

Jose Ma. Sison
(Amado Guerrero)

Defeating Revisionism, Reformism and Opportunism

Selected Writings, 1969 to 1974

International Network for Philippine Studies
The Netherlands

and

Aklat ng Bayan, Inc.
Philippines

ISBN 978-1-62847-921-8



9 781628 479218

Copyright © 2013 by International Network for Philippine Studies (INPS)

Published by
International Network for Philippine Studies (INPS)
and Aklat ng Bayan, Inc.

ISBN 978-1-62847-921-8

Cover design by Janos J.L.L. Sison
Book design by Alvin Firmeza

Contents

Editor's Note	ix
Author's Preface	1
Carry the Struggle against Modern Revisionism through to the End	5
The Lava Revisionist Renegades Are Counterrevolutionaries	7
On the Reformists	11
A Seminar of Landlords on "Land Reform"	11
Masaka Factions Quarrel over Ople	11
Soviet Social-Imperialists Cooperate with US in Defence-Aerospace Program	12
The Treachery of Taruc as a Negative Example	15
Taruc-Sumulong Gangster Clique Is Desperately Isolated	25
Fake Controversy Concocted to Obscure Fundamental Issues in Church	27
Reformist Organizations Beg for Land Reform from Reactionary Government	29
Reactionary "Labor" Confederations "Unite" behind Management and Marcos	33
Bertrand Russell Peace Foundation, Inc. Admits It Enjoys State Protection	35
Expose and Oppose the Vicious Crimes of the Monkees-Armeng Bayan-Masaka (Lava) Gang	39
On the Counterrevolutionary Line of the Lava Revisionist Renegades	43
On the Movement for the Advancement of Nationalism Against the Wishful Thinking of a Revisionist Puppet of US Imperialism	51
I. Capitulation to US Imperialism and the Domestic Ruling System	59
II. Abandonment of Revolutionary Struggle	67
On the Pretended Capture of Sumulong	77
On the Philippine Business for Social Progress	79

Cast Away the Labor Aristocrats!	83
Kidnapping and Murder of Carlos B. del Rosario	
Perpetrated by the Marcos-Lava-Lacsina Conspiracy	85
Counter-Guerrilla Views	89
I. On Armed Struggle and "Peaceful Transition"	89
II. On the Jose-Jesus Lava Leadership	95
III. On the Great Communist Leaders	103
IV. On "Peaceful Coexistence" and Accommodation with US Imperialism	109
Anti-Marxism and Eclecticism	117
I. Marxism-Leninism and the Question of Armed Struggle	118
II. The Universal Significance of Chairman Mao's Theory of People's War	124
III. Guerrilla Warfare Raised to the Level of Marxist-Leninist Theory and Strategy	131
IV. Once More on the Question of Armed Struggle in the Philippines	137
On Lavaite Propaganda for Revisionism and Fascism	145
Foreword	145
Introduction	146
I. Lavaites Are Anti-Marxist and Anti-Leninist Obscurantists and Chauvinists	156
II. Lavaites Are Not Only Careerists But Super-careerists, Conspirators and Doubledealers	168
III. Lavaite Putschists of Yesteryears Are New Revisionist Fascists	179
IV. The Lavaite Philosophy of "Interconnection of Seemingly Contradictory Phenomena"	194
V. The Lavaite Theory of "Stupid Masses" and "Incidental Leadership"	207
VI. The Lava Revisionist and Reformist Line of Parliamentary Struggle	217
VII. The Lavaite Theory of "Enlightened New Imperialism" and "US Imperialism Is Serious about Land Reform"	234
VIII. The Lavaite Line of "Taking the Purely Anti-Marcos Line"	243
IX. The Lavaite Line of Attacking the New Forces and the National United Front	253
Conclusion	270
On the Lavaite Misrepresentation of the Proletarian Foreign Policy of China	273
The Proletarian Foreign Policy of the People's Republic of China	274
The People's Republic of China and the Main Trend of Revolution in the Third World	280
The Question of Diplomatic Relations Between the Philippine Reactionary Government and China or the Soviet Union	285
A Tale of Two Renegades	289
I. The World Outlook of Taruc and Pomeroy	290

II. The "Military Leadership" of Luis Taruc	293
III. Taruc as a Major Representative of the Old Merger Party	296
IV. The Capitulationist Line of the Lavas and the Tarucs	301
Pomeroy's Forest Nightmare	309
I. The Theme of Bourgeois Pessimism	309
II. The Purely Military Viewpoint	314
Apologia for US Imperialism	321
I. On the Seizure and Retention of the Philippines as a US Colony	323
II. A False Balance Sheet of US Imperialism in the Philippines	330
Pomeroy's Apologia for Soviet Revisionism	341
I. On the Proletarian Dictatorship	343
II. On the All-Round Restoration of Capitalism	349
III. On the Question of the Superstructure	360
IV. On "Peaceful Coexistence" and Social-Imperialism	366
International Lavaite Spokesman Openly Admits Collaboration of US-Marcos Clique and the Lava Revisionist Renegades	375
Lava Revisionist Renegades Formally Surrender to the Fascist Dictator at Malacanang Palace	377

Editor's Note

Defeating Revisionism, Reformism and Opportunism is a selection of the writings of Jose Maria Sison (Amado Guerrero) pertinent to the struggle of the proletarian revolutionaries against counterrevolutionary trends from 1968 to 1974. It underscores the anti-revisionist foundation of the reestablished Communist Party of the Philippines. It also covers the reformist and opportunist currents other than Lavaite revisionism. It is rounded up by referring to the disintegration of the Lavaite revisionist party as a result of its open surrender to the Marcos fascist dictatorship in 1974.

The book presents in a comprehensive and thoroughgoing way how Sison led the Filipino proletarian revolutionaries in criticizing, repudiating and defeating the line of modern revisionism in order to reestablish the Communist Party of the Philippines (CPP) on December 26, 1968 and found the New People's Army (NPA) for the purpose of waging people's war along the line of national liberation and democracy.

In the history of the old merger party, a series of leading figures from the Lava family had been responsible for a series of opportunist errors. Vicente Lava was responsible for the Right opportunist "retreat for defense policy" which weakened the armed resistance against Japan in 1942-43; Jose Lava for the "Left" opportunist line of rapid military victory within two years in 1949-51 without giving due attention to painstaking mass work and land reform; and Jesus Lava for the Right opportunist line of seeking to liquidate

the People's Liberation Army in 1955 and the old merger of the Communist and Socialist Parties in 1957.

The CPP criticized and repudiated mainly the Lava revisionist renegades because they opposed the rebuilding of the Party in accordance with Marxism-Leninism. They sought to use the name of the old merger party to generate the influence of Soviet modern revisionism in the Philippines and oppose the resumption of the armed revolution against foreign and feudal domination.

Writing from abroad, the Lavaite William Pomeroy was also a major target of criticism because he publicly assisted the Lava renegades and their followers in spreading Soviet-inspired modern revisionism in the Philippines and opposing the reestablished Communist Party of the Philippines. On behalf of the CPP, Sison criticized and repudiated the revisionist writings of Pomeroy, including *Born of the People* which he had ghostwritten for Luis Taruc.

As Chairman of the CPP, Amado Guerrero wrote articles and statements against the Taruc-Sumulong gangster clique until it disintegrated in 1971. This clique had usurped authority over remnants of the old people's army and committed serious *crimes* against the people, it misrepresented the armed revolution and blocked the advance of the NPA towards the province of Pampanga from Tarlac. The CPP confronted the gangster clique, criticized its actions and defeated its units and influence.

The struggle against revisionism, reformism and opportunism was a necessary part of the process of rebuilding and further strengthening the Communist Party of the Philippines ideologically, politically and organizationally. It was thus that the revolutionary principles, policies and line of the Party became clearer and could be grasped firmly by the Party cadres and members. Upon the defeat of the revisionists, reformists and opportunists, the Party could advance and win victories on the road of people's democratic revolution along the strategic line of protracted people's war.

Julieta de Lima
Editor
28 August 2013

Author's Preface

The struggle against modern revisionism centered in the Soviet Union since the 1950s and bred subsequently in the Philippines by the Lava revisionist renegades was a crucial component of the process of rebuilding the Communist Party of the Philippines (CPP) on the theoretical foundation of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought.

The lead document in the struggle is the "Rectify Errors and Rebuild the Party," which is incorporated in *Foundation for Resuming the Philippine*

Revolution, 1968-72. It is further developed in this book, *Defeating Revisionism, Reformism and Opportunism*, 1969 to 1974, which criticizes and repudiates the revisionist line of the Lava group and the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.

Defeating Revisionism, Reformism and Opportunism is the direct and inseparable companion book of *Foundation for Resuming the Philippine Revolution*. It focuses on the revisionism of the Lava group and its most ebullient agent William Pomeroy. It further deals with the reformism and opportunism of other groups.

The period covered is from 1969 to 1974, the year when the Lava revisionist renegades openly capitulated to the Marcos fascist dictatorship. Members of the Lava family determined the ideological and political line of the revisionist party even when they were not formally the principal leaders.

With their open capitulation to Marcos in 1974, the Lava revisionist renegades and their party practically committed political suicide and became totally discredited. The capitulation actually occurred secretly as early as 1971 when the revisionist party and the Marcos fascist regime made a deal to collaborate and effect the release of Lavaite political prisoners.

For the duration of the Marcos fascist dictatorship, the Lavaite revisionist party justified its collaboration with the fascist regime by claiming that this was a representative of the national bourgeoisie seeking "national industrialization" against US-led "neocolonial industrialization." It also praised as "progressive" the regime's opening of diplomatic relations with the Soviet Union.

In fact, it was the US that instigated and propped up the Marcos fascist dictatorship, a rule of open terror by a clique of bureaucrat capitalists and their big comprador partners. These engaged mainly in graft-ridden infrastructure projects, financed through foreign loans and supplied by multinational firms with construction equipment and structural steel. The US allowed its puppets to establish diplomatic relations with the Soviet Union and to access oil therefrom when the global "oil crisis" was running high.

The struggle against revisionism, reformism and opportunism resulted in great revolutionary victories, such as the reestablishment of the Communist Party of the Philippines and the subsequent continuous growth in strength and advance of the people's democratic revolution through people's war.

The deep-seated anti-revisionist education of the Filipino proletarian revolutionaries served to protect the CPP and the revolutionary mass movement from discouragement when the Chinese Communist Party no less turned revisionist and took the capitalist road in the Dengist counterrevolution against the Maoists in the latter half of the 1970s.

Out of disgust for the Dengists in China in the early 1980s, certain cadres of the CPP were impressed with the advance of Soviet military strength and with Soviet support for national liberation movements in Africa and wished to avail of direct and indirect Soviet military assistance.

But because of their deep-seated anti-revisionist education, the most mature leaders of the CPP never lost sight of the fact that the Philippine

revisionist party had preempted party-to-party relations with the Soviet Union and were mindful also of the fact that relations with the Soviet party did not make the Philippine revisionist party revolutionary but even more counterrevolutionary and rabidly opposed to the people's war.

The attempt to avail of Soviet military assistance for the Philippine revolution through the National Democratic Front of the Philippines did not succeed and was overtaken by the events of 1989 to 1991 which saw social turmoil in China, the disintegration of revisionist regimes and the collapse of the Soviet Union.

Since then, the deep-seated education against revisionism, reformism and opportunism has once more fortified the CPP and the revolutionary movement against the powerful propaganda offensive of the imperialist powers and various types of petty bourgeois anti-communists declaring the cause of scientific socialism as hopeless and that history cannot go any farther than capitalism and liberal democracy.

After more than three decades of dominance since the 1980s, the neoliberal economic policy propagated by the US and other imperialist powers is now totally bankrupt and is generating an ever worsening crisis of global capitalism. The broad masses of the people are resisting the escalation of exploitation and oppression in both the imperialist and non-imperialist countries.

The crisis is comparable to the Great Depression of the 1930s in terms of the severity of social costs, the intensification of major contradictions in the world, the growing propensity of the imperialist powers for aggression, the rise of revolutionary wars and resurgence of the movements of peoples and nations for national liberation, democracy and socialism.

Defeating Revisionism, Reformism and Opportunism is instructive both for historical study and for enhancing the current revolutionary struggles of the people against imperialism and all reaction. Continuous education against revisionism, reformism and opportunism firms up the revolutionary resolve and invigorates the revolutionary militancy of the advanced detachment of the proletariat, the working class, and the rest of the people.

Jose Maria Sison
Utrecht, The Netherlands
30 July 2013

Carry the Struggle against Modern Revisionism through to the End

First published in *Ang Bayan*, Vol. I, No. 2, July 1, 1969.

The revisionist renegades are creating trouble locally and all over the world and are vainly trying to impede the victorious advance of the people's democratic revolution in the Philippines and of the world proletarian revolution.

It is impossible to fight and defeat US imperialism and local reaction without fighting and defeating modern revisionism.

Modern revisionism performs the special task for US imperialism and local reaction of undermining and sabotaging the revolutionary movement from within.

For a long period of time in the Philippines, Lavaism and Tarucism—the two major local sources and bases of modern revisionism—derailed the Philippine Revolution and besmirched the honor and prestige of the Communist Party of the Philippines. At present, they continuously try to hamper the advance of the revolutionary movement by spreading slander against proletarian revolutionary cadres, by betraying them to the enemy and by resorting to intimidations.

Though they have their own contradictions, the two "independent kingdoms" of the Lava revisionist renegade clique and the Taruc-Sumulong gangster clique, employing the same dirty tactics, consistently attack the Communist Party of the Philippines inspired by Mao Zedong Thought.

Though it appears that the Taruc-Sumulong clique is the more dangerous of the two revisionist renegade cliques in the country today, it is the Lava revisionist renegade clique that actually poses a greater danger to the Party of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought. It consistently performs revisionist work ideologically, politically and organizationally. Its "intellectual" bluster is quite impressive to the social strata prone to subjectivism and opportunism: the petty bourgeoisie and the national bourgeoisie. The Lava clique tries to spread the spirit of reformism among the peasants and workers. The Taruc-Sumulong clique is so bereft of any kind of mass support now that it has become purely a crime gang.

Defeating Revisionism, Reformism and Opportunism

The Lava revisionist renegade clique carries the support of Soviet revisionist social-imperialism. Though it is wracked by internal contradictions, a majority within determines the character of the clique as a puppet of Soviet revisionist social-imperialism. With the knowledge and tacit approval of the reactionary government, it was able to send five "secret" delegates to the "World Communist Conference" organized by the Brezhnev revisionist renegade clique.

The Lava revisionist renegade clique is the purveyor of the worst sustained attacks against Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought. At every turn it defends the most glaring acts of Soviet social-imperialism such as the Soviet aggression against the Czechoslovak people and the armed provocations against the Chinese people on China's frontiers.

The Lava revisionist renegade clique stands to gain temporarily from the "new" foreign policy of the reactionary government and the current attempts to "legalize" the Communist Party of the Philippines. The principal leaders and henchmen of this clique are openly in the payroll of the reactionary government, in the state university, in "brain trust" groups for high reactionary politicians and in business enterprises.

It is necessary for the Party of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought to sustain a protracted struggle against modern revisionism, whether it be of the Lava or of the Taruc-Sumulong brand. All proletarian revolutionary cadres should always maintain the spirit of carrying through to the end the rectification movement and the fight against modern revisionism, Lavaism and Taruc-ism.

Under the present historical circumstances, the heirs and propagators of Lavaism and Taruc-ism have a resilience that can be fatal to genuine Marxist-Leninists if there is no constant revolutionary vigilance and active struggle against their revisionist intrigues and machinations.

The proletarian revolutionary cadres of the Communist Party of the Philippines should steadfastly rebuild and consolidate the Party. Armed with Mao Zedong Thought, they should strengthen the Party ideologically, politically and organizationally on the basis of resolute mass struggle against the class enemy.

* * *

The Lava Revisionist Renegades Are Counterrevolutionaries

First published in *Ang Bayan*, Vol. 1, No. 3, August 1, 1969.

At a time that the reactionaries are fiercely waging a campaign of armed suppression against the revolutionary masses and proletarian revolutionaries even as "statesmen" and generals are employing doubletalk about social amelioration and civil liberties, the Lava revisionist renegades are becoming more and more exposed as counterrevolutionaries complementing and reinforcing the actions and statements of the blatant defenders of the present reactionary state.

1. The Lava revisionist renegades are proud to declare that they are champions of constitutional dissent. It is their view that parliamentary struggle is now the main form of struggle; they say that we need to wait for them in their bourgeois offices to prepare legally for armed struggle. But when cases arise like the brutal raids on the homes of barrio people, the persecution of people's organizations and mass leaders, the kidnapping and murder of a barrio leader who led a rally of 30,000 against the abuses of the Philippine Constabulary and the Philippine Army, or the frustrated

assassination of an outspoken progressive by the fascists, they fail to make the slightest pronouncement in defense of civil liberties and they even callously try to dismiss these cases as mere hoaxes or incidents due to "adventurism." The out-and-out reactionaries even beat them in the pretense at complaining or seeking redress about some cases. In the pretense and actuality of saving their own skin, the Lava revisionist renegades and some elements close to them in such organizations as the Civil Liberties Union, the Bertrand Russell Peace Foundation, Inc. and the Movement for the Advancement of Nationalism always viciously help in denouncing the revolutionary masses and their leading representatives as "troublemakers." The only notable instance during the last two years when they publicly defended "civil liberties" was in connection with a notorious embezzler detained by the Quezon City police as a result of a murder case, an offshoot of his attempt to cover up the malversation of funds for which he had been held responsible in a private company. This person had been expelled from the Party a long time ago for collecting funds falsely in the name of the Party in Mabalacat, Pampanga and Bamban, Tarlac.

2. The Lava revisionist renegades prefer to call themselves nationalist advocates of industrialization. They wish to convince the reactionary state to adopt "economic planning" and grant privileges and subsidies to the national bourgeoisie in order to "strengthen" the "anti-imperialist front." They wish to ape their revisionist counterparts in other countries who helped build up such political personalities as Sukarno, Ne Win, Nehru and the like. As ghostwriters and publicists, they toady to certain personalities who believe that only through legislation like the Magna Carta for Economic Freedom and Social Justice or through the speeches of bourgeois personalities will the cause of nationalist industrialization be advanced. They are no different from such long-term opportunists as Blas Ople, who have made lifetime careers of ghostwriting for bourgeois politicians only to rise among bourgeois rank. But in their hatred for those who are waging armed struggle, they unite with the reactionaries in trying vainly to isolate cadres and progressives who correctly integrate their legal work with the armed struggle. To earn their living, these revisionist renegades write "nationalist" speeches interlarded with anti-communist statements for bourgeois personalities.

3. The Lava revisionist renegades say that they are also trying to mobilize the peasant masses and develop "people's power." They claim to be utilizing the Agricultural Land Reform Code merely to exhaust all legal possibilities. But what they actually do from their city "peasant" headquarters is to slander proletarian revolutionary cadres and Red soldiers through their imperial envoys in the Malayang Samahang Magsasaka (Masaka) in a futile attempt to isolate them from the masses. Their work in the countryside amounts to rural reformism no different from that advocated by the Christian Social Movement, Federation of Free Farmers and the Filipino Agrarian Reform Movement and worse, a boon to armed counterrevolution in the narrow areas that they have been able to reach. Their rural reformism has its parallel in the city, where they spread among their handful of followers in the

trade union movement the revisionist renegade doctrine of using strikes only to improve the "bargaining position" of labor vis-a-vis "management."

4. The Lava revisionist renegades are perfect allies of the reactionary Marcos government in the matter of foreign policy. As they hypocritically raise the slogan of "relations with all countries" or with "socialist" countries to "neutralize" the Philippines, their actual intent is to help advance the anti-communist, anti-China and anti-people strategic alliance between US imperialism and Soviet social-imperialism. These revisionist renegades expect to bloat their small clique with the support of the Soviet revisionist renegade clique, though at times some of them claim that in the style of a Fidel Castro, they reserve the right to criticize the Soviet ruling clique for indefensible Soviet revisionist acts of aggression.

When there is hardly a difference between the pronouncements and actuations of the local revisionist renegades on the one hand and the US imperialist chieftain Nixon and the reactionary Marcos government on the other, it is necessary to expose them to the people as counterrevolutionary agents of US imperialism, feudalism and bureaucrat capitalism who are trying to infiltrate and undermine the revolutionary mass movement. They are even worse than the out-and-out reactionaries because of their deceptive claim of being revolutionaries.

The words and deeds of these sinister elements who call for "unity of anti-imperialist forces" or "united action" should be closely scrutinized. There can be no unity with those who proclaim themselves as the revolutionary leaders in their airconditioned bourgeois offices or in some weekend clan meeting but who spend more time and effort in the character assassination of proletarian revolutionaries more than in fighting the fascists troops suppressing the people or the reactionaries who exploit and oppress them.

As the proletarian revolutionaries arouse and mobilize the revolutionary masses in the practical application of the universal truth of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought, the Lava revisionist renegades will become increasingly exposed as out-and-out counterrevolutionaries.

* * *

On the Reformists

Three articles first published in *Ang Bayan*, Vol. I, No. 3, August 1, 1969. **A Seminar of**

Landlords on "Land Reform"

The seminar on land reform in Asia and the Far East held jointly by the FAO-ECAFE-ILO in Manila during the first half of July was actually a gathering of landlords and landgrabbers.

As usual, the example of Chiang Kai-Shek troops grabbing land from the inhabitants of Taiwan, Zionist "Israel" grabbing land from the Arabs and the forcible liquidation of feudalism in capitalist Japan were praised to high heavens as successful "land reform" under the aegis of US imperialism.

The puppet chieftain Marcos aided by his sidekick Gov. Conrado Estrella of the Land Authority took to boasting of his own "land reform" accomplishments before his fellow landlord puppets. Marcos owns more than 20,000 hectares in the Nueva Ecija-Isabela area and several thousands of hectares in Mindanao all of which he gained through landgrabbing.

The seminar also featured representatives of the Federation of Free Farmers (FFF) and the Filipino Agrarian Reform Movement (FARM) who mildly "criticized" the land reform program of the Philippine government but only to attack viciously the peasant masses themselves whom they fear to be set on waging an agrarian revolution.

The FFF is an organization directed by the Catholic Church, especially American Jesuits, and its president is himself a landlord in Alaminos, Pangasinan. The FARM is an organization subsidized by the Marcos regime and its president is a landlord in Concepcion, Tarlac.

Masaka Factions Quarrel over Ople

One of the minor events in the bourgeois political scene last July was the quarrel of the two national councils of Masaka over such a trivial matter as to who is the real supporter of the senatorial ambitions of Labor Secretary Blas Ople, one of Marcos' "leftists."

Felixberto Olalia¹, who used to implement the decisions of the Lava revisionist renegade clique as late as 1967-68, found himself at the receiving end of hard-hitting press releases issued by the Flores-Santos faction that is now the tool of the Lava revisionist renegades.

All the love and labor expended by the Olalia and Flores-Santos factions for Ople went to naught when the senatorial lineup of the Nacionalista Party was finally announced. Ople did not make it.

The two factions are very active today in supporting this or that political candidate or party as if they could muster large numbers of votes in the bourgeois elections. They are silent, however, about the real life-and-death struggle between the peasantry and the reactionaries in Central Luzon.

¹ Felixberto Olalia, Sr. is better known as a trade union leader. He eventually dissociated himself and his organizations from the Lavas. A veteran trade union organizer and leader from the time of Crisanto Evangelista and a Hukbalahap squadron commander during the anti-Japanese war, he organized in 1957 the National Federation of Labor Unions that stands as one the pillars of the Kilusang Mayo Uno of which he was elected chairperson when this was established in 1980. He remained in this position until his arrest and imprisonment in 1983, which led to his death nine months after on 5 December 1983. - Editor

Soviet Social-Imperialists Cooperate with US in Defence-Aerospace Program

While the chieftains of the Soviet revisionist renegade clique shout "anti-imperialist" slogans at the top of their voices, the 15,000-ton Soviet freighter "Orsha" arrived at the US port of Seattle on June 26, to deliver 900 tons of titanium, a strategic metal known for its high strength and light weight, badly needed by the US imperialists for their defence-aerospace programs. Such behavior clearly showed that the "anti-imperialist" slogans are all sham and that collusion of Soviet social-imperialists with the US imperialists is real.

The Soviet revisionist renegade clique, in their effort to check the economic imbalance it has created in spreading capitalism in the Soviet Union, sent this first cargo to the United States in 19 years, a clear manifestation of the profound interest and concern of the Soviet revisionist renegade clique for US imperialism and laid bare its social-imperialist nature. For even as it is supplying only a bit of scrap iron to the Vietnamese people in their war of resistance against US imperialist aggression, the Soviet social-imperialists offered the strategic titanium metal to US imperialism to enable it to make up-to-date aircraft to slaughter the Vietnamese people and the rest of the peoples of the world who are now waging revolutionary struggle against the counterrevolutionary violence of the US imperialists.

The Soviet social-imperialists, in supplying titanium to the American imperialists, also showed its avid support for the aerospace program of US imperialism. Absurdly, US imperialism is trying to offset in propaganda its debacle in Vietnam by making use of its aerospace program which is supported by superprofits sucked out of US neocolonies and by the exploitation of American labor. Such defence-aerospace program is intended to further develop military technology for aggression against all peoples of the world.

As the US imperialists and the Soviet social-imperialists collaborate on earth and in outer space, the peoples of the world deal deadly blows on their footholds all over the world.

* * *

The Treachery of Taruc as a Negative Example

First published in *Ang Bayan*, Vol. I, No. 4, September 15, 1969.

Luis Taruc bears no significance to the revolutionary movement today except as a special tool of the exploiting classes and a vicious enemy of the people. But in a general review of the history of the revolutionary movement, as we rectify the errors of the past, he bears a special significance of internal

value to proletarian revolutionaries today. The emergence of Taruc as a vociferous traitor to the Party and the people from his past role of being the commander-in-chief of the Anti-Japanese People's Army (Hukbalahap) and a leading member of the Communist Party of the Philippines (merger of the Communist and Socialist parties) makes his case a negative example which provides us an important lesson.

The lesson consists of always giving first place to man in handling the relationship between man and weapons; to political work in handling the relationship between political and other work; to ideological work in relation to routine tasks in political work; and in ideological work, to the living ideas in a person's mind, as distinguished from ideas in books.

Luis Taruc is a living proof of the erroneous ideological influence of the first Lava (Vicente) leadership in the old merger party. Taruc was allowed to remain as the general representative of the members of the Socialist party who failed to grasp the theory of Marxism-Leninism and yet who assumed leading positions in both the old merger party and the Hukbalahap. However, the first Lava leadership of which Taruc was a part was in no position to raise his consciousness on the basis of Marxism-Leninism because in the first place this leadership itself did not grasp Marxism-Leninism. It carried out a bourgeois reactionary line throughout its tenure. Until now, Taruc praises Dr. Vicente Lava to high heavens because both of them were both Right opportunists from the beginning to the end of their party membership. The basic document of rectification, "Rectify Errors and Rebuild the Party," which has guided struggle, criticism, and transformation among Party members, explains the empiricist subjectivism and Right opportunism of Vicente Lava and his ideological affinity to Earl Browder who also turned into a counterrevolutionary revisionist and anticommunist traitor to the American revolutionary movement despite the fact that he had been no less than the general secretary of the CPUSA for one decade and a half.

The importance of correct ideology in the revolutionary movement cannot be overemphasized. Today, those whom we regard as our comrades and those who aspire to become Party members must continuously be raised to the level of proletarian revolutionaries in their theory and practice if our Party and Army are to achieve revolutionary success. Some may fall on the way and turn into counterrevolutionaries like Luis Taruc. That is because they shall have failed to revolutionize their consciousness all the way through constant study and practice. By the law of contradiction there will always be uneven development in the theory and practice of Party members as the Party will always reflect the contradictions existing in society and the bourgeoisie will always attempt to subvert it. It is possible even for an entire revolutionary Party to become revisionist and counterrevolutionary; that is, if the bourgeois headquarters within overpowers the proletarian headquarters. In the Philippines, the dominance of the bourgeois reactionary line of the Lavas and the Tarucs during more than three decades has actually been responsible for too many members of the old merger party turning into shameless traitors like Luis Taruc and the two separate cliques of

counterrevolutionaries: the Taruc-Sumulong gangster clique and the Lava revisionist renegade clique.

The clearest proof that Luis Taruc was never able to grasp the revolutionary theory of Marxism-Leninism and likewise its decisive importance in making revolution is the foolish statement he still makes that to be guided and inspired by ideas proven to be correct in the revolutionary struggles of the world proletariat and of other peoples is unpatriotic and subservience to a foreign power. Thus, he considers Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought as "alien" and "useless" to the Filipino people. This patent stupidity is equal to the treachery and demagoguery of the Spanish governor-general and his local stooges in calling the revolutionary democrats of 1896 as "foreign agents" for being guided and inspired by what they considered to be correct ideas emanating from the French Revolution.

Luis Taruc in his newly-found piety never finds Christian theology an alien ideology by his own definition. He seems not to know that his religious faith was brought over to the Philippines through colonial conquest and this grew on the basis of feudal conditions. He seems not to know that in actually submitting himself to the ideology and material interests of US imperialism, he is the shortsighted and narrow-minded traitor who opposes the broad democratic interests of the masses and who, therefore, isolates himself from the most powerful ideological weapon, Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought, of the international proletariat and the oppressed peoples of all countries.

Taruc should be the last to resort to chauvinist demagoguery because his supposed latest book, *He Who Rides the Tiger*, as was his egocentric *Born of the People*, was written for him by a foreigner, another communist-turned-renegade, written from a class standpoint totally inimical to the interests of the Filipino people. Douglas Hyde, the actual writer who writes of "winter" in the Philippines in the book, is a well-paid CIA agent specializing in the recruitment of traitors to the side of US imperialism. What we wish to emphasize is not the fact that Taruc is a fake author; but that he is a shameless tool of that foreign, power, US imperialism, whose Central Intelligence Agency subsidizes such ghostwriters as Douglas Hyde, such USIS potboilers as that book of treason *He Who Rides the Tiger* and such publishers as Frederick A. Praeger, Inc. and Geoffrey Chapman.

Taruc is now a well-paid agent of US imperialism, domestic feudalism and bureaucrat capitalism whose special task is mouthing "revolutionary" slogans and narrating his "revolutionary" experience with the single vain purpose of attacking and discrediting the revolutionary movement. In his speeches and articles, his modus operandi is first to sound angry at the exploiting classes, then to turn his fire against communists and those whom he imagines to be communists, and finally to call on the reactionary state of the same exploiting classes to strike down those who dare to oppose it. It is, therefore, fitting for such a scab and traitor to get his CIA salary from such a conduit as the Ateneo de Manila University and the Jesuits whom Rizal, through

Pilosopong Tasyo, exposed a long time ago as pretending to be going with the tide of progress but actually trying to hold it back.

Even as he accuses the Communist Party of the Philippines and the New People's Army of being subservient to a foreign power in their application of the universal truth of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought in the concrete practice of the Philippine Revolution, Taruc tries vainly to show off that he has a smattering of Marxism-Leninism by reciting such a line as "One who launches an untimely armed uprising is not only a fool but a 'Left' adventurist criminal" and then by saying that there is no "revolutionary situation" and no "revolutionary crisis" to warrant armed struggle under the present circumstances.

Reciting a line or dropping terms does not automatically impress genuine Marxist-Leninists. But by doing so out of historical context, Taruc only proves himself guilty of the dogmatism, book-knowledge or jargon-memorizing that he accuses others of committing. The line that he recited and the terms he dropped pertain to the launching of an armed uprising for the immediate seizure of power in the cities.

The Communist Party of the Philippines and the New People's Army do not have any intention yet of launching an uprising to seize Manila now or in the near future. To do so now, as did the Jose Lava leadership during its own time, would really be foolish, adventurist and criminal. The Program for a People's Democratic Revolution of the Communist Party of the Philippines, the Rules of the New People's Army and every major document of the Party never fail to point out that, in taking advantage of the grossly uneven development of this semicolonial and semifeudal country, we have to build Red political power first in the countryside before seizing the cities. We are not yet prepared to seize the city. The Party has only been recently reestablished and has just started to develop the armed struggle and build a revolutionary united front in accordance with genuine Marxism-Leninism. It is idle for the traitor and scab Luis Taruc to provoke a metaphysical debate similar to that one he had with Jose and Jesus Lava, which resulted in Taruc begging for peace negotiations and finally surrendering; and in the Lavas foolishly trying to seize Manila even without the necessary rural bases and adequate revolutionary forces and ending up in a crushing defeat which came as quickly as their tempers had risen.

The international communist movement has passed three major stages of development. The first stage was the era of Marx and Engels who developed the theory of scientific socialism, as against the various forms of utopian socialism that preceded it. The second stage was the era of Lenin and Stalin who developed the theory and practice of proletarian dictatorship and established socialism in one country in the era of imperialism. The third stage is the present era of Mao Zedong who has developed the theory and practice of continuing revolution under proletarian dictatorship and of preventing the restoration of capitalism in a socialist country.

Taruc is a counterrevolutionary agent who failed to learn Marxism-Leninism. He certainly is grossly ignorant now of the advances of Marxism-

Leninism in theory and practice. Despicably though ridiculously, he pretends to know Marxism-Leninism and he uses such pretense to attack it. The proletarian revolutionaries of today look for Ideological guidance in Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought and seek historical lessons from the Chinese revolution in the same way that in the era of pre-monopoly capitalism they looked for ideological guidance in Marxism and sought historical lessons from the Paris Commune and subsequently in the era of monopoly-capitalism or Imperialism they would look for ideological guidance in Leninism and seek historical lessons from the October Revolution and the building of socialism in the Soviet Union.

In the same manner that the counterrevolutionaries attacked Filipino communists as "Moscow agents" when the party of Lenin and the Soviet Union held the correct and most advanced position in the world proletarian revolution, the counterrevolutionaries will also attack the genuine communists of today as "Chinese agents" when the Party of Mao Zedong and the People's Republic of China hold the correct and most advanced position in the same world proletarian revolution.

The Communist Party of the Philippines is in stride with the development **of** Marxism-Leninism in theory and practice by being guided by Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought. This by no means is taking Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought as a dogma. We use it as our practical guide in accordance with concrete analysis of concrete conditions. We are in the process of applying it on concrete Philippine conditions. It will still be essentially through the painstaking and self-reliant efforts of Filipino proletarian revolutionaries and the Filipino people that a people's democratic revolution will be won in this country, although the triumphs of the world proletarian revolution and other oppressed peoples against US imperialism, modern revisionism and all reaction will serve as favorable conditions.

As one who pretends to be a revolutionary but who seeks to undermine the revolutionary movement and attack proletarian revolutionaries, Taruc is even worse than a chieftain of a cattle rustling gang or a cruel overseer or a detested landlord whom the people single out for punishment at the earliest stage in the development of a guerrilla zone. Aware of the gravity of his treasonous acts and his cowardice, he is afraid to go to Central Luzon without the armed protection of the reactionary authorities that suppress the exploited masses.

In his demagogic harangues and his articles rewritten by CIA agents, he speaks egotistically of his supposed personal glories as a young "revolutionary and his personal sacrifices for the masses." But one thing is clear: he has ended up as a speculator on the blood of the masses and he is now a well-paid traitor and scab in the service of the bloodsuckers of this society. His personal anecdotes merit no admiration but contempt. In the eyes of the truly revolutionary masses and youth, he is nothing but a vulture feasting on the corpses of revolutionary martyrs and threatening to attack the living masses. In another manner of speaking, one may describe him as

an unprincipled panhandler who would tell any tale of bad luck to solicit a handout every time he dishes out stories about his personal sacrifices.

During his incumbency as commander-in-chief of the People's Army and as a top party person in authority, he was responsible for countless abuses against the masses. He was responsible for the disastrous line of allowing the entry of ruffians into the People's Army and encouraging them to abuse the people in the name of "economic survival." He is now so proud as a supposed "Christian" to criticize the erroneous bourgeois "revolutionary solution to the sex problem" of the Lava leadership but he was responsible for the malicious policy of using women as "bait" for men to enlist in the People's Army and he himself was no exemplar in his conduct towards women. Internally, he abused the power and prestige of the old merger party but he was always notorious for giving the class enemy the best chances for employing counterrevolutionary dual tactics. He was always first in responding to such enemy tactics as negotiations for "peace," amnesty or surrender. Instead of putting down Taruc as a mere careerist in one case, the Lavas should have made a more thoroughgoing analysis of his class standpoint in so many other cases. But the Lavas in their own super-careerism were themselves merely maneuvering for positions in the old party organization and on the whole they shared in the error of allowing Taruc to pursue his career as an agent of the bourgeoisie in the old merger party until he was already breaking it up in a big way through his capitulation to the class enemy.

When he surrendered to Magsaysay under the auspices of the Central Intelligence Agency, Taruc shamelessly bargained for special considerations for himself. While in prison, he allowed himself to be used by the reactionaries in the vain attempt to break the will of the revolutionary masses and his fellow political prisoners. He did this in exchange for comfort. He was never actually in prison. He was provided with a bungalow in the Panopio Compound and he had his own television, refrigerator, a plush toilet and bath and a library. He could go out as he pleased, with government bodyguards, even to seek his kind of spiritual comfort in nightclubs.

Luis Taruc thinks his luck will never run out. Like the Lava revisionist renegade clique of today, he misuses such a term as "united front." He conceives of a "united front" in which traitors and counterrevolutionaries like himself have a role and he thinks that the Communist Party of the Philippines now guided by Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought is being narrow-minded and isolating itself by refusing to engage in a "united front" for parliamentary struggle and putting such traitors and counterrevolutionaries as himself to at par with every one else. As far as the Party is concerned, the only "united front" in which traitors of Taruc's kind have a place is the counterrevolutionary front of US imperialism, modern revisionism, feudalism, bureaucrat capitalism, and all reaction.

This line of Taruc is no different from that of the Lava revisionist renegade clique. The Tarucs and the Lavas of this country think that a "revolutionary situation" and a "revolutionary crisis" will occur after they have exhausted all

legal possibilities. Acting as the spokesman of these counterrevolutionaries, Taruc pontificates:

A revolution is not invited. It comes spontaneously when the rich and powerful have become excessive in their cruelty and greed and the entire people can no longer be stopped in their anger, hunger and anxiety. They shall arise and only then shall emerge good leaders, those with the capability to unite and relate all revolutionary groups.

He declares further:

In all meetings that I have attended in the most strategic places and cities of the entire Philippines, the most widespread desire now of our countrymen searching for patriotic change is a strong national unity conforming to all peaceful and democratic methods.

These statements show that Taruc is a deliberately counterrevolutionary juggler of words and once again prove that, indeed, he was never a communist. He believes in spontaneous revolution. He has no real knowledge of class struggle and of Philippine society; he now mistakes his present bourgeois status and his bourgeois masters and audiences for the state of the nation and the oppressed masses. He does not recognize the uneven development in this semicolonial and semifeudal country on the basis of which a people's war is now being waged step by well-studied step.

Undialectical in their outlook, the Tarucs and the Lavas do not recognize that they are already circumscribed and corrupted in their bourgeois offices even now and that the masses do not recognize them at all as revolutionary leaders. They are not even recognized by the masses as leaders of reformist organizations; they are only vaguely known as beggars of bourgeois peace and accommodation. If they cannot be revolutionary today, there is no reason why they will suddenly become the revolutionary leaders of the masses tomorrow. Even if Taruc delivers a million speeches and writes a million articles, he will only end up as a sham and as a counterrevolutionary.

A man who keeps on writing the following will come to no good end:

with the apparent stupidity if not real stupidity, or pretended blindness if not real loss of sight, of our government intelligence and security agencies, they are putting the whole country in grave danger in the long run. For that matter, the ones with the most responsibility are the President of the Nation and Congress. They are very intelligent people. Why have they not solved it, especially during the time that the revolutionary movement of the HMB was at its weakest, through sincerely humane and democratic methods? It should have been finished a long time ago. And we should have long ago embraced each other as united and loving compatriots, and like one man striving for the progress of the whole nation in democracy, freedom, prosperity and good government.

The big danger that we shall face is this: (the author gives a long warning to the reactionary government) ... It has already started in Central Luzon, it has already reached the Visayas, and it is possible

that it now has groups in Mindanao. That is the danger! What is the answer to that?

Only a real counterrevolutionary, an enemy of the people, can write in such a vicious way as this. He wants the exploited classes to embrace the exploiting classes under the present reactionary state. He is also offering his "expert" testimony and services to convict newsmen and the labor organizers in the bourgeois courts of the Visayas. What "united front" is Taruc really interested in? It is one in which such cheap traitors like him join the reactionary government in suppressing the masses. It is a counterrevolutionary front, not a revolutionary united front.

It is clear in the Program for a People's Democratic Revolution that the Communist Party of the Philippines wields the two weapons of armed struggle and national united front. One helps the other. Our principle of revolutionary united front is different from the counterrevolutionary united front of the Tarucs and the Lavas in that ours is a united front for waging armed struggle against US imperialism, feudalism and bureaucrat capitalism.

Taruc's idea of a "united front" is one that broadens support for his pocket and bloats his ego. He knows that when the Party wields both the weapons of armed struggle and the united front as during the Japanese occupation, it is stronger, more stable and wider in mass support. It is when one is separated from the other that the Party is weak.

It is idle for Taruc to attack the Party for making criticism of certain bourgeois personalities. These same personalities will always be willing to cooperate with us when they see that they stand to gain something from cooperation with us. This fact is clearly evident in Central Luzon where the Party has already established a modest amount of revolutionary power. As a matter of principle, the Party will always maintain its independence and initiative in a united front in the same way that it allows other class allies to do the same. One basic principle in the united front is the combination of unity and struggle all for the sake of taking the best steps to destroy the common enemy. This is based on class analysis. The Communist Party of the Philippines will always criticize and rectify the errors and weaknesses it commits or those committed by its allies in the course of revolutionary struggle.

In writing an article on the treachery of Luis Taruc and in replying to his article entitled "Foreign Ideology of the Patriot" (Isipang Dayuhan ng Makabayan) in *Taliba* (August 31, 1969), it is not so much to engage in polemics with a traitor and a scab like him as to expose his errors and lies for the benefit of the masses and of other allies who might be misled by outbursts of anti-Chinese chauvinism and by counterrevolutionary views on "national unity" and "peace" which are calculated to conceal class struggle and the reactionary character of the present state. It is never a lowly or trivial task to do this. It is a necessity and a duty in the same way that we never tire in exposing the evils of US imperialism, modern revisionism and all reaction.

In conclusion, let it be stated once more that the Communist Party of the Philippine will always be in stride with the advances of the world proletarian revolution in theory and in practice and it will always integrate the universal theory of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought with the concrete practice of the Philippine revolution. It will always combine proletarian internationalism and revolutionary patriotism in the struggle against US imperialism, modern revisionism and local reaction. All of us who fight for people's democracy are all at once patriots and internationalists.

There is not a single significant ideological trend or movement in the Philippines today which does not seek inspiration and lessons from and relations with definite world historical forces. Neither revolutionaries nor counterrevolutionaries nor even the "pure" nationalists can claim their actions and ideas to be absolutely isolated from precedent and contemporary class forces in the world, historically, ideologically or politically. Even such a numbskull counterrevolutionary like Luis Taruc does not show any sign of being solely or mainly guided by the aboriginal ideas of the vestigial Dumagat nomads. Even nationalism was something that emerged in the Philippines during the late part of the 19th century in emulation of the bourgeois liberalism that had been previously systematized in Europe during the early stages of capitalist development.

As proletarian revolutionaries, we are always aided by the struggles and victories of the world proletariat and all oppressed people. But as Chairman Mao has pointed out, "In the fight for complete liberation, the oppressed people rely first on their own struggle and then, and only then, on international assistance." He has long declared: "We stand for self-reliance. We hope for foreign aid but cannot be dependent on it; we depend on our own efforts, on the creative power of the whole army and the people."

* * *

Taruc-Sumulong Gangster Clique Is Desperately Isolated

First published in *Ang Bayan*, Vol. I, No. 4, September 15, 1969.

Since their repudiation and condemnation by the Communist Party of the Philippines and by the overwhelming majority of Red fighters, the ringleaders of the Taruc-Sumulong gangster clique have become more desperately isolated from the people and are already on the verge of annihilation.

As the people have become increasingly aware of their counter-revolutionary gangster features, they have become so weak and ineffective that even as gangsters and stooges for bourgeois electioneering they have been rejected by their close friends like Marcos and Nepomuceno. These bourgeois politicians have chosen to reject their gangster alliance and have found it opportune to annihilate them. Cojuangco, the brutal enemy of the

people of Tarlac, is also avoiding any kind of contact with the Taruc-Sumulong clique.

The impending annihilation of the Taruc-Sumulong gangster clique is a lesson to those who betray the revolutionary class standpoint and fraternize too closely with the class enemy.

Aggravating their isolation from the people, the ringleaders of the Taruc-Sumulong gangster clique have created chaos in their thinning ranks by making executions within the clique at the least suspicion of disloyalty.

Everyday, the Taruc-Sumulong gangster clique and the reactionary Armed Forces of the Philippines are worried about the sure and steady expansion of the New People's Army.

Although Nepomuceno is interested in the soonest extermination of "Commander" Sumulong because of his desire to guarantee the reelection of his wife to Congress this November, the reactionary Armed Forces of the Philippines is deliberately giving the Taruc-Sumulong gangster clique the rope to be able to make intrigues against the Communist Party of the Philippines and the New People's Army.

The ringleaders of the Taruc-Sumulong gangster clique are expected to surrender the moment they, together with the reactionary military authorities, recognize that the people and the New People's Army are already about to arrest them in the most efficient way possible.

Though these bunch of traitors led by Taruc and Sumulong are using their wealth to buy the loyalty of their handful of gangmates through the bourgeois salary system, the sharpening of their contradictions with Nepomuceno has substantially deprived them of their previous sources of income in Angeles City and elsewhere.

* * *

Fake Controversy Concocted to Obscure Fundamental Issues in Church

First published in *Ang Bayan*, Vol. I, No. 4, September 15, 1969.

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

But the Jesuits in their traditional cleverness have concocted a fake controversy obviously calculated to draw fire away from the more substantial

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

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

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

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

* * *

Reformist Organizations Beg for Land Reform from Reactionary Government

First published in *Ang Bayan*, Vol. I, No. 5, October 15, 1969.

Violence and deception are always employed at the same time by the reactionaries. While they attack the revolutionary peasant masses of Central Luzon and the resolute organizers of farm workers and peasants in Negros with the most vicious forces, they field and manipulate reformist organizations that mendaciously borrow the slogans of the revolutionary mass movement with the sole purpose of sabotaging it.

Thus, on the question of land reform, such an ideological and material bastion of feudalism as the Catholic Church started to put up at the Agrifina Circle a sham demonstration for the cause of land reform last September 11.

The press releases issued by the priests and their sacristans tried to create the illusion that they have very many organizations for extending charity to the peasants and farm workers. They are the Federated Movement for Justice and Reform, Young Christian Socialists, Federation of Free Farmers, Youth for Land Reform, Christian Youth Activists, Concerned Christian Youth and so many others with fancy names.

Among the supporters of these "land reform" enthusiasts were characters from the US Agency for International Development (AID), end, of course, the children of landlords in exclusive boys' and girls' sectarian schools.

The bourgeois press bloated up the actual number of the cleric-led demonstrators at the Agrifina Circle from less than 500 to 5,000 at one time and from less than 50 to 500 on most of the days they sat it out on the steps of the old Department of Agriculture building. It always pictured the demonstration leader as furiously threatening to make "revolution" in-between his pleas to have audience with government bureaucrats from the rank of bureau director to department secretary. At one time, the sham demonstrators numbering less than 100 were reported by the bourgeois press to have "stormed" Malacanang and managed to reach Marcos himself without suffering a single casualty despite all "preventive" measures taken by the entire Presidential Guards Battalion.

If a summary is to be made of the whole sham show made by the clerics, the protest demonstration was actually an attempt to minimize the land problem as something that can be solved by the reactionary government.

Playing up to the antics of the clerics and their sacristans, the Flores-Santos faction of the Masaka (Malayang Samahang Magsasaka), which is closely identified with the Land Authority Gov. Conrado Estrella, spent a large amount of money (at least P30,000) on chartered buses last September 19 to ferry about 5,000 people from the provinces in an attempt to join up with the cleric-run demonstration in a "united front" for bourgeois land reform.

They were promptly denounced by the clerics and sacristans as "infiltrators." They were also denounced as "colorum" by the Olalia faction of the Masaka which is closely identified with Secretary of Labor Blas Ople. The press agency of the Lava revisionist renegades bloated up their actual number to 15,000.

Blatantly avoiding Malacanang Palace, the Masaka demonstrators preferred to march from the Agrifina Circle to Plaza Miranda where their energy was dissipated by the speech-making of their officers who demanded that they be employed in the "land reform" agencies of the reactionary government and that such bills as farmers' social security, farmers' memorial and bank, and unification of farmers' associations be passed.

The speakers representing the BRPF (Bertrand Russell Peace Foundation of the Philippines) and the MPKP (Malayang Pagkakaisa ng Kabataang Pilipino) in the Masaka demonstration advocated a "boycott" of the elections. This only served to expose the "multiple policies" of the Lava revisionist renegade clique on the same question. Like the Olalia faction, the Flores-Santos faction is deeply committed to the reelection bid of Marcos and Lopez

and, of course, to the art of begging for official positions in the reactionary government and for financial manna from the reactionaries especially during this bourgeois electoral season.

To the genuine proletarian revolutionaries, land reform is not only a matter of distributing land here and there as the reactionary government may wish. It is essentially the acquisition of political power by the revolutionary peasants themselves under proletarian leadership. Real destruction of feudalism and the achievement of land reform cannot be made without first undermining and destroying the political power of the landlords by revolutionary armed force.

* * *

Reactionary "Labor" Confederations "Unite" behind Management and Marcos

First published in *Ang Bayan*, Vol. I, No. 5, October 15, 1969.

Under the auspices of Labor Secretary Bias Ople, labor aristocrats made a formal agreement last month to merge the Philippine Labor Center and the Philippine Trade Unions Council.

The "united labor movement" was obviously necessitated by the emerging wave of workers' strikes challenging the authority of bourgeois trade union leaders.

The labor aristocrats expressed the view that most of the recent strikes were caused by "squabbles" within and between unions. Slavishly, they declared, "Management is just the innocent victim of these strikes."

The truth is that the trade unions run by labor aristocrats are either disintegrating or rebelling against sham trade unionism.

The labor aristocrats justified their merger as a step to "make organized labor a potent sector this coming elections." They declared, "By being directly involved in the affairs of the government, labor can play a decisive role during elections and can put into office pro-labor officials."

The truth is that the merger is another transitory device to create the illusion that the working class supports the Marcos regime in the November elections.

Among the labor aristocrats, there can be no lasting and true unity because all of them treat trade unions as their own private business ventures.

The Communist Party of the Philippines should work hard in creating party branches and groups among workers in factories, mines, transportation lines and shops in order to topple down fake labor leaders and bring about the ideological, political and organizational unity of the working class. The Party should exert all efforts to smash the bourgeois authority of labor aristocrats

and spread among the workers Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought, which is the proletarian revolutionary ideology.

* * *

Bertrand Russell Peace Foundation, Inc. Admits It Enjoys State Protection

First published in *Ang Bayan*, Vol. I, No. 5, October 15, 1969.

The Bertrand Russell Peace Foundation (Philippine Council), Inc., In a statement issued through the Philippine Collegian last September 10, openly admitted that when an internal struggle occurred among its officers and members two years ago the group now in control of it took advantage of another group by running to the reactionary state for protection and support by having the organization registered in the Securities and Exchange Commission as a non-stock, non-profit corporation.

It must be recalled that when an internal struggle occurred in the BRPF in 1967 the majority members of its Executive Committee decided to oust its chairman, Francisco Nemenzo, Jr., for using the organization as a tool of Soviet modern revisionism and the Lava revisionist renegade clique. Upon his ouster, he flew secretly to London to seek the support of the mother organization. At the same time, certain colleagues of his belonging to the staff of the UP Law Center, an agency of US imperialism created by Romulo in the University of the Philippines, secretly registered the BRPF in the Securities and Exchange Commission without the consent of the BRPF Executive Committee and the general membership. In London, Nemenzo readily got the support of the mother organization which had long before been in the hands of a pack of counterrevolutionaries specializing in attacking the great proletarian cultural revolution and in supporting the revisionist renegade "liberalization" in a number of Eastern European countries. At that time, an internal struggle within the mother organization had only recently resulted in Russell Stetler, US imperialist agent, becoming the trusted hand of the logical positivist Bertrand Russell.

As an international organization, the BRPF has increasingly exposed its counterrevolutionary character and moribund condition since the time it was divided from within by wranglings among the members of its War Crimes Tribunal and its staff.

In the Philippines, the internal struggle in the BRPF has also served to expose the counterrevolutionary stand of the Lava revisionist renegades which has been using it to create ideological confusion and sabotage the struggle against US imperialism, modern revisionism and local reaction. Since 1967, the original members have abandoned it, criticized themselves for joining it on the basis of a low level of political consciousness and

repudiated it as a shameless tool of Soviet modern revisionism and the Lava revisionist renegade clique.

Since the armed invasion and occupation of Czechoslovakia by the Soviet social-imperialists, the BRPF, Inc. has expressed support for Soviet social-imperialism in opposition to the stand of its mother organization supporting the Dubcek revisionist renegade clique. Both internationally and locally, the BRPF has become hopelessly divided against itself as a bourgeois pacifist organization and has been disintegrating in the manner of all bourgeois pacifist organizations.

The BRPF, Inc. is a puny organization that is attractive only to a few in the UP campus who are still impressed with the name of Bertrand Russell and with logical positivism. But it can pose a serious ideological threat if it is not properly exposed and criticized. While it pretends to be "anti-imperialist," it has been consistently slandering proletarian revolutionaries and spreading the counterrevolutionary ideas of Soviet modern revisionism in combination with those of Bertrand Russell and C. Wright Mills. It is an insidious instrument of counterrevolution in the hands of the Lava revisionist renegade clique and the Soviet social-imperialists. It has spread intrigues in mass organizations and it specializes in trying to hold back the rise of political consciousness among teachers and students.

The September 10 statement of BRPF, Inc. served only to confirm the fact that it is a bourgeois pacifist organization when it pompously declared that "the BRPF concept of the movement for peace transcends the traditional pacifist view of passive resistance, appeals to world leaders to be peaceful, and stands for relative non-involvement." All throughout its statement, it was glaringly evident that it was most obsessed with making active resistance to proletarian revolutionaries, in obscuring basic class differences among world leaders, say, between Chairman Mao and the ringleaders of US imperialism and Soviet social-imperialism, and in giving the highest priority to beggarly appeals to "world leaders" and to "relative non-involvement." Reference to "people's war against imperialism" is but a sham afterthought. There was even no clarification as to what "imperialism" it meant.

In an obvious attack against proletarian revolutionaries, the BRPF statement tries to misrepresent them as being against the fight to free the political prisoners. The Program for a People's Democratic Revolution clearly states that the Communist Party of the Philippines is dedicatedly against the curtailment of the political rights of workers, peasants, intellectuals and patriotic individuals. The Party has time and again attacked the unjust incarceration of political prisoners. What the Party is against is the attempt of the BRPF, Inc. to dramatize in propaganda and in practice the freeing of only a small number of political prisoners who are already scheduled to be set free by the bourgeois reactionary government a few months from now. The Party is also aware that the Lava revisionist renegade clique through Francisco Lava, Sr. had continuous behind-the-scenes discussions with then Justice Secretary Claudio Teehankee last year at the US Army and Navy Club regarding the release of only a choice number of political prisoners.

Furthermore, the Party deplors that despite the fact that the Lava revisionist renegade clique is always boastful about its supposed coterie of lawyers it has not cared to extend legal assistance to a big number of other political prisoners who cannot afford the expenses for pursuing their cases in court and who do not have the connections to engage in "judicial diplomacy."

At present, the campaign to free the political prisoners being undertaken by the Lava revisionist renegade clique amounts to nothing but an attempt to glorify a few, obscure many more political prisoners, praise the reactionary government for its false benevolence and beg for only a few months of earlier release for some political prisoners who anyway are scheduled to be set free by the reactionary government.

In a false gesture of magnanimity, the BRPF statement stated that "if in the future they (other organizations) too would have their own political prisoners, it (BRPF) would conduct a similar massive people's campaign to free them, wholeheartedly and with no ill feelings." The falsity of the gesture was evident in the earnestness of the statement to condemn those who criticize the unsavory aspects of the Lava revisionist renegade campaign to free a special category of political prisoners (their Group I so-called).

In practice, however, the hypocrisy of the BRPF is clearest in their silence on the abuses of the landlords and the state against unjustly incarcerated journalists and union organizers in Negros Occidental. The counterrevolutionary revisionists within the BRPF actually go around condemning them as "adventurists" and as "being unworthy of their support." They resent that what they dismiss as "upstarts," the most recent political prisoners, are supposed to be stealing the "limelight" from "their own" political prisoners for whom they are fighting to be released only a few months earlier than scheduled by the reactionary government.

The BRPF is not to be found in the list of organizations campaigning for the freedom of the journalists of the Dumaguete Times, although such less pretentious university organizations like the UP Student Council, the Student Cultural Association of the UP, UP Economics Society, UP Anthropological Society and UP Journalism Club are already deeply involved in a broad and active campaign for their provisional release.

The BRPF also made a confession in its statement that it is nothing but a bourgeois reformist organization. This is an about-face from the pose of its counterrevolutionary revisionist ringleaders when they make it appear in student forums that their organization is even more "revolutionary" than those who actually go and live and fight side by side with the poor peasants and farm workers. The statement confessed that the BRPF is actively involved in propagating the reformist idea of making more "periodic visits" to the countryside.

The BRPF has actually ganged up with certain reactionary campus organizations who talk in a pseudo-left manner about "mass work" but who actually end up imitating the PACD and PRRM (two "rural" agencies of the reactionary government and the US imperialists) and who while away most of their time in hippie joints and coffeehouses in the style of the American

"New Left." This pretentiousness has been harmful as it has been combined with slandering the youth who go with proletarian revolutionaries to the countryside to live with the rural masses in order to participate in the revolutionary mass movement that is determined to wage armed struggle, agrarian revolution and base building. Like Luis Taruc, they use "revolutionary" phrases to attack the genuine revolutionaries.

* * *

Expose and Oppose the Vicious Crimes of the Monkees-Armeng Bayan-Masaka (Lava) Gang

First published in *Ang Bayan*, Vol. II, No. 3, June 1, 1970.

In recent years, the counterrevolutionary bourgeois gang of the Lavas has completely degenerated into a handful of out-and-out agents of the reactionary government. Its ringleaders include four bureaucrats (Francisco Lava, Jr., Francisco Nemenzo, Jr., Haydee Yorac and Ruben Torres); three surrenderees (Domingo Castro, Felicisimo Macapagal and Danny Pascual); and two intelligence agents (Godofredo Mallari and Antonio Santos).

Francisco Lava, Jr. has long been in close association with agents of the CIU (Counter-Intelligence Unit of the PC) and has been funneling information to them against mass organizations. Mallari is no less than a special agent directly connected with Gen. Ismael Lapus of the NICA and is highly paid as clearly evidenced by the sudden increase of his assets since 1964. Santos and Pascual are in direct contact with and regularly report to a certain Major Marcos.

From the beginning, the principal task of the counterrevolutionary gang of the Lavas has been to spread intrigue and slander against mass organizations which refuse to follow its dictates and against those who persist in revolutionary armed struggle. It has boasted of the Masaka as its principal organization and has used a faction of this organization to spread the false illusion that land reform will fall from the gracious hands of the landlords and that land reform could be had by pleading before the offices and courts of the reactionary government.

In its conventions and rallies, the Masaka (Lava) has as its special guests the most reactionary politicians and the most notorious landlords. At the same time, it concocts and whips up the most malicious tales against proletarian revolutionary cadres and other outstanding representatives of the revolutionary mass movement. For what reason? The answer lies in the fact that it receives financial support from the reactionary government to keep the peasants within the bounds of the Agricultural Land Reform Code and to subvert the revolutionary mass movement. Whenever a barrio is raided by reactionary troops, a handful of Masaka (Lava) members is spared of abuses vented on the barrio people by merely bringing out Masaka (Lava) ID cards.

Since sometime last year, however, the counterrevolutionary bourgeois gang of the Lavas has adopted a new tactic in line with the rising fascism of the Marcos puppet reactionary clique. Reacting in a hysterical fashion to the reestablishment of the Communist Party of the Philippines and the emergence of the New People's Army, the Lava revisionist scoundrels adopted a bunch of robbers and "Monkees" as its Armeng Bayan and put at its head a notorious swindler by the alias of Diwa. In a mechanical way, they calculated that with this bandit gang they could attack the Party and the people's army through bloody intrigue and misrepresentation. They stupidly expected to turn the good deed of the Party and the New People's Army in courageously repudiating the Taruc-Sumulong gangster clique into a liability for the people and an asset for their malicious schemes.

Thus, on May 22, last year, the handful of bandits led by Diwa coordinated with the "Monkees," led by former San Luis, Pampanga mayor Federico Taruc and Lt. Cesar Bello, in making a bloody rampage in Angeles City killing and wounding more than a score of innocent civilians. Subsequently, word was systematically spread by the same malefactors that this rampage was the work of the New People's Army. It was also bruited about that retaliatory rampages would be made by the Taruc-Sumulong gangster clique against the people of Tarlac. Attempts to make trouble in Tarlac actually followed. But due to the alertness of the New People's Army, a carload of "Monkees" especially connected with the Diwa bandit gang was intercepted and punished.

Innocent civilians have also been killed at random in several towns in Nueva Ecija and in Arayat, Pampanga and their bodies thrown close to the Tarlac-Nueva Ecija-Pampanga boundary. These murders were made to appear as the work of the New People's Army. Various other crimes, especially extortion and coercion of people to join the Masaka (Lava), have also been perpetrated in several towns in Nueva Ecija, Pampanga and Bulacan in the name of the New People's Army. Thorough investigation by the New People's Army have uncovered the criminal perpetrators to be the Diwa bandit gang in close coordination with the "Monkees" and Masaka (Lava) in all the cases.

The New People's Army have uncovered conclusive proofs of the responsibility of the Monkees-Armeng Bayan-Masaka (Lava) combine for the murder of seven innocent civilians, including three children, in Barrio Sinipit of Bamban, Tarlac. The homes of the barrio people were sprayed with gunfire recently by a group of masked armed men. Subsequently, word was spread by the Tarlac Masaka (Lava) secretary Bartolome Pasio, Bamban Masaka (Lava) secretary Crisostomo Maristela and their handful of henchmen that the Taruc-Sumulong gangster clique was responsible for the rampage. The New People's Army, upon thorough investigation, found out that the incident was perpetrated by the Monkees-Armeng Bayan-Masaka (Lava) gang. Maristela himself, an old running dog of the Lavas, was found out to be a direct participant in the massacre. After Maristela was given his just punishment, together with other culprits, the reactionary armed forces

acknowledged and honored him as an important agent of Task Force Lawin in the Pangasinan and Tarlac area.

Maristela is typical of the "cadres" of the Monkees-Armeng BayanMasaka (Lava) gang. He turned traitor to the revolutionary mass movement in 1953 when he surrendered to Magsaysay. From then on, he operated as an informer of the reactionary armed forces. Upon his death, he was credited by the Armed Forces of the Philippines with the murder of seven fighters and the capture of three commanders of the people's army. There is nothing surprising about the fact that he would still become the Masaka (Lava) secretary for Bamban, Tarlac. The Masaka (Lava) outfit is nothing but an instrument of the reactionary government for deception and murder. Maristela is no different from such notorious traitors and surrenderees as Domingo Castro, Felicisimo Macapagal and Godofredo Mallari who now go around trying to mislead the peasantry.

There is some evidence that Victoria vice mayor Ed Rigor, a "former" high-ranking officer in the National Intelligence Coordinating Agency (NICA), is the armorer of the Monkees-Armeng Bayan-Masaka (Lava) gang in Tarlac province.

The Monkees-Armeng Bayan-Masaka (Lava) gang is as evil as the Taruc-Sumulong gangster clique. They are both enemies of the people. Though these two bandit groups are at odds with each other, each group is being manipulated by a special unit of the reactionary armed forces against the people, the Communist Party of the Philippines and the New People's Army.

The people should be alert to the evil acts of these two counter-revolutionary groups and should act to give them their just punishment. Revolutionary vigilance towards them should be ever sharp. Because they mask themselves as revolutionary, they are even more dangerous and more vicious than reactionary troops in uniform.

* * *

On the Counterrevolutionary Line of the Lava Revisionist Renegades

First published in *Ang Bayan*, Special Release, September 4, 1970.

In a futile attempt to make use of the recent UP campus elections as an occasion for broadcasting counterrevolutionary ideas, the Malayang Pagkakaisa ng Kabataang Pilipino (MPKP) issued a pamphlet entitled "On the Correct View of the Campus Elections" and the Bertrand Russell Peace Foundation (BRPF) issued *Struggle* (Vol. II, No. 1, dated July 20, 1970) with the editorial "Against Adventurism and Reformism."

Making full use of their control of the Movement for the Advancement of Nationalism (MAN), the counterrevolutionary Lava revisionist renegades also put into MAN's official organ, *Sang-ayon sa MAN* (vol. I, No. 5, dated July 22,

1970), such items as "The Stand of the Congress of Trade Unions of the Philippines" and "Our Movement."

The MPKP pamphlet makes token statements against US imperialism and for "people's power" but these serve merely as sugarcoating for the following brazen counterrevolutionary statement:

We consider counterrevolutionary all forms of mass actions that lead to the curtailment of the democratic rights of the people before they are able to effectively defend themselves.... Irresponsible provocation of fascist repression before the masses have attained sufficient political consciousness and preparation is counterrevolutionary and should be fought.

The essence of the above poisonous statement is that revolutionary mass struggle should not be waged lest the reactionaries inflict more atrocities. The clear implication is that preparedness of the masses depends on the readiness of the chieftains of the Lava revisionist renegades to quit their fat-salaried jobs and on the go-signal of their Imperialist, landlord and bureaucrat masters. Ignorant of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought, these revisionist scoundrels also try to make us appear as wanting to seize power in the city so soon even before the full development of the armed struggle in the countryside. No amount of circuitous sophistry and loquaciousness, can cover up the counterrevolutionary line of thinking of the Lava revisionist renegades.

The main purpose of the MPKP pamphlet is very clear in its introduction.

It attacks the heroic masses and proletarian revolutionary leadership that created the first quarter storm of 1970 as a "growing danger" guilty of the "consistent use of misdirected violence and petty vandalism." Then the pamphlet calls for "retrieving the revolutionary gains of the national democratic movement" and states that "responsibility falls on the shoulders of the politically mature and truly progressive mass organizations."

Put these revisionist statements side by side with the diatribes of the fascist puppet chieftain Marcos and other reactionary entities who resort to revolutionary phrasemongering and you cannot fail to see the fundamental similarities. Does not Marcos call the patriotic mass of the demonstrators "mob," "adventurist" and "vandals?" Have not all the diehard reactionaries put blame on the youthful demonstrators for the violence that marked the first quarter storm of 1970? The Lava revisionist renegades could have as well prepared the press release of Raval blaming the students for the murder of their own comrades.

Recent history cannot be easily forgotten; it was the fascist brutes that wantonly attacked the demonstrators with counterrevolutionary violence on January 26 and again on January 30-31. Instead of being condemned as a mindless herd misled by a "few adventurist elements," the masses should be praised for standing up courageously to assert their democratic rights in the face of intimidation and actual terror inflicted on them by the Marcos fascist puppet clique and gloatingly approved by the counterrevolutionary Lava

revisionist renegades who tried might and main to infiltrate the ranks of the demonstrators in order to sabotage the upsurge of revolutionary struggle.

It is not strange for the counterrevolutionary Lava revisionist renegades to support the claims of the Marcos fascist puppet clique that the very plainclothesmen and paid ruffians fielded by Marcos himself to disrupt the ranks of demonstrators and attack petty-bourgeois establishments were bona fide part of the demonstrations. At the height of demonstrations, a handful of no more than 30 redundant members of MPKP and BRPF were given special protection by the fascist brutes to prate about "peace" while government plainclothesmen and paid ruffians tried to discredit the entire demonstrations by attacking demonstrators and petty-bourgeois establishments. There obviously was coordination in a two-pronged effort of the Marcos fascist puppet clique to attack and misrepresent the demonstrators. Several of those caught making trouble were military and police agents.

It can never be denied that revolution is not a dinner party. That it is not a dinner party is no argument for refusing to wage revolutionary struggle or for postponing it until a handful of revisionist renegades are ready to change their counterrevolutionary allegiance to the state.

Putting up a straw figure to puncture at their will, the counterrevolutionary Lava revisionist renegades also claim that the student youth are being made to believe by "student-based organizations" that they are the vanguard of the entire national democratic revolution. What a mischievous fabrication! It has been amply made clear by the Communist Party of the Philippines that the vanguard of the revolution is the working class. In the cultural revolution of the new democratic type, the youth in a way is a vanguard as clearly proven by their taking the forefront during the last whole decade and in the first quarter storm of 1970 in democratic mass actions. It is also possible that from among several youth organizations one of them can be referred to as the vanguard youth organization.

Contrary to the "theorizing" of the Lava revisionist renegades that students are not decisive, the Communist Party of the Philippines has clearly stated that students are decisive. Student demonstrations in Manila have greatly aroused the masses in the countryside and all over the country. From the ranks of student activists there arose many who can remold their thinking to the extent of becoming members of the Communist Party of the Philippines, especially in this era when Imperialism is heading for total collapse and socialism is marching toward world victory. We can assure the Lava revisionist renegades that more and more students are taking the living study and application of Mao Zedong Thought seriously to the extent that they can call the chieftains of the Lava revisionist renegades counterrevolutionary dolls.

There are several more inanities in the MPKP pamphlets. But among these, we pick out one inanity which clearly shows that the Lava revisionist renegades are a bunch of counterrevolutionary idealists. At a time that correct tactics called for the *Collegian* editor to assert his right to hold office

on the basis of examinations he had already successfully taken, the Lava revisionist renegades echo the sham appeals of the Lopez clique to having the student body have a "democratic say" on the *Collegian* with the end in view of forestalling such a democratic policy as allowing the Communist Party of the Philippines to have its views known to the people.

As far as the University of the Philippines is concerned, it is clear as to who is idealist or out of touch with reality. The mass of students have spoken clearly in repudiation of the handful of Malacanang, clerico-fascist and Lava stooges.

The BRPF sheet *Struggle* takes essentially the same reactionary line as the MPKP pamphlet. What makes the former distinctive is that it unwittingly exposes the propensity of the Lava revisionist renegades to resort to malicious intrigue. While it rejects the candidate for chairman of one party, it supports the candidate for vice-chairman of the same party who is bound by the same platform. That is certainly a grand piece of opportunism, hiding under the pretext of fighting opportunism.

Another distinctive characteristic of the BRPF sheet is that it performs the function of the government informer. It suggests that only one particular group carries placards "urging the people to join the New People's Army" and "declaring People's War vs. Martial Law." It also states that one particular group assumes other names in various places.

There is nothing wrong for the large masses to express bluntly the truth; namely, that people's war is the answer to fascist terror. The Party never conceals its political line from the people or from the enemy. But even if the enemy uses a whole division to hunt down Communists, he should not be able to pinpoint a single Communist from among the masses. What needs to be done is to prevent the Lava revisionist renegades and other traitors from being able to point out to the reactionary state who are the members of the Communist Party of the Philippines.

With regard to the question of proliferating organizations, the Communist Party of the Philippines has gathered from its own investigation that each independent youth group from Manila districts participating in the first quarter storm of 1970 is actually several times bigger than the entire "national" BRPF and MPKP put together.

While at certain times the MPKP and BRPF admit and apologize for their extremely small membership in school campuses, they boast of their "bigness" among the masses of workers and peasants and express their disdain for "student-based" organizations. Let us then look into the mass following of these Philistines.

What is pompously called the Congress of Trade Unions of the Philippines is nothing but what is also called the Pambansang Kilusan ng Paggawa. It is also nothing but a remnant of the old Union Impresores de Filipinas, which has a membership of no more than 500 persons. The present leadership of this Lava outfit can collapse as easily as the revolutionary activists can arouse the hoodwinked UIF members to insist on a thorough accounting of

union funds and to seek answers to the question as to why the union has not grown bigger but weaker since after the war or even just since 1954.

Could it be true that the Masaka (Lava) has 5,000; 10,000; 50,000 or even one million members? Have you heard of any significant peasant movement becoming strong without waging revolutionary mass struggles against landlords? Have you heard of any significant mass struggle led by the Masaka (Lava) since its 1964 founding? Anything that would at least approximate the reformist mass actions of the Socialist Party? None, except Masaka (Lava) public meetings which increase during reactionary elections and are lorded over by the officials of the reactionary government. Whenever he is invited by the Masaka (Lava) to be the guest speaker, the fascist puppet chieftain Marcos even disdains to attend personally such meetings and leaves everything to Conrado Estrella, the Land Authority governor.

It is simply impossible to develop really revolutionary mass strength among the peasant masses by misleading them into relying on the Land Reform Code and by preventing them from asserting their armed power.

There is nothing impressive at all about the number of members listed up by the PRRM, Federation of Free Farmers or Masaka (Lava). Without undergoing the test of revolutionary struggle, such members are no better in quality than those chalked up by the Nacionalista Party, the Liberal Party or the Christian Social Movement. Despite the fact that it only openly engages in local reactionary politics, the Masaka (Lava) cannot even elect a councilor from its own ranks in areas such as Cabiao, Nueva Ecija and Bulacan which it boasts of its bailiwicks. Its leaders, notorious surrenderees and swindlers, are no better than panhandlers kowtowing to local landlords and reactionary political figures.

The center of revolutionary peasant struggle in the countryside is Tarlac at the moment. Increasing numbers of peasants here already enjoy rent reduction far more than what the Agricultural Land Reform Code stipulates. In certain areas, some lands have actually been confiscated by the peasants, with the landlords and overseers unable to show their faces. Now who is going to be blamed for the increasing atrocious operations of the puppet military and the introduction of the BSDUs? The peasants? The Communist Party? The New People's Army? According to the counterrevolutionary revisionists, revolutionary mass struggles should not have been waged at all in the first place in order not to enrage their reactionary masters.

It is true that the concentration of BSDUs is in Tarlac and in areas contiguous to this province. To quote from Chairman Mao:

To be attacked by the enemy is not a bad thing but a good thing. It is good if we are to be attacked by the enemy, it proves that we have drawn a clear line of demarcation between the enemy and ourselves. It is still better if the enemy attacks us wildly and paints us utterly black and without a single virtue; it demonstrates that we have not only drawn a clear line of demarcation between the enemy and ourselves but achieved a great deal in our work.

It is noteworthy that in areas where the Monkees-Armeng Bayan-Masaka (Lava) combine is supposed to predominate there are no BSDUs but the lives of the peasants are worse than in areas where we have taken painstaking steps towards agrarian revolution.

As if to flaunt their almost complete control of the Movement for the Advancement of Nationalism, the counterrevolutionary Lava revisionist renegades commit the worst acts of sectarianism by making use of the pages of *Sang-ayon sa MAN* to attack the proletarian revolutionary leadership and the revolutionary masses.

"The Stand of the Congress of Trade Unions" hypocritically calls for "unity" and speaks against the "divide-and-rule" tactics of the enemies of the working class. But in the same breath it seeks to attack the revolutionary struggle of the workers of the Pantranco, US Tobacco Corp. and the Philippine Bank of Commerce. It clearly paints white as black and black as white. It blames the victims of fascist violence by claiming that the workers asked for it.

The CTUP piously states that it does not advocate the use of force and violence as the weapons of the working class struggle. From this basic counterrevolutionary reformist premise, it proceeds to attack the strikes of several workers' unions. Here is an example of a fly dashing its head against the wall. The reformism of the CTUP has not made it any bigger and yet it has the gall to teach revolutionary workers a lesson.

"Our Movement" boasts of its leadership as the "fruit of the tree." The tree must be the Court of Appeals nurturing a CIU agent like Atty Francisco Lava, Jr. to become suddenly the crown prince of the Lava revisionist renegades. Certainly, such a leader of the "kilusan" is not the fruit of the revolutionary mass movement. He is nothing but the heir of the Lava revisionist renegades in the most literal sense. How fantastic that revolutionary leadership can be established simply by bearing a name and by being a bureaucrat both in the reactionary government and in what is patently a bogus revolutionary group.

Now let us take up the question of unity. Was it not under the pretext of calling for unity that mass organizations and important personages have been compelled to withdraw from MAN by the Lava revisionist renegades? At a time that serious attempts were being made to make MAN act on current issues, the Lava revisionist renegades were busy maneuvering to seize MAN completely for themselves. They went to the extent of threatening physical liquidation and writing poison letters to Sen. Lorenzo Tanada against their enemies.

Now, indeed, the Lava revisionist renegades control MAN to the extent that out of 38 national council members they have at least 23 as their running dogs. These council members depend on a listed general membership that is more than 90 percent coming from such wornout marionettes of the Lava revisionist renegades as the Masaka, MPKP, BRPF, Nationalist Lawyers League and Civil Liberties Union. What kind of "united front" is MAN?

Who kept out whom from MAN? What actually kept out what? Who in the end emasculated MAN and paralyzed it during the first quarter storm of 1970? Has MAN become more revolutionary after the Lava revisionist renegades started to lord over it as they did over the colossal failure that was the Democratic Alliance? No! The MAN has become nothing more than a talking shop of the Lava revisionist renegades, the Marcos-type of nationalists and various types of counterrevolutionary agents of US imperialism. It has become no better than that Forbes Park social club, the Civil Liberties Union. It has become the situs of false respectability and compromise. The MAN is only willing to let the Laurel-Langley Agreement lapse but welcomes so many tricks to which the US imperialists and their local running dogs resort.

* * *

On the Movement for the Advancement of Nationalism

First published in *Ang Bayan*, Special Release, September 28, 1970.

There are still some people who are not clear about the current character of the Movement for the Advancement of Nationalism or Makabansang Adhikaing Nagkakaisa (MAN). So, let us clarify how it has become a reactionary organization.

After resorting to various malicious maneuvers during the first two years of MAN's existence, the counterrevolutionary revisionist renegades succeeded in putting at least 23 of their running dogs into the 38-member national council at its Second National Congress. The 15 other council members elected by the Lava revisionist renegade machine were mostly personages without any definite organizational support, with the exception of a few who later withdrew from MAN after realizing that they were being used as mere decoration or as sounding board for intrigues against militant mass organizations that do not toe the bankrupt political line of the Lava revisionist renegades.

As of its Second National Congress, the general membership of MAN was already at least 90 percent controlled by the Lava revisionist renegades. It consists of redundant members from such Lava-controlled outfits as the Masaka (Lava)-Monkees-Armeng Bayan combine, Malayang Pagkakaisa ng Kabataang Pilipino (MPKP), Bertrand Russell Peace Foundation (BRPF), Nationalist Lawyers League (NLL) and the like.

There is no such thing as a united front at work in an organization with the kind of leadership and general membership that MAN now has.

Now, let us look into the ideology of MAN. Let us start by quoting from Senator Lorenzo M. Tanada's keynote address to the Second National Congress of MAN.

1. "The government should begin to take steps now to encourage transfers of American corporations engaged in parity-based industries to the requisite share-ownership by Filipino citizens. *That failing, it should plan out alternatives whereby the government itself might take over the industry—and provide for just compensation to the American shareholders.*" (Emphasis ours.)
2. "*I will not claim that there is enough capital to carry out this industrialization alone.* But I maintain that we have enough capital to play the commandingly leading role in it."
3. "If our government adopts policies to attract capital from abroad, why not first a vigorous policy to draw out local capital from its many hiding places and lure it to industry. The operations of the Manila and Makati stock exchanges are now contributing significantly towards this end. Should there not be more exchanges in other cities like Cebu, Davao or Bacolod?" (No emphasis needed.)
4. "*Foreign capital may be allowed in the non-vital industries* where Filipino capital has not ventured or will not venture, although all incentives must be given to our nationals to widen their area of effective operation."
5. "*Foreign capital may come in* subject to regulations that will make certain that the venture is actually Filipino-controlled, not just nominally so."
6. "*Moreover, foreign investments must be spread out among as many foreign nationalities* as possible so that no one nationality predominates...."
7. "But the above suggested policies are not an isolated idiosyncrasy of a misguided citizen. Australia which started out with an open-arm policy of attraction to foreign investors has reversed that policy *under its new prime minister, Mr. John Gorton.*" (Emphasis ours.)

Sen. Tanada, one of the principal brokers in the enactment of the Investment Incentives Law, made the above statements in direct representation of MAN. It is important for all those who struggle for national democracy to study these statements closely in connection with the Investment Incentives Law, which scoundrels like Gerardo Sicat and John H. Power, have hailed gleefully as a "milestone in the compromise of nationalism and foreign investments." However, like all shysters, the Lava revisionist renegades might make a metaphysical distinction between Tanada the individual and Tanada the MAN representative.

Let us look into what is a more representative document, "MAN's Goal: The Democratic Filipino Society."

First, let us look into "clever" portions of the document:

1. "Through joint ventures and the strengthening of the dominance that foreign capitalists have assured for themselves in previous years, through the encouragement of more repacking and assembly plants and the further processing of the traditional exports of the countries of the Third World, *they (capitalist powers) can still have what they want*

while meeting, to a certain extent the masses' demands for a better life."

2. "Directly, and through the colonial government which they dominate, foreigners seek to preserve their control over Philippine social and economic life by guiding economic development in the direction of colonial industrialization, and, through cultural domination and anti-democratic measures, by curtailing the freedom of the people to decide their own fate. (All emphasis ours.)

The above counterrevolutionary statements rest on a repetition of the "theory of supra-imperialism" concocted by the classical revisionist Kautsky. Hereunder is a more elaborate display of the same thrash in the MAN document:

The new colonial line therefore may be stated as the promotion of capitalist development in the Third World under the hegemony of foreign monopolists. For this reason, various client states of the United States have sponsored, with the enthusiastic support of the latter, land reforms, tax reforms, reforms in public administration, community development programs and others. All these permit some form of local capitalism to succeed.

This merely indicates the need to distinguish between *two possible forms of industrialization: one pursued in the sole interest of imperialist profit, or colonial industrialization; and another guided and determined by the interests of the Filipino people and premised on their exercise of political power or nationalist industrialization.*

Colonial industrialization would benefit both the big landlords and foreign corporations, while giving the illusion of basic improvement—without, however, significantly altering the basis for the conditions which keep the masses in poverty.

Since there would be marked improvement in the living conditions of some sectors of the population, this tactic, if not exposed, would provide anti-nationalists not only with a weapon with which to challenge the concept of attainment of national power as a precondition to the achievement of change, but also with a means to entice some sectors of the nationalist forces to abandon their anti-imperialist position. The danger arising from this stratagem should be apparent. (Emphasis ours.)

Under its quaint "theory of new imperialism," MAN assumes that US Imperialism is still capable of allowing "some form of local capitalism to succeed" and of bringing about "economic development" and "colonial industrialization" to the extent meeting the masses' demand for a better life; not merely to create the "illusion of basic improvement" and worse, provide anti-nationalists with the weapon and means for enticing "nationalist forces" to abandon their anti-imperialist position.

Kautsky's "theory of supra-imperialism," now called "new imperialism" by the "theoreticians" of MAN, was long ago debunked by Lenin who insisted that imperialism is the final stage of capitalism and that it is moribund and

decadent, aggravating backwardness and capable only of oppression and exploitation. Lenin has long ago laid down the theory of uneven development and indicated that imperialism cannot bring about capitalist development or industrialization in a country like the Philippines to the extent feared by MAN as demoralizing to the national democratic movement. It is important for all anti-imperialists to review Lenin's *Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism* and also to make a more thorough study of the nature of imperialism as taught by Chairman Mao, all in connection with the concrete analysis of Philippine history.

MAN's "theory of new imperialism" impugns the basic political line of the new national democratic revolution that can be achieved only through the armed overthrow of US imperialism and its local running dogs. This new concoction of "new imperialism" is a subtle attempt to adduce so much "goodness" to US imperialism in the present system.

Again, where is that much-vaunted "Marxist-Leninist" brilliance of the Lava revisionist renegades? Their economic expertise, too?

Any simple person without any pretensions can easily perceive the intensified oppression and exploitation of every anti-imperialist "sector" in Philippine society. After the ravages of continuous inflation and repeated devaluation of the peso during the last decade, can one still convince others that US imperialism would allow the reactionary government to make "land reform"? Can the reactionary government afford the "just compensation" demanded by the landlord class? Is it not foolish to claim that the "tax reforms" required by the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank are meant to stimulate local capitalism? What "reforms in public administration" and "community development programs" is MAN talking about? In the final analysis, these cannot help US imperialism and these cannot fool the Filipino people.

The essential bankruptcy of "MAN's Goal: The Democratic Filipino Society" lies in the fact that it is addressed to the reactionary state rather than to the broad masses of the people. Prayers for "nationalist industrialization" (including takeover of US firms), land reform (including confiscation of lands), constitutional reforms, reorientation of present culture and so on and so forth are addressed to the enemy. The present reactionary state is expected to make miracles for the broad masses of the people. More can be said about the misorientation of MAN but a full reading of its basic document, especially the section entitled "Working Towards the New Philippine Society," will be better. Anyone who says that MAN is not a reformist organization lorded over by the counterrevolutionary Lava revisionist renegades must be blind to the truth.

The MAN document even fails as an instrument of exposure for people in White areas. It makes a ritualistic denunciation of many unequal treaties and agreements with US imperialism. But it commits serious "acts of omission." It fails to expose the character of the Investment Incentives Law of 1967, the Braderman-Virata communique, the constitutional convention, the resurgence of Japanese militarism, the ASPAC, the global alliance of US

imperialism and Soviet social-Imperialism and so many other evils already well-exposed by truly progressive national democratic organizations. The silence of MAN can only be interpreted as approval of these evils.

The MAN document is so loquacious and overextended, as to make such silly statements as the following:

1. "The Movement must conduct a dialogue with the rank and file of the police and armed forces in order to make them aware of the objectives of the Movement." This obsequious and gratuitous statement is not at all preceded by any clear denunciation of fascist puppetry and the state machinery. This statement programmatically puts MAN at par with the state apparatuses.

2. "Support the *Lupon sa Agham* and other similarly competent agencies on matters concerning the use of consistent science terminology (maugnaying katawagang pang-agham) in Pilipino." The MAN endorses the crackpot language of the purist Gonzalo del Rosario which is the polar opposite of the other crackpot Geruncio Lacuesta, the anarchist of language. As a matter of fact, the "national language" version of the MAN document is in the sectarian and esoteric language of del Rosario.

Hereunder is a gross piece of doubletalk:

The progressive forces of Filipino society must strive to learn how to utilize national and local elections, in order to advance the cause of the democratic Filipino state. Public discussions with the politicians of all political parties must be conducted as well as with other groups or organizations ostensibly committed to freedom, progress and peace, in order to draw the sincere elements into the Movement and expose the false. Election time should be considered an occasion for the propagation of nationalist and democratic ideas. But MAN must guard against involvement in conventional politics, and should not be identified as working for the electoral victory of individuals or groups. (Emphasis ours.)

The special interests of the Lava revisionist renegades in "conventional politics" are not, however, neglected as well demonstrated by the following political demands:

MAN should work for the restoration of:

1. The right of suffrage to all persons disqualified as a consequence of conviction for an offense;
2. The right of suffrage and to hold public office to those who have been convicted of political crimes.

What is essentially wrong about the above prayer to the reactionary state is that it suits the desire of the counterrevolutionary Lava revisionist renegades to whip up the revisionist line that parliamentary struggle is the main form of struggle. And it is pertinent to ask: How many times and for how much have the chieftains of the counterrevolutionary Lava revisionist renegades sold the name of MAN to reactionary puppet politicians in Manila, Nueva Ecija and Bulacan?

The MAN document prates about learning "the dynamics of people's direction, through demonstrations, strikes, petitions and other forms of

political action." But in reality, MAN has only learned to keep away from them or oppose them through its organizational components like the MPKP, BRPF and others which are masterminded by the Lava revisionist renegades. Where was MAN during the first quarter storm of 1970? It could not even issue a press release then. Instead, one of its leading representative was proposing and making big empty talk about a "coalition government" with the Marcos fascist puppet clique.

The MAN cannot be a "united front" at all. Its line does not correspond to the general line of a truly proletarian revolutionary party. It corresponds only to the general line of the Lava revisionist renegades. Some might claim that the MAN document was not drafted by the Lava revisionist renegades alone but certainly no one can deny that in the MAN leadership they have at least 23 running dogs and in the general membership they have more than 90 percent. It is important to repeat these facts in order to show that the Lava revisionist renegades have the final say on everything within MAN.

After this criticism of MAN, there is certainly going to be an uproar about "rocking the boat" among the Lava revisionist renegades and other anticommunist diehards. Have they not always talked about "absolute unity" in their kind of "front" even as they run down their "allies" through the most unprincipled whispering campaigns, poison letters and backstabbing? They are not just fond of holding empty bottles of what they call "old wine." They have resorted to co-masterminding the Monkees-Armeng Bayan-Masaka (Lava) gang to perpetrate bloody intrigues and conduct espionage work for the reactionary state under the cover of MAN and Masaka (Lava) chapters at a few isolated points in the country. The counterrevolutionary Lava revisionist renegades are worried to death by the fact that a real united front has arisen and is developing rapidly outside of their treacherous and narrow circle.

All those who are genuinely interested in the principles of a genuine national united front should read the following writings of Chairman Mao:

1. Introducing *The Communist*
2. The Question of Independence and Initiative within the United Front
3. On Tactics against Japanese Imperialism
4. On New Democracy
5. On Coalition Government
6. Current Problems of Tactics in the Anti-Japanese National United Front
7. Freely Expand the Anti-Japanese Forces and Resist the Onslaught of the Anti-Communist Diehards
8. Unity to the Very End
9. On Policy
10. Greet the New High Tide of the Chinese Revolution

* * *

Against the Wishful Thinking of a Revisionist Puppet of US Imperialism

First published in *Ang Bayan*, Special Issue, January 27, 1971.

Reacting to Chapter One of *Philippine Society and Revolution*, "Review of Philippine History," which appeared in the *Philippine Collegian* last year under the tentative book title *Philippine Crisis*, Jesus Lava wrote the article "Paglilinaw sa 'Philippine Crisis' and had it circulated in mimeographed form with the declared intention of clarifying certain events and policies involving him and the old merger party of the Communist and Socialist Parties since 1950.

The Lava article actually has two major parts. The first part disputes the thesis that feudalism is the social base of US imperialism in a semicolonial and semifeudal country like the Philippines. The second part deals with a number of events and policies that Jesus Lava had to do with since 1950 and that unavoidably had to do with earlier years.

I. Capitulation to US Imperialism and the Domestic Ruling System

Jesus Lava writes, "US imperialism is not joking in its desire to realize land reform. The alliance of the imperialists and feudalists became truly effective during the period of classical or old colonialism. In fact, the principal requirement in the life of imperialism then was to get the substance of mines, put up big plantations which cultivate raw materials for US industries, like sugarcane, abaca, coconut, pineapple, etc. and to export their finished products."

Lava contends that it is to the interest of US imperialism to make land reform in the Philippines inasmuch as it is its strategy to seize or at least neutralize the peasantry and deprive the proletariat of its main force. He contends further that such a significant change in the countryside will raise the income of the peasants and allow them to purchase commodities imported from the United States.

Lava cites and commends the Rivera-MacMillan Report, drafted by a US Imperialist survey mission in 1950, as something almost like the memorandum drafted by a "Communist leader." He claims that US imperialism was bent on making land reform in order to frustrate the revolutionary movement. That land reform was not actually implemented was because, according to him, firstly, the dangers to imperialist rule subsided and secondly, there was still some "small amount of power" in the hands of the feudalists.

"Land reform" (quotes are our own) in Taiwan is gleefully cited by Lava as a proof of the supposed interest of US imperialism in land reform. According to him, this is one "country" where land reform was implemented by US imperialism in order to retain and aggravate its control. And he ventures to state that in "other backward countries" (semicolonial and semifeudal), which he fails to mention, US imperialism is already liquidating feudalism on

account of the fact that feudalism endangers rather than supports US imperialism.

With a triumphant air, Jesus Lava claims that his "facts" debunk what he calls a "new theory invented by Jose Ma. Sison"—the thesis that feudalism is the social base of US imperialism in the Philippines. Unwittingly, Lava exposes for everybody's contempt his colossal ignorance of Marxism-Leninism. He does not know that the formulation to the effect that the landlord class forms the main social base for imperialist rule in a semicolonial and semifeudal country is already part of the great treasure of Marxism-Leninism and is verified by Philippine history, including current reality. This formulation was first made by Comrade Mao Zedong to reflect Old China that was dominated by imperialism and feudalism.

Philippine history shows clearly that US imperialism successfully imposed itself on the Philippines and the Filipino people by assimilating and subordinating to itself domestic feudalism at the beginning of the century. Since then, there has yet been no basic change from the combined rule of US imperialism and feudalism, with the latter serving as the social base of the former. Philippine society is still semicolonial and semifeudal and will remain so until the triumph of the new democratic revolution.

Lenin long ago defined the moribund and decadent character of US imperialism. It is against the very nature of imperialism, its fundamental interest, to liquidate feudalism in the Philippines and thereby bring about the classical development of national capitalism in the Philippines. It suffices for US imperialism to take advantage of the feudal backwardness of the countryside to exact superprofits. Having reached its final stage of development since the beginning of this century, US capitalism relies on feudalism in semicolonial and semifeudal countries in a futile attempt to ward off its collapse. It is not feudalism that endangers US imperialism. It is the new democratic revolution. Only a bourgeois idealist will equate feudalism with the new democratic revolution as a "danger" to US imperialism. Lava's revisionist ideology easily leads him to the sophistry that US imperialism will liquidate itself before it is smashed by the new democratic revolution.

The surplus capital that US imperialism has exported to the Philippines either in the form of loan capital or direct investments has only served to perpetuate the colonial exchange of US finished products and local raw materials and to keep intact the political and economic rule of the comprador big bourgeoisie in cities and of landlords in the countryside. It is not true that US imperialism is already losing interest in mines and plantations in the Philippines. On the contrary, these are now being increased and expanded.

It is a complete folly for Lava to imagine that international capitalism, mainly US imperialism, is no longer interested in having a landlord class reliably providing it with raw materials and assisting it in counterrevolution throughout the country. It is an ideological atrocity for him to imagine that the time is past for what he chooses to call pre-1946 "classical" or "old" colonialism.

Lava should not be allowed to spread US imperialist propaganda. He must be called to task for perfidiously calling Taiwan a "nation" and citing it as an example of a "country" where US imperialism is supposed to have frustrated revolution by implementing "land reform." We must insist on the truth that Taiwan, a province of China under US domination, is still a hell of a place for the peasantry. Serfdom still exists there, in so-called model farms as well, with the peasants paying tribute to private landlords and land administrators of the Chiang bandit gang. The lands arbitrarily seized by the militarist puppets of US imperialism still need to be redeemed. An agrarian revolution will have to be waged by the peasants of Taiwan to liberate themselves from the landlord class and its US imperialist masters.

It is a blatant insult, a brazen act of treason, for Lava to suggest that the Rivera-MacMillan Report was something that could have been written by a Communist. A renegade could have done it though. This report was at the most superficial and led to nothing more than Magsaysay's bogus land reform. It could not have the least misled anyone into believing that US imperialism was interested in realizing land reform had it not been for the failure of the Lavas to effect land reform in the course of revolutionary struggle.

A reading of the entire book, *Philippine Society and Revolution*, especially Chapter Two, "Basic Problems of the Filipino People," will disabuse anyone of the illusion that US imperialism is capable and willing to effect land reform in the Philippines. It is unmitigated treason for one who boasts of himself to be a Communist to spread the lie that US imperialism can and will fulfil the main content of the new democratic revolution, the solution of the land problem.

Lava's wishful thinking leads him to so many inanities. One of them is his underestimation of the peasants' capability for knowing the evil of US imperialism. He writes, "It is difficult to say that the ordinary peasant is really a conscious anti-imperialist." Then he proceeds to demonstrate that the peasant can only become conscious of his feudal exploitation and oppression. This is Lava's way of preparing for his argument that to tackle the land problem is to obscure the evil of US imperialism.

Our Party cadres and Red fighters in the countryside can assure Lava that the ordinary peasants can easily comprehend even at this early stage that the rifles and armored vehicles of the fascist puppets and landlords are supplied by US imperialism to oppress the peasantry; that the rising price of fertilizers is dictated by a "floating rate" imposed by US monopoly capital; that the high fees for irrigation are caused by onerous payments to such international usurers as the World Bank; and so on and so forth.

Lava harps on the misconception or aberration that to lay the principal stress on conducting armed struggle, agrarian revolution and base building among the peasant masses in the countryside is to be led away from the anti-imperialist struggle. Lava's belief that feudalism can be liquidated without fighting US imperialism and that US imperialism can and will effect land reform leads him to the insane conclusion that those who advocate agrarian revolution—the carrying out of genuine land reform as a basic

bourgeois-democratic measure in the new type of democratic revolution—would actually be helping US imperialism to keep its power in the Philippines.

We assure and reassure him that to truly carry out the antifeudal struggle is necessarily to carry out an armed struggle, which is also necessarily an anti-imperialist struggle. It is only by arousing and mobilizing the peasant masses, and one cannot do so without taking up the land problem properly, that the largest and most powerful contingents can be raised against US imperialism. Far from disarming the people against US imperialism, an agrarian revolution will surely arm the people against US imperialism. Furthermore, the increasing breakup of feudalism through armed revolution will surely compel US imperialism to intervene even more brazenly and will therefore intensify the revolutionary struggle against US imperialism.

In his obsession to debunk the formulation that feudalism is the social base of US imperialism in the Philippines, Lava states that US Imperialism tries to increase or change its "supporting forces" or "additional forces" such as "from among the military through 'military assistance,' 'mutual defense,' 'PX,' 'training in the US'; from among the intellectuals and students, by way of scholarships to the US, exchange professorships, etc.; from among comprador capitalists, through new 'trade preferences' (as in sugar); from among bureaucrat capitalists, by way of direct and indirect bribery; from among workers, through labor centers, trade union 'aid' from US trade unions, junkets 10 conferences, etc.; and from among peasants, through land reform, PRRM, rural development, 4-H clubs, rural credit facilities, etc." In this regard, Lava looks so pathetic. The poor man is not even capable of categorization. What he so laboriously enumerates as "supporting forces" or "additional forces," which are supposed to render the land-lords less important, are but various forms of agency to imperialism. Where is all that Lava reputation for intellectualism among bourgeois circles when Jesus cannot even comprehend the specifics of such a category as imperialism?

Lava's acknowledgment of his having written four letters to Macapagal advising him on the land reform bill of 1963 is exceedingly gratifying. Portions of these letters are even reproduced in a self-serving attempt to show that their contents are correct and proper. Upon our examination, these show nothing that saves Lava from the Charge of treason and capitulation to the enemy.

The first letter obsequiously states that Macapagal's "drive for Moral regeneration is important" though it must play second fiddle to agrarian reform. Then it proceeds to give pious advice about land Worm to Macapagal, the chief puppet of US imperialism and feudalism at the time.

The second letter protests that the land reform bill requires the peasants to pay for the land promised to them. It also notes that the peasants are being promised reforms so that neocolonialism and exploitation may be perpetrated.

The third letter expresses sadness about the mutilation of the original Macapagal-Manglapus bill. The implication is carried that the original draft

was good enough. For why should Lava protest its "mutilation," its "emasculatation" and its "dilution?"

The fourth letter is the most treasonous, if not the most stupid. It carries the following passage:

American imperialist self-interest in this regard ("land reform") is truly enlightened; it seeks to perpetuate its dominance by splitting the peasantry from the national movement for emancipation, by isolating the anti-imperialists from the peasantry. Secondly (sic), it hopes to create a lucrative market for its finished goods among the peasantry newly liberated from feudal bondage (but retaining their imperialist chains). By instituting agrarian reforms, it is hoped that peasant unrest and disaffection, which heretofore had been a powerful factor in the national anti-imperialist, anti-colonial revolution, would be assuaged. It is further hoped that the peasantry would thus be transformed from an enemy into a friend—or at least into an indifferent entity (indifferent to imperialist exploitation and domination). Thus, the new colonial relations would be preserved. A brilliant strategy indeed!

Jesus Lava, the revisionist puppet of US imperialism, also cockily pontificates:

The institution of agrarian reforms, in the context of the new colonial relations (which is the goal of imperialism) would thus reduce this government into a mere pawn on the chessboard of American imperialist politics and economics, incapable of independent action for our national progress, forever beholden and subservient to, dependent on, and at the mercy of, the strategy, actions, interests, whims and prejudices of American imperialism and its government.

Though Lava sounds as if he were fighting US imperialism in this passage, he actually insinuates two treasonous lines: (1) that the Filipino peasant masses are a passive entity to whom US imperialism graciously grants agrarian reforms and that agrarian reforms are possible even without mass mobilization; and (2) that the reactionary government is not yet a pawn of US imperialism and that it would be reduced to such a status upon the institution of agrarian reforms. This passage could not have been written by a true Communist.

Lava's unsolicited letters to Macapagal document ideological and political bankruptcy; a surrender of initiative to the enemy on such a vital question as land reform. If Lava were truly revolutionary, as he was no less the general secretary of a communist party, he had no business in the very first place to write letters of advice for a puppet chieftain of US imperialism like Macapagal. No true Communist would ever cheapen himself this way before the enemy.

Lava argues that complete rejection, turning away from or opposition to the land reform bill, especially then, would be interpreted by the peasant masses as refusing to pay attention to their demand and interest. He says that the movement must meet any proposal—from whomever it comes—and show the parts that are good and the parts that are not. If this is not

bankruptcy, what is it then? A true Communist is bound to oppose every sham land reform law passed by the enemy and to lead the revolutionary peasant movement—not to toady up to the Imperialist landlord agent Macapagal!

Lava swings at us with the question, "if US imperialism was the proponent or the one behind the land reform act, why is it that until now almost nothing is being done towards its realization?" For raising this question, we wonder if Lava still has a sound mind. All along he has been claiming that US imperialism is capable and willing to effect land reform in the country.

Then he chides us for making a "simplistic" explanation for the lack of land reform around. He does not accept the observation that the reactionary government is simply bereft of financial resources to carry out enough token land reform projects to keep up the illusion that "land reform" is moving ahead. For the information of Lava, we do not offer the "lack of financial resources" as the "simplistic" explanation for the emptiness of the reactionary "land reform" program. US imperialism and its comprador-landlord allies themselves simply do not want land reform. They use the full range of their political power to prevent it. That is why in the first place the Agricultural Land Reform Code is calculatedly full of loopholes. On the score of financing alone, it will take not only a few billions of pesos in cash and bonds to buy out the landlord class, to satisfy its demand for "just compensation" if it were willing to sell out. And yet the poor peasants would not be able to afford the price of redistribution as in all previous cases of sham land reform.

Believe us, US imperialism and all its running dogs are in a grave economic and financial crisis, so grave that they cannot use their own funds to benefit the very peasant masses that they need more than ever to exploit. Lava makes a big laughingstock of himself by insisting that these enemies of the people, especially of the peasantry, have limitless resources and willingness to effect what in the first place they do not actually want—land reform. Fools as they are, they have become greedier and more brutal even as armed revolution has started in the countryside.

Lava has become such a counterrevolutionary fool, one of the worst revisionist puppets of US imperialism, that he lumps together the clerico-fascists, the manufacturers, workers, peasants and professionals in wanting land reform. Like the US imperialists, the clerico-fascists supposedly want land reform in order to prevent the new democratic revolution, seize the leadership of the revolutionary mass movement from the proletariat and preserve their wealth. Lava says that it is only the landlords and "small landowners," the US militarists and war manufacturers who oppose land reform.

Lava takes pains to distinguish between "peace-loving" US manufacturers and financiers and "warmongering" militarists and war manufacturers. He pictures the former as wanting land reform and the latter as "indifferent, if not opposed" to it. He makes this kind of distinction principally to obscure the essential nature of US imperialism—aggressive and counterrevolutionary.

Lava offers a muddled explanation for what he calls "delay" in the implementation of the "land reform" he expects from US imperialism. It is best to quote from him to show his utter failure to grasp dialectical materialism:

The struggle of classes and groups in the US and also in the womb of the Philippine government, the compromise among those contradicting each other, is the main cause of the frustration of the first land reform bill. The persistence and nonresolution of this contradiction is the reason for the delay in the rapid implementation of the approved bill.

In conclusion to this first section of our reply, we must express disgust as to how Jesus Lava ever became the general secretary of a communist party. His theoretical knowledge of Marxism-Leninism and his perception of Philippine society are extremely defective. He has such a great difficulty arguing against Marxism-Leninism and reality that he oftentimes contradicts himself in the same article or tries vainly to confuse his reader.

II. Abandonment of Revolutionary Struggle

In clarifying events and policies for which the Lavas have been responsible, Jesus Lava takes the air of someone who has led a revolution to triumph or at least preserved revolutionary forces for another advance after a temporary retreat or setback. He may have any kind of illusion. But errors in revolution as serious as those of the Lavas are most easily proven by the total defeat, the obliteration of entire revolutionary organizations. The political isolation of the Lavas for more than two decades is obvious enough to everyone. In the present upsurge of the revolutionary struggle, the Lavas and their handful of minions are utterly isolated from the broad masses of the people in both city and countryside and are cast away at every turn. With their outright counterrevolutionary revisionist standpoint, the Lavas are always caught fawning over the people's enemies.

It has become an incontrovertible part of history that the conversion of units of the Hukbong Mapagpalaya ng Bayan (HMB) into "organizational brigades" was nothing but a preparation for the abandonment of the armed struggle and the formal open adoption of parliamentary struggle as the main form of struggle in 1956. As early as 1955 it was already obvious that the policy on "organizational brigades" was capitulationist, a measure for disarming and liquidating armed units of the HMB.

Whether this policy was formally adopted in 1954 or 1956 is without much help to Lava in his argument or insistence that it was a correct policy. It suffices for us to know that in 1955 and 1956 this policy clearly became an excuse to move the people's army away from armed struggle and marked the reversal of the "Left" opportunism of the Jose-Jesus Lava leadership to Right opportunism.

In defense of his policy on "organizational brigades," Jesus Lava points out the urgent need for emphasizing organizational work since 1954 (since, in his own words of emphasis, the people were already short of bullets and had

difficulties getting replacements) and then he does a lot of preaching about changing main forms of struggle from one period to another. He reviews the aims of the "organizational brigades" as the following (in his own words): (1) to have those in armed units guided in educational work by organizational cadres who had more knowledge and experience in such matters; (2) to have organizational cadres given lessons, experience and security by those in armed units; (3) to promote organizational work among the masses, which was more needed then; and (4) to have those in armed units experience organizational work (feel its problems) which they seemed to forget when they were faced with hunger and extreme difficulty.

It was extremely late for Jesus Lava to think only in 1954 that the people's army should be involved in organizational work. At the very outset and all throughout the course of revolution, the people's army should be engaged in organizational work. The people's army is an armed force for carrying out the political tasks of the revolution. According to Chairman Mao, the Red army fights not only for the sake of fighting but in order to conduct propaganda among the masses, organize them, arm them and help them to establish revolutionary power.

Lava admits that he and his ilk never discovered the correct organizational form in conducting the armed struggle. He can only surmise now in his article that the Committee on Land Distribution could have been the correct form had it been organized in areas where the masses were ready. It is clear that the Lavas never conducted armed struggle together with agrarian revolution and base building. It is possible that the Lavas assumed as early as 1950 and even earlier that to solve the land problem by revolutionary means is to become pro-imperialist. Or they were simply ignorant of the Marxist-Leninist principle that the peasant struggle for land is the main content of the new democratic revolution.

Jesus Lava confirms that the parliamentary form of struggle was formally adopted as the main form of struggle in 1956. He may write without end that the parliamentary form of struggle was appropriate and correct and he may argue with all fury that he tried to conserve or even heighten the armed strength of the people's army by this policy. But he can never change the incontrovertible fact that soon after the adoption of the policy he fled into hiding all by himself and then later allowed such a scoundrel outfit as the Taruc-Sumulong gangster clique to finally usurp leadership in the old people's army.

For the edification of all, let us repeatedly state that the armed struggle is the principal form of the revolution in a semicolonial and semifeudal country. Red political power is possible in the countryside because of the country's extremely uneven development brought about by imperialism. Based on the specific conditions of the Philippines, the armed struggle is in essence a peasant war and the Party's relation with the peasantry and its close relations with the peasant war are Oils and the same thing.

Obdurately trying to obfuscate his responsibility for the failure of his own leadership, Jesus Lava blames what he calls the "special conditions" that

make the Philippines "different" from other countries. In citing four "special conditions," he fails to show how Marxism-Leninism can be applied to tackle them. Instead, he merely uses them as an excuse for not having correctly applied the universal laws of Marxism-Leninism during his own time and even now refuses to make a Marxist-Leninist analysis to show the revolutionary way out.

Firstly, Lava notes that the Philippines among the backward countries is the only one that has the longest experience of democratic processes. He ranks the Philippines with capitalist countries like France, England, Italy, the United States, Canada, Belgium, etc. in this regard. That the country has not had a "dictator" like Chiang Kai-shek, Ngo Dinh Diem, Batista, Peron and Trujillo is due, according to him, to the successful tactic of US neocolonialism to prevent presidents from getting reelected except lately in 1969. The reelection of Marcos has, according to him, meant a change of imperialist tactic; namely, allowing the reelection of a president and subsequently encouraging people to demand Marcos' overthrow. Thus, Lava implies that all mass struggles breaking out now against enemy "due processes" and "duly-constituted" authorities are actually supported by US imperialism.

If one were to believe the Lava organizations of today, the CIA is behind the unprecedented revolutionary mass actions against US Imperialism, feudalism and bureaucrat capitalism, the very same mass actions that these Lavaites try vainly to infiltrate with a handful of henchmen with big banners. These counterrevolutionaries further imagine and insist that Marcos as Marcos will be overthrown not just possibly and probably but surely (because of CIA machinations) and not because he is the fascist puppet chieftain of US imperialism but because he has ceased to be "useful" to US imperialism.

Secondly, Lava notes that the Philippines more than other colonized nations is so steeped in the education and culture of the imperialists. According to him, the "Filipino" is so colonially-minded because of Spanish colonialist destruction of native culture; the adoption of English as national language; the mass media which makes imperialist propaganda.

Thirdly, Lava notes that among all colonized countries in Asia occupied by the Japanese, only the Philippines was "liberated" by the "mother country." The result is that most Filipinos of the 1945 generation have felt indebted to US imperialism.

Fourthly, Lava notes that the Philippines is an archipelago and therefore cannot offer any sanctuary where the people's army can hold large-scale training, stockpile arms and rest from the ceaseless and long struggle.

Lava cannot exculpate himself from his mistakes and failure by merely enumerating the above "special conditions." He only succeeds in exposing his counterrevolutionary idealism, lack of revolutionary class standpoint and malicious regard for the revolutionary leaders and the masses now successfully and correctly dealing with these "special conditions."

Jesus Lava refuses to admit that the Lavas contributed in a big way to the US imperialist trick of maintaining the false illusion that there is democracy in the Philippines. The old merger party, especially under the sway of the

series of Lava leaderships, always vowed allegiance to the puppet governments set up by US imperialism. The principal leaders of the old merger party had the bad habit of running for elective positions under the commonwealth government and the present puppet republic. In the early years after World War II when the old merger party had a people's army, revisionist scoundrels like Jesus Lava and Luis Taruc were more interested in subordinating themselves to the Nacionalista Party, getting a measly share of bourgeois parliamentarism and running for the reactionary puppet congress than in engaging and persisting in armed revolution, the only way by which the enemy can be forced to cast off his mask of bourgeois democracy.

At a time that the revolutionary masses are rising up in both city and countryside, the Lava revisionist renegades busy themselves in slandering the Communist Party of the Philippines, the New People's Army and the national democratic mass organizations as instruments of the enemy for attacking the enemy and for bringing out the worse of the enemy for isolation and revolutionary attack. At the moment, the Party is successfully leading the mass movement to shatter the superstructure of the reactionary system—its policies and culture—and is steadfastly establishing armed revolutionary bases in the countryside.

The Lavas could not have led in the past any revolutionary propaganda movement similar to the present one because in the first place they could not wean even themselves away from counterrevolutionary bourgeois thinking. The cultural revolution of a new democratic type that is now developing so rapidly throughout the archipelago was anathema to the Lavas inasmuch as they sought to make Marxism-Leninism an esoteric cult. Even now they are antagonized by our expounding publicly the class basis of the strategy and tactics of the new democratic revolution.

The kingpins of the Lava revisionist renegades have only themselves to blame for reinforcing the myth that US imperialism liberated the Philippines. Before and after 1945, they helped drum up the lie that US Imperialism would return to establish an independent democratic republic. They did everything to pave the way for the reconquest of the country. They pretended to be mad at McNutt and MacArthur in 1945-46 for opposing "independence"; they had never been as mad at the US government for pretending to "grant" independence. Jesus Lava himself wanted to be a congressman in abject submission to a puppet republic. The Democratic Alliance had been conceived as early as September 1944 as a reception committee to welcome US imperialism.

That the Philippines is an archipelago is no argument against revolutionary class analysis and revolutionary class struggle. The geography of the Philippines did not change in the war of resistance against Japanese imperialism and yet the people's guerrilla could hold their ground against the enemy and whenever necessary, could trade space for time without losing all ground. Provided the masses are fully aroused and mobilized, the

archipelagic character of the Philippines can even aggravate the dispersal and isolation of the enemy in the countryside.

Jesus Lava is an out-and-out renegade who underestimates the revolutionary masses. He would even sneer at and call as untrue a statement of ours that praises the revolutionary spirit of those who wanted to fight back against the enemy in 1946. However, he admits that people in their hatred of the Military Police Command and Civilian Guards were willing to fight but expresses doubts as to whether they were ready for a protracted people's war. He belittles the desire of the masses to fight back when they are being attacked in an attempt to cover up the failure of the leadership. Aside from being attacked by the enemy, in what manner can the people become conscious of the necessity of armed struggle?

If many people were encouraged to join the armed struggle in 1950 because of the large offensives launched by the HMB, it was not their fault that the armed struggle would later fail because of the purely military viewpoint that the Jose-Jesus Lava leadership promoted. The masses and the good cadres in the minority whom had browbeaten should not now be made the whipping boys of a bankrupt Lava leadership.

Lava admits that all the peasants were secretly or openly desirous of having land to own and till. Then to obscure the failure in leadership to conduct land reform in support of the revolution, he writes, "But many were shy and hesitant to express their desire—ashamed before the landlords or afraid of someone. And among those who expressed their desire to have land, only a few were ready to take up arms in order to have it. And so many then wanted only to increase their crop-share and improve some agricultural conditions." Lava would rather underestimate the peasant masses and neglect their interests than recognize the decisive task of arousing and mobilizing them according to their interests.

Lava admits that the Jose-Jesus Lava leadership (PB-In and PB-Out) perpetrated the error of adventurism in 1950. But he denies that the PB-Out was distantly separated from the main units of the people's army and makes the preposterous claim that there were as many units of the people's army as there were regional commands to which members of the PB-Out were dispersed. Lava should not try to deny the obvious: that the isolation of the PB-Out as a whole from the main units of the people's army was best shown during the February-March 1951 emergency meeting when it was helpless in the fastnesses of the Sierra Madre in the face of enemy attacks. He should be honest enough to admit that he underwent difficulties when he could no longer get his mail and supply of canned goods because the squad's *balutan* and couriers could not cross enemy lines.

Lava admits that the adventurist leadership of which he was a part dismissed the value of propaganda among the masses and failed to organize and mobilize the people. But he does not accept the fact that the HMB leaped over unstable and unreliable areas. He insists that all the areas covered by the armed units (afflicted as they were with the purely military viewpoint) were reliable and stable areas. It is obvious that until now he does

not know what constitutes a reliable and stable area. At any rate, defeat is a historical fact that stares him in the face; he must not talk as if he and his clique still stood on a square mile of their kind of reliable and stable areas of yesteryears.

Jesus Lava boasts that the adventurism of 1950 has long been examined and criticized. But it appears that he does not know what it was all about. He even fails to acknowledge that he was a perpetrator himself of adventurism in 1950 and for some years after. After trying vainly to parry off the truth about his own responsibility, he accuses the Communist Party of the Philippines now reestablished on the theoretical basis of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought of failing to learn from the adventurism of 1950. It is clear that the numbskull equates adventurism with armed struggle though such armed struggle be carried out in accordance with Chairman Mao's theory of protracted people's war.

Lava himself admits in his article that in 1950, he and his ilk were lacking in any knowledge of protracted people's war. But it shows that he does not know what it is even now. From his prison cell he makes comment on the current armed struggle. Flaunting his empty reputation as a "veteran," he takes to boasting that he and his ilk lasted long even without any rural base. He is not assailed by a single pang of shame that he and his ilk squandered in only a few months in 1950 the people's gains which were essentially made at a great price in the war of resistance against the Japanese fascists. These were gambled away in a splurge of adventurism after a considerable period of the Lavas' trying to lose them in bourgeois parliamentarism.

Despite his admission that the old merger party failed to perform the political tasks of the revolution well, Lava insists after a mere change of expression that the HMB under Lava leadership pursued the mass line. He admits one thing only to deny it at another turn. He needs to be told that in at least 90 percent of areas which were formerly reached by the HMB the people still relate to the New People's Army the abuses that they suffered in the hands of HMB units forced into desperation by the erroneous policies of the Jose-Jesus Lava leadership. When in desperate need for food, many HMB units resorted to actions contrary to the people's interests. Jesus Lava should not cover this up by accusing us of sheer malice in criticizing the errors that befell the old people's army.

For him to raise the notorious swindler and bandit, Diwa, as a model of the Red fighter persevering on the revolutionary path is to besmirch the honor of true revolutionaries. Diwa is a confederate of a five-man holdup gang which was punished by the New People's Army sometime in 1969. He has directly participated in bloody acts of intrigue against the New People's Army in certain towns in Central Luzon. He is a frequent accomplice-in-crime of BSDUs associated with ex-mayor Federico Taruc of San Luis, Pampanga. He reports frequently to the headquarters of the 10th BCT of the reactionary army. This is the "commander-in-chief" of the Monkees-Armeng Bayan-Masaka (Lava), a common criminal who masquerades as a revolutionary to cast mud at the Party and the NPA.

Lava has a malicious way of verbally smuggling counterrevolutionaries into the ranks of revolutionaries. He tries vainly to smuggle in a notorious bandit into the ranks of Red fighters as he does the US imperialists and the clerico-fascists into the ranks of those who fight for land reform.

Obsessed with the desire of proving himself a superb revolutionary, Jesus Lava claims that the single-file policy strengthened the old merger party instead of liquidated it and that it took effect for only two years after serving its supposed purpose.

Lava cannot argue against history. In 1960 the old merger party was virtually liquidated. The single-file policy had liquidated every branch of this party. The Lava leadership had lost control over all armed units of the HMB. Its supposed contact with Commander Hizon during the early years of 1960s was nothing more than token. Soon the Taruc-Sumulong gangster clique came into full control over the remnants of the HMB and was allowed by Lava to have its "independent kingdom" in Pampanga. In 1962, Lava was so desperately in need of persons to call his party members that he resorted to calling to service a number of his kinsmen and some persons who had surrendered to the enemy during the 1950s.

The resurgence of the revolutionary movement arose independently of Lava's muddled "political transmissions" which were issued only to a handful. Had these been circulated more extensively, Lava's political writings would have caused much more confusion and harm. The Jesus Lava leadership had become so isolated and inutile that the study of Marxism-Leninism and the mass actions were undertaken without its participation at all.

Left to themselves since 1967, the Lava revisionist renegade clique has remained a rotten entity, ever stagnating and disintegrating. Membership in the bogus party is determined by the ringleaders, using the most fickle and evil consideration, that of being opposed to the revolutionary mass movement. The Pambansang Kilusan ng Paggawa cannot be any bigger than the less than 500 regular members of the Union Impresores de Filipinas. The diehards who keep redundant membership in MPKP and BRPF cannot be more than 25. The Lava faction of Masaka centered in Bulacan, Bulacan and Cabaio, Nueva Ecija cannot be any bigger than the Federation of Free Farmers though they are basically bound by the Agricultural Land Reform Code and therefore has no future. The joint January 25th demonstration of all Lava organizations in Malolos, Bulacan to "support Marcos against the CIA" was attended by no more than 200 and showed that the Philistine attitude of the Lava revisionist renegades cannot produce the numbers they wish.

Lava contends that he did not surrender to Macapagal. Nevertheless, he has never disputed the authenticity of his handwritten note offering his surrender to Macapagal. The negotiations for his surrender between his brother, Francisco, Sr., and then Executive Secretary Rufino Hechanova also needs clarification. Without giving any importance to the note and to the negotiations, we can state with all certitude that long before his "capture" Jesus Lava had capitulated to the enemy ideologically and politically.

That Jesus Lava is still "in prison" with the freedom to make lengthy polemics with us is no argument that he is a true revolutionary. The reactionaries are fond of keeping talking birds in a cage. Luis Taruc, another renegade, also spent quite a number of years "in prison" with unusual facilities.

It is idle for Jesus Lava to make innuendoes against our revolutionary integrity. The best proof for one to be a revolutionary is the correctness of his revolutionary words and deeds. Lava has none of this. His article is a clear testimony to his betrayal and muddleheadedness.

As we write this reply to Lava's article, we have before us a copy of the January 23, 1971 joint statement of such Lava organizations as Pambansang Kilusan ng Paggawa (Kilusan), Malayang Samahan ng Magsasaka (Masama), Malayang Pagkakaisa ng Kabataang Pilipino (MPKP), Ang Kapatiran sa Ika-Uunlad Natin (Aksiun), Bertrand Russell Peace Foundation (BRPF, Philippine Council) and Samahang Progresibo ng Kababaihang Pilipino (SPKP). Those who know the actual status of these organizations are not at all intimidated by this listing.

What calls our attention to that statement is its toadying up to Marcos and its attacks against the national democratic mass organizations for opposing Marcos as the chief fascist puppet of US imperialism. Marcos is made to appear as one who has lost the support of US imperialism for having lost his "usefulness" and as one against whom the CIA is now plotting to overthrow. In a perversion of dialectical materialism which they pretend to profess, the Lava revisionist renegades substitute their wishful thinking for reality and dare make weird conclusions and prognostications.

In the now familiar illogic and mendacity of the Lava revisionist renegades, national democratic mass organizations have "become" tools of the CIA for opposing US imperialism, feudalism and bureaucrat capitalism. The Lava revisionist renegades even dare to lump together the national democratic mass organizations and the clerico-fascists (now calling themselves social-democrats) as being similar tools of the CIA.

Carried away by fantasies about their newly-found ally Marcos and their self-acclaimed intimate knowledge of CIA plans, the Lava revisionist renegades actively campaigned for nonparticipation in the January 25th mass action in front of Congress lest it be used as an occasion by the CIA to go on with its sinister plans of replacing Marcos. It never occurred to these counterrevolutionaries that they were taking against the revolutionary mass movement a policy of sabotage no different from the "stay at home" policy of the clerico-fascists.

As usual, the Lava revisionist manifesto makes a call for "unity, unity and greater unity." To hell with the revisionist puppets of US imperialists; they can always unite with their fellow devils. Since 1967 when these counterrevolutionaries were soundly repudiated, the revolutionary mass movement has become more united and has advanced more rapidly than ever in both city and countryside. That is because there is now the Communist Party of the Philippines supremely guided by the revolutionary

theory of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought and brilliantly leading the revolutionary mass movement throughout the country.

* * *

On the Pretended Capture of Sumulong

First Published in *Ang Bayan*, Vol. III, No. 1, February 1, 1971.

The Communist Party of the Philippines and the New People's Army have long exposed and repudiated the Taruc-Sumulong gangster clique as a special instrument of the reactionary government in oppressing the people in a limited area in Pampanga and in attacking the Party and the people's army.

The pretended capture of "Commander" Sumulong (Faustino del Mundo) has clearly proven that the Taruc-Sumulong gangster clique based in Angeles City is isolated from the masses and is nothing but an instrument for heaping praises on the reactionary regime of the present Marcos ruling clique.

The fawning statements made by the "captive" in favor of his "captor" merely expose the mutual counterrevolutionary careers of both. The pretended capture of Sumulong is nothing but the culmination of a scheme of the reactionary government to hoodwink the masses.

The actual surrender of the principal goon in the Taruc-Sumulong gangster clique has only been a matter of time since its exposure and repudiation by the Party and the people's army. The Taruc-Sumulong gangster clique has fully disintegrated and is being withdrawn by its reactionary masters from the assignment of confusing and attacking the people.²

The pretended capture of Sumulong gives no credit to the reactionary armed forces. The latter has merely stepped in to save the former from the wrath of the people.

Now, the reactionary government is relying on the Monkees-Armeng Bayan-Masaka (Lava) gang to perform the old functions of the Taruc-Sumulong gangster clique. One counterrevolutionary outfit is withdrawn and another is fielded in line with the global alliance of US imperialism and Soviet social-imperialism.

Issued by the Political Bureau
Communist Party of the Philippines
September 18, 1970

² Exactly one month after, Pedro Taruc, the other principal partner in the Taruc-Sumulong gangster clique, was assassinated by reactionary government troops and agents. Circumstances would later reveal that Sumulong had supplied vital information about Pedro Taruc's whereabouts. The assassination of Pedro Taruc marked the total disintegration of the Taruc-Sumulong gangster clique.

* * *

On the Philippine Business for Social Progress

First published in *Ang Bayan*, Vol. III, No. 1, February 1, 1971.

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

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

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

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

All this sweet talk to coat a clever scheme to further exploit and oppress the toiling masses and pass it off as an act of "philanthropy" is immediately uncovered by a cursory reading of the lists of the names of the officers, representatives and member companies of the PBSP. The men behind the PBSP are either imperialists like J.J. Wolahan of Caltex (Philippines) Inc., or big time compradors and landlords like Soriano, Elizalde, Roxas, Montelibano, Cabarrus, Sycip, Ledesma and many others. All the member companies of the PBSP are tied up with US monopoly capital in one way or another: either

they are actual branches or subsidiaries of foreign monopolies (i.e., Caltex, Shell, Union Carbide, T.N. Davies), either they are controlled and partly owned by foreign monopolies, or they are heavily dependent upon US monopolies for their raw materials, equipment and spare parts, foreign markets or loans (i.e., Northern Motors, DMG Inc., Lepanto, Philippine Iron Mines, Bancom, PDCP, etc.).

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

The annual contribution of one percent of net income before taxes, roughly P10 million for all the PBSP members combined, is a paltry sum compared to the hundreds of millions of pesos in profits that the imperialists and compradors amass each year. To make a big show about supposedly returning to the people what has been robbed from them is to be callous and hypocritical.

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

At the outset, the paltry fund of the PBSP already limits the scope and size of its projects to be of widespread and lasting benefit to the masses. For example, P10 million is not even sufficient to finance a decent project to replace the slum dwellings in Tondo.

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

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

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

by the PBSP member firms, substantial savings could be had due to economies of scale.

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

The local ruling classes further betray their bankruptcy by even summarily copying their counterrevolutionary tactics from another neocolony of US imperialism, Venezuela. The local compradors even brought over to the Philippines a ranking official of Venezuela's "Dividendo" to instruct the local reactionaries on how the PBSP should be formed.

It is typical of reactionaries all over the world to use real bullets and sugarcoated bullets in waging counterrevolution. The crumbs from the tables of the ruling classes that the PBSP would like to dispense among the masses are in the nature of sugarcoated bullets.

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

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

* * *

Cast Away the Labor Aristocrats!

First published in *Ang Bayan*, Special Release, February 18, 1971.

The unprecedented mass actions that are unfolding during this decade have reinforced the role of the Communist Party as the most advanced detachment of the proletariat and isolated the evil of bourgeois trade unionism that has for so long served to fragment and prevent the proletariat from asserting its revolutionary role as the leading class in the struggle for national democracy.

While great masses of workers are calling for general strikes against US imperialism and its running dogs, principally the Marcos fascist puppet clique, labor contractors like Oca and Co. openly offer their strike-breaking services to the reactionaries. The bourgeois trade union bosses like the labor lawyer Lacsina, despite their previous pretensions of being progressive, also openly show their lukewarm attitude or outright opposition to the development of general strikes and persistently deprecate the propagation and implementation of the universal theory of the revolutionary proletariat, Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought.

The Lava revisionist renegades, despite their counterrevolutionary abandonment of the trade union movement during the last more than two decades, are once more creeping out of their holes to combine with notorious saboteurs of the revolutionary movement of the proletariat in attacking Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought.

The Communist Party of the Philippines faces a bright future in organizing trade unions and Party branches in factories, transportation lines, mines, plantations, logging concessions and other places of work. The political and economic crisis of the enemy is getting worse every day and all the labor aristocrats are clearly becoming incapable of making apologies for the reactionary system.

The workers have long awaited their Party to intensify ideological, political and organizational work among them. During all the time that the barefaced labor aristocrats and the Lava revisionist renegades had all the field to organize the workers, not even 10% of the working class population heeded their sham calls for unionization. A great number of workers preferred to join militant national democratic mass organizations which follow a revolutionary policy.

The labor aristocrats have played the role mainly of either being labor contractors and labor lawyers, represented mainly by the likes of Oca. These antiproletarian scoundrels have gone too far in their counterrevolutionary and corrupt activities. Their ideological and political bankruptcy and their ill-gotten personal wealth lay them open to all-out repudiation by the proletarian revolutionaries.

The conspicuous personal wealth of the labor aristocrats is derived from secret brokers' and retainers' fees from the big bourgeoisie; subsidies from US imperialist agencies, the puppet government and the anti-China lobby; overt and covert strike-breaking and strike-peddling; establishment of company unions; huge salaries from labor federations; collection of huge negotiation fees and lawyer's fees ranging from 10 to 25 percent; manipulation of union funds under various pretexts; and so on and so forth.

The Party in performing its leading role is duty-bound to expose the various forms of betrayal of the proletariat perpetrated by the labor aristocrats. If the workers and student activists participating in mass actions are well mobilized for the trade union movement, these labor aristocrats can certainly be cast away and the revolutionary path of the proletariat can be rid of obstacles. Never before has the situation been as favorable as now for

the development of revolutionary trade unions and the establishment of Party branches.

Long live Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought!

Down with the labor aristocrats!

Long live the Filipino proletariat and the revolutionary masses!

* * *

Kidnapping and Murder of Carlos B. del Rosario Perpetrated by the Marcos-Lava-Lacsina Conspiracy

First published in *Ang Bayan*, Vol. III, No. 4, May 30, 1971.

The puppet reactionary government under the Marcos fascist puppet clique kidnapped Carlos B. del Rosario, an outstanding leader of the Movement for a Democratic Philippines, on the evening of March 19. An investigation conducted by national democratic mass organizations showed that a group of fascist gangsters seized del Rosario a little after 10:00 p.m., just after he had walked out of the campus of the Philippine College of Commerce where he taught. At the time that he was bodily seized, the fascist gangsters staged a "fraternity rumble" to divert attention from his kidnapping. In this related incident, five student activists were mauled, stabbed and wounded by the fascist gangsters who pretended to be members of "warring" school fraternities.

It is realistic to assume that Carlos B. del Rosario was tortured and murdered in the course of enemy interrogation concerning the national democratic movement. It is the overwhelming view of all his comrades and colleagues in the national democratic movement that he died a heroic death in the service of the people. He was murdered at a time that he was at the helm of preparations for the March 29 and 30 congress of the Movement for a Democratic Philippines. Fittingly, militant marches from different points in Greater Manila converged to make a gigantic demonstration on April 12 to protest the fascist crime before Malacanang Palace and to pay tribute to a great revolutionary comrade, Carlos B. del Rosario.

Circumstances surrounding del Rosario's kidnapping clearly show that the Marcos fascist puppet clique acted to murder him on the basis of information provided by the Lava revisionist renegades and the labor aristocrat Lacsina. Thus it has been absolutely correct for all democratic mass organizations to expose and condemn the Lava revisionist renegades and the labor aristocrat Lacsina (who have recently been brought together by cultural and trade union delegations of the Soviet revisionist social-imperialists) as the principal accomplices of the Marcos fascist puppet clique.

The January 1971 issue of *Struggle*, a Lavaite mouthpiece published by the Bertrand Russell Peace Foundation (Philippines, Inc.) carried a long article

slandering the revolutionary mass movement and pointing out who could be some members of the Communist Party of the Philip-pines adhering to Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought. Flimsily using the expression "movement" to stand for the old merger party of the Communist Party of the Philippines and the Socialist Party, the article specifically mentioned Carlos B. del Rosario as among those who had something to do with the "movement" and who chose to repudiate it to reestablish the Communist Party of the Philippines under the supreme guidance of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought. In many other publications, the Lava revisionist renegades have consistently tried to insinuate who are responsible for the propagation of Mao Zedong Thought and the upsurge of the revolutionary mass movement.

In several instances, even before their renewed alliance with the labor aristocrat Lacsina, the Lava revisionist renegades have publicly threatened to use the "Armeng Bayan," a proven special outfit of Task Force Lawin, against activists in the revolutionary mass movement. Lately, the ringleaders of the Lava revisionist renegade clique and certain diehards of such Lava-controlled outfits as the Masaka, MPKP, BRPF and CTUP have been sporting pistols and revolvers (cal. 0.38s and 0.45s which entail government permit) and challenging mass activists to duels in public places.

For his part, the counterrevolutionary labor aristocrat Ignacio Lacsina started last January 29 to issue press statements attacking what he called the "fanatical fringe" of the national democratic mass movement and what he called "the cult of Mao." He issued these in a desperate attempt to cover up his exposure as a special imperialist agent and as a crooked lawyer in the trade union movement by an increasing number of member unions in his own National Association of Trade Unions (an affiliate of the revisionist-controlled World Federation of Trade Unions). In an attempt to cow the rebel trade unions, he sent word to Carlos B. del Rosario through a NATU functionary, Rodolfo del Rosario, threatening him with murder and boasting of special connections with the Metrocom chieftain, Brig. Gen. Ordonez, a brother-in-law of a close lawyer-partner of Lacsina.

Then in a press statement first appearing in the *Manila Chronicle* and then repeated in the *Philippines Free Press* in an article by Edward Kiunisala, Lacsina maliciously declared that Carlos B. del Rosario was being "retained" in the executive council of the Socialist Party of the Philippines in his capacity as the "personal representative" of Jose Ma. Bison. Del Rosario promptly issued press statements exposing Lacsina's fabrication and also the fact that the Socialist Party of the Philippines is an "organization" that comes out only when bourgeois election time approaches and Lacsina tries to sell "labor votes" to reactionary politicians.

Various organizations of the national democratic movement continue to inquire into the kidnapping and murder of del Rosario. While they do so, defense department chieftain Ponce Enrile issues statements casting such intrigues as that del Rosario must have "slipped away to Peking" or that he must have been killed by his own comrades.

While the available evidence shows that the reactionary government was directly responsible for the kidnapping and murder, further investigation is being conducted to determine the full complicity of the armed goons of the Lava revisionist renegades and the labor aristocrats Lacsina in the commission of the crime. The Lava revisionist renegades have become notorious for masterminding many acts of bloody intrigue perpetrated by the Monkees-Masaka-Armeng Bayan. Also Lacsina has become notorious among his fellow yellow trade unionists for operating a "military commission" of the NATU. Since January 1971, armed goons of the Monkees-Masaka-Armeng Bayan and the "military commission" have met a number of times in Cainta, Rizal and Cabiao, Nueva Ecija.

The Lava revisionist renegades and their ally Lacsina may regard themselves clever in perpetrating crimes and intrigues. But they can expect punishment from the people's court in the long run. They can also expect the fate of Alibasbas who became a tool of the reactionary armed forces only to be eliminated by his new-found master.

The counterrevolutionary alliance of the Lava revisionist renegades and the labor aristocrat Lacsina is extremely loose and transitory. They will eventually set upon each other like vultures in serving Soviet social-imperialism, US imperialism and the local reactionaries. The Lava-Nemenzo-Pomeroy apparatus and the Lacsina-Lansang apparatus of the Soviet modern revisionists have unhappy days ahead of them. Their differences will in due time be fought out treacherously and bloodily.

In the list of situations in which the Lava revisionist renegades and the labor aristocrat Lacsina actively serve as special informers and agents of the reactionary government, the national democratic movement is intensifying its campaign to expose their counterrevolutionary activities and to isolate them together with their counterrevolutionary masters, US imperialism, Soviet social-imperialism, feudalism and bureaucrat capitalism.

* * *

Counter-Guerrilla Views

First published in *Ang Bayan*, Special Issue, June 1, 1971.

The small book *Guerrilla and Counter-Guerrilla Warfare* is essentially presentation of the counterrevolutionary and counter-guerrilla of the revisionist William J. Pomeroy, an American GI adventurer who has turned into his political and bookselling capital the short period that he spent with the "Left" opportunist leaders of the old merger Party of the Communist Party and the Socialist Party in Manila and the Sierra Madre.

In the style of a repentant adventurer turned capitulationist, Pomeroy takes all pains in trying to downgrade armed struggle, particularly guerrilla warfare, as a revolutionary weapon. He uses the "Left" opportunist errors of

the Jose Lava leadership to justify Right opportunism and modern revisionism; to slander the great communist leaders and omit Chairman Mao Zedong on the subject of armed struggle; to preach "peaceful coexistence, peaceful transition and peaceful competition" as the general line of the world revolution; and to insist on unprincipled accommodation with US imperialism.

Like his Lavaite revisionist colleagues in the Philippines today, Pomeroy takes the style of giving faint praise or lip service to what he considers the "partial necessity" of armed struggle but only to carry out the sinister aim of disarming the reader, putting him into the state of ambivalence and stupor and laying him open for sly and overt counterrevolutionary prattle assailing the essence of Marxism, the use of revolutionary violence against the bourgeois state machinery. Let us analyze Pomeroy's book. We have the advantage of doing so in the light of the seven years since the book came out in print in 1964 on the eve of Khrushchov's downfall from his revisionist throne.

I. On Armed Struggle and "Peaceful Transition"

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

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

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

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

Pomeroy implies that since the pressures US imperialists feel from all sides come from economic and political contradictions in the organization of their system, US imperialism should employ only "economic and political solutions" (exclusive of military force). He avers that only in the advanced stage of the people's revolution does the problem of US imperialism become a military problem. All this revisionist chatter about separating the military problem from the economic and political problem is calculated to obscure the aggressive nature of US imperialism.

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

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

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

All of Pomeroy's confusion results from his main thesis: "The present historical period, to a greater extent than any in the past, is making it possible for oppressed people to emerge into freedom in a variety of ways, of which armed struggle is but one." This is nothing but a cheap denial and whitewashing of the counterrevolutionary bloody crimes of US imperialism against the oppressed peoples. Khrushchovite revisionism which in previous years whined about "a world without weapons, without armed forces and without wars" has provided the state capitalist basis for the full emergence of social-imperialism under the Brezhnev revisionist gang. Since the 1960s, US imperialism and Soviet social-imperialism have competed in unleashing counterrevolutionary violence. The proletarian revolutionaries of the world remain firm in recognizing and fighting the violent nature of imperialism and its stooges.

Pomeroy elaborates on his revisionist thesis:

In this respect, the present historical period which is one of general transition to socialism and of the breaking up of the colonial system of imperialism, is capable, as time goes on, of proving somewhat different from the preceding great historical change from feudalism to capitalism. The latter was marked by waves of armed revolution, civil wars, and national wars, conducted by the rising capitalist class to attain power. In the present period, the forces for socialism aim for a classless society without war, and seek to prevent the ruling capitalist class from turning to the reactionary weapon of violence to maintain themselves and their systems.

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

Pomeroy states further:

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

Pomeroy should not try to mislead anyone into downgrading armed struggle as "only one among a variety of ways." The fact is that armed struggle is one of the two basic forms or aspects of struggle, the other one of which is parliamentary or peaceful struggle. It does not help him to obfuscate the two aspects of the struggle by enumerating several particular forms of peaceful struggle. And mind you, when we employ armed struggle as the principal form of struggle in the countryside of a semicolonial and semifeudal country, we use peaceful or legal struggle as our secondary form of struggle to advance the armed struggle. As a matter of fact, the peaceful form of struggle is the principal form of struggle in the cities of a semicolonial and semifeudal country like the Philippines before the final seizure of the cities. It would be futile and putschist to bank on city uprisings without coordination with a people's war that has triumphantly matured in the countryside and is already able of winning victory in the cities.

Armed struggle is being waged without letup in the world's countryside of Asia, Africa and Latin America. The victories being achieved there, such as those of the Indochinese people, are gravely weakened US imperialism and

are tremendously helping the proletariat and people in the cities of the world to advance their revolutionary cause. In turn, the revolutionary mass movement in imperialist countries is helping the armed struggle in the world's countryside. We should grasp the dialectical relationship and forward movement of the revolutionary forces in both cities and countryside of the world.

The Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution in socialist China has Served the revolutionary armed struggle raging throughout the world. The revolutionization of the hundreds of millions of Chinese people has resulted in far greater support than before for the revolutionary armed struggle of the oppressed peoples. Following proletarian internationalism as the general line of its foreign policy, the People's Republic of China is splendidly performing its task of supporting the revolutionary farces of the world morally and materially. It is the powerful rear of the great war of resistance of the Indochinese people against US imperialist aggression. The struggle of the Indochinese people is today's focus of armed revolution in the world.

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

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

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

Pomeroy claims that thanks to Soviet modern revisionism, leaders in a score of countries in Asia and Africa—like India, Ghana and Nigeria—have

been able to maneuver for "freedom" without armed struggle. He claims further that armed control or armed intervention by imperialism has been removed from these countries. He even suggests that from their given status in 1964, these countries could develop towards "socialism." What revisionist trash is this Pomeroy capable of concocting!

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

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

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

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

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

II. On the Jose-Jesus Lava Leadership

The chapter on "The Philippine Model" occupies a central position in Pomeroy's nine-chapter book. Here, he makes certain self-damning admissions which confirm facts cited by the document of rectification,

"Rectify Errors and Rebuild the Party," of the Communist Party of the Philippines.

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

What makes Pomeroy's writings dangerous to the revolutionary movement in the present period is that these use the "Left" opportunism of the Jose Lava leadership to justify Right opportunism. At present, the Lavaites appear to be too willing to repudiate the errors of the Jose Lava leadership but only to endorse the Right opportunism and modern revisionism of Jesus Lava and William J. Pomeroy. They deliberately confuse the meaning of "Left" opportunism to exculpate the Jose-Jesus Lava leadership from it and to attack through the method of misrepresentation the Communist Party of the Philippines and the New People's Army on the question of armed struggle.

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

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

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

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

Pomeroy arrogantly states that the "Huk masses" had "a tendency to regard the American army as an ally." This revisionist scoundrel needs to be reminded that before, during and after the antifascist war of resistance it was

the Lavas and the Tarucs who took the stand that US imperialism would truly grant independence to the Filipino people. (Pomeroy would even now speak so approvingly of the "Anti-Imperialist League" in the United States "for helping to secure legislation in the American congress that put the Philippines on the road of self-rule." What "self-rule" is he talking about?)

Pomeroy contradicts himself by admitting that in the face of mailed-fist blows the Huk armed forces regrouped and fought, spontaneously and virtually without central guidance; and that the Communist Party was at this time disorganized, without unity on strategy and tactics and with no clear perspective for the period ahead. During a period of Constant and spreading armed struggle from mid-1946 until mid-1948, the leaders of the "movement" were brazenly assisting the counterrevolutionary puppet state in its campaign of "pacification" and begging for the "restoration of the former state of democratic rights, such as they were."

In an attempt to prettify the Jose Lava leadership, Pomeroy claims that "a more clearly-oriented leadership" was chosen in May 1948 and that a program of struggle with "definite liberation aims" was adopted. Again contradicting himself, Pomeroy admits that "the effort was made to employ the expanding strength of the Huks as a lever to attain democratic peace, for the resumption of parliamentary struggle." The Lavas and the Tarucs preoccupied themselves with begging the reactionary government to adopt a "pro-nationalist, anti-imperialist line," instead of clarifying and promoting the correct strategy and tactics of people's war.

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

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

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

Pomeroy confesses:

At any time up to this point [1948] the American imperialists and their landlord-comprador allies in the Philippines could have attained peace

without a radical change in the social system and without a tremendous waste of more lives and resources, merely by lifting the policies of suppression.

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

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

What is meant by "revolutionary situation" coming about only in 1950? Obviously, Pomeroy has some quaint definition of this term, a definition that denies the concrete conditions of a semicolonial and semifeudal country where the oppressed masses had started to do battle with the reactionaries even before 1950. At any rate, he uses the term to mean that in 1950 upon the formal declaration of a "revolutionary situation" by the Lavas and the Tarucs the situation had turned ripe enough for a people's army of no more than five thousand troops to go on a "strategic offensive" in order to achieve the strategic aim of seizing political power on a nationwide scale within the extremely short period of two years. What he means by passing from "defensive tactics and the tactics of reconciliation" to "tactics of the offensive" is leaping from conducting parliamentary struggle as the principal form of struggle and engaging in Right opportunist capitulationist activity to taking the "Left" opportunist line of doing away with a protracted people's war and immediately launching a "strategic offensive" to liberate the country in a jiffy. The impetuosity of the Lavas and Tarucs is characteristic of unremolded petty-bourgeois elements who sneak into proletarian party. Bourgeois or petty-bourgeois subjectivism gives to sudden shifts from Right opportunism and "Left" opportunism.

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

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

1) The principal factor in the setback of the Huk movement was the ruthless military suppression, carried out with vast quantities of US military aid, by an army equipped, trained and supervised by an American military advisory group.

2) The Huk movement suffered its setback, in the main, because of its own tactical faults; it was due less to the strength and policies of the forces of suppression.

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

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

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

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

The truth is the theoretical works of Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin and Mao Zedong had reached the Philippines even before the outbreak of World War II. Furthermore, after World War II, there was already the military experience of the Filipino people and the HUKBALAHAP to analyze and sum up. Instead, the Lavas and the Tarucs were bent on welcoming the US imperialists and, therefore, also the landlords, as early as September 1944 even as the "retreat for defense" policy was being repudiated. When armed struggle by

the revolutionary masses' grew irresistibly, the Jose Lava leadership sabotaged it by using the 90-week Master Training Schedule of the US Army and Pomeroy's GI wisdom as the principal guide.

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

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

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

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

Pomeroy bewails the fact that no foreign aid came for the Philippine national liberation movement. He writes that there were no groups or committees to inform the world of what was happening or to rally international support. Pomeroy has an utterly distorted view of the great principle of proletarian internationalism. The revolutionary mass movement

in the Philippines then as now continues to be assisted with more than the handouts he asks for. The universal theory of Marxism-Leninism is certainly of great assistance to a truly revolutionary movement. The revolutionary struggles of other peoples against US imperialism are always of great assistance to the Filipino people.

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

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

As if the Lavaite bourgeois leadership is something invincible, Pomeroy makes believe that the resurgence of the revolutionary movement in the 1960s was the result of the protracted legal struggle led by Jesus Lava. Everyone knows that by 1960, there was not a single Party branch under the one-man leadership of Jesus Lava. The persistent armed struggle in the countryside and the revolutionary mass movement in the city were carried out without his leadership. Between 1955 and 1964, Jesus Lava performed the following "feats" of protracted legal struggle: flight from the countryside, political isolation in his room, his policy of liquidating the Party and finally his surrender to the reactionary government. In 1963-64, the Taruc-Sumulong gangster clique brazenly started to impose its own kind of counterrevolutionary leadership over the people's guerrillas in Central Luzon without Jesus Lava raising any kind of protest.

III. On the Great Communist Leaders

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

A nation, fighting for its liberty, ought not to adhere rigidly to the accepted rules of warfare. Mass uprisings, revolutionary methods, guerrilla bands everywhere; such are the only means by which a small nation can hope to maintain itself against an adversary superior in

numbers and equipment. By their use a weaker force can overcome its stronger and better organized opponents.

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

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

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

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

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

Advocates of repressive "special forces" charge that guerrilla warfare has been "taken over" by the Communists "for their special purposes:" or, in other words, that Communists are putting an ancient form of warfare to reprehensible use.... The imperialists seek to create two

impressions with this charge: to link Communists with violence in the achievement of their ends, and to make it seem that all armed struggle are communist-"instigated."

Mr. Revisionist, we Communists have no need for your sham defense and apologies. We are always proud and ready to employ revolutionary violence against counterrevolutionary violence. What we should be ashamed of and oppose vigorously are illusions that in an oppressive society our revolutionary ends could be achieved basically by peaceful means. In this 100th year of the Paris Commune, we recall the only "correction" Marx and Engels made in the *Communist Manifesto*, noted down in the preface to the 1872 German edition of this great document quoted hereunder:

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

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

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

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

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

We notice here that the revisionism to which Pomeroy adheres is the forebear of the classical revisionism of the Kautskys and Bernsteins whom the great Lenin constantly and thoroughly assailed in defending Marxism. Pomeroy has the most condemnable temerity to besmirch the names of Marx and Engels through sheer prevarication by claiming that these two great founders of communism endorsed the revisionist line of the Second International. Marx died in 1883, some six years before the founding of the Second International. While alive, Engels always upheld the Marxist doctrine of the necessity of revolutionary violence. It is very pertinent to cite how he stood firm against the revisionists. In 1895, he wrote an introduction to Marx's *The Class Struggles in France* in which he reaffirmed the Marxist doctrine of the necessity of revolutionary violence. Before this could be

published, the leadership urged him to tone down the "over-revolutionary" spirit of the work and make it "more prudent." He subjected the indecisive position of the party's leadership and its efforts to act exclusively within the framework of legality to scathing criticism. However, he agreed to delete or rewrite certain passages. At any rate, the abridged introduction retained its revolutionary standpoint. But subsequently, the revisionist scoundrels of the Second International tried on the basis of this to misrepresent Engels as a defender of "peaceful seizure of power" and as a worshipper of "legality quondam" (at any price)." Filled with indignation, he had the original introduction published in full in the *Neue Zeit*.

Pomeroy acknowledges the fact that in 1918 Lenin stated:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Pomeroy is peculiar for dishing up untruth by compounding issues. But let us take one by one the issues he raises. The truce in Korea marked the victory of the Democratic Republic of Korea in defending itself and the failure of US imperialism in its war of aggression. The revolutionary attitude held by the Korean revolutionary leadership and people towards the truce is still to be prepared not only to defend the north but also to liberate the south by every necessary and possible means so as to reunify the Korean fatherland. With regard to Laos the facts have clearly shown that the Laotian people are ceaselessly holding their ground through armed struggle and are now

coordinating with the two other Indochinese peoples in a revolutionary war of resistance against US imperialism. With regard to Vietnam, we state the obvious to Pomeroy, that the Paris talks cannot formally bring peace to Vietnam without basic reference to the resounding military victories not only of the Vietnamese people but also of the entire Indochinese peoples in the expanded US war of aggression. Pomeroy should take note that the Paris talks have not stopped US imperialism from expanding its war of aggression under the "Nixon doctrine" it would be disastrous for the Indochinese people to turn away from armed struggle before they can win complete victory and complete independence in the battlefield. Any negotiated settlement will merely reflect the outcome of people's war.

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

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

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

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

IV. On "Peaceful Coexistence" and Accommodation with US Imperialism

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

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

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

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

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

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

Second, "the aggressive nature of US imperialism is changing." In support of this revisionist contention, Pomeroy claims that US imperialism has a "peace-loving wing" (which he sometimes calls "realistic") and a "warmongering wing" (which he sometimes calls "aggressive") among its policymakers. He claims that the Khrushchovite line of "peaceful coexistence" is favored by a "definite section of the bourgeoisie of the developed countries, which takes a sober view of the relationship of forces and of the dire consequences of modern war." Our view is that the general line of "peaceful coexistence" serves US imperialist aggression and puts hope on the big bourgeoisie in the United States rather than on the American people.

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

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

Concerning Khrushchov's policy on Cuba in late 1962, Pomeroy writes:

The stand of the Soviet Union in this instance, placing itself resolutely on the side of Cuba with its missile strength, halted the mounting campaign of imperialist intervention in Cuba and contributed greatly to impressing upon American imperialism the permanence of the Cuban revolution.

Pomeroy conveniently forgets that it was the revolutionary unity and courage of the Cuban people that isolated and destroyed the US invasion force at Playa Giron and that served notice to US imperialism that any other invasion would meet the same fate. He also conveniently forgets that Khrushchov was adventurist in putting up nuclear missiles in Cuba and was capitulationist in withdrawing these as soon as the US imperialist chieftain Kennedy made counter-threats against the Soviet Union. The revisionist buffoon capitulated to US imperialism to the extent of agreeing to the latter's demand for "inspection" of Cuban territory in contravention of the sovereignty of the Cuban people. In the final analysis, it was the revolutionary unity of the

Cuban people that stopped US imperialism from the gravest acts of aggression.

In commenting upon the level of US military intervention in South Vietnam in 1964, Pomeroy would rather imagine that his "forces of peace" are compelling or persuading US imperialism to retreat than present the actual balance of forces and the victories of the revolutionary forces over a series of counterinsurgency plans of US imperialism. Also, he would rather engage in wordplay on what he imagines as the "aggressive sectors" and "peaceful sectors" of US imperialism than analyze Johnson's scheme of aggression and the basic character of US imperialism. Pomeroy dishonestly tries to spread the belief that "the imperialists are forced more and more toward abandonment of preparations for a major war." Now that the Vietnam war has expanded into the Indochinese war, we can definitely laugh with derision at Pomeroy's convoluted analysis below:

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

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

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

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

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

forms of struggle, less costly and more peaceful, than the guerrilla warfare that has featured the contemporary period.

The title of Pomeroy's book should have been "The Counter-Guerrilla Views of a Revisionist Renegade." Pomeroy is against guerrilla warfare and is for "other forms of struggle less costly and more peaceful." Pomeroy believes that US imperialism can be persuaded to act against its own nature and interests on the basis of "realities." He claims that in the past 20 years (since 1944) history has provided imperialism with "all necessary lessons in regard to colonial liberation movements" to become peaceful. He cites France and Britain as having been "compelled to swallow these bitter truths and in a number of instances have abandoned attempts to suppress liberation movements when the cost has become too great and when more extensive losses were threatened."

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

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

It is utterly wrong and treacherous for Pomeroy to insist on the following:
Whatever the orientation of the "realistic" sectors among the imperialists, any shift from armed suppression and intervention to negotiation and accommodation with liberation forces can only be

viewed as a defeat for aggressive imperialism and its attempt to reverse revolutionary changes in the world by means of force. It would mean that, in the effort to save themselves from a complete debacle, the imperialists would be compelled to adopt certain of the positions advocated by the present-day peace movement, a tendency that would strengthen the movement for peace and democracy in the United States and would give a major setback to the ultra-reactionary and war-making wing of imperialism.

The modern revisionists always make fuss about distinguishing between the "realistic" and "war-making" wings of US imperialism. Revolutionaries the world over have long seen this hairsplitting as a trick to conceal the aggressive nature of US imperialism and to water down the main world contradiction between the oppressed peoples and imperialism. Pomeroy overrates his "present-day peace movement" only to show how "reasonable" is US imperialism and how unreasonable are the armed revolutionaries. The kind of negotiation and accommodation with US imperialism that Pomeroy is trying to promote is treachery to the revolutionary masses.

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

Pomeroy exposes himself as an agent of US imperialism in saying the following:

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

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

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

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

Chairman Mao further said:

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

* * *

Anti-Marxism and Eclecticism

First published in *Ang Bayan*, Special Release, June 15, 1971.

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

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

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

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

Marx, Engels, Lenin and Mao Zedong combined have less space than Pomeroy's ramblings. Pomeroy and his fellow writers for the revisionist *World Marxist Review* (like Enrique Lister of Spain, Zisis Zografos of Greece, Bashir Hadj Ali of Algeria, Juan Rodriguez of Venezuela, Alberto Gonzalez of Colombia, Jose Manuel Fortuny of Guatemala, Jose Guello and Asdrubal Dominguez of the Dominica Republic and Luis Corvalan of Chile) hog the pages and have more to say than all of Marx, Engels, Lenin, Mao Zedong and Ho Chi Minh combined. To Pomeroy, Stalin has absolutely nothing to say about the Civil War and the antifascist Great Patriotic War although Tito and some lesser personalities like I. Minz and A. Fyodorov are allowed some say on armed struggle in the Soviet Union.

Definitely, the revisionist Pomeroy is an ideological swindler who would use a few pages from the great communist leaders only as wrappings for rotten goods. All throughout his compilation, he pre occupies himself with the central aim of brazenly or slyly impugning the universal value of Comrade Mao Zedong's theory and practice of people's war. Unlike his other counterrevolutionary revisionist book, *Guerrilla and Counter-Guerrilla Warfare* frequently mentions Comrade Mao Zedong, the Lenin of the present era, but only to picture him as merely one among a motley of personalities, which include Kwame Nkrumah, Regis Debray, Ernesto "Che" Guevara, Pomeroy himself and his revisionist confreres.

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

I. Marxism-Leninism and the Question of Armed Struggle

To deny the revolutionary essence of Marxism-Leninism, which is to say the armed overthrow of the reactionary state and the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat, the counterrevolutionary revisionist Pomeroy declares that it would be a "grotesque distortion" if Marxism-Leninism is "equated" with violence and armed methods.

To develop his thesis that Marxism-Leninism is essentially a peaceful effort to change society, he sets up and quarrels with his own straw figures, such as those "few people" who would take to arms without mass support and without a "revolutionary situation." It would seem that he insists on mass support for armed revolution. Indeed, every revolutionary undertaking has to be a mass undertaking in order to win; we oppose adventurism as much as we oppose capitulationism. But what Pomeroy actually calls for throughout the world is a protracted legal struggle that avoids armed struggle inasmuch as the reactionaries are "willing" to tolerate that legal struggle. At the core of this revisionist line is the stand that the transition from capitalism to socialism is peaceful and that the aggressive nature of imperialism is changing. He repeatedly rubs in the treacherous point that to wage armed struggle in any country is to negate and abandon political work that brings about mass support.

We must tell him that in the concrete semicolonial and semifeudal conditions of the Philippines, mass mobilization and mass support in extensive areas in the countryside have been brought about in the course of armed struggle. On an unprecedented scale, political work, which encompasses the building of the Party, people's army, local or-gains of political power and mass organizations, is being carried out. It is impossible for the Filipino proletariat to lead the peasantry and win it over as its main

force for overthrowing the reactionary state without engaging in armed struggle, agrarian revolution and base building.³

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

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

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

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

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

We must tell Pomeroy that in the Philippines we are waging armed struggle as the main form of struggle and we are at the same time employing the parliamentary form of struggle as the secondary. The Communist Party of the Philippines is today's vanguard in the waging of both

³ In spite of imperialist-backed "base denial" government operations against it, the New People's Army has been successful in expanding itself in all regions of the Philippines, developing people's political power and improving the people's conditions in many respects. The antifeudal campaign to reduce land rent and eliminate usury has been given the highest priority.

forms of revolutionary struggle whereas the Lava revisionist renegades for whom Pomeroy speaks abroad are far behind the revolutionary movement in the cities or in the countryside and are always gesticulating and cursing the masses in words echoing those of the US imperialists and the reactionaries.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Confronted with the problem of preventing the restoration of capitalism in a socialist society, Comrade Mao Zedong put forward the theory of continuing revolution under the dictatorship of the proletariat and personally initiated and led the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution. In the course of the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution, it became clear to Marxist-Leninists

the world over that Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought is the clear demarcation line between genuine Marxist-Leninists and sham Marxist-Leninists. At this stage of world history, one cannot have a comprehensive grasp nor have a clear law of the world proletarian revolution without recognizing the great theoretical and practical contributions of Chairman Mao Zedong.

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

Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought firmly affirms the necessity of revolutionary violence to smash the bourgeois state. In the more than one hundred years from Marx to Mao Zedong, revolutionary violence has remained the essence of Marxism in both theory and practice.

Chairman Mao teaches us:

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

II. The Universal Significance of Chairman Mao's Theory of People's War

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

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

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

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

Chairman Mao teaches us:

Since China's key cities have long been occupied by the powerful imperialists and their reactionary Chinese allies, it is imperative for the revolutionary ranks to turn the backward villages into advanced, consolidated base areas, into great military, political, economic and cultural bastions of the revolution from which to fight their vicious enemies who are using the cities for attacks on the rural districts, and in this way gradually to achieve the complete victory of the revolution

through protracted fighting; it is imperative for them to do so if they do not wish to compromise with imperialism and its lackeys but are determined to fight on, and if they intend to build up and temper their forces, and avoid decisive battles with a powerful enemy while their own strength is inadequate.

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

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

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

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

The anti-Marxist and anti-Leninist Pomeroy wants to kill the vitality of Marxism-Leninism, its continuous theoretical and practical development. In reducing the meaning of "revolutionary situation" to conditions like those attending the October Revolution, conditions that permitted the immediate seizure of cities in an imperialist country after a period of protracted legal struggle, he completely negates the fact that the world proletarian revolution has been fought in varying conditions, undergone distinct stages of development and has wrought changes in the world such that a revolutionary situation now exists in the whole continents of Asia, Africa and Latin America after world War II and that the world revolutionary situation has never been better. Of course, revolution still has to be fought by the people within their own country. Ad International conditions have become so favorable for revolution that even a small and weak country like Vietnam can stand up to

fight and defeat a big and powerful country like the United States by waging a protracted people's war.

There is one basic difference to recognize in considering the revolutionary situation in capitalist countries and in colonies and semicolonies afflicted by feudal and semifeudal conditions. In capitalist countries, when the revolutionary forces decide to launch armed struggle, failure to seize the cities within the shortest possible time can be disastrous for them. Here protraction in legal struggle as the principal form of struggle is necessary and alright so long as ideological and political work is conducted to prepare the proletariat for the armed seizure of power.

However, in colonies and semicolonies, where the people undergo multiple oppression by imperialism and local reaction, revolutionary forces have the advantage of being able to engage in protracted people's war in the wide expanses of the countryside. This is in keeping with Lenin's theory of imperialism's uneven development and the Marxist-Leninist method of attacking the enemy at his weakest points. The national democratic revolutions here help to hasten the ripening of the revolutionary situation in the centers of world capitalism

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

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

Indochinese people rely mainly on their strength in the countryside to resist US imperialism, the biggest and fiercest imperialist aggressor.

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

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

In trying to dismiss Chairman Mao's theory and strategic line as being only "one of those things" and having no worthwhile significance in the whole of Asia, Africa and Latin America, Pomeroy takes pride in a lot of wrong things, makes the most outright anticommunist statements and in the style of an intriguer considers as superior to a victorious and well-consolidated revolution those armed struggles still in progress and in fact guided by Chairman Mao's strategic line of encircling the cities from the countryside.

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

With regard to Africa, Pomeroy states:

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

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

Pomeroy tries to impugn the correct ideas of Chairman Mao that guided the Chinese revolution from victory to victory as being "unMarxist." Only a counterrevolutionary idealist would deny the victories of the national democratic revolution and socialist revolution in China under the leadership of Chairman Mao. Let us examine a bit of thinking that this revisionist fool

makes on Chinese history. Wishing to reverse what is already a verdict of Chinese history, Pomeroy states in reference to the urban uprisings of 1927 in China:

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

This revisionist fool absolutely disregards the semicolonial and semifeudal conditions of China then though he pretends to recognize the law of uneven development at work on the side of the revolutionary forces. He insists that city insurrections would have been all right in China then, had the October Revolution, not the Paris Commune, been dogmatically imitated. However, he does not bother to explain what were those differences between the Paris Commune and the October insurrections, which differences he presumed more important than those between capitalist countries and semifeudal countries. The error of the urban uprisings in China in 1927 was in fighting to the end in the cities and in relying on foreign support. They were correct only insofar as they signaled armed resistance to the Guomindang reactionaries. The road to the countryside and the Jinggang mountains were correctly shown by Chairman Mao.

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

Because he expects that every people fighting for national liberation should be dependent mainly on foreign material assistance, Pomeroy; contends that Chairman Mao's theory of people's war is lacking in internationalism. Socialist China's propagation of a correct theory and pursuit of anti-imperialist policies and actions constitute an important support for the oppressed peoples of the world. Also, China has performed well its duty of extending material support to various revolutionary movements and anti-imperialist countries. But China has always stood firm on the principle that

the people can liberate themselves by relying mainly on themselves. With regard to the Vietnamese, revolutionary struggle against the US war of aggression, China is a reliable rear base and is consistently providing tremendous amounts of necessary support for the Vietnamese people. On the other hand, the Soviet revisionist renegades give mere token support to Vietnam only to use it as a basis for striking bargains with US imperialism over the heads of the Vietnamese people, for sabotaging the Vietnamese revolution and for sowing intrigues within revolutionary ranks. China has no use for what Pomeroy calls an "alliance of socialist countries," an expression for mixing up genuine socialist countries and sham socialist countries, to support the Vietnamese struggle. The bilateral relations between China and Vietnam are good enough for each one to perform its internationalist duty.

Now that the US war of aggression in Vietnam has expanded into one covering the whole of Indochina, we find the pretensions of Soviet social-imperialism totally dissipated, not Chairman Mao's theory of people's war and strategic line of encircling the cities from the countryside. Soviet social-imperialism brazenly supports the US-Lon Nol reactionary clique in Cambodia, condones US aggression against the Laotian people, and continues to give mere token and sham support for the Democratic Republic of Vietnam. As previously pointed out, Soviet social-imperialism wishes to make use of the Indochinese war of resistance against US aggression and for national salvation basically for striking bargains with US imperialism. But the Indochinese people are ever more firmly united to fight for their own liberation against the US imperialist aggressors and their reactionary stooges.

III. Guerrilla Warfare Raised to the Level of Marxist-Leninist Theory and Strategy

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The spectacular success of guerrilla warfare in a number of liberation struggles—especially in China, Vietnam, Algeria and Cuba—has tended to gloss over the fact that several major guerrilla struggles were defeated in the same period, the most important being Malaya, Philippines, Greece, Burma and Kenya, while serious setbacks, at the least, have been given to guerrilla attempts launched in the Congo, Peru, Bolivia and elsewhere. It is quite evident from this that broad and universal generalizations about the efficacy of armed struggle or guerrilla tactics cannot safely be made.

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

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

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

He wants "preparations for armed struggle" to be done only when "all other doors to legal, peaceful ways of effecting change have been slammed shut"—when "warranted by the behavior of the reactionary class forces."

To further support his revisionist stand, Pomeroy takes advantage of the patent failure of Ernesto "Che" Guevara and Regis Debray to serve up the "Cuban model" as the "universal model" for armed revolution surpassing the Chinese revolution. He gloats over the failure of the Latin American Organization of Solidarity (OLAS) to promote the "Cuban model" and also that of Guevara and Debray in their Bolivian adventure which did not attend correctly to the tasks of party building, united front building and mass work as the necessary support for armed struggle. Ostensibly to overwhelm the excerpts from Castro, Guevara and Debray, those excerpts from the counterrevolutionary revisionists Juan Rodriguez, Alberto Gonzalez, Jose Manuel Fortuny, Jose Cuello and Asdrubal Dominguez and Luis Corvalan are made to the entire section on Latin America.

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

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

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

Popular armed struggles of today have been shaped largely by the imperialist tactics of violence, and the forms of struggle in the coming

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

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

Pomeroy completely exposes himself as an agent of US imperialism. He mocks what he calls the "apocalyptic vision" that imperialism and capitalism are being besieged and smothered in a mounting crescendo of guerrilla wars. He insinuates that those who hold the view that the world revolutionary situation is excellent are not Marxist-Leninist and are swayed by "emotion and temperament." He claims as having a "static essence" the general formulation that imperialism and the capitalist system as a whole are in a state of crisis and that the present epoch is a revolutionary one. He grants to US imperialism all the positive vitality that he can imagine and wishes the revolutionary forces; to become static before such a moribund and decadent monster. He disagrees with the view that now is the era of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought. He consistently refers to the particularity of certain countries with the mechanistic aim of separating the particular from the general or universal.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

He prates further:

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

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

IV. Once More on the Question of Armed Struggle in the Philippines

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

The Lavas and the Tarucs formally adopted the policy of armed struggle in May 1948 only after finding themselves rebuffed in their bid to gain official seats in the bourgeois reactionary government. Even when this policy was already supposed to be implemented, the Lavas and the Tarucs continuously

maneuvered for accommodation in the reactionary government and were willing to end the armed struggle in return. To prove this point we cite the amnesty agreement with the Quirino puppet regime in June 1948; the presentation of an obsequious memorandum by the old merger party to an anticommunist committee in the reactionary congress in December 1948; and the support given to the presidential bid of Laurel in 1949 in the vain hope that the Nacionalista Party would give concessions to the Lavas and the Tarucs. All of these were consistent with the policy of the Lavas and the Tarucs that had been adopted as early as September 1944 and implemented thereafter to welcome the return of US imperialism and the Osmena puppet regime and have the old merger party engage in parliamentary struggle under the Democratic Alliance.

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

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

The defeat of the 1950 "all-out armed struggle" policy of the Jose Lava leadership is explained by Pomeroy in terms that completely disregard Chairman Mao's theory of people's war and that violate fundamental principles of Marxism-Leninism. He gives four reasons for the defeat: 1) The Party was incorrect in concluding that the imperialist and their allies were in an irrecoverable situation and that they could "no longer rule in the old way." 2) The Party put almost all emphasis and cadres into the armed struggle, to

the neglect of allies unprepared for armed struggle; proclaimed the principal of "the hegemony of the party over the revolution;" failed to project and build a united front against US imperialism; and failed to side with the Liberal Party against Magsaysay. 3) The Party became careless in its security measures. 4) The Philippine national liberation struggle was physically isolated from international allies.

Let us analyze these reasons one by one.

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

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

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

Not satisfied with his outright opposition to Chairman Mao's theory of people's war and strategic line of encircling the cities from the countryside,

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

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

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

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

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

Pomeroy openly supports the Lava revisionist renegades. As acknowledged by him, the bogus communist party of these renegades put out a statement in the Information Bulletin of the Czechoslovak revisionist party in 1967 attacking the May Day 1967 Statement of the Provisional

Political Bureau of the Communist Party of the Philippines and seeking in a futile manner to refute the line that the outlawed situation of the Party is the result of counterrevolution and the armed struggle is the only method by which the reactionary state can be overthrown.

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

The Communist Party of the Philippines is today leading the New People's Army and fighting a tit-for-tat struggle against the enemy. On the other hand, the Lava revisionist renegades have made themselves notorious by becoming cheap enemy informers and fascist gangsters, operating the notorious Briones-Diwa-Pasion bandit gang. Put to shame and deprived of initiative in the countryside by the New People's Army led by the Party, the Lava revisionist renegades have gone to the extent of colluding with Task Force Lawin⁴ and with special terrorist squads of the Marcos fascist puppet clique in pursuing their extortionist, swindling and other criminal activities in Central Luzon.

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

They are always trying to be the most clever by word and deed in giving support to US imperialism, Soviet social-imperialism, the Marcos fascist puppet clique and the landlord class.

The Lava renegades have busied themselves using the Movement for the Advancement of Nationalism, the Malayang Samahang Magsasaka, the Congress of Trade Unions of the Philippines, the Kilusan, the Bertrand Russell Peace foundation (Phil.), Inc., and the Malayang Pagkakaisang Kabataang Pilipino in attacking the Communist Party of the Philippines and the New People's Army and trying to mislead the people. These Lavaite outfits are mere paper organizations with small redundant membership. They have been useful to the Lava revisionist renegades for begging concessions from

⁴ The anti-dissident task force in Central Luzon province of the Philippine reactionary armed forces. Its operations are concentrated in what are referred to as "traditional hotbeds" of Pampanga and Tarlac provinces. - Editor

the reactionaries and for maintaining their bureaucratic interest within their own clique and within the reactionary government.

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

* * *

On Lavaite Propaganda for Revisionism and Fascism

Report to the Central Committee (OMNIBUS REPLY)

July 20, 1971

Foreword

The Executive Committee of the Central Committee has deemed it necessary and appropriate in the interest of truth and in compliance with the demand of the masses to show comprehensively the degeneration of the Lava revisionist renegades into fascist criminals and special agents of the US-Marcos clique against the Communist Party of the Philippines, the New People's Army and the revolutionary mass movement in general.

The Lava revisionist fascists, obviously in collusion with the reactionary state, have openly identified and acclaimed themselves in public print and in the revisionist press that they are "communists" and are endowed with "knowledge" to show that certain persons and mass organizations were once attached to their clique. Without the least compunction, they have sought to slander persons and organizations with various fabrications in line with a fascist conspiracy to attack the revolutionary movement ideologically, politically and physically.

The most unmistakable hallmark of the fascist conspiracy of the Lavaites and the US-Marcos clique is the ceaseless harping on the "anti-Marcos" line and the impunity with which certain fascist crimes have been perpetrated directly by the Lavaites.

The Communist Party of the Philippines condemns the anticommunist tactics of the Lava revisionist fascists that range from shameless lies to murder. In the interest of the people's democratic revolution, it is absolutely correct to expose these wanton criminals.

What more harm the Lava revisionist fascists can make has been properly weighed. They are already at the end of their tether and are making the most dissonant barks—conflicting statements and brazen lies—that have thoroughly discredited them.

Executive Committee
Communist Party of the Philippines
July 20, 1971

Introduction

Since the latter part of 1970, the Lava revisionist renegades have launched an unprecedentedly vicious campaign of printed slander against the Communist Party of the Philippines, the New People's Army and what they imagine to be the person of Chairman Amado Guerrero. They have not also spared from their contradicting inventions and epithets the person and leadership of Jose Ma. Sison and others; entire mass organizations, especially of the youth; and the entire national democratic movement.

Were it limited only to revisionist prattle, the Lavaite campaign of slander would have had no basic difference from previous manifestos and gossipmongering started by the Lavas sometime in January 1967. But this time vilification is coupled with such fascist actions as specifying to the reactionary state particular persons to attack physically even as these are engaged in legal activities; perpetrating vicious crimes of kidnapping and murder (we do not expect them to keep prisoners); publicly suggesting responsibility for these crimes; and coercing people to desist from criticizing Lavaite revisionism.

The Party has correctly described the Lava revisionist scoundrels as having graduated from the "peacefulness" of Khrushchovite revisionism to the counterrevolutionary violence of Brezhnevite revisionism since their commission during the middle part of 1969 of the crimes of bloody intrigue calculated to use to their advantage our revolutionary struggle against the Taruc-Sumulong gangster clique.

It is necessary to examine Lavaite propaganda in order to gain a profound knowledge of the degeneration of the Lavaite revisionist renegades into fascist adjuncts and tools of the US-Marcos clique. Unwittingly in their most recent outbursts of slander, the Lava revisionist renegades have provided us with the most concentrated collection of materials documenting clearly their treacherous activities. These documentary materials are more extensive than their usual slapdash manifestos and thus amplify the worst characteristics of revisionist and fascist propaganda in content and style.

They provide us with basic and comprehensive view of the counterrevolutionary ideas of the Lava revisionist renegades.

After the publication of separate chapters of Philippine Society and Revolution during the latter part of 1970, the military authorities in Camp Crame allowed Jesus Lava to write a lengthy article claiming that US imperialism will effect land reform in order to seize initiative from the revolutionary proletariat and peasant masses; denying the obvious that feudalism is the social base of imperialism in the Philippines; and pretending to admit errors under his leadership but only to dishonestly take back his admissions in the end or to distort the Marxist-Leninist criteria for self-criticism and criticism in the already notorious Lavaite style of doubletalk. Chairman Amado Guerrero has replied to the article of Jesus Lava with the article "Against the Wishful Thinking of a Revisionist Puppet of US Imperialism." Noting that Jesus Lava's article is replete with anti-Marxist and anti-Leninist statements, including one stupendously anti-China statement that Taiwan is a "country" where US imperialism has done wonders, the Party has reprinted it as an appendix to Chairman Amado Guerrero's article to enable readers to make further comparison of what is correct and what is wrong.

What is striking about the article of Jesus Lava, aside from its fabulously counterrevolutionary statements, is that all of a sudden it starts calling Chairman Amado Guerrero as Jose Ma. Sison. Later, we observe that the "slip" Lava makes in the article served as the signal shot for the unprecedented outbursts of printed slander and fascist terror from Lavaite minions. This was immediately synchronized with the stepped-up campaign of US imperialism and the reactionary government to counter the powerful tide of national democratic propaganda, conduct selective fascist terror in Manila and launch massive campaigns of "encirclement and suppression" in both Central Luzon and Northern Luzon. In the field of propaganda, we find such reactionary publicists as the Tarucs, the Lacsinas, and the Lachicas singing the same tune sung by the Lava revisionist renegades and composed long ago by the US-Marcos clique.

Abroad, Jorge Maravilla (an old pseudonym of the US imperialist agent William J. Pomeroy) wrote the article "Philippines: Results, Difficulties, Prospects" for the revisionist journal *Peace, Freedom and Socialism* (December 1970). The article goes right out to name Jose Ma. Sison and a legal mass organization as directly having something to do with the reestablished Communist Party of the Philippines and the New People's Army. It is indeed very revealing that the Lava revisionist renegades chose to have their major initial attacks written in an enemy military camp; and also abroad by one who has long lost the respect of Filipino revolutionaries for having gotten out of prison upon the intercession of the US government and local military puppets, and for having engaged subsequently in revisionist activities.

The January 1971 issue of *Struggle*, Lavaite mouthpiece published by the Bertrand Russell Peace Foundation (Phil.), Inc., was the very first in the

country to come out with an extensive attack against the Party, people's army and legal mass organizations; and try to link all these together through the single person of Jose Ma. Sison. It starts with an attack against Sison and all revolutionary forces and ends up expressing support for the US-Marcos clique against an imagined CIA-inspired coup d'etat, which was cockily prophesied to happen soon. A crude attempt is made to impugn the integrity of the very revolutionary forces that are in the vanguard of the struggle against US imperialism, feudalism and bureaucrat capitalism. Militant mass organizations are denounced as unwitting tools of the CIA and militant mass actions are described as "Left adventurist," "petty bourgeois revolutionism" and the like.

The entire 16-page issue of *Struggle* frenziedly argues against the reality and main current of the first quarter storm and the second upsurge of 1970 and the firm worker-student struggle against the US oil monopolies. It is well-known, however, that the Lava revisionist renegades have always tried to insinuate themselves into revolutionary mass struggles in Greater Manila but have always been literally kicked out of them by the masses since February 4, 1970 as by their own words and deeds, the Lavaites fully expose themselves as scabs and agents of the US-Marcos clique. Boasting of "peasant" strength in the counterrevolutionary reformist Masaka, the junior Lavaites in their gossip-sheet vainly taunt the revolutionary youth for "not" having peasant strength. They misrepresent the revolutionary youth as the Communist Party of the Philippines. Furthermore, they deliberately shut off their eyes from the fact that the Party and the New People's Army have vast peasant support, the main force for the national democratic revolution.

The greatest mischief of the BRPF gossip-sheet is to "reveal" four names as having something to do with the reestablished Communist Party of the Philippines together with Jose Ma. Sison. Carlos B. del Rosario is one of those mentioned. This outstanding leader of the Movement for a Democratic Philippines will always be remembered as a victim of the Marcos-Lava-Lacsina fascist conspiracy. Mere relatives of national democratic leaders are also mentioned in the Lavaite gossip-sheet and are attacked in a vicious and threatening language foretelling the violence that would also befall Jose Ma. Sison's brother Francisco C. Sison and the latter's driver Elpidio Morales.

In January 1971, the Lava revisionist renegades also put out their external "theoretical" organ *World Outlook*, a collection of articles from such revisionist hacks as Jack Woddis, R. Palme Dutt, A. Iskenderov and L. Stepanov and Henri Alleg; and brandishing William J. Pomeroy as "the theoretician" of the Philippine revolution. In his article "Lessons of the Liberation Struggle in the Philippines," Pomeroy engages in wordplay about the "national bourgeoisie," the "nationalist bourgeoisie" and the "bourgeois nationalists." As is his wont, Pomeroy insists on diplomatic relations with Soviet social-imperialism and on parliamentary struggle as the principal form of struggle. He pontificates that it is "un-Marxist, even foolish to generalize" on the "combination of forms" of struggle. He completely exposes his deliberate opposition to Marxist-Leninist theory.

Designed to "confirm" all the lies spewed out by Jesus Lava, William J, Pomeroy and the glory-be-to-Bertrand Russell outfit, the "internal" bulletin *Ang Komunista* came out in February 1971 in obvious compliance with a schedule of slander. Its editorial sets as the principal Lavaite targets Jose Ma. Sison and Amado Guerrero and any organization which the Lava revisionist renegades consider associated with either name. What is most striking about this policy-setting editorial is that it absolutely does not mention US imperialism, feudalism and bureaucrat capitalism. It announces its policy of "competing" with *Ang Bayan* in terms of "multiplier effect," "mudslinging," "exploiting the irrational side of human psychology" and "technical and financial resources." In this regard, one definitely overhears a bourgeois reactionary university professor, a lumpen proletariat, a crooked businessman and a couple of shysters crouching together on some dirty deal.

But the article of "Mario Frunze" about "Marxism-Leninism" and "revolutionary quixotism" is the most shameless among its content and is supposed to be the definitive article on Chairman Amado Guerrero, the Communist Party of the Philippines, the New People's Army and the revolutionary mass movement in general. The article is a pack of lies and wrong notions about Marxism-Leninism and the strategy and tactics of the people's democratic revolution. From this point on, we shall refer to *Ang Komunista* as the Lavaite bulletin of anticommunism in sharp protest to the usurpation of name. The publishers describe the circulation of their bulletin of anticommunism as "internal" but we have copies of the two editions of their maiden issue and they would not even know how we have gotten them. The second edition hardly improves the style of the first edition because of the basic counterrevolutionary ideas and misrepresentations that remain unchanged. At any rate, this bulletin of anticommunism was extensively quoted in the May 14 issue of *Asia-Philippines Leader* by Teodosio Lansang in the article, "One More View from the Left."

The Lavaite bulletin of anticommunism also contains an article attacking the temporary seizure of the University of the Philippines by the Diliman community of students, workers and teachers on grounds that there was no plan and no capability to develop barricade resistance into a general uprising and that in effect the strikers forewarned the enemy of a tactic that would be employed at a higher stage of the struggle. It is clear by self-admission that members of the Lavaite "political bureau," together with the most reactionary elements, were' responsible for the manifestos attacking the masses of strikers as "radical fascists." They chose to attack and now continue to attack the progressive masses of students, teachers and university workers, instead of joining the fight against the real fascist brutes.

Again abroad, William J. Pomeroy wrote for the February 6, 1971 issue of the US revisionist publication *Daily World* the article "Who's; Who in the Fight." As usual in the fantastic style of revisionist scoundrels, Pomeroy names names but never those of his cohorts and feeds legal entities to witchhunt by the Marcos fascists. He piles malice on 1 malice by accusing the Communist Party of China of "foreign interference" and making snide

remarks against Chairman Mao Zedong. Like a thief crying "Thief!," the US imperialist agent who got out of prison a full decade ahead of his "fellow" political prisoners is quick to accuse others of being agents of US imperialism. (Until now, this revisionist scoundrel can only claim the stream of foreign letters on Malacanang begging for his release as the flimsy reason for his unusual release from prison. But even Filipino letters and tens of thousands of Filipino signatures, not to mention massive rallies, cannot effect the same miracle in the case of genuine revolutionaries who are in prison.)

The long editorial of the February 15, 1971 issue of (Vol. II, No. of *Sang-ayon sa MAN*, ostensibly the organ of the Movement for the Advancement of Nationalism in Pilipino, frets about "disunity" of all "progressive organizations" and in the same breath attacks in the vilest language and with the cheapest fabrications Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought, the Communist Party of the Philippines, the New People's Army, and all national democratic mass organizations, especially the youth and their leaders fighting against US imperialism, feudalism and bureaucrat capitalism. While pretending to support diplomatic relations with "socialist countries" and "all countries," the editorial makes anti-China and anti-Chinese chauvinist attacks. This editorial reveals clearly that the Movement for the Advancement of Nationalism in the hands of the Lava revisionist renegades has been converted into an organization against communism, China, revolution, and the people. The most vulgar invectives and cheapest fabrications are employed in this editorial. At one point, even the name and circumstances of Jose Ma. Sison's father are changed and made the object of spite.

The very first issue (Vol. I, No. 1, March 1971) of *Political Review*, another publication of the Movement for the Advancement of Nationalism, editorially pretends to criticize the state-of-the-nation address of the puppet chieftain Marcos but whips up the rumor that the Marcos puppet clique is bent on fighting US imperialism in its own way. It slanders the revolutionary mass movement as arising only because US imperialism is opening the "safety valves" to "dissipate the revolutionary content of social unrest." The leading article by Alberto Tiongson, "Imperialist Uses of the Sino-Soviet Dispute" arrives at the gloomy conclusion that the struggle between Marxism-Leninism and modern revisionism has been beneficial to US imperialism and slanders the national democratic mass organizations as having fallen in line with the clerico-fascists and the CIA. This line is harped on even as the events of January 25, 1971 showed that the Lava revisionist renegades and other counterrevolutionary outfits like the Christian Social Democratic Front were together in trying to sabotage the protest mass action commemorating the January 26th and 30th mass actions of 1970 and opposing the state-of-the-nation address of the fascist puppet chieftain Marcos before Congress.

The April-May issue (Vol. I, Nos. 2-3) editorializes that the recent revolutionary upsurges in the Philippines are the handiwork of US imperialism and not the achievement of the national democratic movement; dismisses these as mere "revolutionism" and spruces up US imperialism as

being on "full scale offensive for effecting radical reforms to prevent another Cuba" in the Philippines. To lend authority to its bankrupt line, it features an article of the revisionist hack William J. Pomeroy, "Trends in Imperialist Offensive," which outlines the "grand strategy" of an all-mighty US imperialism and peddles set of mysterious "wide-ranging tactics" to belittle armed struggle as the main form of struggle for the oppressed and exploited people of the world against US imperialism and its lackeys. It also presents the "political position" of the rightist Socialist Party of the Philippines led by the labor aristocrat Ignacio P. Lacsina and of the Lavaite "peasant" organization Masaka. The leading article, "Foreign Economic Policy for the Philippines," praises the Magna Carta of Economic Freedom and Social Justice. This "magna carte" is actually designed to perpetuate US imperialist exploitation in the Philippines in more vicious form and advertises the so-called benefits from trade with Soviet social-imperialism. Furthermore, the article tries to douse the revolutionary fervor of the national democratic movement by stating the hopeless conclusion that the Philippines "has no other alternative but to establish a favorable climate for foreign investment...."

The editorial of the June 12, 1971 issue (Vol. II, No. 3) of *Sang-ayon sa MAN* futilely tries to justify the failure of the Lavaite candidates to gain seats in the constitutional convention farce despite its boastful claim of "peasant" strength in the countryside. Instead, it vents its ire on the masses of demonstrators outside the convention hall who have succeeded in forcefully exposing the deception in the "talking shop" maneuver of US imperialism and its local allies. The main article, "Who Are the Real Traitors to the Movement?" keeps up its slander against Chairman Mao, China, the Chinese revolution, communism, the people and the youth. It gratuitously declares that MAN is not Marxist-Leninist but at the same time protests why "a new" Communist Party has been established in the Philippines. There are sections of the editorial, written by the Lava revisionist renegades, implying their direct responsibility for the actual kidnapping and presumable murder of Francisco C. Sison, together with his driver Elpidio Morales, and gloating over the crime. The Lava revisionist renegades boast in gangster fashion that they can commit any kind of fascist crime and warn others not to expose the crime because it is "treasonous" to inform the people about Lavaite criminal conspiracy with the US-Marcos clique.

Sang-ayon sa MAN is mimeographed by Antonio Santos, who is a longtime valet of the Lavas and who publicly boasts that he is the "intelligence bureau" chief of the Lava revisionist renegades. The glossy *Political Review* which has an expensive format is run by notorious Lavaites Francisco Jose and Merlin M. Magallona. It is interesting to note that one publication makes the wildest kind of Lavaite slander and the other makes the "mild" kind. This is a manifestation of the old Lavaite line that there is one style for Pilipino readers and another for readers in English. At any rate, both publications express the same rotten views of the Lava revisionist renegades.

The July 1971 issue (Vol. III, No. 2) of BRPF's *Struggle* tries to cover up the cheap lies previously made in the Lavaite publications by insisting on their "honesty" and "logic," once more attacks the person of Jose Ma. Sison, expressed jubilation over the kidnapping and presumed murder of Sison's brother and the driver Elpidio Morales and invents a story about the New People's Army sending threat letters to Lavaite agents in the reactionary government.

The July 4, 1971 issue (Vol. I, No. 5) of *Ang Gabay*, official organ of the "Greater Manila chapter" of Malayang Pagkakaisa ng Kabataang Pilipino (MPKP), editorializes that the MPKP is the "vanguard" of the Philippine revolution, that it has "a decisive task of leading the waging of the Philippine revolution." The leading article by "Emil Banaag" entitled "The Struggle towards People's Democracy" elaborates on the "strategy and tactics" as put forward by the Lavaite bulletin of anticommunism. After dismissing as unimportant the distinction between armed struggle and parliamentary struggle, the article just the same refers to parliamentary struggle as the principal form of struggle in the stage of "strategic defensive" which is supposed to be preparatory to a rapid putschist sequence of the "strategic counteroffensive" and "general offensive." The article completely discards the three strategic stages of people's war as expounded by Chairman Mao. In its confused "class analysis," it considers the petty bourgeoisie more as a liability than as an ally in the people's democratic revolution, it puts the petty bourgeoisie at par with the lumpen proletariat and prefers the lumpen proletariat to the national bourgeoisie as an ally. In referring to the "world proletarian revolution," it concentrates on defending the Soviet social-imperialist invasion and occupation of Czechoslovakia. The entire article is replete with the erroneous ideas being spread by the Lava revisionist renegades.

Despite the protestations of the Lava revisionist renegades that they are impoverished and that the "Maoists" are well-financed, they are putting out at least six major publications: the bulletin of anticommunism, *World Outlook*, *Struggle*, *Political Review*, *Sang-ayon sa MAN* and *Ang Gabay*. While mass support for publications of the national democratic mass organizations is obvious, the Lava revisionist renegades can only rely on sinister sources of funds.

The study and repudiation of the propaganda for revisionism and fascism of the Lava revisionist renegades has great value. It serves to sharpen our understanding of the universal truth of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought, improve our grasp of the so correct proletarian revolutionary line of the Communist Party of the Philippines; and to strengthen the unity of the revolutionary mass movement against US imperialism, feudalism and bureaucrat capitalism.

The Lava revisionist renegades are a bunch of counterrevolutionaries masquerading as Marxist-Leninists. They try to capitalize on the exceedingly long period when the Lavas succeeded in usurping the leadership of the old merger party. They borrow phrases from or even make occasional references

to the great communist leaders to set their counterrevolutionary ends. They are therefore more clever than such other fire brigades of reaction as the Christian "socialists" of the Manglapus type, the "democratic socialists" of the Lacsina type or "welfare statist" of the Macapagal type.

Shorn of their pretenses, the Lava revisionist renegades are clearly antagonistic to Marxism-Leninism and are among the enemies of the national democratic movement. We can expect that as now and as before US imperialism and its local running dogs will increasingly make direct use of the counterrevolutionary ideas and fascist service of the Lava revisionist renegades in attacking the revolutionary mass movement.

It is important to study the propaganda being churned out by the Lava revisionist renegades so as to be alert to the fascist crimes that they are now committing in collusion with the US-Marcos clique and so as to meet both the immediate and long-term danger that modern revisionism poses to the revolutionary mass movement.

The falsity of the slander flung by the Lava revisionist renegades at the Communist Party of the Philippines and the New People's Army is easily seen in the following ways: claiming sole authority as the source of facts concerning the old merger party; ascribing incongruous words and deeds to other people but never quoting from readily available official publications of our Party and never respecting the colossal reality of revolutionary upsurges; self-contradictory statements in the same article or contradictory statements among articles; making outright lies like changing the name of Sison's father and fabricating a fifth Sison brother; claiming that so-and-so and so-and-so are in the sanctum sanctorum of the CIA together with Lavaite agents; diverting attention from fundamental issues by making outright lies on ostensibly minor issues; giving credit to US imperialism and to the local reactionaries for the revolutionary achievements of the masses and the proletarian revolutionary leadership; preaching about "honesty" and "sense of responsibility" and invoking "unity" to sugarcoat their counterrevolutionary attacks. These are only some of the techniques of deceit employed by the Lavaites to insult their readers and the entire people.

In making their wild campaign of vilification against the Communist Party of the Philippines, the New People's Army and the revolutionary mass movement in general and in perpetrating provocative fascist crimes and brazenly boasting about them in public, the Lava revisionist renegades have exposed themselves as having been accorded by the US-Marcos clique with a great deal of license since Jesus Lava fired his first shot from Camp Crame. This is strikingly evident from the fact that Lavaite gangsters go around displaying firearms and trying to make further provocations in both Greater Manila and limited parts of Central Luzon, Southern Luzon and Northern Luzon.

The utter bankruptcy of the Lava revisionist renegades and fascist gangsters shows as they argue and act against the reality of a rapidly advancing revolutionary mass movement in both cities and countryside, led by the revolutionary party of the proletariat, the Communist Party of the

Philippines, and also as they argue against such basic Party documents as the Guide for Cadres and Members of the Communist Party of the Philippines and Chairman Amado Guerrero's Philippine Society and Revolution. The Lava revisionist renegades are like mayflies plotting to topple a giant tree.

I. Lavaites Are Anti-Marxist and Anti-Leninist Obscurantists and Chauvinists

Taking the air of false superiority, the Lava revisionist renegades brazenly express contempt for Comrade Mao Zedong and Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought. They always take pains to create the impression that Marxism has stopped to develop beyond the stage of Leninism.

These sham Marxists impose their deliberate distortion of Marxist as some kind of sophistication. They try to render Marxism-Leninist static and dead by denying the fact that it has developed to the completely new and higher stage of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought.

Genuine Marxists in the Philippines and the world over recognize that the universal revolutionary theory of the proletariat has passed three major stages. Marx and Engels developed Marxism as the first stage in advancing the theory of scientific socialism as against utopian socialism in the era of pre-monopoly capitalism. Lenin and Stalin developed Marxism to the new and higher stage of Marxism-Leninism in advancing the theory and practice of proletarian revolution and proletarian dictatorship in the era of imperialism and in establishing and consolidating the first socialist state in the Soviet Union. Mao Zedong also made significant contributions to the second stage with the victories of the Chinese revolution before the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution.

Mao Zedong has developed Marxism-Leninism to the completely new and higher stage of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought in advancing the theory and practice of continuing revolution under the dictatorship of the proletariat and in leading the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution to prevent the restoration of capitalism in a socialist society. This third stage encompasses the present epoch. Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought has brought forward the world proletarian revolution and has brought about greater unity, strength and militancy among the revolutionary people despite the betrayal of Marxism-Leninism by the revisionist ruling clique, the neo-bourgeoisie, of the Soviet Union.

The Lava revisionist renegades deny the fact that the Soviet Union has become neocapitalist or revisionist, social-fascist and social-imperialist. As incorrigible bourgeois idealists, they at certain times hypocritically express wishes to have Marxism-Leninism "united" With modern revisionism but they never fail to make attacks against Chairman Mao, the Lenin of the present era; against the Chinese Communist Party; against the People's Republic of China, the bulwark of socialism; and against the several hundreds of millions of Chinese people. In the Philippines, they are out to promote the interests of the Soviet monopoly bureaucrat bourgeoisie and hope that with its help,

including that of US imperialism and the Marcos fascist puppet clique, they can enhance their own bureaucratic ambitions.

Using the notorious Lavaite method of misrepresentation, "Mario Frunze" in the bulletin of anticommunism tries to attribute words to Chairman Amado Guerrero. Here is the fabrication: "He (Chairman Guerrero) argued that it is now the fashion throughout the world for Communist Parties to split and for several Parties to exist in each country."

Messrs. Revisionists, the revolutionary struggles of genuine Marxist-Leninists against modern revisionism is not just a fashion as you yourselves choose to call it in your fabrication. Modern revisionism is splittism. Even the entire Communist Party of the Philippines ceases to be communist or Marxist-Leninist when it becomes revisionist, an Instrument of imperialism. Your clique is a bogus communist party because it is revisionist. Furthermore, Marxism-Leninism does not permit two genuine Communist Parties in one country.

You cannot attribute words to us as you please. "Rectify Errors and Rebuild the Party," which is the Party's document of rectification, is clear and can be read by you and by anyone else. The demarcation line between genuine Marxist-Leninists and sham Marxist-Leninists is Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought. We have repudiated your clique as a counterrevolutionary revisionist group. The Communist Party of the Philippines as it has been reestablished is now guided by Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought and is conducting a living study and application of it in the concrete practice of the Philippine revolution.

The spokesman of the Lava revisionist renegades babbles further: "We shall leave it to the masses to decide whether ... maligning the Soviet Union and other socialist states ... are the distinctive marks of a true revolutionary."

These Lavaites talk as if the masses have not already decided against them. The whole series of Lava leadership, the entire Lava dynasty, during the last more than three decades has been judged. Now that the Lavaites wish to impose Soviet modern revisionism and social-imperialism and their revisionist puppetry, the masses will surely punish them even more thoroughly until their doom. We oppose the social-imperialist and social-fascist rule in the Soviet Union and other countries especially in a number of Eastern European countries and in the People's Republic of Mongolia. It is our revolutionary duty to support the Soviet and other peoples who are oppressed and exploited by the revisionist betrayers of Lenin.

The Lava revisionist renegades can seek no comfort in making such a pious statement in *Ang Gabay* as that "it has been proven, not only in the history of the Philippines but of the whole world, that a revolutionary party of the proletariat can never be destroyed by reactionary elements." The fact is that the Communist Party of the Philippines established in 1930 has been infiltrated and secretly sabotaged from within by the Lava revisionist renegades since 1935 even as the enemy from without sought to destroy it. Even as the revolutionary party of the proletariat is reestablished on the theoretical basis of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought, the barefaced

enemy and his special agents, the Lava revisionist renegades, seek to destroy it. If we are not alert and thoroughgoing in fighting modern revisionism, the Communist Party of the Philippines can once more be taken over or destroyed from within or from without.

Even a revolutionary party of the proletariat in a socialist society can become the victim of modern revisionists and other counterrevolutionary conspirators. Class struggle persists within the Communist Party reflecting the class struggle outside. Look at how the Party of Lenin has been taken over and sabotaged from within by the modern revisionists. But we now have the Marxist-Leninist theory of continuing revolution under the dictatorship of the proletariat. It is a powerful weapon for combating the ideas of the bourgeoisie, preventing the restoration of capitalism in a socialist society and for ensuring the victory of the world proletariat over imperialism, modern revisionism and all reaction.

The Lavaites hate Mao Zedong, the Lenin of the present era, but they honor Bertrand Russell to high heavens. The mouthpiece of the Bertrand Russell Peace Foundation (Phil.), Inc., *Struggle* (January 1971), expresses most aptly the emptiness of the Lavaites' intellectual pretensions. This Lavaite publication says:

They [referring to the Party and the mass organizations] are so busy studying the thoughts of Mao Zedong and issuing statements denigrating the Soviet Union as "social-imperialists," whatever that means....

Already familiar are the charges of "revisionist renegades" and "bureaucrats" hurled repeatedly against MPKP, its fraternal groups and their leaders. Aside from these charges which are never really explained clearly....

Fond of quoting Lenin to oppose Lenin, the Lavaites pretend to know so much but suddenly fail to recognize such Leninist critical terms as social-imperialism, revisionism and bureaucratism.

Social-imperialism means socialism in words but imperialism in deeds, the growth of opportunism into imperialism. It means the betrayal of Marxism-Leninism by the Soviet monopoly bureaucrat bourgeoisie. It means concretely the oppression and exploitation by the neocapitalist ruling clique in Moscow of the various nationalities in the Soviet Union, the peoples in a number of countries in Eastern Europe and in the People's Republic of Mongolia, and the peoples of a certain number of Asian, African and Latin American countries. It means the imperialist and fascist invasion of Czechoslovakia and repeated acts of new-tsarist aggression against China. It means supplying arms and giving all-out support to fascist butchers in Indonesia and India for purposes including the suppression of local revolutionaries and aggression against China. Need we say more? The Lavaites feign ignorance of the substance of our sustained propaganda against Soviet social-imperialism.

In his *Half a Century of Socialism*, William J. Pomeroy echoes his Soviet revisionist masters by stating that opposing classes have ceased to exist in

the Soviet Union and that what prevails is a "state of the whole people." In other words, the dictatorship of the proletariat is no longer thought of as the instrument to suppress counterrevolutionary tendencies within the country, but as an instrument directed solely against enemies from outside.

He also disparages the great red banner of the proletariat by railing that the "hammer and sickle were an apt symbol in the time of Lenin" and that "today's symbols are the computer, the transistor and the atomic ring." These Lavaite statements are revisionist and counterrevolutionary.

Within the Soviet Union, the dictatorship of the proletariat was gradually corroded for decades by capitalist roaders or revisionists under such erroneous ideas as class struggle no longer exists in a socialist society and that progress is a matter of advancing techniques. It was at the 20th Congress of the CPSU that the revisionists headed by Khrushchov sanctified a full-grown dictatorship of the bourgeoisie under cover of "combating the personality cult of Stalin." Such lines as the "parliamentary road" and "peaceful transition" were also broadcast to sabotage the world proletarian revolution. From the time of Khrushchov, the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie has been employed to suppress genuine Communists and the broad masses of the Soviet people. This is the meaning of Pomeroy's statement that "the dictatorship of the proletariat is no longer thought of as the instrument to suppress counterrevolutionary tendencies within the country."

Under the Brezhnev revisionist renegade clique, all basic revisionist policies of Khrushchov have been pushed further to their social-imperialist culmination. The restoration of capitalism has been accelerated with the adoption of the "new economic system" which puts profit in command of everything and authorizes managers and directors to operate individual enterprises and farms as independent capitalist entities. Khrushchov's theory of the "international division, of labor" was also pushed further to convert a number of countries in Eastern Europe and the People's Republic of Mongolia into out-and-out colonies—as markets, subsidiary processing workshops, orchards, vegetable gardens and ranches. Moved by its own revisionist renegade character and also wanting to maneuver itself out of the clutches of the Soviet revisionist renegades, the Dubcek revisionist renegade clique in Czechoslovakia wanted to secure loans from US imperialism and the West German revanchists. Allowing no differences with its colonies, the Brezhnev revisionist renegade clique unleashed the social-imperialist and social-fascist invasion and occupation of Czechoslovakia. This is a clear realization of what Pomeroy means by the statement that a "dictatorship of the proletariat" exists in the Soviet Union only insofar as it is supposed to be "an instrument directed solely against enemies from the outside."

The Soviet social-imperialist attack on Czechoslovakia and the Czechoslovak people deserves considerable attention here because of the following statement of *Ang Gabay*:

Like for example Czechoslovakia. This country is with other socialist countries in an economic organization called COMECON and the product that she contributes to this organization are armaments

because these are her primary products. Because the primary source of socialist countries are weapons for their Armed Forces and of the countries waging revolution against the might of Imperialism is Czechoslovakia, the NATO and the CIA in West Germany attempted to seize power from the Czechoslovak workers through a counterrevolution led by students. The liberal adventurist and romanticist students were influenced by the revanchists in North Germany (sic) or by the adherents of Hitler that are now reviving his dreams to avenge the ignominy they have incurred in the eyes of mankind. Now, the adherents of American Imperialism are using the events in Czechoslovakia to undermine the Soviet Union and broadcast to the whole world that this is a concrete evidence of the Soviet Union's social-imperialism at present.

Because of their genuine concern for the people's interest, all Marxist-Leninists have denounced and opposed all counterrevolutionary policies and actions of Soviet social-imperialism. US imperialism also attacks Soviet social-imperialism but for reasons basically different from those of Marxist-Leninists. US imperialism and Soviet social-imperialism collude and contend with each other and the former always tries to discredit communism by referring to the imperialist abuses of social-imperialists who masquerade as communists. With regard to West Germany, Soviet social-imperialism does not allow its puppet revisionist renegade cliques like the Dubcek revisionist renegade clique in 1968 to beg directly for loans from West Germany. But the Soviet social-imperialists themselves have begged for and gotten loans from the West German revanchists in exchange for the Soviet sellout of the sovereign interests of the German people.

Now that the Lava revisionist renegades are all excited about diplomatic and trade relations between the Philippine reactionary government and Soviet social-imperialism, it is pertinent to quote an unwitting confession made by William J. Pomeroy in World Outlook:

It (trade with Soviet social-imperialism) can reduce the need for the nationalist bourgeoisie to struggle for the home market against imperialist competition; it makes it less essential to forge united fronts with popular movements. For landlord export groups it reduces the need to shift from agriculture to industry. Even for the imperialists, who have caused an enormously unfavorable Philippine balance of payments position that forces the country towards exchange controls, it would ease the crisis and ensure their uninterrupted remittance of profits; hence they do not oppose it as rigidly as before, but seek to limit it and to divert it from public projects.

The Lava revisionist renegades are happy about the prospect that Soviet social-imperialism, in collusion and, in competition with US imperialism and Japanese imperialism, shall be able to apply its theory of "international division of labor" on the Philippines and compel it to further remain a mere supplier of raw materials, a mere market for shoddy Soviet products and a client-state for deceptive and onerous Soviet loan capital. Of course, the

Lava revisionist renegades will say that their "socialist" country, Soviet social-imperialism, will extend aid in the form of capital goods. But we know how gross are the designs of Soviet machines, how high is the overprice exacted, how huge profits and interest rates are exacted by getting payments in the form, of undervalued local products, and how expensive are Soviet technical services. We know the experience of China, India, Indonesia and other countries with regard to Soviet "trade and aid."

The Lavaites, like their social-imperialist masters, are revisionist renegades and their ringleaders are shameless bureaucrats within their own clique as well as in the reactionary government which they serve. Their ideological outlook, political line, organization and fascist activities are opposed to the revolutionary mass movement and support US imperialism, modern revisionism and local reaction.

Under the pretext of attacking "dogmatism," the anticommunist "Frunze" prates: "Guerrero's dogmatism is even more absurd because the formulas he preaches are drawn from the experience of another country and he does not consider the relevance of that experience to the realities we have been through since 1950. Instead, he arbitrarily selects facts and figures from different sources and fits all these into the Chinese schema."

What the Lava revisionist renegades oppose is Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought and the spirit of proletarian internationalism. What they support is the cosmopolitanism of the international big bourgeoisie and certainly they are anti-Chinese chauvinists. We do not have any Chinese schema and formulas as fixed by Lavaite nonsense. What we are trying to do in the Philippines is propagate the living study and application of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought under the concrete conditions of our country.

Also, the Lava revisionist renegades should never suggest that we are treading the old path of "Left" opportunism of the Jose Lava leadership or that the Jose Lava leadership failed in 1950 because it followed Chairman Mao's theory of people's war. Jose Lava was "Left" opportunist in 1950 and he violated Marxism-Leninism through and through with his purely military viewpoint and putschist shallowness. He is a revisionist just like the rest of the Lavaites and he has left for Canada to seek self-comfort. We have no use for such rubbish except as a negative example. The Lavaites are casting Jose Lava away because there is a split among them; because the faction of Mallari, Briones, Narciso, Nemenzo, Castro and Macapagal has vented anger at him because of some old debts. There is an excellent revolutionary Situation today but we are not poised to launch a strategic offensive now in the cities as the Lavaites tried in 1950; we are still in the stage of strategic defensive of a protracted people's war in a semicolonial and semifeudal country. Our urban policy is to carry on and develop the strike movement and the new democratic cultural revolution.

The Lavaites have no reason to accuse us of dogmatism. We have made concrete analysis of Philippine society and revolution. We have exerted vigorous efforts to give Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought a national form. The Lavaites seem to be unaware of the widely circulated *Philippine*

Society and Revolution and the Guide for Cadres and Members of the Communist Party of the Philippines and fail to quote from these a single sentence to misrepresent. They are the ones guilty of dogmatism and stereotyped learning. They rely on foreign bourgeois and revisionist books and have not made any analysis of the Philippine situation which is any better than their occasional scab propaganda and their slapdash manifestos.

The article of "Emil Banaag" in the July 4, 1971 issue of *Ang Gabay* shows that the Lava revisionist renegades deliberately try to confuse the meaning of such terms as dogmatism and revisionism in order to get away with their counterrevolutionary ideas. They define dogmatism as "limiting oneself to only one form of struggle" and nothing more. In a silly gesture, they try to simply throw back the term "revisionism" to Marxist-Leninists. Chairman Mao teaches us:

Both dogmatism and revisionism run counter to Marxism. Marxism must certainly advance; it must develop along with the development of practice and cannot stand still. It would become lifeless if it remained stagnant and stereotyped. However, the basic principles of Marxism must never be violated, or otherwise mistakes will be made. It is dogmatism to approach Marxism from a metaphysical point of view and to regard it as something rigid. It is revisionism to negate the basic principles of Marxism and to negate its universal truth. Revisionism is one form of bourgeois ideology. The revisionists deny the differences between socialism and capitalism, between the dictatorship of the proletariat and the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie. What they advocate is in fact not the socialist line but the capitalist line. In present circumstances, revisionism is more pernicious than dogmatism. One of our current important tasks on the ideological front is to unfold criticism of revisionism.

The Lava revisionist renegades have turned the Movement for the Advancement of Nationalism into a vehicle for the most repulsive chauvinism. *Sang-ayon sa MAN* (February 15, 1971) editorially states:

There is one more example of what can be the result of pontification. This is the use and repetition of some cliches which clearly emanate from Mao Zedong which are not even fully understood by those who utter these. Those are the charges of pro-Chinese against Russia which undeniably is the very first socialist country in the world. Now it is being accused by them as "revisionist," "traitors" and other charges that are repulsive to hear. It seems that from their view everything that China does is all correct and what other countries and persons do are always wrong.

But this is not what is important. In our loyalty to our aspiration to unite the Filipino people, will the open support to any country, whether China, Russia or America give to our people full unity and understanding?

(The reader should refer to the Tagalog original to confirm the illogic and literary incompetence of the Lavaite author or authors of this passage.)

The Lava revisionist renegades need to be told that the struggle between Marxism-Leninism and modern revisionism is not the struggle between the "pro-Chinese" and "anti-Chinese." It is chauvinist and irrational for them to play up the distinction of China from "other countries and persons" as some kind of antagonism. They should not imagine that their ignorance is the ignorance of others. Those who assail Soviet modern revisionism and social-imperialism understand what the Lavaites prefer to disparage as "cliches" and "repulsive" charges. What really attracts the Lavaites most is the language of the bourgeoisie and modern revisionism.

In the same issue of *Sang-ayon sa MAN* where they feign to be unconcerned about the struggle between Marxism-Leninism and modern revisionism, they brandish the book of the British revisionist Scoundrel Jack Woddis against China, communism, the people and revolution and take the occasion to make their own chauvinist attacks end antidemocratic references to the militant leaders of patriotic and revolutionary mass organizations.

While they attack Comrades Mao and Stalin, the Lava revisionist renegades praise the long-discredited revisionist buffoon Khrushchov and endorse everything rotten that he says about the "personality cult." They introduce and spread such poisonous expressions as the "cult of Mao." They use these in common with their reactionary allies like Marcos, Lacsina and the clerico-fascists. They turn the history of the Chinese revolution upside down in their fantasies. They regret that the traitor, renegade and scab Liu Shao-Chi and his gang of capitalist roaders have failed to do what the Soviet revisionist renegades have succeeded to do in the Soviet Union. They have so much hatred for the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution because it has consolidated the dictatorship of the proletariat. They abuse the Ninth Party Congress of the Communist Party of China because it was a congress of unity, victory and vitality.

They want the restoration of capitalism in China as in the Soviet Union. That is why they hate Chairman Mao, the Communist Party of China and the Chinese people. They hate socialist China because it has become the strongest bulwark of socialism and is today the center of world revolution against imperialism, modern revisionism and all reaction.

Going to every length to spite China, the Lava revisionist renegades praise former House Speaker Jose B. Laurel and Majority Floor Leader Jose M. Aldeguer for supporting the US-inspired "two-China" policy. They stick hardheadedly to the inane view expressed previously by Jesus Lava in "Paglilinaw sa 'Philippine Crisis'"—that Taiwan is a "nation-state" (*bansa*). At a time that US imperialism and the Chiang bandit gang are extremely isolated, they busy themselves with making slanderous claims against the People's Republic of China.

In the June 12th issue of *Sang-ayon sa MAN*, it is obvious that the Lava revisionist renegades want to combine counterrevolutions chauvinism with antinational and antidemocratic slander against mass organizations that have repudiated them. In the guise of misrepresenting only one person, they raise the stupid question rhetorically, "Are his fellow Filipinos his principal

enemies rather than Americans and Chinese?" Here they are chauvinists not only against the Chinese people but also against the American people.

In the same publication, they arrogantly misrepresent the new type of national democratic cultural revolution now raging in the streets of Manila and elsewhere:

The truth is, in the view of so many, especially those who have some knowledge, such acts are blind and infantile imitation of what is called "wall posters" which became prevalent in China during the so-called cultural revolution which in fact was a purge in China which only tarnished and further destroyed the good image of a previously admired Red China.

They can talk their heads off against the new type of national democratic cultural revolution. It is rapidly isolating them and their imperialist masters. That is how real and powerful it is as a revolutionary force and as a local creation of the masses. Public opinion is being prepared for harder hammer blows to fall on their heads we have gained a revolutionary lesson and adopted from the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution a method for isolating US imperialism feudalism, bureaucrat capitalism and Soviet social-imperialism. The Lava revisionist renegades are the ones who are blind and infantile who pretend not to see that the revolutionary mass movement has already repudiated them.

In their futile attempt to parry the blows against their US imperialist, Soviet social-imperialist and local reactionary masters, the Lava revisionist renegades rail in the following manner:

We will submit ourselves only to the good of the Filipino masses and to the cause of driving away the foreign imperialists from our soil whether it be American imperialism, Russian imperialism, Chinese imperialism or Japanese imperialism and others.

Such a trick as "attacking the many" to save the real few is a wornout trick of imperialist propaganda. The Lavaites have completely degenerated into chauvinist demagogues and cheap tools of US imperialism. What do they mean by Chinese imperialism? They have completely abandoned all pretensions to understanding the meaning of imperialism as clearly defined by the great Lenin. The Chiang bandit gang, which they adore, is nothing but a puppet and tool of US imperialism.

At one point, the Lava revisionist renegades piously preach that *Sang-ayon sa MAN* or the Movement for the Advancement of Nationalism is "nobody's" instrument and has no ax to grind against the Communist Party. But let us quote the official publication of MAN, *Sang-ayon sa MAN*:

According to Guerrero himself, the united front of progressives is a sine qua non of the progressive movement, in the face of the imperialist enemy. If we accept this to be correct and we believe it, how can we also accept as correct what he did by also setting up a new Party?

The Lavaites presume too much and they make use of MAN to peddle their presumptions. As a matter of fact, their bogus communist party monopolizes what they consider as the "united front." Revisionist renegades

are not progressive. They sabotage and subvert the revolutionary mass movement. They are reactionary and the people see through their pretenses.

Protesting gratuitously that MAN is not Marxist-Leninist, they take the license of using it to attack the reestablished Communist Party of the Philippines. First, they attack the Communist Party of China for having "continued further to depart from, and to repudiate Marxism-Leninism." Then they shift to the following:

From the former young Mao Zedong, whom he (Chairman Amado Guerrero) now worships like a god, a progressive must know what is called contradiction or opposition, if it is antagonistic or non-antagonistic? Does he consider as antagonistic contradictions the petty differences in the ranks of the progressive movement so that he considers these as enemies more than the foreign imperialists? If he has knowledge of the theory of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought, is he not like the churches whose preachings are very different from what they do?

These Lavaites presume themselves to be clever and to be able to confuse people. They only succeed in exposing their own confusion. The contradictions between Marxism-Leninism and modern revisionism are no "petty differences." These are big and serious differences, so big and serious that the Lava revisionist renegades have not hesitated in committing so many fascist crimes against us as well as against the national democratic mass organizations and their leaders. Their main task is to attack us and they have admitted this so many times. Our contradictions are therefore antagonistic. When we fight the Lava revisionist renegades we also fight their imperialist masters. The Lava revisionist renegades are subverters and saboteurs of the revolutionary struggle for people's democracy against US imperialism, feudalism and bureaucrat capitalism.

II. Lavaites Are Not Only Careerists But Super-careerists, Conspirators and Doubledealers

The Lava revisionist renegades have subverted the old merger party and turned it into a revisionist party. They have consistently opposed any criticism of their subjectivism and opportunism and have resorted to conspiratorial methods and spiteful campaigns of slander against those critical of them. As early as January 1967, it was clear that they were resorting to all kinds of tricks to impugn the integrity of proletarian revolutionaries in a futile attempt to oppose criticism and frustrate rectification within the old merger party.

The undeniable proof today of the utter ideological and political bankruptcy of the Lava revisionist renegades is their strained attempt to misrepresent by various malicious tricks the proletarian revolutionary line and arguments so clearly laid down in the document of rectification, "Rectify Errors and Rebuild the Party" and other basic Party documents. They employ such dishonest tricks as inventing stories and statements calculated to get

the assistance of the reactionary state in repressing democratic personalities and mass organizations.

The main line of argument that runs through their written propaganda and rumormongering is that they have the authority to determine what makes the Communist Party of the Philippines and what makes the revolutionary mass movement. They fancy such authority to proceed from their theory of "noble lineage" or "hereditary privilege." Suffering from the "megalomania" that they try to tack on to others, they also imagine themselves to be Jesus Christ and his faithful apostles and thus they speak of "youthful Judases" who are against them.

The Lavaites employ the filthiest and clumsiest epithets drawn from the trash can of bourgeois psychology which only fall on their own heads and make them absurd before Marxist-Leninists and the broad masses of the people. The publications that they have put out are mere indicators of their capacity for reckless gossip in the clownish attempt to claim authority. Their written propaganda is bad enough but their unwritten and other cheap Trotskyite tricks are even worse.

But still they flatter themselves in the following manner in their bulletin of anticommunism:

Knowing that his opponents are restrained by a sense of responsibility to safeguard the clandestine apparatus of an illegal Party, he takes the liberty of distorting and fabricating malicious charges which they could answer only by exposing certain confidential matters to the enemy.

This expressed pretension for being discreet is thrown overboard in the same issue of the same publication of anticommunism, which is widely distributed for "multiplier effect" and is a mere part of a campaign of slander participated in by all Lavaite outfits like MAN, Masaka, MPKP, BRPF, KILUSAN, CTUP, AKSIUN and their respective publications.

What immediately calls our attention is that while the Lava revisionist renegades openly confirm their supposed involvement in the underground they are not subjected to violent repression by the state. On the other hand, their irresponsible attacks against democratic leaders and mass organizations as having something to do with the reestablished Communist Party of the Philippines have already been followed directly by a number of fascist crimes against those whom they attack.

The claims of the Lavaites to being discreet is entirely false even if one would simply base that conclusion on a compilation of local and foreign revisionist publications. The license that they enjoy in talking about themselves in the open about their "authority" in the "underground" and about their "clandestine apparatus" is well taken up and well demonstrated in the memorandum dated May 18, 1971 by a certain Miss Liwayway T. Reyes to the Movement for a Democratic Philippines. This memorandum carries the names of just about all the "central committeemen" of the Lava revisionist renegade clique and is a clear testimony to the anticommunist philistinism and vulgarity of the Lava revisionist renegades. Miss Reyes has properly warned the people and the national democratic mass organizations

and leaders against the criminal collusion between the Lavaite traitors and the US-Marcos clique.

If we go over the history of inner struggles in the old merger party, we cannot fail to see immediately that the Lavaites characteristically put down those who oppose their opportunist line by grossly violating the principle of democratic centralism and simply beating down their critics as "careerists" or even as "enemy agents." But this kind of trick will no longer do at this stage of the Philippine revolutionary movement. The heyday of such rascals as the Lavas and the Tarucs is long past.

One would certainly be a careerist if he were to keep silent or simply let the modern revisionists and enemy agents use the old merger party to subvert and sabotage the revolutionary mass movement simply because he does not want to lose his membership in the highest leading organ of that party. Being docile to and accepting the counterrevolutionary wishes of the modern revisionists is a crime among true Marxist-Leninists.

In principle, the old merger party ceased to be entitled to the glorious name of Communist Party and to have any claim to democratic centralism when it was completely poisoned by modern revisionism and when it was completely overrun by revisionist scoundrels and notorious enemy agents. This occurred sometime in April 1967. No amount of invocation to democratic centralism and discipline can ever be enough to sanctify this utter degeneration. It is those few who love the empty titles of being members of the Lava revisionist renegade clique, especially of its bogus political bureau and central committee, who are careerists.

But the Lava chieftains themselves, the series of four general secretaries (Vicente, Jose, Jesus and Francisco, Jr.) from the Lava clan, are guilty not only of careerism but of super-careerism. They are in a way a unique phenomenon in the entire history of the international communist movement. But this is nothing but a reflection of the bourgeois and feudal politics instituted within the old merger party. The Lavas have systematically cultivated a myth about themselves being the "geniuses" of the Philippine revolution and have always calculatingly kept "trustworthy" men around themselves to do their bidding as in the fashion of big and petty dynasties within the reactionary political parties. There is not much difference between the Lava clan within the old merger party and, say, the Laurel clan of the Nacionalista Party or the Roxas clan in the Liberal Party.

In 1942, Vicente Lava as general secretary of the old merger party maneuvered to have his brother Jose become the head of the organization department despite the fact that the latter was a new party member. After World War II, the Lavas had their Right opportunist pawns take formal leadership over the old merger party and Vicente Lava became "adviser" of the HUKBALAHAP to be able to hold it down. At that time, the Lavas and Lavaites were mainly interested in gaining seats in the reactionary government. Only when they were frustrated in their bureaucratic ambitions did they pretend to respond to the mass clamor for revolutionary armed struggle. Jose and Jesus Lava subsequently concocted the theory of "parallel

leadership" (the Politburo-In and Politburo-Out) so that one Lava could be the reserve of the other Lava in perpetuating a dynastic rule. They also put up Federico Maclang, a close kin of theirs and an overseer of their private lands in Bulacan, as the head of the organization department and appointed other close kinsmen of theirs to leading positions in the regional commands surrounding Manila in their vain hope of seizing and monopolizing power soon. The absurdity of this Lavaite super-careerism was extremely obvious when in 1963 Jesus Lava appointed two close kinsmen of his to what was then the leading body on no other basis than their personal "trustworthiness" to him.

The Lava revisionist renegades are fond of invoking rules of organization and correct procedure, without reference to the ideological substance of centralism. But let us test the validity of their claims to being the legitimate continuers of the old merger party. Let us proceed by asking them questions.

1) On what basis and by what method did Jesus Lava in 1963 choose the five-man "executive committee" (considered the leading core of what was then intended to be the central committee in the future)? Was it not sheer nepotism and clear disregard of a number of other capable cadres of the old merger party that mere kinsmen of his were appointed by him without due regard to their ideological, political and organizational achievements and capabilities? For instance, what qualified Francisco Lava, Jr. to become a member of that "executive Committee"?

2) Why was it that Pedro Taruc was all along a mere name in that "executive committee" (sometimes called the "provisional higher organ" then) despite the fact that he was supposed to have been the general secretary after the "capture" of Jesus Lava in 1964 and was the only member who was then in the countryside? Why was every attempt of some members of the "executive committee" to pave way for a meeting with Pedro Taruc frustrated even before he became a completely rotten tool of the criminal gangster Sumulong? What behind all this doubledealing?

3) How did it ever occur that come April 1967 Francisco Lava, Jr. (out of five members of the "executive committee") took it upon himself alone to convene a meeting to form a "provisional political bureau? Why did he convene persons of dubious character and of his own choosing? What made him think that he could constitute himself in a "majority of one"?

All of the above questions can be reduced to one. Who gave Francisco Lava, Jr. the authority to collect a number of scoundrels as the "provisional political bureau" and then as "central committee"? The 1963 "executive committee" was never properly dissolved. Did the humble non-careerist and literary giant of sorts, the fifth-rate lawyer- bureaucrat and criminal trickster Francisco Lava, Jr. dissolve the body all by himself? Or is it true that Jose and Jesus Lava gave son special orders from prison through Francisco Lava, Sr. as claimed by his junior? But Messrs. Revisionists, three members of that "executive committee" represented the main body of whatever vestigial and new members there were of the old merger party. Francisco Lava, Jr. who had no experience in the revolutionary mass movement and who could hardly

sustain sense in a paragraph, could be excluded from that body and that body could still stand then.

Who is Francisco Lava, Jr.? By what process of alchemy has he become a leading revolutionary? Until his recent leave of absence from the staff of the Court of Appeals, he was a fulltime deputy clerk there with a tiny marginal time for anything else. Before his strange appointment by his uncle to membership in the "highest organ" of the old merger party, he had never had any organizational experience except that of being a minor member of a college fraternity during his school days and of being a bureaucrat in the reactionary government. What could he have contributed to the revolutionary mass movement? To build up his own son in the Lavaite circle, Francisco Lava, Sr. used to intrude upon meetings of the "executive committee" only to brag that he and his junior made researches and wrote speeches for the late Senator Recto and Senator Tanada. We cannot be taken in by such presumptuous claims that only petty hacks will make. We simply must inquire what the humbug Francisco Lava, Jr. has written in his own name or in his alias that is of any revolutionary value. Nothing! Even the other Lavaite ringleader, Francisco Nemenzo, Jr., cannot help but express publicly his low regard for Lava Junior's theoretical and literary competence.

In the main we merely raise questions here about the old merger party and the usurpers of authority therein. That is because there is no more point in talking about "legitimacy" in terms of the outmoded 1946 constitution of the old merger party or even in terms of the appointments made by Jesus Lava alone in 1963. Our differences are now as clear as the fundamental differences between Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought and Lava revisionist fascism. We do not consider these as "petty differences" or a matter of mere "fashion." These are life-and-death questions between genuine revolutionaries and counterrevolutionaries who masquerade as revolutionaries in their evil scheme to subvert and sabotage the revolutionary mass movement. The Lava revisionist fascists have already incurred blood debts on us.

Let us refer to the other ringleaders of the Lava revisionist renegade clique: Godofredo Mallari, Alejandro Briones, Gorgonio Narciso, Francisco Nemenzo, Jr., Merlin M. Magallona, Antonio Santos, Domingo Castro, Felicisimo Macapagal, Cipriano Robielos and Ching Maramag. Mallari is a highly-paid enemy agent, a wealthy businessman in Malabon and a notorious 1948 expellee from the old merger party. Briones is a petty reactionary politician in Tarlac and is a direct mastermind of the criminal activities of the Briones-Diwa-Pasion gang which is a partner-in-crime of the "Monkees." Narciso is a former town politician who is now a bureaucrat in the reactionary government. Nemenzo was admitted member of the old merger party in 1965 and was soon elevated to his high rank despite his social-democratic views and unremolded character as a bourgeois professor of political science. Magallona is employed with a reactionary government agency engaged in counterrevolutionary propaganda and previously with an agency of the US government. Santos is an old-time lumpen-proletarian valet of the Lavas and

an incorrigible petty swindler and enemy informer. Castro and Macapagal are notorious surrenderees who now receive honoraria from the Land Authority in their capacity as Masaka organizers. Robielos is the Comelec registrar of Malolos, Bulacan and is a liaison man of the PC Counter-Intelligence Unit. Maramag is the promotions manager of the Manila Times. Is this collection of scoundrels and fulltime bourgeois bureaucrats capable of the pompous presumptions that Lavaite publications brag about? It is important and necessary to expose them thoroughly to the revolutionary mass movement so as to frustrate their counterrevolutionary activities. Their secret deals with the US-Marcos clique will not save them from the wrath of the masses.

The Lava revisionist renegades may resort to the hullabaloo about making "expulsions" from the old merger party. If they were not only given to misrepresentation, they would recall that they were told the following a long time ago while they were busy conspiring, doubledealing and vilifying other people: "Your makeshift group is no party. If you call it a party, then we call it a party of modern revisionism. You have had yourselves expelled from the Marxist-Leninist party." This was a brief note that was cordially delivered to Francisco Lava, Jr. and his group through Francisco Nemenzo, Jr. and his wife before their bogus plenum of May 1967.

There could not have been any fruitful discussion with the Lavaites after April 1967. The criminal gangsters among them were already plotting to murder those who opposed the revisionist renegade line. The "internal" bulletin of anticommunism now reveals that the Lavaite ringleaders are recriminating each other for having taken wrongly a "lenient policy" and for having placed "so high a value on past friendship" regarding those who opposed their line within the old merger party. The Lavaites never learn from their old mistakes, that of resorting to assassination and coercion to silence those who oppose their erroneous line, their conspiratorial methods and their super-careerism. Chairman Amado Guerrero was already aware of the evil schemes of the Lavas as early as January 1967 because of certain revelations from Ignacio P. Lacsina.

The Lava revisionist renegades may do all the bragging about the ninety percent "proletarian and peasant" composition of their bogus central committee and bogus communist party. Such boasting has only invited noncommunist people like Miss Liwayway T. Reyes, once misled into one of the Lavaite outfits, into exposing what has been carelessly told her by the Lava revisionists themselves in their short-sighted and narrow-minded campaign of slander against revolutionary leaders and the revolutionary mass movement. Her list of the Lavaite "central committeemen" reveals unremolded bourgeois elements.

The Lava revisionist renegade clique has been increasingly in the grip of the reactionary armed forces. The surrender of Jesus Lava in 1964 was arranged by Francisco Lava, Jr. and Sr. through one of the Lavaite "central committeemen," Cipriano "Connie" Robielos who made use of his brother Cid, an agent of the PC Counter-Intelligence Unit. This was in coordination with efforts of Francisco Lava, Sr. to get assurances of "royal treatment" for

his brother from Macapagal through the Social Security System medical officer and the late executive secretary Rufino Hechanova.

Godofredo Mallari and his clique within the Masaka have been directly responsible for spying and informing on the remaining units Of the old people's army on behalf of the reactionary government; for extorting and swindling the poor peasants under the cover of the Masaka and in the name of the Communist Party of the Philippines Since 1964 and even in the name of the New People's Army since early 1970 and for arranging with special murder units of the reactionary government like the "Monkees" under ex-Mayor Federico Taruc of San Luis, Pampanga in committing crimes of bloody intrigue.

The Briones-Diwa-Pasion gang, previously calling itself "Armeng Bayan" and now openly calling itself "Hukbong Mapagpalaya ng Bayan" after the disintegration of the Taruc-Sumulong gangster clique, has been responsible for such wanton crimes as the massacres of innocent civilians in Angeles City on May 21, 1969; Porac, Pampanga on November 17, 1969; and in Bo. Sinipit, Bamban, Tarlac in February 1970. This criminal gang has lately extended its operations to Greater Manila and has participated in an increasing number of provocative acts, such as kidnapping, murder, demonstration-breaking, vandalism and mauling incidents. It is relevant here to refer to the criminal background of Briones, Diwa and Pasion. Briones is now a direct henchman of the vice-mayor of Victoria, Tarlac, Ed Rigor, a "retired" officer of the National Intelligence Coordinating Agency. Diwa was once a gangster agent of Sumulong and later earned the latter's ire In 1967 for not turning over funds mulcted from jeepney drivers in Angeles City. Pasion was a branch manager of a US company, was fired for personally appropriating P60,000 and then was accused of murdering the company supervisor who discovered his anomalies In 1967. These three are old-time gangsters who provide goons for reactionary politicians in Central Luzon. These goons are drawn from putschist elements of yesteryears under the Jose-Jesus Lava leadership.

The Lava revisionist renegades cast a lot of invectives against the young Party members and concoct such stories as those concerning someone "separating the young from the old." Such puerile fabrications have only evoked derision for the fabricators. The rebuilding of the Communist Party of the Philippines is not merely a question of chronological age. Rejuvenation is not a question of cutting off the aged from the young but of new ideas and new forces replacing old wornout ideas and forces. We follow Chairman Mao's teaching on the building and consolidation of a proletarian party:

A human being has arteries and veins through which the heart makes the blood circulate, and he breathes with his lungs, exhaling carbon dioxide and inhaling fresh oxygen, that is, getting rid of the stale and taking in the fresh. A proletarian party must also get rid of the stale and take in the fresh, for only thus can it be full of vitality. Without eliminating waste matter and absorbing fresh blood, the Party has no vigor.

Rejuvenation is also misrepresented by the Lava revisionist renegades as accommodating merely the "petty bourgeois students." It is beyond their knowledge today that there are in the reestablished Communist Party of the Philippines a majority of youthful members of worker and peasant background. The upsurges of the revolutionary mass movement in both cities and countryside would not have been possible without these members, together with militant Party members of urban petty-bourgeois origin. There are also elderly Party members many of whom came from the old merger party. It is gratifying to us for the Lava revisionist renegades to claim that there are "less than a dozen Party members" in the reestablished Party. This means that they really do not know much about us and they can only make wild guesses about us. But being equally unknowledgeable about our Party the US-Marcos clique has taken Lavaite propaganda for the truth and has taken punitive measures against targets of Lavaite false testimony.

The Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Philippine includes a comrade who is in his late 60s and has been engaged in every phase of the armed struggle since the antifascist war of resistance. It also includes members who are youthful and who are middle-aged. They are of worker, peasant or urban petty-bourgeois origin. All Party members within and outside the Central Committee and arduously remolding and tempering themselves as proletarian fighters through the living study and application of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought.

The Lava revisionist renegades blame anyone and anything but themselves for the utter isolation and desperation that they have been driven to. The bulletin of anticommunism claims:

The Mao Thought party claims to have been founded on December 26, 1968. However, its real origin can be traced a few years back. Fresh from Indonesia and ostensibly acting on orders from external elements, the original Amado Guerrero began his campaign for control of the Partido Komunista ng Pilipinas with the avowed purpose of converting it into a puppet of another Party. But he found no supporters among the veteran comrades to whom bitter experiences in the 1950s had taught valuable lessons about the danger of Left adventurism and subservience to external elements.

The Communist Party of Indonesia is being attacked here by these revisionist scoundrels. But inadvertently they imply that the criticism of their ideological, political and organizational line has gone on for quite some time.

Then here comes their international revisionist spokesman William J. Pomeroy who takes occasion to slander the great, glorious and correct Communist Party of China:

Unity was disrupted in 1967 onwards when a young leader of the Kabataang Makabayan, Jose M. Sison, developed a Maoist outlook, reinforced by several trips to People's China, following which he endeavored aggressively to swing the whole growing movement to a line of sharp confrontation and of armed struggle.

All Lavaite publications boast of having conducted "criticism and self-criticism and rectification." They refer to having as early as 1966 a document of rectification, the so-called "Thesis on the National Situation." There never was such a thing. But even if there was, assuming that the Lava revisionist renegades kept it to themselves, the best proof that there never had been any genuine criticism and self-criticism or rectification is that the Lavaites have remained basically counterrevolutionary Rightists and have even become since 1969 brazenly revisionist fascists,

It was within the five-man "executive committee" of the old merger party that a memorandum was being prepared, with three sections encompassing the international, national and Party situation as early as 1965. The drafts of the sections on the international and national situation were finished and presented but the section on the Party situation was never presented before the "executive committee." Though a definite committee member was appointed by the "executive committee" to make a draft of the entire memorandum, Francisco Lave Jr. suddenly "volunteered" to write the section on the Party situation only to sit on it, sabotage the completion of the entire memorandum and carried out unprincipled bickering with members of the "executive committee" preparatory to his completely disregarding the entire "executive committee" in his mad desire to convene his faction of modern revisionists and out-and-out enemy agents.

Now that the Lavaites realize that the name Lava no longer amounts to so much as political capital, the bulletin of anticommunism makes the gratuitous claim that the Lavaite "general secretary" is no longer a Lava. It prates:

Contrary to the oft-repeated charges of Guerrero and his minions, the present PKP Secretary-General is not a city-based intellectual but a comrade who comes from the working classes. He is the highest and most powerful official of our Party. Although we view family affiliation neither as an asset or liability, it can be stated as a matter of fact that he is not a Lava and he is not even remotely related to the Lava family.

Whether this "general-secretary" is Alejandro Briones, Godofredo Mallari, Antonio Santos, Francisco Nemenzo, Jr., Merlin M. Magallona Gorgonio Narciso, Domingo Castro, Felicisimo Macapagal or who else since October 1970, there has been no basic change in the ideological, political and organizational line of the Lava revisionist renegade clique; as a matter of fact, this clique has become even more rabidly counterrevolutionary, engaging directly in heinous fascist crimes of vindictiveness. Deception is a notorious characteristic of the Lava revisionist renegades.

The Lava revisionist renegades claim that the "single file" polio; of Jesus Lava was in the final analysis a good thing. They admit: "It is true, as Guerrero says, that for many years the lines of communication between the Secretary-General and the rank and file were ruptured." Then they argue like shysters: "That was a reality imposed upon the Party by conditions over which we have lost control and not as he claims, the result of deliberate policy to 'liquidate' the Party organization." Blame the stars and not the

noble motives of Jesus Lava! Finally, the revisionist scoundrels resort to outright prevarication to support their contention that the "single file" policy was even a good thing. They conclude: "The present Central Committee (the Lavaite ringleaders) is critical of single file, but it should also be noted that single file was not meant to be inflexible. In fact, several organs in the rural areas never ceased to function."

Then, going on with what they call self-criticism and rectification, the Lava revisionist renegades turn to abusing others about the "single file" policy: "This ambitious rattlesnake who spouts venom at Comrade Jesus Lava was in fact the most avid practitioner of single file to shield his proteges from contacts with older comrades, thereby cultivating their personal allegiance." But in BRPF's Struggle (January 1971), the Lava revisionist renegades contradict themselves by claiming to have opposed the "opening up of the movement leaving its doors wide open to infiltration by the enemy." The "enemy" that they refer to here are the youth in the revolutionary mass movement.

We state that the best proof for the bankruptcy of the "single file" policy is the fact that in 1960 there was no longer any extant branch of the old merger party. Party life had been liquidated on a large scale by Jesus Lava. Even in Central Luzon, particularly in what was formerly Regional Command No. 2, there were only a few squads and half-squads of the old people's army. These were cut off from Jesus Lava and not one among them attended to party building. When the "executive committee" was formed in 1963, Jesus Lava had no shame in appointing two kinsmen of his who were isolated from the revolutionary mass movement and in using the name of Pedro Taruc to embellish the committee.

The Lava revisionist renegades boast of having broken from their Isolation and of moving forward. But in fact they have become more notorious for opposing by deceit and by violence the revolutionary mass movement in cities and in the countryside. They rely on stale and wornout elements who specialize in opposing the present revolutionary upsurges created by the new revolutionary forces. When we speak of new forces, we mean basically the revolutionary masses aroused and mobilized by proletarian revolutionary cadres inspired by and implementing the universal theory of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought in the concrete practice of the people's democratic revolution.

III. Lavaite Putschists of Yesteryears Are New Revisionist Fascists

The Lava revisionist renegades have gone far in their degeneration. They have gone to the extent of committing the crimes of systematic informing, kidnapping, murder, killing rampages, extortion in the name of the Party and the people's army, organizing BSDUs, cattle rustling, breaking up of strikes and demonstrations, acts of vandalism and various other provocations in collusion with the US-Marcos clique in their vile and rabid opposition to

Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought and to the Communist Party of the Philippines and the New People's Army.

There is more than enough basis to assert that the Lava revisionist renegades have become fascist agents of the US-Marcos clique. When they say that they also engage in "armed struggle" which is "secondary" to their parliamentary struggle, they actually mean criminally opposing the Communist Party, the New People's Army and the people and engaging in fascist activities consonant with their propaganda of supporting the US-Marcos clique against the national democratic movement. The Lava revisionist renegades have become agents of the big bourgeoisie and the landlord class.

There must be an explanation for this degeneration of ideological revisionism into fascist gangsterism. We have long recognized the class essence, social roots and varied manifestations of Lavaite revisionism in "Rectify Errors and Rebuild the Party," in other basic Party documents and in critical comments carried by Ang Bayan. But for the first time we shall here present comprehensively the historical links of Lavaite revisionism and Right opportunism with the present phenomenon of Lavaite fascist gangsterism. It is not enough to speak of the inevitable growth of Khrushchovite social-pacifism into Brezhnevite social-imperialism and social-fascism; it is necessary to present the internal degeneration of the Lava revisionist renegade clique itself which now enjoys support from its social-imperialist masters and the US-Marcos clique.

In reaction to the revolutionary armed struggle being waged by the New People's Army under the leadership of the Communist Party of the Philippines, the Lava revisionist renegades have formally declared that while their main form of struggle is parliamentary they are also waging armed struggle as a secondary form. They have been compelled to draw their line in this manner in the face of the fact that they are losing ideological, political and organizational initiative everywhere, whether it be in the countryside or in the cities. They imagine that they can bluff people, but they are merely acknowledging that they have a small collection of ruffians whom they employ to carry out their counterrevolutionary line of violence against the Communist Party of the Philippines, the New People's Army and the broad masses of the people.

Who are these ruffians and where do they come from? To answer this question fully, it is necessary to see through the seeming repudiation by present-day Lavaites of the previous "Left" opportunist line carried out by Jose and Jesus Lava between 1948 and 1955. The Lavaites have not actually repudiated this "Left" opportunism but have put it into the service of their Rightism. What they have done is to reintegrate into their present organization a number of those putschist and lumpen proletarian elements that were the hatchmen of the Jose-Jesus Lava clique of yesteryears. These are the fascist gangsters of today who would commit any kind of heinous crime to support the counterfevolutionary revisionist line of the Lavaites. Such revisionist bureaucrats as Francisco Lava, Jr., Godofredo Mallari,

Francisco Nemenzo, Jr., Gorgonio Narciso, Merlin M. Magallona and others sit on their asses dictating their Rightist line but they have such lumpen proletarian putschist elements as those of the Briones-Diwa-Pasion gang to perpetrate fascist crimes for them.

What have the Lavaites gained by their violent and malicious opposition to the national democratic mass organizations, by informing on Carlos B. del Rosario or actually kidnapping and murdering Francisco C. Sison and his driver Elpidio Morales? They have gained nothing by colluding with the fascist gangsters of the US-Marcos clique in the perpetration of the shooting rampages that resulted in the killing and wounding of scores of innocent civilians in Angeles City; Porac, Pampanga; and Barrio Sinipit, Bamban, Tarlac. The Lavaites have gained nothing but intense hatred among the broad masses of the people. No one has been cowed by a handful of fascist gangsters resorting to old putschist acts.

The Jose-Jesus Lava leadership of 1948-55 took the putschist and purely military viewpoint. It failed to give the correct ideological and political guidance to the old people's army and the revolutionary mass movement. In empty arrogance, it expressly opposed Chairman Mao's theory and practice of people's war in a semicolonial and semifeudal country though in mere form it usurped the phrase "new democracy." It did not care for painstaking mass work and propaganda, building the Party, building organs of political power and mass organizations and conducting land reform and production.

The Jose-Jesus Lava leadership were wont to employ what is called "liquidation squads" to murder or coerce good cadres and members of the old merger party who questioned its line. Always arrogant, it always accused those who opposed it of the very careerism and conspiratorial methods of which it was guilty. It fabricated evidence or looked for the flimsiest excuse to impose the most severe punishment, including death, against Party cadres seriously critical of it. To support itself mainly, it concocted the theory of "economic struggle." Under this fake theory, robbery and extortion, including the holdup of ordinary bus and train passengers, were employed to "support" the revolution "so as not to increase the barrio people's burden." To implement this gangster theory, Jose and Jesus Lava raised such notorious gangsters as Nick Pamintuan, Boy Bulacan, Danny Pascual, Sumulong and Diwa to the level of "cadres" and "commanders."

Because of its putschist line based on the wrong analysis that it was time in 1950 to launch a strategic offensive, the Jose-Jesus Lava leadership prematurely created large military formations and overextended them in the most adventurist manner. It never entertained the idea that a genuine people's war would have to pass through the strategic phases of the defensive and stalemate before the strategic offensive. It flaunted and glorified the lumpen-proletarian and gangster style and carried it over into the rural areas on a large scale. It did not carry out revolutionary political work among the masses to prepare conditions for advance in the military field. It was obsessed with the erroneous idea of being able to seize political power in Manila within two years.

Even now, the Lava revisionist renegades consider as a "mere farce" of their past follies the step-by-step growth of the New People's Army and the great emphasis laid on the development of powerful mass support. They openly cheer the enemy campaigns of "encirclement and suppression" against the New People's Army and imagine to no end that the people have no more fighting force. They close their eyes to the fact that Task Force Lawin and the various PC commands are getting nowhere in their fascist campaign not only in Central Luzon but also in Northern Luzon. They refuse to recognize that guerrilla bases and guerrilla zones are also gradually emerging elsewhere.

During the time of the Jose-Jesus Lava leadership, the people in entire barrios were considered enemy whenever the real enemy succeeded through coercion and deception in setting up "civilian guard units," the forerunners of the present BSDUs. Because the people's army was under instruction to seize nationwide victory within two years' time, so many armed units adopted the method of rushing the people and having no patience with what they considered "enemy" barrios. Doing the work of the enemy, so many units of the old people's army whose command had been usurped by lumpen proletarian elements committed such putschist acts as massacre, arson, rape and robbery. It would be worthwhile to go into a detailed investigation of the excesses committed in the course of military attacks ordered by the Jose-Jesus Lava leadership and determine how large a part putschist abuses took in harming the interests of the broad masses of the people.

Even now, the Lava revisionist renegades are peddling the view that when BSDUs are set up in a barrio, the territory is permanently lost and the people there have become the "enemy" of the New People's Army. They foolishly mock the New People's Army for not making large-scale attacks, for employing the flexible guerrilla tactics of concentration, shifting and dispersion alternately. They refuse to recognize that the Party and the people's army are today isolating and destroying diehard BSDUs, including those set up by the Masaka and the Briones-Diwa-Pasion gang. They refuse to see the entire BSDUs that have justly killed their PC supervisors and gone over to the New People's Army with their arms. The Lava revisionist renegades give all credit to the US-Marcos clique and such scoundrels as Mayor Lino David and other diehard reactionaries.

The basic counterrevolutionary errors of the Lavas and Tarucs, when they were still lording over the people's army, were for some time covered up by the real abuses committed directly by the enemy, the utter rottenness of the entire enemy regime and the excellent objective conditions for making revolution after World War II. The enemy, however, got wise to the putschist weaknesses of the Lavas and Tarucs. After capturing the entire Political Bureau-In and Secretariat in Manila in October 1950, the enemy forces counterattacked by intensifying their strategic offensive. Among their major tactics was to employ troops posing as "Huks," to commit the worst atrocities and blame these on the old merger party and people's army. Revolutionary cadres and members and genuine Red fighters and commanders in effect

suffered from the intrigues of the open enemy and such hidden enemy as the Lavas and the Tarucs.

During the debacle of the HMB, so many heroes died, so many others withstood the assaults of the enemy and a number of units persisted in revolutionary struggle. However, many scoundrels capitulated, informed on their former comrades and participated in the suppression of the revolutionary mass movement. The prematurely large military formations disintegrated. Then came a sudden swing to the uncoordinated movement of roving rebel bands. Units of the old people's army not immediately crushed by the enemy were overextended, lacking in correct leadership and isolated. Many of them committed grave abuses just to be able to secure food for themselves and also committed acts of arrogance and vengeance on entire barrios where they were rebuffed. In due time, the people turned against those who completely departed from the revolutionary path.

In 1954, Luis Taruc escaped from the Lavaite "liquidation squads" and landed on the lap of the enemy. Jesus Lava started to veer towards Luis Taruc's line of "peaceful struggle" in late 1954 but formally adopted parliamentary struggle as the main form of struggle only in 1956 under the influence of Khrushchovite revisionism. It was only in limited areas in Central Luzon where armed struggle persisted. Year after year the central leadership of the old merger party increasingly lost contact with the remaining guerrilla units that were led by local cadres. In 1960, Jesus Lava was definitely left all to himself hiding in his small room in Manila.

In 1962, Comrade Hizon who was leading the remaining people's guerrillas of good standing made contact with Jesus Lava but was soon captured. The contact between the two was limited to Jesus Lava passing on his old "political transmissions" and asking for a large amount of money. It was after Comrade Hizon's capture that Sumulong was able to get hold of the senior cadre Pedro Taruc and used him to take over the people's guerrillas and to approve his gangster activities. A struggle emerged between good and bad elements within the old people's army. But Jesus Lava never lifted a finger to oppose Sumulong, save Pedro Taruc and support the good elements. What he did merely was first to include the name of Pedro Taruc as "secretary for peasants" in the 1963 "executive committee" and to appoint him in early 1964 as "general secretary" without the benefit of meeting his fellow members of the "executive committee." Soon in 1964 Jesus Lava surrendered to the enemy.

The conjecture of the professional anticommunist Alfredo Saulo that Jesus Lava "laid the ground work" for the upsurges of the revolutionary mass movement is without basis. Despite his line of parliamentary struggle, Jesus Lava failed to take advantage of the still limited anti-imperialist agitation among sections of the national bourgeoisie and urban petty bourgeoisie which trailed after Senator Claro Mayo Recto during the 1950s. Nothing substantial came out of Lavaite efforts to make use of the Nationalist-Citizens Party, which practically disintegrated after the reactionary elections of 1957. And the National Progress Movement was an independent creation

of such elements as Blas Ople and known personnel of the National Intelligence Coordinating Agency (NICA) who were close to President Carlos P. Garcia.

The Masaka was organized in 1964 by certain persons led by Godofredo Mallard, who either had been expelled from the old merger party during the late forties or surrendered to the reactionary government during the 1950s. The organization of the Masaka was not done under any directive of Jesus Lava. The organizers were merely contacted by Antonio Santos through a small study circle called "Tinig ng Bayan" and put in touch with the "executive committee" through Francisco Lava, Jr. in January 1965 long after Jesus Lava's surrender. Through the Masaka, expellees and surrenderees were able to creep back into the old merger party. The Bulacan Farmers Association led by Romerico Flores, which had been previously affiliated with the Federation of Free Farmers and then the Philippine Labor Unity Movement, became affiliated with the Masaka only several months after January 1965.

Since late 1964, the Taruc-Sumulong gangster clique by all appearances had the people's guerrilla under its full control. But in 1965 two definite trends emerged to oppose the Taruc-Sumulong gangster clique: one was the positive revolutionary trend represented by Comrade Delio and the other was the negative renegade trend represented by Alibasbas. Alibasbas brazenly went over to the side of the enemy and was promptly murdered together with his entire family by the very reactionary faction that had coddled him when another reactionary faction exposed "Huk-coddling" in connection with the 1965 elections. Comrade Delio died in battle before he could accomplish the task of leading the mass repudiation of the Taruc-Sumulong gangster clique but left behind enough revolutionary influence among the good elements who were later to be led by Comrade Dante against the Taruc-Sumulong gangster clique. On March 29, 1969, the Red commanders and fighters met to repudiate the clique, and were reconstituted into the New People's Army under the leadership of the reestablished Communist Party of the Philippines.

Since 1964, the Masaka clique masterminded by Godofredo Mallari has systematically established "branches" of the old merger party without the permission and supervision of the "executive committee" and collected into its fold dubious elements, including surrenderees, former agents of Magsaysay and active enemy agents. Some of these the Lava revisionist renegades may now choose to call "their partisan units" that have suddenly become "brave" only after the disintegration of the Taruc-Sumulong gangster clique. In 1965, the persistent enemy role of Mallari and his clique was already evident when they contacted and manipulated Alibasbas through Maximo Lacanilao ostensibly against the Taruc-Sumulong gangster clique. During the same year, Mallari also dispatched Domingo Castro and Felicisimo Macapagal to the Taruc-Sumulong gangster clique ostensibly to ask for funds for a "plantation" project in Isabela but actually to doubledeal with and spy on this clique.

In 1966, after it felt blessed with authority from the Lavas, the Mallar clique more vigorously set up "branches" of the old merger party through the Masaka especially in Nueva Ecija. Under the pretext of fighting the Taruc-Sumulong gangster clique, the Mallari clique brazenly ordered its men to fight the people's guerrillas without making distinction between the good and bad elements, to borrow arms from the Philippine Constabulary and the 10th BCT and enlist as informers in order to "protect" themselves.

When Francisco Lava, Jr. was told that leading organizers of the Masaka like Jose Parungao, Ben Catanghal and "Commander" Villamor had been surrenderees-turned-government-informers, he boasted of his own connections with agents of the Counter-Intelligence Unit of the PC and gave further encouragement to the implementation of what he called the policy of "infiltration." The Lavaite bulletin of anticommunism confirms this policy today with the following statement: "Parliamentary struggle does not mean putting up candidates for elective positions in order to transform the nature of the neocolonial government. It simply means laying stress on infiltration of public institutions...."

The Briones-Diwa-Pasion gang eventually became the core of all Masaka elements who "infiltrated" the reactionary armed forces under the pretext of fighting Sumulong but in fact attacked all the people's guerrillas without distinction. This gang brought together two major types of ruffians: those who had surrendered to the reactionary government and betrayed the revolutionary masses when the 1950 "Left" opportunist policy collapsed and those who had turned to various nefarious activities and enjoyed the protection of such bureaucrat capitalists as Rafael del Rosario of Angeles City. From the very outset, the Masaka membership card served as a military pass in Central Luzon and served to exempt its bearer from brutal action by the enemy armed forces engaged in campaigns of "encirclement and suppression."

It was only several months after it became publicly known that the Taruc-Sumulong gangster clique had been repudiated and the New People's Army had been formed under the leadership of the reestablished Communist Party of the Philippines that the Lava revisionist renegades started to boast in whispers of having an "army" of their own for "secondary" purposes, the Armeng Bayan. The existence of this "pro-Soviet army" was first publicly noted in the Symington Report.

The New People's Army gained a full picture of the role and history of the Briones-Diwa-Pasion gang only in May 1970 when the Masaka secretary for the whole province of Tarlac (Bartolome Pasion), the Masaka secretary of Bamban, Tarlac (who was called "Commander" Villamor) and other criminal agents of the reactionary armed forces end at the same time of the Lava revisionist renegades were discovered to have committed the crimes of bloody intrigue, crimes calculated mainly to slander the New People's Army.

The crimes of bloody intrigue included the shooting rampages in Angeles City on May 21, 1969, in Porac, Pampanga on November 17, 1969 and on a lesser scale in other towns of Pampanga and Nueva Ecija which resulted in

the killing and wounding of several scores of innocent civilians including women and children. In these crimes, the ruffian method of "spraying" homes and crowds with automatic gunfire was employed. The senseless killings were mainly attributed to the New People's Army as acts of vengeance against the Taruc-Sumulong gangster clique by the rumormongering Lava revisionist renegades, especially the Mallari clique within the Masaka, and the reactionary military "psywar" experts through the reactionary press.

The senseless killings were committed with the collusion of the Briones-Diwa-Pasion gang, "Monkees" under ex-Mayor Federico Taruc of San Luis, Pampanga and former policemen under ex-Mayor Rafael del Rosario of Angeles City. It was a collusion between the Lavaite Masaka and Task Force Lawin, pure and simple. Their common evil purpose was to make it appear that "Dante and Sumulong were destroying each other."

The New People's Army discovered the truth in the course of investigating the murder of two small children and a young girl in Barrio Sinipit of Bamban, Tarlac in February 1970. The homes of the barrio people were sprayed with gunfire by a group of masked armed men. What immediately caught the attention of the investigators of the New People's Army was that the men were masked (indicating that at least someone from the barrio or an adjacent barrio was involved) and that the source of rumormongering to the effect that the culprits were "Sumulong men" was traced to the few Masaka members in Bamban Tarlac. Acting on the basis of these and other clues, the New People's Army arrested suspects. Those arrested revealed more than enough about the criminal activities of the Lava revisionist renegades. From then on, the Party had always spoken of the Monkees-Armeng Bayan-Masaka (Lava) gang and its crimes of bloody intrigue.

When punishment was justly meted out to "Commander" Villamor a "cadre" of the Lava revisionist renegades, AFP headquarters posthumously praised him in a press release as a reliable agent of Task Force Lawin and credited him with the murder of seven fighters and the capture of three commanders of the people's army in his lifetime. It is a matter of official record that he surrendered to Magsaysay in 1953 and from then on became a cheap enemy informer. But he became Masaka secretary of Bamban, Tarlac. There is nothing surprising about this because he is no different from such notorious traitors and surrenderees as Godofredo Mallari, Domingo Castro and Felicisimo Macapagal who are among the ringleaders of the Lava revisionist renegade clique.

The bloody crimes of intrigue have been confirmed by the editorial staff of the Lavaite bulletin of anticommunism in an oblique way, in the manner of doubletalk. Here it is: "It may be noted that despite the violent encounters last year, the PKP maintains good relations with ordinary NPA partisans...." (Emphasis ours.) The Lava revisionist renegades would rather describe as "encounters" with the New People's Army the shooting rampage undertaken by them against innocent civilians; the succeeding punishment of their criminal agents and the ambushes launched against certain BSDUs in

Bamban, Tarlac and Mabalacat, Pampanga found to be accomplices of the Briones-Diwa-Pasion gang.

Party cadres and units of the New People's Army have made a more extensive investigation into the criminal activities of the Briones-Diwa-Pasion gang and have discovered that this gang has engaged in espionage on the Party and the New People's Army, in outright extortion and collection of "contributions" from the people in the name of the Party and the people's army, especially in Nueva Ecija, eastern Pampanga, northern Bulacan and Bataan. Also, it is engaged in robbery and cattle rustling in combination with notorious gangsters under the late Ricardo Lim (ex-policeman of Angeles City) and with the "Pitong Gatang" gang. The crimes being committed by the Briones-Diwa-Pasion gang are obviously a resurrection of the old Lavaite policy of "economic struggle."

Grossly underestimating its own readers, the bulletin of anticommunism proceeds to dish up another lie about Lavaite magnanimity: "On one occasion, a unit led by Comrade Diwa himself attacked from the rear a contingent of the puppet army so that an encircled NPA squad may be able to escape." So, it has become one of the "secondary" tasks of the Lava revisionist renegades to help out squads of the New People's Army! These Lavaite scoundrels are shallow tricksters. The truth is that the petty bandit Diwa has his living and sleeping quarters at the headquarters of the 10th BCT and command posts of Task Force Lawin when he is not in Manila under the protection of ex-Mayor Rafael del Rosario or the yellow labor leader Ignacio P. Lacsina who resides in a favorite housing area of reactionary military officers.

But even in their propaganda, the Lavaite revisionist renegades are not consistent. The same issue of the Lavaite bulletin of anticommunism echoes a canard from Task Force Lawin: "Arthur Garcia ... was liquidated by Dante's followers." The BRPF's Struggle calumniates the entire New People's Army. Its January 1971 issue states: "It would be a secondary task of the revolutionary movement to expose pseudo-revolutionary groups now collaborating with the CIA-managed anti-Marcos camp like ... that bunch of surrenderers—the NPA." Its July 1971 issue states: "And now the NPA is reduced to a sorry band which specializes in terrorizing the people of Isabela." Another passage runs along the same line: "It seems that the NPA (more appropriately called the New People's Assassins) finds it more efficient to liquidate those whom they cannot persuade to toe their counterrevolutionary line." The Lavaites have always proven themselves to be the cheap propagandists of Task Force Lawin.

Since the exposure of the Monkees-Armeng Bayan-Masaka (Lava), the diehard minions of the Lava revisionist renegades who have dared to remain in Central Luzon have become out-and-out diehard members of BSDUs. Right now, it is clear that a certain number of diehard BSDUs in Angeles City, Mabalacat, San Fernando, Magalang and Arayat of Pampanga and Cabiao and San Antonio of Nueva Ecija belong to the Lavaite Masaka. These are being used for criminal activities like extortion, robbery, cattle rustling and

kidnapping for ransom by the Briones-Diwa-Pasion gang. Godofredo Vergara, a Lavaite "cadre" and hatchetman of the Briones-Diwa-Pasion gang is the direct organizer of several BSDUs and the most notorious BSDU chieftain in Central Luzon. Among the first BSDUs in Isabela is one organized by a handful of Masaka and MPKP members in Barrio Bannawag of Jones, Isabela. The principal Lavaite agent in Isabela is a certain Atty. Fernandez who is a corrupt lawyer and a loan shark who is now often seen in the company of PC officers.

The Lava revisionist renegade clique boasts of its "peasant" strength in the countryside by claiming the membership of Masaka as its "mass base." It is to the credit of these counterrevolutionary pests that robbery, cattle rustling, extortion and other crimes against the barrio people prevail in the very same areas where they have a "strong mass base." Professional gangsters that they are, they even brag about such "revolutionary methods" of organizing the people as stealing the people's carabaos and other property and promising to return them if they join the Masaka; using the name of the New People's Army in areas where they want to gain a foothold and later slandering the Party and the people's army after their preliminary efforts; and threatening with death those who refuse to join their counterrevolutionary antipeople organization.

In Greater Manila, the Lava revisionist renegades have shamelessly participated in the breaking up of demonstrations, marches and strikes. They have colluded openly with the agents of the US-Marcos clique in making various provocations even as they piously talk about peace and proper decorum and slander the militant masses as "adventurists," "petty bourgeois revolutionists," "romanticists" and the like. They commit criminal acts of vandalism against the property of ordinary people and the urban petty bourgeoisie to blame these on national democratic mass organizations. They have resorted to every trick to discredit and disrupt the national democratic movement and prepare the ground for the fascist suppression of national democratic mass organizations. To hear the Lavaites talk and to see them act is to hear echoes from the US-Marcos clique and to see the fascist agents of the US-Marcos clique.

It is part of a fascist conspiracy between the Lava revisionist renegades and the US-Marcos clique that the former have made the outburst of anticommunist publications and articles since the latter part of last year all calculated to implicate legal personalities and legal and noncommunist mass organizations with the underground. Jesus Lava was the first to "confirm" Jose Ma. Sison as Amado Guerrero. Then he was followed by the US imperialist agent William J. Pomeroy who wrote the following in the revisionist journal *Peace, Freedom and Socialism* (December 1970):

Jose M. Sison has presumed to usurp the name of the Communist Party of the Philippines ("reorganized").... The Sison group makes use of ... Kabataang Makabayan, and has associated itself with an armed group in a small area of Central Luzon, mainly limited to a corner of the Province of Tarlac, which it calls the New People's Army.

One after another the traitor publications of the Lava revisionist renegades were widely circulated in Manila. The January 1971 issue of BRPF's *Struggle* declares: "Sison proceeded to organize a conspiracy to overthrow the leadership of the Movement, of which he was, by the way, a part. He talked to the masses of KM and Masaka members in the countryside and he thought they were on his side after he conferred with their leaders."

Other passages seek to implicate other noncommunist organizations:

But then the renegade KM and its allies, especially the infantile SDK subverted this democratic method of exercising leadership and captured it for themselves; and in the process converting the MDP into a dictatorship of the KM, its allies and sympathizers. KM efforts to paint the MDP as a "united front of all progressive organizations" are fruitless because practically all MDP members are either KM chapters given different names, memberless groups, or KM controlled organizations....

Then the February 1971 issue of the Lavaite bulletin of anticommunism states categorically: "The Party actively assisted him (Jose Ma. Sison) in building Kabataang Makabayan." In this regard, we can see that the Lava revisionist renegades will invent anything to bring down any person or organization to their level. They fancy themselves as the big patrons of revolution but they only succeed in bringing out their true character as mendacious and cheap paid witnesses of the reactionary state.

It is absolutely clear that the Lava revisionist renegades have turned into bloodthirsty revisionist fascists. They would fabricate anything to serve their imperialist and reactionary masters and they flaunt their license given them by the US-Marcos clique to assert their "authority" in their bogus communist party. To Jesus Lava and his kind belong the historical distinction of having pressed for the inclusion of Jose Ma. Sison in the wanted list of the reactionary armed forces and encouraging the reactionary forces to attack the national democratic movement.

What proved fatal to Carlos B. del Rosario, outstanding leader of the Movement for a Democratic Philippines, is the following passage from the BRPF's *Struggle*: "Sison had managed to create a clique within the movement led by him. Members of this clique included Nilo Tayag, Arthur Garcia, Carlos del Rosario, Jose Luneta and others." In the context of the Lavaite article, "movement" means the old merger party and "clique" means the reestablished Communist Party of the Philippines. In a press statement towards the end of January 1971, the labor aristocrat and Marcos agent Ignacio P. Lacsina "confirmed" the above particular reference to Carlos B. del Rosario by claiming that the latter was a "personal representative" of Jose Ma. Sison in his organization. Lacsina spoke out of spite against the national democratic movement and del Rosario because a number of trade unions had bolted out of his outfit after having discovered Lacsina's counterrevolutionary practices.

What proved fatal to Francisco C. Sison and his driver Elpidio Morales on May 24, 1971 was the following passage in the Lavaite bulletin of anticommunism: "A hunted guerrillero can even evade the enemy for a long

time by hiding among relatives or a few trusted friends outside of the area of operation." The Lava revisionist renegades obdurately refuse to recognize the fact that Jesus Lava remains today a negative example for his flightism and other errors. They insist:

the city intellectuals (Amado Guerrero included) have left the countryside to surround the city from the comfort and safety of their suburban homes. "Makibaka, Huwag Matakot" meant "Huwag kayong matakot, kami lang ang tatakbo."

Under the erroneous belief that the principal object of their spite is somewhere in Manila, they have resorted to a series of fascist crimes in collusion with the US-Marcos clique against those whom they have calculated to have knowledge of his whereabouts.

Francisco, a mere brother of Jose Ma. Sison, had also been previously the object of spite by the BRPF's Struggle although this person had never had any pretensions to being revolutionary unlike the Lava revisionist renegades who themselves hold highly-paid posts in the reactionary government. There are passages in the June 12, 1971 issue of the Lavaite *Sang-ayon sa MAN* admitting in an oblique manner that the Lava revisionist fascists have been responsible for the dastardly crime of kidnapping and murder. One passage is very revealing: "Lightning is far more clear than thunder which deafens but is empty. Don't be piqued, Sison!" What the Lava revisionist fascists mean is that their fascist crimes are clearer than the revolutionary propaganda being waged among the people. The revisionist fascist scoundrels do not realize that their total exposure is a preparation for their actual doom in the hands of the revolutionary masses.

The fascist character of the Lava revisionist renegades has become evident in Greater Manila since the first quarter storm of 1970. They have openly displayed their firearms in public and have been desperately trying to provoke leaders and mass activists of the national democratic movement, especially the youth movement. They brandish cockily the license that they enjoy from the present ruling faction in the reactionary state.

These Lava revisionist fascists have not learned the negative examples of Alibasbas and Sumulong who were eaten up by the very enemy that coddled them as they became isolated and useless in their role as special enemy agents and even before the revolutionary masses could directly punish them. The reactionaries may eat them up as fast as the present ruling faction is replaced by another or even earlier than expected by any reactionary faction. Even within the reactionary armed forces, there are factions trying to eat up each other. No one will be surprised if one of these days any one of these factions eat up the Lava revisionist fascists. Our policy is to intensify anti-imperialist, antirevisionist and antifascist propaganda and thereby hasten the utter isolation and destruction of the Lava revisionist fascists. The main point now is to advance steadily wave upon wave in the countryside, and wipe out all agents of fascism, revisionist or otherwise.

The US-Marcos clique should not be too happy about the special service that the Lava revisionist renegades are rendering to it. Both the US-Marcos

clique and the Lava revisionist fascists will pay a heavy political price for every crime that they commit and for every victim of their madness. The most important thing is to arouse and mobilize the masses against these traitors. We cannot be deterred by fascist crimes, whether these are committed by the US-Marcos clique directly or through the Lava revisionist fascists. The Party has done well in ridding itself of the Lavaites ideologically, politically and organizationally and is determined to obliterate them.

IV. The Lavaite Philosophy of "Interconnection of Seemingly Contradictory Phenomena"

The muddleheadedness for which the Lava revisionist renegades have become notorious springs from a bourgeois idealist philosophical outlook. Their philosophy is best expressed in their bulletin of anticommunism in the following pontification: "Dialectics examines concretely the interconnection of seemingly contradictory phenomena in the total process of development."

There are two inanities in this pontification which prove beyond doubt that the Lavaites are fake communists to the core. First, dialectics is misrepresented as the examination of interconnection, instead of being the struggle of mutually exclusive opposites or the cognition of such struggle. Second, contradiction is misrepresented as "seeming." Contradiction in things or phenomena is denied. Metaphysics is decked out as materialist dialectics.

Chairman Mao teaches us:

"Contradiction exists in the process of development of all things and that in the process of development of each thing a movement of opposites exists from beginning to end." "All things invariably divide into two." "The law of contradiction in things, that is, the law of the unity of opposites, is the basic law of materialist dialectics." (On Contradiction)

The great Lenin pointed out:

"The splitting of a single whole and the cognition of its contradictory parts is the essence of dialectics." (On the Question of Dialectics) "In brief, dialectics can be defined as the doctrine of the unity of opposites. This embodies the essence of dialectics, but it requires explanation and development." (Conspectus of Hegel's book The Science of Logic)

Chairman Mao teaches us further:

The law of the unity of opposites is the fundamental law of the universe. This law operates universally, whether in the natural world, in human society, or in man's thinking. Between the opposites in a contradiction there is at once unity and struggle, and it is this that impels things to move and change. (On the Correct Handling of Contradictions Among the People)

Engels pointed out:

Dialectics has proved from the results of our experience of nature so far that all polar opposites in general are determined by the mutual action of the two opposite poles on each other, that the separation and opposition of these poles exists only within their mutual connection and union, and conversely, that their union exists only in their separation and their mutual connection in their opposition. (Dialectics of Nature)

Finally, Chairman Mao teaches us:

In society as in nature, every entity invariably breaks up into its different parts, only there are differences in content and form under concrete conditions. (Speech at the Chinese Communist Party National Conference on Propaganda Work)

Basing ourselves on the great Marxist philosophers themselves, we find the Lavaite philosophy of "interconnection of seemingly contradictory phenomena" to be an idealist and metaphysical nonsense. The bourgeois idealism expounded by the Lava revisionist renegades is the worst variety of the reactionary philosophy of "combine two into one." It does not only put up the "interconnection," "unity" or "identity" as absolute but also completely goes in an outright manner against the grain of the entire materialist philosophy which is that contradiction is not seeming but real.

No amount of verbal hocus-pocus can extricate the Lava revisionist renegades from their self-exposure as fake communists. To pound on the true meaning and essence of materialist dialectics, let us repeatedly quote the great Lenin whom they patronizingly call a "competent dialectician" and whose name they often invoke to attack Marxism-Leninism. The great Lenin states: "In its proper meaning, dialectics is the study of contradiction existing in an entity." Reiterating himself, he also stated: "The knowledge that a united thing is divisible into two, one contradicting the other ... is the substance of dialectics." "All phenomena and processes have a tendency toward contradiction, opposition and mutual repulsion." All these Leninist statements are diametrically opposed to the Lavaite pontification that: "Dialectics examines concretely the interconnection of seemingly contradictory phenomena in the total process of development."

Have we made ourselves clear against the fake communists? We are dialectical materialists and we are bound by the revolutionary philosophy of "one divides into two" (a phrase drawn from the great Lenin and elaborated on by Chairman Mao). We hold that the nature of anything is the contradictoriness within it. There is nothing in the world that cannot be separated into its tendencies or aspects. There is no motion that is not contradiction, whether this be physical, chemical, biological, social or cognitive motion. It is the internal contradiction in things that determines their nature and also impels their development.

In the unity of opposites, the struggle of opposites is absolute while the unity or identity is relative and conditional. The fundamental concern of dialectics is the separability of aspects in things. This is true in analysis as well as in synthesis. Analysis is clearly concerned with the different aspects

in a thing. Regarding synthesis, however, there are still those confused about it. But holding firmly to the absoluteness of struggle or the universality of contradiction, to the truth that contradiction operates in every process and at every stage of any process, we assert that contradiction is in synthesis, from analysis to synthesis is development which leads to further development. Synthesis involves "one eating up the other" in simple language. Otherwise we fall into the pit of Hegelian synthesis or idealism. A denial of the universality of contradiction is a denial of development, the contradiction between the new and the old and the replacement of old contradictions with new contradictions.

If we fail to recognize the absolute character of the struggle between opposites, we fail to recognize the motive power for the development of things. External mechanical "integration" would supplant "knowing the source of self-motion." If this fallacy is pursued to the end, it will lead to such Lavaite confusion as attributing every development in the revolutionary mass movement to the "primary power of propulsion" of US imperialism which the Lavaites consider almighty and ever capable of fooling and splitting revolutionaries for its own benefit. It leads to the pit of mysticism, even to the existence of a "deity."

In the editorial of their bulletin of anticommunism, the Lava revisionist renegades complain about the "reduction into simplistic formulas and colorful slogans of the complex laws of revolutionary struggle" by the Communist Party of the Philippines and the national democratic mass organizations. They presume that they are the geniuses upon whom the masses must rely to unravel the "mysteries" of revolutionary struggle. They fancy themselves as the prophets who shall still have to write the scriptures for us to follow. They do not recognize the objective reality of unprecedented mass movements and they have the temerity to call the revolutionary line and slogans against US imperialism, feudalism and bureaucrat capitalism as nothing but the work of "Hitler and Goebbels." They sepal not to recognize that the great masses of the people are holding up antirevisionist placards, signifying a very high level of political consciousness. They would rather consider their repudiation from the revolutionary mass movement as the work of US imperialism than of genuine revolutionaries who ally themselves with such distinct forces as the semiproletariat and the urban petty bourgeoisie but who fiercely oppose revisionist saboteurs masquerading as communists.

Spiteful of the revolutionary mass movement, the Lava revisionist renegades mix up things in line with their reactionary philosophy of "combine two into one." Claiming to have some "reliable" information from the sanctum sanctorum of the CIA, probably "infiltrated" by the intelligence bureau headed by Antonio Santos, they prate with all the malice that they can command that the national democratic mass organizations and the New People's Army are together with the clerico-fascists and Jesuits in a CIA plot to topple down Marcos, the fascist puppet chieftain of US imperialism. At one time, the Lava revisionist renegades put out a manifesto foretelling January

25, 1971 as the day when the plotters would make a coup d'etat to depose Marcos. It turned out that the Lava revisionist renegades and the clerico-fascists were respectively taking a "take-a-leave-of-absence" and "stay-at-home" policy on that date. The New People's Army did not enter Manila on that date but the national democratic mass organizations consistently braved the enemy and continued to denounce US imperialism, feudalism and bureaucrat capitalism in a peaceful demonstration of protest.

The Lava revisionist renegades have a defective world outlook which affects all their political ideas. Because they are anti-Marxist and anti-Leninist bourgeois idealists, they always talk of "absolute unity" and "absolute identity." They fail to deal with concrete material reality. They characteristically fail to pose a problem and analyze it, dividing it correctly into its aspects to grasp the solution within the problem. They wish to turn revolutionary struggle into a mystery. To bamboozle people, they always talk of the "complex," "combining various forms" and other such terms. So, when they are compelled to divide things into their aspects, they fail to distinguish correctly the principal aspect from the secondary aspect. When pressed hard on the question of whether armed struggle or parliamentary struggle is the principal form of struggle, they first try to talk in the abstract and in a most circuitous manner about the "interconnection" of the two and then finally they state the revisionist line that parliamentary struggle is the principal form of struggle in the Philippine revolution.

Jesus Lava pontificates in his "Paglililaw sa 'Philippine Crisis'": "The forms of struggle *do not contradict each other*; different forms of struggle can exist at the same time and together." [Emphasis ours.] This is a classic statement of stupidity by one who pretends to know his Marxism; he certainly qualifies as the theorist of Camp Crame. It is absolutely wrong to say that different forms of struggle do not contradict each other though it is correct to say that different forms of struggle can exist at the same time and together.

In the notorious revisionist journal, *Peace, Freedom and Socialism* (December 1970) the US imperialist agent Pomeroy trumpets the line of the bogus communist party of the Lava revisionist renegades in the following manner:

Among its present tasks the Communist Party of the Philippines includes: explaining to the Filipino masses that they have no alternative but to respond in better measures to the organized violence of the enemies of the revolution, preparing for and developing the most varied forms of struggle....

In *World Outlook* (January 1971) Pomeroy also states:

In the Philippines, where the situation is very complex, a combination of many forms of struggle is occurring, both legal and illegal, both peaceful and armed struggle. A fight to gain legality for the Communist-led liberation forces does not contradict the building of the broadest kind of anti-imperialist unity. Peaceful demonstrations in cities and towns do not contradict armed struggle in parts of the countryside....

This passage tries to beg a question but only succeeds in being a clear demonstration of the confusion of the Lava revisionist renegades. They wish to beg for legality for the Communist Party from the reactionary state, to pledge the liquidation of armed struggle, and still think that they can still have armed struggle, too, under present conditions in the Philippines.

The Lavaite bulletin of anticommunism or rather Eduardo Lachica's "well-schooled theoretician educated in England" rails against Chairman Amado Guerrero:

Again the self-appointed champion of ideological purity counterposes two interconnected aspects of revolutionary strategy. He declares the armed struggle as the only means of liberation and condemns as "revisionist" the use of other forms of struggle.

It is correct to counterpose the interconnected aspects of armed struggle and parliamentary struggle. If one does not make any counterposing, it would be impossible to determine what is the principal aspect and what is the secondary aspect. To determine the principal aspect in contradictory aspects is not a "scholastic" approach as the Lava revisionist renegades claim. When we speak of armed revolution being the only road or the only means for national and social liberation, we are merely adhering to the Marxist-Leninist theory of state and revolution, recognizing the violent nature of imperialism and all reactionaries and learning the lessons provided by more than one hundred years of proletarian revolutionary struggle.

However, we have never said that we are absolutely against parliamentary struggle. As a matter of fact, it is the reestablished Communist Party of the Philippines that is leading the peaceful and legal struggles in cities, provincial capitals and towns today. It is not the Lava revisionist renegades. On the other hand, these scoundrels have made it their major task to "identify" Communists from among the revolutionary masses for the benefit of the reactionary state. What we consider as revisionist is not parliamentary struggle subordinated to and serving armed struggle but parliamentary struggle being the sole or "main" form of struggle in the concrete conditions of the Philippines today and at this stage of world revolution. We shall discuss this more extensively under another section.

The Lavaite revisionist renegades are capable of "splitting" things but only in the manner of mechanistic itemization serving their reactionary purpose of "combining two into one." William J. Pomeroy in his general introduction to the revisionist compilation *Guerrilla Warfare and Marxism*, states:

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

The actual purpose in this passage is to obscure armed struggle as being merely "one among so many" and to "combine two into one, combine armed struggle and parliamentary struggle into a mystic unity.

Another passage from Pomeroy runs in the following manner:

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

Pomeroy wants the liquidation of armed struggle under the pretext and fabrication that genuine independence from imperialist rule can be peacefully achieved.

In his article, "Paglilinaw sa 'Philippine Crisis'," Jesus Lava also tries to drown out the significance of feudalism as the social base of imperialism in the Philippines by enumerating so many things which are at any rate a mere itemization of the manifestations of US imperialism. Here is the pertinent passage:

In the era of neocolonialism, especially in the era of surging new democratic revolution, the imperialists try to supplement or change its basic forces since it is not enough to rely on the force of the feudal landlord. The imperialists try to realize these supplementary forces from various social ranks, from the military rank through "military assistance," "mutual defense," PX, "training in the US," etc.; from the rank of the intellectuals and students, by means of scholarships in the US, "exchange professorships," etc.; from the capitalist comprador, through new "trade preferences," (like sugar); from the bureaucrat capitalists, by means of direct and indirect bribery; from the workers, through labor centers, trade union "aid" from US trade unions, junkets to whatever conferences, etc.; and from the peasants, through land reform, PRRM, rural development, 4-H clubs, rural credit facilities, etc.

The above enumeration is made to support the following conclusion:

It is obvious that feudalism is not the social base of imperialism; imperialism can exist even without the so-called social base, and it even actually becomes the fuse endangering imperialist domination of the country.

So the Lava revisionist renegades expect US imperialism to fulfil for the peasant masses the main content of the people's democratic revolution in the Philippines. To serve their merging with US imperialism, the Lava revisionist renegades think wishfully that the US imperialists can "split" the peasant masses from the people's democratic revolution.

The Lava revisionist renegades mix up things. The US imperialists are made out to be antifeudalists. The clerico-fascists and "peace-loving US industrialists" are mixed up with workers, peasants, professionals and local factory owners as being similarly desirous of "no Joking" genuine land reform.

With its characteristic bluster, the Lavaite bulletin of anticommunism imagines that in the succeeding passage it can stack its own cards against Chairman Amado Guerrero:

The self-proclaimed master of dialectics counterposes reform and revolution, as if they are mutually exclusive categories. A competent dialectician like Comrade Lenin does not equate the struggle for reforms with reformism; neither does he counterpose reform and revolution.

Chairman Amado Guerrero has always sharply counterposed the reformism of the Lava revisionist renegades and the people's democratic revolution being carried out under the leadership of the Communist Party of the Philippines. In *Philippine Society and Revolution*, he devotes a section to a comprehensive discussion of the kinship of reformism and revisionism. For the sake of argument, let us grant that somewhere our Party chairman counterposed reform and revolution. So now, we state categorically that it is correct to counterpose reform and revolution. The contradiction between the two is real and it is not an "as if." There is certainly a great difference between a mechanical series of reforms and the whole process of revolution. Between the idea of reform and that of revolution, there is a difference and a contradiction. There is also certainly a difference and contradiction between campaigning for the election of delegates to the 1971 constitutional convention and arousing the peasant masses to build local organs of political power.

Lenin does not equate the struggle for reforms and reformism. Certainly there is a great difference between the struggle for reforms and reformism which is the use of reforms or even only the idea of reforms to deceive the people and lead them away from revolution. It is to slander Lenin for the Lava revisionist renegades to claim that he does not counterpose reform and revolution; there is still a contradiction between the two even if reform, like wage increases gained through a militant strike, is made to serve the revolutionary awakening and advance of the proletariat. It is wrong to recognize only the identity of things or aspects. It is correct to recognize their contradictoriness in order to grasp their law of motion. In considering reforms, it is necessary to recognize those which can be used serve the revolution and those which cannot be used and which even harm the revolution. In considering a kind of reform that can be used to serve the revolution, it is also necessary to recognize that it has an aspect that may be used to serve the revolution and another aspect that harms the revolution. It is unmitigated reformism and revisionism for *Ang Gabay* to proclaim: "To a revolutionary, reform and revolution are interrelated and one cannot be emphasized at the expense of the other." To a revolutionary, a certain reform can be good only when it can be used to serve the revolution. Only a reformist or a revisionist will consider reform coequal to revolution and will refuse to consider revolution superior to any kind of reform.

In concrete reference to the puny Lavaite outfit with the pompous name, Confederation of Trade Unions of the Philippines, it is completely reformist and counterrevolutionary for it to declare in its "The Stand of the Confederation of Trade Unions" published by *Sang-ayon sa MAN* that "it does not advocate the use of force as the weapon of the working class struggle."

Only a Leo Hubermann or a John Strachey will write such nonsense. Such a line confines the working class to the winning of reforms. As the great Lenin said: "the Marxists wage a most resolute struggle against the reformists who, directly or indirectly, confine the aims and activities of the working class to the winning of reforms."

Among certain reforms in a semicolonial and semifeudal country like the Philippines, there is a basic contradiction between the Agricultural Land Reform Code peddled by the Masaka under the Lava revisionist renegades and the genuine land reform made possible by the armed political power of the peasantry under the leadership of the proletarian revolutionary party, the Communist Party of the Philippines. The matter of land reform is released from the realm of reformism or of being a mere economic measure and nothing more when it serves and is linked with the revolutionary armed struggle for people's democracy against US imperialism, feudalism and bureaucrat capitalism. The Lava revisionist renegades are guilty of reformism in making the implementation of the Agricultural Land Reform Code their main activity in the countryside even as they have already acknowledged this code as an instrument of US imperialism.

Always insulting the masses, the Lava revisionist renegades have also tried to peddle the idea that socialist China is no different from Soviet social-imperialism or that there is no conflict between Marxism-Leninism and modern revisionism. They even go to the extent of misrepresenting the diplomatic relations between two states with different social systems or the negotiations concerning Soviet aggression against the Chinese people and territory as the dissolution of fundamental contradictions between Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought and modern revisionism.

The Lavaite *Sang-ayon sa MAN* (February 15) chatters:

But now both the Chinese and Russia are beginning to understand each other. In fact, they have exchanged ambassadors. It is not surprising that in the not too distant future, these will agree on the view that imperialism is their common diehard enemy. Supposing that they agree, what will the ardent pro-China say?

The glossier Lavaite *Political Review* (March 1971) takes up the same theme:

It is with optimism that all the anti-imperialists view the current efforts on both sides (China and Soviet Union) to resolve the conflict, as they hope that success towards this end will project with greater clarity once more the need for unity in the struggle against imperialism.

The core of the Lavaite philosophy of "interconnection of seemingly contradictory phenomena" or "combine two into one" lies in merging contradictions; combining Marxism with revisionism; liquidating revolutionary struggle; mixing up friends with enemies; supporting US imperialism, feudalism and bureaucrat capitalism; making no distinction between socialism on one hand and imperialism and social-imperialism on the other.

Let us pursue the Lavaite notion of combining genuine Marxism and sham Marxism and also socialism and social-imperialism. In the end, what do the

Lavaites say when the real contradiction persists against their hypocritical wishes?

The *Political Review* further states: "This ('Sino-Soviet dispute gives a hint at the alienation of one socialist country from another, to the benefit of the imperialist camp...." It also states: "By any measure, the Sino-Soviet dispute is an unfortunate development that has profoundly affected the worldwide struggle against the forces of imperialism and reaction."

Because they refuse to recognize the fundamental contradiction in what they call the Sino-Soviet dispute, the Lavaites are led to the gloomy conclusion that US imperialism has been benefited by the split between Marxism-Leninism and modern revisionism. To this day, in complete opposition to the great theory and practice of continuing revolution under the dictatorship of the proletariat and in complete opposition to the fact that revolution is the main trend in the world today, the Lavaites consider the split between Marxism-Leninism and modern revisionism unfortunate. On the other hand, we consider it fortunate. Modern revisionism is what is unfortunate. The advance of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought is fortunate. Never has the world anti-imperialist struggle been better than now. Only revisionist renegades will sadden in the face of the surging revolutionary mass movements because they have placed themselves on the side of counterrevolution.

The Lava revisionist renegades say that the split between Marxism-Leninism and modern revisionism is bad. We say that it is good. It is good for China and for the whole world. It is good for the Philippines. Without the ideological and political clarity that it has provided to the Filipino proletarian revolutionaries, the Lava revisionist renegades would have continued undetected to subvert and sabotage the Philippine revolution. They would not have been cleaned out of the Communist Party of the Philippines and the revolutionary mass movement.

The Lava revisionist renegades grossly err in their analysis in the *Philippine Review*:

The imputed contraposition of the various sectors of the progressive forces corresponding to the sides in the Sino-Soviet dispute has forced the entire anti-imperialist movement in the Philippines into an arena where the terms of the struggle has changed, from a singular concentration of forces against US imperialism to a vicious campaign against socialist unity, from anti-imperialist solidarity to imperialist unity.

We see through the "various sectors" of progressive forces, the "singular concentration of forces," the "socialist unity" or "anti-imperialist solidarity" of the Lava revisionist renegades. Despite their counterrevolutionary revisionist and fascist character, which indeed parallels that of their Soviet social-imperialist masters, they wish to include themselves among the anti-imperialists and supporters of socialism. At the same time, they wish us to share with them their despondency over what they consider the rising fortunes of US imperialism. Revealing their counterrevolutionary character,

they try to bluff and blackmail us with "imperialist unity" and cover up the fact that US imperialism and all its running dogs are now extremely isolated and disunited.

Before the Lava revisionist renegades were roundly repudiated, they busied themselves with attacking us and even now as they prate about being for "anti-imperialist unity" they continue to attack us with a viciousness that they have never applied on US imperialism. They have committed fascist crimes that can only compete in shamelessness with their kowtows to their imperialist masters. Once upon a time, they gloated over their "victory" in seizing the Movement for the Advancement of Nationalism which they promptly converted into an anemic Philippine version of the Guomindang. But they failed to realize until it was too late for them that we busied ourselves with the reestablishment of the Communist Party of the Philippines on the theoretical foundation of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought. And they refuse now to recognize that it is their counterrevolutionary revisionism that has isolated them from the masses. While the masses are now aroused and mobilized on an unprecedented scale by the proletarian revolutionary vanguard, they shed crocodile tears over "disunity" in the anti-imperialist movement to cover up their exceedingly malicious attempts to attack the leadership and the very people that are more than ever before united in fighting US imperialism, feudalism and bureaucrat capitalism.

The Lava revisionist renegades abuse the revolutionary mass movement as in the following passage:

Recently, a segment of this conglomerate opposed the establishment of diplomatic relations with a socialist country, and no doubt the opposition is based on the fact that the country in question happens to be the Soviet Union. Quite logically from the viewpoint of this conglomerate, such move would be welcome if the socialist country would be China. Thus the basis of its opposition is not the socialist essence of the country but the fact that it is Chinese or Soviet.

We assure the Lava revisionist renegades that we oppose Soviet social-imperialism (not a socialist country) and a Philippine government that is thoroughly a puppet of US imperialism. The Philippine reactionary government and Soviet social-imperialism can have any kind of relationship but we will never stop opposing both and each. We know that Lavaite propaganda and sinister fascist activities are subsidized by Soviet social-imperialism because these do not have the support of the Filipino masses. The Lava revisionist renegades expect to be able to do more harm to the revolution if there is a Soviet embassy in Manila as the bargaining and coordinating center for US imperialism, modern revisionism and local reaction. Already the Lava revisionist fascists have put themselves in line with the US-Marcos clique in obedience to their Soviet social-imperialist masters.

We consider it as a legitimate right of a socialist country, referring to the People's Republic of China, to have diplomatic relations with any other country with a different social system. This is in line with the Leninist policy

of peaceful coexistence. What we are against is the Khrushchov general line of peaceful coexistence, which violates the fundamental principle of proletarian internationalism. The policy of peaceful coexistence should never be converted into a general line running against the main trend of revolution in the world today, and into a line of capitulation to US imperialism. The proletarian foreign policy of the People's Republic of China has always been clear and consistent. It is: to develop relations of friendship, mutual assistance and cooperation with socialist countries on the principle of proletarian internationalism; to support and assist the revolutionary struggles of all the oppressed people and nations; and to strive for peaceful coexistence with countries having different social systems on the basis of the Five Principles of mutual respect for territorial integrity and sovereignty, mutual nonaggression, noninterference in each other's Internal affairs, equality and mutual benefit, and peaceful coexistence and to oppose the imperialist policy of aggression and war.

As a genuine socialist country, the People's Republic of China will never interfere and dictate on the Philippine revolutionary mass movement to stop fighting the people's enemies. Diplomatic relations or the prospect of such between a socialist country and a reactionary government are always subordinate to the cause of world proletarian revolution and to the cause of the people's democratic revolution. China has vowed never to be a superpower like US imperialism or Soviet social-imperialism which has arrogated unto itself the prerogative to decide the destiny of other peoples in its shady deals. After all, revolution cannot be exported or stopped from abroad. The irrepressible internal contradictions of Philippine society will keep on developing against US imperialism and all its running dogs.

We are already fed up with the reactionary theory of "conciliation of contradictions"—the Lavaite philosophy of "interconnection of seemingly contradictory phenomena." The Party and the people are antagonized by little Proudhons, little Kautskys, little Deborins, little Bukharins, little Trotskys, little Khrushchovs and little Brezhnevs who wish to muddle up the Philippine revolution.

V. The Lavaite Theory of "Stupid Masses" and "Incidental Leadership"

Within their narrow circles, the Lavaites evade the responsibility of leadership by attributing errors and failures to objective conditions "beyond their control" and to the masses "being at fault." They harp on the "correctness" and "goodness" of their motives, without relation to effects. It is necessary for us to present the correct dialectical relationship between leadership and the masses as we criticize the subjectivist, conspiratorial and careerist attitude and policy that the Lavaites take on the question of leadership and the masses.

The attitude of the Lava revisionist renegades towards the masses is best expressed by the bulletin of anticommunism in the following manner:

When the masses allowed themselves to be duped into believing that artesian wells and PACD toilets would lift them out of their misery, it was rather difficult to resist the temptation of despising their stupidity. But we persisted in humdrum mass work, sustained by our Marxist-Leninist faith in the inevitability of revolution....

These words can only come from counterrevolutionaries who fancy themselves in bourgeois fashion as the "heroes of the herd." No genuine revolutionary would call the masses "stupid" and mass work "humdrum." That these are written in an "internal" and "theoretical" bulletin posing as communist shows that the authors are anticommunist conspirators. That the authors should claim "Marxist-Leninist faith" is to discredit Marxism-Leninism. These revisionist scoundrels deserve to be despised to their doom.

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

The Lava revisionist fascists curse the masses with the vile intention of covering up their crime of misleading the revolutionary mass movement in yesteryears when they succeeded in usurping the leadership in the old merger party. They callously blame the masses. But unwittingly, they uncover the roots of their longstanding unrectified opportunism and their present revisionist treachery. They hate the masses!

The Lavaites were so stupid that their "revolutionary work" was all negated by a few artesian wells and PACD toilets, they would rather make recriminations against the masses whom they would picture as having "waited hopefully for Magsaysay the man of action, not of words—to translate his words into action." They credit Magsaysay as they abuse the masses in their attempt to wash their hands of responsibility for their gross errors, failure and defeat.

The imperialist-landlord agent Magsaysay was not able to put artesian wells and PACD toilets even in 10% of Philippine barrios. Even if he did, these things could not have overturned the correct mass line of a truly revolutionary leadership. Artesian wells and PACD toilets do not revolutionize the lives of the peasant masses. The Lavaites were responsible for something that was grave, that involved the correct relationship between the leadership and the masses. This was not something that was as light and flippant as the gimmickry of Magsaysay.

Now we understand why until now the "humdrum mass work" of the Lavaites has not yielded anything better than their empty claims that the reformist outfit Masaka is making "revolution" through the Agricultural Land Reform Code. They have pitifully become the appendage of the Land Authority of the reactionary government. Until now we have not heard any landlord complaining against them; certainly landlords cannot be stopped from raising a howl when their interests are opposed.

The Lavaite ringleaders have acknowledged the reactionary land reform code as US-inspired but it is precisely what their Masaka is trying to have implemented to the detriment of the peasant masses. They have directly

helped the landlords further harshen the feudal system of exploitation. They are accomplices in the creation of sisantes (displaced tenants) and in the further impoverishment of the peasant masses in a number of towns, especially in Bulacan, Nueva Ecija and Laguna.

The Lavaite bulletin of anticommunism continues to slander the masses:

History has shown that when the masses are paralyzed by fear and deluded by promises of reforms, no howling of slogans or waving of banners and raising of clenched fists could summon them back to the struggle. They have to learn from experience and they have to experience the futility of reforms before they become receptive once again to the idea of revolution.

The Lavaites have an extremely low regard for the masses. First, they say that the masses are "paralyzed by fear and deluded by promises of reforms" until they learn that these are worth nothing. Second, they never stop to consider what slogans and whose banners they raise. Third, they wish to "give a lesson" to the masses by leaving them to an indefinite series of reactionary reforms. They oppose the truth of Chairman Mao's teaching that in a semicolonial and semifeudal country "social democracy" is not as possible and as effective for deceiving the people as in capitalist countries.

Nothing good ever comes out of arrogance towards the masses. Nothing good ever comes out of taking opportunist lines such as the "Left" opportunist line represented by Jose and Jesus Lava from 1948 to 1954 and the Right opportunist line represented by Jesus Lava since 1955.

The Lavaite bulletin of anticommunism admits:

Our Party was effectively isolated. The masses were scared just to be seen in the company of known cadres. They shunned organizations with the slightest hue of red. In that situation we had to content ourselves with inordinately modest goals.

It was not real Communists that the masses were afraid of. It was the Lavaite counterrevolutionaries usurping the name of Communists whom they even fought. They were not scared; they repudiated the criminal abuses that flowed from opportunism and from a counterrevolution that sabotaged the revolutionary mass movement from within.

Chairman Mao speaks of the masses in the following manner: Every revolutionary party and every revolutionary comrade will be put to the test, to be accepted or rejected as they decide. There are three alternatives. To march at their head and lead them. To trail behind them, gesticulating and criticizing. Or to stand in their way and oppose them. The people, and the people alone, are the motive force in the making of world history.

Chairman Mao gives us clear and correct guidance:

As long as we rely on the people, believe firmly in the inexhaustible creative power of the masses and hence trust and identify ourselves with them, no enemy can crush us while we can crush every enemy and overcome every difficulty.

Without this correct attitude towards the masses and without the correct mass line, a political party can only pretend to make revolution and is bound to fail.

Until now, the Lava revisionist renegades have not changed their counterrevolutionary attitude towards the masses. Let us take note of a passage from a "political transmission" of their bogus political bureau issued on June 12, 1971:

Progressive organizations should cultivate new links with the hitherto inert and deluded masses, with that vast segment of the population who are normally impervious to revolutionary propaganda.

These traitors never tire of slandering the masses, calling them "inert," "deluded" and "impervious to revolutionary propaganda."

The Lava revisionist renegades should always serve as our teachers by negative example. In this regard, let us search into our minds the teaching of Chairman Mao: "Modesty helps one to go forward, whereas conceit makes one lag behind. This is a truth we must always bear in mind."

The Lava revisionist renegades have already become notorious for serving US imperialism and the landlords, for committing all sorts of crimes and for bloodily opposing the Party and the people's army in the countryside. Now, let us get a passage from one of their "mass" publications. The January 1971 issue of BRPF's Struggle states:

Witness the latest violent rallies last December 9, 1970 at Plaza Lawton and January 13, 1971 at Plaza Miranda. On the other hand, even those who remain when violence erupts only manage to reveal their unpreparedness to battle it out with the mercenary hirelings of the fascist Marcos with their utter lack of discipline and disorganized behavior. Are these the revolutionary masses whom the KM points to as the liberators of the Filipino people?

The Lavaites consider themselves clever for being able to caricature the revolutionary masses. This is the malicious spirit that runs through all their counterrevolutionary propaganda, especially when it is directed against the youthful masses of workers, peasants, students and intellectuals whom they sweepingly call "immature," "reckless," "kabataang musmos" (a phrase borrowed from the reactionary columnist Max Soliven).

The Lava revisionist renegades have the temerity to claim that they have broken out of their isolation and express a wish to recruit more youthful forces. They even claim that the national democratic mass organizations, which they consistently calumniate, have benefited from their policies. For all their braggadocio, it has become a familiar public spectacle for their puny outfits to be literally kicked out of gigantic mass actions and to place themselves on the side of fascist brutes before, during and after these mass actions in every manner that they are capable of. Now that they have overstepped themselves by committing fascist crimes, their exposure as counterrevolutionaries has become even more thorough and their isolation is certain to lead to their extinction.

Consistent with their overlord attitude towards the masses, the Lava revisionist renegades have also concocted the counterrevolutionary theory of "incidental leadership." This is a theory which is made to sound as if they were not gravely concerned with the question of leadership. It is their way of telling the people to be unconcerned about the question of leadership so that they, the super-careerists posing as humble "collectivists," can dictate what ideological, political and organizational line to take.

The bulletin of anticommunism babbles: "The question of leadership is incidental to our struggle with the Mao Thought party." Leadership is not something incidental to any political struggle. It is essentially the question of line in ideology, politics and organization. Cadres or persons who take the lead carry a definite line, represent a definite class and perform the function of leadership.

Leadership is a fundamental question in the struggle of the Communist Party of the Philippines against the bogus communist party of the Lava revisionist renegades. No matter how these revisionist scoundrels make it appear that they are unconcerned about what leaders or what class should lead the revolutionary mass movement, their counterrevolutionary propaganda clearly shows that they have in mind themselves and the big bourgeoisie and the big landlords to persist as overlords in Philippine society.

When they brandish Khrushchov's anti-Stalin fallacy of "personality cult," it is to attack the revolutionary leadership of the proletariat. When they slander Comrade Mao Zedong by speaking of the "Mao cult" they attack not only one person but the great proletarian revolutionary leader, Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought, the world proletariat and people, the Communist Party of China, the Chinese, people, the Filipino proletariat and people, the Communist Party of the Philippines and the New People's Army. In short, these slanders hew to the leadership and line of the big bourgeoisie and the landlord class. The Lava revisionist fascists have placed themselves on the side of US imperialism and its running dogs.

In the history of proletarian revolutionary struggle, enemy agents have surfaced to say that Marxism is not scientific socialism, that Leninism is not Marxism or that Mao Zedong Thought is not Marxism-Leninism. These scoundrels have not hesitated at making the most vicious personal and ideological attacks against the great communist leaders Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin and Mao Zedong.

In the Philippines today, it is not surprising for the Lava revisionist renegades to concentrate their slander on the person of Chairman Amado Guerrero. They wish to attack the Communist Party of the Philippines, the New People's Army and the entire revolutionary mass movement. It is not surprising for the Lava revisionist renegades to concentrate their slander on the person of Comrade Dante. They wish to attack all Red commanders and fighters and the heroic armed struggle in the countryside. It is not surprising for the Lava revisionist renegades to concentrate their slander on the person of Jose Ma. Sison. They wish to attack the legal mass organizations which are the main current of the revolutionary mass movement in urban areas.

Because of their conspiratorial and bankrupt line on the question of leadership, the Lava revisionist fascists would rather have Marcos, the fascist puppet chieftain of US imperialism, as their own leading representative. This is the direction of their ceaseless protests that the national democratic mass organizations are taking a "purely anti-Marcos line." At the same time, the chief target of their propaganda is Guerrero or Sison whom they alternately refer to. Such is the bankruptcy of the Lava revisionist renegades.

The vile outbursts of Lavaite propaganda against the Communist Party of the Philippines, the New People's Army and the revolutionary mass movement in general is clearly synchronized with largescale campaigns of "encirclement and suppression" in Central Luzon and Northern Luzon and also with "special operations" of "special forces" of the US-Marcos clique, with the special assistance of the Briones-Diwa-Pasion gang in the Greater Manila area. The Lavaite publications shamelessly refer to persons, organizations and places for enemy ruffians to assault.

The Lava revisionist renegades harbor boundless presumptions beyond their capabilities. They boast of having "made Sison." But they cannot "make themselves." They boast of being "great theoreticians." But their slapdash manifestos prove the contrary. They boast of being "great organizers." But they are clearly isolated from the great mass movement. They boast of being "great revolutionaries." But their words in black and white and their public and sinister deeds prove that they are counterrevolutionaries. Their last resort is to feign humility and accuse others of "megalomania" in their old style of thief crying "Thief!"

Praising the enemy in a roundabout way, they make it appear as being responsible for the great unity, strength and prestige that the revolutionary organizations and people have achieved. They claim that the revolutionary forces have been artificially created by the enemy itself with publicity and finances. They have absolutely no faith and no trust in the revolutionary masses and the revolutionary leadership that has emerged through consistent struggle. They consider the distorted reporting and comments on gigantic mass actions by the reactionary press as support for the revolutionary mass movement. They consider contributions pooled from the masses as coming from the enemy.

If only the Lava revisionist renegades would turn against and attack their big bourgeois and landlord masters with the same fury that they attack the revolutionary mass movement, they will certainly get their share of the distorted reporting and comments in the mass media. The big mass media are owned by reactionaries who serve imperialist-comprador-landlord advertisers and at the same time try to deceive their petty-bourgeois readership with the myth of "press freedom." The obscurity that the Lava revisionist renegades have suffered is their own making. But certainly they are now becoming increasingly notorious among the revolutionary masses because of their revisionist and fascist treachery. They should take note that their big bourgeois and landlord masters have succeeded so far to suppress in the reactionary: mass media news about revisionist fascist crimes.

The Lava revisionist renegades reveal a low regard for themselves. Unwittingly, they reveal this fact with their own straight statements, though we can always conclude from their unadulterated lies that they are rotten and cheap. Here is an unwitting self-revelation from the editorial of their bulletin of anticommunism: "Many comrades, eager to retaliate, have raised the demand for a paper that would engage the Mao Thought party in a fierce mudslinging bout."

They spit on their own "comrades." They consider them as no better than mudslingers and pretend to criticize them but in fact go on mudslinging against us. Contempt for the masses has become so ingrained in them that they do not realize it when they themselves have slapped their own faces. The February 15th issue of *Sang-ayon sa MAN* at one point actually calls Lava "a Pilate" although the author of the article means to say that MAN is "absolutely" not an instrument of anyone.

On the other hand, the Lavaite bulletin of anticommunism speaks of its "general secretary" as the "highest and most powerful official." By this phrase alone, they betray their servility to some potentate of sorts.

Whoever is their "highest and most powerful official," the Lava revisionist renegades remain opportunist and revisionist. They are even worse now. They commit fascist crimes. We need to repeat that the local revisionist renegades will never lose their Lavaite appellation so long as they persist in keeping to Lavaite revisionism, the longstanding opportunism in the old merger party that has served as the basis of modern revisionism and lately of revisionist fascism.

It is also idle for the Lava revisionist renegades to espouse the theory of "being born red" under the pretext of discarding its old theory of "noble lineage." They bluff no one when they say that their "Secretary General" is no longer a city-based intellectual and that the membership of their bogus central committee is 90% "proletarian and peasant." No one is born red. Marx and Engels became great proletarian leaders, though their class origin was neither worker nor peasant, by remolding themselves and engaging in the revolutionary struggle of the proletariat. The Communist Party has a single class character which is proletarian and is the advanced detachment of the proletariat; it cannot be both "proletarian and peasant." It is, however, important to make sure that most Party members should be of worker and peasant origin. And the Party never closes its door to elements of petty-bourgeois origin who adopt the revolutionary proletarian outlook and remold themselves by engaging in revolutionary practice.

Godofredo Mallari, Alejandro Briones, Gorgonio Narciso, Domingo Castro and Felicísimo Macapagal have no claims to being peasant or proletarian now. Mallari is an enemy agent and a businessman of considerable assets drawn from his counterrevolutionary work. Briones is a bourgeois politician, an hacienda overseer and a criminal gangster. Narciso is a bureaucrat in the reactionary government. So are Castro and Macapagal whose racket is to receive honoraria from the Land Authority and to swindle peasants. Though they can trace peasant origins, they are as anti-peasant as Francisco Lava, Jr.

whose main business is to compel the peasant masses to pay fees to Lavaite shysters. All of them are isolated from the revolutionary peasant movement.

To cover up the fact that an overwhelming majority of the bogus central committee of the Lava revisionist renegades are bureaucrats, enemy agents and chronic aspirants for bourgeois electoral posts, the Lava revisionist renegades have concocted the theory of "physical affinity;" applied it on the leaders of the national democratic mass organizations; tried treacherously to seek out these leaders' kinsmen who are employed in the reactionary government; and even gone so far as to invent blood relations, political kinship or anything else intended to insinuate doubts about the convictions of genuine leaders of the national democratic movement.

A typical example of the shallow and malicious fascist trickery of the Lava revisionist renegades is the following statement of BRPF's *Struggle* (January 1971): "Jose Ma. Sison has a brother who is an NBI agent and another brother is with the Presidential Economic Staff (PES)." Falsehood and truth are deliberately mixed. Sison has no brother with the NBI. Though his brother was with the PES, there was no sane reason at all to kidnap and presumably murder him and his driver Elpidio Morales and to gloat over the fascist crime in several tens of thousands of copies of the July 1971 issue of BRPF's *Struggle* and other leaflets distributed all over Greater Manila and certain parts of Central Luzon and Southern Luzon.

Francisco C. Sison held a civilian post in the reactionary government, had no pretensions of being a leading revolutionary like the Lavaite bureaucrats and had never interfered in the affairs of the revolutionary mass movement. It was an absolutely stupid calculation that he would know the whereabouts of his brother. Not even the previous kidnapping and presumable murder of Carlos B. del Rosario had yielded anything to the fascist criminals concerning the whereabouts of Jose Ma. Sison.

Consistent with their theory of "physical affinity," the Lava revisionist renegades have gone so far as to fabricate in *Sang-ayon sa MAN*, (February 15, 1971) the following: "Perhaps the blind followers of Sison, who is a son of the late Vicente Sison who was a MAKAPILI and traitor to the Filipino people during the time of the Japanese and because of that was allegedly killed by the Huks have a wrong belief..." This fabrication is absolutely insane. As already reported by various national democratic mass organizations, Sison's father, Salustiano was a patriot who resisted the Japanese fascists in Ilocos Sur and who died of natural causes in 1958. In their propaganda and other activities, the Lava revisionist renegades have utterly degenerated into fascist liars. Their theories of "noble lineage" or of "being born red" or of "physical affinity" are all fascist rubbish.

In the final analysis, the question of leadership is whether or not we adhere to and implement the universal theory of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought in the concrete practice of the Philippine revolution today. The Lava revisionist renegades boast of applying the principle of "democratic centralism" in their organization. But the essence of their "centralism" is modern revisionism and fascism. We have already presented how they have

abhorred and violated the mass line. No correct ideological, political and organizational line can therefore be expected of them. Their counterrevolutionary revisionist line has led them to fascist gangsterism.

Because it adheres to Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought end to the mass line, the Communist Party of the Philippines can be expected to lead the revolutionary mass movement correctly and victoriously. Our Party relies on the masses, has faith in them and fully arouses them. Its principle of leadership is "from the masses to the masses," "take the ideas of the masses and concentrate them, persevere in the ideas and carry them through."

VI. The Lava Revisionist and Reformist Line of Parliamentary Struggle

Lenin, in his Address to the Second All-Russian Communist Organizations of the Peoples of the East, told the Communists of the Eastern peoples that they must recognize the characteristics of their Own countries and that, relying upon the general theory and practice of communism, they must adapt themselves to particular conditions different from those in European countries.

Instead of waging parliamentary struggle over a protracted period of time, the Chinese Communists under the leadership of Chairman Mao Zedong brilliantly applied Lenin's theory of uneven development end set out to wage protracted armed struggle and establish Red political power in the countryside before seizing the cities. Comrade Mao Zedong developed the theory of people's war and carried out the strategic line of encircling the cities from the countryside. These theory and strategic line are apt for a semicolonial and semifeudal country.

Today, in a semicolonial and semifeudal country like the Philippines, the Lava revisionist renegades imagine themselves to be in an imperialist country like tsarist Russia and think of "revolutionary situation" in terms of being able to launch a strategic offensive on the cities and seizing political power within a short period of time after a protracted period of parliamentary struggle. They deliberately and arrogantly oppose Chairman Mao's teachings in the same way that they did in all previous years, especially when the line of armed struggle was formally adopted but distorted into a putschist line by the Jose-Jesus Lava leadership.

Because they oppose the universal theory of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought no less, the Lava revisionist renegades completely fail to recognize the excellent revolutionary situation in the world as well as in the Philippines. They fail to see that a completely new and higher stage of world proletarian revolution has been effected by Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought, enabling Filipino revolutionaries to make armed struggle the principal form of struggle. The world has not stood still since 1917 or even since 1949. Objective and subjective conditions are ever more favorable for advancing the world k proletarian revolution.

Based on its detailed examination of the concrete situation in the Philippines, the Communist Party of the Philippines takes the view that conditions are excellent for waging protracted armed struggle as the principal form of struggle, for taking the strategic defensive and launching tactical offensives in the countryside or for fighting on exterior lines within interior lines, for gradually building up the revolutionary forces, for effecting land reform in a revolutionary way and for doing everything that will transform the backward barrios into advanced political, military and cultural bastions of the revolution.

It is revisionist and reformist for the Lava revisionist renegades to engage in parliamentary struggle as the principal form of struggle work for the bogus land reform program of US imperialism, advocate nationalization through legislation and the stock market, allow their ringleaders to run for offices in the reactionary government, fan up hopes in the constitutional convention and the like. Though they claim to be already engaged in armed struggle as a "secondary" form, they have been exposed for using their armed minions in the service of the fascists to oppose the Communist Party of the Philippines, the New People's Army and the people in so many criminal ways. At this early stage, they have already utterly failed. Their posts in the reactionary government and their main system of reliable agents so evident in their legal outfits are dead weights around their necks. They are fools to daring to fight the proletarian revolutionary party whose main organization is the people's army.

It is absolutely correct for the Communist Party of the Philippines to have right away as its main organization the New People's Army. The Party should not be a lamb waiting to be butchered any time by US imperialism and its running dogs. It is simply impossible to develop a people's army only at a later date when the people's enemies are striking us down from positions that may be gained by us from parliamentary struggle (if it were the principal form of struggle). We allow our actual and potential class allies to compete with the reactionary diehards in running for electoral posts in the reactionary government and we get their cooperation for the revolutionary armed struggle. But the Party should never have bourgeois electioneering as its principal concern above the requirements of armed struggle. We cannot develop a genuine people's army without immediately attending to the decisive question of land in a semicolonial and semifeudal country and without arousing and mobilizing the peasant masses to rise up in arms, engage in agrarian revolution and build revolutionary bases under the leadership of the proletariat. If we do not engage in armed struggle as the principal form of struggle, it would just be enough for the US-Marcos clique to hire a few revisionist gangsters to perform "liquidation" jobs and spy on us. The joint criminal activities of the US-Marcos clique and the Lava revisionist renegades underscore the correct line that we have taken.

The first time that the Lava revisionist renegades reacted formally to the proletarian revolutionary line was sometime in 1967 when they issued through the *Information Bulletin* of the Czechoslovak revisionist party a

statement carrying the following view: "The correct position, which is the position of the PKP, is to combine dialectically parliamentary struggle and armed struggle, legal and illegal forms of action." Previously, the 1967 May Day Statement of the Provisional Political Bureau of our Party had been published in major publications of fraternal Marxist-Leninist parties like the *Peking Review* (China) and the *People's Voice* (New Zealand). Our statement defined our commitment to rebuilding a Marxist-Leninist party cleansed of modern revisionism, or Right and "Left" opportunism, to revolutionary armed struggle, to a revolutionary united front and to proletarian internationalism.

Now the Lavaite bulletin of anticommunism declares:

In our assessment of the existing balance of forces, the time for strategic offensive has yet to come. We are still at the stage of preparation and the main form of struggle is legal or parliamentary struggle. The principal tasks are the politicization and organization of the masses, including the most backward sectors who up to now constitute the vast majority. The armed struggle must be waged even today but it occupies a secondary and subordinate role in relation to the parliamentary struggle. As the revolutionary situation develops, however, the armed struggle will steadily gain importance until objective conditions shall dictate that it be adopted as the main form.

That it is not yet time to wage a strategic offensive is no argument for parliamentary struggle being the principal form of struggle. It is idle and it is to beg the question for the Lava revisionist renegades to prate that the strategic offensive has yet to come and therefore the principal form of struggle is legal or parliamentary struggle. In a semicolonial and semifeudal country, only those revolutionary forces that take pains in protracted armed struggle, in fighting through and winning the strategic defensive and the strategic stalemate will be in a position to launch the strategic offensive victoriously. It is simply inconceivable how a party while engaged in parliamentary struggle as its principal activity is able to set up sizeable revolutionary armed forces even if only in one town. What is possible would be to have a few gangsters like those of the Briones-Diwa-Pasion gang latching on to Task Force Lawin, landlords and reactionary politicians. Even at this early stage, a stage of squads and platoons, the New People's Army is already being subjected to massive enemy assaults by Task Force Lawin and by their special assistants, the revisionist fascists.

Were it not for the strong mass support of the urban petty bourgeoisie, especially the students, teachers, journalists and other professionals, the spying and informing done by the Lava revisionist fascists on city-based and legal mass organizations would have caused a massive enemy crackdown on Party cadres, a destruction of the main body of the Party or at least a paralyzation of the same. But because the main body of the Party (its cadres and members) is in the people's army and in the countryside, we cannot be destroyed at one blow. So, both the US-Marcos clique and the Lava revisionist fascists do not really pose a serious threat to us, even if a massive fascist onslaught in urban areas were to come any time. Even here our Party

cadres and members are by necessity and choice underground and their Party membership unknown even as they participate in and lead mass activities.

Ang Gabay elaborates on the "strategy and tactics" of the Lava revisionist renegades. It gives a hilarious misinterpretation of such strategic stages of people's war as the strategic defensive, strategic stalemate and strategic offensive. It pushes the erroneous idea that parliamentary struggle is the principal form of struggle during the "strategic defensive." Through what it calls the "general tactic" of parliamentary struggle, the "subjective strength" of the revolution is brought forward to what it quaintly calls the "strategic counteroffensive," a stage which the "tactical leadership" must breeze through because of the "geographical limitation in the Philippines" and the "advanced war materiel" of the reactionary state. A "quick shift" is supposed to be made to the "general offensive." The three-stage schema of "strategic defensive," "strategic counteroffensive" and "general offensive" does not at all indicate how the people become armed and build their political power step by step; it actually preaches parliamentary struggle as the preparation for "Left" opportunist or adventurist actions in the 1950 style. The Lavaites expose their abject ignorance of simple military terms by relabeling the strategic stalemate as "strategic counteroffensive" and by failing to recognize that "counteroffensive" and "offensive" are synonymous terms for the revolutionary forces which start from the defensive.

It is worthwhile to read *Ang Gabay* itself in order to know better the anti-Marxist and anti-Leninist pretensions of the Lava revisionist renegades. In this regard, we are reminded of what the great Lenin said: "These people are striving to invent something quite out of the ordinary and in their effort to be clever make themselves ridiculous." Hereunder is a passage from the Lavaite publication:

The stages of struggle, therefore, is composed of three major parts according to the balance of the subjective strength of the contending forces. In the *first stage*, the forces of the state against the forces of the revolutionary movement is stronger. This is the stage of the *strategic defensive*. Because the aim in this stage is to make the forces of the movement balance those of the State, it is only reasonable that the primary task of revolutionaries should be to organize and arouse the large part of the Filipino masses. Also at this stage, the national crisis begins to spread. The ripening of the national crisis also means the occurrence of the revolutionary situation. This leads to the *second stage*: the stage of the relative equilibrium of forces. This is the stage of *strategic counteroffensive*. If the revolutionary Movement has no sufficient preparation to meet this task and hesitates to accomplish this, it is only natural that the revolution will not happen. But if during the stage of strategic defensive, the movement prepares for this stage, it will not encounter difficulty in shifting its general tactics from parliamentary struggle to the waging of People's War. It is in the ability of the tactical leadership that the increasing adherents of revolution

can be mobilized and placed in the front ranks of people's war. This needs quick action on the part of the movement in order to adapt to the geographical limitation of the Philippines; otherwise, it will be defeated by the State because of her advanced war materiel especially in transportation, communication, military bases and modern weapons of war. This existing concrete situation dictates the necessity for the quick shift to the third stage of struggle, the stage of general offensive. The primary task under this condition is the seizure of power.

It is clear in the conditions described above that the stage in which we find ourselves today is the first stage of struggle—the stage of Strategic Defensive. At this stage, the revolutionary movement enters the last step of *Strategic Defensive* and is within view of the second stage of the struggle—the *Strategic Counteroffensive*. The legal form of struggle is still the main tactic of the period....

The Lava revisionist renegades are out of their wits if they believe that their principal form of struggle which is parliamentary struggle will prepare the strategic offensive. They have not learned at all from the line of parliamentary struggle adopted formally by Jesus Lava since 1956; it is a line that has sabotaged and subverted the revolutionary mass movement. But they still have the temerity to wish that it should have been adopted earlier and should have lasted even longer. They wish to skip stages in people's war and hope for a putsch in the cities someday. This subjectivist thinking links Right opportunism to "Left" opportunism. All Communists should be forewarned that there are these scoundrels who would first enjoy themselves in their airconditioned rooms and peddle the "radical reforms" of US imperialism and who would scheme to infiltrate a few gangsters into the ranks of the revolutionaries when the strategic offensive shall be on as a result of the victorious conduct of the prior stages of strategic defensive and strategic stalemate in people's war.

In mass demonstrations, we have already had a preview of what these Lava revisionist renegades are capable of doing. They bring in a few people with large banners and then attempt to sabotage and: subvert the revolutionary mass movement from within by howling revisionist, chauvinist and bourgeois pacifist slogans. At the same time, they have a few other hooligans of their own who commit acts of provocation and vandalism against the people so that they can peddle their pro-imperialist and pro-Marcos Rightist line under the pretext of combating what they call "Left adventurism." It is now characteristic for the Nemenzos, Dizons and Torreses to be babbling about the question of "strategic offensive" in connection with the militant demonstrations of the new democratic cultural revolution or with workers' strikes while the Lavas, Santosos, Mallaris and Pascuals order a handful of hooligans to combine with the fascist agents of the US-Marcos clique to disrupt the mass actions which are the "parliament of the streets." We must be uncompromising and kick these scoundrels out of our midst again and again until they can no longer stand up. Their behavior now while

their "main form" is parliamentary struggle will be their behavior when their "main form" shall be armed struggle.

While they are at their kind of parliamentary struggle, they oppose the revolutionary mass movement, whether it be the first quarter storm or the second upsurge of 1970 or the strikes against the oil firms and various firms or the temporary seizure of schools. Taking the name of Comrade Stalin in vain in the style of the Brezhnev gang, they refer to him only to adorn their erroneous view that there is yet no revolutionary flow. Pretending to be Marxists, they stick such labels as "Left adventurism," "petty bourgeois revolutionism," "romanticism" and the like on what has been clearly defined as the strike movement and the national democratic cultural revolution of a new type. When they monopolize or successfully infiltrate an organization, they use it to attack us as they have done with the Movement for the Advancement of Nationalism. In the countryside, their minions peddle the Agricultural Land Reform Code, swindle or extort from the peasant masses, engage in cattle rustling, organize BSDUs and inform on and attack the Party and the people's army. Give them quarters and they strike you down.

The Lava revisionist renegades say that they need to have parliamentary struggle as the "main form" first so that they can engage in the "politicization and organization of the masses." Does armed struggle preclude these? No! In our case, politics is in command of armed struggle which is our principal form of struggle, and of parliamentary struggle which is our secondary form of struggle. It is in command of everything that we do at any stage. In the countryside, armed struggle cannot be developed without arousing, organizing and mobilizing the peasant masses and without building Party branches, local organs of political power, the barrio mass organizations and the local guerrillas and local militias. The subjective forces for revolution are being built up because objective conditions for revolution now exist. These subjective forces are further developing the objective forces and conditions for revolution. It is utterly Rightist for the Lava revisionist renegades to make the mock pledge that they "will wage armed struggle on a large scale when objective conditions shall ripen" for them.

In the meantime, the Lava revisionist renegades through the July 4, 1971 issue of *Ang Gabay* try to intimidate, belittle and scorn those who are interested in revolutionary armed struggle by sweepingly calling them "romanticist youth," "adventurist children" and "petty bourgeois students and lumpen" whom they consider to be unworthy of joining the ranks of their "people's army" and the ranks of "professional revolutionaries" like them. These anticommunist scoundrels rail that those who wish so much to join the people's army or know the existence of such an organization are merely showing "low consciousness" and are being aware of "only one way of increasing their efforts." They beat their breasts and bellow that it is they and not others who can decide as to who should join the guerrillas and as to when the "cruel blow of people's war" should be unleashed. They also say that for the broad masses of the people to take the road of armed revolution

now is to go against "the decision of the people's army." What "people's army" are these anticommunist scoundrels talking about in the first place?

Ang Gabay states:

But despite the truth that conditions are not ripe yet in order to shift the main tactic to the waging of armed struggle, many among the ranks of petty-bourgeois students and lumpen are demanding that this process is hastened to accommodate their desire to join the People's Army. This romanticist youth do not understand that the People's Army constitutes only the most conscious, most disciplined, most reliable and most determined elements from the revolutionary ranks. These adventurist children cannot understand that their weak will that surfaces especially in the period of tactical defeat or when confronted with serious problems even only in the ranks of legal organization, is one of the major reasons why they cannot be accepted by the People's Army. Their reasoning that their joining the People's Army or their knowledge about the existence of this organization is the only way of increasing their efforts is not a reason of a true revolutionary but is oily a sign of their low consciousness. They should understand that the People's Army in the Philippines under the leadership of the PKP continues to exist and continues to fight wherever it is.

Although it is true that the prominence of the People's Army is fully inspiring, this should not be made the basis for the activity or non-activity of revolutionaries especially of revolutionaries who have been assigned to man the parliamentary struggle. It is not their task to decide whether they can join the guerrillas and they have no right to insist on counting themselves among the ranks of professional revolutionaries. It is not their task to decide when the People's Army should fully unleash the cruel blows of people's war and they have no right to wage this against the decision of the People's Army.

In their bulletin of anticommunism, the Lava revisionist renegades disparage as "cowboy ideology" such Marxist-Leninist statements of Chairman Mao Zedong as "Political power grows out of the barrel of a gun" and "Without a people's army, the people have nothing." They slander us by claiming that we hold the gun as a "fetish." Is it a fetish when the Party commands the gun? It is their fascist gangsterism that proves their "cowboy ideology." They put themselves to ridicule when they try to twist our stand that armed revolution is the only road to national and social liberation. Between the two aspects of revolutionary struggle, armed and parliamentary, it is armed struggle that is the determinant and is the principal aspect. What is essential to Marxism-Leninism is that it stands for revolutionary violence against counterrevolutionary violence and that it stands for proletarian dictatorship. The moment we fail to grasp this truth we become counterrevolutionary revisionists.

The best proof that the principal form of struggle today is the armed struggle is not only the fact that the main body of Party cadres and members is engaged in armed struggle but also the fact that most of the masses

organized by the Party and the New People's Army are in the countryside enthusiastically participating in various ways in the armed struggle. While so far the urban legal mass organizations have aroused and mobilized the masses in several tens of thousands for each public meeting at Plaza Miranda and have made recruitment of members from them only in part, the Party and the New People's Army have brought under local organs of political power and barrio mass organizations at least 300,000 people in Northern Luzon and Central Luzon. This figure does not yet include those in the guerrilla bases and guerrilla zones in other regions. It is quite evident that the people are more enthusiastic when they have armed power. There is a big qualitative difference between the people that we have organized and those misled into being enrolled into the Masaka. We are supported in our life-and-death struggles with the enemy, whereas the mythical membership of Masaka has not succeeded in making real the bureaucratic ambitions of the Lavaite ringleaders who run in reactionary elections.

In the cities, the revolutionary masses have become increasingly militant because they recognize that their efforts serve to inspire the Party cadres and Red fighters in the countryside and to promote the armed revolution on a nationwide scale. They put their trust in the Communist Party of the Philippines because it has a force for destroying the enemy and defending the people's democratic interests. That is the very reason why the Lava revisionist renegades resort to all kinds of lies against the New People's Army and now flaunt their Monkees-Armeng Bayan-Masaka gang so as to achieve their evil counterrevolutionary purpose of subverting and sabotaging the revolutionary mass movement in the cities as well as in the countryside.

The Lavaite bulletin of anticommunism keeps on slandering us. It says:

While denouncing in venal terms what he calls "the misleaders of the 1950s," Guerrero is actually repeating the same errors committed by the Central Committee under the Jose Lava leadership.

Guerrero also mocks the idea of strategic counteroffensive advanced by Comrade Jesus Lava at the ebb of the revolutionary tide. But again he upholds the very philosophy underlying it. He asserts that a counteroffensive is the best way to restore morale and redeem the sagging militancy of the masses. Last year, he tried to put this into practice in Tarlac, and the result was worse ₁ disaster. Instead of reversing the tide, it isolated his organization. ₁

We are fond of quoting the Lava revisionist renegades because that is a good way of catching their lies. Here as usual they imagine us saying or doing something and then in black and white they write that we have said or done it. They would rather invent an assertion from Chairman Amado Guerrero than quote a passage from the writings and policy statements that he has made which are well circulated. What errors of Jose Lava are being repeated? What "strategic counteroffensive," what "sagging militancy," what "disaster" and what "isolation" are they babbling about? Once more we tell the Lava revisionist renegades that while there is a great difference between the line of protracted armed struggle and their line of protracted

parliamentary struggle there is also a great difference between the line of protracted struggle and Lavaite putschism. There is a great difference between our being on the strategic defensive now and our being on the strategic offensive in the future. Also, there is a great difference between our being on the strategic defensive now and the malicious Lavaite imputation to us of the wrong belief that now is the time for the strategic offensive. Once more we say that the Jose-Jesus Lava leadership was stupid for adopting a putschist line and a two-year timetable in 1950 and once more we say that Jesus Lava was stupid in adopting a policy of strategic counteroffensive after the 1950 debacle, when there was no basis for such a policy and when the enemy was on strategic offensive.

Regarding the masses today, their militancy keeps on rising. The Lava revisionist renegades are fond of claiming disasters and isolation befalling the New People's Army. Their propaganda is supplementary to that of the US-Marcos clique, particularly the reactionary armed forces. The fact is that the fascist allies of the Lavaites in Task Force Lawin are getting dizzy with more and more guerrilla bases and guerrilla zones emerging on an unprecedented scale in Northern Luzon and Central Luzon. The BSDUs about which the Lava revisionist renegades are so ecstatic are either being wiped out or bringing themselves and their arms to the New People's Army. Mistaking their ill will for reality, the Lavaites ask why, if the New People's Army is already crushed, Chairman Amado Guerrero and Comrade Dante are not yet apprehended. Then they make the most malicious answer to their own question: "The PKP Intelligence Bureau can neither reject nor confirm rumors that they are protected by powerful figures in the ruling class." Such irrationality and such rumormongering now prevail among the Lava revisionist renegades. What we have confirmed about the tale that the NPA is already "crushed" and that Chairman Amado Guerrero and Comrade Dante have "broken up" is that the Lavaite rumormonger Haydee Yorac and Benigno Aquino are among the main informants of Eduardo Lachica for his anticommunist book *Huk: Philippine Agrarian Society in Revolt*. This book has exactly the same ideas as those expressed in the Lavaite bulletin of anticommunism. This book has been published by the local CIA conduit, Solidaridad Publishing House.

In *Peace, Freedom and Socialism* (December 1970), the Lavaite William J. Pomeroy states in reference to the period 1948-56 in the Philippines:

There was a leftist tendency to project the armed struggle to the exclusion of other forms of struggle, and a similar tendency to assert the full hegemony of the Communist Party of the Philippines over the national liberation struggle to the neglect of a broad anti-imperialist struggle.

It was indeed "Left" opportunist of both the Jose and Jesus Lava leaderships "to project armed struggle to the exclusion of other forms of struggle" and, we add, to order the people's army to seize political power in Manila in two years' time without the real mass basis for it. But here in the same passage the revisionist hack and US imperialist agent Pomeroy introduces the brazen counterrevolutionary idea that: to assert the

leadership of the Communist Party of the Philippines in the struggle for national liberation is to neglect a broad anti-imperialist struggle. We insist that the three magic weapons of the Philippine revolution are: the Communist Party of the Philippines, the New People's Army and the national united front.

The Lava revisionist renegades express through Pomeroy in *Peace, Freedom and Socialism* their view on Philippine reactionary elections in the following manner:

The boycott call [against the presidential election of November 1969] stressed that it was not intended to reject the electoral process, but to condemn its corruption and misuse to serve the interests of a few.

Adopting the slogan of boycott but dishonest about practicing it, the Lava revisionist renegades put up one of their ringleaders, Alejandro Briones, as candidate for congressman in the second district of Tarlac in 1969. Briones even had the temerity to send an emissary to the Party and the New People's Army to ask for "cooperation" and "support" in October 1969. It was at this occasion that the emissary of Briones boasted about the "Armeng Bayan." (This was before the discovery of its crimes of bloody intrigue.) Briones was rebuffed, of course. He lost the election as one of the tail-enders among at least ten candidates, where a single sizeable bloc of votes would have meant a lot.

The participation of the Lava revisionist renegades in reactionary elections is a good gauge of what they call their "peasant strength." In 1967, Briones had also run for mayor in his own hometown of Vitoria, Tarlac and had lost. Together with other reactionaries, the Lava revisionist renegades have become discredited. They come out as having neither bourgeois strength nor "peasant strength." They rationalize that their electoral failures are successes because their purpose in the first place is "not to win but to explain."

Such an explanation is bankrupt. The Lavaites leave themselves open to the accusation, which is truthful, that they are mere "nuisance" candidates out to make money on some reactionary candidates by splitting the votes of other reactionary candidates. They cannot compare themselves to the Bolsheviks in their electoral struggles for the Duma. One thing that can be said immediately is that revolutionary cadres in the countryside of a semicolonial and semifeudal country have all the chances for conducting mass work on a daily basis. What the main Lavaite organization, the "peasant" Masaka, does is to prostrate itself before reactionary candidates for funds every election time and before the reactionaries in power for the same stuff off-election time.

Let us now take a very outstanding statement in the Lavaite bulletin of anticommunism:

Parliamentary struggle does not mean putting up candidates for elective positions in order to transform the nature of the neocolonial government. It simply means laying stress on infiltration of public

institutions and legal organizations, and utilizing and broadening whatever democratic rights are available.

Factually, is not top Lavaite Alejandro Briones representative of several Lava revisionist ringleaders running for top reactionary posts? That may, however, be considered one of the Lavaite methods of "infiltration." Top ringleaders of the Lava revisionist renegades are employed in the Court of Appeals, Commission on Elections, Land Authority, Bureau of Soils, University of the Philippines, UP Law Center, National Intelligence Coordinating Agency, Counter-Intelligence Unit of the Philippine Constabulary, Task Force Lawin and the like. These "infiltrators" account for at least 80% of their bogus central committee. While we recognize that they have "infiltrated" the reactionary government, we also recognize that they have been infiltrated by it to the extent that they have become the cheap fascist tools of the US-Marcos clique.

Maravilla also expresses in *Peace, Freedom and Socialism* the position of the Lava revisionist renegades on the constitutional convention:

The Communist Party, while prepared to fight issues wherever they arise, including in the struggle for constitutional reform in which it will fight for the adoption of democratic amendments, has warned of the futility of expecting democratic changes from neocolonial bourgeois bodies in which the people and their organizations are not represented and has insisted that changes can come only from mass struggles.

Shorn of its embellishment, this passage lays bare the Lavaite theory of "end parliamentarism through parliamentarism." So they will fight for "constitutional reform," for the adoption of "democratic amendments." Since their line has been that "all legal possibilities must first be exhausted," we raise the question whether the revisionists, once better placed in the reactionary state would ever tire not only of presidential decrees, congressional bills, and court decisions but also of constitutional conventions.

The Lava revisionist renegades issued sometime last year a statement of their bogus political bureau on the constitutional convention. The statement goes:

The fact that the Constitutional Convention in the context of the present alignment of forces will never realize the ultimate goals of the national democratic movement is not sufficient ground to adopt a policy of boycott.

Take note of the doubletalk in the same statement. Also take note of the disparity between the statement and the "boycott" pronouncements of some Lavaite outfits like BRPF and MPKP.

Again taking the name of the masses in vain, the statement of the bogus political bureau of the Lava revisionist renegades runs further:

On the basis of first-hand reports from cadres who work daily among the masses of workers and peasants, (we are) convinced that illusions about the possibilities of reforms through the Constitutional Convention

are still widespread. In other words, this specific type of parliamentary institution is not yet politically obsolete.

The Lava revisionist renegades always follow the reactionaries in arranging the agenda of counterrevolution and take to every fashion and farce the reactionaries design.

Taking the name of the Communist Party of the Philippines in vain, the Lavaite statement continues:

The other form of participation which PKP considers to be the most realistic under existing circumstances is designed to help the masses learn from life itself, through their own experience, the futility of parliamentarism, of constitutional reforms. In implementing this, four concrete steps are suggested:

1) Support candidates who include in their platforms and actually campaign for the basic goal of the national democratic movement. It is not enough for them to promise that, once elected, they will carry the voice of the Movement in the Convention. The campaign is a more important vehicle for political education than the Convention debates.

2) Distribute leaflets and organize teams of hecklers and agitators for joint rallies sponsored by the COMELEC. The objective is to instigate discussion of basic national issues, specifically to expose the bankruptcy of conservatism and the futility of reformism.

3) Organize mass rallies during the Convention to demand elimination of Parity, rejection of the "vested rights theory," confiscation of big landholdings and properties of American monopolies, removal of the government's power to restrict the rights of political dissent and industrial strikes, etc.

4) Since the Convention delegates will represent the vested interests in a neocolonial society they will surely ignore these demands. Therefore, it is necessary to prepare the campaign machinery for a "NO" vote in the plebiscite.

Romerico Flores, the Bulacan chieftain of the Lavaite outfit Masaka, expressed most clearly in his "Masaka Day" (September 19) speech the line of the Lava revisionist renegades:

In order that the Filipino people become sure about the improvement of the Constitution which is the life and soul of our society, it is necessary to use the power of the people. The full change of the Constitution in accordance with requirements of modern society is needed. This depends on the representatives of the people who cannot be bought with the money and power of the foreigners and the Filipino reactionaries who are not ashamed to betray the interests of our country. The representatives who come from the ranks of the masses who understand and feel the situation and requirements of the majority of the people. The Malayang Samahang Magsasaka agrees to the full change in the form of our government. A parliamentary government wherein the representatives come from every sector of our society according to their function and number. [Our translation.]

Romerico Flores himself ran for the constitutional convention and lost despite the much-vaunted "peasant" strength of the Lava revisionist renegades in Bulacan, the home province of the Lavas. His comic antics are representative of those of so many Lava revisionist renegades who ran for the constitutional convention in Nueva Ecija and Laguna and used all sorts of Lavaite tricks including the art of heckling imported direct from Hyde Park by their chief theorist, only to lose miserably. As in every reactionary election that they participate in, the Lava revisionist renegades only succeed in giving their approval to the reactionary elections and at the same time discrediting themselves before the people. Such parliamentary opportunism is abhorrent.

The Lava revisionist renegades are inveterate bourgeois constitutionalists and lapdogs of US imperialism. They attack the organizations exposing the constitutional convention as a farce. They do not believe that the masses are for a genuine revolution. So they say in *Sang-ayon sa MAN* (June 12, 1971):

There are organizations which from the very beginning have expressly stated that we won't get anything from this CONCON. They outrightly call this a dupery and dissuade the masses from getting involved in this convention because it is claimed that we won't get anything from this. There are also organizations which held demonstrations at the same time that the convention was opened and posted costly "posters" condemning the convention. Is this tactic correct?

Let us further analyze some facts existing until today. There are still more people today who still believe that we can achieve change without going through a bloody revolution and killing among fellow countrymen. In short, people who believe that we can achieve significant changes through mere reforms and not through revolution. The number of people who hope that this ¹ CONCON will be the solution to our problems is still considerably larger than the number of progressives. There are still so many people who get irritated at the abusive and insulting language of the so-called progressives who seem to consider that nobody is right except them. These people who still constitute the majority are what we call the masses of the Filipino people. Under such circumstances, how can we persuade and attract these so-called masses?

All the distinctions that the Lava revisionist renegades have made between the "struggle for reforms" and reformism are hogwash. It is clear in the foregoing passage that after all they hold the view that the people believe that "we can achieve significant changes through mere reforms and not through revolution." This is unadulterated reformism. It falls into line with the Lavaite motto: "To a revolutionary, reform and revolution are interrelated and one cannot be emphasized at the expense of the other."

The Lava revisionist renegades will say anything to slander the national democratic organizations such as calling revolutionary propaganda as mere "vandalism," "rudeness" and "vulgarity" as in the following:

We have also noticed that some organizations put so many printed wall posters stating that the CONCON is a deception on the people. They seem to ask the people not to participate in and rely on this show. But in our opinion, in spite or precisely because of the profusion of wall posters expressing this warning, people do not pay attention to these writings because what they have in mind is that these are done by troublemakers and are a type of "vandalism" which do not appeal to them. Especially if we consider that those who do these practically do not realize that their actions do not attract but alienate masses because of the common rudeness and vulgarity of the words they use and the people whom they abuse in such manner are people who are more recognized and honored by the majority and the common people than those who write these but who do not want themselves known or who do not identify themselves.

Despite the fact that they did not succeed in electing a single candidate to the constitutional convention (certainly Lichauco and Guinigundo are not Lavaites!), the Lava revisionist renegades prate what a fine thing it would be if the reactionary constitutional convention would just proclaim in the preamble of the constitution "our genuine Independence" as proof of "our being nationalist." In all Lavaite gatherings, this sort of proclamation is done at the drop of a hat but so far the Lava revisionist renegades on their own continue to subvert and sabotage the revolutionary mass movement. Reading the passage below is once more hearing an old idealist nonsense from Francisco Lava, Sr., the notorious crackpot and grey eminence of the Lava revisionist renegades:

It is enough to show that as proof of our lack of independence the government cannot decide as to the definite date of our independence. Before, it was celebrated every July 4th. But when this act of ours was exposed and became shameful which shows our servitude to the Americans, this was transferred to a new date and this became June 12 as set by Macapagal who is a diehard puppet of the Americans.

But, any researcher who studies the independence allegedly proclaimed by Aguinaldo in Kawit, Cavite in 1899 proves that this freedom was empty... In other words, we are still a "protectorate" and a colony of the United States and without independence.

Therefore, it is only correct that the "PREAMBLE" of the CONSTITUTION WHICH WILL BE ADOPTED SHOULD PROCLAIM OUR GENUINE INDEPENDENCE AS A PROOF OF OUR BEING NATIONALIST.

The Lava revisionist renegades take up the pretense of criticizing the erroneous "Left" opportunist lines of Jose and Jesus Lava only from 1948 to 1955 but they do not really have any clear idea what these exactly were or are simply dishonest about them. Thus, two hilarious results come from their "criticism and self-criticism and rectification": First, they misrepresent the disastrous "Left" opportunist lines of Jose and Jesus Lava as the application of Chairman Mao's theory of protracted people's war and strategic line of encircling the cities from the countryside. Second, they use today the "Left"

opportunism of Jose and Jesus Lava to justify Right opportunism. They support the Right opportunist line which Jesus Lava formally adopted in 1956 and chide him for not having adopted it earlier as the renegade and anticommunist Luis Taruc had proposed. So, the Lavaite bulletin of anticommunism states: "In the opinion of the present PKP leadership, the mistake Comrade Jesus Lava made was not in shifting emphasis from armed struggle to parliamentary struggle, but in shifting too late." Afterwards, it turns to abusing the masses for their "stupidity" and "dupery" in believing Magsaysay.

The dishonesty and malice of the Lava revisionist renegades in their "criticism and self-criticism and rectification" became utterly clear when they concentrate on misrepresenting the Communist Party of the Philippines and the New People's Army as "Left adventurist" and on claiming themselves to have learned lessons from the past. They quote Comrade Lenin several times only to attack Comrade Lenin and even Chairman Mao once to attack Chairman Mao. They always leave these quotations hanging in their propaganda. These are merely used as sugarcoating for every Lavaite attempt to muddle issues. It would be to offend Comrade Lenin if one were to quote him about the concrete analysis of concrete conditions only to fail in making the concrete analysis of concrete conditions in one's own country. It is the obnoxious style of the Lava revisionist renegades to preach above the heads of the great masses of our people.

VII. The Lavaite Theory of "Enlightened New Imperialism" and "US Imperialism Is Serious about Land Reform"

The Lava revisionist renegades have thoroughly converted the Movement for the Advancement of Nationalism (MAN) into their antinational, antidemocratic and anticommunist instrument. It is being used to attack not only Chairman Amado Guerrero, the Communist Party of the Philippines and the New People's Army but also its founding general secretary Jose Ma. Sison and various noncommunist national democratic mass organizations against which the Lava revisionist renegades have special spite.

What has become of the Movement for the Advancement of Nationalism? Twenty-three members of its 38-man national council are running dogs of the Lava revisionist renegades and a number of these are the top ringleaders of the Lava revisionist renegade clique. At least 90% of its mass membership are redundant members of such Lavaite outfits as Masaka, MPKP, BRPF, KILUSAN, CTUP, Nationalist Lawyers' League and the like. The small membership of the bogus communist party of the Lava revisionist renegades has become an open affair in MAN. One simply has to take note of the same few persons assuming positions here and redundantly in two or three other Lavaite organizations to observe who is who.

An examination of the contents of MAN publications like *Sang-ayon sa MAN* and *Political Review* shows that, under the pretext of attacking only the person of founding MAN general secretary Jose Ma. Sison, MAN actually

attacks more entities, the Communist Party of the Philippines, the New People's Army and noncommunist national democratic mass organizations. In contrast with its pretended attack of the evils of US imperialism, feudalism and bureaucrat capitalism, it uses the vilest and most vulgar language to slander patriotic and progressive entities, persons and organizations, which have proven themselves to be the most militant fighters in the struggle for national democracy. The Lava revisionist renegades have also used MAN as a platform for making counterrevolutionary attacks against Mao Zedong, the Communist Party of China and communism.

What is behind the actions and actuations of MAN? Everything can be traced to the Lavaite theory of "enlightened new imperialism" consecrated by the MAN Second National Congress, which marked the Lavaite takeover of the organization. This theory is a refurbishing of Kautsky's revisionist theory of "supra-imperialism" which Lenin had roundly repudiated.

The program of MAN, "MAN's GOAL: The Democratic Filipino Society," gives the gist of this theory of "enlightened new imperialism":

This colonial line ... may be stated as the promotion of capitalist development in the Third World under the hegemony of foreign monopolists. For this reason, various client-states of the United States have sponsored, with the support of the latter, land reform, tax reforms, reforms in public administration, community development programs and others. All these permit some form of local capitalism to succeed.

Like their classical revisionist predecessors and their Soviet revisionist masters, the Lava revisionist renegades make a lot of postal, against US imperialism. But in the final analysis, they wish to spread the counterrevolutionary idea that US imperialism permits the development of local capitalism in a semicolonial and semifeudal country. To befuddle others, they make a lot of fuss distinguishing what they call "colonial" and "national" industrialization. But their main point is to attack the Marxist-Leninist view that imperialism, after linking with feudalism, arrests rather than promotes the development of capitalism in colonies and semicolonies. A certain quantitative growth of local industries in the Philippines cannot be considered a qualitative change nullifying the Leninist theory on imperialism as the final stage of capitalism.

That US imperialism is now being wracked by an internal crisis, being beset with military defeats abroad and trying frantically to draw more and more profits from accumulated foreign direct investments and extremely onerous loan capital exports should convince everyone that it will not promote capitalist development in the Philippines. It is completely false, contrary to the claims of Jesus Lava, that US imperialism will destroy its feudal social base and create a full-fledged capitalist society in the Philippines in the classic style of development of pre-monopoly capitalism. The Lava revisionist renegades take the view that this capitalist development is certain and that the only issue to be debated on is whether this be "colonial" or "national."

The Lava revisionist renegades go to every length to picture US imperialism as almighty. They obscure its bankrupt political and economic position at home and abroad. They underestimate the rebellions and strike movement of American workers, colored minorities, students and now even the imperialist troops. They minimize and express disdain for the revolutionary armed struggles of the oppressed peoples and nations in Vietnam, Cambodia, Laos, Palestine, Thailand, India, Burma, Indonesia, Malaya, Philippines and elsewhere in Asia, Africa and Latin America. They refuse to see that the imperialist powers, especially US imperialism and Soviet social-imperialism, must collude yet bitterly contend with each other because the areas for neocolonial exploitation is rapidly shrinking. They foolishly deny the immediate and long-term effects of the consolidated position of socialist China in the world proletarian revolution. The irrepressible and colossal growth of the world revolutionary forces has long ago changed the course of world history from capitalism to socialism. And today the world revolutionary situation is becoming more and more excellent.

Consistent with their bleak view of the world struggle against US Imperialism and world capitalism, the Lava revisionist renegades go to every length to attack the national democratic revolution. They concede to US imperialism the "enlightened" role of making "land reform" and permitting local capitalism "to succeed." They welcome the very "tax reforms" now being used to suck more blood from the broad masses of the people as something as positive as the US-inspired "land reform." They also welcome the "reforms in public administration" now being used to facilitate the rise of counterinsurgency and fascism in the same manner.

The MAN program concedes to US imperialism the ability to provide anti-nationalists with an omnipotent weapon:

Since there would be marked improvement in the living conditions of some sectors of the population, this tactic, if not exposed, would provide anti nationalists not only with a weapon with which to challenge the concept of attainment of national power as a precondition to the achievement of change, but also as a means to entice some sectors of the nationalist factors to abandon their anti-imperialist position.

The poisonous idea of the Lava revisionist renegades is very clear. They concede everything to US imperialism and the "anti-nationalist forces." They actually tell us that if US imperialism would improve living conditions here there is no more need to fight it. They trap themselves in their own inanities. Of what use would be the flimsy weapon of mere "exposure" supposedly wielded by them against the weapon of "improved living conditions" supposedly wielded by US imperialism?

The editorial of the April-May 1971 issue of *Political Review* states: "Imperialism is in full-scale offensive for effecting radical reforms to prevent another Cuba." The implication of this statement is that US imperialism can do anything as it pleases to frustrate the efforts of the revolutionary masses.

The editorial goes on:

The imperialist-controlled "revolutionary situation" is more than artificial show. It is an earnest recognition that the whole social setting must undergo revamp if capitalism is to survive at all. Revolutionism could awaken the backward elements of the ruling classes to the gravity of the political and economic crisis. More than that it could lead to reforms that effect a refinement in the operation of the exploitative system in order to keep the oppressed masses in good humor again. To say that the imperialist aim is merely to get rid of President Marcos and his greenish-revolutionary spouse is to take a very limited view of the situation. Under attack are the outmoded forms of political and economic exploitation that stand on the way to more "enlightened" capitalist construction, or in the first place, its survival.

What a profound stupidity is the Lava revisionist renegades' profound belief that the revolutionary situation emanating from the real internal and external crisis of US imperialism is artificial show! More profoundly stupid and more profoundly counterrevolutionary is their belief that the "revolutionism" of the oppressed masses is "more than an artificial show" only in the sense that it is all made up by US imperialism to "awaken the backward elements of the ruling classes" and "to lead to reforms that effect a refinement in the operation of the exploitative system to keep the oppressed masses in good humor again." Only running dogs of US imperialism are capable of such twisted thinking in the face of reality. Only traitors are capable of such hopes as that US imperialism is after all the mastermind behind revolutionary activities that "backward elements of the ruling classes" are being pressed to join up with the "advanced elements" of the ruling classes and that a "refinement" of exploitation "will keep the oppressed masses in good humor again." What is all this convoluted analysis of the Lava revisionist renegades for? They wish to spread the poisonous idea that US imperialism itself is making the attack on the outmoded forms of political and economic exploitation in order to remove the obstacles towards "more 'enlightened' capitalist construction, or in the first place, its survival." The Lavaites are consistent believers of Kautsky's theory of "supra-imperialism." Actually, in the first place, they do not think that US imperialism is in any real crisis. Inflation, increased unemployment, devaluation, balance of payments problem, higher taxes and all other incontrovertible manifestations of crisis in the country today must be to them either figments of the imagination or tactical moves of US imperialism to strengthen itself further.

It is very clear why the Movement for the Advancement of Nationalism has taken the line of "letting the Laurel-Langley Agreement lapse but letting the Investment Incentives Law take over." It has long agreed to the replacement of the phrase "parity rights" with the phrase "national treatment." We are no longer surprised why even as the Investment Incentives Law had been enacted in 1967, the Lavaite MAN never questioned it or even mentioned it in its program. This Investment Incentives Law is

even worse than the Laurel-Langley Agreement. And the constitutional convention which the Lava revisionist renegades have endorsed is going to bless this new law, together with several other legal devices, to prolong US imperialist domination.

Senator Lorenzo M. Tanada, co-author of the Investment Incentives Law and chairman of MAN, openly expressed in his keynote address to the Second National Congress of MAN the "nationalist" view that "just compensation" be paid to American shareholders who sell out; that foreign capital be attracted and given incentives; that more stock exchanges be put up; that foreign investment be spread out among as many foreign nationals as possible (including Japan and the Soviet Union, of course); and the like.

What is certainly unique about a document like the MAN program is that it does not even pretend to be addressed to the Filipino people but to the Philippine reactionary state. Since its Second National Congress, MAN has not engaged in anti-imperialist mass actions that are as purposive and as militant as those of the first quarter storm of 1970. Instead, the Lava revisionist renegades have completely transformed MAN into their clique instrument in conducting malicious attacks against the revolutionary mass movement and in supporting their petty parliamentary struggle.

The revisionist scoundrel Jesus Lava states in his Camp Crame article regarding the Agricultural Land Reform Code:

American imperialist self-interest in this regard is truly enlightened; it seeks to perpetuate its dominance by splitting the peasantry from the national movement for emancipation, by isolating the anti-imperialist nationalists from the peasantry.

There are two major points in this treacherous statement. First, US imperialism is presented as capable of splitting the peasantry from the national democratic revolution with a sham land reform program such as the Agricultural Land Reform Code. Second, US imperialism is "enlightened." All these points constitute another resurrection of Kautsky's theory of "supra-imperialism" which harps on the unlimited capability of imperialism to extend its life by going against its own moribund and decadent nature as the final stage of capitalism. All these constitute an attack against Lenin who clearly proved in his great theory on imperialism that imperialism allies itself with the most reactionary feudal interests to counteract the bourgeois democratic revolution in colonies and semicolonies.

Jesus Lava states:

The American imperialists are not joking in their desire to effect land reform. The alliance of the imperialists and feudalists became truly effective during the time of classical or old colonialism. In truth, the main requirement for the life of imperialism then was to be able to get the content of mines, to establish big plantations which plant raw materials needed by factories in the US, like sugar, abaca, coconut, pineapple, etc. and to export their finished products.

In a new situation like this, the persistence of feudalism in the countryside (the alliance of the imperialists and feudalists) previously

was able to help the long-term interest of imperialism, and was able to establish its power in colonies has turned into the opposite—it has become the danger to its power, and has become the fuse for the collapse of the imperialists in the neocolony.

Here, Jesus Lava in bad sentence constructions [which should be confirmed by the reader by referring to his article] equates feudalism and the national democratic revolution to each other and mixes them up as similarly a danger to US imperialism.

In *Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism*, the great Lenin said:

The bourgeois reformists, and among them particularly the present-day adherents of Kautsky, of course, try to belittle the importance of facts of this kind by arguing that it "would be possible" to obtain raw materials in the open market without a "costly and dangerous" colonial policy; and that it "would be possible" to increase the supply of raw materials to an enormous extent "simply" by improving conditions in agriculture in general. But such arguments become an apology for imperialism, an attempt to embellish it, because they ignore the principal feature of the latest stage of capitalism: monopolies. Free markets are becoming more and more a thing of the past; monopolist syndicates and trusts are restricting them more and more every day, and "simply" improving conditions in agriculture means improving the conditions of the masses, raising wages and reducing profits. Where, except in the imagination of sentimental reformists, are there any trusts capable of interesting themselves in the conditions of the masses instead of the conquest of colonies?

It is important to take note that the Lava revisionist renegades are conscious that the Agricultural Land Reform Code is an instrument of US imperialism. They are, therefore, conscious agents of US imperialism in making the implementation of the Agricultural Land Reform Code their main activity in the countryside.

Through the actual operation of this law of sham land reform, with the active complicity and cheering of the Lavaite outfit Masaka, the landlords, have made full use of all provisions that have further oppressed, dispossessed and exploited the peasant masses. It is for this reason that the Lava revisionist renegades are regarded as cheap agents of US imperialism, feudalism and bureaucrat capitalism in the limited areas reached by them in Central Luzon and Southern Luzon.

The Lava revisionist renegades pompously claim to have a "membership" of 100,000 peasants in their Masaka outfit. While it is true that through Masaka they have divested great numbers of people of their money in the form of membership dues, lawyers' fees and "contributions" since 1964, it is clear that these do not constitute stable revolutionary peasant strength. In such swindler outfits as Masaka, KASAKA and Federation of Free Farmers, "members" come and go as fast as they are deceived and as fast as they wake up to the fact that the Agricultural Land Reform Code is all a sham.

What fails the Lava revisionist renegades in their boisterous bluff that they have the support of large "peasant" masses is the obvious fact that since 1964 they have not made any single peasant strike even only in the reformist style of the Khi Rho and the Federation of Free Farmers. It is too much to expect that they are conducting agrarian revolution, which ranges from forcible reduction of rent and interest to the confiscation of land, because such a phenomenon cannot come about "quietly." The landlord class cannot be stopped from raising a howl when agrarian revolution occurs, even if the Lava revisionist renegades prefer to conduct it "without press fanfare" as they claim

The Lava revisionist renegades seem unaware that the general membership of Masaka is fast awakening to the fact that the Masaka has merely encouraged landlords to take advantage of loopholes in the Agricultural Land Reform Code to the detriment of the peasant masses. Thousands upon thousands of former Masaka members curse the Masaka for having fleeced them of membership dues and contributions and also condemn such shysters as Ruben Torres, Haydee Yorac and Merlin Magallona for having collected lawyers' fees from them. In the countryside, Masaka is now called MASAMA (the real acronym of the outfit which means evil) by the masses.

Whenever Party cadres and units of the New People's Army reach the areas where there is or there was a Masaka chapter, the peasant masses pour out their grievances against the local tyrants, which include the despotic landlords, rotten bureaucrats and bad elements from the Masaka who are either extortionists, swindlers or cattle rustlers. The Party and the New People's Army are joyously welcomed or awaited today in areas where the Monkees-Armeng Bayan-Masaka and the Taruc-Sumulong gangster clique have committed various kinds of abuses. Reacting to the advances made by the Party and the New People's Army, the Monkees-Armeng Bayan-Masaka has helped Task Force Lawin in setting up BSDUs.

The Philistine method used by the Lava revisionist renegades in bamboozling the people about their imaginary numbers is to boast when they are in the countryside that they have all the workers, students and professionals in Manila under their command and when they are in Manila that they have all the peasants in the countryside under their command. When they make international press releases through the hack of modern revisionism William J. Pomeroy, they claim to have the revolutionary mass movement under their command in both cities and countryside. They slander the Party, the New People's Army and all national democratic mass organizations as being the beneficiaries of the very counterrevolutionaries that raise hell in the reactionary press and distort facts that the mass protest actions and the military victories of the New People's Army have become so significant and so considerable that the local and international bourgeois press at the least cannot ignore them in their slanted reporting and comments.

The proletariat, student youth and other city-dwellers can never be bluffed by the Lava revisionist renegades. The mass protest actions in cities are unprecedented in magnitude and scale in the entire revolutionary history of the Philippines and these are not the achievements of the isolated Lavaite outfits. Revolutionaries in the cities are also aware that the Communist Party of the Philippines and the New People's Army under its leadership build Party branches, regular guerrilla squads and platoons, local guerrilla and militia units, local organs of political power and barrio mass organizations for workers, peasants, youth, women and children. The Lavaite outfit Masaka impresses no one with its parliamentary "peasant" strength when it cannot even have its ringleaders Alejandro Briones, Romerico Flores, Cesar Arenas and the like elected to the various government posts that they have sought. The electoral frustrations of these Lavaites have not raised the political consciousness of the people. On the other hand, they have only made the Lava revisionist renegades a laughingstock in some towns and in some electoral districts.

VIII. The Lavaite Line of "Taking the Purely Anti-Marcos Line"

The Communist Party of the Philippines and the New People's Army have always expressed full support for the genuine national democratic organizations which have been most militant and consistent in awakening the people in the Greater Manila area and throughout the country to the great revolutionary struggle for national democracy against US imperialism, feudalism and bureaucrat capitalism.

When the great mass actions of unprecedented magnitude and scale broke out in 1970, the Party paid them close attention and issued the statements necessary for inspiring and guiding them. Party cadres in cities and provincial capitals have militantly worked for what has come to be widely known as the new type of national democratic cultural revolution for promoting armed struggle. The course of the revolutionary mass movement in urban areas is defined by the series of Party statements some of which have been compiled under the title First Quarter Storm of 1970.⁵

Inspired by the brilliant development in cities, the Party and the New People's Army have worked and fought even more vigorously in the countryside. They have expanded and consolidated the revolutionary mass movement in the countryside to support the revolutionary mass movement in the cities. The people's war in the countryside is the best answer to the constant threat of martial law and the acts of terrorism perpetrated by the Marcos fascist puppet clique in behalf of US imperialism, feudalism and bureaucrat capitalism.

⁵ Included in Jose Ma. Sison (Amado Guerrero), *Foundation for Resuming the Philippine Revolution: Selected Writings, 1968 to 1972* (INPS and Aklat ng Bayan, 2013). - Editor

To give further profound direction to the revolutionary mass movement in both countryside and cities, Chairman Amado Guerrero has written *Philippine Society and Revolution*, an attempt to give the universal theory of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought a national form and guide the Philippine revolution. This book relates the people's democratic revolution not only to the reestablishment of the Communist Party of the Philippines on December 26, 1968 but also to all previous revolutionary events in Philippine history. It is a comprehensive study involving the main strands of Philippine history, the basic problems of the Filipino people, the social structure and the class logic of the strategy and tactics of the Philippine revolution. Here are presented the character, motive forces, targets and tasks of the Philippine revolution.

The general line of the Communist Party of the Philippines, which is the people's democratic revolution, has been enthusiastically carried out by the revolutionary mass movement. The situation of US imperialism, feudalism and bureaucrat capitalism has seriously worsened. At the same time, the revolutionary mass movement has fundamentally rid itself of such long-term saboteurs and disrupters as the Lava revisionist renegades and has become stronger and more united to its core. Though the Lava revisionist renegades keep on fretting about the failure of their kind of "unity" since 1967, the revolutionary mass movement has made vigorous advances that cannot be denied by anyone who is not blind to the main trend of current history.

No one in his right senses will deny that it is the Communist Party of the Philippines, the New People's Army and the genuine national democratic mass organizations which have been responsible for building up a broad revolutionary mass movement against US imperialism, feudalism and bureaucrat capitalism. Certainly, it is not the Lava revisionist renegades and their bureaucratic and puny outfits. That is a matter of recent history and cannot be twisted by a few badly written articles and manifestos by hacks of the Lava revisionist renegades.

Before we refer to the great achievements of the revolutionary mass movement, which are palpable enough to all, we have taken pains to show the basic counterrevolutionary character of the ideology and political line of the Lava revisionist renegades. As we take up the criminal collusion between the Lavaite traitors, renegades and scabs and the US-Marcos clique, we become ever more convinced that they are enemies of the people deserving of not only all previous ideological and political repudiation but also of more and harder blows for every crime that they commit against the people, the Party, the people's army, the national democratic mass organizations and their leaders.

The collusion between the Lava revisionist renegades and the US-Marcos clique became unmistakably clear during the first quarter storm of 1970. A handful of Lavaites like flies intruding upon a feast of the people invited themselves to the January 26 and 30-31 demonstrations and raised big banners. Later it was discovered that when the demonstrators were subjected to the most brutal fascist treatment like the Mendiola massacre, maiming, mass arrests and mass torture, the handful of Lavaites had

scampered on January 30, 1970 to the safety of an extension office of the fascist puppet chieftain Marcos and were rewarded with sandwiches and soft drinks.

After Marcos delivered his January 31 speech attacking his victims and the great mass of demonstrators as "Maoists," "anarchists" and "mob," the Lava revisionist renegades immediately started to sing the same tune and added refrains of modern revisionism. In succeeding days, the Marcos fascist puppet clique used the Lava revisionist renegades and the still unexposed Lacsina yellow outfit to spread the rumor among the national democratic mass organizations that a massacre would occur if the mass protest rally scheduled for February 12, 1970 at Plaza Miranda would be pushed through. The national democratic mass organizations saw through the tricks of the enemy, unmasked the treachery of the Lava revisionist renegades and proceeded to hold the February 12 mass action and created in full the first quarter storm of 1970—a historic phenomenon of far-reaching significance in the heroic struggle for national democracy against US imperialism, feudalism and bureaucrat capitalism.

Undaunted by their exposure as agents of counterrevolution, particularly as agents of the US-Marcos clique, the Lava revisionist renegades brought out their scab line of accusing the revolutionary mass movement of "taking the purely anti-Marcos line." It is preposterous for them to consider Marcos as nothing more than his own person. They thought that this was a clever idea to defend Marcos. They harped on this line to cover up the strident reality that US imperialism, feudalism and bureaucrat capitalism were for the first time in the entire history of the Philippines being exposed and opposed with utmost clarity and concreteness by the national democratic movement on a nationwide scale.

Throughout 1970 and thereafter, the Marcos ruling faction showed its ugly fascist character and its character as a puppet of US imperialism and as the general representative of the local reactionary classes. As a reaction to the revolutionary mass movement, Marcos reinforced the fascist puppet character of his regime and resorted to using all kinds of fascist tricks to attack and slander the national democratic movement. Despite all these, the Lava revisionist renegades consider themselves clever for having sidled up to Marcos and defending him. They made fools of themselves by claiming in effect to defend the CIA (Alejandro Melchor, Juan Ponce Enrile & Co.) from the CIA (Benigno Aquino, the American Jesuits & Co.). They wish to divide the people into "factions of the CIA." They peddle the counterrevolutionary line that the people are not themselves the motive force of history but a mere plaything of the reactionaries.

The counterrevolutionary character of the Lavaite line accusing the revolutionary mass movement of "taking the purely anti-Marcos line" became utterly clear again when at the beginning of 1971 Marcos was doing everything within his power to oppose the mass protest actions against the US oil companies and the commemoration of the Mendiola massacre. The Lava revisionist renegades unleashed their "special knowledge," issued an

emergency manifesto and spread the rumor that Marcos would be overthrown through a coup d'etat on January 25, 1971 by the CIA, using as pawns Vice President Fernando Lopez, Senator Benigno Aquino, the American Jesuits, the clerico-fascists and the national democratic mass organizations and even the Communist Party of the Philippines and the New People's Army. The Lavaite traitors wanted to make Marcos appear as "no longer useful" to US imperialism at a time that he was making himself extremely useful to US imperialism, particularly in the suppression of worker-student strikes against the US oil companies.

In a ridiculous attempt to appear credible, the top ringleaders of the Lava revisionist renegade clique took leaves of absence from their bureaucratic posts in the reactionary government to "prepare" for the outbreak of violence on the day that they had appointed. It turned out that the clerico-fascists, renaming themselves as the Social Democratic Front, were advocating a "stay-at-home" or "watch-the-television" policy, which was no different from the "take-a-leave-of-absence" or "go-to-Bulacan, Bulacan-or-Cabiao, Nueva Ecija" policy of the Lava revisionist renegades. On its part, the Communist Party of the Philippines issued the timely statement of January 18, 1971 clarifying the issues and criticizing the imputation of "Left" opportunist or putschist ideas to national democratic mass organizations by the US-Marcos clique, the Lava revisionist renegades, the clerico-fascists and other counterrevolutionaries. The Party correctly encouraged the masses to go on with their protest actions and to brave the enemy bluff. The result was that the brazen fascist threats of Marcos, the pseudo-Marxist analysis of the Lava revisionist renegades and the paid advertisements of the Social Democratic Front all fell apart.

Even after January 25, when the masses braved fascist-revisionist threats and held a peaceful militant rally, the Lava revisionist renegades defined the defense of Marcos as their main political task in the January 1971 issue of *Struggle*:

The present main task of the Movement therefore would be to expose this anti-Marcos camp of the ruling classes riding on the wave of popular discontent and posing as champions of genuine reform. Marcos would still be dealt with but the main task of completely discrediting him before the masses has been, for the most part, already accomplished. It would be also a secondary task of the Movement to expose pseudo-revolutionary groups now collaborating with the CIA-managed anti-Marcos camp like the Left adventurist KM, the infantile SDK, the clerico-fascist Lakasdiwa, NUSP, YSP, and that bunch of surrenderees—the NPA.

The above passage speaks of a main task and a secondary task. A careful analysis of this and subsequent Lavaite pronouncements and activities clearly show that to perform their "main task" of attacking the "anti-Marcos camp" the Lava revisionist renegades are actually out to defend the US-Marcos clique and attack the Communist Party of the Philippines, the New People's Army and the noncommunist and legal mass organizations.

In line with their wild counterrevolutionary thinking, the Lava revisionist renegades elaborated on their line accusing the national democratic movement of "taking the purely anti-Marcos line" in *Struggle*. They beg for giving Marcos "understanding":

It would be useless to quarrel over how Marcos should be called; whether it be an agent of neocolonialism or a chief puppet of US imperialism. What is important is to understand the present situation of Marcos in relation to American imperialism and the cleavage within the ruling classes.

The Lavaites still want us to believe that any day now US imperialism will overthrow Marcos. *Struggle* insists: "The CIA has now practically shifted its attention to and bestowed its favor upon the anti-Marcos faction of the ruling classes."

Struggle accuses the national democratic mass organizations of complicity with US imperialism and elaborates:

There is an all-out campaign waged by this band to further discredit Marcos in order to launch a CIA-sponsored coup d'etat and install a new US puppet. Of course a purely anti-Marcos line is what holds this group together.... Now there exists an anti-Marcos faction of the ruling classes that wields economic, political and military powers complete with international connections and blessed by the CIA. Therefore the US imperialists can now afford to fan the flames of dissatisfaction with the Marcos regime, organize counterrevolution and pave the way for the ascension into power of the anti-Marcos bourgeoisie and landowners.

Given the present position of Marcos vis-a-vis US imperialism and given the open cleavage within the ruling classes, US imperialists through the CIA now seek to organize massive purely anti-Marcos movement in order to facilitate the takeover of the anti-Marcos faction of the bourgeoisie and landowners.

Part of the tactics of the CIA and the anti-Marcos camp is to use every anti-Marcos exclamation on the part of the national democratic forces to their advantage.

The Lava revisionist renegades can never give credit to the integrity and ability of the revolutionary mass movement and the national democratic forces in exposing, opposing and taking advantage of the bankruptcy of the US-Marcos clique. They cannot trust and have faith in the masses; they are blind to the fact that the revolutionary masses accumulate their own strength through their struggles. Consistent with their theories of "stupid masses" and "incidental leadership," they attribute to US imperialism the success of the revolutionary masses in isolating the rotten US-Marcos clique. They deny such colossal facts as the steady advance of the revolutionary mass movement and the revolutionary leadership made evident by the mountains of anti-Imperialist, antifeudal and antifascist manifestos and books and the repeated people's marches and people's assemblies whose gigantic size and level of political consciousness are unprecedented.

In the editorial of the April-May 1971 issue of *Political Review*, the Lava revisionist renegades give credit to US imperialism and its running dogs for the revolutionary upsurges in the cities and the countryside:

Even President Marcos who has cleverly combined voracity and puppetry, is now at war against the oligarchy....

As though to assure that the "revolutionary situation" would not go out of control, the imperialist forces have abetted the split in the progressive movement and it would not be much of a surprise if it would turn out that they too have provided leadership to "revolutionary" groupings, including armed contingents.

The counterrevolutionary line of the Lava revisionist renegades is that the revolutionary mass movement cannot be genuine because they are out of it. Trying to squirm out of their repudiation and isolation, they sometimes count themselves among the progressives only to make malicious slander against these, including the Communist Party of the Philippines and the New People's Army which are the principal components of that which they themselves acclaim as the progressive movement. They are bogged down in their own doubletalk in the face of the surging revolutionary mass movement.

Going so far as to make self-contradictory statements, the Lava revisionist renegades seek not only to protect Marcos but praise US imperialism. So their bulletin of anticommunism says:

Marcos has been found sorely wanting. In the process of failing to carry out successfully American-sponsored programs of reform such as rural development and land reform because of the government bureaucracy and corruption he has woven, Marcos has thus failed to carry out the essential imperialist task of arresting the growth of the revolutionary movement of the masses led by the national democratic forces. And so Marcos is now a liability because his very corruption and bankruptcy obstructs the successful implementation of reform programs and hastens the revolutionary process aimed against American imperialism.

The Lava revisionist renegades seem at times to take a dig at Marcos and even to admit the undeniable reality of the growing revolutionary mass movement but only to be able to give praise to the "reform programs" of US imperialism which they consider so efficacious as to be able to stop the revolutionary mass movement. There is consistency in the inconsistency of the Lava revisionist renegades of claiming at one turn that the revolutionary mass movement is instigated by US imperialism and at another turn that this same revolutionary mass movement grows on the rottenness of a puppet regime, which US imperialism wishes now to depose for the sake of counterrevolution. Consistently, they picture US imperialism as always on its own volition capable of arresting the growth of the revolutionary mass movement. Also consistently, they picture the revolutionary mass movement as the passive object of the "benevolence" of US imperialism. They deny the fact that the grave crisis in which Marcos finds himself is not only the result of his own corruption and failure to carry out "reform programs" but also the

result of the grave crisis in which US imperialism itself is bogged down. They deny the fact that US imperialism itself is already in a grave crisis and is being dealt increasingly harder blows by the revolutionary masses in the United States itself and throughout the world. The Lava revisionist renegades in clear pursuit of their philosophy of "interconnection of seemingly contradictory phenomena" muddle up the situation to mix up the friends and enemies of the revolution.

Confirming the political line carried by BRPF's *Struggle*, the Lavaite bulletin of anticommunism states: "Who is the bigger oligarch of the two (Marcos and Lopez) is of no concern to the revolutionary organizations, except perhaps to the fronts of Guerrero for reasons not exactly ideological." This is a silly statement. The Communist Party of the Philippines and the revolutionary mass movement it leads will always be interested in any serious split of the reactionary classes and will always take advantage of it to expand the united front and further isolate the reactionary diehards.

The Lavaites have the bad habit of licking the boots of the people's enemy. They have done this to practically every ruling clique in the Philippines from the time of Quezon down to Marcos. Vicente Lava committed the old merger party to a policy of unity without struggle with the Quezon ruling clique and the US government in the antifascist struggle, particularly in the years preceding the outbreak of World War II, and then of welcoming the US imperialists and the Osmena government after the war of resistance. Supporting the Osmena ruling clique, the Lavaites converted the old merger party into a minor servitor of the Nacionalista Party through the Democratic Alliance. The Castros, Frianezas, Lavas and Tarucs shamelessly quarrelled over which candidate for puppet president to support in 1946, instead of continuing to build the revolutionary party of the proletariat, the people's army and the revolutionary united front.

Despite the utter fascist character of the Roxas ruling clique, the Lavaites agreed with it on the "pacification campaign" which was directed against the Communist Party, the people's army and the people and which resulted in the murder of so many cadres and Red fighters in 1946-47. During the critical year of 1948, Luis Taruc was permitted in June by Jose and Jesus Lava to bargain with the Quirino ruling clique on the surrender of the people's army; and the Lavas themselves drafted a memorandum of the old merger party pledging loyalty to the reactionary constitution and government for the Committee on Un-Filipino Activities in December. To cover up their old-time opportunism in connection with the Quirino ruling clique, the Lava revisionist renegades now recriminate themselves for having taken "a purely anti-Quirino line" from 1948 to 1952 and for having taken a boycott policy in the presidential elections of 1952. What else could have these sham Bolsheviks done to become a voting factor in the reactionary elections? To cover up their opportunism, they express a wish to have more of it to achieve the success that keeps on eluding them. They insist on the counterrevolutionary line that Right opportunism is the solution to "Left" opportunism and that the reactionary elections should be the central question in a semicolonial and

semifeudal country. The point is that even if they supported Quirino, they could not have been saved from the enemy strategic offensive because of their unrectified opportunist errors of the Right variety and then of the "Left" variety which sabotaged the old merger party from within and which had already isolated them from the masses.

During the time of the Magsaysay ruling clique, Jesus Lava and his fellow Lavaites entertained the surrender emissaries of Magsaysay like Manahan and Mondonedo who are diehard CIA agents. During the time of the Garcia ruling clique, Jesus Lava tried to flatter Garcia by sending him letters of support including one praising the Anti-Subversion Law "for giving Communists without criminal record a chance to surrender and live a peaceful life." Lava has only recently publicly acknowledged his obsequious and anticommunist letters to Macapagal. The treacherous anticommunist note dated March 15, 1964 which he sent to Macapagal contain the following:

We men here have a high regard for President Macapagal's sincerity in realizing his promises to the people and in his sense of fairness and justice. He is the man who could put an end to communism in this country—though only it should be—by being considerate and generous to their needs. I am speaking in behalf of the whole Communist organization.⁶

Until now, Jesus Lava cannot dispute the authenticity of the note which is supposed to be in his own handwriting.

There is nothing surprising about the Lavaite policy towards Marcos whom Jesus Lava openly described in 1969 as "veering on the course toward the achievement of our cause." Jesus Lava flattered Marcos in the following terms: "President Marcos picked up the issue of nationalism, as no other presidential candidate before him did, to win his reelection. Everybody knows that we in the Party have been advocating this issue for the last forty years." Lava also claimed that there was a "quickenning withdrawal" of Philippine ties with the United States as a determining factor hastening the "nationalist goal of self-reliance" under the Marcos puppet regime. These statements were reported by the Manila Times and until now the Lavaites have not yet called the reporter to task as a "liar." The letters framed and sent by the Taruc-Sumulong gangster clique to Marcos were no different from the counterrevolutionary line and approaches made by the Lava revisionist renegades towards Marcos. This in fact only shows that the Taruc-Sumulong gangster clique was nothing but a historical and political ramification of Lavaite opportunism.

A favorite line used by the Lava revisionist renegades to call for support for the puppet reactionaries in power is to claim that the puppet president has gained the displeasure of US imperialism and that an assassination or a coup d'etat threatens the puppet president. Always, the implication of this

⁶ Diosdado Macapagal, *A Stone for an Edifice: Memoirs of a President* (Quezon City, Mac Publishing House, 1968), p. 166.

line is that the revolutionary mass movement has to move to the defense of the puppet president who will in turn give concessions to the Lavaite ringleaders. It seems that the Lava revisionist renegades, who are always concerned about personal safety and selfish interests, have never stopped to consider that the disruption of the "normal processes" of the reactionaries will favor the revolutionary masses in the end.

Only a shortsighted fool will cower in fear before the threat of a coup d'etat or martial law. The best thing to happen is for the reactionaries to lose the advantage of claiming that a "democracy" exists in this country. Let them throw away all their rules of decorum and due process to the garbage. In this regard we will always oppose them for abusing the people. The overthrow of the Ngo Dinh Diem clique in south Vietnam was not of any help to US imperialism. It merely encouraged the Vietnamese people to fight even more fiercely and build up their own organs of political power in the countryside. Right now, even as the series of coup d'etat is over and there are now reactionary elections monopolized by Thieu, Ky and their kind, the people in south Vietnam have built their own Provisional Revolutionary Government.

In the Philippines, the Communist Party of the Philippines has correctly taken the view that if the reactionaries and their imperialist masters should choose to make a coup d'etat or declare martial law, the revolutionary movement, especially the armed struggle in the countryside, will be able to advance even more rapidly. The more violent the split among the reactionary classes, the more excellent is the revolutionary situation for the Party, the New People's Army and the people. A coup d'etat or martial law will come about due to the bankruptcy of the entire political system of the reactionaries, with such conditions as that the revolutionary mass movement has become truly strong and that the reactionary ruling classes can no longer settle their differences in the old way.

The Lavaites have long served as special agents of the big bourgeoisie and the landlord class. Their special task has always been to infiltrate into the ranks of the revolutionary mass movement so as to corrode their unity and strength from within. But now they are exposed, repudiated and kicked out of the revolutionary mass movement. They can no longer be effective with their old opportunist tricks. They have sealed their doom with their fascist crimes no matter how much hope they place on their collusion with the US-Marcos clique and on their Soviet social-imperialist masters. The revolutionary masses are now led by the Communist Party of the Philippines, correctly guided by Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought.

IX. The Lavaite Line of Attacking the New Forces and the National United Front

To support their revisionist renegade stand and their fascist crimes, the Lavaites have shamelessly described the main current of the revolutionary mass movement as "Left adventurist," "petty bourgeois revolutionism," "romanticism" and have flung many other labels along the same line. The

reality that they are trying to argue against and misrepresent include the strike movement and the national democratic cultural revolution of a new type which are now rapidly advancing in urban areas; and the armed struggle in the countryside which is still in the stage of strategic defensive, within which tactical offensives are being launched, in accordance with the Marxist-Leninist teachings of Comrade Mao Zedong.

The Lava revisionist renegades never tire of impertinently prating about the "strategic offensive" which is supposed to make a "revolutionary situation" in the style of seizing political power as in Petrograd and Moscow in the October Revolution. But all their show of sham Marxism is nothing but an excuse for carrying out what they have openly and in black and white declared as their main task: to defend the "Marcos camp" against the "anti-Marcos camp." When we analyze the quantity and quality of Lavaite propaganda, we can easily see that they want to stop what they prefer to call the "purely anti-Marcos line" so that they can in turn harp on their own "purely anti-Sison line."

The Lava revisionist renegades have chosen to concentrate their fire on Jose Ma. Sison, whom they alternately refer to as Chairman Amado Guerrero, so as to attack the entire revolutionary mass movement, especially the new and youthful revolutionary forces, and serve them up for brutal repression jointly by the fascist gangsters of the US-Marcos clique and their own.

It is undeniable to the toiling masses and to the youth that Jose Ma. Sison's Struggle for National Democracy and founding efforts in several mass organizations have contributed greatly to the brilliant transition from the 1960s to the 1970s of the revolutionary mass movement. The mass organizations that have made possible the upsurges of revolutionary mass actions in the 1970s can directly trace their development to the 1960s. We hold Jose Ma. Sison in high regard as an outstanding figure in the national united front and among the revolutionary youth and for his indefatigable efforts to push forward the national democratic movement. His maligners cannot but appear as agents of counterrevolution and cheap gossipers of the lowest order. The Party cannot remain silent concerning him while he and what he stands for are subjected to attack. At any rate, we admire the national democratic mass organizations for defending him and themselves and for appropriately counterattacking the entire gamut of Marcos fascists, revisionist fascists, clerico-fascists and other denizens of counterrevolution.

The Lava revisionist fascists think wrongly that they can combine their role of being special agents of the US-Marcos clique and their pretensions to being Communists. But they have only succeeded in exposing themselves for what they are. Their kind of propaganda and their fascist crimes against the national democratic movement smack of the infantilism and adventurism that they maliciously asperse to others. Fabricating the personal circumstances of Sison, such as claiming his father is "Vicente" and giving him a "fifth" brother, is not only a case of simple impertinence but also a case of irrational fascist propaganda. To crow about the "honesty" and "logic" of these fabrications, as the Lava revisionist renegades do in print and in

floods of leaflets, is to heap abuse on the broad masses of the people. It is correctly stated by a noncommunist observer like Miss Liwayway T. Reyes, a former member of one of the Lavaite outfits, that the Lava revisionist renegades are vulgar anticommunists. Upon their exposure, these scoundrels come off inferior to their anticommunist superiors like Jose Crisol and his staff.

In their role as cheap government informers, the Lava revisionist renegades have miserably failed to be convincing. They claim that Sison reorganized the Communist Party on December 26, 1968 but at another turn they claim that he did so a long time ago in 1962. They claim that he never set foot in the countryside before he met Comrade Dante but at another turn they claim that he went to the countryside to talk to Masaka members. They ceaselessly proclaim themselves in public print that they compose the "legitimate" communist party but they do not suffer the fascist crimes inflicted on those whom they attack. They are not hailed to the reactionary courts for "violation" of the Anti-Subversion Law even if only to raise their credibility. We have the crudest and most foolish kind of revisionist renegades before us.

Trying to gain wider publicity for their campaign of slander and calculated attempt to implicate particular organizations in the genuine national democratic movement to the underground, the Lava revisionist renegades extended to Teodosio Lansang their "internal" bulletin anticommunism in addition to other more widely distributed anticommunist materials which Lansang had already had. Lansang wrote an article for the May 14, 1971 issue of *Asia-Philippines Leader*, "One More View From the Left," and acknowledged having read the "internal" bulletin.

A month later, in February 1971, *Ang Komunista*, "internal bulletin of Partido Komunista ng Pilipinas" (Vol. 2, No. 1) came out with eight major articles, one of which "Marxism-Leninism and Revolutionary Quixotism," supposedly written by "Mario Frunze" reveals a similar image of Amado Guerrero and his group.

Lansang asserts:

After "Guerrero" had fled the city and was later heard to have joined forces with Dante, following a supposed Party plenum, the KM—to which "Guerrero's" personal name had been identified as organizer and leader but which in fact was a Party assignment before the split came about—went on all out offensive to "KM-ize" practically all up-and-coming student, youth cultural, worker and peasant organizations, like the Molabe, the MDP (Movement for a Democratic Philippines), the Kamanyang, the NATU (National Association of Trade Unions) and the Masaka, to name only a few. To make such a tactical maneuver on fraternal organizations could not of course be immediately understood, much less appreciated by the affected groups.

Lansang adds:

"Guerrero" as early as 1965 [sic], just after the founding of the present Kabataang Makabayan (KM), with him as chairman, was already being

criticized for "overextension" since he was concurrently general secretary of the Movement for the Advancement of Nationalism (MAN) and first deputy chairman of the Socialist Party of the Philippines, and occupied positions of authority and importance in a few other organizations.

Apparently enjoying the same license that the "revolutionaries" of the Lava revisionist renegade clique enjoy and being in the same conspiracy with them, the crackpot Teodosio Lansang has his own bragging and his own fabrication to make regarding an "ad hoc national liberation committee" in the reactionary press:

the present unfortunate situation in all the various revolutionary and progressive groupings in the movement—beginning with the topmost CPP-NPA combination down to the lowest level of a small and newly organized student cultural group, like the SAKABA (Samahan sa Kaunlaran ng Bansa)—it will do well for the whole of the movement to reconsider its strategy and tactics....

Just before he (Sison) left his comrades, he was also interested in the chairmanship of an ad hoc committee on national liberation....

To buttress his position, Lansang openly declares himself to be a "precious cadre" of "thirty years' standing" and keeps on calling others "comrades" in the national liberation movement.

Just about everyone, including the slanderers, is implicated with the underground. Yet the Lava revisionist renegades continue to report to their offices in the reactionary government and to their business or professional offices. They even sport pistols and revolvers and have armed escorts now. They continue to make their campaign of slander in coordination with the propaganda mills of the reactionary government and such "sober revolutionaries" as the Lacsinas and Lansangs of the "Socialist Party of the Philippines." They are using every bit of their wornout reputation as "revolutionary veterans" to make malicious claims about the "counterrevolutionary role" of others. Yet despite all their pretensions, they are left undisturbed by the US-Marcos clique.

Against the attempt to implicate them with the underground, such legal and noncommunist mass organizations as the Movement for a Democratic Philippines, Kabataang Makabayan and Samahang Demokratiko ng Kabataan have heroically stood their ground and have not slackened in their patriotic militancy.

A consistent line of attack pursued by the Lava revisionist renegades is that the revolutionary youth so much influenced by Chairman Amado Guerrero and Jose Ma. Sison have "separated the young from the old." But to reduce this absurdity to what it is, a young woman activist writes in the *Asia-Philippines Leader* (June 11, 1971) the following: "As a matter of fact, Sison and Guerrero have been attacked by the reactionaries for having the highest respect for Mao Zedong and for having the lowest regard for a much younger man like Richard Nixon."

She explains further:

We the young activists and students must oppose (the) fabrication that we do not regard the present revolutionary mass movement as being continuous with previous revolutionary mass struggles. There is a great difference between rejecting the failed leadership of the Lavas and giving credit to the previous revolutionary mass struggles and the revolutionary cadres truly worthy of respect.

It is puerile for Lansang to speak arrogantly about our being "not born yet" or "still in swaddling clothes" when the Lavas were already bungling the revolution or Lansang was still enjoying himself abroad in one vacation resort after another....

The youth are doing everything within their capability to help maintain and bring to higher stages the revolutionary mass movement of workers, peasants, and the urban petty bourgeoisie, irrespective of age. But they have no illusion that the youth alone can make revolution; the revolutionary class standpoint demands proletarian leadership and the mobilization of the toiling masses of workers and peasants.

Despite their reputation as revolutionary "veterans," however, the Lavas, Lansangs and Lacsinas have opposed and slandered the revolutionary mass movement as nothing but the work of the "adventurist" and "anarchist" young. These "veterans" echo every line of attack uttered by the fascist Marcos to justify kidnappings, murders, massacres, and disruption of popular demonstrations.

The Lavas, Lacsinas and Lansangs have the bad habit of ascribing silly and incongruous statements and deeds to other people. They say that it is Sison's or Guerrero's view that "the young must be separated from the old." They fabricate statements to this effect because they cannot make any direct quotation from *Struggle for National Democracy* or *Philippine Society and Revolution*. Then, they turn to abusing the young as "immature," "inexperienced," "reckless," "adventurist," and the like.

One outstanding characteristic of the ringleaders of the Lava revisionist renegades is their relatively advanced age. However, this does not necessarily mean maturity in revolutionary work when we consider the age disparity between them and the youthful masses of workers, peasants, students, intellectuals and other patriots that have repudiated them. Rather it is a clear manifestation of a long period, almost two decades, of seeking cowardly safety and of counterrevolutionary hibernation. They seem to be getting active now that there is a revolutionary flow (which they still describe as "transition from ebb to flow") but only to impose their degenerate Lavaite ways and oppose the revolutionary youth who find them repulsive. On the other hand, truly revolutionary cadres of previous revolutionary struggles who have had a good grasp of the developing situation have been invariably welcomed into the ranks of the revolutionary movement.

At the age of thirty, the great Lenin explained why the youth of less than thirty predominate in the revolutionary ranks:

the composition of the politically guiding vanguard of every class, the proletariat included, also depends both on the position of this class and on the principal form of its struggle. Larin complains, for example, that young workers predominate in our Party, that we have a few married workers, and that they leave the Party. This complaint of a Russian opportunist reminds me of a passage in one of Engels' works.... Retorting to some fatuous bourgeois professor, a German Cadet, Engels wrote: "Is it not natural that youth should predominate in our Party, the revolutionary Party? We are a party of innovators, and it is always the youth that most eagerly follows the innovators. We are a party that is waging self-sacrificing struggle against old rottenness, and youth is always the first to undertake a self-sacrificing struggle." No, let us leave it to the Cadets to collect the "tired" old men of thirty, revolutionaries who have "grown wise," and renegades from Social-Democracy [Communism]. We shall always be a part of the youth of the advanced class.

It is very natural that most of the Red commanders and fighters of the New People's Army are young peasants, workers and former students and also that most of the activists in the national democratic cultural revolution of a new type and the strike movement centered in the urban areas are young workers, students, professionals and handicraftsmen. On the basis of these large new forces, the proletarian revolutionary party of today is youthful. At any time, this is a fact that cannot be avoided; the youth are always the majority in any population and are reflected by the membership of any party. This is underscored in the revolutionary mass movement by the failure of the Lavaites to arouse and mobilize the broad masses of the people for an extremely long period. At any rate, we agree with Engels and Lenin that the spirit of revolutionary innovation so characteristic of the youth will always attract the youth to the Communist Party of the Philippines.

It is unthinkable how the Lava revisionist renegades, as they grow older but never wiser, will ever leave their posts in the reactionary government, their business establishments and other conservative commitments. If they continue to make sweeping attacks against the new forces of the revolution, they will find themselves more isolated, more filthy-mouthed and more decadent in the years to come. Their blood debts have further shortened their shameless career.

Let us quote some invectives of the Lava revisionist renegades against the youth from *Sang-ayon sa MAN*:

Never has it [Movement for the Advancement of Nationalism] taken the pretension of being Marxist-Leninist like the common pretension of many movements or organizations of infantile youth who still have milk in their tongues [may gatas pa sa dila]...:

Nevertheless, we can be proud that never have we betrayed our ideals and never have we betrayed the people and we have not yet had any of the childish and ignorant youth killed....

But the students went to extremes and destroyed the windows and the stores of the people—who recoiled and became angry with the demonstrators.

From BRPF's *Struggle*:

To think that the KM arrogantly describes itself in its program adopted as its 3rd Congress as the vanguard of the Filipino youth! Since when has a student-petty bourgeois-based group been a vanguard of any revolutionary struggle?

Take note of the Lavaite shift from the phrase "the vanguard of the Filipino youth" to "a vanguard of any revolutionary struggle." There is an attempt at a cheap trick but literary incompetence and ideological bankruptcy on the part of the trickster are too obvious. Is it not a historical fact that the organization being maligned is both "a" and "the" vanguard of the youth movement?

It is the Lava revisionist renegades who have the false illusion that it is their kind of youth organization (the MPKP) which is "the vanguard" not only of the Filipino youth but of the entire Philippine revolution. The lead paragraph of the editorial of the July 4, 1971 issue of *Ang Gabay* reads fully as follows:

The situation obtaining in the whole archipelago at present is showing the certain treading of the Filipino masses on the revolutionary road towards national democracy and freedom. In the face of this fact, the vanguard organization of the Filipino youth [reference to the MPKP] is today performing a decisive task of leadership in the Philippine revolution. [Emphasis ours.]

That is a blatant denial of the proletariat's role of leading the Philippine revolution through its highest form of class organization, the Communist Party of the Philippines. The Lava revisionist renegades wish to have their scab youth group assume the vanguard role in the entire Philippine revolution.

Whenever the Lava revisionist renegades speak about Kabataang Makabayan, they wish people to believe that it had disintegrated a long time ago by "splits." The Lavaite bulletin of anticommunism even boasts that the "disintegration" of KM has been the result of "retaliatory blows from the Party." If that is the case, what is all the fuss about KM? They also publicly boast that it was the expert intrigues of Merlin M. Magallona and Romeo Dizon through Vivencio Jose and Perfecto Tera that caused the formation of Samahang Demokratiko ng Kabataan against KM. But what is the fact today? KM and SDK, the major noncommunist youth organizations, are together in the forefront of the struggle against US imperialism, feudalism and bureaucrat capitalism and Soviet-Lavaite revisionism.

It is a major method of the Lava revisionist renegades to bluff people with their supposed "peasant" strength in their campaign to slander and attack the new revolutionary forces and the broad national democratic front. The Lava revisionist renegades are fond of brandishing the Masaka as a sign that they have the peasantry in their pockets and boasting that no revolution can

be made without the list of those swindled by them. This kind of empty Lavaite arrogance is manifested by the BRPF's Struggle speaking of "MPKP-controlled areas." The following passage is more extensive:

While MPKP may grant that the KM has a large student following in the city, it cannot say that KM has the advantage where it counts most—in the countryside. KM leaders themselves know for a fact that they cannot equal, much less approximate the following that MPKP and fraternal groups have in the countryside....

William J. Pomeroy in his article "Who's Who in the Fight" echoes his fellow revisionists in the Lavaite MPKP:

To Sison's mechanical attempt to transfer the Maoist ideas on the peasantry to the Philippines, the MPKP said: "The KM commits unpardonable blunder in declaring the peasantry in the Philippines to be the decisive force because they are 'the most oppressed and most numerous.' Sheer number alone does not constitute a valid criteria for determining which class should be the decisive factor. In the neocolonial and semifeudal setup of Philippine society, the decisive force is the alliance of the workers and peasants. The leadership, however, is provided by the working class, in conformity with historically confirmed and elementary principles of dialectics of present revolutionary movements, principles which the KM understandably ignores, what with the dominance of petty-bourgeois elements in its ranks. It is also ironic that the KM does not even have a massive peasant base in spite of its contention that the peasantry is the leading force."

In the above passage, the Lava revisionist renegades once more resort to adducing their own words and ideas to other people. They claim that KM takes the view that the peasantry is decisive for-being the "leading class" and they laugh at their own dishonesty and then make another childish taunt that KM does not even have a peasant base. It would be fair for KM to slap the faces of these revisionist pre- varicators with its manifestos and with Jose Ma. Sison's Struggle for National Democracy. On behalf of the Party, we urge all the national democratic mass organizations to read and study Chairman Amado Guerrero's Philippine Society and Revolution and we also wish to assure them that the revolutionary bases in the countryside serve as a powerful rear and basic support for all revolutionary efforts in the cities.

The Party has observed a high level of ideological and political consciousness among the genuine national democratic organizations. It is well understood among them that the proletariat is decisive for being the leading class; the peasantry is decisive for being the main mass support and the urban petty bourgeoisie is decisive for being the most important stratum for winning the middle forces and shifting the balance of forces in favor of the people's democratic revolution in the Philippines. These are basic and therefore decisive forces; without one the others cannot win the revolution in a semicolonial and semifeudal country like the Philippines.

In the basic document of rectification, "Rectify Errors and Rebuild the Party," the historical and social roots of Lavaite opportunism and revisionism have been traced to the unremolded petty-bourgeois thinking of the Lavas which was made to prevail in the old merger party. Obviously wanting to get back at the Party and revolutionary movement that have repudiated them, the Lava revisionist fascists have taken to the bad habit of expressing disdain for the masses of the urban petty bourgeoisie like students, teachers, journalists, professionals and the like and considering any mass organization with large concentration of these elements as counterrevolutionary. The Lavaites should be reminded time and again that there is a great difference between the petty-bourgeois elements creeping into a Communist Party with unremolded petty-bourgeois thinking and the entire social stratum of the urban petty bourgeoisie which, after the semiproletariat, is the closest ally of the proletariat.

The Lava revisionist fascists are today extremely antagonistic to the urban petty bourgeoisie because they have become the agents of the big bourgeoisie, the US-Marcos clique and the Soviet monopoly bureaucrat capitalists. They do not have the honest desire of criticizing minor currents like those of Che Guevarism, Regis Debrayism, Carlos Marighellaism and the counterrevolutionary ideas of Herbert Marcuse which our Party has properly criticized. They have the vile motive of attacking the entire urban petty bourgeoisie when they concentrate their attack on the mass organizations which have been in the main current and among those in the forefront of the strike movement and the national democratic cultural revolution of a new type. The revolutionary students, teachers, journalists and other professionals are greatly assisting the proletariat and its Party in arousing and mobilizing the masses on a nationwide scale for the people's democratic revolution against US imperialism, feudalism and bureaucrat capitalism.

One important reason why the US-Marcos clique cannot yet make an all-out attack against the Party and the people is the unprecedented rising of revolutionary consciousness among the urban petty bourgeoisie. This social stratum has made heroic sacrifices for the revolutionary mass movement and every time an abuse befalls them, the US-Marcos clique as the abuser, has found itself more politically isolated. The key to the nationwide promotion of revolutionary ideas is the powerful support of progressive sections of the urban petty bourgeoisie to the revolutionary proletariat.

The political actions of the urban petty bourgeoisie, together with the toiling masses, cannot be disregarded by the reactionary press, even if such press is controlled by the big bourgeois and big landlord publishers and advertisers. It is because the great bulk of newspaper readers and radio listeners belong to the urban petty bourgeoisie. The reactionary press can only pretend to report on revolutionary events. It cannot disregard such events as those massive protest actions participated in by the urban petty bourgeoisie, though these are led by the revolutionary proletariat. Revolutionary ideas also travel fast among the members of the urban petty bourgeoisie, including the working journalists, whether the reactionaries like

it or not. As a whole, the reactionary press has always tailed after revolutionary events and distorted its reporting and comments on these against the revolutionary cause. Direct democratic action is resorted to by the revolutionary masses precisely because the channels of "democracy" in the hands of reactionaries, including the press, are stumbling blocks for the airing of genuine public opinion. The Lava revisionist renegades in the fascist bankruptcy would rather imagine now that there is a conspiracy between the reactionary publishers and the national democratic mass organizations, despite the fact that it is a Lavaite ringleader like Ching Maramag who is a big boss in the Roces publications.

Here is another clear counterrevolutionary Lavaite attack against the entire petty bourgeoisie, the youth and journalists:

The myth about revolutionary peasants and workers rallying around "Chairman" Amado Guerrero and his close comrade-in-arms, Commander Dante, appeals to youthful romantics who need an exciting symbol in an otherwise boring petty-bourgeois existence. It provides a constant source of sensational news to metropolitan journalists and it is indispensable to the puppet armed forces who must have celebrated villains to hunt down for budgetary purposes....

This is an inane statement worthy of a Teodoro Valencia. In fact, the only kind of journalists ever willing to broadcast the views of the Lavaites includes Eduardo Lachica, Teodoro Valencia and Max Soliven. The Philippines Herald, an organ of the biggest comprador group in the Philippines, is fond of utilizing the press releases of the Lavaite outfits in order to slander the revolutionary mass movement.

The Lava revisionist renegades prefer to call the awakening and mobilization of the masses as "publicity" with pejorative connotation. So, they state in their bulletin of anticommunism:

In the petty-bourgeois order of values, publicity is the highest measure of success. Ignacio Lacsina, the Socialist Party leader, noted quite perceptively that these buffoons would sacrifice the long-range objectives of the socialist movement in their infantile craving for daily publicity.

At a time that the fraud and press-release maniac Lacsina is already being cast away as a yellow labor leader and as rubbish, the Lavaites pick him up as an authority from whom to derive "wisdom" in their attempt to show that they "shun" the limelight. But we recall that obscure speech of Francisco Lava, Jr. before the MPKP on November 30, 1969 where he categorically states that he wants "officers who can get more publicity in the metropolitan newspapers, radio and television." Thus, the MPKP was reorganized on January 25, 1970 and such press-release hacks as Ruben Torres and Romeo Dizon, a Lava clansman, became chairman and general secretary, respectively.

We also recall the press release concerning the MPKP which Lacsina issued on February 15, 1970 when he was trying to cover up his own counterrevolutionary role. We quote:

Ignacio P. Lacsina, chairman of the Socialist Party of the Philippines, yesterday denounced the Malayang Pagkakaisa ng Kabataang Pilipino (MPKP) as a "pseudo-nationalist paper organization" and sought its exclusion from the Movement for a Democratic Philippines.

Exposing what he described as the MPKP's underhanded "splitting activities," Lacsina charged that "this phony organization is the creation of an inordinately ambitious clique of senile leftists whose inability to attract popular support has led them to futile, if destructive, attempts at power takeover of militant youth, labor and peasant groups."

Lacsina said that "the main preoccupation at present of the MPKP seems to be the promotion of a split between the students, on the one hand, and the workers and peasants, on the other, who have forged strong solidarity in their common struggle against imperialism, feudalism and fascism.

The Lava revisionist renegades have hired themselves out to the US-Marcos clique and to earn their keep they have to resort to every trick to divide the urban petty bourgeoisie from the proletariat in the cities and to divide the revolutionary mass movement in the cities from the revolutionary mass movement in the countryside. So much exasperated by large masses of the urban petty bourgeoisie adopting the general line of the Communist Party of the Philippines, which is the people's democratic revolution, the US-Marcos clique has hired the services of the Lava revisionist fascists for "pinpointing" Communists and slandering entire mass organizations in cities with the use of pseudo-Marxist analysis.

What the US-Marcos clique cannot accomplish with open force during mass actions, the Lava revisionist fascists have pledged to accomplish with pseudo-Marxist analysis and selective terror in coordination with the reactionary state. The spite of the Lava revisionist renegades for the revolutionary forces in the cities, especially the urban petty bourgeoisie, is best expressed in the vulgar language of the editorial of their bulletin of anticommunism:

PKP (Lava revisionist renegades) draws a distinction between an ordinary peasant member of the Mao Thought party and the "salamins," the intellectuals from the city who harbor intense hatred towards us.

The Lavas, the Nemenzos, Dizons and Torreses must have stopped wearing glasses or have taken to wearing contact lenses to make this kind of statement.

The Lava revisionist renegades have become such rabid agents of the big bourgeoisie and the big landlord class that they despise not only the petty bourgeois but also the national bourgeoisie. They attack the national bourgeoisie on the ground that it, with the exception of a few elements whom they call the "nationalist bourgeoisie," has completely sold out to US imperialism. In effect, they deny that there exist contradictions between the national bourgeoisie and foreign monopoly capitalism which includes US

imperialism and Japanese imperialism. They actually boast that US imperialism has already sufficiently brought the national bourgeoisie into "joint ventures." The Lava revisionist renegades deliberately obscure the composition of the national bourgeoisie, with its right, middle and left wings. They wish to deprive the proletariat of a significant ally in the people's democratic revolution. Thus, they express through Ang Gabay the following:

As a special class in the Philippines, therefore, the middle bourgeoisie or national bourgeoisie is no longer allying itself with the working class against the American imperialists.

In this regard, they would rather upgrade the lumpen proletariat as a more reliable ally. They do so to the extent of putting it at par with the petty bourgeoisie.

The national united front policy of the Communist Party of the Philippines is a proletarian policy concerning classes in Philippine society entails knowing who are our friends and who are our enemies among the various classes and strata. Chairman Mao teaches us:

Who are our enemies? Who are our friends? That is a question of first importance for the revolution.... A revolutionary party is the guide of the masses and no revolution ever succeeds when the revolutionary party leads them astray. To ensure that we will definitely achieve success in our revolution and will not lead the masses astray, we must pay attention to uniting with our real friends in order to attack our real enemies.

The national united front is led by the proletariat and is based mainly on the alliance of the proletariat and the peasantry. Through the Communist Party of the Philippines as its advanced detachment, the proletariat goes into the midst of its closest and most reliable ally, the peasantry, to conduct mass work and wage revolutionary armed struggle. On the basis of the worker-peasant alliance, such middle forces as the urban petty bourgeoisie firstly and the national bourgeoisie secondly can be won over as allies in order to isolate and destroy the enemy diehards. A united front of the proletariat, peasantry, the urban petty bourgeoisie and the national bourgeoisie should be built up in order to deal death blows on the big bourgeoisie (the imperialists and the big compradors) and the big landlords. The forces of the national united front have a common ground for common agreement. It is the people's democratic revolution, otherwise known as the national democratic revolution against US imperialism, feudalism and bureaucrat capitalism. The program of the national united front corresponds to the Party's Program for a People's Democratic Revolution. The national united front is therefore a component of the political line of the Party. It is a weapon complementing and serving the revolutionary armed struggle.

It is not always necessary to have a formal nationwide united front organization to be able to implement the united front policy of the Party. But the Party at the moment has a special organ, the Preparatory Commission of the National Democratic Front, which helps popularize the national democratic line and pays special attention to relations with allies. Whether

there is a formal united front organization or there is none as it is now the case, there can be no "absolute unity" within the united front as the Lava revisionist renegades insist. There is unity and struggle within the national united front because of the varied class interests within it. There is restraint on struggle only insofar as it fosters national democratic unity against the enemy. The Party maintains its ideological, political and organizational independence and initiative and proves its leadership through revolutionary theory, policies and deeds. Likewise, the allies can also be expected to maintain their own independence and initiative.

The Movement for a Democratic Philippines is not the entire national united front, though it strives vigorously to help build up and unite the broadest alliance of legal mass organizations and personages for the national democratic revolution. There is no doubt that it had played quite a significant role in Greater Manila and other urban areas in the country. But it takes more than the Movement for a Democratic Philippines to make the entire united front. It is silly of the Lava revisionist renegades to conjecture that the Party itself takes this alliance of legal mass organizations as the entire united front or even a mere replica of it.

It is even more silly of the Lava revisionist renegades to insist that the Movement for the Advancement of Nationalism is the entire national united front under the command of their bogus communist party. The organization is controlled and run by the Lava revisionist renegades and therefore is disconnected from and opposed to the revolutionary armed struggle. It has become a Lavaite outfit for attacking the Communist Party of the Philippines, the New People's Army and the entire revolutionary mass movement. To go over its organizational setup is to go over all other Lavaite outfits. It is here where all Lavaite outfits, including the bogus communist party and Armeng Bayan, converge.

It is in the rural areas today that the Communist Party of the Philippines is creating the biggest, most stable and firmest basis for the national united front. By conducting mass work and waging a protracted people's war here, the Party is building up the worker-peasant alliance. Among the peasant masses, the Party is creating the basis for independence, initiative and leadership in the united front. Among the peasant masses, the Party also maintains the revolutionary class line in relying mainly on the poor peasants, winning over the middle peasants and neutralizing the rich peasants. Armed contingents are being drawn mainly from the peasant masses and the advanced detachment of the proletariat leads them. The New People's Army is the splendid fruit of the worker-peasant alliance. Party branches are springing up in the countryside. The people's government has emerged in the countryside in the form of local organs of political power like the barrio organizing committees and the barrio revolutionary committees. In these organs of political power, the three-thirds agreement is being followed as a practical application of the Party's united front policy. It means that one part is drawn from the communist cadres and members; another part is drawn

from mass activists from the ranks of the poor and lower-middle peasants; and still another part is drawn from other revolutionary elements.

The organs of political power are led by the Party and are supported by local mass organizations of workers, peasants, youth, women, children and cultural workers. In Northern Luzon and Central Luzon alone, there are now at least 300,000 people governed by the local organs of political power and participating in various mass organizations at the barrio level. These constitute a powerful mass support for the national democratic front all over the archipelago. How do the handful of BSDU gangsters and swindlers in the Monkees-Masaka-Armeng Bayan compare to these?

In the urban areas today, the workers are rapidly rising under the leadership of the Communist Party of the Philippines. They are vigorously launching strikes and are joining mass actions on various political issues against US imperialism, feudalism and bureaucrat capitalism. The Party is establishing Party groups in various labor organizations and Party branches in workplaces and communities. The workers hate the Lava revisionist renegades for sabotaging the Party and the workers' movement for several decades and they also hate the labor aristocrats that ride roughshod over them. Linking closely with the workers in strikes and other mass actions is the urban petty bourgeoisie whose wide influence has served to popularize the national democratic line and expose the fascist tricks of the enemy.

Workers, students and other city residents are also found together in various national democratic mass organizations. Party branches have been established in schools and offices and Party groups in various mass organizations. The revolutionary forces in the countryside are inspired by the revolutionary slogans and achievements of these mass organizations. In turn, these mass organizations can rely on the revolutionary forces in the countryside.

In its own unstable and vacillating way, the national bourgeoisie is opposing monopoly capitalism, feudalism and bureaucrat capitalism. It has its own organizations that look after its own interests. It has a few representatives or spokesmen in the constitutional convention, though this is dominated by the reactionary parties. It also has representatives or spokesmen in both the Liberal Party and the Nacionalista Party, though these reactionary parties are strategically controlled by the big bourgeoisie and the landlord class. The left wing, middle wing and the most progressive members of the national bourgeoisie have extended support to the revolutionary mass movement and have even come to the legal defense of national democratic mass organizations. The national bourgeoisie can be expected to cooperate more with the revolutionary mass movement as the latter grows in strength and US imperialism increasingly becomes weakened. The Party must always exercise revolutionary vigilance in its relations with the national bourgeoisie because of its dual character.

United front tactics can be applied on the reactionaries in order to isolate and destroy the enemy diehards among them. It is a good policy to fight the reactionary factions one by one and to make use of the contradictions among

them to favor the revolutionary mass movement. It is important to pay close attention to the split between one reactionary faction and another reactionary faction in the concrete conditions of a province or district; and within the ruling Nacionalista Party between the US-Marcos clique and other cliques. These splits or contradictions are favorable to the revolutionary mass movement.

The more violent the contradictions among the reactionaries become the better for the revolutionary mass movement. When such violent contradictions occur, we acquire plenty of room for maneuver and for gaining mass support. All progressive classes, strata and groups tend to seek leadership and support from the revolutionary party of the proletariat and the people's army. It is favorable to us that the reactionaries are rapidly arming themselves to the teeth against each other. They have now increased their bodyguards and enlarged their security agencies into veritable private armies.

The stronger the revolutionary mass movement becomes, the more contradictions among the reactionaries tend to become more violent. The ruling clique tends to use the reactionary armed forces and the police and such additional forces as the BSDU, "Monkees" and its own private gang not only against the revolutionary mass movement but also against a reactionary faction seeking power for itself. In other words, it tends to monopolize power. It does occur, however, that a lower ruling clique tends to seek cooperation with the revolutionary mass movement when it considers it politically hopeless to oppose the masses or when it is bitterly opposed by another reactionary faction enjoying the support of a higher ruling clique. In any case, the Party can make use of the contradictions among the reactionaries to defend and advance the revolutionary mass movement, especially the people's army.

The national minorities of Mindanao have been fiercely waging armed struggle against the reactionary armed forces and the big landgrabbers. Their armed struggle and ours support each other. In this sense, we have a united front against the common enemy. It accords with the Party's united front policy to support the struggle of the national minorities of Mindanao for self-determination against US Imperialism, feudalism and bureaucrat capitalism. The Party must exert all efforts at the same time to avert sheer religious strife which only favors both the Christian and Muslim reactionaries. The national minorities have to coordinate with the poor settlers in fighting against the real exploiters and oppressors—the real landgrabbers who are big landlords and big concessionaires for plantations, mines, ranches and timber. A united front of minorities and poor settlers can be worked out as the Party establishes itself in Mindanao and creates its own armed contingents there.

As the political and economic crisis of the ruling system worsens, the Party, the New People's Army and the national united front will become stronger weapons of the revolutionary masses for destroying the enemy and

for advancing the people's democratic revolution. US imperialism, modern revisionism and all reaction are certain to be doomed.

Conclusion

In conclusion, let us quote from Chairman Mao:

I hold that it is bad as far as we are concerned if a person, a political party, an army or a school is not attacked by the enemy, for in that case it would definitely mean that we have sunk to the level of the enemy. It is good if we are attacked by the enemy, since it proves that we have drawn a clear line of demarcation between the enemy and ourselves. It is still better if the enemy attacks us wildly and paints us as utterly black and without a single virtue; it demonstrates that we have not only drawn a clear line of demarcation between the enemy and ourselves but achieved a great deal in our work.

Indeed, after the outburst of written Lava revisionist fascist propaganda, it has become exceedingly clear how correct is the revolutionary road we have taken under the illumination of the universal theory of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought. It is so much easier now than before for every member of the Communist Party of the Philippines to answer revisionist fascist attack after the Lavaites have comprehensively laid bare in black and white their ideas and schemes.

The wild fascist actions and propaganda of the Lava revisionist renegades are a manifestation of desperation and are the last fits of the dying. These revisionist scoundrels are like leeches squirming on salt. They will eventually cough up the blood that they have sucked from the people. They will soon curl up and expire.

We can safely make a prediction that it will not be long before the Lava revisionist renegades would totally disintegrate like the Taruc-Sumulong gangster clique. But the danger of modern revisionism will still remain. In the future, there will be revisionist renegades with more finesse and subtlety. It is therefore an important task to study seriously and combat vigorously Lavaite opportunism of the past and the Lavaite revisionism of the present with the long-term view of facing more serious dangers from the evil of modern revisionism. By consistently fighting modern revisionism, we sharpen our ideological, political and organizational weapons against US imperialism, feudalism and bureaucrat capitalism.

* * *

On the Lavaite Misrepresentation of the Proletarian Foreign Policy of China

First published in *Ang Bayan*, Special Issue, July 30, 1971.

There are definite reasons for concentrating fire on the Lava revisionist renegades at certain times. First, they ask for it by taking the initiative of trying to hit us so that it is necessary to hit them back in the spirit of tit-for-tat struggle. Second, hitting them amounts to hitting their masters, US imperialism and Soviet social-imperialism. Third, they can mislead and deceive people, if they are not exposed, because they usurp the name of the Communist Party for anticommunist purposes. Fourth, they express the enemy's hidden intentions or measures of last resort because they are special enemy agents whose task is to creep into the revolutionary mass movement and subvert and sabotage it from within. In any case, to take the Lava revisionist renegades to task is to sharpen our understanding of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought.

It is, therefore, necessary to take up the article, "Ping Pong Diplomacy," in the Lavaite bulletin of anticommunism (Vol, II, No. 4, July 21, 1971) as the starting point for a discussion and clarification of the proletarian foreign policy of the People's Republic of China.

The Lavaite article seeks to misrepresent the forthcoming visit of US imperialist chieftain Nixon to China in the following terms:

The announcement of Nixon's visit to China dealt a stunning blow at the pivotal myth in the Maoist ideology. Without bothering to understand the essence of Maoism, the local idiots imagine China to be an uncompromising enemy of imperialism who would rather go to war than negotiate the settlement of outstanding international problems.

The Lava revisionist renegades imagine the US imperialist chieftain Nixon as some kind of conquering hero when he makes his visit to the People's Republic of China. They invert the reality that it is Nixon who seeks terms from the People's Republic of China. There is a fundamental difference in principle and circumstances between what may develop as the state-to-state relations between the Chinese government and the US government on the one hand and the kind of relations already fostered between the Khrushchov-Brezhnev revisionist renegades and the US imperialists on the other hand.

The Lava revisionist renegades seek to misrepresent the Communist Party of the Philippines as having held the view that it is China, not US imperialism, which "would rather go to war than negotiate the settlement of outstanding international problems." They would say anything to obscure the fact that modern war is born of imperialism. They deny the fact that China has amicably settled problems with other countries through negotiations; and then they have the gall to adduce to us such denial of fact in their malicious fashion.

These revisionist scoundrels are sloppy publicists not only of their Soviet social-imperialist masters but also of the US imperialists whom they consistently prettify at the expense of the revolutionary forces. That is why the Lavaite article cites such political mummies as former Secretary of State Dean Rusk and Kenneth Youth and such imperialist publications as *New York Times*, *Foreign Affairs* and the *US News and World Report* as its authorities and prop in slandering the People's, Republic of China.

The Proletarian Foreign Policy of the People's Republic of China

The proletarian foreign policy of the Communist Party of China and the Chinese government has consistently embraced three aspects: (1) to develop relations of friendship, mutual assistance and cooperation with socialist countries on the principle of proletarian internationalism, (2) to support and assist the revolutionary struggles of all the oppressed people and nations; and (3) to strive for peaceful coexistence with countries having different social systems on the basis of the Five Principles of (a) mutual respect for territorial integrity and sovereignty (b) mutual nonaggression, (c) noninterference in each other's internal affairs, (d) equality and mutual benefit, and (e) peaceful coexistence and to oppose the imperialist policies of aggression and war.

The fundamental principle of proletarian internationalism is clearly upheld. It encompasses the full range of external relations that a socialist country can make. It gives the highest priority to relations with other socialist countries and assistance to the revolutionary struggles of all the oppressed people and nations. The policy of peaceful coexistence is merely one of the aspects of China's foreign policy and is not the strategic line of any socialist country or party in the world proletarian revolution. It simply means having relations with countries with different social systems and agreeing not to unleash wars of aggression against each other.

On the eve of the founding of the People's Republic of China, Chairman Mao declared in his "Address to the Preparatory Meeting of the New Political Consultative Conference":

We are willing to discuss with any foreign government the establishment of diplomatic relations on the basis of the principles of equality and mutual benefit and mutual respect for territorial integrity and sovereignty, provided it is willing to sever relations with the Chinese reactionaries, stop conspiring with them and adopts an attitude of genuine, and not hypocritical friendship towards People's China. The Chinese people wish to have friendly cooperations with the people of all countries and to resume and expand international trade in order to develop production and promote economic prosperity.

The Chinese government initiated the Five Principles of Peaceful Coexistence in 1954. It was on the basis of these principles that the Ten Principles of Peaceful Coexistence were formulated with the active participation of the People's Republic of China in the 1955 Bandung Conference. Imbued with the spirit of proletarian internationalism, China has always pursued the policy of peaceful coexistence to strengthen the cause of socialism, support the oppressed peoples and nations in their revolutionary struggles and oppose the imperialist policies of aggression and war.

Through negotiations, China has amicably settled border questions with several neighboring countries, with the notable exception of India and the Soviet Union which are obdurate in their bellicose anti-China and

expansionist posture. Always confused by their own malice, the Lava revisionist renegades insinuate evil in any kind of negotiations carried on by China to fend off imperialist aggression. They wish to paint a bellicose picture of China and rave about "Chinese Maoist hegemony" but they contradict themselves when they express displeasure at China for not having a single troop outside its borders.

It is not in the nature of a socialist country to provoke wars with other countries or to export revolution. Every genuine socialist country recognizes that the internal contradictions of other societies lead to revolution. Only when attacked will a socialist country counterattack. It is utterly malicious and stupid for the Lava revisionist renegades to expect China to be a warmonger and then call it a phrasemonger when it consistently pursues the Leninist policy of peaceful coexistence.

There is a fundamental difference between the Leninist policy of peaceful coexistence which the People's Republic of China follows and the general line of peaceful coexistence concocted by Khrushchov. One upholds the fundamental principle of proletarian internationalism and is merely one aspect of a proletarian foreign policy. The Khrushchovite general line of peaceful coexistence is a reflection of the restoration of capitalism in the Soviet Union and constitutes international class collaboration with other imperialist powers, chiefly with US imperialism.

The policy of peaceful coexistence should not be distorted and raised to the level of a general line of the foreign policy of socialist states and the world proletarian revolution. To do so is to violate the Leninist policy of peaceful coexistence. But Khrushchov and his successors have done so in conformity with their anti-Leninist and revisionist renegade view that the transition from capitalism to socialism is peaceful and that the road to revolution is parliamentary.

The fallacies of "peaceful transition" and "parliamentary road," raised under the cover of "combating the personality cult," a filthy-mouthed condemnation of Comrade Stalin during the 20th Congress of the CPSU, have long given away the Soviet revisionist renegades despite all their lip service to the Leninist policy of peaceful coexistence and all doubletalk about proletarian internationalism.

The 22nd Congress of the CPSU can never be forgotten for its full and open systematization of the general line of peaceful coexistence with its three "peacefuls" and two "wholes": "peaceful coexistence," "peaceful transition" and "peaceful competition," and "state of the whole people" and "party of the whole people." These fallacies constitute a complete betrayal of Leninism and explain the eagerness of Khrushchov in his own time to destroy the relations of the Communist Party of China and the Communist Party of Soviet Union and extend basic ideological differences into differences even in the diplomatic relations between China and the Soviet Union.

The great proletarian leader Lenin taught us: "Modern war is born of imperialism." He also stated:

the very thought of peacefully subordinating the capitalists to the will of the majority of the exploited, of the peaceful, reformist transition to socialism is not only extreme philistine stupidity, but also downright deception of the workers, the embellishment of capitalist wage slavery, concealment of the truth.

In every imperialist country, the proletariat can never hope to win victory without smashing and breaking the military bureaucratic machine of the big bourgeoisie.

Among the oppressed nations and people, national and social liberation cannot be won completely without reckoning with the aggressive nature of imperialism and state power of the local reactionaries. Among the imperialist countries, there will always be bloodthirsty collusion against communism and revolution but they themselves will at the same time contend to the point of violence for colonies and semicolonies, spheres of influence, sources of raw materials, markets and investment grounds. The transition of capitalism to socialism cannot be peaceful but violent. Revolution is the only possible antidote to war. Chairman Mao teaches us: "With regards to the question of war, there are but two possibilities: one is that war will give rise to revolution and the other is that revolution will prevent war." So long as imperialism exist, the danger of war exists. The imperialist countries will never stop their arms expansion and war preparations.

When the Lavaite bulletin of anticommunism refers to the "principle of peaceful coexistence," it means the Khrushchovite general line of peaceful coexistence and not the Leninist policy of peaceful coexistence which China has consistently pursued. Thus, we recognize the craven wishes of anti-Leninist traitors when we read the conclusion of the Lavaite article: "PKP welcomes a Sino-American rapprochement if it is sincerely designed to ease world tensions...." We can assure the Lava revisionist renegades that the Nixon visit to China will not bring to reality their wishful thinking about the "easing of world tensions." The revolutionary storms will continue to smash imperialism, modern revisionism and all reaction. True to its principle of proletarian internationalism, China has long ago repudiated Khrushchovite revisionism and has only recently overthrown China's Khrushchov, Liu Shao-Chi, and his gangmates.

In the same manner that China maintains diplomatic relations and conducts negotiations with a social-imperialist country like the Soviet Union, China can conduct negotiations or even open and maintain diplomatic relations with an imperialist country like the United States. At the same time, China remains firmly opposed to US imperialism in the same revolutionary spirit that it is firmly opposed to Soviet social-imperialism, notwithstanding diplomatic relations. It will always be alert to the arms expansion and war preparations of every one of these imperialist powers.

It is absolutely foolish and stupid for the Lava revisionist renegades to berate China for having relations with Canada and other nonsocialist countries. It is idle for them to go at great lengths in tracing how much US capital is there in Canada or to feel sorry that Soviet social- ' imperialism

does not control the foreign trade of China. They do not really understand the Leninist policy of peaceful coexistence that Comrades Lenin and Stalin pursued in their own time. By their own accounts concerning China's policy of peaceful coexistence, these Lavaite scoundrels slap their own faces and fail to keep up even with the external relations of their social-imperialist masters who carry these to the point of making "peaceful coexistence" their strategic line contrary to Marxism-Leninism.

Wishing to deceive people about the forthcoming visit of Nixon to China, the Lava revisionist renegades go so far as to deride the Leninist policy of peaceful coexistence as a "doublefaced" policy. Decking themselves out as "independent analysts," these bogus communists and agents of Soviet social-imperialism cast nonsensical epithets in the vain hope that these would preempt the defense of the fundamental principle of proletarian internationalism and the Leninist policy of peaceful coexistence.

The Khrushchovite line of peaceful coexistence has brazenly degenerated into the social-imperialism and social-fascism of the Brezhnev revisionist gang. The Soviet social-imperialism now raucously brandish the Brezhnev Doctrine, with its five fallacies. First, the fallacy of "limited sovereignty." It means that the sovereignty of the Soviet big monopoly bureaucrats is "supreme" and "unlimited" while that of others is "limited." Second, the fallacy of "international dictatorship." It means that a slight difference of opinion with the Soviet social-imperialists will result in the invasion of one's own country with hundreds of thousands of foreign troops, as has happened in Czechoslovakia. Third, the fallacy of "socialist community." It means submission to the Warsaw Pact and the COMECON as in the "Free World" of US imperialism, the "New Order of Europe" of Hitlerite Germany and the "Greater East Asia Co-Prosperity Sphere" of Japanese militarism. Fourth, the fallacy of "international division of labor." It means that the backward and agricultural countries will have to remain so through "specialization" in their "traditional export commodities." Fifth, the fallacy of "our interests are involved." It means that Soviet social-imperialists can act as a "superpower" in the gangster fashion of US imperialism throughout the world. Lenin defined social-imperialism as "socialism in words, imperialism in deeds, the growth of opportunism into imperialism."

Like their Soviet social-imperialist masters, the Lava revisionist renegades contradict themselves in their avowals of peace. While they say that they welcome what they call "Sino-American rapprochement if it is sincerely designed to ease world tension," they at the same time chide the People's Republic of China for not having a single troop outside its borders and for not sending in Chinese troops into Vietnamese territory even without the expressed request of the Vietnamese people for Chinese volunteers.

These little Brezhnevs pretend to be ignorant of the fact that the Vietnamese leaders and people have always asserted their sovereign right of and capability for defending themselves. They pretend to be ignorant of the fact that the Chinese leaders and people have always made clear to the US imperialists that the relationship between Vietnam and China is like the lips

to the teeth, that the Chinese people are always prepared against war and are ready to make the heaviest national sacrifice for the revolutionary cause of the Indochinese people and that the imperialist use of nuclear weapons will mean a war without boundaries.

The words of the People's Republic of China have never been idly uttered. These are borne out by revolutionary deeds and actual support not only for the Vietnamese people but also for the Cambodian and Laotian peoples. These are so different from the Soviet social-imperialist policy of sham support and real betrayal. As a matter of fact, the Lava revisionist renegades now prefer to call the tremendous increase of Chinese support for the Indochinese people as "strong Maoist pressures." As in the past in the Korean War, the Chinese people will not hesitate to fight together with fraternal peoples whenever the need arises. But of course, like Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde, the little Brezhnevs can turn themselves into little Khrushchovs at will and rave, "That is revolutionism!" They fail to appreciate the truth in revolutionary propaganda as well as in historical facts.

Despite all their posturings in defending their Soviet social-imperialist masters, the Lava revisionist renegades admit that "counterrevolutionary peace evolution" has occurred in the Soviet Union. And they point out that the same is still a danger to Chinese. But as usual, they treacherously conceded to US imperialism the full initiative and capability of dividing "socialist countries."

On our part, we state that the peaceful evolution of socialism into capitalism in the Soviet Union and other revisionist countries has indeed occurred. China has learned lessons from such an experience. It is extremely significant in the worldwide struggle against US imperialism and its likes that Chairman Mao has developed the theory and practice of continuing revolution under the dictatorship of the proletariat to consolidate the People's Republic of China and prevent the restoration of capitalism in a socialist society. China is now stronger than ever before in carrying out its proletarian foreign policy.

The People's Republic of China and the Main Trend of Revolution in the Third World

The People's Republic of China has undergone and overcome imperialist blockade and embargo, revisionist betrayal and sabotage and extreme natural calamities. These even coincided with the Great Leap Forward policy. Big and small attempts of imperialism to attack and destroy it have dismally failed. Today, while US imperialism and its running dogs are conspicuously and inextricably in crisis, the People's Republic of China is prosperously thriving and providing light and hope to all the revolutionary peoples and nations.

Learning from the lessons of the first socialist state, particularly its peaceful evolution into a neocapitalist state, Chairman Mao has developed the theory and practice of continuing revolution under the dictatorship of the

proletariat and personally initiated and launched the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution to overthrow China's Khrushchov, Liu Shao-Chi, and other capitalist roaders and to consolidate the People's Republic of China.

China is now a well-consolidated socialist state, whose several hundreds of millions of people have a high level of ideological and political consciousness. It has found the key to preventing the restoration of capitalism and has used it successfully. Because of the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution, China has become the iron bastion of socialism. It has made unprecedented revolutionary progress in the class struggle, in the struggle for production and in scientific experiment. It is fully prepared against war, against natural calamities or against anything else. The Chinese people are ever more united to win still greater victories.

The People's Republic of China is the powerful home of the Lenin of the present era, Chairman Mao Zedong, and is the center of the world proletarian revolution. It has firmly upheld the revolutionary cause of the proletariat among one-fourth of humanity. Together with the People's Republic of Albania, it has made clear to the people of the world that socialism is invincible before the onslaughts of imperialism, modern revisionism and all reaction. Under the supreme guidance of the universal theory of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought, genuine Marxist-Leninist parties and organizations are growing stronger and more united in leading the revolution in their respective countries. Revisionist cliques ranging from the Brezhnev clique through the Miyamoto clique to the local Lava revisionist renegade clique are daily being isolated and disintegrated.

The determination of the People's Republic of China to liberate Taiwan and to support the revolutionary struggles cannot be trifled with. US imperialism continues to make every effort to use Soviet social-imperialism and Japanese militarism against China but it has been frustrated at every step. At the height of the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution, the New Tsars of the Soviet Union tried to make trouble by violently encroaching upon Chinese territory but they were effectively repulsed. US imperialist chieftain Nixon brought out of his magician's hat the Nixon doctrine of making Asians fight Asians. But in all his subsequent efforts under this doctrine, US imperialism has miserably failed.

In Indochina, the main battlefield of the world today, all the strategic plans and large-scale offensives of US imperialism have been frustrated. The 50 million people of Vietnam, Cambodia and Laos have united in revolutionary armed struggle and have splendidly coordinated their efforts for national liberation and national salvation against US aggression. The Chinese people have consistently given them the necessary support. A clear demonstration of the unity of the Chinese and Indochinese peoples was made when they stood together fearless of intensified aggression and nuclear threats during the strategic offensive against southern Laos which was calculated to cut off the Indochinese peoples from each other. The glorious resounding victory at Highway 9 has spelled out the utter failure of the "Vietnamization and "Asianization" plot of Nixon.

In direct opposition to the attempt of US imperialism to use Japanese militarism as its shock force in Asia under Nixon, China has brilliantly expanded the international united front by forging close revolutionary links with the Korean, Japanese, Indochinese and other Asian peoples. By relying on Japanese militarism, US imperialism has only gained increased popular hatred from all the Asian peoples. The Korean people are ever more determined to reunify their fatherland. Becoming increasingly arrogant, Japanese militarism is raising its own demands to US imperialism and is becoming a Frankenstein to its own creator.

In the Middle East, the Palestinian and other Arab peoples persist' in struggling against US imperialism and Israeli Zionism. The Arab national governments are also pressing hard on the US oil monopolies. Even as they collude in sabotaging and opposing the revolutionary struggle, US imperialism and Soviet social-imperialism contend with each other in making their own selfish gains.

The main reason for the shaky position of US imperialism throughout the world is the ever successful socialist revolution and socialist construction in China and the ever surging revolutionary struggle of the oppressed peoples and nations. The peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America have intensified their protracted anti-imperialist struggle and have firmly linked it with the anti-imperialist struggle of the peoples of North America, Europe and Oceania. The May 20th solemn statement of Chairman Mao Zedong serves today as the program of anti-imperialist struggle and continues to inspire revolution throughout the world.

Abroad and at home, US imperialism is isolated and is suffering from a grave political and economic crisis. The American workers, Afro-Americans and other national minorities, students, women, soldiers and other progressive strata are rising up to oppose US imperialism. Unemployment, inflation, high taxes and all the high costs of military adventure are shaking the foundations of US imperialism. The scope, magnitude and intensity of anti-imperialist struggles in the United States are unprecedented in its entire history.

US imperialism has reached the apex of its existence. The more it oppresses the American proletariat and people and the colonies and semicolonies, the more it is faced with powerful mass resistance. The area for neocolonial exploitation has shrunk and the imperialist powers themselves are in cutthroat competition. They try to beg for time. But the surging revolutionary mass movements cannot be stopped.

It is in this world context that the US imperialist chieftain Nixon has sought to be invited to the People's Republic of China. It is utterly counterrevolutionary for the Lava revisionist renegades to boast of the "strength" of US imperialism as they do in the following passage:

Only the politically naive and ignorant could believe that the ritual baring of Maoist fangs frighten the US imperialists. The rulers in Washington take a tolerant, almost indulgent attitude....

What a beautiful, strong and kind image of US imperialism would the Lava revisionist renegades like to draw!

Turning reality upside down, these revisionist scoundrels even dare to state that it is not US imperialism but China that is the "paper tiger!" To back up their foolish view, they have to rely on a 1966 statement of Dean Rusk and a few words of what they hail as the "influential" *New York Times*. What bankruptcy!

Chairman Mao in his May 20th solemn statement points out:

US imperialism, which looks like a huge monster, is in essence a paper tiger, now in the throes of its death-bed struggle. In the world today, who actually fears whom? It is not the Vietnamese people, the Laotian people, the Cambodian people, the Palestinian people, the Arab people or the people of other countries who fear US imperialism; it is US imperialism which fears the people of the world. It becomes panic-stricken at the mere rustle of leaves in the wind. Innumerable facts prove that a just cause enjoys abundant support while an unjust cause finds little support. A weak nation can defeat a strong nation, a small nation can defeat a big nation. The people of a small country can certainly defeat aggression by a big country, if only they dare to rise in struggle, take up arms and grasp in their own hands the destiny of their country. This is a law of history.

The Lava revisionist renegades have all the ill wishes for the People's Republic of China. Recall the Camp Crame article of Jesus Lava, "Paglilinaw sa 'Philippine Crisis,'" which describes Taiwan as a nation-state (*bansa*) and which praises US imperialism for having brought wonders, particularly "land reform," to this province of China. Also recall the praise given by the Lavaite *Sang-ayon sa MAN* (February 15, 1971) to some reactionary politicians for advocating the "two-China" policy. The local agents of Soviet social-imperialism try to spite China to defend US imperialism and the Chiang bandit gang.

The position of US imperialism regarding China has become extremely untenable. There is a rapid increase in the number of countries officially recognizing the People's Republic of China as the sole representative of the Chinese people. Within the United Nations, the Albanian resolution on China is fast gaining ground. World opinion is clearly in favor of the liberation of Taiwan. In the realm of diplomacy, US imperialism is losing ground because of the relentless revolutionary upsurges throughout the world. The diplomatic victories of China serve to broaden the international united front, split enemy ranks and aggravate the isolation of the enemy.

It is ludicrous for US imperialism and a diehard handful of its puppet government to extemporize on a "two-China" or a "one China, one Taiwan" or any such plot. Even in their own home grounds, they are no longer in any position as before to insist on and get what they like. It is clearly a right of the People's Republic of China to liberate Taiwan. The Chinese people are determined and capable of fighting for their right.

It is madness for the reactionaries to speculate now that in exchange for the US withdrawal from Taiwan or the restoration of China's legitimate rights in the United Nations, China will bargain away its proletarian principles and its commitment to advance world revolution. The liberation of Taiwan has become certain precisely because China persists in revolution at home and supports revolutionary struggles abroad.

The People's Republic of China has always vowed never to be a superpower. It does not have the presumption of US imperialism and Soviet social-imperialism that "superpowers" decide the destinies of other peoples. On the question of Taiwan alone, Nixon will certainly be firmly told that it is an internal affair of China and that he had better recognize the national sovereignty and territorial integrity of China as precondition for the normalization of relations. A beggar, even in the guise of a visitor, cannot impose conditions on the Chinese government. The Chinese Communist Party and the Chinese government have just been rid of the Khrushchovs, big and small.

It should be clear to all that it is not for the sake of mere "revolutionism," "repetition" or "phrasemongering" that the Chinese leadership and the Chinese people stress the line that revolution is the main trend in the world today and also that so long as imperialism exists the danger of war exists. All Marxist-Leninists are aware that US imperialism takes the posture of "peace" and utters "nice words" when it fails to get what it wants by force or blackmail. It is by stressing the line and instilling the truth that the people are aroused and mobilized in their millions to make revolution and prepare themselves for war.

Chairman Mao teaches us: "The danger of a new world war still exists, and the people of all countries must get prepared. But revolution is the main trend in the world today."

The Question of Diplomatic Relations Between the Philippine Reactionary Government and China or the Soviet Union

It is the prerogative of a socialist state to have diplomatic relations with other countries having different social systems. The absence of war between a socialist country and a nonsocialist country does not require the proletariat and people in the latter country to stop making revolution. In the Philippines, the people's democratic revolution will continue to be waged even if diplomatic relations between the Chinese government and the Philippine reactionary government is established. The policy of peaceful coexistence is only as good as it is in line with the fundamental principle of proletarian internationalism.

The Lava revisionist renegades consider the question of diplomatic relations between the Philippine reactionary government and the Soviet Union as being of extreme and decisive importance. As the US-Marcos clique dangles to them the prospect of Philippine diplomatic relations with the Soviet Union, they do everything to ingratiate themselves to the reactionary

state. They conduct fascist propaganda and espionage work and perpetrate bloody crimes against the Communist Party of the Philippines, the New People's Army and the people.

To deceive some people about the nature of Soviet social-imperialism, they go as far as to say that it is as socialist as China and that all "progressives" (mixing themselves up with others) must make a clamor for diplomatic relations between the Philippine reactionary government and the Soviet government. However, they also invent such anti-Leninist and anti-China nonsense as "Chinese imperialism" or "Great-Power chauvinist ambition" and they outshout the Marcos fascists and the clerico-fascists in slandering what they call the "Maoists" and the "Maoist" ideology. They defend US imperialism and the Chiang bandit gang in a shameless attempt to promote the Interests of Soviet social-imperialism.

Lately, they keep on worrying that the Philippine reactionary government will seek relations with the People's Republic of China, chronic rice shortages and the impending overproduction of sugar (to the extent of 400,000 tons in 1972) might eventually compel the Philippine reactionary government to move away from its brazen anti-China policy (which it now calls the "two-China" policy) and seek normalization of relations with China.

The Communist Party of the Philippines once more makes it clear that it will always struggle against both and each of the Philippine reactionary government and Soviet social-imperialism.

We are against Philippine relations with Soviet social-imperialism because this monster gives counterrevolutionary support to the reactionary government and the Lava revisionist renegades and helps and competes with US imperialism and Japanese militarism in doing the same thing, in keeping the Philippines a mere appendage of imperialism.

In his article "Lessons of the Liberation Struggle in the Philippines" (*World Outlook*, Vol. I, No. 1, January 1971), William J. Pomeroy himself confesses the following:

It [trade with Soviet social-imperialism] can reduce the need for the nationalist bourgeoisie to struggle for the home market against imperialist competition; it makes it less essential to forge united fronts with popular movements. For landlord export groups it reduces the need to shift agriculture to industry. Even for the imperialist, who have caused an enormously unfavorable Philippine balance of payments position that forces the country towards exchange controls, it would ease the crisis and ensure their uninterrupted remittances of profits; hence they do not oppose it as rigidly as before, but seek to limit it and to divert it from public projects.

Many countries have experienced how the Soviet social-imperialists provide them with capital goods of gross design and shoddy quality' at quite an overprice and then underprice the agricultural or industrial products charged in payment for the capital goods as well as for technical services and other costs. Before 1960 when Khrushchov unilaterally tore up blueprints and economic and technical agreements with China, the Soviet revisionist

renegades had the bad habit of buying capital goods from West Germany, relabeling them as "Made in the Soviet Union" and then reselling them at great profit to China.

Many countries have experienced how Soviet "aid" results in the puffing up of the local bureaucrat capitalists, the sabotage of the revolutionary mass movement, and the grant of outright military support for counterrevolution as in Indonesia, India and other countries. Even at this early stage, the Lava revisionist renegades are already colluding with US imperialism and the Marcos fascist puppet clique in the perpetration of fascist crimes.

One more imperialist power, disguising itself as socialist in the Philippine scene, will not help the people's democratic revolution. It can only help the Lava revisionist renegades and other counterrevolutionaries play their vain role of undermining the unity of the revolutionary forces in the Philippines.

The Communist Party of the Philippines considers fighting US imperialism, feudalism and bureaucrat capitalism and advancing the people's democratic revolution as its main tasks. We adhere to Chairman Mao's concept of "maintaining independence and keeping the initiative in our own hands and relying on our own efforts."

Under the guidance of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought, the Communist Party of the Philippines is growing ever stronger and ever more united like all genuine Marxist-Leninist parties and organizations the world over which are now leading revolutionary mass movements in their respective countries.

* * *

A Tale of Two Renegades

First published in *Ang Bayan*, Special Issue, November 1, 1971.

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

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

To read *Born of the People* is to discover the ideological roots of the development of Taruc into an out-and-out anticommunist and the

counterrevolutionary role of Pomeroy even long before he wrote his later out-and-out revisionist works.

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

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

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

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

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

Instead of writing a history, I wrote his "autobiography," calling it *Born of the People*. I tried to put into that book not only Luis but the Filipino peasantry and the Filipino people in general, struggling to be wholly free of colonialism. For a man like Luis, a leader like Luis, was truly born of the lives and struggles of the peasantry of Pampanga, and I was him as a symbol.

Our essay, "A Tale of Two Renegades," aims to show that even at the writing of *Born of the People* both the real author and the fake author were already bent on promoting erroneous ideas to the detriment of proletarian revolutionary leadership and the revolutionary mass movement. Such erroneous ideas are in black and white in the book

I. The World Outlook of Taruc and Pomeroy

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

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

The two renegades, Taruc and Pomeroy, find much delight in satirizing the workers and peasants and in "burying" Marxism. They disregard the fact that

the Communist Party, composed of the most advanced elements of the proletariat, exists precisely to translate Marxism into the language of the masses and, more importantly, into concrete revolutionary practice. What are these two scoundrels really driving at? Pomeroy lets Taruc speak out:

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

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

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

Regarding attitude towards the masses, Chairman Mao also teaches us:

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

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

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

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

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

Taruc prattles:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

fond of deception, of making their "propaganda line" at odds with their "true line," that they always presume others in the old merger party to be guilty of deception.

II. The "Military Leadership" of Luis Taruc

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

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

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

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

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

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

Contrary to Taruc's idealist assumption that the Red army and the base areas in China dropped from the sky or grew spontaneously from the wide expanses of China, these grew from small to big and were tempered through a long period of struggle under the correct leadership of the Communist Party and Chairman Mao. At the beginning of the agrarian war or at the beginning of the war of resistance against the Japanese fascists, the Red army was always several times outnumbered by well-equipped millions of enemy troops and the Red base areas were always far smaller than the White areas. One must have the correct class standpoint and also an acute sense of proportion to see the applicability of the universal principles of Marxism-Leninism to the concrete conditions of the Philippines. The strength and maneuverability of the Red army in the countryside always depend basically on how well the proletarian revolutionary party has aroused and mobilized the peasant masses. It must be kept well in mind that at no time before or during the war of resistance was the old merger party ever able to carry out agrarian revolution or a land reform program on a broad scale and in a profound manner in order to get the closest support of the peasant masses. The consideration of geographic characteristics is secondary to the all-important question of revolutionary politics. In the course of the enemy campaigns of "encirclement and suppression," the intensity of armed struggle in a small country like the Philippines is comparable to that in a specific part of a big country like China. At the same time, it is always difficult even for a large enemy force to saturate the countryside of a semicolonial and semifeudal country.

Taruc admits that he and his cohorts had the outlook of the roving rebel band when he brags: "We did not even have a base." Mount Arayat was really some kind of a "base" but it was a poorly chosen one and was not even

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

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

III. Taruc as a Major Representative of the Old Merger Party

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

The creation of the old merger party in 1938 was directly masterminded by the now-notorious anticommunist Earl Browder who was then general secretary of the Communist Party of the USA. Vicente Lava was the principal

local agent who promoted the Browderite revisionist slogan "Communism in the 20th century Americanism." The influence of this slogan runs through *Born of the People*. There is not a single word of praise for Comrade Stalin written in the book. But Taruc and Pomeroy are ecstatic about Roosevelt's leadership. They babble:

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

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

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

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

In the interest of the broadest kind of unity, we adopted the slogan: "Anti-Japanese above all." That meant exactly what it said. We would forego an independent struggle for separate working class demands. To show our good faith we dissolved the AMT and KPMP,⁷ the peasant organizations.

To pursue the national struggle does not mean foregoing or suspending the class struggle; to do the latter is to betray the proletariat and the people. To dissolve peasant organization under the pretext of "the broadest kind of unity" is to fawn in the most treacherous manner on the US imperialists and their reactionary stooges.

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

⁷ The AMT was the Aguman ding Maldang Talapagobra (League of Poor Laborers) while the KPMP was the Kapisanang Pambansa ng mga Magbubukid sa Pilipinas (National Peasant Union of the Philippines).

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

Excessive panegyric is heaped on the ghost of the US military officer Thorpe who during the early part of the war had merely promised to give arms to the HUKBALAHAP in Central Luzon. Taruc wails:

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

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

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

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

Taruc and Pomeroy deliberately refuse to draw obvious lessons from the experience of carrying out a united front policy during the war of resistance. Among these lessons should be a recognition of the need to build a strong Marxist-Leninist party, a strong people's army that the party leads and a people's government based in the countryside and having a united front character, altogether capable of confronting the return of US imperialism and the Commonwealth government at a new and higher stage of the

revolutionary struggle. In carrying out the united front policy, we make it a point as Chairman Mao teaches us to "make use of contradictions, win over the many, oppose the few and crush the enemies one by one" rather than be confused by the dual nature of certain temporary allies or surrender our independence and initiative to them.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

When after the war MacArthur and McNutt kept on harping on a "reexamination" of the US pledge to "grant independence" to the Philippines, Taruc and his kind could only have the silly wish that Roosevelt should have lived forever as their final resort. They would not be satisfied with having Harold Ickes for a "defender"; they wished to have a bigger Yankee brother and they wasted a lot of tears on the name of Roosevelt. To Taruc and his kind in the old merger party, Chairman Mao's principle of "maintaining

independence and keeping the initiative in our own hands and relying on our own efforts" was alien.

IV. The Capitulationist Line of the Lavas and the Tarucs

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

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

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

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

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

A vote for Osmena was interpreted as a vote for "independence" on July 4, 1946 and a vote for Roxas as a vote for the "postponement" of independence

as proposed by MacArthur and McNutt. Thus, the old merger party threw in its support for Osmetia. Along this line, it converted itself into a minor electoral organization to help the Nacionalista Party directly in a common effort with the Liberal Party and US imperialism to put up the farce that is the present puppet republic. The revolutionary role of a proletarian party in the struggle for national liberation was cast away. Taruc and Pomeroy still assert in the book: "A victory for Osmetia might have placed the nation on the road to real independence and real democracy." What great faith they have in a reactionary politician! They also ask rhetorically: "Could the betrayal have been avoided?" and they proceeded to answer themselves:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Nothing came out of the "pacification plan" and "negotiations" of the Roxas puppet regime and the old merger party. From beginning to end, Roxas

would not be satisfied with anything less than the "total extermination of communists," including the Lavas and the Tarucs. Only when their own lives were already in clear danger did the Lavas and the Tarucs take the posture of leading the revolutionary masses in armed struggle. They had to fall back on the people whom they had readily slandered as "willing to accept the peace of slaves."

As soon as Quirino became the puppet chieftain in 1948 following the untimely death of Roxas, he sent out feelers to Luis Taruc and his kind that they could enter into a negotiation and an agreement on "surrender and amnesty" with him. Incurable capitulationists that they were, the Lavas and the Tarucs were only too willing to fall into Quirino's political trap despite the people's clamor for revolutionary armed struggle. Taruc took the limelight as a fool for once more agreeing to the "surrender and registration" of HUKBALAHAP fighters.

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

Taruc tries to lessen his counterrevolutionary crime by confessing:

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

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

Taruc rails:

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

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

In their desire to accommodate their selfish interests and seek rotten compromises with the US imperialists and the reactionaries, the Lavas and the Tarucs could easily forget how the Filipino people had been able to gain

standing and become a considerable force through the HUKBALAHAP. The scoundrels made it a habit to oppose the truth of Chairman Mao's teaching that "Political power grows out of the barrel of a gun."

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

I was going to school again. This time it was the school of politics. In our country it has been a special business. People train for it from the time that they are young men. In the universities they make their contacts and become skilled in the game of classroom politics. That is what happens in a colonial country, where politics is usually a doorway to quick wealth through graft and corruption, a system fostered by the dominating foreigners because it enables them to buy politicians, and thus to siphon off the political vigor of the nation. The word "politician" was so debased that it meant "cheater" and "demagogue" to the masses.

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

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

Born of the People is a book of national betrayal from beginning to end. It tries to prettify such national betrayers as the Lavas and the Tarucs. But it futilely does so. It only succeeds in unwittingly presenting the true face of national betrayers. Never truly relying on revolutionary work and on the strength of the revolutionary masses, the Lavas and the Tarucs always pin their fondest hopes on US imperialism and its reactionary stooges. When confronted with Japanese fascism, they pin their fondest hopes on US imperialism and the Commonwealth government. When confronted with the onslaughts of the USAFFE, they pine for the return of General MacArthur or even for the ghost of Thorpe. When confronted with the dirty maneuvers of Truman, MacArthur and McNutt, they wish Roosevelt were alive and Harold

Ickes were kept in office. When confronted with the puppet Manuel Roxas, they think they can rely most on Osmeria. When Roxas gets to be president, they toady up to him until he comes close to strangling them. When Quirino gets to be president, they readily accept terms of surrender and amnesty.

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

* * *

Pomeroy's Forest Nightmare

First published in *Ang Bayan*, Special Issue, November 1, 1971.

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

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

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

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

I. The Theme of Bourgeois Pessimism

It is of utmost importance to recall the words of Chairman Mao Zedong regarding the counterrevolutionary revisionist "theory of human nature":

There is only human nature in the concrete, no human nature in the abstract. In class society there is only human nature of a class character; there is no human nature above classes. We uphold the human nature of the proletariat and of the masses of the people, while the landlord and bourgeois classes uphold the human nature of their own classes, only they do not say but make it out to be the only human nature in existence.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Devoid of any revolutionary class perspective, Pomeroy sinks to the lowest depths of fatalism and defeatism: "Here in the primeval forest, I have never felt so overwhelmingly that human insignificance. Life means nothing in this geological immensity." The anti-communist scoundrels always find it

rewarding to make a whine of despair: "a time of grimness has come into our lives. I have been touched with fatalism. I think I am going to die in the forest...."

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

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

Pomeroy contends in keeping with his bourgeois humanism:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

II. The Purely Military Viewpoint

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

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

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

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

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

Chairman Mao teaches us:

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

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

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

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

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

Expressing awe for the army and disdain for the Red fighters, he rails: "some of the best minds from American military academies are out here meeting their match from untrained peasants"; and "the enemy has the advantage in firepower and modern weapons." Pomeroy's bourgeois militarist

mentality is consistent: the people's army has no chance against the military superiority of the enemy since the military is more important than politics and the peasants are inferior to US-trained officers.

In writing about the February-March 1950 conference of the central committee of the old merger party, Pomeroy fails to present anything—his own or that of the conference—which can shed light on the disastrous line and policies taken by the Jose Lava leadership or a new line of policies that can carry the revolutionary movement forward. The decisions of the conference carry on the false assumptions of the Jose Lava leadership against a protracted people's war and, therefore involve basically the continuance of a wrong line and wrong policies.

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

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

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

When the enemy launches its own offensive against the forest camp, it inevitably turns out that political work has not been well carried out among

the people in the surrounding areas and even within the camp itself. It turns out that the forest camp is relying mainly on physical concealment and not on a well-consolidated base. District organizing committees disintegrate in a day; the enemy forces either seized or poisoned the food supplies before being allowed to pass through. Within the camp itself, harsh punishments are the order of the day to maintain "discipline." Pomeroy misjudges and cannot trust even his own guard.

In January 1951 the enemy succeeds in penetrating the forest camp, first the cluster of huts of the Education Department and Jesus Lava's but where the stocks of food for the entire camp are seized. From then on, the problem of supply and communications becomes extremely acute. Yet after the February-March conference, the Secretariat with a personnel of 200 men and women, including a handful of armed guards, is set up in the forest. This soon becomes a definite and isolated target for intensified enemy operations.

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

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

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

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

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

What a malicious excuse for the colossal errors of the Jose-Jesus Lava leadership.

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

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

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

We are like those who lean over a deep well and drop pebbles into its interior, waiting to hear the far hollow echo of them striking water.

When the sound comes back to us it is a strange echo, like the lost cry of someone drowning in that depth.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

* * *

Apologia for US Imperialism

First published *Ang Bayan*, Special Issue, November 15, 1971.

American Neocolonialism is an attempt to confuse readers about the nature and development of US imperialism with wornout social-democratic arguments. This book is an apologia for US imperialism, particularly for the

direct US colonial rule in the Philippines from 1899 to 1946. It is an incontrovertible proof of the author's role as an agent of US imperialism.

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

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

The revisionist scoundrel observes that US imperialism has consistently fashioned "nonaggressive neocolonial techniques" which prove to be more profitable than direct colonial domination. He maliciously equates the term "neocolonialism" to Kautsky's "supra-imperialism" a "phase when wars shall cease," "a phase of the joint exploitation of the world by internationally united finance capital."

The book strains to show the background of this "neocolonialism" by tracing the contradictions in the ranks of the US imperialists themselves: between the "aggressive expansionists" and the "reluctant expansionists" or between "military authority" and "civil authority." The purpose of the revisionist scoundrel is not to expose and oppose the counterrevolutionary dual tactics of an inherently aggressive and bloodsucking imperialist power. It is to peddle the false idea that contradictions among the ranks of the US imperialists themselves are principal to all other contradictions and that all international developments result essentially from the wishes of the imperialists themselves not from the struggle between revolution and counterrevolution nor between aggression and counter aggression. It is to peddle the false idea that US imperialism ultimately becomes peaceful due to the "sensibleness" of certain imperialists and that aggression and colonial rule are merely the "preferred policy" of some imperialists which is "reluctantly" adopted at certain periods.

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

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

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

The great Lenin said:

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

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

Chairman Mao has pointed out:

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

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

I. On the Seizure and Retention of the Philippines as a US Colony

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

The development of pre-monopoly capitalism, in which free competition was predominant, reached its limits in the 1860s and 1870s. After this period, the tremendous "boom" in colonial conquests began and the struggle

for the territorial division of the world became necessary for the imperialist powers. Lenin pointed out: "There was inevitably ushered in the era of monopoly possession of colonies and, consequently, of particularly intense struggle for the division and redivision of the world...."

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

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

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

He seeks to repudiate the Marxist-Leninist contention that the capitalist crisis of overproduction has resulted in imperialist expansionism by the monopolies by simply calling it as "one of the main arguments of the apologists for imperialist expansion." He argues that US imperialism at the turn of the century could have even foregone actions that brought it out of its home grounds, especially such an action as the conquest and retention of the Philippines as a colony. He insists that the US monopolies were capable of unlimited internal expansion inasmuch as, according to him, the US home market and investment fields prospered and expanded as time passed, due to advances in technology and opening new fields of production as well as due to "structural reforms" in the capitalist system, particularly the "antitrust" measures and the use of a high tariff policy. He blabbers:

Its (US imperialism's) internal market and investment field, capable of great expansion, tempered its drive into foreign markets; the use of a high tariff wall to protect that home market played a more salient role than the acquisition of colonies, colonial markets and resources.

Lenin pointed out:

Bourgeois scholars and publicists usually come out in defense of imperialism in a somewhat veiled form; they obscure its complete domination and its deep-going roots, strive to push specific and secondary details into the forefront and do their very best to dis-tract

attention from essentials by means of absolutely ridiculous schemes for "reform," such as police supervision of the trusts or banks, etc. Pomeroy takes after Kautsky in arguing that "reforms" took place to counteract monopoly practices and to "increase the consuming capacity of the people." What a fond apology for US imperialism!

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

Lenin also pointed out:

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

Pomeroy minimizes the actual role of the dominant US monopolies behind the conquest and retention of the Philippines as a colony and constantly maximizes the role of domestic US agricultural interests (especially beet sugar, tobacco and dairy) in opposing the acquisition or retention of colonies. He underrates the US monopolies and overrates the domestic US agricultural interests. For instance, he easily reaches the absurd point of making the US sugar beet interests appear more powerful than the US sugar trust that was expansively interested in Philippine sugar. In the relationship between the industrial monopolies and agricultural interests in general, the latter has been subordinate to the former.

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

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

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

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

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

The issue of the American colonial system was settled, and the continuation of the Philippine colony during that time (1916) was an anachronism in American imperialist policy. In the opinion of many, the 30 years⁸ between the passage of the Jones Act and the final grant of independence was an unnecessary period of delay.

Pomeroy deliberately obscures the fact that US capitalism relieved itself of the crisis of overproduction during the early decades of the 20th century through its expansionist activities. In the familiar fashion of imperialist apologists, he minimizes total US investments abroad then as having been no more than one-tenth of US gross national product. To rub in the lie that US imperialism was never so dependent on its overseas investments and trade, he compares these to those of British imperialism at its peak in 1914 when a quarter of its wealth was in foreign investments and its foreign trade approximated a quarter of its gross national product.

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

⁸ Thirty years is the gap between 1916 and 1946.

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

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

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

Lenin warned against the empiricist method of studying imperialism: "Simply to compare colonies with noncolonies, one imperialism with another imperialism, one semicolony or colony with all other countries, is to evade and to obscure the very essence of the question."

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

The epoch of the latest stage of capitalism shows us that certain relations between capitalist combines grow up, based on the economic division of the world; while parallel to and in connection with it, certain relations grow up between political combines, between states, on the basis of the territorial division of the world, of the struggle for colonies, of the "struggle for economic territory."

The Philippines had been seized by the United States in order to turn the Pacific Ocean into an "American lake" and to have a base for its latecomer "open-door" policy on China, a policy of trying to have a share of a vast economic territory to which other imperialist powers had prior claims.⁹ But

⁹ The desire for foreign markets and colonies was the root cause of the US war against Spain, then a dying colonial power and easy prey for the

Pomeroy denies the strategic value of the Philippines in the US imperialist scheme; he goes as far as to say that the colonial possession of the Philippines was more of a liability than an asset in Asia for US imperialism. He calls it an "aggravation" of a policy of "weakness." He considers the "open-door policy" a policy of "weakness" rather than a convenient shibboleth for a rising imperialist power in its vigorous attempt to cut into China and Asia in general.

Pomeroy depicts US imperialism as a much frustrated weakling that could easily be bullied by Japan even during the first two decades of the 20th century. He completely obscures the close alliance of British and US imperialism in Asia and the fact that Japan was a debtor-nation to the United States. It was with the indulgence of US and British imperialism that Japan seized Korea and spheres of influence in China. But Pomeroy insists that even as early as 1916 US imperialism was already so terrified by the Japanese victory over the Russians in 1905 and also by the Japanese seizure of all the special privileges of Germany in China during World War I that it was eager to withdraw from its Philippine colony or maintain "unprovocative" presence there. In the entire book, Pomeroy actually gives more weight to the pressure of Japan on the United States than to the unceasing demands of the Filipino people for independence as a factor for compelling the United States to pledge sham independence for the Philippines. He states:

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

Pomeroy states further:

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

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

American expansionists. It was no accident that Commodore George Dewey was in Hong Kong two months before the Spanish-American War.

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

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

II. A False Balance Sheet of US Imperialism in the Philippines

Referring to colonies, the great Lenin unequivocally stated:

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

He also said:

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

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

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

It is utterly ridiculous to expect as did Kautsky that imperialism would rely on the "open market" for its raw materials. Certainly, it became more advantageous than during the Spanish colonial era for US imperialism to hold the Philippines as its own colony and get the raw materials without having to

comply with Spanish laws. The US imperialists would have laughed at Kautsky's pontification that "peace-ful democracy," rather than military occupation, would have opened Egypt more rapidly to British trade had it been uttered when Dewey sailed into Manila Bay.

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

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

Pomeroy misrepresents a short period of initial US investments (1902 and thereabouts) as representing the entire period of direct US colonial rule. He considers it too discouraging as it was "expensive" for the US imperialists to engage in the improvement of public works and communications. He does not consider that these were not only favorable for US business and military operations in the Philippines but were also paid for by taxes exacted from the colonized people.¹⁰ Bonds for provincial and municipal improvements fetched huge profits for US bondholders. US companies exacted huge profits from

¹⁰ In Senate Document 331, p. 878 United States, 57th Congress, 1st Session, General Arthur MacArthur made the following frank statement:

One of my purposes was to improve roads for strategic purposes entirely. I got \$1 million gold for the purpose. Whatever incidental advantage arose to the community was, of course, in consequence of the military necessity. My view was to make passable roads during all seasons, so that by assembling troops at central points and connecting the outpost by wire, we could rapidly move from the rendezvous to the extremities, and thereby avoid the necessity of scattering into so many small posts..."

supply and engineering contracts. Yet Pomeroy arbitrarily cites the "losses" suffered by the operation of railroads in Cebu and Panay as a major cause for "diminished interest" in the Philippine colony. He does not consider that the US monopolies made profits on the building of these particular railroads and he covers up the tremendously profitable US takeover, expansion and operation of the Manila Railroad Company.

The counterrevolutionary idea of Pomeroy that runs through his entire book is that colonization of the Philippines merely caused economic "difficulties" instead of advantages for US imperialism and that such "difficulties" always pressed on the US imperialists to leave the Philippines to a "stable government" of Filipino puppets. In his own particular way, he preaches Kautsky's idea of "peaceful democracy" as a better method for the capitalist countries to gain economic advantage. He maliciously puts aside the irrepressible demands of the Filipino people for national independence and democracy which the US imperialists and the local puppet demagogues always tried to preempt in their shady compromises on "Philippine independence."

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

He claims that if a 20% rate of profit is conceded to US goods, as forecast by merchants in advance of the Payne-Aldrich Act, US manufacturers and merchants earned \$160 million¹¹ from the US-Philippine trade during the first three decades of US colonial rule. He calls it a "generous estimate" for them to have earned \$200 million during the said period, even if such invisibles as insurance and freight charges were included. He bewails that Philippine exports to the United States exceeded imports of US goods by nearly \$400 million¹² (up to 1927, \$1.2 billion as against \$900.1 million). He regrets that overall US profits were "more than overbalanced by far" by the amount of duties waived on Philippine products entering the United States under the

Since the exploitation of the Philippine colony involved the development of the import-export trade and investment principally in the extractive industries, it required the development of roads and railroads.

But the money to build these was raised by taxing the Filipinos, for it had earlier been decided that the insular government was to be supported entirely by taxes levied on the population.

¹¹ The amount should be \$180 million, which is 20% of \$900 million.

¹² The amount should be about \$300 million. Repeatedly Pomeroy bungles his arithmetic.

"free trade" terms of the Payne-Aldrich Act. On the basis of his inane and erratic computations, Pomeroy concludes that the US imperialists incurred losses rather than profits in the US-Philippine trade. Yet, he states that "to some extent," which he does not care to spell out in figures, earnings from Philippine exports went to US investment interests in the islands, in the refining of raw sugar, in manufacture of coconut products and in commercial handling. He claims, however, that the greater amount represented a payment by American taxpayers to "Filipino producers" well in excess of US trade profits.

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

In looking at the military costs of seizing and holding onto the Philippines, Pomeroy completely obscures the fact that such were not at all borne by the US monopolies. On the other hand, the US monopolies profited immediately and in a long-term way from the colonial conquest of the Philippines. The costs of US military aggression were imposed on the American people as well as on the people that were the victims of aggression and colonial domination after their conquest. The Filipino people were compelled to pay the taxes necessary to defray US military expenditures and to maintain the Philippines as a colony. With regard to US military expenditures incurred in World War II, it is obvious that the US monopolies profited tremendously and unprecedentedly from military production and was consequently able to assume the position of No. 1 imperialist power through aggression, intervention and subversion in various countries.

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

freely take the road of self-reliance and industrialization and always subject to manipulation by US imperialism.

The records of the Bureau of Census and Statistics show that the book value of US private investments in the Philippines before the outbreak of World War II amounted to P537 million or \$268.5 million. Book value in the records of the colonial government cannot tell the whole story. But Pomeroy overdoes his role as an apologist of US imperialism by calling this level of US investments "low" and then leaping to the conclusion that these did not make much profit or were not enough to exceed military expenditures and "losses" in trade. We need to stress the fact that even with so little capital invested in colonies and semicolonies tremendous profits could be made and remitted annually to US stockholders. But like his US imperialist masters, Pomeroy would not divulge figures regarding this. The rate of profit for US subsidiaries in colonies and semicolonies is several times higher than in the United States and other capitalist countries. Only a very tiny part of annual earnings is reinvested and accumulated from year to year. It is superficial for one to pay attention only to the magnitude of US investments in the Philippines and then consider it as inconsequential because it is so much less than US investments in Western Europe or Canada. US investments in other capitalist countries are huge because it takes that much to squeeze into a relatively constricted field and to have a significant say on economic and political policies of those countries. What Pomeroy belittles as "small" US investments is within the Philippines big and strategic capital capable of drawing superprofits and controlling the entire economy.¹³

In the case of Meralco, for instance, its original capitalization in 1901 was only \$2.0 million. Sixty years later, the majority stocks would be sold to a Philippine combine for \$50 million. The growth of the investment is striking enough. But what would be more striking is the tremendous amount of dividends remitted to US stockholders in sixty years. Pomeroy conveniently does not divulge this. This is not even to reckon with the profits made on Meralco by its mother and aunt companies on various accounts. General Electric Corporation, the US oil interests, the US banks and other related US businesses are doing the same on this Philippine enterprise.

Referring to the monopolists in capitalist countries, Lenin observed:

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

By insisting that the colonial possession of the Philippines by US imperialism was "not a paying" venture, Pomeroy actually whitewashes US imperialism and denies its bloodsucking activities. It is our view that US imperialism profited greatly from its colonial possession of the Philippines. It is to argue against historical truth and to prettify US imperialism to maintain

¹³ The US remains as the Philippines' top foreign investor, contributing 48.93% to direct foreign equity investment (Business Day, June 25, 1979).

the thesis that it successfully colonized the Philippines only to suffer economic losses.

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

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

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

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

Congressional prerogatives were less when it came to noncolonial areas of investment and trade; operations of a neocolonialism were far less apt to come under scrutiny.

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

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

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

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

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

The annexation of the Philippines was an essential manifestation of US imperialism. This was necessary for US imperialism to satisfy its inherent cravings for superprofits and expansion, to impose its power and influence not only in the Philippines but also in China and the whole of Asia. Now as before, US imperialism (including puppetry to it) is a truly losing proposition in the Philippines through the revolutionary struggle for national liberation and people's democracy. Lenin laid bare the moribund and decadent character of imperialism a long time ago.

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

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

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

When an analysis of the contemporary period is made, it will bear a marked resemblance to the period of debate over imperialist policy following the Spanish-American War. (Clashes between military and civil concepts of policy, authority and administration have also

occurred in a repeated pattern, the MacArthur-Truman dispute in the Korean War, the "hawk" and "dove" antagonism in the Vietnam War, and the frequent Pentagon-State Department rifts being much like echoes of the Otis-Schurman and MacArthur-Taft differences during the Philippine conquest.)

The optimism of Pomeroy is an opportunist one and it lies in placing hopes mainly on the "peace-lovers" among the US imperialist policymakers. It means falling for the more aggressive and more deceptive "Nixon doctrine" of today, for instance.

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

While the conclusion of Pomeroy is that US imperialism will continue to put "reemphasis on indirect neocolonial methods" and to fashion "more subtle techniques of neocolonialism" to prolong its life without any foreseeable end, we busy ourselves with raising the ideological and political consciousness and organized strength of the Filipino people in order to deal deadly blows against US imperialism and all its running dogs. In this regard, we make a criticism and repudiation of Pomeroy's *American Neocolonialism* in line with Lenin's dictum:

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

Chairman Mao teaches us:

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

Imperialism will not last long because it always does evil things. It persists in grooming and supporting reactionaries in all countries who are against the people, it has forcibly seized many colonies and semicolonies and many military bases, and it threatens the peace with atomic war. Thus, forced by imperialism to do so, more than 90 percent of the people of the world are rising or will rise up in struggle against it. Yet imperialism is still alive, still running amuck in Asia, Africa and Latin America. In the West, imperialism is still oppressing the people at

home. This situation must change. It is the task of the people of the whole world to put an end to the aggression and oppression perpetrated by imperialism, and chiefly by US imperialism.

* * *

Pomeroy's Apologia for Soviet Revisionism

First published in *Ang Bayan*, Special Issue, November 30, 1971.

Half a Century of Socialism (Soviet Life in the 1960s) unfolds the role of William J. Pomeroy as both an agent of Soviet modern re-visionism and US imperialism. This book pretends to celebrate the 50th anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution but in fact it celebrates the betrayal of Marxism-Leninism and the all-round restoration of capitalism in the homeland of the great Lenin. It heaps all kinds of empty praises on the 20th and 22nd Congresses of the revisionist Communist Party of the Soviet Union and for the 23rd Congress and the plenary sessions of the CPSU Central Committee from 1965 to 1967 by which Brezhnev and his revisionist gang have outdone Khrushchov in bringing about the all-round restoration of capitalism in the Soviet Union.

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

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

Pomeroy prates that the difference between what he calls the past (the time of Lenin and Stalin) and the present (the time of his Soviet revisionist masters) lies in the "advance of techniques." This is to cover up the betrayal of Leninism and the peaceful evolution of the proletarian dictatorship into a bourgeois dictatorship through the machination of such usurpers as Khrushchov and Brezhnev who is Khrushchov the second. In the process, he

also manages to throw in a flimsily-disguised praise for the international big bourgeoisie. He states:

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

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

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

I. On the Proletarian Dictatorship

Marx wrote:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

This is unadulterated Khrushchovism and Brezhnevism.

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

After the restoration of capitalism through peaceful evolution, the anti-Marxist and anti-Leninists openly flaunt the theory of "state of the whole people" and "party of the whole people" in order to denote the dissolution of the dictatorship of the proletariat and the party of the proletariat, respectively. A dictatorship of the new bourgeoisie such as those of Khrushchov and Brezhnev is set up. It is no surprise, therefore, that the anticommunist scoundrel Pomeroy now admits that his Soviet revisionist masters no longer think of the dictatorship of the proletariat as the instrument for suppressing counterrevolutionary tendencies within the country. State power for them is itself the instrument for counterrevolution.

Throughout Pomeroy's book, it is clear that the kind of "people" who are now living it up in capitalist style in the Soviet Union belong to the bourgeoisie. They converted the socialist economy into state monopoly capitalism. They rob the state treasury centrally and in various enterprises and farms, live in a kind of luxury imitative of the bourgeoisie in the West, squander the social wealth accumulated for decades through the hard work of the Soviet laboring people and intensify oppression and exploitation in order to raise their profits. A monopoly bureaucrat bourgeoisie lords over the state and Party, operates the means of production as capitalist enterprises and poisons education and culture to suit capitalist ends. The Soviet neo-bourgeoisie rides roughshod over the Soviet proletariat, the people of various nationalities and the people of various countries, especially a number of East European countries and the Mongolian People's Republic.¹⁴

Pomeroy refers to the "dictatorship of the proletariat" as an instrument "solely against enemies from outside." However, it is noteworthy that he does not make a single attack, not even a sham one, against US imperialism in his concluding chapter which is his most concentrated way of presenting the revisionist view of the transition from socialism to communism. On the other hand his vicious but futile diatribes are without letup against Chairman Mao, the Chinese Communist Party the Chinese proletariat and people, and the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution. Indeed, Pomeroy reflects very well the evil designs of the Soviet fascist and social imperialist state against China, communism, the people, and revolution. He projects very well also such acts of aggression as the Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia, mischievously called "international dictatorship." Beware of the arms expansion and war preparations being carried out by Soviet social imperialism in its mad quest for world hegemony.

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

If a communist cadre is asked about the romanticism of what he is doing, he will most likely reply that the exciting struggle for power was

¹⁴ See Mao Zedong, *A Critique of Soviet Economics* (Monthly Review Press, 1977). -- Editor

only the initial struggle, the beginning of problems after which the hard weary work begins....

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

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

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

He seems to recognize here the necessity of the dictatorship of the proletariat in pushing through and protecting socialist construction. But his main interest now is to make this dictatorship appear as the straitjacket of democracy. He denies the fact that the dictatorship of the proletariat, while suppressing the people's enemies, created during the time of Lenin and Stalin the broadest democracy among the workers, peasants and revolutionary intellectuals. He exposes his antagonism to genuine democracy when he degrades the revolutionary mass movement as less effective than economic work and argues that economic work by itself is automatically revolutionary. He prates: "An efficiently-run socialist enterprise may possess much greater revolutionary potential than the largest of demonstrations...." Only a counterrevolutionary will lay aside proletarian politics or subordinate it to economic work. Chairman Mao teaches us: "Political work is the lifeblood of all economic work."

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

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

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

necessary for all countries to learn from the October Revolution. Once this gate is opened, Leninism by and large is thrown out.

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

What Pomeroy considers "democracy" is the bourgeois coup d'etat executed by his Soviet revisionist masters, the widespread fascist purges carried out in all the Party and government organizations, from the higher to the lower echelons, and the replacement of proletarian cadres in leading positions by the bourgeois intelligentsia and the worst dregs of Soviet society. Nearly 70% of the CPSU Central Committee members elected at the 19th Congress in 1952 were purged at the top reflected the bigger purges below. The 22nd Congress systematized the Khrushchov revisionist program of "three peacefuls" ("peaceful coexistence," "peaceful competition," and "peaceful transition") and "two wholes" ("party of the whole people" and "state of the whole people"). By the time of the 23rd congress in 1966, nearly 60% of the CPSU Central Committee members elected in the 20th congress were purged. The 23rd Congress sanctified the "new system" or "economic reform" which was first approved in the September 1965 plenum of the Brezhnev-led CPSU Central Committee and which further pushed the full-scale restoration of capitalism.

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

In pursuit of what Pomeroy calls "socialist legality," the Soviet revisionist renegades have sent genuine Communists in great numbers to mental hospitals, prisons and concentration camps since the liquidation of the

proletarian dictatorship by Khrushchov. Outright assassinations are perpetrated. Tanks and armored cars have been dispatched to suppress the resistance of the revolutionary masses of various nationalities against the oppressive revisionist rule. The Soviet army has been indoctrinated with revisionist ideology and revolutionary elements within have been purged. Fascist laws and decrees such as the "regulations on the work of people's control," "law on the basic principles of the corrective-labor legislation" and "regulations on preliminary detention" have proliferated. The police and spies have greatly increased in number and have run berserk. The army, the police, the prisons and courts are relentlessly used to enforce the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie against the Soviet people. Under the Brezhnev revisionist renegade clique, social-fascism, social-militarism and Great-Russian chauvinism have become even more vicious than during the time of Khrushchov.

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

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

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

Under the Brezhnev revisionist renegade clique, Soviet social-imperialism has fully emerged to invade the territory of other countries and abuse other peoples. It has exacerbated its new tsarist and colonial rule over a number of East European countries and the Mongolian People's Republic. It has invaded Czechoslovakia and abused the people there. It cannot tolerate the slightest difference of opinion with the leadership of other revisionist countries and is wont to using the Warsaw Pact and the COMECON¹⁵ to threaten and blackmail other countries. Also, it has not relented in its efforts to sabotage and subvert the People's Republic of Albania. It has repeatedly made aggressive incursions on Chinese territory and has tried to outdo the old tsars. In various other parts of the world, especially in Asia, Africa and Latin America, it has always tried to collude with or outbid US imperialism in exploiting and oppressing the people.

II. On the All-Round Restoration of Capitalism

¹⁵ It is through the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance (COMECON), the Warsaw Pact and the revisionist parties in Western Europe that Soviet social-imperialism banks on to keep itself the "dominant power" in Europe.

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

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

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

This is bourgeois philistinism, pure and simple!

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

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

But is this the truth?

Within his own book Pomeroy fails to be consistent with his lies and slaps his own face repeatedly. He reports that in his land of "superabundance" he saw several street beggars and these are not supposed to shake his faith in the socialist label tacked by his Soviet revisionist masters on their system. While he argues for the putting of principal stress on private ownership of cars as a material incentive, he reports that the public transport system is gravely inadequate and inefficient throughout the Soviet Union. While he argues for putting principal stress on private ownership of flats and villas as material incentive, he reports that there are long waiting lists for accommodation in public tenements, that residents in overcrowded tenements are grouchy, that there are those who collect high rent privately and that blackmarketing of construction materials is spawned by private construction. While he argues for the expansion of private plots and personal subsidiary husbandry, he cites specific data proving, that these have been

attended to at the expense of the collective farms. While he boasts that there has been no shortage in basic commodities such as potatoes and trousers, he reports that Khrushchov was cast away by his successors on account of agricultural shortages that included potato and cotton. He also testifies that there are long queues and bitter wranglings over scarce goods at department stores in such show window cities as Moscow and Leningrad.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The Brezhnev revisionist renegade clique gets the most lavish praise from Pomeroy for making a "profound adjustment" in the Soviet economic system since 1965. This is the "new economic system," otherwise called "economic reform" which establishes in a legal form the capitalist principle of profit for the benefit of the oligarchy of the big monopoly bureaucrats and the privileged bourgeois stratum, all at the expense of the Soviet working people. Its new feature is sup-posed to be the provision of material incentives, such as bonuses and other pay increases, for profitable management in an enterprise. It dictates the practice of capitalist management in all fields of the Soviet economy and it sanctifies the bonus as a "moral stimulus." It involves the complete disruption of the socialist

relations of production and the thorough breaking up of the socialist economic base. The socialist economic system of unified economic planning by the state is abolished in favor of the anarchy of enterprises and farms operated on the basis of profit-seeking.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The "new economic system" gives the enterprises the authority to "own, use and dispose of" all property; to sell "surplus" equipment, means of transport, raw materials, materials and fuel; to let the premises, warehouses,

equipment and means of transport which are "temporarily not in use;" to use "funds at their disposal" for capital construction that is "outside the plan." There is a wide ground for nefarious manipulation of assets. Managers even sell for profit such means of production as machine tools, hoists, generators, locomotives and seamless tubes which are supposed to be state property. Soviet enterprises make profits on each other. Means of production and raw materials are also finding their way into private enterprises.

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

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

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

Though there is anarchy in the relationship of Soviet enterprises due to capitalist competition, there is inevitably the trend towards accumulation and concentration. Small and weak enterprises are drawn by big and strong enterprises into large-scale amalgamations in order to bring the principle of profit into full play and give maximum profits to the monopoly bureaucrat bourgeoisie. The amalgamations become independent business accounting units and become real monopolies. The "new economic system" harps on the autonomy of individual business enterprises only because it aims to destroy the principle of unified socialist planning and build up the kind of centralization demanded by state monopoly capitalism. An example of a huge monopoly enterprise in the Soviet Union today is the Ministry of

Investments and Automation Tools, an independent business accounting ministry.

"Economic reform" in the countryside has brought about a private economy—a kulak economy. Socialist restrictions on private plots and private livestock have been removed. Pomeroy himself unwittingly provides us some 1966 data (though these are watered down, they are still very revealing), which show the anti-socialist course in agriculture. According to him "personal subsidiary husbandry" involved only "three percent" of the country's cultivated land yet it accounted for about "17 percent" of the national agricultural production. Within this total figure are: 60% of the national potato crop, 40% of the national crop of green vegetables, 40% of the national production of dressed meat, 38% of the national milk production and 68% of the national egg production. With his twisted anti-socialist logic, Pomeroy argues that the private plots and private livestock should be enlarged because they have produced so much. This is supposed to be in compliance with the "scientific laws of economics." He completely disregards the fact that the collective and state farms have been neglected in favor of the private plots.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The overall economic situation in the Soviet Union was bad enough in 1967, when Pomeroy wrote his book. But it has become even worse in succeeding years as a result of the "new economic system" or "economic reform" pushed by the Brezhnev revisionist renegade clique. Under the leadership of Stalin, Soviet industry used to develop at a high speed. Taking for example the 1950-53 period, the average annual rate of growth of Soviet industry stood at 16%. But this dropped to 9.6% during the nine years following the 20th congress of the CPSU in 1956 under Khrushchov. This further dropped to 8.5% during the five years since Brezhnev assumed power in 1965. Despite the boastful claims of Pomeroy and his Soviet revisionist masters about the "higher level of techniques" today, the growth rates of labor productivity have consistently gone down in the Soviet Union.

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

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

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

III. On the Question of the Superstructure

Chairman Mao Zedong is the Lenin of the present era. He kids inherited, defended and developed Marxism-Leninism with genius, creatively and comprehensively, and has brought it to a higher and completely new stage of

Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought. To him we owe the invincible ideological weapon for advancing towards the total collapse of imperialism and the worldwide victory of socialism.

With the rise of modern revisionism and the restoration of capitalism in the Soviet Union and other socialist countries, the imperialists and their running dogs were gleeful and congratulated themselves for their view that a dictatorship of the proletariat can be peacefully eroded through a number of generations. But Chairman Mao has come forward to provide the key to solving the problem of capitalist restoration in a socialist society after analyzing and summing up the historical experience of socialist countries. He has put forward the theory of continuing revolution under the dictatorship of the proletariat and has successfully put it into practice through the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution.

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

For all these reasons, the Soviet revisionist renegades and their hack Pomeroy hate Chairman Mao and everything that he stands for. Thus, Pomeroy describes the Great Cultural Proletarian Revolution as "based on an effort to build socialism and communism on 'a very low level'." They describe modern revisionism, the restoration of capitalism and putting material incentives in command of everything as being "on a higher level."

Pomeroy further tries to misrepresent the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution:

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

The main current and outcome of the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution were excellent. The ghosts and monsters were swept away from positions of dominance in the superstructure. But in the main there was no "indiscriminate rejection and destruction" of the literature, art and cultural forms of the past. Traditional and foreign forms that can serve the present revolutionary needs of China and the proletariat were given correct revolutionary content, as splendidly evident in the literary and art models that emerged in the course of the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution. Even those things of the past that are definitely not proletarian in character were

preserved in their isolated places to serve as negative examples. With regard to the Red Guards, they constitute a great mass movement that has heightened the revolutionary spirit of serving the people among the youth, that has tempered the youth in revolutionary struggles under the leadership of the proletariat and that has trained hundreds of millions of youth as successors in the revolution. The imperialists and social-imperialists have been most disappointed with the Red Guards because their emergence has served to explode the sinister hope that modern revisionism would take over China as it has the Soviet Union upon the coming of the "third or fourth generation."

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Pomeroy refers to such bourgeois degenerates as Boris Pasternak, Alexander Solzhenitsyn, Yevgeny Yevtushenko, Anatoly Zhigulin, Bulat Okujave, Andrei Voznesensky and the like as the cream of Soviet literature in what he calls a "50-year cultural revolution."¹⁶ He considers as their principal qualification their being "anti-Stalinist." And he trumpets at the same time the theory of literature for literature's sake. He raves:

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

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

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

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

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

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

He is happy to report that Shelley and Byron are being quoted and interpreted "solely in the light of being defenders of the British working class" in Soviet secondary schools. He approves of Hemingway as the

¹⁶ Some of these bourgeois degenerates like A. Solzhenitsyn have changed sides and defected to US imperialism which now uses them in the cam-paign to discredit genuine socialism in the guise of attacking Soviet social-imperialism. Now, they have become "literary favorites" of US imperialism.

favorite author of the revisionist elements among the Soviet youth and lauds this bourgeois defeatist author for "the courage of his heroes, his preoccupation with good and noble impulses in people" and "the moral tone of his distinctions."

He also approves of John Steinbeck as another "favorite author." He praises John Steinbeck's *Grapes of Wrath* and *Winter of Our Discontent* for "preaching protest against violence." A true Marxist-Leninist can easily see the essence of Steinbeck as bourgeois literary pessimist, at most interested in exposure but terrified by revolutionary violence. There is no surprise at all that this anticommunist scoundrel today rabidly supports the US war of aggression in Vietnam. One who is against revolutionary violence easily turns into one supporting counterrevolutionary violence.

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

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

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

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

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

He states:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

IV. On "Peaceful Coexistence" and Social-Imperialism

From Khrushchov to Brezhnev, the foreign policy of the Soviet Union has reflected the all-round restoration of capitalism. Though the Soviet revisionist rulers pay lip service to proletarian internationalism, they actually betray the interests of the world proletariat and all oppressed peoples for the benefit of the international bourgeoisie, particularly of the Soviet monopoly bourgeoisie. Since the 1960s, a full-blown Soviet social-imperialism (with

state monopoly capitalism as its base) has joined US imperialism to become one of the two main enemies of the world proletarian revolution. It has become the principal accomplice of US imperialism in counterrevolution and has always tried to outdo US imperialism in counterrevolution.

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

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

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

China rebuffed all these ridiculous demands of Khrushchov even as he resorted to economic blackmail. After completely failing to get what he wanted, he eventually tried to sabotage the Great Leap Forward and take

advantage of the imperialist blockade and natural calamities that had created difficulties in China. Without prior consultations with the Chinese leaders, he ordered the sudden total withdrawal of Soviet experts in clear violation of the Sino-Soviet Treaty of Mutual Aid and paid no heed to China's demands that the cases be reconsidered and the experts be returned. But Pomeroy now wishes to depict this as "gradual withdrawal" resulting from "differences over the observance of economic laws." He prates:

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

The real cause was that Khrushchov was so maddened by the refusal of the Chinese Communist Party to follow the revisionist line that he pounded on, his great-power chauvinist dictates, his capitulation to US imperialism and his scheme to turn China into a political and economic appendage of the Soviet Union. After the withdrawal of Soviet "aid," the Chinese authorities discovered to the great relief of the Chinese people that the grossly-designed Soviet goods and Soviet technical services were extremely overpriced and payments in the form of Chinese products were in effect underpriced. They also discovered that the Soviet Union had relabeled and resold West German goods to China at great profit.

It is utterly ridiculous, therefore, for Pomeroy to rave that "the Chinese people would not have deprived themselves of the prime necessities, as was earlier the case of the Soviet people, to carry out economic construction, had the leaders of China conducted a policy of all-round cooperation within the framework of the socialist community." Despite all attempts at sabotage by the Soviet revisionist renegades and their Chinese agents like Liu Shao-Chi, the Great Leap Forward triumphed in the end and proved correct Chairman Mao's line of "going all out, aiming high and achieving greater, faster, better and more economical results in building socialism" and of "maintaining independence and keeping the initiative in our own hands and relying on our own efforts."

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

The Brezhnev revisionist renegade clique has pursued basically Khrushchov's foreign policy and carried it to the extreme through the most brazen acts of aggression against its colonial dependencies as well as against the People's Republic of China. It has invaded Czechoslovakia with hundreds of thousands of foreign troops under its command and put up a

puppet government at bayonet point. It has stationed several Soviet divisions in the Mongolian People's Republic and has moved millions of troops to the Sino-Soviet borders. It has repeatedly made nuclear threats against China and has encroached upon Chinese territory such as Zhenbao island and the Tiehliekti area. It is overstretching itself on a scale even larger than what the old tsars aspired to.

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

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

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

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

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

Fourth, the theory of "international division of labor." It means that a number of countries in East Europe Asia, Africa and Latin America should specialize in "traditional export commodities" that suit the Soviet Union. The Soviet Union is supposed to expand its neocolonial spheres of influence in order to get raw materials from backward countries at great profit for itself.

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

In its relations with countries in Asia, Africa and Latin America, Soviet social-imperialism has always sought to exercise political control and extort superprofits through its "aid." It pretends to extend loans at low interest rates but overprices the goods and technical services that it gives. Payment for these is made mainly in the form of raw materials which are in effect greatly underpriced. The Soviet Union also acts as a munitions merchant and sets an arbitrary price for the military material that it delivers. It is very instructive to study closely how the Soviet Union has taken advantage of India, Egypt, Indonesia and other countries.

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

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

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

The Brezhnev revisionist renegades have repeatedly raised the slogan of "united action" and "united anti-imperialist struggle" against the US war of aggression in Vietnam. But their aim is merely to shake off their isolation

from the revolutionary forces that act to isolate them for their counterrevolutionary actions and slander. If their aim were really to support Vietnam, they can always make use of bilateral agreements. But their aim is to make trouble among the revolutionary forces and to put into question the undeniable fact that China is the closest, strongest and most reliable rear not only of the Vietnamese people but also of the entire Indochinese people. As the US war of aggression has spread throughout Indochina, China has emerged as the most powerful supporter of the revolutionary struggle of the revolutionary struggle of the Vietnamese, Cambodian and Laotian peoples; and the Soviet Union as the most sham supporter, always angling for an opportunity to strike a bargain with US imperialism.

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

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

Chairman Mao has provided us with the theory of continuing revolution under the dictatorship of the proletariat and has shown us in practice how to prevent the restoration of capitalism in a socialist society. An antidote to opportunism at its worst and to social-imperialism has been developed. That is Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought, the revolutionary theory of the proletariat in the present era.

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

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

Chairman Mao has also pointed out:

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

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

Chairman Mao has urged us:

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

* * *

International Lavaite Spokesman Openly Admits Collaboration of US-Marcos Clique and the Lava Revisionist Renegades

First published in *Ang Bayan*, Vol. IV, No. 1, January 15, 1972.

In several publications, the Lava revisionist renegades have given "credit" to the reactionary armed forces for having "disintegrated" and "driven out" the New People's Army from Central Luzon in 1970. The Lavaite bulletin of anticommunism in its February 1971 issue states:

The wind swiftly changed direction a few months later. The puppet army unleashed a vicious counteroffensive, killing, torturing and looting the barrio people.... It was the 1950 tragedy reenacted as a farce.

The July 1971 issue of *Struggle* follows this up with the malicious lie that "now the NPA is reduced to a sorry band which specializes in terrorizing the people of Isabela."

William J. Pomeroy, international Lavaite spokesman, openly admits afterwards that the Lava revisionist renegades have worked hand in glove with the reactionary armed forces against the New People's Army led by the Communist Party of the Philippines. In his article "Source Materials on Philippine Revolutionary Movements" published in the 1971 Summer-Fall issue of the *Bulletin of Concerned Asian Scholars* (Vol. 3, No. 3-4), he states: "This [the New People's Army] existed for a time in the southeast corner of Tarlac province, but when it began killing HMB and Masaka members in villages, the HMB drove it out of Tarlac in 1970 and it shifted to the mountain

provinces of northern Luzon." [Emphasis ours.] The reactionary armed forces and the Monkees-Armeng Bayan-Masaka or the Briones-Diwa-Pasion gang, which now claims itself to be the "HMB" after Sumulong, are indeed together in opposing the Communist Party of the Philippines, the New People's Army and the revolutionary masses.

Events have shown the exact opposite of what the Lava revisionist fascists futilely describe as "disintegration" and "flight" of the Party and the New People's Army. The effective repudiation of the Lava-Sumulong gangster clique, the exposure of the Lava revisionist renegades and the punishment of the Lavaite diehard agents in the reactionary armed forces and the rich harvest of military victories by the New People's Army led by the Communist Party of the Philippines have all resulted in an unprecedented advance of the people's democratic revolution.

Contrary to the malicious claims of the Lava revisionist fascists, the Party and the people's army now command wide areas of operation not only in Central Luzon but also in several other regions of the Philippines and the revolutionary masses have made significant political, military, economic and cultural gains in these areas.

That the Lava revisionist fascists have now chosen to boastfully proclaim their crimes against the people, the Party and the people's army with the clear intention of doing the worst against the Philippine revolution should make us more vigilant against them. Always keeping in mind the long list of the bloody crimes of the Lava revisionist fascists, the Party, the people's army and the broad masses of the people are ever more determined to give these counterrevolutionaries the punishment that they deserve.

The Communist Party of the Philippines and the New People's Army have always been guided by Comrade Mao Zedong's correct assessment of the reactionaries. He states:

Make trouble, fail, make trouble again, fail again ... till their doom; that is the logic of the imperialists and all reactionaries the world over in dealing with the people's cause, and they will never go against this logic. This is a Marxist law.

Counterrevolutionaries that they are, the Lava revisionist fascists will certainly fail for they will never go against this logic.

* * *

Lava Revisionist Renegades Formally Surrender to the Fascist Dictator at Malacanang Palace

First published in *Ang Bayan*, Vol. VI, No. 4, November 15, 1974.

Seven bosses of the Lava revisionist renegade clique, presenting themselves as the entire "political bureau" of their clique, brought with them 26 members of what they called their "armed elite" to Malacanang Palace

last October 11 and formally surrendered to the fascist dictator Marcos himself in elaborate ceremonies attended by a clutch of fascist military officers.

The seven bosses included Felicisimo Macapagal, "party general secretary"; Alejandro Briones, "HMB commander-in-chief"; Mariano de Guzman, the notorious gangster otherwise known as "Commander Diwa"; Romeo Dizon, son-in-law of Jose Lava; Federico Maclang, a cousin and longtime overseer of the Lava brothers; Romulo de Guzman, another Lava kinsman; and Merlin Magallona, a petty bureaucrat at the UP Law Center. The presence of Dizon, Maclang and R. de Guzman in the affair clearly showed the active participation and approval of every rat in the innermost recesses of the Lavaite domain.

The absence of such other Lavaite bosses as Francisco Lava, Jr., Antonio Santos, Godofredo Mallari, Danilo Pascual and Domingo Castro from the surrender ceremonies proved neither that they were camera-shy nor that they disapproved of the affair. It is an old Lavaite trick for some to surrender openly to the people's enemy while others move around in small circles to whisper that the surrender is not really a surrender.

The original Lava scoundrels instigated Luis Taruc at the time of Roxas to dissolve the people's army, register its personnel with the enemy, surrender arms and participate in the "pacification drive" against the people; and again instigated him at the time of Quirino to surrender himself and the people's army. But these revisionist scoundrels always placed themselves behind the scenes. It satisfied them that their treasonous line and unprincipled transactions damaged the revolutionary cause.

At the surrender ceremonies, Macapagal read from a Lavaite script and pleaded to the fascist dictator, "Your Excellency, you have called for national unity and we are here today in response to your call. We do so with an offer of patriotic and socially conscious participation in nation-building, which has long been denied us."

Mustering all the obsequiousness that he could, Macapagal further said:

We couldn't help but realize that for the first time in the political history of our country, genuine reforms are being directed and carried out in a determined manner by no less than the President; reforms that are meant to advance the frontiers of social justice and open opportunities for a better life for all our people. The President deserves the support of all, in the spirit of national unity; and particularly at this time when problems keep mounting every day.

We did a lot of soul searching. We can't be communists simply for the sake of communism. We are communists for the sake of our country and our people; and the first duty of a communist is patriotism. When the President called for national unity, we knew he needed it for the sake of our country. What else, do you think, should all true Filipinos do?

Certainly, it is not to surrender and accept the fascist puppet dictatorship as it is today but to fight for the revolutionary cause of the broad masses of

the people. In the surrender ceremonies, Briones, otherwise known as "Commander Yeye," turned over his Magnum revolver and cane to the fascist dictator. So did "Commander Diwa" his 0.45 cal. automatic pistol and jungle uniform. Nineteen assorted firearms previously turned over by these revisionist traitors to fascist military authorities were also laid down on the carpet for photographers to focus their cameras on.

All these flamboyant gestures were supposed to signify Lavaite renunciation of the armed struggle and surrender to the fascist dictatorial regime of the US-Marcos clique. All the revisionist traitors in the affair swore allegiance to the "new society" and pledged to inform on anyone they know who bears arms and opposes the fascist regime.

The fascist dictator gleefully welcomed the formal surrender and responded, "I feel that because of the mutual trust and confidence which we have demonstrated here, we will continue moving forward as a nation." He praised the revisionist traitors for their surrender and their offer to surrender further everyone whom they had misled. He assured them that they would continue to hold safe-conduct passes from the fascist military and that they could participate in the activities of the "new society."

In a subsequent move, the fascist dictator issued on November 3, Presidential Decree No. 571 granting amnesty to the leaders and members of the Lava revisionist renegade clique, the Armeng Bayan (sometimes usurping the name of Hukbong Mapagpalaya ng Bayan), Malayang Samahang Magsasaka (Masaka), Malayang Pagkakaisa ng Kabataang Pilipino (MPKP) and Samahang Pambansa ng Kababaihan sa Pilipinas (SPKP). One measly fascist decree, amendable any time at the whim of the fascist dictator and calculated to uncover all personnel and resources of the Lava revisionist renegades, is the only sop that is thrown in the direction of those misled by the revisionist bosses.

There is nothing surprising about the formal surrender and complete sellout of the Lava revisionist renegades to the fascist puppet dictatorship. Since 1967, these counterrevolutionaries have pursued a line of betrayal and collaboration with the US-Marcos clique. Since 1969, they have perpetrated bloody crimes of intrigue against the Communist Party of the Philippines, the New People's Army and the broad masses of the people. They have done so in collaboration with the reactionary armed forces at a low level and in specific areas. The only thing new is that the fascist dictator has condescended to entertain them directly and openly at Malacanang Palace and has thereby made public acknowledgement of the fact that they are his cheap petty agents through and through.

As soon as Marcos made his rightist coup in 1972, the Lava revisionist renegades on one side and those whom they had misled on another side split on the question of opposing the fascist puppet dictatorship. The question was raised by the latter who took the position of opposing the fascist dictatorship. The Lavaite diehards took the position of supporting the fascist puppet dictatorship and riding on it in order to gain all the license in

attacking the Communist Party of the Philippines, the New People's Army and the democratic organizations and the broad masses of the people.

A series of murders was perpetrated by the Lavaite diehards in order to silence anyone within their organization who dared to propose an antifascist line. These crimes were uncovered by the Philippine Constabulary upon the complaint of the family of one of the murder victims and upon the subsequent arrest of Danilo Pascual and other revisionist thugs. It is obviously in exchange for the condonation of those crimes that the Lava revisionist renegade clique has decided to cooperate with the fascist puppet dictatorship even to the point of their own total political extinction. Even before their formal surrender at Malacanang Palace, the Lava revisionist renegades had taken every opportunity to serve the enemy and attack the people. Only last August, a company of the Fifth Infantry Brigade converged on Barrio Inuman of Matulid, Bulacan. It was acting on an allegation made by Alejandro Briones at Camp Capinpin that the people in the barrio were supporting the New People's Army. The fascist troops were not able to pounce on the people who had already fled but they burned and looted the houses, destroyed the crops though already ripe for harvest and ate all the pigs and chicken within sight.

By publicizing the total surrender of the Lava revisionist renegades, the fascist dictator has apparently calculated to create the false illusion that he is gaining some support; but on the contrary the results are salutary to the revolutionary movement and detrimental to his regime. He exposed and thereby incapacitated his own agents who previously could pretend to be revolutionaries to some people and yet specialized in criminally attacking the people and the revolutionaries. Now, especially within the national democratic front it has become more certain than ever before to everyone that the Lava revisionist renegades are counterrevolutionaries and special agents of the enemy.

By their own cupidity, the Lava revisionist renegades have more than ever damned themselves before the broad masses of the people. Their villainous counterrevolutionary character is more than ever clear to the millions upon millions of people. No one should lose sight of the fact that the Lava revisionist renegades, like their Soviet social-imperialist masters, would go to any length in undertaking self-defeating collusion with US imperialism and its local fascist agents so long as this collusion is against a Marxist-Leninist party, the people and the revolution.

* * *