

DRAFT

**Book 2: For Democracy and Socialism against
Imperialist Globalization**

Table of Contents

1. On Celebrating the Centennial of the Philippine Revolution of 1896
2. Protracted People's War and Diplomacy
3. On the Combination of Legal and Illegal Forms of Struggle
4. The Philippine Revolution and the Nationality Question
5. Message of Solidarity to the People's Conference Against Imperialist "Globalization"
6. The Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution: Impact on the Philippines and Continuing Global Significance
7. Lenin and Stalin on the Relationship of Democratic. and Socialist Revolutions in Colonial and Semi-Colonial Countries
8. Speech at Protest Meeting on Asylum Case
9. Accelerated Destruction of Productive Forces
10. Reaffirm the Communist Manifesto
11. The Bankruptcy of Imperialist Globalization and the Urgency of the Socialist Cause
12. The Fatal Course of Imperialism and Inevitability of Socialism
13. "Globalization" and Class Struggle
14. Advance the People's Resistance to Imperialist Globalization
15. On 100 Years of Struggle Against US Imperialism
16. The People's Struggle Against War
17. The Left on the Eve of the 21st Century
18. Imperialism, Fascisation and Fascism: an Overview

1.

ON CELEBRATING THE CENTENNIAL OF THE PHILIPPINE REVOLUTION OF 1896

August 23, 1995

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

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

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

The revolution was in prospect of winning total victory in 1898. But U.S. imperialism intervened, unleashed a brutal war of aggression against the Filipino people and turned the Philippines into its own colony. It did not only deploy a far superior military force to defeat the revolutionary army and massacre 10 percent of the people but also launched the deceptive propaganda of

benevolent assimilation and pro-imperialist liberalism which coopted the bourgeois liberal leadership of the revolutionary movement.

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

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

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

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

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

In celebrating the centennial of the Philippine revolution of 1896, we must carry out the general line of national democratic revolution against foreign monopoly capitalism, domestic feudalism and bureaucrat capitalism. In this regard, we must be able to make a class analysis of Philippine society and must grasp the correct and effective relationship of the basic revolutionary forces.

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

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

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

Uphold the revolutionary legacy of 1896!
Carry the Philippine revolution forward!
Long live the Filipino people!

2.

PROTRACTED PEOPLE'S WAR AND DIPLOMACY

Introduction

5 December 1995

My assignment in this anti-imperialist conference is to discuss protracted people's war and diplomacy. I propose to discuss first the protracted people's war in the Philippines. Then, I shall discuss diplomacy and the relation of this to people's war.

Protracted People's War

The protracted people's war in the Philippines cannot be discussed without priorly understanding the character of Philippine society and the corresponding character of the Philippine revolution.

Philippine society today is semicolonial because in form the political system is independent but in fact it continues to be dominated by imperialism behind the joint class dictatorship of the comprador big bourgeoisie and landlord class. The dominant political parties and the series of ruling cliques represent these exploiting classes and are subservient to foreign monopoly capitalism. The apparatuses of state power are dependent on and controlled by U.S. imperialism.

Philippine society is semifeudal because its socioeconomic system is basically agrarian, without basic industries, and is run by the aforesaid exploiting classes to serve foreign monopoly capitalism. In the cities, the big compradors reign over the import-dependent enterprises in the commercial and industrial sectors in combination with the direct subsidiaries of foreign monopoly firms. In the countryside, the landlords own the vast tracts of land for the production of export crops and staple food.

In correspondence to the semicolonial and semifeudal character of Philippine society, the character of the Philippine revolution is national-democratic or in other words anti-imperialist and antifeudal. The principal tasks of this revolution are to fight for the people's national sovereignty and achieve national liberation against imperialism and its local puppets and to realize as the main substance of democracy the social liberation of the peasant majority of the people through land reform.

Pursuing these tasks began with the old democratic revolution of 1896. But it was frustrated by the intervention of U.S. imperialism in 1898 and by its war of aggression, starting in 1899. The current revolution in the Philippines is therefore a resumption of the old democratic revolution. But at the same time, it is a democratic revolution of the new type. The class leadership is no longer that of the bourgeoisie but that of the proletariat. The revolution is no longer within the context of the world bourgeois democratic revolution but that of the world proletarian socialist revolution.

The new-democratic revolution cannot be accomplished without overthrowing the power of imperialism and their local puppet reactionaries. Therefore, the road of armed revolution has been once more taken by the people in order to get rid of the counterrevolutionary state and free themselves from oppression and exploitation by imperialism, feudalism and bureaucrat capitalism. Upon the nationwide seizure of political power, the proletariat and the people can proceed to socialist revolution.

As the advanced detachment of the leading class in the revolution, the Communist Party of the Philippines has adopted the general line of national democratic revolution through protracted people's war since the reestablishment of this party on 26 December 1968. This general line is based on domestic concrete conditions and the rich historical

revolutionary experience of the Filipino people and is guided by Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought and the advances made in the struggle against imperialism, revisionism and reaction in the '60s.

In people's war, the strategic line of encircling the cities from the countryside and accumulating strength in the countryside over a long period of time until it is possible to seize the cities is in accordance with the revolutionary class line of the CPP. This class line seeks to bind the proletariat and peasantry in a basic alliance as the foundation of the national-democratic revolution as well as of the consequent socialist revolution upon the nationwide seizure of political power. In the concrete semifeudal conditions of the Philippines, the worker-peasant alliance is effectively developed through people's war.

The comprehensive revolutionary class line of the CPP is to uphold the leadership of the proletariat, rely mainly on the peasantry, win over the middle social strata of urban petty bourgeoisie and middle bourgeoisie and take advantage of the splits among the reactionaries in order to isolate and destroy the power of the worst reactionary puppet clique at every given time.

In the countryside, the antifeudal class line requires the proletariat to rely mainly on the poor peasants and farm workers, win over the middle peasants, neutralize the rich peasants and take advantage of the splits among the landlords in order to isolate and destroy the power of the despotic landlords.

The people's war is a revolutionary mass undertaking. It is a politico-military process which entails three integral components. These are the revolutionary armed struggle, agrarian revolution and the building of the mass movement.

The CPP conceives of a probable course of development in people's war. This involves the strategic stages of defensive,

stalemate and offensive. Up to this time, the New People's Army is in the stage of the strategic defensive within which it can launch tactical offensives. It is determined to grow from small to big and from weak to strong in the countryside where the peasant majority of the people are and where the terrain affords room for maneuver.

In the long course of people's war, it is possible for the revolutionary movement to carry out land reform in stages from the minimum program of rent reduction, elimination of usury, raising of farm wages, fair prices for farm products and the raising of production in agriculture and side occupations to the maximum program of land confiscation from the landlords and free distribution of land to the peasants.

In mass base building, the CPP arouses, organizes and mobilizes the masses. Mass organizations of workers, peasants, women, youth, cultural activists, children and others are built and carry out mass campaigns on various basic issues. The appointive provisional organs of political power and then the elective regular organs of political power are formed. The people's democratic government attend to problems in mass organization, public education, land reform, finance, production, defense, health, culture, arbitration and so on.

Diplomacy of the People's Democratic Government

So much for the general explanation of protracted people's war. I wish to start discussing diplomacy in its proper sense. In the simplest dictionary definition, it means the conduct of relations between states directly through their respective heads or through representatives.

The revolutionary forces and the people led by the CPP are building a new revolutionary state even as the old reactionary state of the comprador big bourgeoisie and landlord class is still well entrenched in the cities. The new revolutionary state seeks

to displace the old reactionary state in more and more areas of the countryside until it becomes possible to do so in the cities.

I have referred to the revolutionary organs of political power. These have been formed since the very beginning of the protracted people's war. These are now in thousands of villages in the Philippines. These are the foundation of higher levels of political power at the municipal, district, provincial, regional and national levels.

At whichever level, the appropriate leading organ of the CPP can exercise sole governmental authority until the organ of political power, appointive or elective, can arise to assume administrative functions. The NDF, as the underground united front organization, helps to prepare the way for the emergence of organs of political power at levels higher than the village level. The CPP is at the core and leads all organs of political power.

Since 1972, the CPP has promulgated the Rules for Establishing the People's Democratic Government. This amounts to the constitution of the organs of political power. But so far, there is yet no public proclamation of the provisional revolutionary government at the national level. In the latter half of the '80s, some regional and provincial governments were proclaimed prematurely and erroneously, unduly exposing regions and provinces where the revolutionary forces and the masses were relatively strong.

The CPP is now avoiding the public proclamation of provisional governments at levels higher than the village level. It has decided that it is better to gain further strength and broaden participation than to beat the drums, blow the trumpets and attract enemy onslaughts. It has recognized that to form organs of political power prematurely at higher levels is to draw cadres away from basic revolutionary tasks at the grassroots and towards unnecessary and costly bureaucratic verticalization.

For quite some time, since the '70s, the CPP and the NDF have related discreetly with foreign governments and offices which take an anti-imperialist stand in addition to ruling revolutionary parties and movements abroad. But even when there is a presumption that the CPP or the NDF is representing the people's democratic government in dealing with a foreign government, there has yet been no open and explicit proclamation of the relations as diplomatic in character. So, the CPP and NDFP have preferred to call these relations protodiplomatic.

In recent years, the revolutionary forces and organs of political power led by the CPP have authorized the NDF to represent them in protodiplomatic and diplomatic relations with foreign governments. Insofar as there is yet no open and formal diplomatic recognition extended by any foreign government, it may be said that the informal and discreet relations that the NDF has with certain governments or offices thereof have a protodiplomatic character.

At the point that the U.S. was about to launch its war of aggression in the Persian Gulf in 1990, the NDF co-signed with the representative of the Iraqi government a document against the impending war of aggression. In connection with the prospect of peace negotiations with the Manila government, the NDF has been in official contacts with several states and interstate agencies and has been the subject of official references in the communications of several states and in resolutions passed by European governments, including those of the Swiss parliament and European Parliament.

The revolutionary organs of political power and the revolutionary forces have authorized the NDF to engage the Manila government in exploratory talks about peace talks and in formal peace talks. In both types of talks, the NDF has faced up to the reactionary government in the Philippines on an equal footing within the purview of international law.

The NDF has retained its revolutionary integrity and upheld the Rules for Establishing the People's Democratic Government. So has the Manila government stuck to its counterrevolutionary character and 1987 constitution. Both parties can engage in formal peace negotiations only because they have agreed in The Hague Joint Declaration of 1 September 1992 on a framework of mutually acceptable principles such as national sovereignty, democracy and development, and social justice and of there being no precondition whatsoever that would violate the character and purpose of peace negotiations.

The Hague Joint Declaration also sets forth by mutual agreement the substantive agenda which includes such headings as the following: (1) mutual respect for human rights and international humanitarian law, (2) social and economic reforms, (3) political and constitutional reforms, and (4) end of hostilities and disposition of forces.

As in any peace negotiations, the two contending parties agree to engage in these upon the premise that they try to address the root causes of the war. The NDF takes firmly the position that the revolutionary forces and organs of political power that it represents can engage in the peace negotiations only if such basic problems of the Filipino people as foreign monopoly capitalism, domestic feudalism and bureaucrat capitalism are addressed.

The position of the NDF is that under international law the NDF and the revolutionary movement it represents are guided by a constitution, have the inherent status of belligerency, acquired through revolutionary hard work and struggle, have a national structure of political authority and military command and exercise effective control over a significant portion of the Philippine population and territory.

Indeed, the NDF and GRP are co-belligerents in a civil war. The GRP is absolutely wrong whenever it claims anywhere that the

revolutionary forces and organs of political power represented by the NDF are merely insurgent forces. How can the revolutionary forces in the Philippines be considered a mere police problem, when their just revolutionary cause is clear, they encompass millions of people and the enemy deploys its regular military forces against them and has spent hundreds of billions of pesos in more than 26 years?

It has been the consistent position of the NDF since 1990 that exploratory talks and formal peace talks with the GRP be held in a foreign neutral venue, with the cooperation and assistance of a foreign state or interstate agency. The NDF has learned well the lessons drawn from the ceasefire talks and ceasefire agreement with the GRP in 1986 and 1987. There are serious costs to the revolutionary government, if talks were to be held in Manila or in any guerrilla front in the Philippines.

In connection with the question of venue for exploratory talks from 1990 to 1995, the NDF and the GRP have mutually agreed several times to communicate in parallel to some governments as possible host. They mutually agreed to approach the Belgian government separately and in parallel to request it to host the opening of the formal peace negotiations. The Belgian government, through its foreign ministry, graciously agreed to host and facilitate the formal opening of peace negotiations last 26 June 1995.

The GRP has suspended its peace negotiations with the NDF since 27 June 1995 after failing to release NDF consultant Sotero Llamas from detention in compliance with the Joint Agreement on Safety and Immunity Guarantees. However the GRP and the NDF have had back channel communications and are looking forward to the resumption of their negotiations subsequent to the release of Llamas. The two parties are exploring the venues for the meetings of the negotiating panels and the reciprocal working committees in Europe.

Relationship of People's War and Diplomacy

Let me now discuss the relationship of the protracted people's war and the diplomacy that is arising from the GRP-NDF peace negotiations. Are these not contradictory with each other? Don't the peace negotiations undermine or run counter to the protracted people's war.

Of course, we recognize that the two different things are contradictory. But we must know what is the principal thing and the secondary one and we must also see the identity that makes the two things related and significant.

It is clear to the NDF as a matter of principle that the protracted people's war is the principal thing and that it goes into peace negotiations as a secondary thing in order to carry forward the unwavering line of struggle for national liberation and democracy. The peace negotiations are one more form of struggle that has arisen between the revolutionary and counterrevolutionary governments in the Philippines.

The NDF has made clear to everyone that even as it wisely and properly conducts peace negotiations through its duly authorized negotiating panel these are secondary not only to the revolutionary armed struggle, which is now the principal form of struggle, but also to the legal mass movement of the patriotic and progressive forces. The overriding principle over all forms of struggle is to fight for national liberation and democracy. Otherwise, peace negotiations become a mode of capitulation.

The peace negotiations as conducted by the NDF is one more form of legal struggle which is not superior to the legal mass struggles but which is superior only in one respect, that these negotiations allow the NDF to face the GRP as an equal under international law. There are quite a number of legal forms of

struggle that involve operating within the legal and political framework of GRP.

What is identical in the revolutionary forces engaging in both protracted people's war and in peace negotiations is the aim of fighting for a just and lasting peace across the battlefield as well as across the negotiating table. So as not to confuse the people, the revolutionary forces always make clear that the line of struggle for national liberation and democracy is the same line for a just and lasting peace. So far, the protracted people's war has given solid results along this line whereas the peace negotiations have not yet begun even only to tackle the first item in the substantive agenda.

The formal peace negotiations between the NDF and the GRP signify a high level of national and international recognition for the strength already achieved by the revolutionary forces in the Philippines. For a long period of time, the GRP regarded the NDF as a containable police problem and as unworthy of being talked to in formal peace negotiations. But at this point in time, the GRP has already co-signed five documents with the NDF.

Two of these documents, The Hague Joint Declaration of 1992 and the Joint Agreement on Safety and Immunity Guarantees of 1995, are signed and approved by the Chairman of the National Council of the NDF and the President of the GRP. The rest are derivative documents within the competence of the negotiating panels. Amidst the provisions of equality, mutuality, joint capacity, reciprocity and the like, there is not a single term, phrase or clause which detracts from the revolutionary integrity of the revolutionary forces and organs of political power or which suggests capitulation of principle or arms on their part.

The NDF can enter into peace negotiations without the GRP being able to impose its constitutional, legal and political presumptions on the NDF only because of the proven strength of the revolutionary forces and organs of political power.

Through its highest political and military officials, the GRP has expressed a serious regard for the growing strength of the revolutionary forces in view of the revitalization, consolidation and expansion of that strength as a result of the rectification movement undertaken by the CPP since 1992.

In the course of peace negotiations with the GRP, it is perfectly the legitimate right and interest of the NDF to assert its status of belligerency under the laws of war and to seek international or diplomatic recognition of this status of belligerency.

Whether there are peace negotiations or not or whatever is the progress of these negotiations, it is also possible for foreign governments to recognize said status of belligerency or the political authority of the revolutionary forces and seek from the NDF safe conduct and protection for their citizens, NGO operations and business concerns in the Philippines so long as the strength of the revolutionary forces are growing and the areas under their control are expanding.

Having foresight, the NDF is already studying how diplomatic missions and consular offices can be established in order to relate to and cooperate with foreign governments and foreign nationals.#

3.

ON THE COMBINATION OF LEGAL AND ILLEGAL FORMS OF STRUGGLE

5 December 1995

General Comment

As a student and teacher of political science, let me comment on the combination of legal and illegal forms of struggle waged by the proletariat and the people against the big bourgeoisie. I try to speak in the light of the Marxist-Leninist theory of state and revolution and, of course, the historical experience of the proletariat.

Whenever I refer to the revolutionary party of the proletariat, I mean the party guided by the theory of Marxism-Leninism and in particular by its component theory of state and revolution. Such a party may already be waging armed revolution or if not yet doing so recognizes the necessity of this in the attainment of socialism.

In any country where the big bourgeoisie reigns, the party of the proletariat that aims to carry out socialist revolution runs the risk of being suppressed someday. The class dictatorship of the big bourgeoisie exists to prevent the proletariat from taking power and establishing socialism.

While it can still use imperialist and neocolonial methods of exploitation and pretend to be democratic and civil in its homeground, the big bourgeoisie has a repertoire of peaceful methods for coopting, undermining, cutting down and isolating the revolutionary party of the proletariat, short of unleashing all-out fascist repression. But when such a party cannot be undermined, cut down and isolated through peaceful methods and instead grows in strength until it is perceived as a real threat to the very life of the ruling capitalist system, then the big bourgeoisie carries out violent suppression.

It is revisionist to believe that the proletariat can evade the class dictatorship of the bourgeoisie and peacefully bring about the socialist revolution. According to Marx and Engels, the class dictatorship of the proletariat must replace that of the bourgeoisie in order to bring about socialism. So far, there is yet no historical instance of a peaceful transition from capitalism to socialism. But there is ample proof that the peaceful transition from socialism to capitalism is possible.

In Industrial Capitalist Countries

In industrial capitalist countries, the party of the proletariat wages legal struggle as the main form of struggle for a long period of time, for so long as it is possible and necessary. It is foolhardy to play with an armed insurrection when the severity of the crisis does not yet render the big bourgeoisie incapable of ruling in the old way, when the people are not yet desirous of overthrowing the state and when the party of the proletariat is not yet strong enough to lead a successful revolution.

For the party of the proletariat to wage any form of armed struggle that is untimely is to invite total destruction by the big bourgeoisie, which has centralized and concentrated in its hands the means of coercion, livelihood and communications. And yet the revolutionary party of the proletariat that is not waging any armed struggle must combine illegal forms of struggle with the legal forms of struggle in order to prevent the big bourgeoisie from effectively conducting surveillance, penetrating, controlling, redirecting, framing up, discrediting or marginalizing all the proletarian revolutionaries in the short run and in order to develop a powerful underground in preparation against fascist suppression and for armed revolution in the long run.

While the big bourgeoisie can still afford legality to the party of the proletariat, it uses the intelligence services, the mass media,

the schools, churches, civic associations and a two-party or multiparty system to push said party of the proletariat to the margin of electoral and other political processes.

When the crisis of capitalism becomes severe to the point that the revolutionary party of the proletariat and the revolutionary mass movement becomes too strong for toleration by the big bourgeoisie, then the previous lack of or incompetence at the illegal forms of struggle will certainly result in the total destruction of the revolutionary forces.

From one industrial capitalist country to another, there may be illegal forms of struggle other than armed struggle which vary according to the bourgeois laws obtaining. For instance, in certain industrial capitalist countries, it is illegal to simply keep guns without license. In the United States, it is legal for individuals and gun clubs to keep a wide array of guns without license.

In all industrial capitalist countries, the intelligence services of the bourgeois state exert all efforts to know the entire list of members of a working class party. Even if there is no law against secret membership in such a party, there is a presumption or anticipation of illegality attached to the secrecy of the membership of any portion of that party.

However, the best teacher in the secrecy of the most important operations are the big bourgeois who keep their business and political secrets well. They use secrecy to prepare policies, laws and contracts not only against each other in their competition but most importantly against the proletariat and the people.

In fighting the big bourgeoisie and in preparing against the worst that this class can unleash, the revolutionary party of the proletariat is required by concrete conditions of class exploitation and oppression and by its historic mission of

realizing socialism to combine legal and illegal forms of struggle. For one thing, it cannot naively expose all its personnel to the coercive apparatuses of the bourgeois state or put all its eggs in the basket of parliamentary struggle, especially when counterrevolutionary currents are running high.

In this general comment, I refrain from specifying what illegal forms of struggle the party of the proletariat must undertake in any industrial capitalist country. The proletarian revolutionaries in this type of country are wise and competent enough to know and use these in their own country.

In the Philippines

The Philippines is a semicolonial and semifeudal country where it is necessary to wage the national-democratic revolution and where protracted people's war has been carried out for more than 26 years.

Before the revolutionary armed struggle began in 1969, there was a period of predominantly legal struggle. In most of the '60s, an anti-imperialist and antifeudal legal mass movement was carried out by the proletarian revolutionaries on domestic and international issues in order to recover from the crushing defeat of the armed revolutionary movement in the early '50s and early '60s and in order to prepare the way for the resumption of the armed struggle.

It became possible to resume the armed revolution in 1969 because the revolutionary forces previously combined legal with illegal forms of struggle. The proletarian revolutionaries used the legal forms of struggle to arouse, organize and mobilize the people nationwide within a short period of time but at the same time made secret preparations for the resumption of the armed struggle.

Even when the armed struggle becomes the principal form of struggle, the legal forms of struggle are indispensable. The coordination and combination of the legal and illegal forms are necessary. These two forms of struggle are complementary, dialectically interact and support each other's development.

In theory and practice, the armed struggle is the principal form of struggle because it is that form of struggle which enables the proletariat and people to seize power and build organs of political power in one rural area after another and ultimately to overthrow the imperialists and the local exploiting classes of big compradors and landlords nationwide and establish the people's democratic state.

The legal forms of struggle in the cities and countryside can propagate the line of the national democratic revolution on a wide scale and even ahead of the propaganda and organizing capability of those armed units waging the armed struggle. Legal forms of political and organizational work can prepare the advance of the armed revolution.

There are various forms of legal struggle. These include legal mass struggles conducted by class or sectoral organizations and their alliances, work within reactionary institutions, the electoral process, legal defense of the victims of human rights violations and the peace negotiations.

The legal forms of struggles can be successful if there is a powerful underground secret network in support and there are many open legal activists who cannot be easily illegalized even as the reactionary state attempts to illegalize them. These activists have to make sure that they cannot be illegalized. Otherwise, they shift to the field of revolutionary armed struggle if their urban-based legal work becomes untenable.

The urban-based democratic mass movement must be mainly legal and defensive in character even if verbally offensive, articulate and militant. The protest mass actions must not be conceptually and practically mixed up directly with armed struggle. Even outside the mass actions, the armed city partisans must not engage in punitive actions at a rate and to an extent that

prejudice the mainly legal and defensive character of the legal democratic mass movement.

From period to period in the course of the protracted people's war in the Philippines, there have been changes in what is considered legal and illegal. In the period preceding the martial rule of Marcos, it was legal to form organizations with an anti-imperialist and antifeudal character and for them to launch mass actions. Under martial rule, these were banned.

For a long time, extending to the period of the Ramos regime, mere membership in the CPP or mere possession of publications considered subversive could be a cause of detention or punitive action. Upon the repeal of the antiradicalism law in 1992, the U.S.-Ramos regime tried to conjure the illusion of less repression.

But currently there are serious moves to amend the 1987 constitution in order to prolong the rule of Ramos, eliminate a number of formal guarantees in the bill of rights of the 1987 constitution and enact an antiterrorism law which is far more draconian than the discredited and repealed Antiradicalism Law.

In the Philippines, whatever are the fluctuations in what is legal and what is illegal, the fundamental fact is that there is a joint class dictatorship of the comprador big bourgeoisie and landlord class and that many of the oppressive laws issued by the Marcos fascist autocracy persist. The most horrible violations of human rights are perpetrated by the counterrevolutionary state against the workers, peasants and the rest of the people in campaigns of anticommunist suppression.

Whatever the fluctuations are in the lawmaking of the counterrevolutionary state, the revolutionary movement has learned to coordinate and combine the legal and illegal forms of struggle and use these to advance both forms of struggle.

The CPP has adeptly utilized and coordinated the legal and illegal forms of struggle. When this coordination is well done, the revolutionary movement grows in strength and advances.#

4.

THE PHILIPPINE REVOLUTION AND THE NATIONALITY QUESTION

February 15, 1996

May I convey warmest greetings of solidarity to all the participants in the International Seminar on the Nationality Question. I am deeply pleased and honored to be invited as one of the lecturers. And I am thankful to the All India People's Resistance Forum for the invitation.

I regret that for an unavoidable reason I cannot attend the seminar. However, I am contributing a paper about the Philippine revolution and the nationality question.

The nationality question can be dealt with only in historical terms. It involves correctly relating the political, socioeconomic and cultural aspects of nationality as well as the whole national formation, its parts and the world. In its origination and development, Philippine or Filipino nationality is first of all a political concept that has arisen and developed from the necessity of uniting and activating the entire people of various social conditions and cultural traits in the anticolonial and then the anti-imperialist struggles for national independence and democracy.

To this day, the Marxist-Leninist teachings on the nationality question are our best guide. There is yet no experience more advanced than that of Lenin, Stalin and Mao in successfully dealing with the nationality question in the course of overthrowing the counterrevolutionary state and establishing and building socialism. It is to the credit of all the great Marxist-Leninist builders of socialism that it took the modern revisionists a considerable period of time and effort both in the social-imperialist center and in its neocolonies to

completely destroy the national formations under proletarian class dictatorship and to cast away the bonds of proletarian internationalism.

1. The Philippine Revolution of 1896 and Filipino Nationality

The Philippine revolution of 1896, whose centennial the Filipino people are celebrating this year, had the distinction of being the first bourgeois democratic revolution to overthrow a Western colonial power in Asia. It was guided by the bourgeois liberal ideology. It was for national liberation against Spanish colonial domination and racial oppression. It was for democracy not only in terms of civil and political liberties for individuals, associations and the people but also in terms of being opposed to the feudal oppression inflicted on the people, chiefly by the Spanish religious corporations, the biggest landlords in the country then.

As a concept and historical force, Filipino nationality was originally the product of the revolutionary movement of the people led by the revolutionary organization *Katipunan*. Previously, the Spanish colonialists referred to their colonial native subjects as *indios* or *indigenes* and to the Philippine-born Spaniards as *Filipinos*. It was in a manifesto that the revolutionaries categorically appropriated the term *Filipino* to refer to the entire colonized people of various ethnolinguistic communities in the struggle for national liberation. Previously, the *Katipunan* leaders and common people often referred to themselves as *Tagalog*, *Malay*, or *lahing kayumanggi* (brown race) and the reformists in the propaganda movement in Spain as *indios bravos* (noble indios).

Filipino nationality was first of all a political-revolutionary term and at the same time it all-roundedly carried political, socioeconomic and cultural significance and content. It denoted the revolutionary will and movement of the people to

establish the first nation-state encompassing the entire archipelago. It was essentially in the manifestoes and decrees of the *Katipunan* and the Philippine revolutionary government, in the proclamation of Philippine independence on June 12, 1898 and in the Philippine Constitution of 1899.

The Philippine Revolution of 1896, which lofted the concept of Filipino nationality, was the product of a long series of armed uprisings of the people in various localities through more than 300 years of Spanish colonial rule. More than 200 uprisings had taken place, at first sporadically and then increasing in scale, intensity and duration. The Spanish colonialists could continue their colonial rule for as long as there was yet no national consciousness and no nationwide revolutionary mass movement to wage the anticolonial resistance. It was in the 19th century, especially within its last three decades, that Filipino national consciousness spread throughout the archipelago.

National consciousness arose in response to the intensification of colonial, feudal and racial oppression. The people started to realize that they must rise up as a new nation in armed revolution in order to liberate themselves from the foreign oppressors. National sentiment and aspirations became defined in terms of achieving national independence from Spanish colonialism and establishing a modern nation-state. This was in repudiation of the reformist demand in the Propaganda Movement for the Philippines to become a regular province of Spain in order to enable the native people in the archipelago to acquire rights and duties under the 1812 liberal Cadiz Constitution of Spain.

In the course of the revolutionary struggle against Spanish colonialism from 1896 to 1898 and then against US imperialism from 1899 onward, the Filipinos of the Malay race, the *mestizos* (with Chinese and Spanish blood) and non-Malay ethnic communities united and participated in the struggle for national liberation and democracy. They were bound by

socioeconomic relations, by a *lingua franca* and growing mutual respect for each other in every region and by a long-running resentment over and resistance to colonial impositions.

Upon the coming of Spanish colonialism, the Malay people, who according to anthropologists, had been in the Philippines around 500 BC with an iron age culture, comprised more than 85 percent of the one million population and inhabited the seacoasts and banks of big rivers. Generally, they had small scale communities of the patriarchal slave form of society. They belonged to more than 100 ethnolinguistic communities but the overwhelming majority of them belonged to the biggest eight ethnolinguistic communities: Ilocano, Pangasinan, Kapampangan, Tagalog, Bisaya, Ilonggo, Waray and Maguindanao.

It was possible for the Spanish colonialists to conquer by armed force and convert some communities into Christianity and then conscript troops from one locality in order to further carry out the conquest and conversion of another locality from the late 16th century onward because the native people were characteristically divided into so many independent small societies and scores of ethnolinguistic communities.

The highest sociopolitical formation attained in the archipelago before the coming of the Spaniards were the Islamic sultanates in southwestern Mindanao whose population then comprised around 4 percent of the population of the entire Philippine archipelago. These sultanates had been established since at least the 15th century. They carried the elements of slave and feudal societies and were the most conscious and best organized to engage in prolonged armed resistance against the Spanish conquest. The Spaniards derisively called them *Moros* in recollection of the Catholic *reconquista* against the Moors in the Spanish peninsula and for a long time systematically roused the Christianized population against them.

The Spaniards also had great difficulties in extending their rule to the upland hill tribes which comprised some 10 percent of the population. They were in the main descendants of pre-Malay inhabitants (the so-called Austronesians with a neolithic culture) who had started to be in the archipelago since at least 5000 BC. Like the Moros of southwestern Mindanao, the Igorot tribes (currently presumed to have been in the archipelago since the first Christian millennium) continuously resisted attempts of the Spaniards to occupy the Cordilleras in Northern Luzon and to open gold mines there until the last quarter of the 19th century.

Also, the Spaniards simply did not have enough troops and priests to go into the areas of the Lumads in Mindanao and found no necessity to conquer and proselytize among the nomadic forest-based and food-gathering aborigines, the Negritos, who comprised less than one percent of the population. The Negritos or Aetas are the most probable earliest people in the Philippines. Archaeological evidence shows that the islands were inhabited by people since 22,500 BC. But human fossils and associated artifacts of the Tabon cave man do not indicate the racial stock.

Long before the coming of Spanish colonialism, the people in the Philippine archipelago had commercial and cultural connections with the rest of the Malay people, who were earlier and more heavily influenced by Hindu and Arab culture, and with the Arab, Indochinese and Chinese traders. Islamic proselytization had been extended from southwestern Mindanao to the Visayas and Luzon only a few decades before the coming of the Spanish colonialists. Trade with the Chinese became so brisk that a few of them stayed on as permanent residents, very often intermarrying with the native women.

The Spanish colonialists encouraged the residence of Chinese traders and artisans. They were most interested in the trade of goods between Mexico and China via the galleon trade via the Manila-Acapulco route long before the opening of the Suez

Canal in 1815. But almost every 30 years on the average they roused the native population to engage in racial pogroms against the Chinese in the environs of the walled city of Manila.

To achieve their oppressive and exploitative purposes, the Spanish colonialists imposed a centralized system of administration on the colonized people and laid out a network of Spanish lay administrators and priests to control them. In more than 300 years of colonial rule, Spain developed a colonial and feudal society in the Philippines. The owners of the best and biggest estates were the religious corporations and the colonial bureaucrats, the religious corporations and the foreign merchant companies dominated commerce, especially foreign trade.

At the end of Spanish colonial rule, the social structure of the native population was as follows: the top class were the landlords who concentrated on the production of staple crops; the intermediate strata, which included the small entrepreneurs, master craftsmen, merchants and the few professionals; and the basic exploited classes, which included a huge peasant class comprising more than 90 percent and a working class comprising no more than 5 percent and consisting of workers in transport, printing, wood, tobacco, food processing and the like.

2. Filipino Nationality under US Imperialism

The bourgeois-democratic revolution of the old type led by the liberal bourgeoisie in alliance with the native landlords against the Spanish colonialists and religious landlords was eventually frustrated by US imperialism. The US prevailed in the Filipino-American war from 1899 to 1902 by using its military superiority, directly and indirectly causing the death of 10 percent of the seven million Filipino people, and by issuing the proclamation of "benevolent assimilation" which promised autonomy and liberal reforms in order to coopt the dominant bourgeois liberal ideas in the revolutionary leadership and to split the revolutionary movement.

The main forces of the Philippine revolutionary army were broken in 1902. But armed resistance continued or reemerged in substantial parts of Luzon and the Visayas until 1910. When this dwindled, the US military forces increasingly paid attention to the Moro provinces. The Moro people fought heroically but were completely defeated in 1916 and brought under US colonial administration.

The US imposed its own colonial rule on the Philippines, banned all expressions of Filipino patriotism and promoted a blatantly counterrevolutionary political party of native puppets that espoused assimilation into the U.S. federal state. Due to the people's irrepressible resistance and demands for national independence, however, the US colonial regime would subsequently allow the formation of a political party among another set of puppet politicians who grabbed the slogan of "absolute, immediate and complete independence" but who in fact pushed the reformist line of begging for the grant of national independence by the colonial master in order to avert armed revolution.

The revolutionary concept of national independence along the bourgeois liberal line in 1896 was at first suppressed, then reinterpreted and divorced from the requisite of armed revolution and ultimately became subordinated to a pro-imperialist kind of bourgeois liberalism, masking the power of US monopoly capitalism. The prevailing framework was for the US to teach "democracy" to the Filipino people and train them in self-rule before nominal independence was to be granted to the US-trained puppet politicians, bureaucrats and professionals. The US cleverly used the public school system and the Catholic and Protestant missionaries to bring the people in the remotest areas under US colonial administration and counter the influence of the Philippine revolution.

A pro-imperialist bourgeois-liberal concept of Filipino nationality prevailed under US colonialism as the US developed a semifeudal type of society. The US promoted the more efficient production of certain agricultural crops for export, opened mines and introduced US companies in the manufacture of certain products for domestic consumption. It improved the system of transport and communications. It expanded and encouraged the public and private educational system in correspondence with the expanded requirements of the bureaucracy and business under modern imperialism. Unlike old-type colonialism, which engaged in sheer plunder to serve the primitive accumulation of capital in the West, foreign monopoly capitalism delivered surplus goods and capital from abroad in order to extract maximum profit from the colony.

The social structure among the people changed. The comprador big bourgeoisie among the natives and permanent residents, including the Spanish and Chinese descendants of the colonial ruling class, arose as the most wealthy and powerful basic exploiting class and acted as the principal financial and commercial agent of the foreign monopoly capitalists. At the same time, the landlord class was retained and remained as the more widespread basic exploiting class. The intermediate social strata expanded and included the national bourgeoisie limited to light manufacturing of goods for domestic consumption and the urban petty bourgeoisie. Among the basic exploited classes, the working class expanded but the peasantry remained as the most numerous exploited class.

Inspired by the national consciousness as Filipinos, the people of various ethnolinguistic communities, religions and races, persevered in various forms of struggle for national independence. The struggle for national independence against imperialism favored and forged a revolutionary sense of national unity. From decade to decade under US colonial rule, the most progressive of the workers and peasant organizations

carried the political demand for national independence in combination with their social and economic class demands. They launched strikes and other forms of mass actions. There were outbreaks of armed resistance in every decade.

When organized for the first time under the guidance of Marxism-Leninism in 1930, the Communist Party of the Philippines made the call for national independence but simplistically focused on the contradiction between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie. It neither stressed sufficiently the need to gain genuine national independence nor succeeded in making a profound analysis of Philippine society and revolution. Nonetheless, in a few months' time, it was suppressed. When it was legalized in 1937 and it merged with the Socialist Party in 1938, it accepted the US-approved Philippine Constitution of 1935 and the Commonwealth government as the transition form of government towards the US grant of independence in 1946, as provided for by the US Tydings-McDuffie Law of 1935.

Among the Filipino communists, there was yet no complete clarity about all the basic requirements of the new-democratic revolution both in theory and in practice. However, in opposition to the Japanese invasion and occupation of the Philippines in World War II, the merger party of communists and socialists were able to take the political lead against imperialist Japan in the Central Luzon region, waged armed struggle and carried out land reform. As a result of the armed struggle against the Japanese invaders, the revolutionary forces became strong enough to be considered by US imperialism and the local reactionaries as the principal threat to them. And yet the merger party never withdrew its reformist support for the US grant of independence and readily adopted the slogan of "peace and democracy" after World War II.

In the course of the patriotic armed resistance during World War II, the Filipinos of various ethnolinguistic communities,

including the aboriginal Aeta clans and hill tribes of the Itnegs, Igorots, Mangyans, Lumads and the like, participated actively and fiercely in the guerrilla warfare against the Japanese collaborators. The Japanese grant of nominal independence to the Philippines ahead of the US version failed to deceive the people and only incited them to fiercer national resistance.

As soon as the US imperialists returned to the Philippines within the last year of World War II in the Pacific, they carried out a policy of using their troops and their puppets to suppress the armed revolutionary movement, reconcile the pro-US and pro-Japanese reactionaries, dismantle the provisional provincial and municipal governments proclaimed in Central Luzon by the revolutionary movement and undo the land reform carried out there by the revolutionaries during the war. As if blind to the determination of the US and local reactionaries to wipe out the revolutionary movement, the old merger party of communists and socialists decided to convert the People's Army against Japan (Hukbalahap) into a veterans' association and a legal peasant association to engage solely or mainly in parliamentary struggle.

In the aftermath of the 3-year Japanese occupation of the Philippines in World War II, the US granted nominal independence to the Philippines on July 4, 1946 and thereby shifted from direct colonial to indirect semicolonial rule over the Philippines. Responsibility for administration was turned over to the representatives of the local exploiting classes of big compradors and landlords. At that time, the Philippine population had risen to 17 million, despite the loss of one million Filipino lives in World War II.

The US had no choice but to grant nominal independence in 1946 not only because it was bound by the Tydings-McDuffie Law and the long historical train of popular demand for national independence but also because it wanted to head off

the armed revolutionary movement for national liberation. This became more assertive and militant after the imperialists and local reactionaries frustrated the reformist and revisionist line. They expelled from Congress the elected communist and progressive noncommunist representatives who had run for office under the banner of the Democratic Alliance in 1946. A patriotic war for national liberation and democracy, led by the merger party of communists and socialists, ensued until the main revolutionary forces were defeated in the early '50s.

In granting sham national independence, the US retained its all-round economic, political, military and cultural power over the Philippines. It preserved and expanded the property rights of US corporations and citizens in the Philippines; it kept its military bases; it made the armed forces of the neocolonial state dependent on the Pentagon; it continued to manipulate the reactionary parties and advise and direct the bureaucracy; and in so many ways it superimposed cultural imperialism on the Philippines. The US kept the Philippines in neocolonial subordination not only in the framework of bilateral relations but also in the framework of regional and global relations under the hegemony of US imperialism.

Among the colonies in Asia, the Philippines was the first to be granted nominal independence by a Western colonial power after World War II. For 25 years the US touted the Philippines as the show window of democracy until 1972 when martial rule was imposed on the Filipino people upon the instigation of the US. Nonetheless, the Philippines continued to be the model of neocolonial subservience to foreign monopoly capitalism.

3. The New-Democratic Revolution and Filipino Nationality

Since the '60s, the proletarian revolutionaries responsible for reestablishing the CPP on the theoretical foundation of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought have clarified as never before the character of Philippine society as semicolonial

and semifeudal, the character of the Philippine revolution as national-democratic of the new type, the motive forces of the revolution such as the proletariat, the peasantry and other patriotic and progressive strata of Philippine society, the targets of the revolution such as the comprador big bourgeoisie and the landlord class, the national-democratic and socialist stages of the revolution, the current national-democratic tasks and the socialist perspective of the Philippine revolution.

The ongoing national-democratic revolution in the Philippines is a resumption of the old democratic revolution in the sense that it struggles for national liberation and democracy in the entire Philippines. But the struggle is at a new and higher level. The class leadership no longer belongs to the bourgeoisie or any of its stratum but to the working class whose advanced detachment, the Communist Party of the Philippines, follows the ideological line of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism and pursues the general line of new-democratic revolution through protracted people's war. In the era of modern imperialism and proletarian revolution, it is only under the class leadership of the proletariat that the struggle for national liberation can be completed and that the struggle for land reform can be realized as the main substance of democracy.

At this time, the class proportions in the structure in Philippine semicolonial and semifeudal society have become as follows: the basic exploiting classes of big compradors and landlords are a mere fraction of one percent, the intermediate stratum of the national bourgeoisie is some one percent and that the urban petty-bourgeoisie is 6 to 8 percent and the basic exploited classes of workers and peasants are 14 percent and 76 percent, respectively. This class structure has basically persisted from 1968 when the Philippine population was still 36 million to the present when the population is already 71 million, especially because of the deterioration of the socioeconomic conditions during the Marcos and post-Marcos regimes.

The CPP adheres to the line that the big comprador-landlord state must be overthrown through armed revolution and replaced by a people's democratic state. Accordingly, the character of Filipino nationality must change politically, socially and culturally. The CPP criticizes and repudiates the counterrevolutionary line of the imperialists and the local exploiting classes that the bourgeois concepts of nation-state and Filipino nationality are unchanging and irreplaceable, that these permanently transcend, gloss over or reconcile exploiting and exploited classes and that these are expressible only in abstract terms such as individuals, associations and the state, with constitutional rights and duties unrelated to imperialism and the exploiting classes.

The CPP and the revolutionary movement of the Filipino people are fighting for the overthrow of the existing counterrevolutionary state which is the joint class dictatorship of the comprador big bourgeoisie and landlord class and for the establishment of a people's democratic state under the leadership of the working class. The character and concrete content of Filipino nationality under the people's democratic state are radically different from those under the big comprador-landlord state.

It is of crucial importance to know the differences because there are reformists and revisionists who masquerade as Marxist-Leninists and who cannot think of nationality beyond the confines of the big comprador-landlord state because in the first place they do not wish to overthrow such a state and do not recognize at all the need to establish the people's democratic state. Every time there is resistance to the existing counterrevolutionary state, they denounce this automatically as an attack on national unity which is in fact the social system ruled by the exploiting classes.

The CPP's Program for a People's Democratic Revolution clearly defines what constitutes the Filipino nation and the

Filipino people, as including all the patriotic and progressive classes and strata and excluding the comprador big bourgeoisie and landlord class whose loyalty is to foreign monopoly capitalism and to themselves.

In waging the national-democratic revolution through a protracted people's war, the CPP is building the people's army as the main component of democratic state power and is building the local organs of democratic political power among the people. It is building a new state even while the big comprador-landlord state is still well-entrenched in the cities. Since 1972, the building of revolutionary state power has been guided by the Rules for Establishing the People's Democratic Government.

There are now thousands of local organs of political power, especially at the village and municipal levels. At levels higher than those at which organs of political power have not yet been organized, the CPP Central Committee is responsible for governmental leadership. The National Democratic Front has the task of assisting in the formation of the organs of political power and has also been authorized to engage in diplomatic and other international relations.

The CPP considers the political revolution as the most important prerequisite to the making of the people's democratic state and the new Filipino nationality. In connection with the political revolution, which involves the overthrow of the old counterrevolutionary state and the establishment of the new revolutionary state, the socioeconomic and cultural revolutions are carried out. The political, socioeconomic and cultural aspects of the people's democratic revolution result in the further revolutionary development of the character and content of Filipino nationality.

In the social revolution, the relations of production are so arranged that foreign monopoly capitalism and the local exploiting classes are overthrown and cease to exploit the

working people and that the forces of production are liberated. The land problem is solved and national industrialization is carried out. The nationalization of the industrial means of production, sources of raw materials and major lines of distribution, land reform and cooperativization of agriculture and the temporary concessions to small and medium producers are done to facilitate and not to obstruct and delay the socialist transformation of the economy and society.

In the cultural revolution, a national, scientific and mass culture is promoted under the guidance of Marxism-Leninism. The national cultural heritage must be cherished to serve the present. The scientific outlook and education must be propagated to let the nation learn and benefit from the outside and advance materially and spiritually with the rest of the world and must combat imperialism, chauvinism, religious obscurantism, bourgeois decadence and racism. Culture must serve the people, especially the working people.

The national language, which is Manila-based Tagalog, and the literature in this language must be vigorously promoted to replace English as the principal domestic language in the Philippines and the local languages and literature must be respected, cherished and promoted and not to be the target of any chauvinist discrimination. However, English may still remain as the No.1 foreign language of the country for international intercourse.

So far, the reactionaries have used the English language, rather than the officially designated national language, as the principal medium in bureaucratic communications, legislation, judicial proceedings, education, public information and all other fields and as an instrument for the exploiting classes to browbeat and discriminate against the exploited classes.

The revolutionaries have promoted the use of the national language to facilitate nationwide revolutionary communication

and understanding in opposition to the absurd primacy of English over the national language within the country. They have demonstrated that the national language is a beautiful language in literature and is a precise language in any kind of discourse.

At the same time, they use and promote whatever is the language of any locality because the point is to arouse, organize and mobilize the people immediately for the new-democratic revolution. So far, in recent times, the imperialists and the local exploiting classes have failed to generate any widescale communal conflicts from ethnolinguistic, racial, religious or other cultural differences by way of dividing and ruling the people. The people have a high sense of Filipino nationality as a consequence of the old-democratic revolution, the continuing opposition to foreign domination be it old colonial or modern imperialist and, of course, the new-democratic revolution.

Discrimination due to ethnolinguistic differences is subdued by the development of social, political, economic and cultural relations and by the now widespread acceptance of the national language in addition to the much earlier acceptance of a *lingua franca* on a regional or provincial scale.

Malay chauvinism, usually against Negritos and the Chinese is subdued by a number of factors. The Negritos stand up for their rights and participate in the revolutionary movement against the oppressors and exploiters. Some Chinese have adopted Filipino nationality in an all-round sense, whether or not they retain their distinctive cultural traits. Other Chinese have legally opted for citizenship in the People's Republic of China since the latter half of the '70s. The Chinese have their own cultural and commercial associations and tend to cluster in residential and commercial areas in various cities.

Christian chauvinism is usually directed against the Muslims and the animists who are derided as heathens. But it is

counteracted by the forces of the national-democratic revolution movement and by the people of various religious beliefs who uphold the freedom of belief. They have so far frustrated every major attempt of the reactionaries to rouse Christian chauvinism against the Moros. But the imperialists and their local agents persist in trying to build political parties and movements based on religion and directed against the new-democratic revolution.

In principle, policy and concrete practice, the CPP has exerted the utmost effort to put into full play in the new-democratic revolution the unity and militant participation of the Filipino people with diverse customs, race, languages, religious affiliation and other cultural traits. In more than 27 years of revolutionary struggle since its reestablishment on December 26, 1968, the CPP has surpassed all previous revolutionary and patriotic movements in going to the remotest areas and going deep among the native inhabitants and the poor settlers there.

The reasons are obvious. The people there are the most oppressed, exploited and neglected by the counterrevolutionary state and are exceedingly interested in the new democratic revolution. Even as they are being rapidly dispossessed of land and other natural resources by the foreign monopoly capitalists and the local exploiting classes, they still inhabit an extensive and rough terrain suitable for guerrilla warfare in the protracted people's war. They have valiantly fought against the enemy and withstood the most brutal campaigns of suppression and genocide, including bombardments, arson and forced mass evacuations.

The CPP and the revolutionary movement unite the native inhabitants and the poor settlers against the foreign and domestic agrocorporations, the bureaucratic and military landgrabbers and speculators, the logging firms, the big ranchers, the mining firms and other types of "development" aggressors who grab the land and despoil the environment. The right of the native inhabitants to their ancestral land is upheld and defended. At

the same time, the poor settlers who have come to the hinterland and stayed for generations are accommodated.

4. The Right to Self-Determination Among the Minorities

The CPP and the revolutionary movement recognize the right to self-determination of the national minorities, including the right to secede from an oppressive state and the right to autonomy under a nonoppressive state. The principle of self-determination is an inalienable right. The right is always there to be invoked and exercised whenever there is the need to struggle against oppression, to promote the legitimate interest of a community and to demand and undertake affirmative action.

But the right cannot be justly invoked nor exercised in order to deliver a community to the imperialists and the counter-revolutionaries or to serve micro-chauvinism, ethnocentrism, racism, counterrevolutionary localism, cultural nationalism, religious and other cultural prejudice against the common interest of the Filipino nation. The forces of the national-democratic revolution criticize and repudiate those imperialist and reactionary forces that superimpose cultural nationalism on political and social questions in order to slander and attack the revolutionary movement and prevent the people with various cultural traits to participate in the national-democratic revolution.

In opposition to the revolutionary political concept of Filipino nationality as encompassing all the people in the Philippine archipelago of whatever ethnolinguistic, religious, racial or other cultural affiliation, some ideologues and propagandists of the imperialists and reactionaries try to drum up the notions that only those who have been Christianized, Hispanized or Westernized are Filipinos and that, according to their counterrevolutionary definition, Filipinos are intrinsically chauvinist or colonialist (relative to the upland people and the Moro people) even when promoting the national

revolutionary consciousness and unity of the entire Filipino people against the imperialists and their local lackeys.

The objective of the enemies of the national-democratic revolution, in whipping up Filipino chauvinism or some micro-chauvinism against the revolutionary concept and reality of Filipino nationality is to divide the entire people of the Philippines now and in the future and undermine the Philippine revolution. The enemies of the Philippine revolution seek to manipulate the differences in the cultural traits of the people and to disrupt the course of the political, socioeconomic and cultural revolution.

Historically and currently, the imperialists and the local reactionaries have directed and funded the ideologues, publicists and so-called NGOs (nongovernmental organizations) who push the line that ethnicity is beyond the range of communists and the anti-imperialist and class struggles. At the moment, the imperialist-dominated UN is pretending to be concerned about indigenous people. In fact, the imperialists and their agents have been responsible for the most dastardly forms of oppression and exploitation as well dispossession and destruction of the environment at the expense of the indigenous peoples.

The forces of the national-democratic revolution have consistently championed the right to self-determination of all the peoples in various ethnolinguistic communities against the chauvinism and national oppression and exploitation perpetrated by the counterrevolutionary state, the foreign monopolies, the local exploiters, the Catholic church and other dominant institutions. The principle of the revolutionary movement is to rely on the masses everywhere in the Philippines, to respect their cultural characteristics and to put into full play their all-round initiative.

While the necessary number of outside cadres are utilized in order to open any new area of revolutionary work, the unwavering purpose of the CPP and the revolutionary movement is always to let the local masses assume responsibilities in the revolutionary struggle for their own social benefit and to develop revolutionary cadres and organizations among them. In the building of organs of political power of whatever scale, there is always a special regard for the particular characteristics and interests of minorities and for local autonomy and proportionate representation whenever there is a mixture of people with different ethnic characteristics.

In doing revolutionary work among the hill tribes and other upland people, the cadres and forces of the national-democratic revolution do rigorous social investigation, integrate themselves with the local people and their way of life. They show respect for the local customs and beliefs and avoid bureaucratism and roughness in dealing with these. Even in combating superstition, they use the most persuasive means of education and the good results of appropriate scientific alternatives to put forward the new ideas and practices.

They have respected traditional but benign forms of local leadership, like the council of elders, and have acted as facilitators and guarantors of unity and peace in intertribal relations even as the new mass organizations and organs of political power are established. They have also recruited, trained and transformed the local warriors as people's militia auxiliary to the New People's Army.

There are scores of ethnolinguistic communities or national minorities in the upland. They comprise around 10 percent of the Philippine population (excluding the Moros). They include such communities as those under the generic names of Aetas, Itnegs, Igorots, Mangyans, Lumads and the like.

Revolutionary organizations have arisen among the national minorities, such as the Cordillera People's Democratic Front (CPDF), the Revolutionary Organization of the Lumads, Moro Revolutionary Organization (MORO) and are allied organizations within the National Democratic Front of the Philippines. At the same time, there are legal progressive organizations of national minorities, such as the Cordillera People's Alliance (CPA), the Federation of Indigenous Peoples in the Philippines (KAMP), the Central Luzon Aeta Association (CLAA), the Subanen Union of Lumad Organizations (SULO) and the Tribal Association of Mangyans in Mindoro.

The various ethnolinguistic communities are not known to easily invoke the right to secede for obvious reasons. Their respective population and social economies are small scale. They are interconnected with the existing social system in the country. They have repeatedly joined up with the lowlanders in patriotic armed struggles against foreign oppressors. Their way out of oppression and exploitation is bound up with the new-democratic revolution of the rest of the Filipino people.

So far, only one significant force has arisen from among the ethnolinguistic communities or national minorities to invoke the right to secede. This is the Moro National Liberation Front (MNLF). It had its historic distinction of adopting the political concept of Moro nation to encompass some 13 small ethnolinguistic communities in southwestern Mindanao, with the current population of some 3 million and with Islam as the common dominant cultural characteristic. Originally, the MNLF was a petty-bourgeois radical organization trying to combine Moro nationalism, Islam and Marxism. From 1972 to 1976, it waged an armed struggle strong enough at its peak to absorb 30 percent of the combat effectives of the reactionary armed forces and was objectively helpful to the new-democratic revolution when the NPA was still germinal in most parts of the Philippines.

The forces of the national-democratic revolution have always supported and encouraged the MNLF and other Moro organizations to act according to the Moro people's right to self-determination, including the right to secede, as a weapon against the counterrevolutionary state, national oppression and Christian chauvinism. It is in the common interest of the Filipino people, including the Moros, that the Moro organizations wage armed struggle, for self-determination.

The CPP and the revolutionary movement have therefore repeatedly offered revolutionary alliance, cooperation and coordination with the MNLF and other Moro organizations and have held in prospect regional autonomy under a nonoppressive unitary or federal state of the future. At the same time, they have taken definite steps to organize the Moro masses and develop cadres among them wherever the MNLF and other Moro organizations are not doing revolutionary work.

The Christians for National Liberation (CNL), which is a major allied organization in the NDF, have been active since the early '70s in counteracting and frustrating every scheme and attempt of the counterrevolutionary state to rouse Christian chauvinism among the Filipino people in general against the Moro nation in particular. Contrary to the view of Moro micro-chauvinists, the Filipino people in general and the Moro people in particular need each other in the common struggle against foreign monopoly capitalism, domestic feudalism and bureaucrat capitalism.

Moro chauvinism, which denounces even Filipino revolutionaries as colonialists, needs the puncturing of its arrogance. It circulates the myth that the Moros have never been conquered by any foreign power and are different from and superior to the rest of the Filipino people. While it is true that the Moros have retained Islam as the dominant religion among them, it is not true that they have never been conquered.

The heroic prolonged resistance of Sultan Kudarat was subdued in the 17th century by the Spanish colonialists. Equipped with iron-side gunboats, the Spaniards forced the sultanate of Sulu to agree to the deployment of Spanish garrisons in the Sulu archipelago in the middle of the 19th century. The US imperialists subjugated all the Islamic sultanates by force of arms after the defeat of the forces of the old democratic revolution in Luzon and Visayas. Thus, the Moro people were put under US colonial rule and subsequently under the existing counterrevolutionary state.

From the viewpoint of the national-democratic revolution, the MNLF has contradictory characteristics. Even if led by petty-bourgeois radicals who use nationalism and Islam as their rallying points, it is progressive in fighting for self-determination against a counterrevolutionary state. But it is also reactionary because it has a negative attitude towards the new-democratic revolution of the entire Filipino people and does not have any clear democratic program for the benefit of the Moro people. It has nothing to say against the Moro big bureaucrats, big compradors and landlords conniving with the existing counterrevolutionary state.

The MNLF leadership has verbally attacked the forces of the national-democratic revolution as those of what it defines as Filipino colonialism. And yet it has repeatedly gone into accommodations with the counterrevolutionary Philippine state. In 1976, it signed with the Marcos regime the Tripoli Agreement, whose first provision requires the MNLF to submit itself to the principle that the Moro problem be solved within the framework of Philippine "sovereignty and territorial integrity". It chose to capitulate in principle to the Marcos fascist regime at a time that the Filipino people, including the Moro people were under extreme oppression by that regime.

The MNLF leadership has also gone into accommodations with the succeeding Aquino and Ramos regimes. It entered into a truce agreement with the Aquino regime and renewed this with the Ramos regime. It has solicited from both the privilege of ruling the whole of Mindanao in utter contempt of demographic facts. The 1990 population of the Moro nation is 2.6 million, only 4.3 percent of the total Philippine population of 71 million and only about 19 percent of the entire Mindanao population of 13.9 million.

Even as it has gone into peace negotiations and agreements with the counterrevolutionary state, the top leadership of the MNLF has repeatedly refused to negotiate and enter into alliance, cooperation and coordination with the forces of the national-democratic revolution. On several occasions, it has even issued hostile statements to the effect that the forces of the national-democratic revolution are even worse as an enemy than the counterrevolutionary state.

The forces of the national-democratic revolution have avoided making any hostile statement towards the MNLF. They have consistently supported the Moro people's struggle for self-determination, have repeatedly urged the MNLF and other Moro organizations to wage revolutionary armed struggle against the oppressive state and have exerted efforts to cooperate with the MNLF at any level. However, they are aware of the anticommunist influence exercised on the MNLF by its supporters among the oil-producing Islamic countries.

When the new-democratic revolution wins in the Philippines, it is highly probable that the imperialists and the reactionaries abroad will utilize the pro-imperialist and reactionary forces all over Mindanao and in particular in the Moro areas against the people's democratic state. It is therefore absolutely necessary for the forces of the national-democratic revolution to arouse, organize and mobilize the Moro people in concert with the rest

of the Filipino people and develop truly revolutionary forces and cadres among the Moro people.

5. Concluding Remarks

After the basic completion of the new-democratic revolution through the nationwide armed overthrow of the big comprador-landlord state, it becomes necessary and possible to proclaim the people's democratic state and begin the socialist revolution even as bourgeois-democratic reforms are still undertaken in the transition.

Under these conditions, the people of various nationalities, ethnolinguistic communities, religious affiliation and other cultural traits, will become united in a revolutionary modern nation-state of a higher type than the one envisioned and struggled for in the Revolution of 1896. Filipino nationality or citizenship in the people's democratic state means national liberation from imperialism, freedom from class exploitation and the enjoyment of individual and collective rights in the political, social, economic and cultural spheres.

The socialist revolution will strengthen the national cohesion and integration of the entire Filipino people. The unity of the international proletariat and the cooperation of socialist countries under the principle of proletarian internationalism will also strengthen the entire nation against chauvinism at any level in the country and against imperialism from without.

The defeat of the imperialists and the local exploiting classes will certainly drive these evil forces to multiply their resistance to the revolution, in ways more clever than before, when the opportunities for a violent return to power are not immediately available. They will use sugarcoated bullets. As already demonstrated by the experience in socialist countries, where capitalism has been restored through a gradual process of peaceful evolution, revisionism can arise and prevail if

unchecked by proletarian revolutionary vigilance and militancy despite all socialist achievements.

The most clever counterrevolutionaries will attempt to undermine the proletarian ruling party, the state, economy and the whole of society by misrepresenting revisionist ideas as proletarian, spreading cynicism against socialism and the masses and ultimately claiming that the working class has accomplished its historic mission or that the class struggle is dying out and all that needs to be done is to develop the forces of production. The revision of the fundamental principles of Marxism-Leninism is carried out and the policies are adopted to dissolve socialism.

When socialism and proletarian internationalism are lost in a country, the most reactionary centrifugal forces reemerge in society. The imperialists and their agents now misrepresent the preceding period of revisionism and capitalist restoration as a period of socialism and blame socialism for the reemergence of unbridled bourgeois nationalism, ethnocentrism, racism and religious obscurantism. But they cannot really conceal the culpability of the bureaucrat monopoly capitalists as well as their own culpability for the ever worsening national disorder and disintegration in the former revisionist-ruled countries.

The crisis of overproduction in the world capitalist system is accelerated by the competitive use of high technology and the most abusive methods of finance capitalism. It is wreaking unprecedented havoc in the industrial capitalist countries and more so in the neocolonial client-states. It is generating social turmoil and armed warfare and is pushing the exploiting classes to use nationalism, ethnocentrism, religious fundamentalism and fascism as their tools of political rivalry and mass deception. Nevertheless, economic crisis and war create the conditions favorable to the revolution.

A new round of revolutionary struggle is bound to develop under the initiative and leadership of the proletariat against imperialism and the local reactionaries. When the forces of national liberation and socialism resurge, they shall be led by the revolutionary parties of the proletariat that are guided by Marxism-Leninism-Maoism because these are at a vantage point to comprehend the previous experience of socialism, the betrayal of modern revisionism and the current world disorder and are in the best position to further develop in theory and practice, under the new global conditions, the requirements for national and social liberation at a new and higher level. #

5.

19 November 1996

**MESSAGE OF SOLIDARITY TO THE PEOPLE'S
CONFERENCE AGAINST IMPERIALIST
"GLOBALIZATION"**

Warmest greetings of solidarity to all the organizers and participants of the People's Conference Against Imperialist Globalization!

I wish to express my admiration to you for holding this conference and for standing up against the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC) leaders' summit, headed by the United States and Japan. By standing up for the rights and interests of the proletariat and peoples of the world, your conference is diametrically opposite to the APEC, the imperialist states and neocolonial client-states and the multinational firms and banks that use them.

Your conference is also radically different from the so-called parallel NGO conferences that are in fact under the shade of the APEC and whose main role is to deck themselves out as the alternative to the revolutionary movement for national liberation and democracy against imperialism and the local reactionaries.

I am confident that you will succeed in analyzing and criticizing the exploitative, destructive and deceptive character of imperialist "globalization" and inform the broad masses of the people so that they shall be further aroused, organized and mobilized to uphold and defend their rights and interests against imperialism and all reaction.

It is of crucial importance to stress the need for the revolutionary struggle of the people in the face of the destructive character of the imperialist states and their supermonopolies as they use high

technology and the most rapacious forms of finance capital in order to extract superprofits and accumulate capital and in the process further exploit and oppress the proletariat and peoples of the world.

After the Keynesian decades of "development" which promoted infrastructure-building and the overproduction of raw materials in underdeveloped countries and also after the collapse of revisionist regimes based on state monopoly capitalism, the US and other centers of monopoly capitalism appear to face no formidable resistance to their intensification of monopoly capitalist exploitation under the signboard of neoliberalism. Your conference can be significant as an encouragement to revolutionary resistance.

We are still in the era of imperialism and proletarian revolution. The uneven development of the world capitalist system has become more gross than ever before. Look at how monopoly capitalism is ravaging the third world and the former Soviet bloc countries. Look at the worsening social conditions in the industrial capitalist countries and the intensifying cutthroat competition among the monopoly capitalists and capitalist powers.

It is utterly deceptive of the imperialist states and their neocolonial client-states in the APEC to tout "free market economies", "free competition" and "free trade" in order to camouflage the reality and workings of monopoly capitalism and to impose on the oppressed peoples and nations worse conditions of neocolonial dependence and subservience to monopoly capitalism.

US monopoly capitalism has always used the liberal slogan of "free market place of goods and ideas" to confuse people. But in recycling this slogan today, it is bringing down drastically the level of economic development in more than 90 percent of the countries of the world. It is trying to break down all barriers to its

export of surplus goods and surplus capital and gives no leeway to its neocolonial client-states to make any pretense at economic sovereignty.

Principles of economic and political development drawn from history are obfuscated by assertions that transnational corporations (TNCs) have rendered useless and helpless the states in general and the role of the state in the economy, even as the monopoly bourgeoisie continues to use the imperialist states as well as neocolonial client-states to aggrandize itself and to further exploit and oppress the people.

A semicolonial and semifeudal country like the Philippines cannot attain the status of a newly-industrialized country (NIC) under a regime that shuns national industrialization, that liberalizes the importation of surplus manufactured and agricultural goods from the imperialist countries, that seeks to attract foreign investments for export-oriented manufacturing and that squanders domestic resources and foreign funds on upper-class consumption.

As well articulated in the Anti-Imperialist World Peasant Summit, the Philippines will not only remain agrarian but will sink to a lower level -- that of a disjointed agrarian country, lacking in food self-reliance -- while there is no land reform, the agricultural surpluses of the imperialist countries flood in, the agro-chemicals, seeds and equipment are controlled by the MNCs and the land is further concentrated in the hands of the landlords and the corporations of all sorts.

The crisis of overproduction in the world capitalist system is driving the supermonopolies to accumulate constant capital and reduce variable capital to beat their competitors and raise their profits in their homegrounds. Thus, they cut down their domestic market through massive unemployment and cutbacks on social spending and unwittingly lower the national rates of productivity

and profitability. Consequently, they seek to maximize their profits by exporting their surplus goods and surplus capital.

Capitalist competition within capitalist countries leads to larger monopolies and more intense competition among the capitalist countries. It is untrue as some theorists of imperialists globalization that monopolies have lost their national basing. There are indeed international combinations of monopoly firms and alliances of capitalist countries. But there is also the sharpening competition to redivide the world as the general crisis of capitalism worsens.

The United States is upsetting the balance of its relations with other imperialist countries by trying to take back previous accommodations granted to its favored allies during the Cold War. It wishes to solve its colossal debt and deficit problems by using its technological lead, reviving its manufacturing capacity and intensifying its export drive. It has been consolidating its national market and its regional market (like NAFTA) as well as penetrating the markets of its capitalist rivals. It is taking the initiative in APEC in order to keep Japan in tow, prevent it from taking its own initiative in the AFTA and EAEC and harmonize US-Japan partnership at the expense of other countries.

The Ramos regime can never attain the status of a NIC by imitating the earlier examples of the so-called four tigers of East Asia, especially two of them, Taiwan and South Korea, which have developed relatively more comprehensive economies. The regime conveniently forgets that these carried out land reform, accumulated capital from export-oriented manufacturing to build some basic industries and, most important of all, enjoyed special accommodation in the US market and were allowed to protect state and domestic investors for the overriding purpose of front-lining in the anticommunist crusade.

It must be pointed out that today these "tigers" and their imitators are now altogether suffering from a crisis of overproduction in

their type of products and are now facing declining rates of productivity and profitability. Moreover, they are all under pressure to open their domestic markets to the unrestricted inflow of consumer products and speculative capital from the imperialist countries.

In fact, all the countries hooked to export-oriented manufacturing in Southeast Asia, South Asia, Latin America and Central Europe are now confronted with increasing trade deficits and foreign debt. In the case of China, the misallocation of resources towards export-oriented manufacturing and import-dependent consumption of the new bourgeoisie has undermined the national industrial foundation previously established under socialism. Consequently, the US is requiring China to further liberalize its investment and trade policies in return for admission to the WTO.

The portfolio funds for the so-called emergent markets are meant more to finance budgetary and trade deficits, sustain luxury consumption among no more than the top ten percent of the population and enable the MNCs to finance their sale of consumption goods and the operation of labor-intensive sweatshop enterprises. These so-called emergent markets are no more than ten countries at every given time and are mostly within the ambit of APEC.

The imperialists and their neocolonial puppets are utterly reprehensible for propagating and enforcing the dogma that development is possible in underdeveloped or less developed countries only if they opt for "competitive" exports by keeping labor cheap and attracting foreign investments. The wage and living conditions of the workers are pressed down and a huge reserve army of labor is maintained. And yet 75 percent of the global flow of foreign direct investments is concentrated in the United States, Japan and the European Union and only 25 percent is in countries where superprofits can be drawn due to cheap labor and lower levels of economic development.

The APEC is one more device for imposing imperialist policies on the Philippines and the other neocolonial states. It tries to promote and accelerate trade and investment liberalization already gained bilaterally and through the multilateral agencies like the IMF, World Bank and WTO. The most interesting events in the APEC leaders' summit are not the individual action plans of the neocolonial puppets, which are obsequious to both the US and Japan, but the expressions of these two countries about their competition and anti-people collusion and the US message to China on US preconditions to her entry into the WTO.

Under imperialist domination, the Philippines has no other way to go but deeper into semicolonial and semifeudal status, weighed down by foreign and local debt, foreign trade deficits, budgetary waste of the proceeds of privatization, and heavier taxation on the people to countervail the reduction and elimination of tariff barriers.

No matter how high or low are the GDP growth rate and gross international reserves, it is far more important to consider the nature of the economy, the exploitation done by the foreign monopolies and the local reactionaries, the rising foreign trade deficit and real budgetary deficit (minus the window-dressing), the growing foreign and local public debt and the mounting flow of resources to the coercive apparatuses of the state and to bureaucratic corruption.

The raw-material exports of the Philippines have long been pressed down in the world market since the '70s and the low value-added products of export-oriented manufacturing are already in jeopardy in the global crisis of overproduction. The export of live human beings, which is actually the biggest earner of foreign exchange, is also tending to fall because of the global recessive trend and the growing restrictions imposed by foreign governments against migrant labor.

The objective conditions for the new-democratic revolution through protracted people's war are increasingly favorable in the Philippines. By intensifying the exploitation and oppression of the people of the Philippines and throughout the world, the US and other imperialists are generating the conditions for revolutionary resistance on an unprecedented global scale.

In analyzing, criticizing and condemning imperialist "globalization", your conference has the objective of helping to arouse, organize and mobilize the broad masses of the people. It is not to offer recommendations to the states in APEC as to how they can improve the methods of imperialist exploitation and avert revolutionary resistance.

The main targets of your conference are the imperialist states and the neocolonial puppet states, which altogether serve monopoly capitalism. I presume that you condemn not only the anti-worker and anti-people agenda in the APEC leaders' summit but also the human rights violations and extraordinary costs inflicted on the Filipino people in order to prepare and stage this summit.

But you can also take a look at and condemn the special agents of monopoly capitalism who organize so-called alternative conferences which are dependent on funding from imperialist agencies and which pretend to criticize APEC within the limits of reformism but whose main objective is to seize the initiative from the national democratic movement.

The US-instigated low intensity conflict in the Philippines involves not only the most conspicuous forms of brutal actions but also psychological warfare. This involves the use not only of military and police thugs in mufti, special operations teams of the reactionary armed forces and religious fanatical cults but also certain foreign-funded "NGOs" operated by covert agents of US and Philippines intelligence agencies, together with Trotskyites, racketeers, revisionists, pseudosocialists, bourgeois populists, pro-imperialist liberals and the jesuitical religio-sectarians.

I hope that your conference can draw up clearly the firm line of resistance against imperialist "globalization" and work out further cooperation through an international network of anti-imperialist forces. Of course, I also hope that the people's caravan from Manila to Subic and the nationwide protest actions of the people will be successful.

I wish you all the success in struggle now and in the future.
Thank you.

6.

**THE GREAT PROLETARIAN CULTURAL
REVOLUTION: IMPACT ON THE PHILIPPINES
AND CONTINUING GLOBAL SIGNIFICANCE¹**

December 14-15, 1996

I wish to express my warmest greetings to the China Study Group of New York, *Monthly Review* and ESU of the New York School and all the participants of the Symposium, “Reexamining the Chinese Cultural Revolution”, which is held to mark the 30th anniversary of the launching of the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution (GPCR) as well as the 20th anniversary of its effective end in September 1976.

I also wish to thank the organizers for inviting me to contribute a paper devoted to the GPCR, in particular about its impact and the way this ended or continued in revolutionary struggles in the third world. Due to some burden of work, I am unable to submit on time a more elaborate paper on the impact of the GPCR on the entire third world. But let me deal with this in general terms and give some focus on the Philippines and proceed to make some remarks on the continuing global significance of the GPCR.

For your reference, there is a longer article which is pertinent to the impact of the GPCR on the Philippines. This is “Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought as Guide to the Philippine Revolution”, contributed by Armando Liwanag, chairman of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Philippines, to the International Seminar on Mao Zedong Thought, held in 1993 in Germany, on the occasion of the 100th birth anniversary of Mao Zedong.

¹ Contribution to the symposium “Reexamining the Chinese Cultural Revolution”, marking its 30th Anniversary

And let me take the opportunity to cite the General Declaration on Mao Zedong Thought, issued by the aforesaid seminar. It upholds the theory of continuing revolution under proletarian dictatorship and the GPCR as the greatest contribution of Mao to the further development of Marxism-Leninism. This declaration diametrically opposes the common view of the imperialists and the Chinese revisionists and bureaucrat capitalists that the GPCR was a total disaster.

Impact of the GPCR on the Philippines

The GPCR inspired the building and strengthening of many Marxist-Leninist parties in the third world. To this day, a significant number of them persevere in revolutionary struggle in Southeast Asia, South Asia, Central Asia, Latin America and Africa. Some of them are in the International Conference of Marxist-Leninist Parties and Organizations, upholding Marxism-Leninism and Mao Zedong Thought.

At the forefront are revolutionary parties of the proletariat guided by Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought or Maoism and leading new-democratic revolutions through people's war against imperialism and reaction. They are the most tempered and most serious advanced detachments of the proletariat. They follow the basic teachings of Mao Zedong and respond to the central question of revolution.

They stand in sharp contrast to the parties that previously avowed themselves to be Marxist-Leninist and antirevisionist but have become drawn to the path of revisionism and reformism. They have also withstood the attempts of the followers of Deng Xiaoping and Enver Hoxha to fragment and destroy the antirevisionist parties as well as certain attempts to reduce adherence to Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought to a question of defending one or another Chinese figure or group regarded as the principal successor or supporter of Mao.

The parties most prone to abandoning the Marxist-Leninist position have been those constituted by the unremoulded petty-bourgeois, especially in North America and Western Europe. In the late '70s and early '80s, they were confused and driven towards liquidationism or abandonment of Mao's line by the Deng revisionist line of reversing the GPCR, betraying socialism and making out US imperialism and the bourgeoisie as the principal positive forces for China's economic development and for a pretended opposition to Soviet social-imperialism, as well as by the Hoxha line of holding Mao chiefly responsible for Deng's misuse of China's three-world diplomatic concept as a license for capitalist restoration in collusion with US imperialism and as a substitute for proletarian internationalism.

The theory and practice of the GPCR pertained directly to China as a socialist country, with the proletarian revolutionaries, the proletariat and the rest of the masses striving to continue the revolution under proletarian dictatorship in order to consolidate socialism, combat revisionism and prevent the restoration of capitalism. But in a comprehensive and profound way, the GPCR has also inspired and influenced the revolutionary parties of the proletariat in the third world even as these are not yet in the process of socialist revolution and construction. It has enhanced the understanding of the basic principles for making the new-democratic and socialist stages of the revolution and for aiming at the ultimate goal of communism.

It has urged the study and application of the basic teachings of the great communists, including the major contributions of Mao in the advance of Marxist-Leninist philosophy, political economy and social science. It has educated proletarian revolutionaries in building the vanguard party and in carrying out the new-democratic revolution through protracted people's war and subsequently the socialist revolution and construction.

It has clarified the basic principles and methods of class struggle for combating modern revisionism, preventing the restoration of

capitalism and consolidating socialism in socialist society, up to the threshold of communism in the long process of making a radical rupture from the millennia-old institution and consequences of private ownership of the means of production. Thus, it has shed light as never before on the road to communism.

The proletarian revolutionaries in the Philippines reestablished the Communist Party of the Philippines on December 26, 1968 on the theoretical foundation of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought. They sought to apply the universal theory of the proletariat on the concrete conditions of the Philippines. They drew inspiration and encouragement from the full range of Marxist-Leninist teachings, from the Chinese revolution as a whole and from the GPCR.

They earnestly learned crucial lessons from the experience of the Chinese revolution and criticized and repudiated modern revisionism centered in the Soviet Union. Thus they armed themselves with a powerful ideological weapon to fight and defeat the long-running line of revisionism and opportunism of the Lava revisionist renegades in the old merger party of the Communist and Socialist parties. They studied and endeavored to apply the teachings of Mao Zedong on the law of contradiction and social practice, on Party building and the rectification movement, the class analysis of semicolonial and semifeudal conditions, the new-democratic revolution, the strategy and tactics of protracted people's war and united front policy.

The revolutionary forces and the people advanced from victory to victory for so long as the CPP adhered to the ideological line of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought and to the general political line of new-democratic revolution through protracted people's war. From 1969 to 1977, the CPP grew in strength and became nationwide in scale and deeply rooted among the masses in the course of the armed revolution against the US-Marcos dictatorship.

Departing from the “Tribute to Mao Zedong” written by Amado Guerrero, chairman of the CPP Central Committee, soon after Mao’s death, the central leadership of the CPP did not resolutely and militantly defend Mao’s Marxist-Leninist line and accomplishments against Dengist attack even after this started to become full scale and conspicuous after 1978 when the policy of capitalist-oriented reforms and “opening up” to the world capitalist system was proclaimed. Eventually, the silence led to the neglect of the study and application of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought and to the growth of subjectivism and opportunism, despite the continuous formal declarations of adherence to Mao Zedong Thought and of upholding the GPCR in CPP documents.

Mao Zedong became reduced to just one in an amorphous array of revolutionary leaders. Even the petty-bourgeois radical leaders of anti-imperialist movements in Central America gained a standing higher than Mao’s among some members of the CPP Central Committee (CPP/CC). These stirred up the revisionist notion that the Philippine revolution could win only if it had direct or indirect Soviet military and financial assistance. They frowned upon the principle of self-reliance. And they started to consider the Soviet Union as socialist in violation of the CPP’s long-standing criticism and repudiation of Soviet revisionism and social-imperialism.

Contrary to the facts, the subjectivist notion arose that the Philippines was no longer semifeudal and that the US-Marcos regime had industrialized and urbanized the country to the extent that the strategic line of people’s war, requiring the encirclement of the cities from the countryside, was no longer valid. The worst of the “Left” opportunists called for armed urban insurrection as the principal form of struggle. And the worst of the Right opportunists called for urban-based legal struggle as the principal form of struggle and for cutting down the leading role of the CPP in the united front.

The Right opportunists became assertive from 1986 onward under the influence of the US-Aquino regime and later on by Gorbachovism. Frustrated by their own errors and setbacks, the “Left” opportunists swung to the Right in 1989 and joined the long-running Right opportunists along a revisionist and liquidationist line under the influence of events in China and the Soviet-bloc countries. The “Left” opportunists had inflicted the most severe damage on the revolutionary movement with their revisionist concept of armed struggle, divorced from painstaking mass work and corrosive of the principle of self-reliance. The damage was only overshadowed by the advances made by the proletarian revolutionaries and revolutionary masses up to 1986.

Because good Party cadres and members continued to stand on the CPP’s strong foundation in Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought, the revisionists and opportunists could not go on spreading their erroneous line and inflicting damage to the CPP and the revolutionary movement. Exactly when they were at the peak of their anti-CPP activities, the CPP was ready to launch a rectification movement. Since 1992, this movement has been conducted and has won resounding victories.

The CPP owes to Mao Zedong the principle and method of rectification. It has been able to strengthen itself ideologically, politically and organizationally by reaffirming the basic principles of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought. It has defeated the revisionists and liquidationists. It has also thwarted the imperialist ideological and political offensive.

This offensive uses as grist the disintegration of the revisionist bureaucrat capitalist regimes in the former Soviet-bloc countries, the restoration of capitalism in China and the uprisings in 80 Chinese cities in 1989, especially the massacre at Tienanmen; and misrepresents the revisionist regimes as socialist and as proof of the futility of the socialist cause in order to dissuade the people from the revolutionary cause.

The imperialist offensive also involves the use of Filipino revisionist renegades and anticommunist petty-bourgeois grouplets in carrying out anti-CPP propaganda as a component of the psychological warfare in the US-instigated “low-intensity conflict”. Thanks to Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought, the CPP has been able to consolidate its ranks and continues to reap victories in performing the critical and constructive tasks of the rectification movement.

By reaffirming and carrying out the basic revolutionary principles of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought in ideology, politics and organization, the CPP has revitalized itself and has become more confident than ever before in holding high the banner of proletarian revolutionary leadership and carrying out the new-democratic revolution through protracted people’s war.

It is proud of persevering in the highest form of revolutionary struggle and being at the forefront at a time that the anti-imperialist and socialist movements are at an ebb on a global scale. At the same time, it is humbly well aware of the tremendous odds that it faces. It is conscious of performing its internationalist duty by carrying the Philippine revolution forward and contributing to the stimulation and resurgence of the anti-imperialist and socialist movements.

The Continuing Global Significance of the GPCR

Let me make just a few remarks on the continuing global significance of the theory and practice of the GPCR. I hope that these are relevant and useful in your discussions. I make these remarks against the notion that because the GPCR was defeated it has lost significance and validity.

As long as capitalism exists, the cause of socialist revolution does not cease. In making revolution, there are twists and turns, victories and defeats until total victory is won on the scale of one country and that of the whole world. The struggle between

capitalism and socialism will continue for a whole historical epoch, as Lenin and Mao pointed out, until socialism wins on a global scale and communism becomes possible.

The proletarian revolutionaries never gave up the cause of socialism when the short-lived Paris Commune of 1871 or the Russian revolution of 1905 was defeated. They were never discouraged when the fascists crushed the communist parties and invaded the Soviet Union and other countries. The capitalist counterrevolution by the revisionists in socialist countries does not spell the end of the socialist cause. The proletarian revolutionaries always come out the wiser and more victorious when they learn lessons from previous victories and defeats.

1. The fact that the GPCR triumphed in Mao's time should not be glossed over. Until now in the history of mankind, there has never been as intensive and extensive a democratic process as the GPCR, with the proletariat and the people being able to express themselves freely, seize back the authority usurped by capitalist-roaders and overthrow such deeply entrenched high officials of the Party and the state. The victory of the GPCR came as the culmination of a series of struggles between the proletarian revolutionary line and the bourgeois renegade line within the Communist Party of China (CPC) and the Chinese socialist state. The contradiction between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie started to simmer in 1956, following the overthrow of the proletariat by the revisionists in the Soviet Union and the basic socialist transformation of the ownership of the means of production in China and in the course of the Eighth Congress of the CPC.

The basic principles and practical methods that Mao drew up for the GPCR were guided by and developed from the basic teachings of his great communist predecessors and arose from the two-line struggle within the CPC and from the lessons learned from the building of socialism by Lenin and Stalin, from the

mistakes and shortcomings of Stalin and from the betrayal of socialism by the Soviet revisionists.

Among the points that Mao put forward during the GPCR were the following: that the main contradiction in socialist society is between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, that class struggle is the key link in all spheres, that revolutionary politics must be in command, that the mass line must be pursued, that both the mode of production and the superstructure must be revolutionized, that the youth and the masses must be trained and gain experience as revolutionary successors through cultural revolution, that there must be the dialectical interaction and mutual supervision and cooperation between the leadership and the masses, that there must be a three-in-one combination of cadres, masses and experts, that there must be freedom and discipline, that special attention must be paid to the revolutionary education of the intelligentsia and the bureaucracy lest they become the ideological and social base of revisionism and capitalist restoration.

Liu Shaoqi, Deng Xiaoping and the like opposed the proletarian revolutionary line of Mao with such notions as the harmony of Marxism-Leninism and revisionism, self-cultivation and expertise above the heads of the masses, dying out of the class struggle, the main contradiction in socialist society is between the backward productive forces and the advanced relations of production, the Kautskyite “theory of productive forces” (building socialism is merely an economic operation), dealing with labor power and means of production as commodities subject to the capitalist law of value, the consolidation of the national democratic revolution and Bukharinite prolongation of concessions to the national bourgeoisie and the rich peasants and shunning the restriction and eventual elimination of bourgeois rights.

The Chinese capitalist roaders wanted to overthrow Mao and his proletarian revolutionary line. In the demagogic fashion of the

Soviet revisionists, they depicted him as guilty of the cult of personality and even as a feudal autocrat. But on the way to the GPCR, Mao succeeded in putting forward the general line of socialist revolution and construction, launching the Great Leap Forward and building the people's communes, making a comprehensive critique of Soviet modern revisionism and defeating the most overt Right opportunists in 1957 to 1959 and redirecting the socialist education movement against the Party persons in authority taking the capitalist road as the main target.

What makes the theory and practice of the GPCR the greatest achievement of Mao is that by this he was able to identify the crucial problems that, if unsolved, can spell the peaceful change of socialism into capitalism and to win victory in the solution of those problems up to a significant level in a significant period of time. The defeat of the GPCR urges us to learn both positive and negative lessons, in the same way that Marx analyzed the Paris Commune and upheld its revolutionary significance.

Some lessons include the necessity of precluding factionalism, ensuring that the Left win over the Middle to isolate the Right, using due process in addition to Party leadership and mass movement in order to narrow the target and limit the number of those subject to punitive measures, directing the ideological and political offensive against the worst forces and factors, using education and persuasion on those who merely lag behind and preventing the return to power of the incorrigible and systematic capitalist-roaders like Deng Xiaoping. Because of serious errors, the proletarian revolutionary succession to Mao could not be fulfilled all the way after his death.

2. The Chinese revisionists who have reversed the proletarian revolutionary line of Mao and falsely judged the GPCR as a total disaster cannot gloat endlessly over their betrayal of socialism. The actual restoration of capitalism in China indubitably proves the correctness of Mao in putting forward the theory and practice of continuing revolution under proletarian dictatorship through

the GPCR. The basic revisionist notions of Liu Shaoqi and Deng Xiaoping against the socialist line of Mao have led to capitalist counterrevolution and the unbridled exploitation and oppression of the proletariat and people by the imperialists and the Chinese bourgeoisie.

The Chinese revisionists and bureaucrat capitalists still masquerade as communists and pretend to run a socialist state. But the truth can be easily drawn from the facts. The class rule of the proletariat has been overthrown in all spheres and the capitalist-oriented reforms and integration of China into the world capitalist system have created a powerful bureaucrat and private comprador big bourgeoisie. Especially after Mao's criticism of Soviet revisionism and monopoly bureaucrat capitalism, it is naive of some people to say that China is socialist simply because of the existence of state-owned enterprises and the formal rule of a communist party. These are merely the base of a bureaucrat monopoly bourgeoisie, which is growing as a comprador big bourgeoisie in collusion with the imperialists and private bourgeoisie in the Chinese economy.

It is important for the symposium to clarify and demonstrate how the Chinese revisionists and bureaucrat capitalists have revised the basic principles of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought in philosophy, political economy and scientific socialism, overthrown the class dictatorship of the proletariat, redirected and reorganized the CPC, adopted and enforced policies and laws that have destroyed the socialist character of China and turned it into capitalist in politics, economy and culture and in fact inflicted severe oppression and exploitation on the broad masses of the people by the imperialists and the domestic Chinese bourgeoisie.

It is interesting to try answering the following questions: how much longer will the bureaucrat and private capitalists use the signboards of the communist party and the socialist state to legitimize and enforce their bourgeois class rule before giving way to openly anticommunist political liberalization as the

inevitable consequence of economic liberalization; and whether there are still sufficiently resolute and courageous proletarian revolutionaries to avail of the legacy of Mao Zedong and the GPCR and lead the masses in a revolutionary movement for socialism.

3. The completely undisguised restoration of capitalism in the former Soviet Union and the disintegration of the Soviet Union verify and vindicate the correctness of Mao's critique of modern revisionism and the theory and practice of the GPCR. The direction in which the Chinese revisionists are taking China is presaged by the earlier 35-year experience of the Soviet revisionist renegades.

In a manner of speaking, the Chinese revolution was overtaken by the betrayal of socialism in the Soviet Union in 1956. Mao's opponents took inspiration from the Soviet revisionists and tried to cast away his proletarian revolutionary line. But Mao prevailed while he was alive. His successful resistance to modern revisionism and defense of Chinese socialism actually lasted for 20 years from 1956 to 1976 and gave him the opportunity to make a pathbreaking critique of an unprecedented phenomenon, which was revisionism in power and capitalist restoration in the Soviet Union.

A necessary component of Mao's theory and practice of the GPCR is his comprehensive and profound critique of Soviet modern revisionism. History presented to him the task of analyzing something unprecedented, revisionism subverting and gaining power in a socialist society. And he performed his task well, up to predicting correctly the undisguised restoration of capitalism and disintegration of the revisionist regimes. Quite a number of people had believed that Khrushchov would build the material and technical foundation of communism in in the Soviet Union in twenty years' time and later on that Brezhnev's "real socialism" was irreversible.

4. Mao's theory and practice of continuing revolution under proletarian dictatorship through the GPCR is indispensable to proletarian revolutionaries in understanding the problems of making socialist revolution and construction in the face of imperialism, revisionism and reaction.

Without this theory and practice, Marxist-Leninists would be at a loss in the face of the attempt of the imperialists, the revisionists and all their anticommunist petty-bourgeois camp followers to completely discredit the socialist record of Lenin, Stalin and Mao, further attack socialism by misrepresenting the anti-Stalin and anti-Mao revisionist regimes as socialist and prate about the futility of the socialist cause.

With Mao's critique of modern revisionism and his theory and practice of the GPCR, there is ample scientific basis for revolutionary foresight and optimism and for the confidence that when socialist societies shall again arise from the crisis of imperialism and upsurge of proletarian revolution, the communists will have a better grasp of what to do in upholding, defending and advancing socialism towards the ultimate goal of communism.

5. Because of the defeat of socialism since 1956 in the Soviet Union and conspicuously since 1978 in China, the proletariat and the people of the world are still very much in the era of imperialism and proletarian revolution and are being subjected to ever worsening conditions of exploitation and oppression. (Hua Guofeng from 1976 to 1978 was comparable to Malenkov from 1954 to 1956 as a transition figure, already encircled by the revisionists.)

The centralization and concentration of capital are more rapid than ever before in the entire history of capitalism before because of the use of high technology and the most speculative forms of finance capital. The destructive consequences of present-day capitalism are unprecedented in both industrial capitalist

countries and underdeveloped countries. The uneven development of capitalism is far grosser than ever before, as most evident in the general run of third world and former Soviet-bloc countries.

Insofar as the new-democratic and socialist revolutions will still have to be waged in various countries at different times, the basic teachings of the great communists from Marx to Mao and the lessons from successful revolutions will continue to be relevant and applicable long into the future. The basic principles of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought shall be upheld and further developed on the basis of persistent, worsened and new concrete conditions.

In closing, I wish you all the success in the symposium and I eagerly await the results to be published. #

7.

LENIN AND STALIN ON THE RELATIONSHIP OF DEMOCRATIC AND SOCIALIST REVOLUTIONS IN COLONIAL AND SEMICOLONIAL COUNTRIES

Comrades and friends,

I wish to convey to all of you sincere greetings of solidarity on the occasion of this year's Brussels International Seminar, which is sponsored by the Workers' Party of Belgium and has as its theme the road of the October revolution, in advance celebration of the 80th anniversary of this great socialist revolution.

I thank the Workers' Party of Belgium for inviting me to participate in this seminar and to deliver the main report on Lenin and Stalin and on the relationship of the democratic and socialist revolution in colonies and semicolonies.

My presentation covers the teachings of Lenin on the two stages of the Russian revolution, the implementation of these teachings by Lenin and Stalin, the extension and further development of these in colonies and semicolonies, the violation of these by the modern revisionists and the continuing validity of the Marxist-Leninist theory and practice of the two stages.

I. Introduction

Colonial and semicolonial countries have large survivals of feudalism. Thus, they are susceptible to imperialist domination. In countries where feudalism or semifeudalism reigns, there is categorically the need for a bourgeois-democratic revolution before there can be a socialist revolution. This is mainly in terms of taking into account the socioeconomic conditions in the revolutionary process and, as a matter of course, the antidemocratic character of the counterrevolutionary state.

Where there is a certain degree of industrial capitalist development as in the case of Germany during the time of Marx in 1856 or Russia during the time of Lenin in 1917 or due to imperialist domination as in the case of colonies and semicolonies, the industrial proletariat must forge an alliance with the peasantry to carry out an uninterrupted revolution from the stage of bourgeois-democratic revolution to that of socialist revolution.

At the end of the 1840's, Marx put forward the thesis of such an uninterrupted revolution in the "Address to the Communist League"; and subsequently pointed out the necessity of combining the peasant revolutionary movement with the proletarian revolution in a letter to Engels in 1856 by stating: "the whole thing in Germany will depend on the possibility of backing the proletarian revolution, by some second edition of the Peasant War."

The foregoing ideas of Marx were not developed in the subsequent works of Marx and Engels. Neither did the theoreticians of the Second International and the West European social-democratic parties. They did their utmost to bury the ideas of Marx connecting the bourgeois-democratic revolution with the socialist revolution. They became obsessed with the Eurocentric notion of waiting for the industrial proletariat to become the majority of the population as the precondition to socialist revolution anywhere. They also took it for granted that after the bourgeois revolution the peasant masses would betray the revolution and a long "lull" of fifty or a hundred years would follow during which the proletariat would be "peacefully" and "lawfully" exploited by the bourgeoisie until the time came for the socialist revolution.

Lenin brought to light the forgotten ideas of Marx. He did not merely repeat them but developed them further. He molded them into a harmonious theory of socialist revolution by regarding the

alliance of the proletariat with the peasantry and other semiproletarian elements of town and country as an indispensable factor of socialist revolution and as a condition for the victory of the proletarian revolution.

Lenin guided the Third Congress of the Russian Social-Democratic Party in London in April 1905, to differentiate the Bolsheviks from the Mensheviks, on the basic tactics and line of class leadership of the proletariat in the bourgeois-democratic and socialist stages of the Russian revolution and the necessity of the worker-peasant alliance. In their own rump congress, the Mensheviks conceded to the bourgeoisie the class leadership in the bourgeois-democratic revolution and wanted the proletariat to be a mere appendage of the liberal bourgeoisie and a mere beggar of economic reforms in the course of the bourgeois-democratic revolution.

Subsequently, in June and July 1905, Lenin wrote *Two Tactics of Social Democracy in the Democratic Revolution* to clarify in a comprehensive, profound and thoroughgoing manner the bourgeois-democratic and socialist stages of the revolution and set forth the tactics of continuous proletarian class leadership through its revolutionary party, the alliance of the proletariat and the peasantry, the armed uprising for seizing political power, the provisional revolutionary government, the democratic dictatorship of the workers and peasants, the confiscation of land from the landlords and the realization of the 8-hour day and other immediate demands of the working class.

Stalin immediately and consistently followed the Leninist theory and tactics of revolution, with such works as: "Armed Insurrection and Our Tactics", "The Provisional Revolutionary Government and Social Democracy" (1905), "Two Clashes," "The Present Situation and the Unity Congress of the Workers' Party" (1906), Preface to the Georgian edition of Karl Kautsky's Pamphlet, *The Driving Forces and Prospects of the Russian Revolution*" (February 1907).

II. The Precision of Lenin's Work

Lenin's *Two Tactics of Social Democracy in the Democratic Revolution* was precise in applying Marxism on the concrete conditions of Russia. It served as the programmatic guide of the Bolsheviks and the proletariat for the entire period from 1905 to their victory in the Great October Socialist Revolution in 1917.

Within that period, Russia could be correctly described in several ways. It was a military-feudal imperialist power, especially in relation to the many nationalities that it oppressed and exploited. It had a few industrial enclaves, surrounded by an ocean of feudalism and medievalism. It could produce industrial fuel and basic metals and chemicals but not machine tools and was therefore a weak capitalist country. It was a semicolony of British, French and Belgian imperialism which provided the finance capital and capital equipment for the exploitation of the proletariat and the people.

The industrial proletariat was a minority of the population and could not make revolution of any kind without the alliance with the small peasantry and other semiproletarian masses who composed the overwhelming majority of the people. It could not aim for the socialist revolution without passing through the bourgeois-democratic revolution and without seizing the initiative and leadership of the revolution from the liberal bourgeoisie who acted as the agents of the big bourgeoisie and who courted the support of the peasantry. The wisdom of Lenin was to declare forthrightly that the proletariat was to seize the leadership of the bourgeois-democratic revolution so that this could pass on to the socialist revolution.

It was of decisive importance to define the basic tactics of the Bolsheviks and the proletariat because the Russian situation and the Russian revolution were complex and they were confronted with several types of opponents: the tsarist autocracy, the big

bourgeoisie, the liberal bourgeoisie and the opportunists in the Russian Social-Democratic Party and the “socialist revolutionary” descendants of the Narodniks.

The tsarist autocracy, together with the landed aristocracy, blew hot and cold in countering the revolution, at one time pretending to make reforms and another time unabashedly escalating brutal reaction. The big bourgeoisie used the liberal bourgeoisie, the constitutional democrats, in an attempt to outwit the Bolsheviks and dupe the people with the proposal of a constitutional monarchy and bourgeois-democratic reforms.

At the same time, there were the opportunists, the Mensheviks, who were avowedly for the overthrow of tsarism but who were open to compromise with the liberal bourgeoisie and who posed as Marxists but who wished the liberal bourgeoisie to lead the bourgeois-democratic revolution and make the proletariat its subsidiary. Further, there were the petty-bourgeois socialist revolutionaries, who advocated a populist supraclass kind of socialism and who were deeply hostile to the Bolsheviks and the proletariat.

While conducting ideological and political struggle against the Mensheviks, Lenin also resolutely conducted a parallel struggle against the opportunists and revisionists of other parties in the Second International on a comprehensive range of issues pertaining to imperialism and the proletarian revolution. He combated Kautsky’s theory of “ultra imperialism” and the social-imperialist, social-chauvinist and social-pacifist position of the social-democratic parties, which collaborated with the blatantly bourgeois parties in supporting imperialism, increasing the war budget and the like.

The bankruptcy of the social democratic parties became exposed upon the outbreak of World War I. Lenin’s description of imperialism as the eve of socialist revolution and his call to turn the imperialist war into a revolutionary civil war rang loud and

clear. In 1916, he wrote *Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism* to consolidate his theory on imperialism and proletarian revolution. This work reinforced his *Two Tactics of Social Democracy in the Democratic Revolution*. Unfolding the theory of uneven development, he demonstrated that Russia was ripe for armed revolution for carrying out the consequent stages of bourgeois-democratic and socialist revolution, both under the leadership of the proletariat.

In the process of making the February bourgeois-democratic revolution of 1917, there was basically an objective alliance of different political forces determined to overthrow tsarism, especially after it became culpable for the catastrophic involvement of Russia in World War I. The situation became undoubtedly ripe for armed revolution. At the same time, there was a life-and-death contest for hegemony in the revolution between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie. The bourgeoisie had the initiative of forming the provisional revolutionary government under Kerensky. But Lenin recognized that there was already dual power in Russia, involving the power in the hands of the Kerensky regime and the other in the hands of the soviets of workers, soldiers and peasants' deputies.

He upheld the independence of the revolutionary party of the proletariat and called for winning over the majority of the soviets in order to make the bourgeois-democratic revolution pass on to the socialist revolution in October. The linkage of the soviets of workers' deputies with those of the soldiers' deputies under Bolshevik leadership meant the alliance of the proletariat and the peasantry because most of the soldiers were peasants. And when the Bolsheviks were able to win the majority of the soviets of peasant deputies, they were ready for the armed uprisings. The fate of the Kerensky regime was sealed.

With the slogan of bread and peace, the Bolsheviks were able to seize the initiative and galvanize the masses as the Kerensky regime made grievous mistakes arising from its bourgeois class

nature and its puppetry to the Western imperialist powers that dictated the continued involvement of Russia in World War I. They resolutely and militantly led the proletariat and the people against such further involvement in the interimperialist war and against the threats posed by the diehard tsarist forces and the imperialists. They won political power by storming the urban centers of bourgeois political power.

Upon establishment of soviet power or the dictatorship of the proletariat, Lenin immediately issued a decree on nationalization of the land, involving the confiscation of land from the landlords for the benefit of the peasant masses. This was to complete the bourgeois-democratic revolution and to fulfill the longrunning peasant demand for land in keeping with the alliance of the working class and the peasantry. This also laid the ground for the subsequent victories of the Bolshevik in more extensive and intensive armed struggle.

The Bolsheviks were determined to withdraw Russia from the interimperialist war and proceeded to forge the Brest-Litovsk peace treaty with Germany in order to gain a breathing spell and consolidate the victory of the revolution. But the imperialists and the local reactionaries were hell-bent on recovering their lost power in Russia and launched the war of foreign military intervention and civil war, from 1918 to 1920.

The armed struggle was carried out mainly in the countryside. The Bolsheviks could win because of the basic tactic of worker-peasant alliance. The overwhelming support of the peasantry enabled the Bolshevik party and the Red Army to trounce the imperialists and the local reactionaries. In viewing the Russian revolution, it is incorrect to separate and isolate the urban armed uprisings from the subsequent armed struggle in the countryside.

After the war, the Bolsheviks had to restore the economy as soon as possible. To continue with “war communism” would be untenable and intolerable, especially to the peasantry from whom

a tremendous amount of supplies had been requisitioned for the war effort. Thus, Lenin put forward the New Economic Policy (NEP) as a transitory measure, giving concessions even to the rich peasants, small traders and entrepreneurs, from 1921 onward. At the same time, Bolsheviks continued to hold on to the commanding heights of the economy, the industries, the means of transport and communications, the banks and other major assets confiscated from the enemy.

After Lenin's death in 1924, Stalin assumed leadership of the Party, the state and the revolution. He comprehensively summed up and defended Leninism in his *Foundations of Leninism*, which was issued in the same year, against the anti-Leninist elements who had wished to take advantage of the illness and death of Lenin. This work defined Marxism-Leninism in the era of imperialism and proletarian revolution.

He continued to implement the NEP. He fought and defeated Trotsky and his ilk who wished to terminate it prematurely. The objective of these "Left" opportunist scoundrels was to break up the worker-peasant alliance, subject the peasantry to intolerable exploitation and fulfill their prophecy that socialism in the Soviet Union was impossible.

From 1926 onward, Stalin vigorously pushed the line of socialist industrialization and from 1930 onward, the collectivization of agriculture in conjunction with socialist industry. He fought and defeated Bukharin and his Right opportunist ilk who wished to indefinitely prolong the temporary concessions given to the rural and urban bourgeoisie under the NEP. The Bolsheviks aroused, organized and mobilized the masses of small peasants against the rich peasants who carried out sabotage and other forms of violent resistance.

Under the leadership of Stalin, the worker-peasant alliance among the various nationalities in the Soviet Union was maintained through varied phases and in varied conditions. The

workers in socialist industry needed the food and raw materials and the peasants in the collectives received in return the agricultural machinery, agrochemical and consumer manufactures from the workers. There was a dialectical and spiraling interaction of the two toiling classes in a series of five year plans which created a powerful socialist economic base and superstructure.

III. The Two Stages in the Colonies and Semicolonies in the East

In tracing the historical destiny of the doctrine of Karl Marx in 1913, Lenin marked three periods: the first, from the revolution of 1848 to the Paris Commune of 1871; the second, from the Paris Commune to the Russian Revolution of 1905, and the third, since the Russian revolution.

In the first period, the doctrine of Marx was proclaimed by the *Communist Manifesto*. It started out as only one of the numerous trends of socialism. The revolutionary storms revealed the various classes in action and established the fact that the proletariat alone could lead the socialist revolution. Bourgeois society took shape. Liberalism was exposed as a tool of reaction. Pre-Marxian utopian trends of socialism were swept away. Independent proletarian parties were born: the First International (1864-72) and the German Social-Democratic Party.

In the second period (1872-1904), there were generally no revolutionary storms in the West inasmuch as in the main it had finished with bourgeois revolutions. Socialist parties, basically proletarian, were organized on a wide scale. The Marxian doctrine spread and was so predominant in the working class movement that liberalism tried to revitalize itself in the form of socialist opportunism.

In the third period, the East opened up in a big way as the source of great revolutionary storms. The bourgeois democratic revolutions in Russia, Turkey, Persia and China broke out one

after another. And may I point out that the pioneer of the bourgeois-democratic revolutions in Asia was the Philippine revolution of 1896.

Lenin criticized the opportunists for singing without cease the praises of “social peace” and the nonnecessity of storms under “democracy” in the face of the revolutionary storms in Asia. He saw the Asian revolutions as revealing the spinelessness and baseness of liberalism and at the same time the sharp demarcation between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie.

At the same time, he saw the high cost of living and the oppression perpetrated by the trusts, engendering an intensification of the class struggle in Europe. He pointed to the feverish arming and the policy of imperialism turning the so-called social peace of Europe into a barrel of gunpowder more than anything else.

He recognized the growing importance of the East as the battlefield between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie. He pointed out the potential dialectical interaction between the revolutionary movement in the East and that in the West. He was on the road of extending and further developing Marxism of 19th century free-competition capitalism to the stage of Leninism in the era of modern imperialism and proletarian revolution.

The opportunists and revisionists of the Second International acted as the social chauvinist and social pacifist tail of the direct parliamentary agents of the monopoly bourgeoisie in exploiting the proletariat in Europe, in raising war budgets and in encouraging imperialist policy and projects. Kautsky’s theory of ultra-imperialism went so far as to presume that imperialism is benign and progressive because it is supposed to break down precapitalist formations and open the way to capitalist development and the growth of the proletariat in colonies and semicolonies.

Lenin categorically described imperialism as moribund capitalism and as the eve of socialist revolution. He put forward the theory of uneven development in order to demonstrate that imperialism involves the spasmodic and uneven expansion of capital and at the same time in a bigger way the destruction of productive forces in the wake of taking superprofits from the colonies, semicolonies and the dependent countries; and that where the oppression and exploitation is most intense on a wide scale revolutionary resistance arises. Thus, in addition to the slogan “workers of all countries, unite!”, he issued the slogan for the oppressed peoples and nations to unite against imperialism and local reaction.

Under the theory of uneven development, Russia was the weakest link in the chain of imperialist countries and was where the proletarian revolution was most likely to win, provided the subjective forces were developed to take advantage of the ripening revolutionary situation. The economic and technological conditions in the stronger imperialist countries are more apt for socialism than those in the less-developed countries but their social and military power at home plus the superprofits taken from colonies and semicolonies provide the imperialists with more resources to preempt, crush or derail the proletarian revolution.

Lenin estimated that workers’ uprisings in the West, especially in Germany would be helpful to the Russian revolution. But when these failed, he became even more determined to encourage the bourgeois-democratic revolutions in the East and place them within the framework of the world proletarian revolution. Thus, soon after the victory of the October revolution, he proceeded to form the Third International in 1919 in order to promote the building of proletarian revolutionary parties in both the imperialist countries and the dominated countries.

On the occasion of the first anniversary of the Third International at a meeting of the Moscow soviet in 1920, Lenin said,

In the early period of the revolution many entertained the hope that the socialist revolution would begin in Western Europe immediately when the imperialist war ended; at the same time when the masses were armed there could have been a successful revolution in some of the Western countries as well. It could have taken place had it not been for the split within the proletariat of Western Europe being deeper and the treachery of the former socialist leaders greater than had been imagined.

Lenin wrote the preliminary draft theses on the national and colonial questions and on the agrarian question for the Second Congress of the Communist International in 1920. At the Congress, he delivered the report on the national and colonial questions, where he made the following important points:

1. It is beyond doubt that any national movement can only be a bourgeois-democratic movement, since the overwhelming mass of the population in the backward countries consists of peasants who represent bourgeois-capitalist relations. It would be utopian to believe that proletarian parties in these backward countries, if indeed they can emerge from them, can pursue communist tactics and a communist policy, without establishing definite relations with the peasant movement and without giving it effective support.

2. It will readily be understood that peasants living in conditions of semifeudal dependence can easily assimilate and give effect to the idea of Soviet organization. It is also clear that the oppressed masses, those who are exploited, not only by merchant capital but also by the feudalists, and by a state based on feudalism, can apply this weapon, this type of organization, in their conditions too. The idea of Soviet organization is a simple one and is applicable, not only to proletarian, but also to peasant feudal and semifeudal relations.

3. The question was posed as follows: are we to consider as correct the assertion that the capitalist stage of economic development is inevitable for backward nations now on the road to emancipation and among whom a certain advance towards progress is to be seen since the war. We replied in the negative. If the victorious revolutionary proletariat conducts systematic propaganda among them, and the Soviet governments come to their aid with all the means at their disposal--in that event it will be erroneous to assume that the backward peoples must inevitably go through the capitalist stage of development.

Trotsky betrayed the Bolshevik revolution by stubbornly seeking to make it dependent on the workers' uprisings in Germany and in other imperialist countries, and by being contemptible of the oppressed nations and peoples, especially the peasantry in Russia and other backward countries and by failing to understand and attacking the theory and practice of the two-stage revolution.

Faithful to the legacy of Lenin, Stalin stood forthrightly for socialism in one country, availing of every possible support not only from the proletariat in imperialist countries but also from the oppressed peoples and nations outside the imperialist countries. And he paid close attention to the work of the Third International.

The propagation of the two-stage revolution by Lenin and Stalin would bear abundant fruit in the form of people's democracies in Asia and Eastern Europe after World War II. The colonies and semicolonies proved to be the more fertile ground for the victory of the armed revolution led by the proletariat than in the imperialist countries.

The people's democracy in China was the most important of the revolutionary crop because of the huge population and size of the country and more importantly because here was to be seen the transition from the bourgeois-democratic revolution to socialism and the heroic effort to consolidate socialism against revisionism and the danger of capitalist restoration. The Chinese revolution

under Mao Zedong's leadership grew in importance as modern revisionism took hold of the Soviet Union starting in 1956.

IV. Further development of the two-stage revolution

The salvoes of the October Revolution and the work of the Third International inspired and caused the establishment of the Communist Party of China (CPC) in 1921. In leading the CPC and the Chinese revolution, Mao Zedong learned from Lenin's theory and practice of the two-stage revolution under proletarian dictatorship and further developed it by making his own unique contributions.

He made concrete analysis of the concrete conditions of semicolonial and semifeudal China. He characterized the first stage of the Chinese revolution as bourgeois-democratic of the new type or new-democratic revolution against foreign monopoly capitalism, domestic feudalism and bureaucrat capitalism.

He identified the comprador big bourgeoisie and the landlord class as the class enemy within Chinese society and, among the motive forces of the revolution, the proletariat as the leading class, the peasantry as the main force and the worker-peasant alliance as the foundation of the revolutionary united front.

To come to the second stage of the Chinese revolution, which is socialist, the new-democratic revolution must be basically completed through the nationwide armed overthrow of the joint class dictatorship of the comprador big bourgeoisie and the landlord class and the establishment of the democratic dictatorship of the working class and the peasantry which is at the core and in essence the class dictatorship of the proletariat.

Mao regarded the new-democratic revolution through protracted people's war as the preparation for the socialist revolution. He pointed out that the new-democratic revolution was distinguishable from but continuous with the socialist revolution

because both stages were led by the revolutionary proletariat and were within the framework of the world proletarian-socialist revolution. As Lenin taught, he asserted that there was no need to pass the stage of capitalist development.

He repudiated the Trotskyite view, expressed most prominently by Chen Duxiu, the founding secretary of the Communist Party of China, that there was a separation of the bourgeois-democratic and socialist stages of the revolution and that the Chinese proletariat could only be an appendage of the Guomindang (GMD) because the proletariat was supposedly incapable of leading the bourgeois-democratic revolution. In fact, Chen Duxiu merged the CPP with the GMD and subordinated it to the latter in the 1924-27 period.

Mao pointed out that the proletariat could lead the bourgeois-democratic revolution and maintain its independence and initiative by strengthening itself ideologically, politically and organizationally as the advanced detachment of the proletariat; by having the peasantry for its main ally and by fulfilling the peasant demand for land as the main content of the democratic revolution. He was responsible for the establishment of the rural base areas, the first soviets of workers and peasants, which served the CPC in good stead after Chiang Kaishek's betrayal.

Regarding Party-building, Mao introduced the rectification campaign as the principle and method for confronting subjectivism, opportunism and other errors. He consistently espoused the line of trusting the masses, relying on them and mobilizing them as the way for carrying out and raising the revolutionary struggle from one level to a new and higher level.

He upheld the armed revolution as the main form of revolutionary struggle because the central task of the revolution is the seizure of political power. He was inspired by the declaration of Stalin that continuous armed struggle in China was an advantage of the Chinese revolution.

To this day, Mao is recognized as the master strategist and tactician with his theory and strategic line of people's war, involving the encirclement of the cities from the countryside over a protracted period of time in order to accumulate strength through tactical offensives until sufficient strength is built to seize the cities on a nationwide scale.

This theory and strategic line integrates the armed struggle, the agrarian revolution and the building of political power and the mass base. Mao demonstrated that in the course of the bourgeois-democratic revolution of the new type it was possible to respond to the peasant demand for land and to create Red political power based in the countryside even while the power of the reactionaries is still entrenched in the cities. In the Russian experience, dual political power arose only in the February revolution.

Mao made a continuous class analysis of Chinese society in accordance with Marxism-Leninism to guide Party building, the armed struggle and united front work. Insofar as it had the support of the peasant masses and had absolute leadership over the people's army, whichever was the main enemy at a given time, the CPC could maintain its independence and initiative and at the same time handle correctly its other allies and range the broadest possible united front to isolate and destroy the enemy.

After nationwide victory of the bourgeois-democratic revolution under its leadership in 1949, the Chinese proletariat could commence the socialist revolution. The state that was established took the form of a people's democratic republic. At the core was the proletarian dictatorship. The main component of state power, the people's army, was under the absolute leadership of the proletariat through the CPC.

Mao basically followed the teachings and example of Lenin and Stalin in nationalizing the land and carrying out land reform as a

bourgeois-democratic measure to satisfy the land hunger of the poor and lower middle peasants, in capturing the commanding heights of the economy for socialism by confiscating the productive assets of the imperialists and the domestic big bourgeoisie and in adopting the transitory measures for reviving the war-ravaged economy and realizing the basic socialist transformation of the entire economy. Under the leadership of Stalin, the Soviet Union assisted China.

In 1955 the peasants began to move towards cooperativization from the level of mutual aid teams. In 1956 the basic socialist transformation of the Chinese economy was accomplished. The Right opportunists and revisionists began overtly and covertly to oppose the proletarian revolutionary line of Mao.

They wanted to perpetuate the concessions previously granted to the patriotic bourgeoisie and rich peasants and opposed the restriction of bourgeois rights. They prated about the consolidation of the national-democratic revolution and yet self-contradictorily about the dying out of the class struggle. They insisted that the main contradiction was between the backward forces of production and the advanced relations of production and that socialist progress was simply a matter of promoting the forces of production.

Mao upheld the line of socialist revolution and construction. He pointed out that the main contradiction in socialist society is between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie. He followed Lenin's dictum that socialism would take a whole historical epoch and that the defeated bourgeoisie would continue to resist socialism in so many ways.

He defined the correct handling of contradictions among the people and those between the people and the enemy. Thus, the middle and petty-bourgeoisie as well as the rich peasants could be subordinated to the socialist policy of the state and violent counterrevolution could be averted. He also adopted the policy

of making heavy and basic industries as the leading factor, agriculture as the basis of the economy and bridging the two with light industry in order to accelerate delivery of producer and consumer goods to the peasant masses and thereby lighten their burden in the process of economic development.

He put forward the policy of the Great Leap Forward along the general line of socialist revolution and construction, involving “walking on two legs” and building the people’s communes. The policy overcame the imperialist blockade, the natural calamities and the sabotage by the Soviet revisionist renegades as well as the Bukharinite Right opportunist opposition and “Left” opportunist “communist wind”.

Following the resounding success of the Great Leap Forward and bountiful harvests from the communes, Mao launched a counteroffensive against the Right opportunists. He stressed that the key link to grasp in the class struggle and directed the socialist education movement against the Party bureaucrats taking the capitalist road.

He made a comprehensive critique of modern revisionism and engaged the Soviet revisionist party in an ideological debate. Taking into account the phenomenon of modern revisionism and the two-line struggle between the proletarian revolutionaries and the bourgeois renegades within the CPC, he subsequently put forward the theory of continuing revolution under proletarian dictatorship in order to combat revisionism, prevent the restoration of capitalism and consolidate socialism.

He put the theory into practice through the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution (GPCR). This involved the all-round dialectical revolutionization of both the mode of production and the superstructure of socialist society.

It surpassed the widespread notion that dissolving the exploiting classes was merely a matter of doing so economically, legally and

administratively and that building socialism was merely a matter of developing the productive forces and the technical expertise.

V. Antisocialist policy in agriculture

So far, in the history of the world proletarian revolution, socialism has arisen in countries where feudal and semifeudal relations in agriculture exist to a significant extent. The backward conditions in agriculture necessitate the bourgeois-democratic revolution, involving the completion of land reform and building the worker-peasant alliance. The question of social relations in agriculture is of fundamental importance in the transition from the bourgeois democratic revolution to the socialist revolution. Failure to complete land reform and advance from one stage of cooperativization to a higher one is fatal to the socialist revolution.

Excluded from the discussion are national liberation movements that were helpful to the anti-imperialist movement on a global scale but were essentially anticolonial, antiracist or antidespotic and came to power through neocolonial compromise or insurrection (e.g., several liberation fronts in Africa and the FSLN in Nicaragua) and confined themselves within the framework of an uncompleted bourgeois-democratic revolution of the old type. Some of them have not even tried to carry out genuine and thoroughgoing land reform and others have tried but have failed because of the lack of genuine proletarian class leadership and because of the lack of complementation by basic industrialization.

In all the people's democracies established after World War II, there was the debate between the proletarian revolutionaries and the Right opportunists concerning the social conditions and relations and the socialist path to be followed in agriculture. The teachings of Lenin and Stalin regarding measures of transition from the bourgeois-democratic to the socialist revolution in

agriculture and collectivization of agriculture in connection with socialist industrialization guided the proletarian revolutionaries.

Tito of Yugoslavia, as pioneer of modern revisionism, abandoned land reform and collectivization in 1948 and allowed the rich peasants to persist. The question of agriculture was a pivot point for him in his overall antisocialist position of denying the necessity of central economic planning, atomizing the economy under the pretext of workers' self-management and raising the flag of bourgeois nationalism against the Cominform.

In most of the people's democracies in Eastern Europe, land reform and collectivization were either frustrated or delayed, reflecting the strength of the Right opportunist current in the ruling parties which were typically mergers of communists and social-democrats who posed overnight as communists. When modern revisionism prevailed in the Soviet Union and spread in Eastern Europe, starting in 1956, land reform and collectivization were either put off completely or tokens of these were undercut by the persistence of rich peasants, farm capitalists and merchants.

The revisionists in Eastern Europe underestimated the peasant question as something to be solved automatically by the expansion of socialist industry and farm mechanization. The peasantry is supposed to be dissolved by employment generated by socialist industry and only a small number of farm workers is supposed to be needed to operate the farms.

But long before the promise in their argument is realized, the revisionists also use the backward conditions in agriculture as the factual basis for their argument for the retention or revival of the capitalist law of value, for the bourgeois freedom of dealing with labor power and means of production as commodities and for all related notions and practices of so-called market socialism.

In the Soviet Union, Khrushchov's drive to undo the socialist work of Lenin and Stalin included undermining and discrediting socialist agriculture in a series of clever moves. As first secretary of the Party, he pushed Malenkov the prime minister to plant the wrong crops on vast areas in order to discredit the latter as well as socialist agriculture. After taking all power into his hands, he broke the alliance of the working class and the peasantry. He dissolved the machine and tractor stations run by the proletariat, allowed the collectives to individually own, buy and sell farm machines and spare parts, expanded the private plots and the free markets and encouraged the reemergence of the rich peasants.

Soviet agriculture went into shambles before Khrushchov fell from power. This was one of the major reasons for his ouster. But his successors did not reverse his agricultural policy but continued to praise the supposedly higher productivity in the private plots than in the collective farms from which the rich peasants and free traders stole products.

With their "new economic system", Brezhnev and Kosygin expanded and aggravated the antisocialist policies initiated by Khrushchov in both industry and agriculture. The principal reason why Kremlinologists called the Brezhnev regime neo-Stalinist was that Brezhnev made a sham rehabilitation of Stalin and recentralized certain strategic industries to get revenues for the all-union bureaucracy and the arms race.

By the time Gorbachov came to power, the Soviet economy had become so depressed and bankrupted that he could easily disorganize and discredit it completely. He continued to misrepresent monopoly bureaucrat capitalism as socialism and moved towards his ultimate goal of open privatization of public productive assets. Finally, he called for "land reform" which meant the retrogression to private farming and the dissolution of state farms and collectives.

In a certain sense, the rise of modern revisionism in the Soviet Union in 1956 overtook the Chinese revolution. The right opportunists in the CPC became heavily influenced by Soviet revisionist ideas, including the economic ideas of the late Nicolai Voznesensky and E. Lieberman, because of the continuing close Sino-Soviet relations then and the flow of Chinese students and trainees.

It is to the credit of Mao that he was able to stand up victoriously against Soviet modern revisionists and the domestic revisionists, who tried but failed to overthrow him, from 1956 to 1976. He was able to carry out socialist revolution and construction, build socialist industry and the people's communes, make a comprehensive critique and repudiation of modern revisionism and carry out the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution.

But it should not be surprising that after his death his proletarian revolutionary line could be defeated. He himself was aware of the tremendous odds, involving the objective conditions and subjective factors. For him to move from one victory to another, he had to overcome the powerful opposition of the capitalist-roaders.

In Chinese agriculture, Mao put forward the line that agricultural cooperation could be realized, with mechanization progressively coming in as socialist industry could provide. The point was to preempt the further growth of the rural bourgeoisie, which had been tolerated in the period of transition. But Liu Xiaohu pushed the Bukharinite rich peasant line that cooperativization should always be preceded by mechanization or else it should not be undertaken at all.

They fielded "work" teams to nitpick and dissolve the cooperatives initiated by the peasant masses in 1955 in answer to Mao's call for these to be established wherever possible on the basis of the mutual aid teams. To oppose the building of the people's communes during the Great Leap Forward, they

alternated between Right opportunism and whipping up the “communist wind”. Up to the early ‘60s, they pushed the four big freedoms of the rich peasants--to hire labor, trade, lend money and rent out land.

After the death of Mao, the top Chinese revisionists or capitalist-roaders headed by Deng Xiaoping pushed their plan of big-comprador “modernization” and whipped up their line of capitalist reforms and opening up to foreign monopoly capitalism. They had as initial social base the national capitalists to whom they returned capital by redeeming the government bonds previously given in exchange for expropriated assets and the petty-bourgeoisified sections of the Party and state bureaucracy who were itching to have their revenge on Mao for the cultural revolution.

They proceeded to break up the people’s communes, which by implication they derided as a system of collective irresponsibility, and revived the pre-revolutionary system of individual farming which they described as the individual household responsibility system. The local Party cadres who complied with the new line rewarded their own families and friends with the choicest portions of land, including orchards and fishponds. The rich peasants were resurrected overnight and became the biggest social base of the Dengist counterrevolution.

The rural industries built on a widescale during the cultural revolution were privatized under the legal fiction of management lease. At the municipal, provincial and national levels, the bourgeoisie reemerged rapidly. As in the old days of the Guomindang, the biggest Chinese bourgeois are the bureaucrat capitalists, with the difference that they masquerade as communist to legitimize their rule. They retain the state enterprises as milking cows and at the same time run the most profitable private enterprises, in combination with the foreign monopolies.

Mao's thesis that as soon as the revisionists come to power they restore capitalism and become social fascist has been proven correct. They have deprived the workers of the right to strike and other democratic rights and subject them to severe exploitation and oppression under the pretext of "socialist labor discipline".

The myth is being spread that because of capitalist reforms and opening up to foreign monopoly capitalism, China has developed rapidly and that, good for socialism, the Chinese proletariat has increased in number. The truth is that the proletariat previously generated by a self-reliant socialist industry has been eroded and replaced by untenured cheap labor for sweatshops. Coolie labor of pre-revolutionary times has come back with a vengeance.

There is an explosive social polarization in China, with less than ten percent of the population getting high income and more than 90 percent reduced to a miserable level of subsistence and subjected to job insecurity and growing unemployment. While the imperialist and big-comprador enclaves of export-oriented manufacturing glisten in the coastal provinces, the west and central regions of China are rapidly plunging into lower levels of stagnation, depression and refeudalization.

V. The continuing validity of the two stages

The most important fact to recognize about the character of monopoly capitalism today is that it is destructive to productive forces and harmful to the well-being of the proletariat and people to an extent and in a manner unprecedented in the entire history of capitalism. As we enter the 21st century under the shadow of imperialist "globalization" and neocolonialism, the overwhelming majority of the people of the world (up to 80 percent) suffer from semicolonial and semifeudal conditions. More than ever before, we are still in the era of imperialism and proletarian revolution, as Lenin described.

1. At the very global centers of capitalism, the United States, the European Union and Japan, there is a rapid rise in the organic composition of capital. The monopoly firms which are ahead in the competition are rapidly concentrating and centralizing capital, putting more capital into reequipment and retooling and reducing the wage fund through downsizing of labor and use of part-time and short-term contract workers in order to extract superprofits.

The result is the stagnant and recessive tendency of national productivity and profitability rates. The United States is economically strongest among the monopoly capitalist powers because it is using its technological lead to manufacture goods for export and pushing its export drive at the expense of the other monopoly capitalist powers. The unemployment rate is made to appear relatively low because temporary part-time jobs in the service sector are being generated and misrepresented as regular employment.

The handful of so-called newly-industrialized economies like South Korea and Taiwan are reeling from increasing economic difficulties because the capitalist crisis of overproduction has extended to export-oriented manufacturing, previously conceded to them since the '70s. US monopoly capitalism wishes to exploit its own domestic consumer market and is pushing the export of its own products to these economies under the slogan of trade and investment liberalization.

2. In the past, notwithstanding the Comecon, the bureaucrat monopoly capitalists in the former Soviet bloc countries put their economies within the world capitalist system, competed and colluded with the traditional industrial capitalist countries for a while and ultimately` their revisionist regimes could not survive under the weight of the rapacity of the new bourgeoisie, the arms race and the huge debt from Western creditors.

Now, the former Soviet bloc countries are generally in an ever-worsening state of compradorization and economic devastation.

The industrial and agricultural system of the former Soviet Union has broken down and its production has continuously plunged. It sells its natural resources cheaply to pay for the consumer manufactures being dumped on it from the West. Most of the republics of Russia and most of the former Soviet satellite countries in Eastern Europe are flagrantly in economic and social conditions similar to those of the third world.

All the former Soviet bloc countries are dependent on loans and manufactured supplies from the Western monopolies and are trapped in the web of such multilateral agencies as the International Monetary Fund (IMF), World Bank (IBRD), World Trade Organization (WTO) and the EBRD. They are being reduced to the status of semicolonial and semifeudal countries ruled by the comprador big bourgeoisie and landlord class.

3. Since the overproduction of raw materials in the '70s, the third world countries have continuously plunged from one level of economic degradation to a lower one. Without exception, they have become neocolonial debt vassals of the imperialist countries and dependents on manufactured imports. Africa today presents the bleakest scene of misery and turbulence. But many countries in Asia and Latin America are basically in the same bleak situation.

In the notable case of China, the self-reliant industrial foundation previously established under socialism has been undermined. Export-oriented manufacturing and high consumption by the new bourgeoisie is bringing about the compradorization and refeudalization of China. The rapidly growing foreign debt and domestic public debt manifest the dismal neocolonial direction of China. The United States is pressing for extension of the bourgeois liberalization of the economy to that of the political system, i.e., discarding the signboard of the CPC and socialism, as in the Soviet Union.

The basic industries established in the past in some other third world countries like India and Brazil, have also been phased out or bankrupted due to the trade and investment liberalization enjoyed by the multinational corporations. The imperialists extend their direct investments and loans up to a certain point, where the compradorization as well as refeudalization of the economy can be generated.

In view of the massive retrogression of social economies in the third world and former Soviet bloc countries as a result of the depredations of monopoly capitalism, the theory and practice of the two stages of revolution remain valid and applicable in most countries of the world.

Now and for quite some time to come, the bourgeois-democratic revolution of the new type, under the leadership of the proletariat, is necessary in order to confront and defeat the imperialists and the local exploiting classes and overcome semicolonial and semifeudal conditions that afflict more countries than ever before and to prepare the way for the socialist stage of the revolution.

It is completely untrue that mankind is already beyond the era of imperialism and proletarian revolution, that bourgeois-democratic revolutions of the new type have become outdated and unnecessary, that the immediate political line everywhere is socialism and that pursuing the socialist revolution is merely a matter of raising similar economic demands everywhere, like equal pay for equal work and six-hour work day without reduction of pay.

The appropriate economic demands, which are internationally and nationally applicable must be made by the proletarian revolutionary parties. And they must be mentioned in the proper order in a particular country because a communist would look silly in the Philippines if he missed the immediate problems of mass unemployment and the actual low-wage levels and

demanded first of all that the Filipino worker should get the same amount of wages as the workers in industrial capitalist countries.

More important than making economic demands, as if the imperialists were kindhearted, is undertaking the workers strikes and the protest mass actions on the basis of concrete conditions in various countries in order to condemn the imperialist policies that oppress and exploit the proletariat and the broad masses of the people.

In the imperialist countries, the most important tasks are to build, expand and consolidate the revolutionary parties of the proletariat, generate workers' strikes and mass protest actions, raise economic demands but not be limited by them and prepare for the overthrow of the monopoly bourgeoisie. Socialist demands are made in order to raise the level of consciousness and militancy of the proletariat and the people and not really to expect mercy from the monopoly bourgeoisie.

In the third world and former Soviet-bloc countries, which are suffering from basically semicolonial and semifeudal conditions, it is possible and necessary to build revolutionary parties of the proletariat that can lead the broad masses of the people in the new-democratic and socialist stages of the revolution. In these countries, the people are now far more predisposed than those in the imperialist countries to wage armed revolution. The resurgence of the armed revolutionary movement in these countries can stimulate the forces of proletarian revolution in the imperialist countries.

The new world disorder that has arisen in the wake of the end of the Cold War provides favorable conditions for the resurgence of revolutionary movement led by the proletariat in the imperialist and dominated countries. The violent conflict in many parts of the world due to the bitter rivalries of reactionary factions under worsening socioeconomic conditions, the growing military interventions of imperialist powers and the sharpening

competition of the imperialist powers themselves as a result of the crisis of overproduction are preparing the stage for interimperialist war as well as for revolutionary wars on an unprecedentedly wide scale in the forthcoming century. Pax Americana is not forever.

If something bigger like the October Revolution of 1917 came after the Paris Commune of 1871 and still something bigger like several socialist countries and a great wave of national liberation movements came after the October Revolution, then something much bigger is forthcoming in the 21st century. The historical epoch of struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie is far from over. Let us look forward to the next peak of the world proletarian revolution. #

8.

SPEECH AT PROTEST MEETING ON ASYLUM CASE

13 December 1997

Julie my wife, Jasm our son and I wish to thank you for your continuing solidarity and support in our struggle for asylum in the Netherlands.

We convey our special thanks to our lawyers and to the amici curiae, the Office of the UN High Commissioner for Refugees, Amnesty International and the European Democratic Lawyers. For striving to generate moral support and mass campaigns in the Netherlands and abroad, we convey special thanks to the Committee of Respected Persons, the Dutch Committee for the Asylum of the Sison Family Now, The Filipino Refugees in the Netherlands and the International Committee for Asylum of the Sison Family.

We are encouraged by this protest meeting and by the various mass actions that have been undertaken since December 10, human rights day, in other parts of the world. It is comforting to us that many Dutch people and many more people in other countries have supported us. Your support is in stark opposition to the unjust position of the Dutch justice ministry to deny us admission as refugees and the permit to reside for so many years.

Application for Asylum in 1988

In my specific case, I applied for asylum on October 24, 1988 as an immediate consequence of the cancellation of my Philippine passport on September 18, 1988 by the Aquino regime, under the pressure of military officials, including Generals Ramos and De Villa.

Since then, the Dutch justice ministry has shamelessly acted against me as if it were the long arm of persecution on behalf of the Philippine and US governments. It has converted the asylum procedure into a humiliating and degrading ordeal for me and my family. It has repeatedly ignored the 1992 and 1995 judgments of the Raad van State (Council of State) in my favor and has maliciously serialized its arguments against my asylum for nearly a decade.

My family and I have long suffered the uncertainty and insecurity about our circumstances in the Netherlands. We have suffered moral damage due to false accusations, the slander and defamation that I am a “terrorist”. We have suffered material damage due to the ban on my right to reside, and consequently on my right to work, to practice my teaching profession and travel freely even only in Europe for my personal and professional development.

Negative Decision of Justice Ministry in 1990

After failing to act promptly on my application for asylum from 1988 to 1990, the Dutch justice ministry made its first negative decision on 13 July 1990. It cited a mysterious investigation and secret dossiers from the Dutch Intelligence Service (BVD) as the basis for the negative decision. It vilified me as the “auctor intellectualis” of revolutionary violence of the New People’s Army.

It listed up against me incidents occurring either while I was still under maximum security detention in 1985 or while I was already abroad in 1988 and 1989. It made the false claim that I was not even a political refugee, someone without a well-grounded fear of persecution, and that I merely faced prosecution and punishment commensurate to the charge of subversion.

The justice ministry ignored the evidence and arguments 1) that I had a long record of persecution, including torture, solitary

confinement and illegal detention from 1977 to 1986, 2) that officials of Partido ng Bayan whose establishment I had presided in 1986 were being kidnapped and murdered in 1987 and 1988, 3) that the prize of one million pesos for my head had been offered since 1989 and that I was wanted dead or alive, 4) that I was being subjected to a campaign of slander and defamation in the Philippines and throughout the world, 5) that false charges were fabricated in order to persecute me and 6) that I faced deadly threats not only from the official military and police units but also from unofficial death squads and vigilante groups.

I have been the target of a secret operational plan called Oplan Jericho to assassinate me and blame renegades as culprits. I have been put on the so-called order of battle of the Armed Forces of the Philippines. As a target personality, wanted dead or alive, I am presumed to be armed and dangerous and prospective assassins are promised the reward of one million pesos for my head.

Since August 1989, US diplomatic officials in Manila and The Hague have issued statements against my application for asylum in the Netherlands. In 1991 the US Central Intelligence Agency and the Dutch BVD collaborated in an attempt to recruit a Filipino asylumseeker to spy on me. They were caught in the act by the TV crew of a VPRO news program. Despite the exposure, they would persist in recruiting this person, eventually rewarding him with the grant of asylum and a trip to the United States and ultimately naturalization as a Dutch citizen. This scoundrel would be allowed to commute between the Netherlands and the Philippines to circulate propaganda against my person.

In 1992, two years after its first negative decision, the justice ministry put me through a hearing of its advisory commission. This was not a fair hearing. The commission rejected my demand for a hearing of witnesses pertaining to the BVD secret dossiers against me and subjected me to an ideological

inquisition on the contents of a book I had written in 1969 in the exercise of my freedom of thought and expression.

In October 1992, the Raad van State heard my appeal. It was during the hearing that the representative of the Dutch justice ministry declared that to grant me asylum to the Netherlands would offend a third government friendly to both the Dutch and the Philippine governments. This was said in connection with the argument that the Dutch state had to maintain its integrity and credibility to its allies. The US government is actually the strongest power opposing my asylum in the Netherlands.

Favorable Judgment of the Raad van State in 1992

On 17 December 1992, the Raad van State made a favorable judgment on my appeal for asylum and ruled that I am a political refugee, with well-grounded fear of persecution, that I cannot be sent back to the Philippines under the principle of nonrefoulement, that there was no sufficient evidence to prove personal responsibility for any criminal offense and that the use of secret dossiers against me is contrary to the general sense of fair administration of justice. The highest administrative court of the Netherlands went so far as to chide the justice ministry for failing to grant me asylum after more than four years.

At the time of the Raad van State judgment, the Philippine government had repealed the anti-subversion law in September 1992. But the Dutch justice ministry acted worse than the Philippine government by recycling the false accusations already dissolved by the repeal of the antismsubversion law and by parroting the oppressive principle of guilt by association under said law. Although this law was repealed, the Philippine government continued to offer the prize of one million pesos for my head since 1989. It also continued to throw at me the false charge of multiple murder through senate hearings since 1989 and with the filing of a formal complaint since 1991.

Instead of taking guidance and instruction from the 1992 Raad van State judgment in my favor, the justice ministry made its second negative decision in March 1993 and made a public announcement of this in a press release, slandering me as someone “responsible for crimes against humanity”. It ignored the judgment of the Raad van State and continued to deny to me recognition as a political refugee as well as admission as a political refugee and the permit to reside.

In 1993, it continued to use the secret dossiers supplied by the Dutch intelligence service (BVD) to argue that in the first place I should be excluded from consideration as a political refugee and at the same time it used a letter of the Dutch foreign ministry to argue that it was safe for me to return to the Philippines because supposedly I could avail of amnesty and I could be as safe as released political prisoners, especially because I was supposed to be a prominent opponent of the Ramos regime.

Favorable Decision of the Raad van State in 1995

After another two years of dilatory tactics by the justice ministry, I had to make another appeal to the Raad van State. On 21 February 1995, the Raad van State again made a judgment in my favor. It reiterated its recognition of me as a political refugee. Nullifying the arguments of the justice ministry, it ruled that I cannot be excluded from being recognized as a political refugee, that under Article 3 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms I cannot be sent to any country where I face being subjected to torture or to inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment and that I should be admitted to the Netherlands as a refugee.

Once more the Dutch justice ministry ignored the judgment of the Raad van State for a long time. My lawyer and I approached the newly created Aliens Chamber to seek the enforcement of the Raad van State decision in June 1995. The justice ministry pretended to be looking for another country to which I could be

sent. On 4 May 1996, the Aliens' Chamber made a decision instructing the ministry to make a new decision on the question of admission and residence.

On 8 June 1996 the justice ministry made its third negative decision and argued that my recognition as political refugee by the Raad van State does not automatically mean admission as refugee. In November 1996, it put forward the argument that nondeportation without admission as refugee and without permit to reside is sufficient compliance with Article 3 of the European Convention.

Then in early 1997, the Alien's Chamber suddenly shifted the case to the Law Unity Chamber/Rechtseenheidskamer (REK) which swiftly decided to take into consideration the BVD's secret dossiers. It was clear then that both the Dutch justice ministry and the REK were collaborating to circumvent and negate the 1995 Raad van State judgment.

REK Judgment in 1997

On 11 September 1997, the REK made its judgment. Like the Dutch justice ministry, it conceded that I am a recognized political refugee and that I cannot be sent to the Philippines or any other country where I face treatment contrary to Article 3 of the European Convention. But it ruled that the justice ministry complies with Article 3 of the European Convention by not deporting me and at the same time refusing me legal admission as a refugee and the permit to reside.

The REK concedes that it is the general policy of the Dutch justice ministry to admit as refugee someone already recognized as a political refugee. But I am supposed to be a reasonable exception. And the REK upholds the unproven and false claims of the justice ministry that I am a threat to public order, that I am in contact with terrorist organizations and that my individual

interest is outweighed by the general interest of the Dutch state in maintaining its integrity and credibility to its allies.

In my supposedly exceptional case, there is no respect for my individual rights. There is no recollection on the part of the REK and justice ministry that upholding the rights of a political refugee, already recognized by Dutch judicial and executive organs, is a matter of treaty commitment to the Refugee Convention and is also a matter of general interest to the Dutch state.

The fact is that I am a victim of exceptional arbitrariness. I am held liable for criminal offenses without due process and made to suffer the violation of my civil and political rights. In terms of nondeportation and nonadmission, I am put at par with asylumseekers who are not recognized as political refugees or are excluded from consideration as political refugees. There is now the absurd situation in which I am recognized as a political refugee by the Raad van State, and therefore by the Dutch state. But the REK and the justice ministry engage in hairsplitting and declare that I cannot be admitted as a refugee.

The REK judgment is grossly unjust and absurd in relation to the 1992 and 1995 judgments of the Raad van State and in relation to the fact that I have in fact lawfully resided in the Netherlands since 1987, that I have never committed any criminal offense in the Netherlands or anywhere else in the world and that even the Manila government has dissolved the oppressive subversion charge in 1992 and in 1994 dismissed as something based on pure speculation the charge of multiple murder which had been fabricated in 1991.

Consequences of the REK Judgment

Without legal admission as a refugee and without the permit to reside, I am prohibited from getting a work permit, from using my profession as a teacher and from having a travel document to

move freely even only within the area of protection of the European Convention. I am deprived of the full protection of the Refugee Convention, the European Convention and the International Bill of Rights.

I have been slandered as a “terrorist” and criminalized. Yet the same bureaucrats in the justice ministry are oblivious of the fact that there has never been a basis for hailing me to an investigation or trial for any criminal offense in the Netherlands, where I have lived for more than ten years since 1987. There was a time when I had a legal permit to reside in the Netherlands for one year and a half, from February 1988 to August 1989, as a research consultant in a department of the University of Utrecht. Since then, what criminal offense have I committed?

I am placed in a condition of banishment. This is a condition of unjust punishment in violation of my rights. This has been running for nearly ten years since my application for asylum in 1988. My family and I have to suffer unwarranted deprivations and restrictions that other recognized political refugees do not suffer. In this regard, the justice ministry has persisted as an instrument of the US and Philippine governments in persecuting me and my family.

In my concrete case, both the US and the Dutch governments have repeatedly exposed their hypocrisy on the question of human rights. Five times, these two governments collaborated in preventing me from attending as a plaintiff the trial of the human rights case against the Marcos estate in the US federal courts. The first time was in 1992 at the liability phase of the trial. The second time was in 1993 at the exemplary damage phase. The third time was in 1995 at the compensatory damage phase. The fourth was my appeal to the US appellate court in 1996 and the fifth was the retrial of the compensatory damage phase of my case in 1997. Despite the obstacles, I have won the human rights case against the Marcos estate up to the level of the US Supreme Court.

Continuing Legal and Political Struggle

The REK and the justice ministry have circumvented and negated the 1992 and 1995 judgments of the highest administrative court, the Raad van State, which has had comprehensive jurisdiction over my asylum case. It is well known that the REK is not an impartial court. It is a division of a mere district court which is dependent on the Dutch justice ministry for advice, personnel and funding. That such a court is now the highest court over asylum cases demonstrates the irrationality of the anti-refugee current running through the Dutch political and legal system.

Consequent to the unjust decision taken by the REK, I am preparing an appeal to the Hoge Raad (High Court) on questions of law and at the same time to the European Commission and European Court for Human Rights for effective remedy. My lawyers are also studying whether there are remedies to the slander and defamation that I have suffered from the Dutch justice ministry as well as the prohibition on me to get remunerated work and to exercise my profession as a teacher.

Friends, pursuing the legal remedies is not enough. I have always valued conscious and militant mass support. Without this, the Dutch justice ministry would have been able to trample upon my rights even more viciously. With your support, I can wage a more effective struggle for asylum and for justice.

I also wish that my struggle be linked with that of many asylumseekers and political refugees who are being subjected to oppressive policies and actions in the worsening climate of narrow nationalism, racism and fascism in Europe. These are being whipped up not only by barefaced neofascists but also by hypocrites who pretend to be progressive or who even take the name of labor in vain. They are out to obscure monopoly capitalism as the cause of social ills and persecution in imperialist countries and in the countries which these dominate.

I am pleased that the struggle for my asylum has exposed the rotten character of the political and legal system of the monopoly bourgeoisie and I have come to know and cooperate with truly just and progressive people in the Netherlands and elsewhere in the world who have a high sense of internationalism.

Thank you.

9.

ACCELERATED DESTRUCTION OF PRODUCTIVE FORCES²

I wish to express my solidarity with all the participants in the People's Conference Against Imperialist Globalization: Continuing the Resistance, from November 21 to 25, as well as with those in the NO to APEC International Youth and Student Caucus on November 27.

I congratulate the NO! to APEC Coalition for its successful preparatory work and I wish the aforesaid conference and caucus the utmost success in continuing the resistance to APEC and the monstrosity that is imperialist globalization.

You hit the nail on the head when you speak of imperialist globalization. The monopoly capitalists, their political stooges in states and their reformist "civil society" apologists try to bamboozle people with the term "globalization" as if it were a brand-new fact of life that one cannot do anything about, except to adjust to it or at best plead to the monopoly capitalists and their states to reform and improve themselves.

Retrogressive Meaning of "Globalization"

"Globalization" is a term to which the imperialists and their camp followers attach a retrogressive meaning, denoting the hoary dogma of "free trade" and the entire antipeople train of liberalization, deregulation and privatization. The neoclassical and neoliberal terminology of free competition capitalism simply does not apply to the reality of monopoly capitalism and neocolonialism.

² Message of solidarity to the People's Conference Against Imperialist Globalization, Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada, November 21, 1997

We are still very much in the era of imperialism and proletarian revolution, especially because of the betrayal of socialism in the Soviet Union since 1956 and in China since 1976 and the persistent predominance of monopoly capitalism. The higher technology that is now available and that further compresses the globe has a higher social character than the earlier electro-mechanical technology and is far more suitable to socialism than before. But unfortunately, the capitalist social relations and the private methods of appropriating the product of labor have become even more avaricious and antisocial.

As the imperialists use the term, globalization means a policy shift from Keynesian or social-democratic methods to neoliberal methods, or rather to the use of neoliberal jargon to rationalize the unmitigated greed of the monopoly capitalists. It is meant to disparage the idea and experience of state intervention for social welfare, economic development and coping with the crisis even within the world capitalist system and, most of all, to counter the cause of socialism.

The neoliberal bias disdains fiscal measures and favors the use of monetary measures in running the economy and letting the monopoly capitalists have the utmost free play in the market. At any rate, the monopoly capitalists still use both fiscal and monetary measures to aggrandize the monopoly capitalists.

It is untrue that there is a growing separation between the multinational corporations and banks on the one hand and the states on the other hand. States have always been the instrument of the ruling class, now the monopoly bourgeoisie. It is also untrue that multinational firms and banks have no national basing. National stockholders own and control each of them, even as their predatory operations are borderless.

The 18 chiefs of state in the APEC Summit are subdivisible into the representatives of a few imperialist states and the more

numerous client-states. They are all servants of monopoly capitalism. Under the neoliberal policy shift, pushed vigorously by Reaganism and Thatcherism since the 80's, these states shamelessly abandon social pretenses, accelerate the delivery of public resources to the monopoly capitalists and push corporate welfare at the expense of social welfare in the very centers of global capitalism and prevent economic development in the neocolonial hinterlands.

For a long time, until the '70s, the traditional imperialists had to adopt the fiscal measures of state intervention in order to cope with the crisis of overproduction during the Great Depression, to run war economies in the course of World War II, to combat socialism and national liberation movements in the aftermath of World War II and subjugate Soviet monopoly bureaucrat capitalism in the Cold War.

Destructive Character of “Globalization”

In comparison, the neoliberal policy-shift is proving to be far more destructive to the forces of production and far more shortlived. In the last ten years, from 1987 to 1997, we have witnessed a series of worsening crises, the stock market crash of 1987, the debt crisis and hyperinflation in Latin America in the late '80s, the Mexican peso collapse and the current economic and financial turmoil. Also within the last decade, the growth rate of all the OECD countries have fluctuated between 1 and 3 percent, despite the extremely speculative overvaluation of assets and the more than 30 times overvaluation of the real value of world output.

The national profit rates in the three global centers of capitalism, the United States, Japan and the European Union have drastically fallen. Winning monopoly firms maximize profits by putting in more capital into new technology and by downsizing their labor force, generating mass unemployment and increasingly utilizing

untenured and part-time labor under the so-called flexible labor policy in both imperialist and client states.

The United States has relatively the strongest economy among the imperialist powers because it uses its technology lead and its politico-military strength and attracts funds into its stock and bond markets from the weaker and more stagnant imperialist economies. It benefits most from the investment and trade liberalization that it is pushing most vigorously under the WTO and through trade blocs like APEC and NAFTA.

However, the accumulated costs of the Cold War and imperialist preeminence as well as the decline of its client economies reduce and adversely affect the growth of the US economy. The United States is still suffering from a huge debt burden and trade deficits, even as its export drive has undercut Japan and the European Union and such old tigers as South Korea and Taiwan.

Since its economic bubble burst in 1990, Japan has continued to languish in economic decline, despite its exceptionally heavy deficit-spending on public works, shifting plants abroad, export of supplies for export-oriented manufacturing in East Asia, investments in US bonds and financing real estate speculation mainly through Honking banks. The European Union suffers from an official rate of unemployment at 12 percent and has adopted austerity measures.

Seventy to 75 percent value-added by multinational corporations is still being produced in the imperialist countries. The process of concentration through mergers and acquisitions, assisted by bankruptcies, continues unabated. Only 100 MNC's or 0.3 percent of the total number own one-third (USD1.8 trillion) of the total of foreign direct investments.

Seventy per cent of the total global flow of direct investment is concentrated in the three global centers of capitalism and some neighboring countries. In turn, 30 percent is concentrated in only

some ten so-called emergent markets, with East Asia taking the lion's share. Up to the eve of the current economic and financial turmoil which conspicuously started in Southeast Asia last July, the imperialist finance companies and multinational firms put their funds into the so-called emergent markets in Southeast and Northeast Asia because they could get here the highest rates of profit in the world.

Surplus capital from the global centers of capitalism went into financing in the client states of East Asia budgetary and trade deficits, privatization of state assets, importation of luxury goods, supply of components for low value-added export-oriented manufacturing, sale of telecommunication equipment, real estate development and other speculative activities. If the most conspicuous construction under Keynesian economics was that of public roads and bridge, that under neoliberal economics has been that of office and residential towers and golf courses.

Of course, the overborrowing and overspending by the “emergent markets” must come to a dismal end. Now, there is gross overproduction in low value-added, labor-intensive export-oriented manufacturing. The oversupply of garments surfaced in 1994, followed by that of consumer electronics in 1996. The old tigers also find their higher value-added products squeezed by the US export drive and the continuing decline of the Japanese economy.

The debt problem of Southeast Asia has gone from bad to worse at an accelerated rate. The causes have also gone from bad to worse. Whereas up to the late '70s the debt problem involved heavy borrowing and spending for infrastructure and expansion of raw- material production, it has now involved frenzied use of private speculative capital from abroad to sustain upper class consumption, real estate speculation and other antipeople and antidevelopment activities.

Obscurantism in the APEC

The current economic and financial turmoil now shaking the entire world capitalist system is inevitably the focus of discussion in the APEC summit. The summiteers are bound to expose themselves as obscurantists when they gloss over the rotten fundamentals of the world capitalist system, especially because of the neoliberal policy-shift, push further for trade and investment liberalization under the WTO and promote the entire range of prescriptions in the Multilateral Agreement on Investments from the OECD.

There is massive capital flight from the “emergent markets” in East Asia. Austerity measures are certain to be applied on them. They are being required to accept new conditionalities from the IMF in exchange for bail-out funds, now running at more than USD80 billion for a number of East Asian countries. The deterioration of economic conditions in the client-states in the Asia-Pacific region means further shrinkage of the market and a dwindling source of superprofits for the United States, Japan and the European Union.

The crisis of the world capitalist system is certain to worsen, pushing the imperialist powers to redivide the world because of the shrinking market and reduction of superprofits. The client states are also driven to compete with each other in producing goods for export and in pushing down wage and living conditions and producing goods for export.

Volatility in the world capitalist system is induced by a large bloat of speculative capital, including the daily flows of more than USD1.2 trillion through foreign exchange markets and USD55 trillion traded in the derivatives market. In the stock markets, the multinational corporations buy back their own stocks or engage in cross sales of stocks with their sister companies to conjure the illusion of recovery. But in real terms, they are losing markets and profits and have to reduce production.

All the while, the overwhelming majority of third world countries, which have been brought down economically by the global overproduction of raw materials since the late '70s continue to sink in further underdevelopment, poverty and civil strife. Foreign exploitative capital have gone only in trickles into these countries, in contrast to the large amount poured into East Asia since the late 80's. At any rate, they continue to be crushed by the debt burden and ever deteriorating terms of trade for their raw-material exports.

The former Soviet bloc countries have been plunged into third world conditions. The most rapid destruction of productive forces is demonstrated by Russia, where production has gone down by more than 40 percent since 1991. Surplus goods from the West rather than productive capital have been dumped on Russia, which now is more than ever dependent on the export of oil and other raw materials. In the former Soviet satellite countries, production has gone down in the range of 16 to 30 percent.

Capitalist Crisis and Proletarian Revolution

The imperialist countries are themselves reeling from the crisis of their system and the class struggle between the monopoly bourgeoisie and the proletariat is coming to the surface. The old tigers and all the later "emergent markets" are in serious economic trouble fraught with social and political unrest. In Southeast Asia, the Filipino people are demonstrating to neighboring peoples that protracted people's war is possible and necessary. China which has gotten the lion's share of speculative capital for "emergent markets" has compradorized and made its economy lopsided, is now in economic decline and is vulnerable to renewed social turbulence.

In general, the third world countries and former Soviet-bloc countries are sinking deeper into lower levels of povety and

misery and discontent. The people in these countries suffer stagnation and destruction of productive forces and the worst forms of oppression and exploitation. They are weighed down by the global unemployment of more than one billion people and a debt burden of more than USD2 trillion. They have no way out but to wage revolutionary struggle.

Conditions in the world capitalist system are now comparable to those during the Great Depression and even worse in several respects. The stage is set for far worse capitalist crisis and interimperialist war as well as for proletarian revolution and national liberation movements in the 21st century. I am confident that in the revolutionary struggles of the proletariat and the people in the forthcoming century, the cause of national liberation, democracy and socialism will win victories greater than those in the 20th century.

I express my admiration for the organizers and participants of the People's Conference Against Imperialist Globalization for carrying on the criticism and repudiation of monopoly capitalism, the imperialist and client states and the reformists who use the slogan of "civil society" to inveigh against revolutionary mass struggles and who wish to keep the people within the confines of the capitalist system and neocolonialism. You help to light the way towards a new and higher level of revolutionary anti-imperialist struggle for national liberation, democracy and socialism.

Once more, I congratulate you. I hope that your conference will inspire more people to continue the struggle against imperialism. Thank you.

10.

REAFFIRM THE COMMUNIST MANIFESTO³

May 1, 1998

We are still in the historical epoch of class struggle between capital and labor, between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat. Thus, we reaffirm the *Communist Manifesto*.

The general principles laid down in this great document of the proletariat remain valid and urgent until the ultimate goal of communism is reached. The spectre of communism which haunted the bourgeoisie and all reactionaries of Europe at the time of Marx and Engels continue to haunt the monopoly bourgeoisie, the revisionists and all reactionaries throughout the world.

I. General Principles of the *Communist Manifesto*

After the tens of thousands of years of prehistory encompassing the] primitive communal society, the history of mankind in thousands of years has been a history of class struggles.

Slave, feudal and capitalist societies have come into history. In each form of society, the material conditions of production and social structure determine the intellectual and cultural life of the oppressing and oppressed parts of society.

One lower form of society yields to a higher one only through class struggle by which the rising progressive class, representing a higher mode of production, overthrows the reactionary ruling class.

³ Address to the New Communist Party of the Netherlands

Since the overthrow of the feudal system, the modern bourgeoisie has ruled capitalist society. It has used science and technology and exploited the proletariat. In the process it has surpassed and dwarfed the achievements of all precapitalist societies put together.

To make itself the ruling class, it has ceaselessly advanced [? developed] the means of production, increased and ceaselessly exploited the proletariat in order to extract profits from labor power and accumulate capital. But the advance of capitalism is not unilinear.

There is a fundamental contradiction between the social character of large-scale machine[?commodity]production and the private mode of appropriation. The extraction of surplus labor from the proletariat and the accumulation of capital leads to ever worsening crises of overproduction. The contraction of the market exactly when it peaks leads to the destruction of productive forces.

There were the commercial crises of the 19th century. And there have been more terrible crises and interimperialist wars in the 20th century.

Capitalism has reduced society into two great camps, the few who own the means of production and the many who do not and are obliged to sell their labor power in order to subsist. The bourgeoisie consolidates its national market but ceaselessly seeks in the name of free trade to expand global market, acquire colonies and dominate other people in order to counter crisis [and aggravate the next one]???

At first, the proletariat comes into being and expands at the bidding of the capitalist class but eventually learns to organize trade unions to defend its own economic and social interest and ultimately form political parties to seek political power. In the

final analysis, the capitalist class creates its own gravedigger, the revolutionary proletariat.

Communists constitute the advanced detachment of the proletariat. By all means, they link themselves with the entire proletariat. They are needed to fulfill the historic mission of the proletariat, to understand the course of history and set the line of march for the entire proletariat.

The communists and the proletariat seek to abolish bourgeois property (i.e., the private ownership of the means of production by the bourgeoisie) and replace it with common ownership. Bourgeois property is the most complete and final form of private ownership. To abolish it is to make a radical rupture from the millennia[?] of private ownership of the means of production.

For the first time in the history of mankind, the proletariat is an exploited class that is capable of becoming the ruling class. It is also a class that emancipates itself from bourgeois rule only by emancipating all other oppressed and exploited sections of the people. For the proletariat to emancipate itself and win political power is to win the battle for democracy and consequently to make a radical rupture from the millennia of exploitative society by ultimately ending all class oppression and exploitation.

The proletariat is an internationalist force that disdains and combats nationalism as well as the cosmopolitanism of the bourgeoisie. But it can overthrow the bourgeoisie only by forcibly and violently overthrowing the bourgeois state in each country. As Marx and Engels emphatically pointed out in their 1872 preface to the *Manifesto*, the proletariat cannot simply lay hold of the ready-made state machinery and wield it for its own purposes. It must smash the bourgeois bureaucratic and military machinery in order to establish the proletarian state.

It does not suffice for communists to recognize and lead all the forms of class struggle of the proletariat. The revolutionary

essence of the *Communist Manifesto* is to seek the overthrow of the bourgeois class dictatorship and install the class dictatorship of the proletariat through the class struggle.

The struggle for communism goes through stages. In the *Manifesto* itself, Marx and Engels expected the German proletariat to lead the democratic revolution and immediately thereafter the proletarian revolution and in several other countries they also observed that the struggle for national independence by the proletariat and people as necessary prelude to proletarian revolution.

The communists and the proletariat fight for immediate aims as well as for the ultimate aim of communism by which the oppression and exploitation of one class by another and one country by another is finally ended.

II. The Achievements of Communists Since 1848

In large historical terms, so short a period of time--only 150 years--has passed since the publication of the *Communist Manifesto* in February 1848. This great document has inspired and guided great achievements by communists and the proletariat from one stretch of 50 years to another.

Marx and Engels were commissioned by a small international organization of workers called the Communist League in November 1847 to write the manifesto as a program. They wrote it from December 1847 to January 1848. It was submitted for publication in February 1848 before the outbreak of the February revolution in France.

The *Communist Manifesto* unfolded the general principles of scientific communism in the face[?] of the bourgeois and other reactionary forces in Europe trying to terrorize the public with nursery tales about the "spectre of communism". It also came up against several brands of unscientific socialism, those deceptively

reactionary ones of the feudalists, the petty-bourgeois and the German idealists, the unabashedly conservative or bourgeois and the naive and kindhearted one of critical-utopian socialism and communism.

The *Manifesto* was first published in German prior to the workers' uprisings of 1848 in so many cities of Europe. But in fact, it had scarce influence. After the June 1848 workers' uprising in Paris, the cause of proletarian revolution looked ill-fated and destined to be a mere foot stool of the bourgeoisie against the landed aristocracy. The Communist League dissolved in 1852 after the Cologne Communist trial.

But Marx and Engels persevered in their communist theoretical and practical work among the workers. In 1864 they led the formation of the First International, the International Workingmen's Association. In 1871, the workers of Paris rose up and established the Paris Commune. This was shortlived but it demonstrated that the proletariat could seize power from the bourgeoisie and served as the prototype of the class dictatorship of the proletariat.

In the wake of the defeat of the Paris Commune, once more it looked as if the cause of proletarian revolution would come to naught. The First International was allowed to fade away in 1872. But Marx and Engels and their communist followers in the working class persevered in their revolutionary work.

By the time that the Second International was founded through the International Socialist Workers' Party in Paris in 1889, the Marxist parties under the inspiration and guidance of the *Communist Manifesto* were dominant. The first 50 years of the *Manifesto* ended in 1898, with Marxism becoming unquestionably the main trend in the working class movement.

Free competition capitalism of the 19th century gave way to capitalism or modern imperialism as the dominant force of the

20th century. Lenin inherited, extended and further developed Marxism. He contended with the revisionism, social chauvinism and social pacifism of the social-democratic parties in the Second International.

Adhering to the revolutionary essence of Marxism, as enunciated in the *Communist Manifesto* and learning lessons from the Paris Commune, the Bolsheviks under the leadership of Lenin were able to use the dire conditions of the first interimperialist war to bring about the Great October Socialist Revolution and establish the first socialist state. They fulfilled the hope expressed by Marx and Engels in the 1882 preface to the Russian edition of the *Manifesto* that the proletarian revolution would succeed a two-stage revolution on the basis of the common ownership of land.

In the spirit of proletarian internationalism, Lenin proceeded to establish the Third International in 1919. This broadcast the *Communist Manifesto* and the anti-imperialist line in both the imperialist countries and the dominated countries, the colonies and semicolonies.

The Bolsheviks defeated the imperialists and all local class enemies in the civil war and the interventionist war and surmounted economic blockade, military encirclement and all kinds of provocations in order to build the Soviet Union.

Stalin pursued the line of socialist revolution and construction. Under his leadership, the Soviet state and people created a powerful industrial foundation and a collectivized and mechanized agriculture. The educational and cultural system was expanded and it produced within a short period of time the largest contingent of professionals and technicians for socialist construction.

The Soviet Union thrived with a population which was one-sixth of the world's while the imperialists were stricken with the Great Depression and were driven by their contradictions to the second

interimperialist war. The Soviet proletariat and people overcame the Nazi German aggression at great cost and proceeded to lead the great counterattack against the fascist forces of monopoly capitalism.

In the course of the second interimperialist war, communists in so many countries in the world excelled in fighting and defeating the forces of fascism and laid the basis of people's democracies and socialist states. Thus, before the 100th anniversary of the *Communist Manifesto*, communist and workers' parties were on the way to ruling more than one-third of the world's population.

The last 50 years that began in 1948 with the desperate declaration of the Cold War by the imperialists against the rising combination of socialist countries and national liberation movements. The peak of communist strength was reached on the basis of the great unity of the Soviet Union and the People's Republic of China.

But alas the new bourgeoisie through the Khrushchov revisionist clique overthrew the proletariat in 1956 and the revisionist cliques in Eastern Europe followed suit. Mao and Hoxha stood up for Marxism-Leninism and combated modern revisionism.

With China's one-quarter of humanity, Mao pursued the line of socialist revolution and construction, striving to avoid the pitfalls of Soviet development and surpass its achievements. From 1966 to 1976, he put forward the theory and practice of continuing revolution by combating revisionism, preventing the restoration of capitalism and consolidating [the achievements of] socialism under the dictatorship of the proletariat through the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution.

In 1975, US imperialism was categorically defeated in its war of aggression against the Vietnamese and other Indochinese peoples and was stricken by a deepening crisis which signaled its strategic decline.

But in the latter half of the '70s, the line of Mao was reversed in China, Soviet bureaucrat monopoly capitalism went into stagnation and the imperialist alliance headed by the United States had succeeded in entrapping most countries in the third world in the web of neocolonialism.

In the entire '80s, the dogma of free trade was anachronistically touted by monopoly capitalism. The restoration of capitalism was speeded up in all the revisionist-ruled countries, including the Soviet Union and China, under the slogan of reforms. From 1989 to 1991, the revisionist rulers were toppled, public assets were brazenly privatized and social turmoil occurred in the former Soviet-bloc countries. The Soviet Union itself disintegrated.

Until the middle of 1997, it would seem as if the imperialist powers and their client-states would continue to rule without serious danger from the ever worsening crisis of the world capitalist system and as if the imperialists would never again face any serious challenge from the proletariat and the people.

As we celebrate the 150th anniversary of the *Communist Manifesto*, we recognize more clearly than ever before that the monopoly bourgeoisie and all its camp followers cannot escape the worsening crisis of their own system. The myth[?] of the global free market is proven bankrupt[?the myth is bankrupt?The global free market is a myth and has proven to be bankrupt.] The revolutionary movement of the proletariat and the people against imperialism and for socialism is beginning to surge forward once again. Communists are preparing for greater battles and greater victories ahead.

III. Continuing Struggle of the Proletariat

On the 50th anniversary of the *Communist Manifesto*, the proletariat and the rest of the people of the world confront the

monopoly bourgeoisie and the reactionaries. All the basic class contradictions are intensifying. We are certain that in the next 50 years there shall be greater disorder, greater class struggle and greater revolutionary victories of the proletariat and the people.

The restoration of capitalism in socialist countries and the neocolonial redirection of newly independent countries and national liberation movements have only meant far more intolerable oppression and exploitation. The proletariat and people of the world are impelled to struggle for national liberation, democracy and socialism.

In the temporary defeat and decline of the working class movement, which became clear as a trend in the last two decades, the imperialist powers headed by the United States have accelerated their exploitation of the working people and have forced them into lower depths of misery. It is clearer than ever that we are still in the era of imperialism and that the need is urgent for democratic and socialist revolutions led by the proletariat.

Within the imperialist countries, the basic contradictions between capital and labor, between the monopoly bourgeoisie and the proletariat is becoming acute. The rise of productivity through higher technology has accelerated the accumulation of capital and the drive for higher profits by downsizing the labor force and bringing down wage and living conditions are bringing to the surface and intensifying deepseated class contradictions.[?]

The proportion[?] of profits for the monopoly bourgeoisie has risen fast while the proportion[?] of wages for the mass of working people who need to sell their labor power has decreased. Unemployment and reduction of wage levels have decreased the domestic market of the imperialist countries and has resulted in an ever worsening crisis of overproduction.

Thus, successful monopoly firms register extremely high profits, while many others that are unsuccessful go bankrupt or are absorbed by other firms. There is the general tendency for growth and profit rates of entire national economies to fall.

Coming from the balance of forces resulting from the last interimperialist war and further compelled to band together in the Cold War in the last 50 years, the imperialist powers continue to unite under the chieftainship of the United States against the proletariat in their homegrounds and against the oppressed peoples and nations of the world.

But the shrinkage of the domestic and foreign markets drive the imperialist powers to compete against each other, despite the interweaving combinations of monopoly interests through multinational firms and banks. The greatest shrinkage of the market has occurred in the overwhelming majority of countries which have remained dependent on raw-material production for export. They have been stricken with the crisis of overproduction in this line of production since the '70s. they have been crushed by the deteriorating terms of trade and foreign debt and forced to go into austerity and abject misery.

After being touted as “emergent markets”, exceptional countries to which the imperialist powers have conceded low value-added manufacturing of consumer goods for export have sunk because of the global overproduction of the type of goods that they produce and because of overborrowing from the imperialist countries to finance the superprofit-taking of the foreign monopoly firms and the consumerism of the local exploiting classes. Even the rarer economies like those of South Korea and Taiwan, previously given the concession to build basic industries and export higher value-added goods, are now sinking.

At first, the revisionist-ruled countries that have rapidly pushed the privatization of public assets appeared to be new fields of investment for the global expansion of capital. But China has

undermined its own industrial foundation and has become dependent on the export of low value-added products of which there is now global overproduction. The former Soviet-bloc countries have destroyed most of their industries and have become dumping grounds of surplus product and speculative capital from the West on top of a smaller amount of productive capital to exploit local cheap labor. Their economies continue to break down.

Where socialism has been betrayed by the revisionist renegades for several decades, the bureaucrat and private capitalists tend to assume the role of comprador big bourgeoisie, make the economy retrogress to presocialist conditions and consign the working people to a life of unemployment and misery. The most rapid destruction of productive forces has occurred in the former Soviet-bloc countries in the current decade.

The strategic plan of the imperialist powers is to prevent the development of large countries such as Russia, China, India and Brazil into powerful industrial capitalist rivals and keep them down as captive markets, sources of raw materials and fields of anti-industrial investments. The United States, Japan and the European Union know too well that the world has become too small to accommodate more industrial capitalist countries.

As a consequence of the ravages of neocolonialism, social strife has been flaring up in the underdeveloped countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America and in the former revisionist-ruled countries, particularly in the former Yugoslavia and parts of the former Soviet Union. So far, the most numerous armed conflicts are due to the rivalries of bureaucratic cliques raising the slogans of nationalism and religion against each other. The long-term misrepresentation of socialism by the imperialists, revisionists and reactionaries have pushed down the level of the political discourse and struggle.

But some armed revolutionary movements of the toiling masses of workers and peasants in certain countries are led by communist and workers' parties. These parties are significant because they hold high the revolutionary essence of Marxism-Leninism and are inspirational examples in the current transition from a period of global defeat for the toiling people to a new period of revolutions led by the proletariat on an unprecedented scale.

In the countries where socialism was betrayed by revisionists and which are on a ceaseless course of economic retrogression, new communist and workers' parties are arising to reassert the revolutionary legacy of the proletariat and to respond to the challenge of armed revolution against the big bourgeoisie.

In all the major and minor industrial capitalist countries, there is social unrest due to the rising mass unemployment and degradation of wage and living conditions. General strikes and other mass protest actions have surged against the worsening social conditions and against the political currents of nationalism, racism and fascism. Genuine communists and workers' parties are striving to emerge and grow against tremendous odds.

Contradictions among the imperialist powers are increasingly conspicuous in the field of economic competition, despite the existence of multinational firms and banks and the multilateral agencies. The danger of an interimperialist war approaches upon conditions of global depression, the rise of fascist forces within the imperialist countries and collisions of interest among the imperialist powers in the dominated countries.

Both private and state monopoly capitalism exist together, even as the monopoly bourgeoisie shifts the emphasis of its policy from Keynesian to neoliberal. The monopoly bourgeoisie always uses its own state as the instrument of its class dictatorship to oppress and exploit the proletariat and the people within national boundaries. Farther afield, the imperialist states and the business

corporations that they serve dictate upon the client states and impose conditions that escalate the oppression and exploitation of the people.

When monopoly capitalism anachronistically uses the myth and language of liberalism and refurbishes this as “globalization”, it is to stress the dominance of the private monopoly bourgeoisie over the entire society and to use both imperialist and client states in accelerating the delivery of public funds and resources to the private monopoly corporations at the expense of any social pretense or actual social spending.

From the ‘30s to the ‘70s, the imperialist powers used the state in economic activity in order to counter economic crises, wage global war, reconstruct war-ravaged economies, conduct the Cold War and arms race and undertake pseudodevelopment programs in the former colonies. But since the ‘80s, they have shifted to a so-called neoliberal policy of “free trade”. In so short a time, the fear of stagflation in the ‘70s has transmuted into a fear of global deflation and depression in current times.

As soon as the wreckage of the lives of the toiling masses by the unbridled greed of monopoly capitalism causes economic depression, the monopoly bourgeoisie will certainly use the state more conspicuously for pump priming the economy, accelerating the arms race and suppressing the people and the mass movement. The monopoly bourgeoisie and its state will swing back to making social pretenses.

In the backwash of the social turmoil in China and the disintegration of the Soviet-bloc revisionist regimes and the Soviet Union itself, the conservative bourgeoisie and rabidly anticommunist section of the petty bourgeoisie have made an ugly chorus about the futility of socialism and the class struggle of the proletariat.

They have touted as the happiest arrangement the trilateral alliance of the existing bourgeois states, big business and the so-called civil society of nongovernmental organizations and institutions. In unison, they have decreed as intrinsically uncivil and evil any plan or attempt to overthrow the existing bourgeois states. They have considered as superior to the revolutionary class struggle for socialism any movement which they describe as beyond class.

They obscure the long record of communists in fighting for the right of nations to self-determination, for civil and political rights, a sound economic development against the plunder and pollution of the environment by the imperialists, for the right of women to equality with men, and so on.

But no matter how strident or subtle is the anticommunist propaganda and no matter how powerful the anticommunist influence of the high-tech mass media, the schools, churches and the like, the proletariat and the masses of the people are confronted with the intolerable conditions of oppression and exploitation and the ever worsening crisis of the capitalist system and are driven by their own interest to wage revolutionary class struggle against monopoly capitalism and aim for socialism.

Surely, when the revolutionary movements against imperialism and for socialism become strong again, the imperialists and their bourgeois, petty bourgeois and even feudal and clerical propagandists will once more pick up the slogan of socialism in order to misrepresent it and outflank the advocates of scientific socialism.

Right now, certain parties and organizations persistently specialize in misrepresenting themselves as socialist and communist and in opposing the revolutionary essence of the *Communist Manifesto* and the teachings of all the great communist thinkers and leaders. They continue as part of the political variety show of the monopoly bourgeoisie and they

stand guard to block the resurgence of the revolutionary movement led by genuine communist and workers' parties.

But the genuine communists and the proletariat learn their lessons well from both positive and negative experiences. They know that the communist movement has moved from peak to peak, the Paris Commune of 1871, the Great October Socialist Revolution of 1917, the Chinese Revolution of 1949 and other socialist revolutions after World War II and the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution. They also know the troughs that the movement has gone through before each peak is reached.

Communists have a wealth of experience to avail of in overthrowing the class enemy, building socialism, combating classical and modern revisionism and striving to prevent the restoration of capitalism. The next upsurge of the world proletarian revolution will entail learning well the lessons of the past and taking full account of new conditions. The process of raising the level of theory and practice of communists to a new and higher one is an endless process, within the historical epoch when communists are needed to arouse, organize and mobilize the proletariat in fulfilling its historic mission of building socialism until the ultimate goal of communism is reached.##

11.

THE BANKRUPTCY OF IMPERIALIST GLOBALIZATION AND URGENCY OF THE SOCIALIST CAUSE⁴

Introduction

I thank all the organizers for inviting me to speak in this celebration of the 81st anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution.

The broad range of organizers and mass participants in this occasion is admirable. We are all interested in the historic mission of the working class and in the pursuit of the objectives of the October Revolution. We gather at a time that the crisis of the world capitalist system is extremely grave and the urgency of the socialist cause presses upon the proletariat and people of the whole world.

The October Revolution of 1917 remains significant and relevant. It brought about the first socialist state and society. It demonstrated the capability of the working class, in unison with the peasantry, to take power and build socialism in response to imperialist crisis and war. Lenin addressed the working people with the stirring call to turn the imperialist war into a revolutionary civil war.

The Soviet Union of Lenin and Stalin scored great achievements in an all-round way and inspired the proletariat and the oppressed peoples and nations to wage revolution against imperialism and all reaction. But unfortunately, from 1956 onward, a long period of revisionist betrayal undermined and destroyed socialism.

⁴ Speech at the Celebration of the 81st Anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution, Amsterdam, Netherlands

Bureaucrat monopoly capitalism took the place of socialism and ultimately brought about the complete destruction of the Soviet Union and the undisguised and unbridled privatization of public assets.

The imperialists headed by the US have gloatingly misrepresented the fall of the revisionist regimes in the Soviet-bloc countries as the permanent fall of socialism and have proclaimed that history cannot go beyond the stage of capitalism and liberal democracy. With overweening arrogance, they have trumpeted the dogma of “free market” as the essence of globalization and as the only way to economic growth and social progress.

However, in so short a time, the bankruptcy of imperialist globalization, is thoroughly exposed by the growing trend of global economic depression, social misery, political turmoil and wars. We witness today the massive destruction of productive forces in the entire world, in both the imperialist and dominated countries. The urgency of the socialist cause is clear.

Bankruptcy of Imperialist Globalization

The monstrous irrationality of imperialist globalization is that it has retrogressed to the most rapacious forms of capitalist appropriation, under the anachronistic slogan of the “free market”, exactly when the social character of production has increased to an unprecedentedly high level through high technology.

Since the beginning, the policy shift from Keynesianism to neoliberalism has wrought havoc on the lives of the proletariat and the people in both imperialist and dominated countries. The main thrust of monopoly capitalism is to accelerate the concentration of capital and maximize profit through deregulation, privatization and liberalization of trade and investments.

In the name of promoting economic growth and preventing inflation, monopoly capitalism has used its imperialist state to trample upon the hard-won rights of the proletariat, bring down the wage and living conditions of the people, provide tax cuts to the monopoly firms but raise the tax on basic consumer goods and services and cut down government spending for social benefits and social services. It has done so to accelerate the accumulation of capital, maximize profits and counter the general tendency of profit and growth rates to fall in the imperialist countries.

The inevitable result is that monopoly capitalism itself shrinks its own market by disemploying large numbers of the working people and robbing them of their just wages and social benefits. The crisis of overproduction arises relative to the reduction of effective demand. Right now, amidst the shrinking market, overproduction is leading to production cutdowns, further mass layoffs and bankruptcies.

In all imperialist countries, the reality of mass unemployment is glossed over through sheer deception in official statistics. In certain imperialist countries, like the United States and the Netherlands, the illusion of employment is conjured through the generation of temporary part-time jobs in the service sector. In Japan and the whole of the European Union, monopoly capitalism is unable to conceal the chronic mass unemployment.

For some time, the illusion of growth has been conjured through the sheer abuse of finance capital. The most imaginative forms of making money on money have been devised. Real assets are overvalued through the securities market, through unbridled bank borrowings by corporations and hedge funds (speculative investment firms), through speculative mergers and through the practice of international usury at the expense of the dominated countries.

Every day, at electronic speed, trillions of dollars move around the world in financial transactions among multinational firms and banks. Central banks keep a blind eye to the private transactions until the financial collapse occurs and the IMF moves in to require the client states to assume responsibility for the private debts, raise interest rates and devalue the currency or until within the imperialist countries themselves public funds are used to bail out the private firms and banks.

Right now, the multinational firms and banks are hit hard by the economic collapses in East Asia, Russia and Latin America. Since last year, two big waves of stock market collapses have occurred on a global scale. From July to September this year, stock market collapses wiped out USD4.3 trillion. Investors shift to the bond market but yields are also falling here because of overcrowding and the pressures on the imperialist state to lower interest rates in a vain effort to stimulate production and market demand.

Under the neoliberal policy shift, the imperialist countries have dropped their pretense at aiding the economic development of the countries that they dominate. Since the 80s, they have selected only some ten countries to become the so-called emerging markets.

Some 80 percent of global direct investments flowed among the three global centers of capitalism, the United States, Japan and the European Union, chiefly to the US. Some 20 percent went to the “emerging markets”, chiefly those in East Asia. Since the currency devaluations and stock market collapses in July 1997, the net flow of imperialist funds to East Asia has dropped by more than half, as capital flight has caused a deep recession.

Neoliberalism is so far the worst form of neocolonialism since the end of World War II. It freezes the “emerging markets” at their given levels of development and makes them dependent on exports, dumps on them speculative capital and surplus goods,

further compradorizes them and destroys any self-reliant national industry. At the same time, the overwhelming majority of countries long depressed since the crisis of overproduction in raw materials in the late 70s are further deteriorating economically and socially.

The foreign debt burden of the third world and the former Soviet-bloc countries has shot past the USD 2.0 trillion mark. Under “free market” globalization, it has increased at a far higher rate than under the previous Keynesian policy. The funds, some USD 350 billion in the last ten years, flowed to the “emerging markets”, in order to stimulate the high consumption of the exploiting classes by financing private construction booms and importation of cars and other consumption durables.

Until July last year, the multinational firms and banks extracted the highest rates of profit from the “emerging markets” in East Asia, which was being flattered as the fastest growing region in the world. Since then the force of several nuclear bombs has hit the region. Currency and stock market collapses have occurred. Foreign capital took flight as the foreign exchange holdings of these East Asian economies became depleted by the accumulation of foreign trade deficits and debt burden. There is no way for the export income to beat the import payments and debt service because of the global overproduction of the types of goods produced for export.

Among the imperialist countries, Japan has been the hardest hit, with the problem of bad loans arising from operations in Southeast Asia and South Korea coming on top of those of Japanese companies since the bursting of the Japanese economic bubble (overvalued real estate and stocks) in the early 90s. Like Japan, the US and the European Union are now increasingly hard hit by loan defaults and market contraction in East Asia.

Before July last year, more than 40 percent of the finance-capital flow to East Asia came from Japan, some 40 percent from several

West European countries and only about 20 percent from the US. Forty percent of Japanese exports, 30 percent of US and some 20 percent of European went to East Asia.

Now, the imperialists speak of a contagion among the “emerging markets”. They admit that a global recession is already in motion. The bankruptcies of Russia and several East European countries, Brazil and several Latin American countries, add to what is already a depression in East Asia. All major multinational banks have suffered severe losses and multinational firms have suffered big drops in sales and profit rates. Since then, there has been a sharp fall in stock markets all over the world. Values have been wiped out, ranging from 40 to 85 percent, in major multinational firms and banks in the period of July to September this year.

Under the neoliberal policy, specifically under the flexible labor policy, employment and income of the working people in the imperialist countries have been driven down, more so in the “emerging markets”. Current global unemployment rate has gone beyond 40 percent and poverty afflicts 90 percent of the people of the world.

There is chronic global overproduction in all types of goods, whether these be industrial and agricultural products of the imperialist countries, the basic industrial and reassembly products of South Korea, Taiwan and Brazil, the labor-intensive consumer semimanufactures of Southeast Asia and China or the oil and gas of Russia.

The worsening chronic crisis of overproduction is leading further to the destruction of productive forces in the form of production cutdowns, mass layoffs and bankruptcies. The crisis in the real economy is also collapsing the paper pyramids of finance capital.

The IMF itself has gone bankrupt and is faced with increasing difficulties in raising bailout funds for the “emerging markets”. It

imposes austerity measures, high interest rates and devaluation on these economies and drive them to the ranks of the long-depressed countries of the third world.

At the same time, the US is pressing for the lowering of interest rates among the imperialist countries in order to revive their economies. But it does not want to lower its own interest rates to a level lower than those in other imperialist countries so that it can continue to attract investments from them. Interest rates in Japan and most of the EU are already much lower than those in the US.

Departing from the neoliberal norm of the US, Japan has engaged in Keynesian public deficit spending for public works since the bursting of the Japanese bubble but has failed to rise from stagnation since 1991. On the other hand, the European Union has curtailed public spending to 3 percent of its GNP in complying with requirements for the European monetary union as well as falling in line with the predominant neoliberal policy.

The Group of Seven (G7) and all their multilateral agencies, the IMF, World Bank and WTO are at a loss as to how to revive the world capitalist economy. They have contradictory proposals and they doubt the efficacy of their own proposals. They estimate that the ongoing mega-bust will continue to worsen before the economy improves within the next two to three years.

Current crisis conditions allow the imperialist countries in the OECD to push more effectively than ever before the Multilateral Agreement on Investments (MAI) on the dominated countries and trample on their economic sovereignty. But even among the imperialist countries, economic competition is sharpening in the face of the shrinking world market. The lesser imperialist powers are wary of the US breaking down the barriers to their own national economies and penalizing them for violating treaty obligations, such as national treatment to foreign investors.

In the absence of powerful revolutionary mass movements, monopoly capitalism can bounce back from a global recession and rise to a higher level of capital concentration at the expense of losing companies and the dominated countries. But an economic depression can be so severe as to lead to assertions of economic sovereignty, protectionism, higher levels of fiscal and monetary intervention by the bourgeois states, to the intensification of interimperialist contradictions and even wars, to the aggravation of social turmoil and to the rise of social revolutions, such as those that have occurred in the 20th century.

The Urgency of the Socialist Cause

The imperialists themselves and local reactionaries in the dominated countries, including their ideologues and propagandists, admit that the current conditions of global recession generate social unrest and political turmoil. The present crisis of the world capitalist system is the worst since the end of World War II and bears characteristics comparable to those that led to World War I and World War II. The severity of the crisis is such that the call for revolution and for socialism has become urgent.

The objective conditions of worsening socioeconomic and political crisis in the world capitalist system are favorable for the building or rebuilding of the Marxist-Leninist parties and revolutionary mass movements that aim for the realization of socialism.

All the basic contradictions in the world today are sharpening. These include those between the imperialist countries and the oppressed peoples and nations, among the imperialist countries and between the monopoly bourgeoisie and the proletariat.

The sharpest among these contradictions is that between the imperialists and the oppressed peoples and nations. The worst of oppression and exploitation by the imperialists and local

reactionaries is unabated in Asia, Africa, Latin America and those former Soviet-bloc countries which have destroyed their industrial foundations and have retrograded into backward social and economic conditions.

In several countries, as in India, Nepal, Turkey, Peru and the Philippines, Marxist-Leninist parties are leading people's wars. These are the advance posts of the world proletarian-socialist revolution because they answer the central question of revolution. They are committed to pursuing the new-democratic and socialist stages of the revolution. There are also other armed revolutionary movements as in Colombia, Mexico, Kurdistan, Eelam, East Timor, Burma, Cambodia, Sudan and the Congo.

However, in most of the countries of the oppressed peoples and nations, the imperialists and reactionaries are one-sidedly unleashing high levels of violence against the people. In many countries, especially in Africa, Central Asia and the Balkans, reactionary forces are engaged in internecine warfare. The widespread conditions of social and political disorder are auspicious for the proletarian revolutionaries to build parties and mass movements.

Remember that the Bolsheviks on their way to the October Revolution were able to rouse popular resistance to the violent character of the czarist rule and take advantage of its violent contradictions with the oppressed peoples in the Russian empire. So did the Chinese Communist Party avail of the united front against the northern warlords as well as the violent contradictions among the warlords.

The collapse of the "emerging markets" completely discredit not only the notion of the "free market" but also the entire world capitalist system in the same way that this system was previously discredited by the failure of the Keynesian notion of "development". In the currently sinking markets, contradictions between reactionary forces can also be utilized to generate broad

anti-imperialist movements under the leadership of the proletarian revolutionary party.

In the whole of Southeast Asia, the conditions are again fertile for people's war. In the key country of Indonesia, nationwide mass protests have forced the 32-year long Suharto dictatorship to give way to successors pretending to be more democratic. But the Indonesian people are not satisfied with anything less than the revolutionary solution to undo the military fascist dictatorship. The Filipino people and the Communist Party of the Philippines have demonstrated in the last 30 years that it is possible and necessary to wage a protracted people's war against US imperialism and the local exploiting classes.

In Northeast Asia, the proletariat in South Korea are taking the forefront in waging general strikes and other militant forms of mass protests. Workers' strikes and peasant resistance continue to crop up in China. Conditions exist for the development of a genuine communist party to oppose bureaucrat monopoly capitalism and the comprador big bourgeoisie and seize the initiative from the revisionists as well as the blatant anticommunist exponents of bourgeois liberalization of Chinese politics.

In many countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America, militant workers' strikes and other forms of mass protests have broken out. Legal mass struggles can prepare for or be coordinated with the effective method of seizing political power. In these days, throughout the world, the proletariat and people of the world are standing up to celebrate the October Revolution, condemn the oppressors and exploiters and cry out for social revolution.

In most countries, republics and regions of the former Soviet bloc countries, there is the resurgence of parties that call themselves Marxist-Leninist amidst the social deterioration and disorder and the game of musical chairs of the revisionists and blatant anticommunists, social-democrats and revisionists. On October

7, in Russia, a gigantic wave of protest mass actions surged to shake the rule of the criminal new bourgeoisie. Again the people are mobilizing to celebrate the Great October Socialist Revolution.

Genuine Marxist-Leninists, grasping the revolutionary essence of the teachings of Lenin and Stalin, are bound to arise against the criminal new bourgeoisie and also the looming threat of military fascism in Russia. It is in this vast country, as in China, where the proletarian revolutionaries can draw from the history of successful socialist revolutions and strive to reestablish socialism on a large scale.

Several states retain a high measure of anti-imperialist policy. Some of them, like Cuba and North Korea, resolutely and militantly fight for national independence and socialist aspirations. The imperialists describe them all as rogue states and subject them to aggression, intervention, blockades and threats. By resisting imperialism, they contribute to the advance of the broad anti-imperialist movement.

At this very moment, the imperialist alliance headed by the US is still holding. The imperialist countries combine to oppress and exploit the proletariat and people of the world. But as the crisis of the world capitalist system worsens, their interimperialist contradictions sharpen. The imperialist powers have increasing policy differences over economic, financial, political and security matters.

The US has been quite adept at maintaining its chieftainship over the imperialist alliance and at getting the most out of such “free trade” arrangements as the WTO, APEC and NAFTA, expanding the NATO towards the borders of Russia and beefing up the US-Japan security partnership in East Asia, while decreasing US financial obligations and increasing the obligations of its allies.

The stage for interimperialist war is being laid. The NATO is provocatively expanding to the borders of Russia, stirring up complicated violent situations in the former Yugoslavia, in the entire Balkans and in Central Asia. The US is always stirring up troubles in different parts of the world and presenting itself as the final arbiter of “peace”. In the process, it seizes all or most of the spoils of aggression and intervention as in the Middle East, East Asia, South Asia and elsewhere.

The class contradiction between the monopoly bourgeoisie and the proletariat is constant. It starts from the extraction of surplus value from labor power in the course of commodity production. As productivity rises, the relative rate of exploitation and mass unemployment also rises.

In the US, sustained workers’ strikes in major industries have broken out against downsizing and union-busting. In Western Europe, general strikes of unprecedented scale have emerged against chronically high rates of unemployment, the deterioration of wage and living conditions and the manifestations of racism and neofascism. In Japan, strikes and other forms of mass protest have burst out against the roots and results of the longrunning stagnation and the impositions of the US and US-Japan security partnership.

In this current period of unbridled neoliberal exploitation and unprecedented bust, the workers in the imperialist countries have all the ground for building Marxist-Leninist parties and launching general strikes and other protest movements. To advance on the road of proletarian revolution, they must fight the monopoly bourgeoisie frontally and seize the initiative from the labor aristocracy, the reformists and revisionists and cast away from the working class the spell of petty-bourgeois mentality.

It ought to be most advantageous and suitable for socialism to be built on the economic and technological foundations previously produced by the proletariat in the imperialist countries. But it is

also here where the monopoly bourgeoisie is strongest in reacting to the workers' movement and to the socialist cause.

Protracted legal struggle of the proletariat is necessary in the industrial capitalist countries. So far, the proletariat in such countries has seized power from the bourgeoisie in connection with interimperialist wars. But in the protracted class struggle of the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, any of the basic contradictions can push the rapid development of the other basic contradictions.

The revolutionary movement of the proletariat and people in the imperialist countries is more than ever dialectically interconnected with that in the dominated countries. This interconnection has a potential of spiraling in basic correspondence to the accelerated intensity and expansion of the world capitalist crisis induced by the use of ever higher technology for profit and the most avaricious methods of monopoly capitalist exploitation.

The urgency of the socialist cause is clear because of the tremendously higher social productivity fettered by monopoly capitalism and because of the bitter consequences of imperialist globalization now ravaging the entire world. The current crisis of monopoly capitalism is bound to persist with the chronic overproduction, chronic mass unemployment and chronic abuse of finance capital.

As the great Lenin has taught us, we are in the era of imperialism and proletarian revolution. This is the era of moribund capitalism and social revolution. We are in this era, especially so because revisionist betrayal of socialism and the aggravation of imperialist exploitation and oppression drive the proletariat and the people of the world to fight for socialism and to further develop the ways of staying firmly on the road of socialism.

The struggle for socialism takes a whole historical epoch. There are advances and retreats, twists and turns, in this struggle.

Wherever the Red flag falls, the proletariat picks it up in order to advance. The chronic crisis of imperialism always generates the conditions for the subjective forces of the revolution to regain strength and surge forward.

The undeniable bankruptcy of “free market” globalization engenders excellent conditions for proletarian revolutionaries to carry forward the revolutionary cause of socialism. The ground is well laid out for the resurgence and advance of the world proletarian revolution and the broad anti-imperialist movement.
##

12.

**THE FATAL COURSE OF IMPERIALISM
AND INEVITABILITY OF SOCIALISM⁵**

November 9, 1998

Dear Colleagues and Friends,

Thank you for inviting me to make a written contribution to your conference, even if on such short notice.

I am happy to participate in an autopsy. “Neoliberalism” or “free market” globalization is practically dead. It has been killed by the current global recession. The economic policy-makers of monopoly capitalism have themselves declared that the disease could not be cured by the monetarist medicine prescribed by Dr. Milton Friedman.

They say that the problem is no longer simply one of manipulating interest rates but it is one of stimulating growth to counter the recession. The social-democrats of Europe are considering how to mix pump-priming with “neoliberal” reforms. But, of course, Japan has been trying to pump-prime its own domestic economy since the bursting of its bubble more than seven years ago.

As far as baby doctors are concerned, Dr. Paul Krugman is acclaiming Malaysia’s exchange controls and even Dr. Jeffrey Sachs has come around to prescribing a dose of protectionism for Thailand after his ill-fated prescriptions of large “neoliberal” doses to Russia and Brazil.

⁵ Contribution to the International Conference on Alternatives to Globalization, Tagaytay City, Philippines

I wonder how far the OECD countries can go in pushing the Multilateral Agreement on Investments (MAI) as an international treaty whereby the prospective state contracting parties, including the imperialists, explicitly and totally give up their economic sovereignty and national patrimony and allow multinational enterprises to sue them for unfair and unequal treatment of foreign investors and traders and for hindering the free flow of capital or cases amounting to expropriation.

This proposed treaty would have been the peak of “neoliberal” globalization, surpassing all the previous peaks attained by the IMF, World Bank and WTO. But the “free market” dreamworld is dissipating. The global recession comes as a reminder to the imperialist countries that they have contradictory interests among themselves. Some prominent think tanks have begun to whip up their protectionist instincts as well as remind them of pump-priming methods for their respective domestic economies.

Our conference should diagnose the fatal disease not only of “free market” globalization but also of the entire capitalist system, whatever policy stress it adopts. In that way, we have a better scientific grounding for the socialist alternative in the imperialist countries and the necessary sequence of new-democratic and socialist revolutions in most countries that are similar to the Philippines.

The Meaning of “Globalization”

As used by the monopoly bourgeoisie and its retinue of “neoliberal” apologists, the catchword “globalization” is meant not only to oppose the Keynesian theory of state intervention within the capitalist system but, more importantly, also to undercut the Leninist critique of imperialism and proposal of socialist revolution. And, of course, “neoliberalism” dogmatically and atavistically misrepresents monopoly capitalism as “free market” capitalism.

Beyond the era of free competition capitalism of the 19th century, the imperialists have always dishonestly called monopoly capitalism as “free enterprise” capitalism in the 20th century. But in recent decades, they attach a certain set of meanings to the slogan of “globalization”.

They contrapose the “free market” to state intervention as they demand the liberalization of trade and investments, the privatization of public assets and the deregulation against social and ecological concerns. It does not mean that they reject the role of the state. They recognize it as the most important instrument of domination over the working class domestically and the oppressed peoples and nations abroad; and that it is a necessary political instrument as much as multinational firms and banks are necessary economic instruments.

In fact, imperialist states in the G-7 and OECD directly and through such multilateral agencies as the International Monetary Fund (IMF), the World Bank and World Trade Organization (WTO) dictate upon client states to open up their domain and make way for multinational firms and banks to invest and trade and to facilitate the exploitation of the people. There is a hierarchy of states as much as there is a hierarchy of business corporations.

In economic and social policy-making, the imperialists have shifted from a Keynesian position to a “neoliberal” position since the beginning of the ‘80s after so much ideological work by Milton Friedman and the Chicago School since the ‘60s. With Reagan and Thatcher taking the lead, they have adopted the official line that the cause of the phenomenon of stagflation in the ‘70s is supposedly the rising wage levels and the government’s big social spending. The bias is against the working class and the people. However, the imperialists obscure the cost-push effect of their high military spending.

They wish above all that the state give free rein to the “free market” and the central bank act sparingly in managing public securities, money supply and interest rates. They wish at all times that the state collect more taxes from the mass of consumers and to deliver to big business a plethora of tax cuts, revenues and assets. Their line is: corporate welfare, yes! social welfare, no!

For the state to engage in any productive activity and expand any system of social welfare is supposed to be inflationary and inefficient. According to the “neoliberals”, the best thing to do is for the state to deliver public funds to the corporate giants in order to boost production, generate employment at the proper pace and avert inflation.

To deal with the ups and downs of the economy, they favor the monetarist policy of manipulating interest rates when necessary and contrapose this to the state making direct investments. In times of bust, such as the current one, they are willing to use public funds for bailing out the ailing companies, reluctant to engage in public works pump-priming and hostile to any nationalization of private companies.

The “neoliberals” wish to maximize capital in the hands of the monopoly bourgeoisie by pushing down wage levels, cutting back on social spending and accelerating the delivery of funds from the state, private banks, securities markets and pension funds. The rationale for accelerating the accumulation and concentration of capital is to promote retooling and adoption of higher technology.

Then in self-fulfilling prophecy, the “neoliberals” proclaim that the multinational enterprises and high technology suit each other and tout the former as irresistible throughout the globe. Information technology under the control of the monopoly bourgeoisie is supposed to break all barriers and spell freedom in all aspects of social life throughout the globe.

The “neoliberals” most outlandish claim is that multinational firms and banks have lost their national character and basing and have become so powerful internationally as to render impotent all kinds of states and reduce to irrelevance all questions of national sovereignty. But in fact, multinational enterprises have most of their capital, stock owners, personnel, research and development in their home countries and depend on their own imperialist states and multilateral agencies of states for protection, insurance and subsidies in their overseas operations and expansion.

The “neoliberals” deliberately gloss over the reality of imperialist states and the dominated states for a certain reason. They wish to make people forget that there are contradictions between the imperialist states and the oppressed peoples and nations, among the imperialist states and between the monopoly bourgeoisie and the proletariat in imperialist countries.

They have as collaborators pseudoprogressives who criticize multinational enterprises as having become more powerful than states in order to insinuate that imperialist and client states are more benign than the MNEs and in order to beg for reforms from both MNEs and states.

Front door and backdoor “neoliberals” collaborate in disregarding distinct national modes of production and superstructures in different countries and, most importantly, in denigrating the need for the broad anti-imperialist struggle and class struggle in the specific circumstances of various countries.

Under the banner of “free market” globalization, the imperialists have aggravated the exploitative and oppressive conditions of neocolonial domination. They demand the complete surrender of economic sovereignty and the free flow of imperialist capital and goods and oppose the use of state intervention in the dominated countries to undertake national industrialization and genuine land

reform, protect local industry and agriculture and exercise controls on foreign exchange and imports.

They hope for the realization of the Multilateral Agreement on Investments, an international treaty being cooked up by the OECD countries, to make the underdeveloped countries give up their economic sovereignty, accord national treatment to multinational enterprises and allow these to sue client-states for unfair and unequal treatment and compel them to pay damages.

They have put aside previous Keynesian pretenses at aiding the development of underdeveloped countries, which they so well drummed up in the UN decades of development and in World Bank and UNCTAD propaganda. They have simply sapped the general run of third world countries through repeated IMF structural adjustment or austerity programs, which in the absence of industrial development actually aggravate their problems of chronic accounts deficits and debt burdens.

Under “free market” globalization, the global flow of foreign direct investments has been concentrated on the imperialist countries themselves to the extent of 80 percent or even more after the capital flight from the few “emerging markets” which receive the remainder of that flow. The private financial transactions which the “neoliberals” favor and which are intra-MNC or between MNCs and local big compradors, are concentrated only in some ten countries.

Since the fall of the revisionist regimes in the Soviet bloc countries and the undeniable restoration of capitalism in China, the “neoliberals” have proclaimed that history cannot go beyond capitalism and liberal democracy and that socialism is simply impossible in the face of the liberal utopia of the “free marketplace of goods and ideas”.

The least intelligent among the “neoliberals” are so carried away that they call themselves anti-statist, even as they are devoted

creatures of an imperialist or client-state and propose the development of “civil society” within the trilateral frame of the bourgeois state, big business and civil society of NGOs. The imperialist-funded NGOs are the most vociferous in mocking the anti-imperialist struggle and the class struggle and in trying to separate these from or collide these with such important social concerns as community self-determination, gender equality and the environment.

In the face of the current grave crisis of the world capitalist system, particularly the proven bankruptcy of “free market” globalization, the exponents of “neoliberalism” should be utterly embarrassed. Their imperialist paymasters themselves are at a loss about solving the crisis and fear that the crisis is generating social unrest and the resurgence of revolutionary movements.

The nature and gravity of the crisis

As Marx and Engels pointed out a long time ago in the *Communist Manifesto*, the basic contradiction in capitalism is between the social character of the forces of production and the private character of appropriation by the capitalist class. This contradiction became manifest in the commercial crises of the 19th century and in the far bigger crises and global wars of the 20th century in the era of imperialism and proletarian revolution.

This contradiction has grown more acute than ever before with the rapid rise of social productivity, through the adoption of higher technology and the availability of a more knowledgeable and skillful workforce, and with the extremely rapacious and accelerated accumulation and concentration of both productive and finance capital by the monopoly bourgeoisie.

The current crisis involves the overaccumulation of productive capital in the hands of the monopoly bourgeoisie, overvaluation of assets through finance-capital manipulation, excessive leveraging in the imperialist countries as well as in the “emerging

markets”, chronic mass unemployment and overproduction relative to the shrinking market demand. The illusion of growth in the past decade, even if low and stagnant at the average of two percent or lower for the OECD countries, has been conjured by ever growing overvaluation of assets.

At the moment, all basic contradictions in the world are sharpening in the socioeconomic sphere. These include those between the monopoly bourgeoisie and the proletariat in imperialist countries, between the imperialists and the oppressed peoples and nations and among the imperialist powers.

In the imperialist countries, constant capital (plant and equipment) is being increased at the expense of variable capital, the wage fund for living labor. The monopoly bourgeoisie systematically reduces regular industrial employment, extracts a larger amount of surplus value from those who remain on the job and imposes a higher rate of exploitation relative to the higher productivity made possible by higher technology.

There is job insecurity and all the rights and benefits gained in past struggles are being cut down. Those who remain employed are subjected to increasing work stress. The computer is a far faster device for speed-ups than the old conveyor belt.

Those who are laid off are diverted to lower-paid, temporary and part-time jobs, mainly in the service sector. In the US, full employment is conjured by the generation of this type of jobs. But in the European Union and Japan, the high rate of chronic unemployment can no longer be concealed either by this type of jobs or by statistical manipulation.

Social benefits for the employed, underemployed and unemployed and the rest of the people (including the aged, children and single parents) are being cut back. The “neoliberal” reasoning is to combat inflation and deliver public funds to the “supply side”, the corporate giants that are supposed to expand

production and generate employment. The monopoly bourgeoisie is deemed as the productive force and not the working class.

Among the imperialist countries, the US is relatively the strongest not only because it has the lead in technology but also because it receives the most investments from the other imperialist countries. It carries the factors of implosion which include its accumulated federal debt and unceasing trade deficits. In all imperialist countries, there is overvaluation of assets through the workings of finance capital, such as bank loans, stockmarket sales, speculative mergers and excessive leveraging by hedge funds.

In addition to the basic class contradictions, every imperialist country is beset with problems in its relations with “emerging markets” in its particular region and in other regions. The economic collapses in the “emerging markets” have already caused two big waves of prolonged and steep stockmarket declines in the financial centers of the imperialist countries, in the fourth quarter of 1997 and another one in the third quarter of this year.

The contradiction between the imperialists and the oppressed peoples and nations in the socioeconomic sphere is now the sharpest in the world. It involves the overwhelming majority of the people of the world who suffer the worst forms of exploitation and oppression in the hands of the imperialists and the local exploiting classes.

Under the imperialists’ “neoliberal” policy, countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America, which depend on the production and export of raw materials and which have suffered the crisis of overproduction in raw materials and the ever deteriorating terms of trade and crushing debt burdens since the late ‘70s, have been reduced to a permanent condition of depression and have continuously deteriorated economically and socially.

Since the beginning of the '80s, the imperialists have shifted from the pretense of officially aiding “development” to promoting the “free market” between them and the client-states at whatever given stage of development. They have chosen only some ten countries as “emerging markets”, to which 20 to 25 percent of global foreign direct investments (FDIs) flow in and out. The rest of the third world are also made to follow the IMF and WTO prescriptions, without receiving significant amounts of the speculative kind of funds that flow into the “emerging markets”.

China has been getting more than one third of FDI for “emerging markets. The reason of the imperialists behind this is to penetrate the huge Chinese market, promote capitalism, cause lopsided development towards dependence on exports and undermine the industrial foundation previously established under socialism.

The few chosen “emerging markets” have been assigned different export specializations. China and Southeast Asia are assigned the export of such import-dependent low value-added semimanufactures as semiconductors, garments, shoes and toys; South Korea, Taiwan and Brazil, such higher value-added manufactures as cars, some machinery, home appliances and basic steel; and Russia, oil and gas.

These “emerging markets” have been targeted for the largest flows of FDI outside of the imperialist countries not only for the purpose of financing the production of their types of export but also for stimulating high consumption among the exploiting classes (imported cars, communications equipment and materials for private construction) and speculating on the budgetary and trade deficits, the need for debt service and new loans and the fluctuations in interest rates, exchange rates and stock prices.

Under the “neoliberal” policy of privatization, deregulation and liberalization, the multinational enterprises and their big comprador accomplices can freely acquire public assets, expand

their holdings and exploit the natural resources. Under the policy of the free flow of capital, the central bank is deliberately blind to private transactions, which are intra-MNC and between MNCs and big compradors. Thus, capital outflows always outrun inflows, leading ultimately to currency and stockmarket meltdowns, loan defaults and capital flight that started in July 1997.

The “emerging markets” have collapsed in one country after another and in one region after another since July 1997 because their types of goods are overproduced on a global scale and their falling export incomes expose their gross inability to pay back the foreign funds that they receive. There is a limit to the generation of superprofits by the monopoly capitalists from highly speculative finance capital on the basis of a real economy that is subject to the global crisis of overproduction.

The economic collapse of the chosen models and copycats of the export-oriented “emerging markets” has permanent or lasting effects. The belated aspirants for the status of “emerging markets” will not give up contributing their share of overproduction to give a breather to the earlier “emerging markets”. In general, they sink to the level of the long-depressed overwhelming majority of the third world countries.

The Southeast Asian countries have abruptly exposed their fundamental semifeudal backwardness and have plunged to a new depth of poverty and misery. Gone are the illusions of development conjured by real estate speculation, droves of late car models and proliferating sweatshops for slightly processed products.

China only seems to be the least ravaged by the East Asian economic collapse, because it has devalued the renminbi since 1994 and cheapened Chinese labor to lead in the overproduction of semimanufactures for export and because it uses the defenses available to state monopoly capitalism. But the bureaucrat

capitalist rulers and the imperialists have succeeded in making China a capitalist country, with a new comprador big bourgeoisie in power. Many of the private and state enterprises have gone bankrupt. Mass unemployment has risen.

South Korea, Taiwan and Brazil are in serious trouble. Their types of higher value-added products directly compete with those of the imperialist countries. They cannot export their way out of their problem by producing more of what is already overproduced by their imperialist masters.

Under the rule of the new comprador big bourgeoisie, Russia and the rest of the former Soviet-bloc countries have continued to suffer sharp falls of industrial and agricultural production and deterioration of wage and living conditions. Russia has become a big dumping ground for surplus goods and a beggar of food and foreign loans from the West.

The contradictions among the imperialist powers are becoming conspicuous as a result of the global recession. They are certainly united under the leadership of the US against the proletariat and people of the world and against certain states assertive of their national independence. But they have increasing differences over a comprehensive array of issues.

The economic crisis is driving the imperialist powers to maneuver against each other for advantageous position and for a larger share of the global market. As the leader of the imperialist alliance, the US tries to divide the costs of policing the world but is always poised to grab the entirety or lion's share of the spoils of aggression and intervention.

In East Asia, we see the conflicting economic strategies of the US and Japan. The US wishes to take over the key ailing technological and financial firms and have the rest declared bankrupt. But Japan would rather use taxpayer money to bail out the Japanese monopoly firms and banks and revive the Japanese

and East Asian economies with public works pump-priming. It advocates state restrictions on the outflow of foreign funds. As principal creditor in East Asia, it wishes to retain the largest chunk of the market in the region.

In Europe, there is resistance to the US demand for lowering interest rates. At the same time, the US keeps its interest rates higher than those in other imperialist countries in order to attract foreign investments from them and avert the dumping of US bonds and stocks in their hands. As principal creditor of Russia and Eastern Europe, Germany wishes to keep the largest chunk of the market there.

War among the imperialist powers is still a remote possibility. The crisis of the world capitalist system must first worsen to a level that brings to power the forces of fascism in specific imperialist countries. Even in much-weakened Russia, which is imperialist relative to many nationalities, the rise of military fascism is still a possibility.

The inherence of war in imperialism is currently manifested by the expansion of NATO to the borders of Russia, the beefing up of the US-Japan security treaty partnership in East Asia, the stirring up of local wars and aggressive acts and threats by US imperialism in the name of peacemaking and humanitarianism.

Right now, the conditions for interimperialist wars in the 21st century are being laid by the worsening of economic conditions, the rise of fascist and racist movements, the acts of aggression and intervention of US imperialism and the growing complexity of a global situation in which interimperialist collisions can occur in the future.

Popular Resistance and Socialism

The basic conditions for socialism grow within the very womb of industrial capitalism. The social character of the forces of

production rises with higher technology and with higher knowledge and skills of the working class. Ultimately, the capitalist relations of production can no longer contain the growing forces of production.

“Neoliberalism” has coldbloodedly brought about the worst of the capitalist relations of production. The style of exploitation is that of laissez-faire capitalism but it is carried out by monopoly capitalism. An unprecedented crisis of monopoly capitalism has broken out just before the end of the 20th century and has laid the ground for the great struggles for national liberation and socialism against imperialism in the 21st century.

But the subjective forces of the socialist revolution must arise and develop to take advantage of the basic conditions, especially during prolonged periods of serious crisis of the world capitalist system such as the current period. The proletariat must build its revolutionary party for fulfilling its historic mission of building socialism. There must be mass organizations and movements to involve the broad masses of the people in the revolutionary process and to fight the adversary in every aspect of social life.

The exploiting classes (industrial monopoly bourgeoisie in imperialist countries and the big compradors and landlords in the dominated countries) control the economy, politics and culture. They wield both the coercive and persuasive apparatuses to maintain class rule. When their rule meets with serious challenge, they do not hesitate to unleash the full force of state violence.

The optimal economic and technological conditions for building socialism are available in the industrial capitalist countries. But it is also in these countries where the capitalist class is strongest in using both the coercive and persuasive means to prevent socialist revolution.

So far, in its epochal struggle against the bourgeoisie, the proletariat has been able to make use of the very crises and global wars generated by monopoly capitalism to seize political power and build socialism at the weakest points of the world capitalist system. But now, at the very centers of imperialism, new conditions have arisen to sharpen the class struggle between the monopoly bourgeoisie and the proletariat.

The so-called third stage of the technological revolution (high technology spearheaded by information technology) under capitalism initially allows the monopoly bourgeoisie to tighten its control over society. But the growing disparity between imperialist propaganda and reality ultimately incites the proletariat and the rest of the people in imperialist countries to fight for their social liberation.

The adoption of high technology within capitalist relations of production accelerates the concentration and centralization of capital at an unprecedented rate and the monopoly bourgeoisie is driven to counter the tendency of profits to fall by further cutting down employment and bringing down wage and living conditions of both the blue collar and white collar workers.

The inevitable consequence is the intensifying protest and resistance of the proletariat and people against mass unemployment, job insecurity and rapidly worsening social conditions, and the demand of the proletariat and people for the reduction of working hours at full time pay in order to spread the dignity of employment and expand the domestic market.

The monopoly bourgeoisie uses the high-tech mass media to spread disinformation and false illusions as well as petty bourgeois mentality among the workers, underemployed and unemployed. But the people can as well use electronic techniques to conduct revolutionary propaganda in ever widening and intensifying guerrilla fashion, if there is a party of the

proletariat to raise the level of revolutionary consciousness and militancy.

General strikes and strikes in key companies manifest the sharpening class struggle between the monopoly bourgeoisie and the proletariat. These are breaking out increasingly beyond the control of the labor aristocracy. In view of the growing social discontent, the blatantly conservative parties that push “neoliberal” policy are discredited. But the other bourgeois parties push the same policy and sugarcoat this with deceptive phraseology in order to win elections. There are also the parties and movements which whip up neofascist and racist currents.

Conditions are becoming favorable for the working class to build up their revolutionary parties and break out of the lingering influence of relatively better times in the past, widespread petty-bourgeois mentality, the bureaucratic control of unions by the labor aristocracy and reformist and revisionist parties and organizations. The working class must include into its ranks the white collars who do repetitive work with their fingers rather than with their full arms and shoulders.

For so long as there are no revolutionary parties of the proletariat that are capable of overthrowing the monopoly bourgeoisie, the boom-and-bust cycle will continue to recur. But new conditions in social production worsen the structural crisis, involving chronic overproduction, chronic high rate of unemployment and chronic abuse of finance capital.

The “neoliberal” policy stress of sucking up resources under the pretext of averting inflation, which is blamed on rising wage levels and social spending, has wrought havoc on the lives of the proletariat and the people. Even if there were a swing back to Keynesian or whatever policy mix of “neoliberalism” and Keynesianism, the basic contradiction of rising social productivity and the rapacious capitalist appropriation will persist.

The overwhelming majority of third world countries that have been excluded from the “neoliberal” category of “emerging markets” remain under the sway of neocolonialism, wallow in the mire of semifeudal conditions and have continued to deteriorate economically and socially since the end of the Keynesian policy stress on “development” left them with crushing debt burdens, austerity programs and ever-deteriorating terms of trade for their raw-material exports.

The general level of political struggle in these countries has plunged to one among reactionary factions hogging the center of the political stage and mouthing the slogans of bourgeois nationalism, religion and ethnocentrism in the course of electoral competitions or in the course of unleashing violence against each other in an increasing number of countries.

Under these conditions of political disorder among the reactionaries themselves, the proletariat and the people have ample opportunity to build the revolutionary party, the people’s army and the united front to wage a new-democratic revolution towards the socialist revolution.

In this regard, a number of third world countries have revolutionary parties of the proletariat guided by Marxism-Leninism and are waging the new-democratic revolution through a protracted people’s war. They play a signal role for the spread of armed revolution against the imperialists and the local reactionary classes. There are also some states, like Cuba and the People’s Democratic Republic of Korea, that fight for national independence and the socialist aspirations of their people.

The economic collapse in the few “emerging markets” in the third world has brought about conditions of social and political disorder and revolutionary mass struggles. The withdrawal of Suharto from his position of power is remarkable. But his

replacement by one of his stooges underscores the need for a new-democratic revolution.

In such countries as China and Russia, genuine communist parties can arise to avail themselves of outstanding revolutionary legacies, such as those of Lenin, Stalin and Mao. They can easily target for popular condemnation and overthrow the new bourgeoisie, which has so flagrantly robbed the people of their social wealth. In Russia, general strikes and mass protests have erupted on a widescale. In China, workers' strikes, local peasant uprisings and other forms of concerted action have occurred.

The intensifying exploitation and oppression compel the proletariat and the people to wage the revolutionary struggle for socialism against imperialism and the local reactionaries. For this struggle to succeed, the revolutionary party of the proletariat must lead the broad masses of the people in the process of overthrowing the class dictatorship of the bourgeoisie and building socialism.

The scientific socialists of today must learn from the basic teachings and great achievements of their predecessors and draw lessons from both positive and negative experience in order to fare better and win greater victories in the forthcoming struggles against the imperialists and reactionaries.

The victory of socialism over monopoly capitalism is inevitable on the scale of a whole historical epoch. The revolutionary party of the proletariat and the broad masses of the people must master the circumstances, pursue the correct strategy and tactics, defeat the imperialists and reactionaries in one country after another and build socialism until it prevails over imperialism on a global scale. #

13.

“GLOBALIZATION” AND CLASS STRUGGLE⁶

15 November 1998

Dear Comrades,

It is a distinct honor and privilege to be invited as the guest speaker of your national conference which is in commemoration of the 80th anniversary of the founding of the Communist Party of the Netherlands.

I am thankful for this invitation and for previously having had the opportunity to participate in the educational program of your Party and hold study sessions with highly responsible cadres of your Party on the subject of “globalization” and Party building.

Neoliberal policy in the Netherlands

At the outset, let me clarify that “globalization” is a fancy expression to obscure the precise and scientific term imperialism. It is a supraclass, petty-bourgeois expression originally used by bourgeois journalists and academics and subsequently adopted by corporate executives and high bureaucrats. It seeks to smuggle into the public consciousness the acceptance of the antiworker and antipeople notion that the increasing “laissez faire” rapacity of monopoly capitalism is necessary and appropriate to high technology and increased social productivity.

You are well acquainted with the concrete meaning, actual workings and disastrous consequences of “globalization” because you live in an imperialist country whose state and multinational enterprises are notorious advocates and practitioners of “globalization”.

⁶ Speech at the Conference of the New Communist Party of the Netherlands

In domestic terms, it means bringing down the wage and living conditions of the proletariat and the people, by nullifying hard-won social rights, reducing regular tenured employment in favor of temporary part-time jobs under the slogan of labor flexibility and dismantling the system of social benefits that were adopted in the course of several decades of struggle by the proletariat and the people. And yet a heavy tax burden, in the form of personal income tax and value-added tax for goods and services, is imposed on the Dutch working class.

The prices and fees that ordinary people in the Netherlands pay for basic goods (food, clothing, etc.) and services (housing, transport, telephone, water and energy, etc.) are always creeping up. In sharp contrast, the giant multinational enterprises are granted tax cuts, overpriced contracts and subsidies and are allowed to bring out of the Netherlands large amounts of capital to invest in other imperialist countries, especially the United States, and in some chosen “emerging markets” and to keep the capital holdings and profits in tax havens. The monopoly bourgeoisie uses the state to tax the ordinary people heavily and to incur a huge amount of public debt.

State companies, state financial institutions (insurance companies and banks), state stockholdings in private companies, public utilities (postal service, telecom, energy, water, garbage and sewage) and social services (including medical insurance and functions related to labor and social welfare), have been privatized at bargain prices to the private monopoly firms. The government uses the proceeds from the sale of public assets for budgetary expenditures and for making up for the reduction in the taxes paid by the private monopolies.

It seems that the only things not being offered for sale in the so-called free market are the office of the prime minister, parliament, the core of the civil bureaucracy, the courts and the army. But, of course, all these remain tools of the monopoly bourgeoisie at public expense and are unprofitable concerns. The rule of the

private monopolies is to privatize what is profitable and to socialize what is unprofitable.

The rationale behind the attacks on the wage and living conditions of the proletariat and people and to privatize public resources is to make more capital available to the monopoly bourgeoisie, supposedly to generate economic growth and employment and to sally forth for megacompetition worldwide. The shameless line of the imperialists is to serve the welfare of big corporations and to oppose people's welfare.

The result is jobless growth. The Netherlands officially boasts of a low unemployment rate of 3.9 percent. But in fact, among the industrialized countries, it has one of the highest rates of eliminating regular tenured jobs. It is notorious for converting regular into temporary and part-time jobs, under the scheme of "labor flexibility". The illusion of growth is conjured mainly through the overvaluation of private monopoly assets through the workings of finance capital. Ultimately, paper pyramids collapse, as you have seen the billions of guilders in stock values wiped out in the Amsterdam stock exchange since July this year. The quarterly reports of the Dutch multinational enterprises show huge reduction of profits from the levels of last year.

They extract superprofits from the workers in subsidiary plants and a multitude of sweatshops in some underdeveloped countries. They can extract superprofits because they give extremely low wages and in effect impose 12 hours or more of work time for a subsistence wage through exceedingly high output quotas. They can do so because they collaborate with client-states that toe the line of "economic liberalization" as dictated by the imperialist states through the IMF, World Bank and WTO.

The multinational enterprises still enjoy huge amounts of profits. But they have shamelessly announced further mass layoffs and further pressing down of the wage level in order to increase their profits and counter the tendency of profits to fall. They have

announced closure plans of a considerable number of plants in the Netherlands and abroad.

The Dutch multinational firms extract superprofits from the workers in subsidiary plants and a multitude of sweatshops in some underdeveloped countries. They are able to do so because they give extremely low wages and in effect impose 12 hours of more of work time for a subsistence wage through exceedingly high output quotas. They can do so because they collaborate with client-states that toe the line of “economic liberalization” dictated by the imperialist states through the IMF, World Bank and WTO under the rubric of “free market liberalization”.

Within the Netherlands and on a global scale, the rapid upward concentration of productive and finance capital in the hands of the monopoly bourgeoisie results in the crisis of overproduction, as production with high technology and low regular employment result in the shrinkage of the market. The Netherlands is a big contributor and is at the same time vulnerable to the global crisis of overproduction and the global crisis of finance capital. According to the latest information from Fenedex, 54 percent of the Dutch gross national product consists of exports.

The Dutch banks, especially ING and AMRO, are also overextended in speculative expansion and lending operations to foreign governments and private corporations. In the current global crisis, many of the private debtors have become incapable of paying back what they have borrowed. Ultimately, it is the client-states that assume the debt burden of the private sector in exchange for IMF-initiated bailouts that use public funds.

The Dutch multinational enterprises face a drastically reduced demand for their exports because of the economic collapse of the “emerging markets” and the global recession affecting all imperialist countries. At the same time, the Dutch exports are squeezed by the increased export of other countries trying to

solve their own economic crisis by increasing the quantity of their exports at lower prices.

The biggest Dutch multinational enterprises have incurred greatly reduced profits because of the global overproduction of what they produce: Shell in oil, Akzo Nobel and DSM in chemicals, Philips, Baan and ASM Lithography in consumer electronics, software and chip-making equipment, respectively; KPN in telecommunications; KLM in air transport; Hoogovens in steel and aluminum; and so on and so forth. Even Vedior and Randstad are finding the market for temporary employees glutted. Name any major Dutch company. It is in trouble.

In the Netherlands, the rising rate of exploitation and the deterioration of wage and living conditions compel the proletariat and the rest of the people to fight back and demand basic social reforms. The conditions of increased exploitation in imperialist countries are the very same conditions for the revolutionary party of the proletariat to strengthen itself, wage a revolutionary class struggle against the monopoly bourgeoisie and lead the entire people in the struggle for socialism.

In the world today, all types of goods are overproduced relative to the shrinking market. The imperialists and local reactionaries in the entire world try to solve the problem by aggravating the problem through mass layoffs and further exploitative policy actions against the proletariat and the people. The inevitable result is social and political turmoil. The objective conditions of all-round crisis are favorable for the building of the world proletarian socialist revolution.

It is absolutely necessary that the proletariat and people in both imperialist and dominated countries to unite under the banner of proletarian internationalism and anti-imperialist solidarity. The monopoly bourgeoisie oppresses and exploits the working people of the world all at the same time and inflicts terrible suffering on them in the current crisis. The working people of the world must

therefore unite to liberate themselves from imperialism and to build socialism.

The meaning of “globalization”

Beyond the era of free competition capitalism of the 19th century, the imperialists have always dishonestly called monopoly capitalism as “free enterprise” capitalism in the 20th century. But in recent decades, they attach a certain set of meanings to the slogan of “globalization”.

They contrapose the “free market” to state intervention as they demand the liberalization of trade and investments, the privatization of public assets and the deregulation against social and ecological concerns. This does not mean that they reject the role of the state. They recognize it as the most important instrument of domination over the working class domestically and the oppressed peoples and nations abroad; and that it is a necessary political instrument as much as multinational firms and banks are necessary economic instruments.

In fact, imperialist states in the G-7 and OECD directly and through such multilateral agencies as the International Monetary Fund (IMF), the World Bank and World Trade Organization (WTO) dictate upon client states to open up their domain and make way for multinational firms and banks to invest and trade and to facilitate the exploitation of the people. There is a hierarchy of states as much as there is a hierarchy of business corporations.

In economic and social policy-making, the imperialists have shifted from Keynesianism to “neoliberalism” since the beginning of the ‘80s after the ideological work of Milton Friedman and the Chicago School from the ‘60s onward. With Reagan and Thatcher taking the lead, the imperialists adopted the specious official line that the phenomenon of stagflation in the ‘70s has been caused by rising wage levels and the government’s

big social spending. The bias is against the working class and the people. However, the imperialists obscure the cost-push effect of their high military spending.

They wish above all that the state give free rein to the “free market” and the central bank act sparingly in managing public securities, money supply and interest rates. They wish at all times that the state collect more taxes from the mass of consumers and to deliver to big business a plethora of tax cuts, revenues and assets. Their line is: corporate welfare, yes! social welfare, no!

The “neoliberals” deliberately gloss over the reality of imperialist states and the dominated states for a certain reason. They wish to make people forget that there are contradictions between the imperialist states and the oppressed peoples and nations, among the imperialist states and between the monopoly bourgeoisie and the proletariat in imperialist countries.

They have as collaborators the pseudoprogressives who criticize multinational enterprises as having become more powerful than states in order to insinuate that imperialist and client states are more benign than the MNEs and in order to beg for reforms from both MNEs and states. Front door and backdoor “neoliberals” collaborate in disregarding distinct national modes of production and superstructures in different countries and, most importantly, in denigrating the need for the broad anti-imperialist struggle and class struggle in the specific circumstances of various countries.

The imperialists have aggravated the exploitative and oppressive conditions of neocolonial domination. The OECD countries are pushing the Multilateral Agreement on Investments, an international treaty, to make the underdeveloped countries give up their economic sovereignty, accord national treatment to multinational enterprises and allow these to sue client-states for unfair and unequal treatment and compel them to pay for damages.

They have put aside previous Keynesian pretenses at aiding the development of underdeveloped countries, which they so well drummed up in the UN decades of development and in World Bank and UNCTAD propaganda. They have simply sapped the general run of third world countries through repeated IMF structural adjustment or austerity programs, which in the absence of industrial development actually aggravate their problems of chronic accounts deficits and debt burdens.

Economic crisis as consequence of “globalization”

As Marx and Engels pointed out a long time ago in the *Communist Manifesto*, the basic contradiction in capitalism is between the social character of the forces of production and the private character of appropriation by the capitalist class. This contradiction became manifest in the commercial crises of the 19th century and in the far bigger crises and global wars of the 20th century in the era of imperialism and proletarian revolution.

This contradiction has grown more acute than ever before with the rapid rise of social productivity, through the adoption of higher technology and the availability of a more knowledgeable and skillful workforce, and with the extremely rapacious and accelerated accumulation and concentration of both productive and finance capital by the monopoly bourgeoisie.

The current crisis involves the overaccumulation of productive capital in the hands of the monopoly bourgeoisie, overvaluation of assets through finance-capital manipulation, excessive leveraging in the imperialist countries as well as in the “emerging markets”, chronic mass unemployment and overproduction relative to the shrinking market demand. The illusion of growth in the past decade, even if low and stagnant at the average of two percent or lower for the OECD countries, has been conjured by ever growing overvaluation of assets.

At the moment, all basic contradictions in the world are sharpening in the socioeconomic sphere. These include those between the monopoly bourgeoisie and the proletariat in imperialist countries, between the imperialists and the oppressed peoples and nations and among the imperialist powers.

Among the imperialist countries, the US is relatively the strongest not only because it has the lead in technology but also because it receives the most investments from the other imperialist countries. It carries the factors of implosion which include its accumulated federal debt and chronic trade deficits. In all imperialist countries, assets are overvalued through the workings of finance capital, such as bank loans, stockmarket sales, speculative mergers and excessive leveraging by hedge funds.

In addition to the basic class contradictions, every imperialist country is beset with problems in its relations with “emerging markets” within its particular region and in other regions. The economic collapses in the “emerging markets” have already caused two big waves of prolonged and steep stockmarket declines in the financial centers of the imperialist countries, in the fourth quarter of 1997 and another one in the third quarter of this year.

The contradiction between the imperialists and the oppressed peoples and nations in the socioeconomic sphere is now the sharpest in the world. It involves the overwhelming majority of the people of the world who suffer the worst forms of exploitation and oppression in the hands of the imperialists and the local exploiting classes.

Since the beginning of the ‘80s, the imperialist countries, among which circulate 80 percent or more of the global foreign direct investments (FDIs), have shifted from the pretense of officially aiding “development” to open promotion of the “free market” between them and the client-states at whatever given level of

development or underdevelopment. They have chosen only some ten countries as “emerging markets”, to which 20 percent of global foreign direct investments flow in and out. The rest of the third world are also made to follow the IMF and WTO prescriptions, without receiving significant amounts of the speculative kind of funds that flow into the “emerging markets”.

The “emerging markets” have collapsed in one country after another and in one region after another since July 1997 because their types of goods are overproduced on a global scale and their falling export incomes expose their gross inability to pay back the foreign funds that they receive. There is a limit to the generation of superprofits by the monopoly capitalists from highly speculative finance capital on the basis of a real economy that is subject to the global crisis of overproduction.

The Southeast Asian countries have abruptly exposed their fundamental semifeudal backwardness and have plunged to a new depth of poverty and misery. Gone are the illusions of development conjured by real estate speculation, droves of late car models and proliferating sweatshops for slightly processed products.

The economic crisis is driving the imperialist powers to maneuver against each other for advantageous position and for a larger share of the global market. As the leader of the imperialist alliance, the US tries to divide the costs of policing the world but is always poised to grab the entirety or lion’s share of the spoils of aggression and intervention.

In East Asia, we see the conflicting economic strategies of the US and Japan. The US wishes to take over the key ailing technological and financial firms and have the rest declared bankrupt. But Japan would rather use taxpayer money to bail out the Japanese monopoly firms and banks and revive the Japanese and East Asian economies with public works pump-priming. It advocates state restrictions on the outflow of foreign funds. As

principal creditor in East Asia, it wishes to retain the largest chunk of the market in the region.

In Europe, there is resistance to the US demand for lowering interest rates. At the same time, the US keeps its interest rates higher than those in other imperialist countries in order to attract foreign investments from them and avert the dumping of US bonds and stocks in their hands. As principal creditor of Russia and Eastern Europe, Germany wishes to keep the largest chunk of the market there.

The inherence of war in imperialism is currently manifested by the expansion of NATO to the borders of Russia, the beefing up of the US-Japan security treaty partnership in East Asia, the stirring up of local wars and aggressive acts and threats by US imperialism in the name of peacemaking and humanitarianism.

Right now, the conditions for interimperialist wars in the 21st century are being laid by the worsening of economic conditions, the rise of fascist and racist movements, the acts of aggression and intervention of US imperialism and the growing complexity of a global situation in which interimperialist collisions can occur in the future.

Popular Resistance and Socialism

The basic conditions for socialism grow within the very womb of industrial capitalism. The social character of the forces of production rises with higher technology and with higher knowledge and skills of the working class. An unprecedented crisis of monopoly capitalism has broken out just before the end of the 20th century and has laid the ground for the great struggles for national liberation and socialism against imperialism in the 21st century.

The subjective forces of the socialist revolution must arise and develop to take advantage of the basic conditions, especially

during prolonged periods of serious crisis of the world capitalist system such as the current period. The proletariat must build its revolutionary party for fulfilling its historic mission of building socialism. There must be mass organizations and movements to involve the broad masses of the people in the revolutionary process and to fight the adversary in every aspect of social life.

The optimal economic and technological conditions for building socialism are present in the industrial capitalist countries. However, it is also here where the capitalist class is strongest in using both the coercive and persuasive means to prevent socialist revolution.

So far, in its epochal struggle against the bourgeoisie, the proletariat has been able to make use of the very crises and global wars generated by monopoly capitalism to seize political power and build socialism at the weakest points of the world capitalist system. But now, at the very centers of imperialism, new conditions have arisen to sharpen the class struggle between the monopoly bourgeoisie and the proletariat.

The so-called third stage of the technological revolution (high technology spearheaded by information technology) under capitalism initially allows the monopoly bourgeoisie to tighten its control over society. But the growing disparity between imperialist propaganda and reality ultimately incites the proletariat and the rest of the people in imperialist countries to fight for their social liberation.

The proletariat and people are intensifying their protest and resistance against mass unemployment, job insecurity and rapidly worsening social conditions. They have raised the demand for the reduction of working hours at full time pay in order to spread the dignity of employment and expand the domestic market.

The monopoly bourgeoisie uses the high-tech mass media to spread disinformation and false illusions as well as petty

bourgeois mentality among the workers, underemployed and unemployed. But the people can as well use electronic techniques to conduct revolutionary propaganda in ever widening and intensifying guerrilla fashion, if there is a party of the proletariat to raise the level of revolutionary consciousness and militancy.

General strikes and strikes in key companies manifest the sharpening class struggle between the monopoly bourgeoisie and the proletariat. These are breaking out increasingly beyond the control of the labor aristocracy. In view of the growing social discontent, the blatantly conservative parties that push “neoliberal” policy are discredited. But the other bourgeois parties push the same policy and sugarcoat this with deceptive phraseology in order to win elections. There are also the parties and movements which whip up neofascist and racist currents.

Conditions are becoming favorable for the working class to build up their revolutionary parties and break out of the lingering influence of relatively better times in the past, widespread petty-bourgeois mentality, the bureaucratic control of unions by the labor aristocracy and reformist and revisionist parties and organizations. The working class must include into its ranks the white collars who do repetitive work with their fingers rather than with their full arms and shoulders.

For so long as there are no revolutionary parties of the proletariat that are capable of overthrowing the monopoly bourgeoisie, the boom-and-bust cycle will continue to recur. But new conditions in social production worsen the structural crisis, involving chronic overproduction, chronic high rates of unemployment and chronic abuse of finance capital.

Under these conditions of political disorder among the reactionaries themselves, the proletariat and the people have ample opportunity to build the revolutionary party, the people’s

army and the united front to wage a new-democratic revolution towards the socialist revolution.

A number of third world countries have revolutionary parties of the proletariat guided by Marxism-Leninism and are waging the new-democratic revolution through a protracted people's war. They play a signal role for the spread of armed revolution against the imperialists and the local reactionary classes.

The economic collapse in the few "emerging markets" in the third world has brought about conditions of social and political disorder and revolutionary mass struggles. The withdrawal of Suharto from his position of power is remarkable. But his replacement by one of his stooges underscores the need for a new-democratic revolution.

In such countries as China and Russia, genuine communist parties can arise to avail themselves of outstanding revolutionary legacies, such as those of Lenin, Stalin and Mao. They can easily target for popular condemnation and overthrow the new bourgeoisie, which has so flagrantly robbed the people of their social wealth. In Russia, general strikes and mass protests have erupted on a widescale. In China, workers' strikes, local peasant uprisings and other forms of concerted action have occurred.

The intensifying exploitation and oppression compel the proletariat and the people to wage the revolutionary struggle for socialism against imperialism and the local reactionaries. For this struggle to succeed, the revolutionary party of the proletariat must lead the broad masses of the people in the process of overthrowing the class dictatorship of the bourgeoisie and building socialism.

The scientific socialists of today must learn from the basic teachings and great achievements of their predecessors and draw lessons from both positive and negative experience in order to

fare better and win greater victories in the forthcoming struggles against the imperialists and reactionaries.

The victory of socialism over monopoly capitalism is inevitable on the scale of a whole historical epoch. The revolutionary party of the proletariat and the broad masses of the people must master the circumstances, pursue the correct strategy and tactics, defeat the imperialists and reactionaries in one country after another and build socialism until it prevails over imperialism on a global scale. #

14.

**ADVANCE THE PEOPLE'S RESISTANCE
TO IMPERIALIST GLOBALIZATION**

November 28, 1999

I wish to congratulate the People's Assembly Committee and the Sentenaryo ng Bayan for successfully planning and convening the People's Assembly and March-Rally to expose and oppose the World Trade Organization. I stand in solidarity with all the participants and join them in condemning and combating the WTO, the Agreement on Agriculture and all the other schemes of imperialist globalization.

I am glad that you are carrying forward the people's resistance that was initiated in 1996 in Manila by the People's Conference Against Imperialist Globalization and the People's Caravan Against APEC and followed up in Vancouver in 1997 by the conference organized by the Network Opposed to APEC and further in Kuala Lumpur in 1998 by the Asia Pacific People's Assembly with the theme "Confronting Globalization: Reasserting People's Rights."

It is of high significance and urgent necessity that you confront the World Trade Organization on the occasion of its Third Ministerial Meeting in Seattle. Under the guise of "free trade", monopoly capitalism has wrought havoc on the lives of the working class and the rest of the people of the world. This ministerial meeting aims to push further ultranational depredations by the multinational firms.

It is supposed to launch a new round of multilateral trade negotiations and issue a declaration. It conjures the illusion that 134 contracting states enjoy equality and decide matters on the basis of consensus. But in fact the US and other imperialist states

make the most crucial decisions on trade issues inside and outside the WTO.

For a keynote, I am tasked to speak on the need for advancing the people's resistance. To define such a need, I shall present a comprehensive critique of imperialist globalization, the suffering of the proletariat and the people of the world, the current status and prospects of the people's resistance.

Globalization is imperialism

Globalization is a slick and shallow term. It glosses over the reality of modern imperialism or monopoly capitalism, i.e., capitalism beyond the stage of free competition, the capitalism of a few gigantic MNCs monopolizing investment, production, sales, trade and profits.

Corporate executives, bureaucrats, bourgeois academic pedants and imperialist-funded NGOs have circulated the term globalization as if it meant a new shiny and amazing thing. They try to pass off monopoly capitalism as an irresistible fact of life. In fact, they recycle the old jargon of the laissez faire doctrine to misrepresent monopoly capitalism as free enterprise, free market and free trade.

We are still in the era of monopoly capitalism and proletarian revolution, especially because of the betrayal of socialism by revisionists in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe and subsequently in China. Now, that the traditional imperialist powers are lording over the world without challenge from any powerful socialist country, you can see the escalating levels of oppression and exploitation and the rapid degradation of the human condition. These circumstances generate the people's resistance.

It is in the nature of the imperialist states, acting as the instrument of their respective monopoly firms, to compete with each other. The contradictions increase upon the aggravation of the crisis of overproduction in the world capitalist system. You can observe the conflicting interests of the US, Japan and the European Union on major issues in any gathering of their representatives. They quarrel about the trade of their industrial and agricultural surpluses, about steel and cars and about beef and bananas.

But they always strive to override their contradictions by taking common positions against the working class and people of the world and by shifting the burden of crisis to them. The US-led alliance of imperialist countries is still holding under a common policy of neocolonialism, involving the political use of client states and economic and financial control through bilateral and multilateral agreements, to the detriment of the working people.

The imperialist states and client states act in the interest of the multinational firms and the big comprador firms (principal local trading and financial agents), respectively. A handful of imperialist states, headed by the US, and concentrated in the Group of Seven, control and use an array of the most powerful multilateral agencies, like the IMF, World Bank and WTO, to determine the pattern of investments and trade in the client states and thereby dominate the world, economically and consequently in all other respects.

The IMF is the instrument for dictating financial and monetary policy on client states, requiring them to "liberalize" investments and trade in favor of the foreign monopoly firms and give free rein to profit remittances, especially through transfer-pricing (overpricing imports and underpricing exports). It pushes the client states to sink ever deeper into foreign indebtedness as a result of the ever-growing deficits in the balance of payments. Client states that do not comply with the recurrent structural adjustment and stabilization programs are deprived of foreign

direct investments and credit to which they have become addicted.

The World Bank is the instrument for dictating fiscal policy on client states, requiring them to shun the use of public resources for industrialization and to direct these towards programs and projects other than industrial development. Generally, infrastructure projects for the benefit of the multinational firms, the big compradors and landlords are passed off as development. Official “development aid” is used to facilitate imports from the donor countries and to allow the ruling reactionaries to have more funds for military and other forms of wasteful spending.

The WTO is the instrument for dictating trade policy on client states, requiring them to drastically reduce or eliminate tariff barriers and other forms of support and protection to domestic industry and agriculture and open up to the unrestricted importation of goods and services from the imperialist countries. Noncompliance with so-called trade liberalization in favor of the overdeveloped countries means trade sanctions.

Under the rubric of protecting intellectual property rights, the multinational firms prevent the client countries from availing of world scientific and technological advances for their own development and yet appropriate for themselves the genetic property of the client countries and the results of local researches funded by them with paltry amounts.

The imperialist states and the multinational firms rail against protectionism. But they are the most rabid practitioners of protectionism. In fact, the monopoly firms strengthen themselves by using the state and public funds, to protect themselves from foreign competition and to wage their own trade offensives. In undertaking state monopoly capitalism to complement private monopoly capitalism, the imperialist states use tax money to have equity in strategic firms, to fund research and development, to make purchase contracts with private firms, to bail out financially

ailing monopoly firms and to provide all kinds of direct and indirect subsidies for the production and export of goods and services.

The worst kind of protectionism in the world is the use by the US and other imperialist states of political, military, economic and financial power to prevent the economic development of client countries as well as to engage in the most blatant forms of intervention and aggression. Thus, the imperialist powers come to acquire foreign markets, sources of raw materials, fields of investment and spheres of influence and reduce other countries to a level of development that make them captive customers of the multinational firms and perennial beggars of foreign loans.

The imperialist states, especially the US, deck themselves out as champions of "free trade" when it comes to goods and services that they are in a priorly superior position to produce and export. Look at how they push their high-tech products, genetically manipulated seeds, livestock and food, agricultural surpluses and financial services. The overwhelming majority of countries are reduced to being producers of raw materials and a small number of them, to semimanufacturers of low value-added consumer goods (like semiconductors, garments, shoes and toys) for the imperialist countries.

After inducing these countries to overproduce their types of goods, the imperialist states use the most blatant instruments of protectionism against them. They continue to arbitrarily impose tariff duties and other restrictions on the exports of the client countries. They dump on these countries surplus goods as well as surplus capital for facilitating trade in favor of the monopoly firms.

The imperialist states, acting as the class instrument of their multinational firms, are the masterminds of the "flexible labor" policy, the chief instigators of human rights violations by client states and the biggest plunderers and polluters of the

environment. Two-handedly, the monopoly bourgeoisie has always used the imperialist and client states and the multinational firms to oppress and exploit the people. But the imperialist states and the monopoly firms sometimes shed crocodile tears and invoke labor standards in social and environmental clauses in order to extract further investment and trade privileges from the client countries or to justify the application of trade sanctions on client states that turn recalcitrant.

The US is, of course, the most notorious practitioner of protectionism. It uses its so-called Super 301 to club any other country, including its imperialist allies into submission. Its Department of Commerce can arbitrarily make "antidumping" rulings and impose exorbitant tariffs. Japan and key states in the European Union are increasingly resentful of the US over a wide range of trade issues because of US penchant for acting unilaterally, bilaterally or through regional trading arrangements and disregarding the WTO framework whenever it suits the US to do so.

A number of important negotiations will be done in Seattle. The review of the Agreement on Agriculture, the trade-related intellectual property rights (TRIPS) and the General Agreement on Trade and Services (GATS) which are built in into the Seattle Agenda will be subject to tough negotiations among imperialist powers. It is important to campaign against the imperialist scheme to open a Millennium Round of negotiations, which aims to expand imperialist exploitation through so-called investment liberalization (the grant of national treatment to multinational firms and the punishment of noncompliant client-states) in furtherance of the failed MAI. Other important issues in the Millennium Round negotiations are liberalization of government procurement, e-commerce and competition policy.

We support the call of peasant movements, including Via Campesina and Kilusang Magbubukid ng Pilipinas, to take agriculture out of the WTO. It is necessary to denounce the

imperialist policy on investments and trade as detrimental to food security, land reform and comprehensive development. Demands must be raised in line with the call for condemning the WTO.

In coordination with the IMF and World Bank, the WTO is an instrument of the imperialist states for ravaging the economies of the client countries and making them susceptible to fluctuating doses of foreign direct and indirect investments. Look how far these three agencies of monopoly capitalism have pushed the Philippine economy to the most desperate straits and the Manila authorities to the most shameless position of betraying the national sovereignty and auctioning off the national patrimony.

The US-Estrada regime is offering to foreign investors unlimited ownership of Philippine land and other natural resources, public utilities, banks, educational institutions, mass media, retail trade and all conceivable kinds of enterprises. The absurd logic of the regime is to bargain away one's national assets to be able to compete globally. Turning everything upside-down, the traitorous regime call the protection of national patrimony an act of treason.

Let me say something about the admission of China to the WTO. The US and other imperialist states are beside themselves celebrating it because China has agreed to make new laws allowing foreign investors to have majority equity in enterprises, especially telecommunications and financial services, and yet the predominantly sweatshop-type export products of China to the US remain subject to antisurge or antidumping laws.

China's admission to the WTO further tightens the hold of the foreign monopoly capitalists and the domestic comprador bourgeoisie on the Chinese economy and other aspects of Chinese society. The dismantling of the state-owned enterprises and the debilitation of the national industry are expected to accelerate. While foreign monopoly capitalists anticipate greater

superprofits, the Chinese people are bound to suffer increased unemployment and further impoverishment. Such is the destiny of any country that falls into the trap of neocolonialism.

Need for advancing the people's resistance

Imperialist globalization, with its neocolonial and neoliberal thrust, has accelerated the concentration and centralization of capital in the three global centers of capitalism (the US, the European Union and Japan) and the extraction of superprofits from the underdeveloped countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America and the retrogressive former revisionist-ruled countries. The new depths into which the chronic crisis of overproduction has plunged, lay bare the exceedingly exploitative character of the relationship of the imperialist and client countries.

The oversupply of all types of goods and services, relative to market demand, has led to widespread bankruptcies and closure of enterprises and therefore mass unemployment of unprecedented proportions. This destruction of productive forces means the further contraction of the global market.

The average growth rate of the industrial capitalist countries in the (Organization of Economic Cooperation and Development) OECD continues to stagnate. Most important to observe is the rapid upward accumulation of industrial and finance capital in the hands of the monopoly bourgeoisie in a few imperialist countries and mostly in the US. The inflation of assets in the hands of the monopoly bourgeoisie accounts for a high proportion of the statistical economic growth rates.

The US takes advantage of its lead in high technology and its well entrenched economic, financial, political and military power. It has an economic growth rate above the average of OECD growth at the expense of its own imperialist allies, Japan and the European Union, and at the greatest expense of the proletariat and the people of the world.

Under the neoliberal policy, the monopoly bourgeoisie constantly drums up the fear of inflation and blames labor as well as any social spending by the bourgeois state as the cause of inflation. It accumulates capital in its hands as it pushes down wage levels, attacks job security, trade union and other democratic rights of the workers, privatize public assets, gets tax exemptions and subsidies and cuts back on social spending by its government.

The attack on the workers, even while intended to counter the falling rate of profits, actually tends to reduce the market in the imperialist countries. The workers are compelled to fight back. Thus, the resistance of the workers and the rest of the people is growing in imperialist countries.

The few economies like that of South Korea, that the imperialists allowed to industrialize in order to serve as showcases and frontliners in the anticommunist crusade, find their industrial exports increasingly squeezed by the overproduction of similar products by the imperialist countries. The organizations and movements of workers and the rest of the people are therefore developing in response to the growing economic crisis.

The full restoration of capitalism in the former Soviet Union, Eastern Europe and China has meant the expansion of the economic territory for the imperialist powers to exploit. For a while and to some extent, these new client countries seemed to relieve the imperialist countries of the crisis of overproduction by serving as a dumping ground for surplus goods and surplus capital.

But the process of compradorization and de-industrialization in these former revisionist-ruled countries has meant the unprecedented large-scale destruction of productive forces and consequently the constriction of the market for imperialist goods and capital. These new client countries also contribute to the oversupply of certain goods, such as the sweatshop products of

China and some amount of oil, steel and other products from Russia and Eastern Europe.

The widescale destruction of industries, mass unemployment, the unbridled corruption of the new bourgeoisie and the deterioration of all social conditions have made the former revisionist-ruled countries hotbeds of mass discontent and wars. Amidst the dire circumstances, revolutionary organizations and movements are arising. Marxist-Leninist parties can be built to lead the people's resistance in these countries as they reassert their revolutionary legacy and thoroughly criticize and repudiate the revisionist ideas and policies of the past that led to the restoration of capitalism.

The peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America continue to suffer the most appalling conditions of neocolonialism, aggravated by the neoliberal policy stress that unleashes the so-called free market and rejects state-led or state assisted industrial development. Most of these countries have been depressed since the late 70s because of the global overproduction of raw materials. Those few countries, including China and those of Southeast Asia, which have gone into the production and overproduction of low value-added semimanufactures for export, have also drastically fallen into depression since 1997.

They were touted as the new "emergent markets" as they received large doses of foreign funds for upscale private construction and luxury imports and for covering the ever-growing current accounts deficits. The bubble had to burst because the income from their kind of exports kept on falling far below the payments for imports and debt service, especially because other client countries had gone into their kind of exports.

The protracted depression of the raw-material exporting countries have generated people's resistance. However, more prominently in the meantime, military coups and civil wars have burst out, often involving the most senseless massacres. In cases where the control of oil resources and other strategic interests of

imperialism are at stake, the US and other imperialist powers have intervened and carried out wars of aggression, as those against Iraq and Yugoslavia.

In the countries like those of Southeast Asia and China, which have abruptly dropped into depression as a result of the global glut in export-oriented semimanufactures and the abuse of finance capital, conditions are fertile for the resurgence of revolutionary movements. In one outstanding example, the Indonesian people have succeeded in overthrowing the long-running Suharto regime and are desirous of carrying forward the revolutionary movement.

As the 20th century draws to a close, all the basic contradictions are intensifying, that between the imperialists and the people of the world, that among the imperialist powers and that between the monopoly bourgeoisie and the proletariat in the imperialist countries. The new world disorder that has followed the end of the bipolar cold war is the prelude to the resurgence of the anti-imperialist and socialist movements.

The broad masses of the people wage various forms of anti-imperialist and democratic struggle against the exploitation and oppression that they suffer. At the same time, reactionary forces have the propensity to engage in violent conflicts in an increasing number of countries over the division of spoils that are fast dwindling. The revolutionary forces of the people can take advantage of the contradictions among the reactionary forces and among the imperialists.

The danger of interimperialist war still appears remote. But a review of history shows that the crisis of overproduction can lead to polarization of revolutionary and counterrevolutionary forces in imperialist countries and the imperialist powers are driven to redivide the world. Interimperialist contradictions can sharpen as a result of interventions in client states. Learning from history, the people can be vigilant and mobilize themselves

to overcome the danger of fascism and world war and to transform an imperialist war, if it cannot be stopped, into a revolutionary civil war.

The main contradiction in the world today is still between imperialism on one side and the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America and, in addition, of the rapidly retrogressive former revisionist-ruled countries, on the other side. The spread and intensification of revolutionary struggle in these client countries can ultimately create a situation in which the proletariat in imperialist countries can surge forward to overthrow the monopoly bourgeoisie in its heartland.

Amidst the new world disorder, Marxist-Leninist parties in at least six countries are leading the proletariat and the people in waging protracted people's war along the line of new-democratic revolution. Farther afield are other armed revolutionary movements, with a significant measure of anti-imperialist and democratic character. It can be expected that as the crisis of the world capitalist system continues to worsen, all forms of people's resistance are going to spread and intensify.

Your anti-imperialist stand is correct and admirable. You distinguish yourselves from those reformist organizations that are heavily funded by the imperialists and are playing the role of loyal opposition to imperialism and reaction. They pretend to be for the people and spread the lie that only under the sway of imperialism can the people enjoy "civil society" and the "culture of peace".

You must be alert to an entrapment of the people's demands within the trilateral framework of collaboration among imperialist-lining entities posing as civic representatives of the people, imperialist and client states and the multinational and big comprador firms. You must ensure that your struggle for reforms serves to advance the strategic aim of combating and defeating imperialism.

You must also be alert to those who pose as representatives of labor but who in fact collude with imperialism in spreading the chauvinist myth that client states and labor in the client countries take away industries and jobs from the imperialist countries. The truth is that monopoly capitalism is responsible for destroying jobs and pressing down labor and social standards in both imperialist and client countries. Therefore, the workers of the world must unite and prevent imperialism from dividing them.

The multinational firms adopt higher technology in their bid to maximize profits and in the process destroy jobs in the imperialist countries. They also impose on the client countries the policy of cheapening labor and take the lead in violating labor and social standards all for the purpose of maximizing profits. The end result is a global glut in low value-added products and further underdevelopment, which together kill jobs in the client countries.

There is an urgent need to advance the people's resistance to imperialism and reaction because of the rising level of oppression and exploitation throughout the world and the ceaseless worsening of the chronic crisis of overproduction in the world capitalist system. The broad masses of the people cannot tolerate the system, policies and methods that have impoverished them and made their lives miserable and have enriched the imperialist countries and the exploiting classes.

Your people's assembly and march-rally are a significant contribution to advancing the people's resistance. I wish you the utmost success in attaining your objectives, such as making the people aware of the disastrous effects of the WTO and all the schemes of imperialist globalization, promoting linkages, common resolve and cooperation in anti-imperialist campaigns and paying attention to building the people's resistance in the belly of the beast--the No. 1 imperialist power and No.1 enemy of the people of the world.

In this regard, I take the opportunity of inviting all the participants in your people's assembly and march rally to join in the founding of the International League of People's Struggle within the last quarter of next year, 2000.

The League shall promote and develop the anti-imperialist and democratic struggle of the workers and oppressed people against the inhuman policies and acts of the multinational companies, their governments and international instruments such as the IMF, World Bank, WTO and military alliances.

The League shall act to realize the unity, cooperation and coordination of the following forces: workers, unions and organizations of women, youth, peasants, teachers, health workers, journalists, writers, scientists, and technologists, lawyers and other professionals, and movements for national and social liberation, gender equality, world peace and solidarity, environmental protection and against fascism, militarism and other social ills.

The League has ten major concerns for which it is ready to stand and fight.

1. National and social liberation from imperialism and all reaction;
2. Human rights in the civil, political, economic, social and cultural fields;
3. The cause of peace against wars of aggression and against nuclear and other genocidal weapons;
4. Workers' rights and reduction of working hours at full pay against mass unemployment and decreasing wage levels;
5. Rights of peasants, farm workers and fisherfolk against feudal and semifeudal exploitation and oppression;
6. Women's rights against gender discrimination and children's rights against child labor and other forms of exploitation;

7. Rights of indigenous peoples and nationalities against chauvinism and racism;
 8. The rights of teachers and the youth;
 9. Environmental protection against plunder and pollution;
- and
10. Rights and welfare of refugees and migrant workers.

If you are interested, please convey to the Initiative Committee your expression of support for the League and willingness to participate in its founding. The League can be one more way of advancing the people's resistance to imperialism. The **WEBSITE** is <<http://www.geocities.com/ilps2000/index.htm>> and **E-MAIL:** <ilp515@excite.com>.

The goal of socialism

We must expose and oppose the evils of imperialism. But we must also have a clear positive goal. This is socialism. It can be attained through the new-democratic revolution in pre-industrial countries like the Philippines. It can be attained more directly in industrial capitalist countries through the overthrow of the monopoly bourgeoisie by the working class.

But the problem is that in imperialist countries where the economic and technological wherewithals for socialism are best available it is also where the monopoly bourgeoisie is at its strongest in preventing revolutionary change. The problem can be solved by developing simultaneously the people's resistance in both imperialist and client countries.

The time will surely come for the working class to win political power and establish socialism on a wide scale, after the workers and peasants win the new-democratic revolution once more in several countries where oppression and exploitation by the imperialists and the local reactionaries are most rapacious. The conditions for making revolution are most favorable.

We are confident that we shall ultimately win the fight for socialism because of the rapidly rising social character of the means of production and the irrationality of the monopoly capitalist system of private appropriation. The recurrent and ever worsening crisis of overproduction brings about higher levels of chronic mass unemployment, poverty, social injustice and counterrevolutionary violence by the imperialists and local reactionaries..

The people of the world have no choice but to fight for socialism against monopoly capitalism in order to liberate themselves from oppression and exploitation. It is an advantage for the scientific socialists to learn lessons from both the positive and negative experiences, in all previous socialist revolution and construction. In the revolutionary struggle against imperialism and for building socialism in the 21st century, people of the world can do even better than in the 20th century. #

15.

**ON 100 YEARS OF STRUGGLE AGAINST US
IMPERIALISM⁷**

February 3, 1999

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

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

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

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

The absence of genuine national independence and the reign of greed and terror in our country are the bitter consequence of the successful US war of aggression. The US destroyed the

⁷ Address to the International Conference sponsored by the Congress of Teachers and Educators For Nationalism and Democracy (CONTEND)

Philippine republic that issued from the armed revolution against Spanish colonialism. The US imposed its own colonial rule on the people and granted them nominal independence only after making sure that it could continue to profit from semicolonial rule through the local exploiting classes of big compradors and landlords.

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

The US war of aggression

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

The historians present in your conference can tell you all the facts about the double-faced dealings of US agents in Singapore and Hongkong, the arrogant and clever military maneuvers of the US forces in Manila, the pre-arranged surrender of the Spanish authorities and the mock battle for Intramuros, the Proclamation of Benevolent Assimilation, the US-Spanish Treaty of Paris on December 10, 1898 ceding the Philippines to the US for USD20 million, and the US provocation at San Juan bridge on February 4, 1899.

To impose themselves on the Filipino people, the US aggressors arrested, tortured and killed hundreds of thousands of Filipinos.

Millions of our people suffered forced relocations and food blockades. The genocidal methods previously used against the American Indians were used in the conquest of the Philippines and would be used again and again in the '40s and '50s and from 1969 to the present. The same methods were also used against the Vietnamese people during the '60s and '70s.

The estimate of Filipino casualties from the US war of aggression ranges from 250,000 to one million or more than 10 percent of the entire population. General Bell testified before the US Congress that at least 600,000 Filipinos were killed in Luzon alone. Until now, there has been neither the full satisfaction of the people's demand for revolutionary justice nor official apology from the US government over its dastardly crimes against the Filipino people and entire humanity.

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

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

Continuing US domination

The US reconquered the Philippines in 1945. In advance of the grant of bogus independence to the country, it made sure that US military bases and US property rights and privileges would

persist. And yet it tried vainly to postpone the shift to semicolonial rule. However, confronted by an armed revolutionary movement, it relented and gave way to such a rule in 1946, with national administration conceded to the politicians and bureaucrats of the big compradors and landlords in subordination to US imperialism.

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

In the semicolonial political system, the people have suffered a series of puppet regimes. The US is the most responsible for the prolonged the oppressive and exploitative policies of all these puppet regimes, from Roxas to Estrada, and for the prolonged Marcos fascist dictatorship. The US dictates all major policies either bilaterally or through US-controlled multilateral agencies like the IMF, World Bank and WTO. The US remains as the No. 1 imperialist power dominating the Philippines even as it even as it has found it convenient since the '60s to take cover behind multilateral arrangements.

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

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

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

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

The neoliberal language of so-called globalization is nothing but a recycling of the antiquated bourgeois-liberal catchphrase, “free marketplace of goods and ideas”. It is calculated to assail and put aside the Marxist-Leninist critique of modern imperialism, exactly at a time that the rapidly rising social character of the productive forces through the adoption of higher technology by the imperialists in their own countries makes the capitalist relations of production and the relations of the imperialists and the oppressed peoples more untenable than ever before.

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

Since the late ‘70s these pseudoprogressive recruits of imperialism and local reaction from the petty bourgeoisie have claimed that the Philippine social economy is no longer predominantly agrarian and semifeudal but an industrial capitalist one because of the supposed economic development under the big comprador-landlord Marcos regime. Since the coming to power of Ramos in 1992, they have proceeded to claim that the Philippine economy is so tightly integrated into the global economy that the question of national sovereignty and independence has become passe.

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

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

Most important development

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

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

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

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

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

In the new-democratic revolution, there is always the need for an echelon of alliances: the basic alliance of the workers and peasants, the progressive alliance of the toiling masses and the urban petty bourgeoisie, the patriotic alliance of the progressive forces and the middle bourgeoisie and, whenever possible and necessary, the unstable temporary alliance with sections of the reactionaries—all for the purpose of isolating and destroying the power of the enemy, the most reactionary puppet of the imperialists.

Front runner in the anti-imperialist struggle

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

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

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

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

16.

THE PEOPLE'S STRUGGLE AGAINST WAR⁸

1 May 1999

The choice of theme for this seminar is highly significant and urgent. Imperialism means war. It is necessary for us to comprehend the nature and history of imperialism as the source of war and confront the current reality of a worsening new world disorder and the spreading scourge of war.

The point is to arouse, organize and mobilize the people against war and necessarily against imperialism which is the cause of war. The way to oppose and defeat imperialism is to wage all forms of revolutionary struggle for national liberation, people's democracy and socialism.

As long as it exists, imperialism breeds and unleashes wars. These arise from the impulses of the monopoly bourgeoisie within the imperialist countries, from the contradictions among the imperialist countries and from their interventions and aggressions against the countries and peoples that they oppress and exploit.

To deny or obfuscate the aggressive nature of imperialism and the corresponding need for revolution against it is to condone imperialist war. Both classical and modern revisionists have played the special role of drumming up pacifism only to promote imperialism and war. Today in Europe, social-democratic and "green" parties in ruling coalitions that have previously taken pride in depicting themselves as pacifist are actively supporting the US and NATO war of aggression against Yugoslavia.

⁸ **Contribution to the Brussels Seminar on the theme "Imperialism Means War"**

There are also the phrasemongers of “civil society” who are financed by the imperialists to gloss over the oppressive nature of the monopoly bourgeois state and the aggressive nature of imperialism. Their role as special agents of imperialism is to whip up a bias against the anti-imperialist struggles of the people, to spread the notion of collaborating with the imperialist and local reactionary states and monopoly firms as a way of promoting so-called civility and to rationalize the interventions and aggressions of imperialist powers against weaker countries in order to further oppress and exploit the people.

We are still in the era of imperialism and proletarian revolution. Imperialism or monopoly capitalism is the highest and final stage of capitalism. It is parasitic, destructive and moribund. It is proven by the increasingly worse crises of monopoly capitalism and interimperialist world wars and by the ensuing rise of proletarian revolution and socialist states against imperialism in the 20th century.

The epochal struggle between the forces of imperialism and those of socialism is far from finished. Capitalism is not the end of history. As a new thing in the history of mankind, socialism has to go through twists and turns and ups and downs. The revolutionary parties of the proletariat have to learn their lessons well from both positive and negative experiences in order to resurge and prevail over imperialism.

The revisionist betrayal of socialism and the success of monopoly capitalism in neocolonialism have set back the people of the world to a situation comparable to that period before World War I, when there was as yet no powerful socialist state to oppose imperialism. The temporary success of the US-led imperialist alliance in the Cold War and the exacerbation of oppression and exploitation are precisely the reasons for the proletariat and the rest of the people to make revolution even more resolutely and more militantly than ever before. Only the revolutionary struggles of the proletariat and the people can put an end to the

daily violence of exploitation and to the outbreaks of imperialist war.

I. Imperialism as the Source of War

In its evolution from free competition capitalism in the 19th century, monopoly capitalism or modern imperialism in the 20th century has not only persisted in extracting surplus value from the proletariat but has relentlessly increased the rate of exploitation in both imperialist and client countries. Having gained dominance in industrial capitalist society and having merged industrial and bank capital to form a finance oligarchy, the monopoly bourgeoisie has throughout the century pushed the concentration and centralization of capital at the expense of the proletariat and the people of the world.

It has ceaselessly sought to raise the organic composition of capital by accumulating constant capital for the instruments of production at the expense of variable capital for wages. On top of using productive capital for reproduction and further accumulation, it has used distinctly financial transactions to accelerate the exploitation of the proletariat and people, submerge them in indebtedness and draw superprofits from the parasitic practice of international usury.

In sharp contrast to the laissez faire doctrine raised by the rising industrial bourgeoisie in most of the 19th century against the mercantilist doctrine of the trading monopolies, the monopoly bourgeoisie has taken full control over the bourgeois state and used it as an instrument to keep the proletariat in subjugation, to appropriate public resources for private profit, to protect national industry and invoke free trade to subjugate other countries and nations and to launch wars of intervention and aggression in order to divide and redivide the world.

Whatever is the policy shift or fashionable language of imperialism at a given period, be it “free market” or “state intervention”, the monopoly bourgeoisie somehow uses the state to preserve and enlarge its class interest. As its own necessity dictates, the monopoly bourgeoisie resorts to state monopoly capitalism and fascism.

The use of finance capital to stimulate production and circulation of goods and, more importantly, to draw profits from distinctly financial transactions has made the monopoly bourgeoisie an increasingly parasitic class. At any rate, the monopoly firms proceed to higher levels of competition, technology and production. These lead to the crisis of overproduction upon the contraction of the market resulting from the reduction of the wage fund in the effort of the monopoly bourgeoisie to counter the tendency of profit rates to fall upon the expansion of production.

The crisis of overproduction further leads to the destruction of the forces of production, through production cutbacks, mass unemployment and bankruptcies of firms losing in the competition, the intensification of class struggle between the monopoly bourgeoisie and the proletariat, the absorption of the weaker or bankrupt firms by the stronger firms, use of the state funds to bail out the monopolies, the intensification of interimperialist contradictions and, in the worst situation, the outbreak of world war.

In trying to resolve the contradictions within the imperialist countries, the monopoly bourgeoisie resorts to the export of surplus goods and surplus capital to the weaker capitalist countries and to the underdeveloped countries. It thereby seeks to extract superprofits from abroad in order to make up for and countervail the falling rate of profit within its domestic economy.

But there are limits to the expansion of capital and extraction of superprofits from abroad because, in the first place, imperialism

prevents the emergence and growth of industrial capitalism and potential competitors in most countries of the world. The uneven development of countries becomes more pronounced under imperialism, with capital increasingly concentrated in the imperialist countries.

Under old-style colonialism, the export of surplus goods rather than the export of surplus capital was more important. Under imperialism, the export of surplus capital gains more importance. In turn, loan capital and direct investments for quick profit-taking gains importance rather than for the comprehensive and well-balanced development of other countries. The export of surplus capital is not aimed at spreading productive capital but at financing the export of surplus goods from the imperialists, whetting the appetite of the local exploiting classes for the consumption of imported goods and, most importantly, drawing superprofits from some amount of direct investments for the purpose of market penetration and from increasing amounts of loans that are incurred by the client states for covering their chronic trade and budgetary deficits.

Through the export of surplus capital, the imperialists convert the overwhelming majority of countries into their debt vassals. Under the auspices of the IMF, World Bank and WTO, the client states have thus far become more financially and economically subjugated than they were before World War II, despite the claims of these states to national sovereignty and independence. The practice of international usury exposes most starkly the parasitic and decadent character of imperialism. It is at the core of the phenomenon called neocolonialism.

Crushed by heavy debt burden, the client countries regress farther into underdevelopment. They have to ceaselessly beg for new loans to pay the interest on old loans. The levels of debt service rise but still the accumulated debt continues to rise. The client countries plunge to lower levels of austerity, poverty and misery, as we can see in Asia, Africa, Latin America and the former

Soviet-bloc countries. Eventually, the global market for the surplus goods and surplus capital from the imperialists contracts and puts the imperialists themselves in a more severe crisis.

Monopoly firms form international combines to arrange production and the market and to maximize profits at the expense of the proletariat and the people. But the competition among the monopoly firms also never ceases. It brings about the crisis of overproduction from one cycle of boom and bust to another. So long as imperialism persists, so will this crisis proceed from one level of severity to another. Under conditions of economic crisis, interimperialist competition sharpens and can sharpen to the point of causing the breakup of international combines and the realignment of monopolies and lead to wars, such as World War I and II.

But imperialism will not collapse on its own accord, even if interimperialist wars occur. The crisis of overproduction and interimperialist wars can only provide the favorable objective conditions for the subjective forces of the revolution to take advantage of in order to grow in strength through struggle and overthrow the imperialists and local reactionaries. Only the armed revolution of the proletariat and the people can destroy the power of imperialism and reaction.

There are those who claim that monopolies which have been rechristened as multinational or transnational firms have lost their national character and national basing. There can be nothing farther from the truth. To deny the national character and national basing of the monopolies amounts to saying that imperialism has disappeared. It is anti-Leninist to obscure the national and ultranational rapacity of any imperialist power.

The Bretton Woods agreements, the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) and now the World Trade Organization (WTO), the regional banks and regional trade agreements and capital mergers across borders must be seen as reflective of a

balance of strength at a given period and not as the indivisible unity of monopoly capitalism, no matter how much higher has been the level of imperialist unity against the proletariat and the people since World War II.

To this day, each imperialist country has its own set of monopoly firms and banks, its flagship corporations, with most of the capital in the hands of its own monopoly bourgeoisie and its own state, with most management personnel recruited from among its own nationals and with its principal headquarters and main plants on its own homeground. The imperialist powers have their respective national interests and have contradictions among themselves. They use such international organizations of states as the Group of 7, the OECD, IMF, World Bank and WTO and so on to arrive at common economic policies at the expense of client-states and, most of all, the proletariat and the people.

In the era of imperialism since the end of the 19th century, the entire world has become the economic territory of monopoly capitalism. There is no part of the world that is not somehow a field of investment, market, source of raw materials or position of strength for the imperialist countries. Surpassing the mercantilistic thrust of old-type colonialism, which had promoted the commodity system of production, but which had left so much of the world still in the realm of the natural economy of self-sufficiency, modern imperialism has blanketed the entire globe with the commodity system of production.

At the beginning of the 20th century, no part of the world fell beyond the tentacles of colonial and imperialist powers. Beyond the homegrounds of these powers were countries that were either colonies, semicolonies or dependent countries. It would entail war for any imperialist power or group of imperialist powers to redivide the world according to their growing economic and military power.

Wars have occurred because the crisis of overproduction constricts the market for the growing imperialist powers and generates within the imperialist countries the economic and political forces and currents that demand expansion and war. The real motivations for war are misrepresented when the imperialist warmakers and warmongers express these in terms of “civilizing” mission, Christianity, democracy, human rights, humanitarianism or peacekeeping.

World War I (1914-1918) broke out as the first interimperialist war between the Allies (Great Britain, France, Russia and US) and the Central Powers (Germany, Austria-Hungary and Turkey). This was preceded by the crisis of overproduction and by jostling for economic territory in various parts of the world. Such latecomers in the colonial game as Germany, Japan and the United States had persisted in pushing over the old and weakened colonial powers and trying to erect their own colonial domain since the waning years of the 19th century. Their imperialist drive and ambitions upset the old balance of power.

Tens of millions died in World War I. British imperialism, prominently supported by US imperialism, led the pack of winners. But the war led to the establishment of the first socialist state in one-sixth of the world, at the weakest link in the chain of imperialist powers. The victory of the Bolsheviks also served to arouse the national and democratic aspirations of the oppressed peoples and nations. From the beginning, the imperialists hated the proletarian revolutionaries. They instigated civil war, unleashed an interventionist war against the proletarian state and imposed an economic blockade against it all the way.

World War II (1939-1945) broke out essentially as an interimperialist war even as the Soviet Union joined the Allies against the worse side of imperialism, the Axis powers. Before and during the war, the fascists set as their special mission the destruction of the communist parties and the Soviet Union. The world war came from the concatenation of the Great Depression,

the intensified contradictions among the imperialist powers and the rise of fascism. Again tens of millions of people died in the war.

The Soviet Union suffered more than 20 million dead as it bore the main brunt of the war offensive of Nazi Germany. But it carried out the strategic counterattack that broke the backbone of the Axis Powers. China also suffered more than ten million dead, as it became the main arena as well as the main graveyard of Japanese aggression in the Far East. The scale of the war was unprecedented in the entire history of mankind.

As in World War I, US imperialism took advantage of its geographic position and profited tremendously by engaging in war production, for a while supplying both sides of the war and later joining in the fray late in the day to pick up the lion's share in the spoils of war. It emerged as the strongest imperialist power after World War II, pushing aside British imperialism to a secondary waning position.

To preempt a Soviet offensive on Japan, US imperialism dropped the atom bomb on Hiroshima and Nagasaki even as Japan was already poised to surrender. The atom bombing of the civilian population was in fact the signal act for the beginning of the Cold War, which would be declared only much later. The US was terrified by the demonstrated strength of the Soviet Union and by the advancing forces of socialism and national liberation movements in Europe and Asia.

The outcome of World War II was worse for the entire world capitalist system than World War I. Several socialist countries and people's democracies arose in one-third of the world. With one-fourth of humanity, China became the biggest loss for the world capitalist system. A great wave of national liberation movements emerged and tended to take the road of new-democratic revolution in the continents of Asia, Africa and Latin America.

The Cold War ran for most of the second half of the 20th century. In Europe especially, a strategic stalemate existed between the US and the Soviet Union with both sides avoiding a world war, especially after the latter developed its own nuclear weapons. For half a century, there was neither a hot world war among imperialist powers nor one between the imperialist powers and the socialist countries. But in fact the Cold War involved a series of wars of aggression launched by US imperialism and its local reactionary allies in various countries.

The US waged the most brutal wars of aggression against Korea, Vietnam and the rest of Indochina where the death toll for the people ran into many millions. It conducted anticommunist campaigns of suppression in Asia, Africa and Latin America from the late '40s onward and instigated massacres, of which the biggest was of more than one million people in Indonesia in 1965. In the 70s and 80s, it systematically carried out counterrevolutionary wars under the doctrine of low-intensity conflict in Angola, Mozambique, Nicaragua, El Salvador and Afghanistan. The total death toll in the Cold War ran into millions, comparable in magnitude to a world war. Thus, the Cold War was practically World War III.

The wars unleashed by monopoly capitalism have made the 20th the bloodiest century in the entire history of mankind. And under conditions of imperialist domination, the people of the world in their billions have suffered excruciating oppression and exploitation. Even in the socialist and anti-imperialist countries, the people have suffered US economic blockade and the threats and acts of intervention. And yet the "civil society" propaganda of the imperialists and their special agents focus on depicting the armed revolutions of the proletariat and the people, as the source of war and "uncivility".

To override its contradictions with its imperialist allies, especially after the economic reconstruction of West Germany and Japan in

the course of the Cold War, the US incurred high trade and budgetary deficits and heavy public borrowing in order to accommodate its allies in the US and world capitalist market, engage in war production and maintain US military bases and forces overseas and spend for military and space research and development. As the Soviet Union further turned away from socialism to state monopoly capitalism and social imperialism, the Cold War became an interimperialist struggle between the US-led imperialist alliance and Soviet social-imperialism.

To win the Cold War, the US and other traditional imperialist powers used the full power of the state and state monopoly capitalism. In the name of an anticommunist crusade, they used tremendous amounts of social wealth to defeat the Soviet Union. However, the Soviet Union was defeated principally due to the internal factors of modern revisionism, the rise of the new bourgeoisie, social degeneration and wastage of resources in the arms race. The US and its imperialist allies did not defeat the Soviet Union in a shooting war but rendered its highly developed military power impotent by inducing the new bourgeoisie within the Soviet Union to degrade the Soviet economy under the guise of reforms and integrate it fully into the world capitalist system.

The victory of US imperialism and the traditional imperialist powers in the Cold War is a Pyrrhic kind of victory. US imperialism carries over from the Cold War certain fatal weaknesses which it can try to overcome only by coming into serious contradictions with its own imperialist allies. It continues to suffer the effect of the high costs incurred in waging the Cold War. The crisis of the world capitalist system has gone from bad to worse. All basic contradictions in the world capitalist system, such as between the proletariat and the monopoly bourgeoisie, between the imperialist countries and the oppressed peoples and among the imperialists, are intensifying and have ushered in a new world disorder.

II. The Trend Towards More and Bigger Wars

In the last decade of the 20th century, the trend towards more and bigger wars is well established. This is most glaringly exposed by the series of wars of aggression against Iraq and against Yugoslavia. Social and political turbulence is rising from year to year, contrary to previous propaganda of the imperialists and their camp followers that the end of the Cold War would yield a “peace dividend”, like ensuring global economic growth and promoting human rights, democratization and civil society.

The sole superpower is more arrogant than ever before in herding its imperialist allies towards war and in imposing itself on client countries. It is quick to make and carry out military threats. The weapons it uses against other countries include political interference in internal affairs, withholding of loans and supplies, reduction of market accommodations and military pressure, intervention and aggression, including use of high-tech military weaponry. It demonizes as “rogue” states those states that defend their national independence and thereby seeks to intimidate all client countries to stay under the sway of neocolonialism.

The US and its imperialist allies practice terrorism at the level of state-to-state relations and at the level of confronting the proletarian revolutionary parties and anti-imperialist mass movements. They tack the label “terrorist” on all anti-imperialist forces and thus rationalize all sorts of barbarities that they inflict upon them. The fevered language of imperialism reflects the intensifying contradictions in the world and their own propensity, together with their local reactionary puppets, to use brute force against the people.

The shift in stress of imperialist policy from Keynesian to neoliberal fits in with the US scheme to recover from the heavy cost incurred in order to win the Cold War. Under the pretext of promoting the “free market”, US monopoly capitalism accelerates the rate of exploitation and the appropriation of state resources, takes advantage of its imperialist allies in so many

ways and withdraws from the underdeveloped countries the false promise of development.

Originally, the neoliberal shift of stress in economic policy was aimed at countering the phenomenon of stagflation, which was blamed on supposedly rising wage levels and big government spending. However, the policymakers underplayed as factors of stagflation the cost-push effect of high military spending in the arms race, the US war of aggression in Indochina, the US deployment of military forces abroad and the growing global crisis of overproduction from the reconstruction and competitiveness of Japan and West Germany.

To this day, the US and its imperialist allies acclaim neoliberalism as their common policy stress. The naked common interest of the monopolies is to squeeze more profits from the proletariat, cut back on social benefits, enjoy tax deductions and exemptions and grab state assets and funds. These are done under the rationale of fighting inflation and making more capital available to the monopoly firms for the purpose of economic growth and job generation.

The result is rapid concentration and centralization of capital in the hands of the monopolies, the inflation of assets in the hands of the monopoly bourgeoisie, the chronic mass unemployment and stagnant growth rates, averaging between two and three percent for all the OECD countries in the last ten years.

Relative to the European Union and Japan, which have lower growth and profit rates and openly high rates of unemployment, the US has the most buoyant and strongest economy. But in fact, the relatively high US growth rate is largely accounted for by the inflation of monopoly assets and by the flow of investments from Japan and Western Europe. What the US presents as full employment is characterized by replacement of regular jobs with part-time jobs.

So far, the US is able to hold its No. 1 economic position but this is at the expense of its imperialist allies. It has revived its manufacturing capacity for export and has therefore cut down the global market for its imperialist allies. However, it has failed to reduce its trade deficit and colossal foreign debt. It maintains a high level of military spending and consumption through foreign borrowing. Thus, it retains its title as the world's No. 1 debtor.

The aggravation of exploitative relations under the flag of neoliberalism and the adoption of higher technology in social production are an explosive combination in the imperialist countries. This spells the chronic global crisis of overproduction and stagnation. Productivity in all types of goods is so high and yet concentration of both productive and finance capital by the monopoly bourgeoisie is so fast. Thus, effective demand in the global market has shrunk.

The crisis of overproduction in all types of goods, industrial and agricultural, intensifies interimperialist competition. Despite paeans to “free trade” and the WTO, there is growing protectionism under various guises among the imperialist countries. Frictions among them are increasing over the issue of dumping various types of goods. Thus, the trend grows towards cutthroat competition in the face of the shrinking global market.

Even as the US strives to preserve its No.1 position as economic and military superpower, interimperialist competition is intensifying and leading to multipolarization. The European Union is a form of consolidation in competition with the US. Japan is also consolidating itself to be competitive with the US, especially in East Asia. Everyone of the three global centers of capitalism is trying to consolidate its domestic and regional markets and penetrate those of the others.

The dozen or so “emergent markets”, all clients previously favored with inflows of foreign investments from the imperialist countries have been sinking since 1997. They are stricken by a

global crisis of overproduction in all their export specialties. Contrary to the expectations of the imperialists, they have ceased to be the expanding market for imperialist goods in exchange for their export income from their export specialties.

This is true in the case of South Korea, Taiwan and Brazil (which produce and export cars, home appliances and steel), China and Southeast Asia (semiconductors, garments, shoes and toys) and Russia and Mexico (oil and gas). Plant overcapacity, upper-class overconsumption and dwindling export incomes have led to huge trade deficits and default on loan payments. Their bank defaults have caused one global wave of financial crisis after another since 1997.

All countries which in the past had built an industrial foundation or some basic industries either under the banner of socialism or bourgeois nationalism have been stricken by the global crisis of overproduction, have shut down industrial plants, have disemployed vast numbers of workers and are now crushed by heavy debt burdens. All of them are economically depressed.

They are sinking in the direction of raw-material exporting countries which have become depressed since the late '70s when the crisis of overproduction hit the raw materials. It must be recalled that the imperialists had derailed in the 60s and 70s the demand of the underdeveloped countries for development by directing foreign loans mainly to programs of building infrastructure and enhancing raw-material production. Now, even the few countries that have tried to become "emergent markets", mostly in the style of China and Southeast Asia, find themselves in dire economic straits due to the global glut in consumer semimanufactures for export to the imperialist countries.

Under the conditions of rapidly worsening economic crisis of the world capitalist system, the consequent political crisis is spawning all kinds of counterrevolutionary forces and generating all kinds of counterrevolutionary violence. It must be

remembered from history that the impulse for war in an imperialist country passes from economic crisis to political crisis.

In the imperialist countries, the monopoly bourgeoisie anticipates the intensification of the class struggle. Thus, it pushes antilabor, antiwelfare and so-called antiterrorist legislation, encourages nationalist, fascist and racist propaganda and groups and increases spending for military and police forces at the expense of social welfare and social services.

The US is strengthening its bilateral and multilateral alliances, like the NATO in Europe and the US-Japan strategic partnership in East Asia. The US also uses the OSCE as a framework for manipulating European states and involving them in imperialist acts of intervention and aggression. Whenever possible, the US uses the UN Security Council to legitimize its wars of aggression. It has taken advantage of its role of sole superpower and its possession of high-tech weaponry and has launched a series of major wars of aggression.

In carrying out under UN flag the wars of aggression against Iraq, it has succeeded in tightening its control of the oil resources and oil income of client countries in the Middle East. It stirs up troubles in the Balkans in order to gain more ground from its bases in Western Europe and Turkey. After conceding Croatia and Slovenia to German influence, it has taken control over Bosnia, Macedonia and Albania under the guise of fighting Yugoslavia. It is already proclaiming that its current war of aggression against Yugoslavia over the question of Kosovo is decisive in converting all the Balkan states into US and NATO protectorates.

US strategic objective is to control both sides of the Mediterranean and all flanks of Russia in order to control oil resources on a wider scale and keep its own NATO allies subordinate to its hegemony. The disintegration of the Soviet Union and the subordination of Russia to the West have enabled

the US and the NATO to launch wars of aggression in Europe. The US is carried away by the arrogance that it can launch a war of aggression with impunity and subjugate any country.

By enlarging the NATO (with the inclusion of the Czech Republic, Poland and Hungary) and expanding it to the borders of Russia, the US lays the ground for US involvement in more and bigger wars across Central and Eastern Europe and within Russia. By having used the forces of NATO for aggression in the Middle East and the Balkans, the US has agitated a broad array of Russian political forces to threats posed by US intervention and aggression. The Caucasus and the former Central Asian republics of the Soviet Union continue as areas of internecine warfare and the US has interest in their oil resources and oil passage to the Mediterranean.

In the meantime, the US has a pliant partner in Yeltsin, the chief political representative of the criminal new bourgeoisie that gorges on public assets and pockets every inflow of IMF bailout funds. Yeltsin and his pack serve the US strategic policy of further weakening Russia economically and socially and thereby letting the high-tech weapons system of Russia deteriorate.

Russia has become so desperate that it is subject to two trends: one is increasing subservience to the Western imperialist powers and the other is polarization between the criminal new bourgeoisie and a broad array of opposition on an immediate basis as well as between the opposite currents of military fascism and proletarian revolution on a longer basis.

Beneath the success at continuous expansion, the US is germinating future problems with its own major imperialist allies. By pushing Germany and Japan to participate and share the costs in wars of aggression and intervention, it is practically encouraging them to strengthen themselves militarily and follow their own imperialist impulses.

In many respects, the economies of China and Russia are complementary. This can be the basis for a political and military strategic partnership. Russia is threatened by the NATO in Europe and by the US-Japan security partnership in the Far East. So is China threatened by the US-Japan security partnership. However, the US can also play off one country against the other or either one of these two can play off one against the US. Farther in the political horizon, Russia can also play off the European Union against the US just as China can play off Japan against the US.

The US maintains a dual policy towards China. One aspect is to “engage” China and induce it to degrade itself further into a US neocolony and throw away the signboard of socialism and the communist party as the Soviet Union had done. The other aspect is to “contain” China with the US-Japan strategic partnership and possibly to manipulate the India-Pakistan contradiction in order to keep it pre-occupied on another flank.

At present, the prevalent strategic position of the US towards China is to “engage” it even as certain sections of US officialdom conjure illusions of China’s growing industrial and military might and claim that China would become the No. 1 enemy of the US in the 21st century. But within China, economic and social conditions continue to deteriorate in a profound way and social contradictions are generating political instability. There are the contradictions between one section of the new bourgeoisie that still wants to retain the signboard of socialism and the communist party and another section that wants to get rid of these.

China has in fact been weakened economically and socially by its capitalist-oriented reforms and full-scale restoration of capitalism, by its concentration on the semimanufacture of low value-added consumer goods for export and on prolonged splurges of private construction and by the ongoing dismantling of its state-owned industrial foundation. The growing weakness

of China is an open invitation to Japan and the Western imperialist powers to intervene in its internal affairs.

The deep-seated instability of China spawned by the restoration of capitalism has been exposed since 1989 by the mass uprisings not only in Beijing but in more than 80 cities and by recurrent peasant uprisings and workers strikes in the 90s. While it has a strong preference for a gradual “democratization” of China, as in Russia, US imperialism is also prepared for aggressive action against China. In this regard, the US-Japan security partnership has been further strengthened as the supposed protector of Taiwan and South Korea, as the counter to China and North Korea, as the guard at the back of Russia, as guarantor of peace and security for “free trade” and “democracy” against revolutionary movements in East Asia and as base for rapid deployment forces to the Middle East.

In an increasing number of countries in Asia, Africa, Latin America and the former Soviet bloc, the social and political turbulence has taken the form of coups and countercoups, mass uprisings, internecine warfare among reactionary forces, recurrent civil wars of varying s and protracted people’s wars.

Outbreaks of counterrevolutionary violence are still predominant. Conflicting reactionary forces invoke the slogans of ethnocentrism and religion. Some pedants call these the “war of civilizations”. But in fact, the social strife is always preceded and caused by economic and social devastation inflicted by the foreign monopoly firms and by such multilateral agencies of imperialism as the IMF, World Bank and WTO.

As a result of economic and social devastation wrought by imperialism and in the absence of any strong revolutionary party of the proletariat or revolutionary movement, the local reactionaries compete for local power by resorting to chauvinistic, religious and other reactionary slogans, either upon the instigation of the imperialists or upon their own initiative.

The chain of events leading to the big massacre in Rwanda in 1994 as well as that leading to the breakup of Yugoslavia, to the more complex communal strife in Bosnia and further on to the current US and NATO war of aggression on Yugoslavia started with the economic and social crisis generated by imperialism.

The collapse of the so-called emergent markets has caused social turbulence and the downfall of Suharto in Indonesia. Now, the US-directed military forces manipulate ethnic and religious differences and instigate communal strife in order to draw away the people's wrath from US imperialism and from Suharto and his henchmen, prolong the role of the military fascists as social arbiters and preempt the advance of the people's revolutionary movement.

Imperialism is responsible for the sequence of economic devastation and political turmoil, either in instances when it appears to have no "vital interest" in the non-oil raw materials of a client country and seems not to care enough to intervene or in those instances when it grandiloquently claims humanitarian interest and intervenes brazenly and aggressively because of more obvious extraterritorial interests. Imperialism is responsible for the abject economic and social conditions preceding the political turmoil that led to the massacre of more than one million people in Rwanda, more than 250,000 people in Bosnia and so many deaths in internecine warfare elsewhere.

There are revolutionary armed struggles that are anti-imperialist and democratic in varying degrees, such as those overthrowing long-running despots like Mobutu of the Congo and Suharto of Indonesia, and there are protracted people's wars along the line of the new-democratic revolution, with a socialist perspective, under the leadership of Marxist-Leninist-Maoist parties. These revolutionary armed struggles of the people are of great importance in overriding the senseless armed conflicts where only the reactionary forces vie for power and in contributing to

the defeat of imperialism and the victory of the world proletarian revolution.

III. The People's Struggle Against War

The worsening crisis of the world capitalist system and the intolerable oppression and exploitation impel the proletariat and people of the world to struggle against imperialism and therefore against war in the industrial capitalist countries, in former socialist countries, in countries with anti-imperialist governments and in so many depressed raw-material exporting countries.

In all major imperialist countries, like the United States, Japan, Germany, France and Britain, the class struggle between the proletariat and the monopoly bourgeoisie is steadily coming to the surface. Workers strikes are occurring in key industries and some entire industrial lines. Occasionally, there are general strikes.

What is currently significant about these strikes is that they constitute a breakthrough. They must be seen against a backdrop of the erosion of the trade union movement from decade to decade since the late 50s, and the predominance of the labor aristocracy in what has remained of the movement. Now there is a growing desire among the workers to form militant unions that are genuinely in their class interest.

The West European workers have been running ahead of the American and Japanese workers in launching strikes. The most frequent and widespread strikes and mass protests are in the lesser industrial capitalist countries, such as Spain, Greece and Portugal, because of the higher rates of unemployment and worse social conditions. So far, American workers have launched more strikes than their Japanese counterparts. They have reacted more strongly against mass layoffs and plant closures and being pushed into part-time jobs.

But the Japanese workers are poised to break out of the clutches of the discredited labor aristocracy and company paternalism. Japan is the major imperialist power hit hardest by the crisis. In nearby South Korea, the workers have launched large and sustained general strikes because of the abrupt plant closures and mass unemployment.

The social disaster is so grave that the US, Japan and their South Korean puppets have been frustrated in their scheme to use South Korea for baiting North Korea and take advantage of the natural calamities in the latter.

In the industrial capitalist countries, conditions are favorable for building Marxist-Leninist parties, progressive trade unions, other basic mass organizations and solidarity organizations in support of other peoples. The proletariat and people have growing contempt and hatred for the monopoly bourgeoisie, the labor aristocracy, the entire array of conservative and pseudoprogressive parties and the currents of revisionism and reformism.

The unemployed, the women, the youth and the migrant workers join up with the workers still on the job in mass protest actions. They take up common issues affecting every aspect of their social life. Together with the proletariat, they fight for the immediate improvement of social conditions as well as for the strategic aim of building socialism. They also stand in solidarity with the peoples who are struggling for national liberation, people's democracy and socialism against imperialist domination, economic blockade, intervention and aggression.

Throughout the world, the workers are rising up against the so-called labor flexibility policy which robs them of job security, hard-won employment benefits and all basic democratic rights. This policy is at the base of the neoliberal policy regime which encourages the monopoly capitalists aided by the state to inflict the most brutal forms of exploitation on the workers.

The workers have therefore fought back with strikes in the imperialist countries and in the industrial enclaves in the client countries. There is growing consciousness among them of the need for a genuine and strong trade union movement against the efforts of the monopoly bourgeoisie to outrightly destroy unions or to coopt them in schemes of collaboration with big business and the counterrevolutionary state.

The revisionist betrayal of socialism has set back the historical advance of mankind. The full restoration of capitalism in the former Soviet-bloc countries has resulted in the destruction of productive forces, unleashed the most hideous forms of exploitation and has allowed US imperialism and the NATO to launch a war of aggression in Europe. Both industry and agriculture are further being devastated under the auspices of Western imperialism and the new bourgeoisie. This comes on top of the decades of revisionist betrayal, bureaucratic corruption and economic stagnation since the late '70s.

Mass discontent and disgust are rising, taking the form of general strikes and broad mass protest actions. Some parties and groups strive to uphold the Marxist-Leninist position and to lead the mass struggles of the people. They are under the test of learning from historical experience, applying the revolutionary legacy of Lenin and Stalin and waging the revolutionary struggles of the proletariat and the people.

In Russia, the rapacity of the criminal new bourgeoisie is boundless. After privatizing the most profitable enterprises, this kind of bourgeoisie continues to use state agencies and state resources to further enrich itself. But it evades taxation and payment for goods and services delivered by state agencies and by the remaining state enterprises. The state has become bankrupt and is unable to pay the wages of government workers. Private companies are also delinquent in payment of wages.

Thus, general strikes and mass protests have broken out frequently and on a wide scale.

Having returned fully to capitalism, Russia has reassumed the traditional role of a weak imperialist power similar to its role in the period before WW1. In an all-round way, it is in a desperate situation. Genuine communists are now faced with the challenge of leading the proletariat and the people against the new monopoly bourgeoisie and taking the revolutionary road amidst the cacophony of the nationalists, revisionists and liberals.

The proletariat and the people hate the new bourgeoisie as well as the US and German imperialists and the IMF and other multilateral agencies and the NATO for coming to the borders of Russia and launching the war of aggression against Yugoslavia. In mass protests, they cry out: “First, Iraq, second, Yugoslavia and third, Russia!”

In China, struggles are mounting against shutdowns and production cutbacks in state enterprises, the deteriorating wage conditions in sweatshops, delayed payments for deliveries of the peasants’ produce and proliferating special levies reminiscent of Guomindang rule. Keynesian pump-priming through public works are now being undertaken but cannot solve the bust in the long-favored low-value semimanufacturing-for-export and private construction.

A few proletarian revolutionaries are striving to build a revolutionary communist party in order to promote the legacy of Mao and lead the people on the revolutionary road in order to override the growing struggle between the blatantly anticommunist section of the new bourgeoisie and the revisionist section that continues to carry the signboard of socialism and the communist party. Revolutionary mass organizations and institutions are being developed discreetly even as revolutionary groups are maintained within the discredited ruling party and state.

In posing the dual policy of “engagement” and “containment” with regard to China, the US is pursuing the objective of promoting capitalism and in due course causing the overthrow of the ruling communist party and the reunification of Taiwan with China under US auspices. Insofar as the US and other imperialist powers threaten the national sovereignty and independence of China, the people of the world can and should support the Chinese people, just as they support the people of Cuba, North Korea, Libya, Iraq, Yugoslavia and other countries which are the target of blockades, intervention and aggression by the US and other imperialist powers.

There is a broad range of anti-imperialist forces in the world today. This includes Marxist-Leninist and other revolutionary parties, mass organizations, mass movements, institutions and some governments that stand for national independence. These forces wage various forms of struggle. There is a positive interaction between the broad anti-imperialist struggle and the revolutionary struggle for people’s democracy and socialism

A significant number of armed revolutionary movements for national liberation and democracy are persevering and growing in strength in Asia, Africa and Latin America. Some of these are led by Marxist-Leninist-Maoist parties, as in the Philippines, India, Nepal, Peru and Turkey. They take the general line of national-democratic revolution, with a socialist perspective. Others are led by non-Maoist parties, as in Colombia, Mexico, North Kurdistan, Eelam and several other countries. They are revolutionary to the extent that they fight imperialism and reaction. Beyond the Cold War, all of these signify the continuation of revolutionary struggle against the continuing oppression and exploitation by the imperialists and local reactionaries.

These armed revolutionary movements play the highly significant role of striving to answer the central question of revolution,

which is the armed seizure of political power. They inflict real blows on the imperialists and the local reactionaries and inspire the proletariat and people in other countries to prepare for armed revolution.

The weakest links in the chain of imperialist domination are in the semicolonial and semifeudal countries. These have the overwhelming majority of the people of the world and have large peasant populations. In most of these countries, it is possible to wage protracted people's war along the line of the new-democratic revolution. The devastation being wrought by imperialism in its current crisis has made the ground fertile for protracted people's war.

In this regard, together with other parties, Marxist-Leninist-Maoist parties have come together through a seminar last December in order to uphold the theory and practice of the revolutionary proletariat, promote protracted people's war in semicolonial and semifeudal countries and to gather support for their revolutionary struggles for national liberation and democracy. The Declaration on Mao and People's War issued by the seminar points out the important role of protracted people's war in the semicolonial and semifeudal countries and its dialectical interaction with the revolutionary struggles in other countries.

Upon its distinct initiative, the proletariat in the industrial capitalist countries wages class struggle to weaken imperialism and prepare for armed revolution. They can take advantage of the defeats and weakening of the imperialists abroad. Ultimately, for socialism to triumph over capitalism on a global scale, the proletariat in the imperialist countries must defeat the monopoly bourgeoisie.

It is highly significant and urgent to promote in semicolonial and semifeudal countries the strategic line of encircling the cities from the countryside to build and accumulate armed strength for

a protracted period of time until it becomes possible to seize power in the cities. This line is at present and for a long time to come the soonest possible way to deliver the lethal blows of armed revolution against imperialism and build Red political power in the localities before the nationwide seizure of political power.

The global influence of Mao's theory and practice of people's war was at a high plateau from the victory of the Chinese revolution to the end of the Vietnam war and the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution. But such influence would be countered by strong revisionist influence, the notion of Soviet assistance as the decisive factor and various petty-bourgeois notions of quick military victory, even as the longest lasting armed revolutionary movements, whether Maoist or non-Maoist, have made extensive use of the countryside in practice.

Ironically, when the influence of Mao's strategic line of protracted people's war was being denigrated by revisionist and petty-bourgeois radicals, the US imperialists were succeeding in the use of some kind of rural mass base, ethnocentric or religious, to fight city-based Soviet-supported regimes as in Angola, Mozambique, Nicaragua and Afghanistan. Whereas the Kennedy line of "special war", using counter guerrilla warfare, previously failed in the Vietnam war, Reagan would succeed with the doctrine of low-intensity conflict.

In contrast, it is well proven in the case of the Philippines that when a revolutionary party of the proletariat correctly applies the strategic line of protracted people's war, the imperialists and local reactionaries fail in their efforts to copy and turn the tactics of people's war against the people's army. Anticommunist NGOs, renegades hired as psy-war agents, paramilitary units, armed religious cults and projects designed to pit one community against another have been frustrated by the armed revolutionary movement.

Mao's theory and practice of people's war is a powerful weapon of the world proletarian revolution, when correctly applied in semicolonial and semifeudal countries. As more parties of the proletariat adopt and carry out the strategic line of protracted people's war in such countries, the imperialist powers and their client regimes will find themselves in a steadily losing course.

In countries where the strategic line of protracted people's war is applicable, the high-tech weaponry of the US is impotent, as proven in the Vietnam war. And if more peoples wage revolutionary war along this line, the imperialists and the local reactionaries would be at a loss as to how to cope with close-in fighting and ceaseless hemorrhaging. With their cowardly method of striking from a distance, they will never have enough cruise missiles and laser-guided bombs to target the shacks of the peasants and the people's army.

In the arsenal of the proletariat and the people, protracted people's war is the indispensable weapon for making imperialism a losing enterprise. It can cut the ground from under the feet of the imperialists even before they launch a war of aggression or a world war. It can do so on a far wider scale when the imperialists wage a world war or a big war in one or two regions of the world.

In the history of the Bolsheviks, the workers first seized power in city uprisings. But the war proceeded to the countryside among the peasants in the civil war and in the anti-interventionist war. In the Chinese revolution, however, power was first seized in the countryside over a protracted period of time.

Does it mean then that revolutionary war in the countryside is possible only in countries where the peasants constitute the majority of the population? In countries where the peasants constitute a significant portion of the population but are no longer a majority, a combination or a sequence of armed city uprisings and rural warfare is possible. In some former socialist countries, whose industries have broken down and are being subjected to

compradorization and refeudalization, the proletarian revolution can start the possibilities of rural warfare in conjunction with workers' uprisings. Even in some industrial capitalist countries, under conditions of interimperialist war, some form of rural warfare is possible as in World War II.

To fight imperialism and war and advance the world proletarian revolution, it takes more than waging protracted people's war in semicolonial and semifeudal countries. Advancing the world proletarian revolution in different parts of the world, under different conditions, takes various forms of revolutionary struggle.

At this time, when there is yet no socialist country as the industrial bulwark for the world proletarian revolution, it is of utmost importance to develop the revolutionary movement in both the former socialist countries and in the imperialist countries. Protracted people's wars and other forms of revolutionary struggles in the client countries help the proletariat and people in the imperialist countries to develop their revolutionary movement.

India is a semicolonial and semifeudal but has some amount of basic industries like the Russia of 1917. Unlike India, the Philippines has no basic industries. For the Philippine revolution to pass from the national democratic to the socialist stage, there must be other peoples winning the revolution in their own countries with whom the Filipino people can cooperate in order to establish their own industrial foundation and preempt any imperialist economic blockade.

By waging protracted people's war along the new-democratic line, the Communist Party of the Philippines is now among the Marxist-Leninist parties at the forefront of the struggle against imperialism and reaction. Being at the forefront is something to be proud of but it involves heavy responsibilities, great risks and sacrifices.

Filipino communists hope that in a relatively short period of time so many more peoples take the road of armed revolution. They regard the current period as one of transition from a temporary trough to a new and higher level in the struggle of the proletariat and the people.

We are optimistic that the broad anti-imperialist movement and the world proletarian revolution will resurge and make great strides forward in the 21st century because we see in the last decade of the 20th century the violent, destructive, parasitic and moribund character of imperialism. The Marxist-Leninist parties and the proletariat and peoples of the world must resolutely and militantly prepare for another big round in the epochal struggle between capitalism and socialism. #

17.

The Left on the Eve of the 21st Century⁹

3 September 1999

Q1. The new inter-relation of power that emerged after 1989 in the world provoked many debates on issues such as: Is the world multi-polar? Which are the relations between the three poles (USA-Europe/Germany-Japan) of the capitalist imperialist system? Is there a dominating super-power, and if yes, up to which extent it is dominating? Which is your opinion about all these questions and about the changes in the international situation since 1989?

JMS: From 1989 onwards, the US has emerged dramatically as the sole superpower. It is still at the head of the imperialist alliance and can dictate upon its own imperialist allies, Japan and the European Union. It has turned Russia into a running dog. That is the outcome of the Cold War as a struggle of two superpowers.

In terms of military power, it is by far the strongest among the imperialist powers, especially if we take note of its lead in high-tech weaponry. In economic terms, it has the lead in new technology and attracts investments in US stocks and bonds from Japan and the European Union even if such investments tend to depress their own economies.

In the long run, the overconcentration of political, economic and military power in the hands of the US will exacerbate contradictions with Japan and the European Union. All three centers of capitalism always try to unite at the expense of the

⁹ An Interview by aristera@orthodox.com

proletariat and oppressed peoples. But they always compete with each other.

The interimperialist competition will intensify as the chronic crisis of imperialism worsens. The US position has certain fundamental weaknesses such as strategic overextension and costliness of its high-tech weapons systems in the military field and its colossal federal debt and chronic trade deficits.

The US can reduce its problems only by taking advantage of its own imperialist allies and provoking their reaction. It is always trying to seize the initiative and requiring its allies to share the costs but always grabs most of the spoils. Thus, multipolarization underlies the present dominance of the US and will ultimately break out.

Q2. What can we say more concretely about two basic links of the world system, i.e. Russia and China? In your opinion, will Russia become an independent imperialist pole, will it break the umbilical cord with the West? Or it will be limited in a role similar to that of czarist Russia in the beginning of our century? China will be a subject of a process of restoration similar to those that we saw and were completed with the changes of 1989 in the ex-Soviet bloc? Or we can expect that it will follow a different course? Which will be the attitude of western imperialism towards China?

JMS: At a glance, Russia and China have become fields of capitalist expansion. But the type of capitalism that is growing in these countries has a big comprador character in tandem with

bureaucrat capitalism. The industrial foundation is in the process of destruction and social wealth is systematically being siphoned off the country.

The flagrant robbery of public assets, the rampant corruption, the imperialist impositions and the impoverishment and misery of the people are generating strong currents of popular resistance as well as bourgeois nationalism. Especially in the long run, Russia and China are major factors in making the world unstable for the US and the other imperialist powers.

As of now, Russia is like the Russia of czarist times, overloaded with loans and manipulated by creditors. The US and the other two global centers of capitalism deliberately pursue the policy of degrading the economy of Russia in order to degrade its weapons systems.

But the economic and social degradation can lead to military fascism or proletarian revolution. Military fascism is more likely to emerge before a proletarian revolution. In fact, the social fascism of revisionism has continued in the form of Yeltsin's despotism and the criminal character of the bourgeoisie. The rise of military fascism in Russia will generate big problems for all and for each of the three centers of world capitalism.

It took several decades for the revisionists to deceive the proletariat and people and to reach the point of blatant privatization. That explains why the proletariat and the people are not so ready yet to overthrow the bourgeoisie. But objective conditions have become exceedingly favorable for building a Marxist-Leninist party in the great tradition of the Bolsheviks and for developing a revolutionary mass movement.

In China, the restoration of capitalism during the last two decades under Dengism has been far more rapid, more direct and more deepgoing than during the first two decades of revisionist rule in the Soviet Union. Since the very beginning of the Dengist

counterrevolution, public assets have been openly privatized, with the return of capital to former big compradors, the breakup of the communes under the guise of the household responsibility system and the privatization of enterprises under the guise of management lease contract.

Blatant privatization of agriculture, industry and services have already gone on for one whole generation in China. The state sector of the economy has been undermined and is run by bureaucrat capitalists. Imperialist and big comprador enterprises are the driving forces of neocolonialism in the Chinese economy. The whole of China has been Taiwanized in economic and social terms. The remaining task of the new bourgeoisie is to cast away the name of the Communist Party and the ritualistic reference to socialism.

The US policy of engagement towards China, despite the policy of containment underlying it, is calculated to allow China to take the relatively peaceful way of casting away the name of the Communist Party and socialist pretenses as in the case of the former Soviet Union. Economic "liberalization" has long paved the way for political "liberalization".

However, there are possibilities of great turbulence in China because of the worsening economic and social crisis. The rabid anticommunists can become too aggressive or the real communists are inspired by the legacy of Mao and lead the people to revolution. US and Japan can also mishandle China and generate troubles within and around China. For instance, they can mishandle the issue of Taiwan.

There is the possibility for Russia and China to work out a strategic partnership in the face of US policies that are too aggressive or too exploitative. For instance, China needs a lot of oil from Russia and the latter needs a lot of consumer goods from the former.

Such a partnership can compensate for the weaknesses of each and can upset the balance of power among the three global centers of capitalism. Russia and China can play off these three against each other. But the big drawback for such a partnership is that each of Russia and China is deteriorating economically and socially and is subject to manipulation by the imperialist powers through the domestic comprador big bourgeoisie. The imperialists can also try to play off Russia and China against each other.

Q3. Maybe you would like to add something more specific about Asia, and especially the regions that witness a certain tension lately: India/Pakistan and Korea. What do you believe about the situation in those countries, and generally about the region of Asia?

JMS: The US maintains and increases its strategic hold over Asia. It does so singly as well as in partnership with Japan and through such multilateral agencies as the IMF, World Bank and WTO. But the contradictions between the US and Japan can flare up as a result of the worsening chronic crisis of overproduction and complications arising from the anti-imperialist resistance of the oppressed people.

The US continues to bully the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and even China over the issue of Taiwan. The strategic purpose of the US is to pursue to the end its crusade of eliminating any communist party, even if that party is a phony one, and in the process to involve Japan in US strategic plans of containment.

The US needs Japan as a military adjutant but is at the same time wary of its nationalist and militarist tradition and tendency. In connection with its scheme of putting up a theatre missile defense system, the US is trying to bind Japan and South Korea against both China and North Korea.

Even while pontificating against nuclear proliferation, the US is ever willing to play off Pakistan and India against each other now and then in order to preempt the possible extension of a Sino-Russia partnership to South Asia and to give China a problem on its western flank.

The US is not really so much bothered by the nuclear weapons of both India and Pakistan because these are limited and are not pointed against the US. It preaches against the possession of nuclear weapons by the two countries only because it constantly wishes to monopolize nuclear power and to discourage the nuclear development program of North Korea.

As proletarian revolutionaries, we should recognize the far reaching consequences of the proven bankruptcy of the neoliberal economic policy stress of imperialism and the unprecedented devastation of productive forces in Asia. All that previous hype about East Asia or the Asia-Pacific region as the lead factor in the ceaseless growth area of a global capitalist economy has been negated.

Japan has been in a decade-long state of depression. The so-called economic tigers of the past are sick. The so-called emergent markets have sunk and continue to sink. Social turmoil in China and the rest of Asia in the first decade of the 21st century is now in the horizon.

The objective conditions for carrying out protracted people's war in several Asian countries are excellent, especially in Southeast Asia and South Asia. People's war is already being waged by Marxist-Leninist-Maoist parties in the Philippines, India and Nepal. Indonesia is ripe for people's war. It is foreseeable that China and Indochina will become hotbeds of social unrest in the next decade.

4. The USA-Japan antagonism in the region of Asia seems to be intensified again. How do you estimate, in this context, the recent agreement between the USA and Japan for the continuation of their military cooperation?

JMS: The new security guidelines further bind the US and Japan in a strategic military partnership against the people of Asia. The guidelines seek to favor the US at the expense of the Japanese people but at the same time gives Japan the license to build up its own military power and intervene anywhere in Asia.

While the NATO is the western pincer, US-Japan security partnership is the eastern pincer of US global strategy, which is aimed at containing either one or both of Russia and China. At the moment, it is in the sphere of economic relations that US-Japan contradictions are becoming conspicuous.

The US has ceased to give Japan concessions in technical licensing agreements and has taken the lead in producing consumer electronics, telecommunications and cars. Japan's export of steel and other products to the US is increasingly being restricted. There is cutthroat competition between the US and Japan in a widening range of products.

At the same time, the US wants to further penetrate Japan. It has long been pressuring Japan to open itself to US investments in all sorts of businesses, US consumer goods and US takeover of financial services. It is taking advantage of the prolonged depression of the Japanese economy.

A major factor in the economic depression in Japan is the competition with the US and increasing restrictions on Japanese goods in the US market. At the cost of depressing its own domestic economy, Japan has long been compelled by the US to

invest too heavily in the US and elsewhere under conditions of increasing competition from the US and Euroland.

The policy of the Japanese monopoly bourgeoisie is to reap profits even in ways that increase unemployment in Japan. It is also whipping up chauvinism and rearmament in order to preempt the resurgence of the Japanese working class movement.

In the long run, the US and Japan will be in severe contradiction with each other in an all-round way when chauvinist and militarist forces gain dominance in Japanese politics, as a result of the protracted depression of the Japanese economy. #

18.

IMPERIALISM, FASCISATION AND FASCISM¹⁰

2-4 May 2000

Comrades,

It is of great importance to the proletariat and the rest of the people of the world, in their current struggle against imperialism and for national liberation, democracy and socialism, that we review the phenomenon of fascism before World War II.

In this regard, I have been asked to focus on German fascism in consonance with the theme of the conference, imperialism, fascisation and fascism. It is appropriate to focus on the chieftain of the Axis powers and stay within the time allotted by the seminar. There is simply no time to deal with some depth on the phenomenon of fascism in other countries.

Even as we focus on German fascism, we should refer to a large historical context, involving the development and general crisis of monopoly capitalism, the struggle between the proletariat and monopoly bourgeoisie and the correlation of the fascists, the social democrats and the communists in the time of the Weimar republic.

Most importantly, our historical review must be useful to the understanding of the persistence and further development of the factors that generate fascism and war up to the current circumstances so that we can find guidance for the current revolutionary struggle. Necessarily, we must consider all the stages of the general crisis of monopoly capitalism up to the present so that we can grasp the current status, tasks and prospects of the revolutionary forces and people against imperialism, fascist reaction and revisionism.

¹⁰ Contribution to the Brussels Seminar

Imperialism, Fascisation and Fascism

Even when monopoly capitalism was becoming dominant in the most developed industrial capitalist countries from the 1870's onward, the monopoly bourgeoisie trumpeted the doctrine of laissez faire. This had been the battlecry of the pre-monopoly bourgeoisie against state trading monopolies and regulations.

By the last quarter of the century of the 19th century, the monopoly bourgeoisie was supplanting free competition with monopoly, consolidating a monopoly bourgeois state and using it to oppress and exploit the working class. When the global era of modern imperialism came about at the beginning of the 20th century, the monopoly bourgeoisie of one country, which had combined industrial and bank capital to form finance capital, used the state in protecting its own industries and competing with the monopoly bourgeoisie of other countries for markets, sources of raw materials, fields of investment and domination of colonies, semicolonies and dependent countries.

The imperialists prated about free trade only to protect their national and ultranational economic interests and to bring about wars on a widening scale for the redivision of the world. Imperialism took final shape as the highest stage of capitalism from 1898 to 1914. The Spanish-American war (1898), the Anglo-Boer war (1899-1902), the Russo-Japanese war (1904-5) and the economic crisis in Europe in 1900 marked the advent of the global era of modern imperialism.

Some imperialist countries, such as England, had the advantage of having colonial possessions even before the imperialist era. Other imperialists like the US, Germany and Japan were late comers in the business of acquiring colonies and became catalysts for a redivision of the world through war. To back up the expansion of capital, the monopoly bourgeoisie in all imperialist countries initiated a certain form of state monopoly capitalism

either through state equity in strategic industries or through war-related supply contracts and subsidies.

As monopoly capitalism developed in Germany, the class struggle between the monopoly bourgeoisie and the proletariat intensified, as in the rest of Europe. In the course of the class struggle, the working class movement grew in strength. By the last decade of the 19th century, Marxism became the dominant trend in the working class movement. The German Social-Democratic Party was the biggest party and mainstay of the Second International.

After all previous efforts to suppress socialism since the time of Bismarck, the monopoly bourgeoisie came to terms with the irrepressible social-democratic party and sought to cultivate the reformists within it. Bernstein was the first to arise as the leader of revisionism, advocating evolutionary socialism under the auspices of the bourgeois state. Then his former protagonist Kautsky himself became revisionist and made revisionism the main trend in the Second International.

Social democracy pronouncedly became bourgeois liberalism dressed up in Marxist and socialist phraseology. It was a petty-bourgeois ideology in the service of the monopoly bourgeoisie. The social-democratic leaders espoused reformism and carried out class collaboration with the monopoly bourgeoisie. They supported the strengthening of the monopoly bourgeois state and the colonization of the oppressed peoples and nations. It is instructive to study Lenin's works that upheld the revolutionary essence of Marxism and comprehensively and profoundly opposed the revisionist renegade line of Kautsky and his followers.

When the imperialist powers prepared for war in connection with the intensifying struggle for a redivision of economic territory, the social democrats voted for war credits, with the verbiage of social-chauvinism and social-pacifism. When the war broke out,

they were embarrassed but not embarrassed to death, as later events would show.

World War I broke out in 1914 as a culmination of the first stage in the general crisis of monopoly capitalism. It had a disastrous consequence for the world capitalist system in that the imperialist powers tried to destroy each other and consequently the Bolsheviks and the proletariat turned the imperialist war into a revolutionary civil war and triumphed in the weakest link of the chain of imperialist powers, in Russia, which is one-sixth of the world.

Germany and its cohorts lost the war among the imperialist powers. Proletarian revolutions broke out in Central Europe. Workers were able to seize power but lost it because of betrayal by the dominant class collaborationist section of the social-democratic movement. The most important of these revolutions was the German revolution of November 1918.

The Spartacists and Independents had the majority in the Berlin Council of Workers and Soldiers' Soviets. But the Independents did not follow the lead of Liebknecht in rejecting the approach of the discredited class collaborationist leaders of the social-democratic party and allowed them to regain political prominence and to penetrate and betray the leadership of the revolution.

The German monopoly bourgeoisie, shaken by defeat in the war, the victory of the Russian revolution, the German revolution of 1918 and the aggravated economic crisis, recognized more than ever before the necessity of retaining the services of the social-democratic party as the special tool for chaining the working class to the bourgeois state and for preventing the advance of the German communists and the proletarian revolutionary movement.

As Lenin pointed out, the development of state monopoly capitalism would accelerate after World War I. The monopoly

bourgeoisie of all imperialist countries, both winners and losers in the preceding war, had to use the state to concentrate capital and control the working class for another round of monopoly competition and another war for redividing the world. Especially for a loser like imperialist Germany, the monopoly bourgeoisie had to use the state in order to reconstruct its ruined economy and at the same time pay the exactions of the winners of the previous war.

Persistent in their belief that socialism can evolve peacefully from monopoly capitalism, the social democrats interpreted the accelerated development of state monopoly capitalism as the growing condition for the peaceful evolution of socialism. They believed more than ever before that they could transform the bourgeois state against the monopoly bourgeoisie. They refused to recognize that the private monopoly bourgeoisie directed and controlled state monopoly capitalism at the expense of the working class. Thus, they shunned the proletarian class struggle against the monopoly bourgeoisie and its state.

The German monopoly bourgeoisie favored the social democrats as the most important special instrument for controlling the trade union bureaucracy, splitting the working class and opposing the communists in the period of 1918 to 1930. But subsequently, it increasingly favored the use of the fascists for the outright repression of the communists and the working class movement as the global and domestic economic crisis worsened and the Weimar republic became more unstable. It was also impressed with the fascist suppression of the communists in Italy since 1922.

As an essential part of understanding the rise of the German fascists to power, it is necessary to look at both social democracy and fascism as complementary and alternating tools of the German monopoly bourgeoisie. Social democracy was a tool in the left hand and fascism was another in the right hand of the monopoly bourgeoisie.

The social democrats and fascists had a common class character and a common penchant for demagoguery. They adopted the petty-bourgeois position and appealed to the level of consciousness of the middle social strata, even as the social democrats specialized in building bureaucratic trade unions and the fascists likewise in mobilizing the youth. They used anticapitalist and revolutionary phrasemongering and yet served the monopoly bourgeoisie. Above all, their leaders were similarly anticommunist, although social democracy had a Left current because of its proletarian mass following and the whole of fascism was rabidly anticommunist.

The social democrats and the fascists differed in methods. The social democrats lived on reformism and loyalty to the bourgeois-democratic constitution. The fascists were for the open use of terror against communists, the working class and other political opponents. They ran far wilder than the social democrats in employing demagoguery to make a mass movement. They played up chauvinist, racial and religious prejudices. They combined these with the people's grievances against the Treaty of Versailles, against the capitalists, Junkers and corrupt officials and against the dire economic and social conditions.

In the course of seeking political power, the German fascists gained the confidence of the monopoly bourgeoisie by carrying on rabid anticommunism, disrupting communist meetings and other activities, by breaking up workers' strikes and mauling and killing communists. They collaborated with the military and police and cultivated the officers to become members of the Nazi party. After a fascist gang brutally disrupted a communist activity, the military or police arrested and imprisoned the victims, who would be charged in court and convicted by the judges.

In *Mein Kampf*, Hitler openly admits that to defeat the communists the fascists must steal the color red from them. Thus, he stole the word socialism. The 21-point Nazi program cynically included the following: abolition of unearned income, breaking

off interest slavery, confiscation of unearned income, confiscation of all war profits, nationalization of all trusts, profit-sharing in large concerns, confiscation of land without compensation for communal purposes and death penalty for usurers and profiteers.

Behind the scenes the fascists received profuse contributions of money for their extravagant propaganda from the Krupps and Thyssens, Deterlings and Hohenzollerns. In the critical year of 1932, the monopoly bourgeoisie acclaimed the fascists as the favored tool for misleading the people and combating the communists. It regarded them as the necessary instrument for a "restricted" type of constitution in the consolidation of German capitalism. This scheme is documented in the *Deutsche Führerbriefe*, confidential bulletin of the Federation of German Industry.

The principal leaders of the social democratic party participated in the long-term process of fascisation and facilitated the rise to power of the fascists. They were social-fascists, for being socialist in words but fascist in deed, by having collaborated with the class enemy in suppressing the proletarian revolution of November 1918, by supporting the emergency decrees and other antiworker and antipeople measures in a series of regimes under the Weimar republic and by rebuffing and actively opposing the timely appeals of the communists for an antifascist united front.

Had the social democrats accepted the offer of a united front against the fascists, their combined strength would have been able to isolate and defeat the fascists. In all the elections prior to the chancellorship of Hitler in 1933, the combined votes of the socialists and communists constituted the overwhelming majority. But whenever the communists offered a united front, the social democrats increased their anticommunist propaganda, barred communists from unions and expelled known Left social democrats.

The leaders of the social-democratic party agreed to the appointment of Hitler as chancellor on the weird notion that the fascists would be discredited upon their failure to fulfill their promises. And even after Hitler undertook a series of measures to monopolize political power and repress the communists, the working class and other political opponents, the social-democrat leader Ebert begged Hitler through Hindenberg that the social democrats be tolerated and accommodated under the fascist regime.

The communists made their own mistakes and had their own shortcomings in the course of confronting the rise to power of the fascists. They allowed the fascists to seize the initiative in taking up the people's grievances against the intolerable impositions by the victors of World War I and neglected to pay as much attention as did the fascists to arousing, organizing and mobilizing the youth, the unemployed, the petty bourgeoisie and the urban semiproletarian masses.

Despite the calls of Comrade Thaelman and the Executive Committee of the Communist International for the German communists to pay adequate attention to work within the dominant trade unions under the control of the social democrats, the German communists assigned only about 10 percent of their ranks to this work and sectarianly confined themselves in the Red trade union opposition.

Having come to power, the fascists turned the bourgeois state into an open terrorist dictatorship of the most rabidly reactionary, chauvinist and imperialist elements of finance capital. It was the most ferocious attack by capital on the working people, unbridled chauvinism, predatory war, rabid reaction and counterrevolution and most vicious enemy of the proletariat and all working people.

For a while, the Nazi regime seemed to be able to stabilize the situation and please the monopoly bourgeoisie with the devices of state monopoly capitalism. It pushed public works projects and

war production, generating profits for the monopoly bourgeoisie and some temporary increase of employment. But the relentless world economic crisis and the rapid rise of war production and militarization of the youth further upset the economy and the lives of the people and drove the fascists even more to launch aggression and ignite World War II, with the ultimate aim of destroying the Soviet Union.

World War II was the climax of the second stage of the general crisis of monopoly capitalism. It was basically an interimperialist war, in which one alignment of imperialist powers fought another for a redivision of the world. However, the war could no longer be decided strictly among the imperialist powers. The German fascists had as main objective the destruction of the Soviet Union. In turn, as one of the Allied powers, the Soviet Union ensured the defeat of the Axis powers and the advance of the forces of national liberation, democracy and socialism.

It served as the most powerful bulwark against fascism and victoriously carried out a patriotic war. It bore the main brunt of the fascist offensive in Europe. But it dealt German fascism the deadliest blow. After winning the Battle of Stalingrad, the turning point of the war, the Soviet Union carried out a powerful counteroffensive to seal the fate of the German fascists and their cohorts.

The Third International and communists of various countries consistently raised the calls for a workers' united front and for the People's Front against the fascists. They were the most resolute and the most militant in realizing these calls. The application of the united front policy extended to all forms of struggle, depending on the circumstances in various countries.

The united front for revolutionary armed struggle against the fascists was of crucial importance. It would result in the liberation of entire peoples and the establishment of people's democracies in Asia and Eastern Europe. The best and most

extensive example of the antifascist united front policy of the communists was carried out in China. Keeping their independence and initiative, the Chinese communists made a truce and alliance with the Guomindang against Japan, took advantage of the imperialist war to strengthen the people's army and was prepared for the revolutionary civil war after World War II.

Fascism in the Period of the Cold War

Soon after World War II ended with the victory of the Allied powers, the third stage of the general crisis of monopoly capitalism began. One-third of humanity came under the leadership of the revolutionary proletariat. Several socialist countries arose in Asia and Eastern Europe. A great wave of national liberation movements was sweeping Asia and Africa.

However, the US emerged as the No. 1 imperialist power, having been unscathed by the war and having picked up the spoils of war as a late joiner as in World War I. US policymakers were alarmed that World War II had brought about several socialist countries and national liberation movements. They were worried about a resurfacing of the US economic crisis if war production were to come to a halt and hordes of US troops were to be demobilized.

The US decided to launch the Cold War as a pretext for continuing its war production, for deploying US troops in overseas military bases and building military alliances. It proclaimed itself as the leader of the imperialist alliance against communism and defender of the "free world". It stepped into the shoes of fascist Germany as the most rabidly anticommunist power and the most aggressive enemy of socialist countries and the national liberation movements.

It adopted fascist demagoguery. Having no formidable social-democratic and communist parties within its national borders, the US settled on misrepresenting monopoly capitalism as "free

enterprise" and conformity to it as "moderation" between the presumed extremes of fascism and communism. US imperialist propaganda started equating the Soviet Union to Hitlerite Germany.

Within US society, the McCarthyite witchhunts targeted communists and all suspected communists in all walks of life. But the US monopoly bourgeois state stayed short of becoming a complete fascist dictatorship. By reaping the most profits from World War II, it actually acquired plenty of economic allowance for retaining the frills of bourgeois democracy. It stood to profit further from the reconstruction of the devastated economies of Europe and Japan and the expansion of a US neocolonial empire at the expense of its own imperialist allies. It conceived of the United Nations and the Bretton Woods agreements as the framework for Pax Americana.

The Cold War policy of containment consisted of economic blockade and building of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) and other military alliances to encircle the Soviet Union and other socialist countries. Had not the Soviet Union developed the atom bomb early enough to bring about a nuclear stalemate in Europe, the US would have used its nuclear monopoly to provoke a war directly with the Soviet Union. Earlier in the closing year of World War II, the US had used the atomic bomb on Hiroshima and Nagasaki to preempt a Soviet offensive against Japan.

In the pursuit of the anticommunist crusade, the US whitewashed the fascist war crimes of the monopoly bourgeoisie of the erstwhile Axis powers and encouraged them to undertake economic reconstruction in subordination to US monopoly capitalism. West Germany served as the forward base for containing the Soviet Union in the West and Japan as the forward base for containing the Soviet Union in the Pacific, China, the People's Democratic Republic of Korea and Vietnam in Asia.

It was in the countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America that US imperialism installed fascist governments to dominate the working people and suppress the legal democratic forces and the national liberation movements. These were rabidly anticommunist regimes of open terror. It was also in such countries that US imperialism launched wars of aggression. The US wars of aggression against Korea and then against Vietnam and the whole of Indochina kept on aggrandizing the military-industrial complex in the US.

The Cold War was practically the third world war if we take into account the following: 1) the massive scale of the overseas military bases, the personnel and equipment that the US mustered in order to encircle the socialist countries and suppress the peoples; 2) the millions of casualties among combatants and local populations in the US wars of aggression; and 3) the hapless victims of carnage in US-directed campaigns of terror carried out by US-sponsored fascist regimes.

In Southeast Asia alone, US imperialism and its puppets were responsible for the killing of more than six million people in Vietnam and the massacre of more than one million communists and suspected communists by the Suharto military fascist regime in Indonesia. Why do we call fascist the rule of open terror by puppet regimes after World War II? They engaged in anticommunist demagoguery and unabashed state terrorism on behalf of the foreign and domestic big bourgeoisie.

Thus, in the Philippine historical experience, we have described as fascist the Marcos regime from 1972 to 1986. This was a rabidly anticommunist rule that did away with bourgeois-democratic niceties and murdered at least 100,000 people (including the Moro people) in order to serve the interests of the foreign and domestic bourgeoisie. The US military conquest of the Philippines, which started in 1899, killed at least one million or ten percent of the population. But we do not call it fascist because it was simply a war of imperialist aggression.

We must include in the rogues' gallery of fascist dictators or bourgeois state terrorists such "heroes" of the US "free world" as Chiang Kaishek of China, Sygman Rhee and Park Chung Hee of South Korea, Ngo Dinh Diem and Nguyen van Thieu of South Vietnam, Lon Nol of Cambodia, Suharto of Indonesia, Marcos of the Philippines, Zia Ul-Haq of Pakistan, the Shah of Iran, Mobutu of Congo, Botha of South Africa, Idi Amin of Uganda, Videla of Argentina, Castello Branco, Costa e Silva, Medici and Geisel of Brazil, Batista of Cuba, Somoza of Nicaragua, Pinochet of Chile, Stroessner of Paraguay, Duvalier of Haiti, Fujimori of Peru and others.

Notwithstanding the millions of casualties and the colossal resources spent by the US in the Cold War, the revolutionary forces of the world won unprecedentedly great victories up to the middle of the 1970s. These included the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution in China and the victory of the Vietnamese and other Indochinese people against US imperialism. It may be said that these were the greatest victories of the revolutionary cause of socialism and national liberation consequent to the third stage of the general crisis of monopoly capitalism and prior to the reversal of socialism in China.

No socialist country was ever defeated by any US war of aggression. When the Soviet Union came under revisionist rule, the US ultimately succeeded in outmaneuvering the Soviet Union in the Cold War by pushing neocolonialism and the arms race and by penetrating all the revisionist-ruled countries. The biggest factor ever that caused the restoration of capitalism in socialist countries of the working class was the rise and advance of modern revisionism, centered in the Soviet Union and spread on a global scale. From the time of Khrushchov to that of Gorbachov, the modern revisionists declared that the working class had completed its historic mission of building socialism in order to liquidate the proletarian class dictatorship and class struggle and push the restoration of capitalism.

Where the working class had taken power and built socialism but where the bourgeoisie subsequently recovered political power and privatized public assets, the modern revisionists played the role of the classical revisionists, the social democrats, as betrayers of socialism. As soon as modern revisionists took power, they became monopoly bureaucrat capitalists and social-fascists using demagogy and terror against genuine Marxist-Leninists, the working class and the entire people.

In Eastern Europe, Tito of Yugoslavia was the early bird of modern revisionism and social-fascism, preceding Khrushchov by some years in the same manner that Mussolini was the forerunner of Hitler. Under encouragement of no less than the Khrushchovite revisionists, the ruling parties of Eastern Europe enthusiastically took the road of revisionism, under the cover of the anti-Stalin campaign. They included in their ranks unremoulded class collaborationist social democrats that had become overnight communists after the triumph of the Soviet counteroffensive.

For more than 30 years since 1956, the political and economic strength of the Soviet Union was sapped by the self-indulgent and thieving monopoly bureaucrat bourgeoisie, that misappropriated for its self-enrichment and for the arms race with the US an increasingly large part of the surplus product produced by the proletariat. The monopoly bureaucrat bourgeoisie pretended to be communist and touted as socialist the state ownership of the means of production, until Gorbachov and Yeltsin dropped the communist and socialist masks, disintegrated the Soviet Union and pushed the undisguised privatization of public assets.

With regard to China, there were internal conditions that bred modern revisionism as in all preceding revisionist countries. Even as the capitalist and landlord classes had been eliminated legally and economically, they could be resurrected by revisionists who germinated and developed from the petty-bourgeoisified section of the bureaucracy and intelligentsia and

who declared prematurely that the class struggle was already dying out.

As in the case of the Soviet Union after the death of Stalin, the revisionists sprang into action to seize political power from the revolutionary proletariat in China soon after the death of Mao. They converted the class dictatorship of the proletariat into that of the monopoly bureaucrat bourgeoisie. In a social-fascist way, they systematically persecuted and removed genuine communists from the communist party and from leading positions in the state. They prated about social order and stability and crowed about socialist labor discipline only to deliver the working people to exploitation by foreign monopolies and the domestic big bourgeoisie.

The undisguised restoration of capitalism in China came about even faster than in the Soviet Union after the Chinese revisionists seized political power. The old bourgeoisie immediately got back its assets, received for a second time redemption payments for war bonds and was allowed to borrow capital from state banks in order to engage in private business. The new bourgeoisie dismantled the commune system, raided the state banks by taking loans without collateral, took over existing medium and small enterprises under the legal fiction of management lease, put up private enterprises by acquiring cheap equipment and raw materials from the state sector and opened the economy to direct and indirect investments by foreign monopoly capitalists.

In any country where socialism is betrayed, the new dominant bourgeoisie tends to assume the character of the comprador big bourgeoisie because it subordinates the economy to the foreign imperialist banks and firms, undermines and destroys the industrial foundation previously created under socialism and stashes away funds abroad in the most unbridled fashion. Always fearful of the working people whom it has robbed, it is quick to use the coercive apparatuses of the state as well as private armed gangs against them.

Since the end of World War II, communists have won great victories against imperialism, revisionism and fascism and all reaction. But so far, the deadliest enemy has been modern revisionism, which has felled ruling communist parties and socialist societies from the inside. Revisionist renegades initially base themselves on a petty-bourgeoisified bureaucracy and intelligentsia and gradually creep up to the highest levels of authority in the party, state, army, economic enterprises and cultural institutions until they can seize political power and use the levers of power to restore capitalism.

Communists have a weapon to fight and defeat modern revisionism in socialist society. This is the theory and practice of continuing revolution under proletarian dictatorship to consolidate socialism, combat revisionism and prevent the restoration of capitalism. It is necessary but it is not enough to install the proletarian class dictatorship by politico-military means, transform private ownership of the means of production to public ownership in socialist construction, train a great number of professionals and technicians, take administrative and judicial measures against domestic class adversaries and build the defense against the imperialists.

For a whole historical epoch, it is necessary to uphold the hegemony of the working class and conduct class struggle at the base and the superstructure of socialist society, to keep the primacy of the socialist relations of production over the forces of production, to deepen the proletarian class stand of the bureaucracy and intelligentsia and to carry out the proletarian cultural revolution continuously in stages in order to complete the proletarian conquest of the superstructure through education and the mass movement under the leadership of the revolutionary party of the proletariat until imperialism is defeated on a global scale and communism becomes possible.

In China, where the antirevisionist theory and practice of continuing revolution under proletarian dictatorship through

cultural revolution was first tried out, the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution prevailed for a decade (1966 to 1976) but still could not prevent the rise to power of the revisionists headed by Deng Xiaoping and their restoration of capitalism.

The Marxist-Leninist attitude towards such a reversal should not be any different from that taken towards the success and defeat of the Paris Commune in 1871. It requires all the communists to study the objective conditions and subjective factors in building socialism as a new revolutionary phenomenon that succeeds for a while but is defeated, to appreciate the victory of the revolutionary proletariat and to learn all the positive and negative lessons in order to reach a higher level of revolutionary consciousness and class struggle in defending, consolidating and further developing socialism.

We must face squarely the fact that modern revisionism has destroyed socialism from within rather than imperialism from without. It is our bounden duty to pose the problem and work for the solution on the basis of all previous experience and achievements. The more urgent practical problem now on a global scale is to fight and defeat the big bourgeoisie and all reactionaries and achieve national liberation, democracy and socialism. But we must be able to answer immediately the honest question of comrades and the people as well as malicious ridicule by the enemy about the resoluteness and competence of genuine communists to sustain and develop socialism after it is won.

In the meantime, imperialism and all reaction are themselves generating the objective conditions for the resurgence of the anti-imperialist and socialist movements. We have an abundance of tested and proven Marxist-Leninist theory and practice in waging socialist revolution and construction up to a certain point. We must have the foresight to go beyond that point by preventing the rise of revisionism and the restoration of capitalism in any future socialist society and to keep the Red flag of socialism flying for

an entire historical epoch until we reach the threshold of communism.

The Currents and Prospects of Fascism

Under conditions of the full restoration of capitalism in the former Soviet Union, China and other countries, the imperialists and reactionaries have the temerity to claim that history cannot go beyond monopoly capitalism and they intensify the oppression and exploitation of the working people in an unprecedented way.

For the second time since 1870, the monopoly bourgeoisie is taking gargantuan and absurd efforts to depict itself as the paragon of "free market" globalization and to use the monopoly bourgeois state as well as the neocolonial puppet states in order to carry out a systematic campaign to attack the working class and oppressed peoples and thereby maximize the profits of the monopoly bourgeoisie. The giant monopolies have accelerated the concentration of productive and finance capital and centralized control of markets.

Taking after the neoliberal fashion set by US imperialism, all the imperialist allies and neocolonial puppet regimes deck themselves out in the language of bourgeois democracy and the "free market". The bourgeois parties of all sorts do likewise throughout the world. In Europe, the social-democratic, Green and other parties that disguise their big bourgeois ideas with petty-bourgeois words can hardly be distinguished now from other big bourgeois parties in pushing neoliberal reforms.

Even while "free market" globalization tries to conjure the illusion that it is for the privatization of public assets rather than for direct investments of the state in productive enterprises, state monopoly capitalism continues to grow as the generator of finance capital and provider of purchase contracts and subsidies to the monopoly bourgeoisie. Based on its past record, the monopoly bourgeoisie can shift from the anachronistic language

of neoliberalism to the blatant terms of state intervention and protectionism at a certain point in the worsening of the capitalist crisis.

Against the ever rising social productivity due to higher technology and higher level skills of the proletariat, the monopoly bourgeoisie is engaged in unbridled profitmaking, by pressing down wage levels, causing mass unemployment, wiping out competition, further ruining client countries and therefore shrinking the world capitalist market. The crisis of overproduction in the world capitalist system is worsening and deepening. One round of the destruction of productive forces leads to another, aggravating the chronic mass unemployment and chronic financial crisis and contracting the global market.

We are now at a new stage in the general crisis of monopoly capitalism, which extends from the latter part of the 70's. This new stage encompasses the squeeze on the third world countries and on the monopoly bureaucrat states (even while the latter masqueraded as socialist), the defeat of the Soviet Union in the Cold War and the current overproduction of all types of goods, lately extending to high-tech.

The contradictions between imperialism and the oppressed peoples, among the imperialist powers and between the monopoly bourgeoisie and the proletariat in imperialist countries are sharpening. The US still manages to hold together the imperialist alliance against the workers and oppressed peoples. But it is increasingly resented by its imperialist allies for acting unilaterally according to its national interest. There are also growing contradictions between the imperialist and neocolonial states. The new world disorder is becoming more turbulent and is generating the conditions for fascism and war as well as the resurgence of the anti-imperialist and socialist movements.

Among the imperialist countries, the US has the strongest economy by having the lead in high technology, attracting Europe

and Japan to invest in US securities, pushing a trade offensive and practising protectionism, skimming the cream mainly from the client states under its neocolonial domination and taking advantage of its imperialist allies. However the US has grave difficulties in trying to overcome such costs of winning the Cold War as the heavy debt burden arising from high military spending and from trade accommodations for erstwhile frontline allies in the Cold War.

The US is still the No. 1 debtor of the world and incurs huge trade deficits despite its trade offensive. The biggest financial bubble in the world is now in the US. It consists of the overvaluation of assets, especially in the areas of financial services and high technology. The current figure for high US growth rate is bloated by such overvaluation. The current high employment rate is actually padded with part-time jobs which have replaced regular jobs in a big way.

In a manner of speaking, Germany has accomplished Hitler's ambition of German economic supremacy in Europe. But as a result of intensified competition with US monopoly capitalism, Germany and the rest of Western Europe have become stagnant and afflicted by a chronic crisis of overproduction and chronic mass unemployment. Russia and Eastern Europe are available for capital expansion but this is limited both by the Western imperialist policy of dumping on them surplus products and by the continuous degradation of the economies there under the auspices of the comprador big bourgeoisie, which has an extremely corrupt and criminal character, especially in Russia.

Since the bursting of its financial bubble in 1990, Japan has been practically in a state of economic depression. The monopoly bourgeoisie has built industrial plants abroad and these have served to push down domestic production and employment at home. As the biggest creditor for financing the high consumption of the exploiting classes of East Asia and the overproduction of certain goods, Japan was hit hard by the bursting of the East

Asian bubble in 1997. The US continues to push hard a trade and financial offensive in Japan and the whole of Asia.

In the lesser industrial capitalist countries, where the workers suffer more mass unemployment and more cutbacks on hard-won social gains than elsewhere, the working class movement and the broad based people's movement have become more militant against the monopoly bourgeoisie and its bourgeois political parties. In time to come, these are bound to spread and mount in defense of the rights of the workers and peoples in all the industrial capitalist countries.

In the absence of a strong revolutionary party of the proletariat, the monopoly bourgeoisie appears to be uninterested in sponsoring fascism in the most advanced industrial capitalist countries. And so the bourgeois parties fallaciously claim that communists beget fascists. In the first place, it is the crisis of the ruling system that engenders the resistance of the workers and the people and the advance of the socialist movement led by communists. When the monopoly bourgeoisie adopts fascism to unleash terror, the communists, the workers and the rest of the people have all the right to wage armed revolution.

Due to the economic crisis, the three global centers of capitalism (US, European Union and Japan) are bound to increasingly find themselves at odds with each other over political, economic, financial and military issues. The currents of nationalism, racism and fascism are rising in direct proportion to the deterioration of social and economic conditions resulting from the neoliberal reforms being undertaken by the dominant bourgeois parties. Fascist parties, groups and movements are already influencing bourgeois propaganda and are preparing to seize the initiative from the bourgeois-democratic parties.

Wishing to share the costs of aggression and still afraid of incurring US casualties in ground wars, the US has encouraged both Germany and Japan to rearm and engage in war production

beyond previous limits and to participate in wars of aggression. Now, a dispute is brewing over the question of whether Europe should have a military force independent of the US. In Japan, resentment is growing over the terms of the US-Japan "new security guidelines" that allows the US to use Japan and its resources for US military purposes. At any rate, war machines are being cranked up and the fascists relish the dream of taking over them someday.

War has already broken out in Europe, with the US and NATO carrying out wars of aggression in the Balkans and with Russia engaged in a war in Chechnya. As the scourge of war spreads in Europe, Germany can deploy troops and fire its guns at first in alliance with the US and increasingly according to its own imperialist interests. The US is also entangling Japan in war preparations and war tensions over the issue of Taiwan and in war preparations against China, North Korea and the national liberation movements in East Asia. Japan is rearming beyond the terms of "self-defense", at first in alliance with the US but also in accordance with its own imperialist interests in the long term.

Russia, the much-weakened imperialist power, is today a hotbed of nationalism and fascism. It is in a position similar to that of Germany after its defeat in World War I. It is in dire economic straits and is under growing impositions from the dominant imperialist powers, the victors of the Cold War, that are strategically determined to keep it even weaker economically and socially in order to render impotent its nuclear arsenal and other modern weapons systems.

A military fascist dictatorship can arise to take advantage of the grievances of the Russian people by promising to revive industry and agriculture, carrying out terror in the name of law and order, engaging in military buildup and taking aggressive actions under the pretext of defending Russian territory and defending the Russian populations in nearby countries. The slide from the prolonged social fascism of the past revisionist regimes and the

current rule of the criminal comprador big bourgeoisie towards a military fascist dictatorship is a very short distance.

The expansion of the NATO to the borders of Russia, the war of aggression against Yugoslavia and the US-NATO neocolonization of the Balkans are provocative and can stimulate the rise of a military-fascist dictatorship in Russia. This is also being abetted domestically by the successor party of the old revisionist party which obsequiously plays the role of loyal opposition and like the social democrats under the Weimar Republic blocks the development of genuine Marxist-Leninist leadership among the workers and the rest of the people. There is the urgent need for the genuine successors of Lenin and Stalin to prepare for the proletarian revolution.

China is one more large ex-socialist country on which US imperialism is applying the duplicitous tactics of engagement and containment. The policy of engagement is aimed at stimulating further the growth of foreign investments and comprador capitalism and the disintegration of the state sector of the economy, and ensuring that the communist and socialist signboard is cast off in due course. The policy of containment is aimed at subtly or overtly threatening China militarily and inducing it to become a complete neocolony of the US. The US deliberately bombed the Chinese embassy in Belgrade to demonstrate the precision of its high-tech military weapons.

The comprador big bourgeoisie is already dominant in China, as private capitalists and bureaucrat capitalists. The national bourgeoisie, that seeks to defend China's independence and develop its industrial foundation, is playing second fiddle and is the motive force for an anti-imperialist kind of bourgeois nationalism. Economic and social conditions are today rapidly deteriorating. Outbreaks of spontaneous workers' and peasants' uprisings are increasing. As polarization proceeds, the contradictory prospects of military fascist dictatorship and proletarian revolution are discernible.

The countries most ruined by the ongoing crisis of overproduction in the world capitalist system are those of Asia, Africa and Latin America and several retrogressive countries of the former Soviet bloc. They have the overwhelming majority of the people of the world. They are squeezed by the global oversupply of mostly raw materials and some low-grade manufactures that they produce for export. They are crushed by perennial trade deficits and foreign debt. Unable to service the ever mounting foreign debt burden, they are under severe forms of austerity and other conditionalities imposed by the International Monetary Fund, the World Bank and WTO.

In all the underdeveloped countries, US imperialism and its imperialist allies somehow intervene in order to determine the course of events. They "normally" pick the local ruling clique to serve as puppet and to control the local situation even through fascism. They rationalize their military intervention and aggression against the people and the forces of anti-imperialism by claiming to fight communists and "terrorists".

The neocolonial puppet states are prone to use open terror in enforcing imperialist policies and in suppressing the resistance of the people. There is a growing trend to put up fascist regimes in lieu of governments with a bourgeois-democratic façade. Wars and war tensions of regional proportions arise because US imperialism manipulate neocolonial states against each other in divide-and-rule fashion and because certain neocolonial states try to deflect attention from their misrule and domestic crisis by being hostile to neighboring countries.

Violence and demagogic use of rabid anticommunism, nationalism, ethnocentrism and religion increasingly characterize the conduct of ruling cliques in oppressing the people as well as in competing with their political rivals. Wanton massacres are perpetrated and millions of people are displaced, especially in Africa. In Rwanda alone, a million people were massacred in the past decade. Hundreds of thousands were also massacred in

Bosnia due to ethnic conflicts stirred up by the imperialists and their puppets.

US imperialism is quick to engage in direct military intervention in armed conflicts in countries that produce oil or have a strategic bearing on US oil interest. Hypocritically, it invokes humanitarianism and peacekeeping in order to deploy and use its military forces for aggression. Thus, it has launched wars of aggression against Iraq and Yugoslavia in order to tighten its control over oil resources and gain strategic positions of strength.

The successes of US imperialism in its wars of aggression against Iraq and Yugoslavia and in imposing Pax Americana in the Middle East, the Balkans and in Central and Eastern Europe are temporary. They merely sow the seeds of wars in the near future, among the imperialist powers themselves and between the imperialists and the oppressed peoples.

US imperialism boasts of its economic and financial power and its high-tech military prowess as instruments for subjugating other countries and keeping them as neocolonies. At the same time, it is worried to death by the assertions of national independence, social instability and possession of nuclear weapons by client states and tries to intervene quickly in conflicts, such as those between India and Pakistan over the issue of Kashmir, in order to promote US hegemony.

In Asia, Africa and Latin America, there are legal mass movements and armed revolutionary movements for national liberation and democracy. Marxist-Leninist parties lead a significant number of these movements. The most sustained armed revolutionary movements are those pursuing the strategic line of encircling the cities from the countryside and accumulating strength over a protracted period of time until the ultimate nationwide seizure of political power.

The US imperialists' neoliberal policy aims to abandon or lessen their claim of extending Keynesian "development aid" and to extract more superprofits from the neocolonies by operation of the "free market". This policy is leading to the formation of fascist regimes, with or without any bourgeois-democratic façade. It is extremely harsh to the people and drives them to resist. It also discredits and weakens the neocolonial puppet regimes and makes them vulnerable targets for a protracted people's war, against which expensive long-distance US high-tech weapons are ineffective.

US imperialism derides states that take an anti-imperialist position as "rogue states" in order to disguise its own aggressive role and to prepare or launch a war of aggression. With boundless arrogance and cowardice, it has used and has threatened to continue using high-tech weapons against such states and against the civilian population, the civil infrastructure, schools and hospitals, power and water facilities, mass media facilities and so on. However, the neocolonial puppet regimes of the US are vulnerable targets for protracted people's war.

For decades, it has continuously used economic blockade and military threats against the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and Cuba. These countries have wisely, courageously and successfully defended their national independence and the socialist aspirations of their people. They inspire the people of the world to struggle against imperialism and all reaction and for the realization of their own national, democratic and socialist aspirations.

The new world disorder generates fascism and war and inflicts intolerable suffering on the people. At the same time, it drives the people to wage revolutionary struggle. The way for communists to avert or overcome fascism and war is to strengthen their ranks ideologically, politically and organizationally and engage in the united front in the legal mass movement and, wherever

practicable, in armed revolution in order to bring about national liberation, democracy and socialism.

In all countries dominated by imperialism, there must be a revolutionary party of the proletariat to lead the proletarian and nonproletarian masses in the revolutionary movement. In the industrial capitalist countries, such a party must be able to arouse, organize and mobilize the workers and the rest of the people. In countries whose peasants still compose the majority or a significant part of the population, such a party must base itself on the worker-peasant alliance as the main force of the revolutionary movement.

Revolutionary parties of the proletariat in semicolonial and semifeudal countries have a special role in carrying out protracted people's war. This is the immediate and decisive way of carrying out armed revolution against the imperialists and the local exploiting classes. This is also the way to enhance the conditions for the revolutionary movement of the proletariat and people in the industrial capitalist countries in order to avert fascism and war and to topple the monopoly bourgeois state in case fascism and war cannot be averted.

The workers and oppressed peoples of the world must unite in fighting imperialism and aiming for the realization of socialism. The revolutionary struggles in the underdeveloped countries must support each other in order to raise the anti-imperialist and socialist movements from one level to a new and higher level. At all times, the proletarian revolutionaries must maintain independence and initiative and exercise vigilance against revisionists who specialize in sabotaging a revolutionary movement or revolutionary government from within, even as it is necessary to conduct a broad united front against the common enemy.

Any further development of state monopoly capitalism in the imperialist countries, either as generator of finance capital or as

direct investor in productive enterprises, with or without the "free market" masquerade, amplifies the general material conditions for socialism but these do not automatically result in socialism or become the argument for the peaceful evolution of socialism. State monopoly capitalism in the imperialist countries is precisely an instrument for preventing the socialist revolution, intensifying interimperialist contradictions, further exploiting the oppressed peoples of the world, destroying the forces of production in one round after another in the crisis of overproduction and bringing about fascism and war.

The further development of productive forces under monopoly capitalism cannot by itself lead to socialism either on a national or international scale. Socialism can be achieved only when the subjective forces of the revolution gain the strength sufficient to smash and destroy the bourgeois state. The armed seizure of political power by the proletariat and the establishment of the class dictatorship of the proletariat in one country after another are prerequisites of the socialist revolution, whether this passes through the new-democratic revolution or not.

The social turmoil that is now spreading and intensifying throughout the world is the prelude to the resurgence of the anti-imperialist and socialist movement in the 21st century. Great victories are ahead for the proletariat and oppressed peoples of the world!