the Filipino people. The people assert and fight for the full scope of human rights in their struggle for national and social liberation.

The national-democratic revolution is waged to overthrow the big comprador-landlord state, to liberate the people from oppression and exploitation and to establish the people's democratic state. The constitution of this state carries provisions against imperialism and the local exploiting classes in order to lay the ground for the full realization of the people's human rights in every sphere of social life.

To counter the revolution, the imperialists and the exploiting classes openly and viciously use the coercive apparatuses of the state to suppress the revolutionary forces and the people. The outcry rises against state terrorism. The main or sole tendency is to invoke the civil and political rights of the victims, as if these were the only human rights under attack.

There is oppression because it is a prerequisite and concomitant to exploitation. The imperialists and the local reactionaries

violate the civil and political rights in order to preserve the system of exploitation. They want the daily violence of exploitation to persist under their state power. This exploitation extends to the violation of economic, social and cultural rights.

While playing a revolutionary role in the past, the bourgeoisie asserted the sovereignty of the people against the so-called divine right of the absolute monarchy and defined the relationship of the state and the citizenry. In the best of bourgeois democratic constitutions, the bill of rights lists the fundamental rights and freedoms of the citizenry.

But after seizing political power and making capitalism the dominant socioeconomic system in a number of countries, the big bourgeoisie has systematically misrepresented the bourgeois state as supraclass in order to conceal its oppressive class character and used the abstraction of individual rights in bourgeois constitutions in order to rationalize the privilege of certain individuals to exploit many other individuals.

The exploiters are a class that in fact controls the bourgeois state. It is simply untrue that all individuals in an exploitative society have equal rights, equal opportunities and equal protection of the law and that their only concern is either to harmonize their relations with the supraclass state or overthrow it when it becomes tyrannical and oppressive.

The provisions on human rights of the United Nations Charter (1945) and the U.N. Universal Declaration of Human Rights (1948) are in line with the traditional bourgeois concept of human rights mainly and essentially as civil and political rights. What is new about these U.N. instruments is the attempt to set an international standard on human rights and to suggest that the international law on human rights override domestic law.

However, there are enough provisions in these U.N. instruments to allow the contracting states under the principle of state

sovereignty to handle all human rights cases within their national borders individually and exclusively and to restrict or even violate human rights by invoking national security, public order and the like. The imperialist states and their client-states in far greater number [in far more instances?] than revolutionary states have used the principle of state sovereignty to assert exclusive jurisdiction over human rights cases within their national borders.

With utter callousness, the United States and other capitalist powers have described the most brutal pro-imperialist regimes as democratic and belonging to the free world and have used the slogan of human rights to pursue anticommunist propaganda against anti-imperialist states or dignify pressures on other states to submit to the policies of foreign monopoly capitalism.

The United States has been the worst of human rights violators on an international scale since 1945. It is the only imperialist power that has used nuclear weapons to wipe out civilian populations in a few seconds. It has launched wars of aggression to kill millions of people as in Korea and Indochina and nearly 200,000 people in Iraq within one month. It has instigated and supported reactionary regimes to engage in the most barbaric acts, including massacres, torture, bombardments on civilian communities, and forced mass evacuation.

We should not forget the massacre of more than a million Indonesians in 1965 and so many other massacres perpetrated in Asia, Africa and Latin America by the imperialists and their reactionary agents. The Marcos regime dared to impose a fascist dictatorship on the Filipino people in 1972 only because the United States approved and supported it. The repression was done in the name of anticommunism and was intended to thwart the growing national democratic movement.

In Philippine history, the worst human rights violations have been committed by foreign oppressors. Spanish colonialism

oppressed and exploited the Filipino people for more than three centuries. In frustrating and defeating the Philippine Republic from 1899 onward, the United States unleashed such barbarities as massacre, torture, food blockade, forced relocation, arson and artillery fire on millions of people and killed off ten percent of the population. During World War II, Japan and the United States in their interimperialist contest took turns in inflicting atrocities on the Filipino people.

As a result of the demand of the underdeveloped countries, the U.N. General Assembly passed not only the U.N. Covenant on Civil and Political Rights but also the U.N. Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights in 1966. The self-determination of the people is affirmed and so is the sovereign power of the contracting states, of whatever character, to be separately and solely responsible for the observance of human rights within their national jurisdiction.

In waging national democratic revolution, the people uphold the principle of their sovereignty and their human rights as individuals, in association, in patriotic and progressive classes and strata, and as a national community. They struggle to liberate themselves from foreign and domestic oppressors and exploiters in order to assert, defend and advance their human rights and establish the people's democratic state under which they can truly enjoy the constitutional guarantees for their human rights.

To harmonize the relations of the state and the citizenry in the observance of human rights is necessary, when that state is truly an instrument of the citizenry who are liberated from imperialism and the exploiting classes and really provides the guarantees that no less itself or any other entity in society can violate the human rights of any citizen with impunity.

The current reactionary state in the Philippines is an instrument of oppression and exploitation, violating the guarantees of civil and political rights in the bill of rights of its own constitution as

well as those in the U.N. instruments on human rights. In the Philippines today, there are five levels of social reality to take into account in dealing with the issue of human rights. The best way to grasp these levels is to grasp them as levels of social contradictions.

These are the contradiction between foreign monopoly capitalism and the Filipino people, that between the reactionary classes of big compradors and landlords on the one hand and the people, especially the workers and peasants, on the other hand, that between the state in the service of imperialism and the local exploiting classes on the one hand and the broad masses of the people, that between the few individuals who belong to the exploitative classes and that between the rational regard for human beings as individuals with basic human rights and the inhuman regard for them as a work force for exploitation.

Taking into account the aforesaid levels of social reality in opposition to their obfuscation by the imperialists and local exploiting classes does not mean laying aside or disregarding the human rights pertaining to human beings as differentiated from the beasts and as individuals with inalienable right to life, liberty and the security of person and with fundamental freedoms.

Such acts, as torture, rape, murder, cannibalism and the like are patently inhumane. Even one accused of having committed the most heinous crime is entitled to due process, deemed innocent until proven guilty in court, treated humanely and punished according to the gravity of the crime and in a manner that does not demean the system of justice. The punishment is meant to give justice to the victims and serve notice to all that no one can violate the human rights of another person or the people with impunity.

The revolutionaries do not sweepingly consider all members of the exploiting classes as criminals. Relatively only a few of

them have criminal accountability and are subject to criminal prosecution before the people's court. An entire exploiting class may be deprived of its means to oppress and exploit the people and certain rights of all members of the entire class may be restricted or dissolved. But they are not arbitrarily regarded and treated as criminals nor are they viewed as beasts. They are given the opportunity to remould themselves and to contribute to society what they can under basically human conditions.

The constitution of the people's democratic state upholds the power of the proletariat and other working people and contains the crucial provisions against the imperialists and the local exploiting classes of big compradors and landlords for the purpose of the all-round social revolution. Such provisions make the constitution radically different from the constitution of the current reactionary state. Consequently, the guarantees for the civil and political rights of the citizenry in the bill of rights come into a context of genuine independence, democracy, social justice and development.

In the Philippines today, there is a bitter contention, in fact a civil war, between the big comprador-landlord state and the people who are engaged in the national democratic revolution and are building the organs of political power. Between the two sides, there is a contention[?] between the constitution of the big comprador-landlord state and the Guide for Establishing the People's Government which upholds the people's sovereignty, sets[?] forth the liberation of the people from imperialism and the exploiting classes and guarantees the human rights of the people in every aspect of social life.

Experience in the Advocacy for Human Rights

In the advocacy for human rights, it is necessary to muster the forces that are engaged in the struggle for national liberation and democracy. These are the working class as the leading force, the basic alliance of the working class and

peasantry as the main force, the aforementioned classes and the urban petty bourgeoisie as the basic progressive forces and all positive forces which include the national bourgeoisie.

The alliance of the patriotic and progressive forces can also take advantage of the contradictions among the reactionaries and avail of the less reactionary sections of the exploiting classes as temporary and unreliable allies directly or indirectly against the enemy (the most reactionary faction, which is most subservient to the imperialists). The point is to develop the broadest possible array of forces in order to isolate and destroy the power of the enemy that is unleashing the worst human rights violations on the people.

In the alliance for human rights along the national democratic line, the patriotic and progressive forces and elements involved may be motivated by various lines of thought and belief. The proletarian revolutionaries, the progressive liberals, religious believers and other people can find common ground in the national democratic movement and agree to defend and fight for human rights against the imperialist and the local exploiting classes. In this regard, there has been a rich experience since the early '70s when upon the instigation of the United States the Marcos regime set out to impose the open rule of terror on the people.

There are the proletarian revolutionaries who have a clear class analysis of Philippine society, take the vantage point of the working class, and consider the national democratic and socialist stages of the Philippine revolution as stages in the advance of the the struggle for human rights. There are the bourgeois liberals who retain the revolutionary or progressive aspect of their political philosophy, share with the proletarian revolutionaries adherence to the people's sovereignty and strive to put the bourgeois-democratic bill of rights and the current bourgeois international canon of human rights in the service of the national democratic movement. There are the religious

believers who find their faith as being in consonance with the struggle for national and social liberation because this upholds the dignity and rights of human beings.

A broad alliance called the Movement of Concerned Citizens for Civil Liberties was formed in 1971 when the U.S.-Marcos regime proclaimed the suspension of the writ of habeas corpus and started to suppress the legal forces of the national democratic movement and all other opposition. The National Democratic Front was established in 1973 in order to preserve, consolidate and expand the forces of the national democratic movement underground after the U.S.-Marcos regime proclaimed martial rule in 1972 and attempted to destroy completely all types of opposition.

Within the NDF, the Christians for National Liberation (CNL) took upon itself the task of creating a formation to defend human rights, seek the support of the church people and counter the reactionary support of the institutional church for the fascist dictatorship. The Task Force Detainees came into being in 1974, under the auspices of the Association of Major Religious Superiors in the Philippines.

Through all the years of the fascist dictatorial regime of the U.S.-Marcos ruling clique, the forces of the national democratic movement struggled to uphold and defend human rights and suffered the main brunt of human rights violations. They ceaselessly offered alliance and cooperated directly and indirectly with all other antifascist forces, including the anti-Marcos sections of the exploiting classes. They excelled in waging armed revolution as well as in developing a broad united front and utilizing legal tactics against the fascist dictatorship.

From the late '70s onward, funds in substantial amounts came from bourgeois and religious funding agencies based in Western Europe to support legal work in human rights. This work was helpful in the reemergence of the legal democratic movement

against the regime. But with the foreign funds also came subtle anticommunist ideas and the floating notion that human rights work was merely a matter of civil and political rights and that democracy was merely a matter of restoring the pre-1972 bourgeois democratic institutions and processes.

Towards the middle of the '80s, bureaucratism became conspicuous among the salaried and office-bound personnel in the human rights organizations and other foreign-funded NGOs. There developed a tendency to neglect painstaking mass work and to depend on funds from outside the mass movement in order to undertake sweeping propaganda and mass protest actions [but] without solid organizing[?]. The wave of mass discontent, arising from the acute economic and political crisis of the regime and from the Aquino assassination, was so strong in the 1983-86 period that mass protest actions could be undertaken even with limited work in political education and mass organizing.

From 1980 onward, the subjectivist notion had gained ground within the central leadership of the Communist Party of the Philippines that the U.S.-Marcos regime had so industrialized and urbanized the Philippines to the extent that it was no longer semifeudal. This erroneous notion became the common launching base for both "Left" and Right opportunism, both of which overrated the importance of urban work and depreciated the strategic line of encircling the cities from the countryside in protracted people's war.

Both the Left opportunist lines of "strategic counteroffensive" (centrally generated) and the "Red Area-White Area" (whipped up in Mindanao) undermined and inflicted severe damage to the revolutionary movement in the entire '80s. By pushing urban insurrectionism and premature regularization of the people's army and drawing cadres away from mass work, these adventurist lines undermined the revolutionary advances achieved by the revolutionary cadres and fighters who carried out

extensive and intensive guerrilla warfare on the basis of widening and deepening mass base.

While "Left" opportunism was riding high in the revolutionary movement, Right opportunism lurked behind, proposing the "New Katipunan" as a device for liquidating the working class leadership in the revolution under the pretext of thereby attracting more mass support. The Right opportunists used foreign funds to favor the creation of "NGO" offices, the proliferation of alliances and campaign centers addressing the spontaneous masses. Like the "Left" opportunists, they had disdain for painstaking mass work and solid organizing.

The "Left" opportunists passed off modern revisionism as Marxism-Leninism and Soviet monopoly bureaucrat capitalism as socialism for the avowed purpose of courting the Soviet and pro-Soviet parties and governments for military and financial assistance. A revisionist concept of armed struggle, dependent on foreign assistance and impugning the principle of self-reliance, took hold among the putschists. The obfuscation of the longrunning antirevisionist position of the CPP, the silence on Dengist revisionism and the endorsement of Brezhnevite revisionism would ultimately lead to the acceptance of Gorbachovism and anticommunism among the opportunists in the latter part of the '80s.

From the United States, some Filipino assets of U.S. imperialism pushed the seemingly Leftist line of supporting the Philippine armed struggle but dropping the strategic line of protracted people's war and seeking the support of the Soviet Union. Subsequently, they whipped up the blatantly Rightist line that the downfall of the Marcos dictatorship would spell democratization and that elite democracy could be transformed through reforms within the system by popular democracy. The exponents of "popular democracy" (bourgeois populism) emerged as an ideological parasite within the CPP as

early as 1984 and subsequently tried to use the foreign-funded "NGOs and POs" against the national democratic movement.

After the complete frustration of their line of urban insurrectionism and militarism as early as 1984, the "Left" opportunists in Mindanao obscured their responsibility for their disastrous line and blamed "deep penetration agents" for their failure and launched the bloody witchhunt Kampanyang Aho from 1985 to 1986. Then they swung towards the Right opportunist line by claiming that the strategic line of protracted people's war was to blame for the 1986 boycott error, exaggerating this major tactical error as the biggest error in the entire history of the revolutionary movement and unabashedly calling for bourgeois reformism as the necessary prerequisite to their failed insurrectionism.

They conjoined with the long-standing Right opportunists and with the "Left" opportunists in other regions as well as with the pseudo-Left anticommunist groups in assailing the CPP as having isolated itself not only because of the boycott error but mainly because of the line of the national democratic revolution through protracted people's war. As early as 1985, it was evident that the agents of U.S. imperialism were instigating and manipulating the opportunists and pseudo-Left groups to discredit, undermine and derail the national-democratic movement.

Despite the disaster caused by the wrong line in Mindanao from 1984-1986, various forms of "Left" opportunism continued to run, cause damage and result sometimes in hysterical anti-informer campaigns in areas other than Mindanao. The Right opportunists used to their advantage the serious damage done by "Left" opportunism. They misrepresented the errors and damage made by the "Left" opportunists as those of Marxism-Leninism.

In 1989, the Right opportunists started to become arrogant and even the worst of the "Left" opportunists started to swing to the position of the Right opportunists. They began to flaunt the books of Gorbachov and Roy Medvedev as their guide and to spread these. They used the anticommunist line in the cold war that the proletarian revolutionary party and the national democratic revolution were outdated and hopeless because of "Stalinism" which they adopted as their favorite cussword.

They collaborated with the pseudo-Left anticommunist groups and the thinly disguised agents of imperialism and local reaction in trying to spread revisionism and liquidationism within the CPP. The urban-basing of the central organs of the CPP and even those of the NPA was also taking a toll in terms of ideological confusion and effective enemy operations. Cynicism, gangsterism and NGO corruption became visible problems.

The Rightist current ran strong in urban-based progressive organizations and offices. Political degeneration set in among certain elements and sections of the human rights organizations. They succumbed to the pressures of Western funding agencies that the revolutionary forces be depicted as equally responsible for human rights violations as the reactionary armed forces. However, they covered up the Kampanyang Ahos and other bloody witchhunts instigated by the failed putschists in their hysteria and attempt to blame deep penetration agents for the disastrous results of their wrong line.

They harped on the line that democratization and the decline of human rights violations were occurring under the reactionary regime, despite the escalation of the total war policy, which involved the killing of prominent progressive political leaders like Rolando Olalia and Lean Alejandro, labor leaders, human rights lawyers, youth activists, personnel of Partido ng Bayan and others in urban areas from 1986 to 1988 and the wider scale of gross human rights violations under Lambat Bitag I, II and III and other military campaigns of suppression in the countryside

from 1986 to the present. Bureaucratism and corruption of a few through multiple compensation in several foreign-funded human rights organizations became more scandalous from year to year.

In 1991, the incorrigible opportunists were already outspokenly anti-Marxist, anticommunist and counterrevolutionary, were spreading pessimism and defeatism among people they came in contact with and were maneuvering to decapitate and disintegrate the CPP and the entire revolutionary movement of the people. They pointed to the fall of the anti-Stalin revisionist regimes as the fall of socialism and Stalinism and as the proof of the marginalization and futility of the anti-imperialist and class struggle for socialism.

Since 1988, the genuine proletarian revolutionaries have been cognizant of the need for a rectification campaign. The most tactful efforts were undertaken in this regard but proved to be ineffective in stemming the tide. It would only be in 1991 that the proletarian revolutionaries decided to launch the Second Great Rectification Movement with resolve and vigor, unprecedented since the First Great Rectification Movement that had led to the reestablishment of the CPP in 1968.

The counterrevolutionary opportunists who are now specialists of the reactionary regime in using the phraseology of the pseudo-Left and neocolonialism to attack the national democratic movement have a handful of cohorts who pretend to be still in the legal work for the protection of human rights. These are the shameless elements in PAHRA who are headed by Ramon Casiple and who are characterized by the following:

1. They vociferously take an anticommunist line and a hostile position towards the forces of the national democratic movement.
2. They adopt the "universality" (in fact the narrow mentality and interests of the big bourgeoisie) to attack the comprehensive position of the national democratic movement on human rights.

3. They misrepresent themselves as "neutral" between the violators of human rights and the victims.
4. They condone the Kampanyang Ahas and other barbaric acts and pass off as advocates of human rights the torturers and murderers who were responsible for these.
5. They harp on the democratization of the Philippine ruling system and on the decline of human rights violations.
6. They are office-bound, engage in bureaucratism and put themselves against the human rights workers in the field.
7. They are corrupted by the funds which they get from foreign funding agencies through multiple compensation, top-heavy administrative spending and padding of accounts.

They are programmed to self-destruct because they cannot long pretend to be advocates of human rights while they attack the national democratic movement and use foreign funds to run their bureaucratic operations and pursue the anticommunist line of foreign funding agencies. They can try to sow intrigues among some victims of human rights violations up to a certain point in time in the past. But certainly they have cut themselves off from the new waves of victims of the counterrevolutionary state.

Further Strengthening Advocacy for Human Rights

The formation of KARAPATAN is the brilliant result of the rectification in the various human rights organizations and basic mass organizations. KARAPATAN repudiates and replaces PAHRA because the latter has fallen into the hands of a small clique of conspirators who have betrayed the advocacy of human rights and who are opposed to the line and forces of the national democratic movement.

Being the genuine alliance for the advocacy of human rights, KARAPATAN is certain to further strengthen itself by fighting for the full range of human rights (civil, political, economic, social and cultural rights) along the national

democratic line and by engaging the participation and support of the broad masses of the people. KARAPATAN can only be as strong as it relies on its component organizations and the mass movement. Its representations and issuances can only be as forceful as it can arouse, organize and mobilize the people on human rights issues.

KARAPATAN is carrying a great amount of work in seeking justice for the victims of human rights violations. The U.S.-Ramos regime knows no other way to deal with the crisis but to unleash gross human rights violations on a wide scale. There is more work ahead as the number of victims increase. The socioeconomic and political crisis is ever worsening and oppression and exploitation is ever intensifying.

The economic bankruptcy of the reactionary state is clearly manifested by the rapid sale of state assets, the mounting foreign and local public debt, the huge trade deficit, overdependence on speculative foreign capital, the rising level of taxation, the runaway inflation in basic commodities and so on. The imperialists are grabbing fast the superprofits and debt service and so are the big compradors their own profits, the landlords their rent and the high bureaucrats their payoffs.

The agrarian and semifeudal character of the Philippine economy continues to aggravate and deepen. There is massive unemployment in both urban and rural areas. The exploitation of the working people is intolerable and social unrest is widespread and acute. The promise of NIC-hood for the Philippines by the year 2000 is a flagrant lie. The U.S.-Ramos regime is not at all engaged in any program of industrialization and is opposed to genuine and thoroughgoing land reform.

It is of crucial importance to recognize that the big comprador-landlord state remains oppressive, that the official terrorism made conspicuous by the U.S.-Marcos regime has extended to the succeeding Aquino and Ramos regimes and that reactionary

military politicians and politicians backed up by blocs of military officers and private armed groups are increasingly in control of the reactionary government and compete for political power and the accumulation of private wealth. These are manifestations of the further deepening of the crisis of the ruling system.

The periodic elections are merely moments of defining the reactionary factions which are at odds with each other. The internal contradictions among the reactionaries are likely to become more violent than now as the economic and political crisis worsens and the people raise the level of their armed resistance to a new and higher one.

But there are strong indications that Ramos wants to prolong himself in power beyond 1998, by amending the GRP constitution in favor of a parliamentary form of government. He has gained control over both houses of Congress and he is seeking extraordinary powers to reorganize the executive and judicial branches of the reactionary government. He is pushing the Anti-Terrorism Bill for the purpose of terrorizing the people as he tightens his autocratic hold on the reactionary government. His autocratic ambitions are exacerbating the political crisis of the system.

Exactly at the point that the negotiating panels of the GRP and NDFP entered the stage of formal peace negotiations last June 26 in Brussels, the Ramos regime suspended these negotiations. It did so after maliciously violating the Joint Agreement on Safety and Immunity Guarantees in the outstanding case of Sotero Llamas. The regime has also recently "suspended" the effectivity of the JASIG.

Even as the Ramos regime appears to be set on terminating the peace negotiations, the Reciprocal Working Committee on Human Rights of the NDFP Negotiating Panel is working on the Draft of the Comprehensive Agreement on Human Rights and International Humanitarian Law.

In the making of this draft, the basic rights and interests of the entire Filipino people, especially the toiling masses and the middle social strata, are taken into account along the national democratic line and in accordance with the Guide for Establishing the People's Democratic Government. The available international instruments and standards on human rights and international humanitarian law are also used for critical study, reference and guidance.

The NDFP is asking all human rights and basic mass organizations to help in drafting the said agreement. Whether there will be further peace negotiations or not, the NDFP draft on human rights and international humanitarian law will set an important standard for the advocacy, active defense and observance of human rights.

The draft should uphold, defend and promote the basic human rights and freedoms of individuals and the patriotic and progressive forces of the people in the context of the people's sovereignty and liberating the people from imperialism and the exploiting classes of big compradors and landlords in all fields of social life and endeavor. The NDFP is bound by the Guide for Establishing the People's Democratic Government and its Part III on the Fundamental Rights and Duties of Citizens.

Your human rights work is of crucial importance and is urgently needed. The imperialists and the local reactionaries are frenziedly engaged in human rights violations. The civil war is proceeding because the imperialists and reactionaries have no wish but to destroy the armed revolution one way or another and the people have no choice but to intensify their struggle and win the national democratic revolution in order to achieve a just and lasting peace.

I wish KARAPATAN the utmost success in performing its role of human rights advocacy in these trying times. I am

confident that your achievements will be great as you are determined to stand up courageously and militantly for the victims of human rights and as you adhere resolutely to the national democratic line.

The traditional view of the Western bourgeoisie is that natural rights or human rights are essentially civil and political rights. It is insufficient to think of human rights only in these terms, although these are the rights most conspicuously violated by the reactionary state and are therefore the most vigorously invoked by the victims in a draconian situation. There is oppression because it is a prerequisite and concomitant to exploitation.

Even in the absence of armed revolution, when the peace and order of the imperialists and the reactionaries reigns, the daily violence of exploitation is at the core of seemingly unresisted [quiescent] violation of the people's economic, social and cultural rights persist. The coercive apparatuses of the state continue to operate in the background and are ready to move to the foreground whenever the rulers deem it necessary.

Since the time that they started to define the natural rights of man in order to oppose the divine right of the absolute monarchy, the philosophers and publicists of the bourgeoisie have abstracted the individual and have [glossed over the reality of classes and class struggle in defining civil and political rights.] have been satisfied with defining the civil and political rights as they gloss over the reality of classes and class struggle.
