



On the Philosophy of Marxism- Leninism-Maoism

jose maria sison

**sison
reader
series**

2

julieta de lima
editor



Jose Maria Sison
***On the Philosophy of Marxism-
Leninism-Maoism***

Sison Reader Series

Book 2

Julieta de Lima, Editor

International Network for Philippine Studies
The Netherlands

Copyright © 2021
by International Network for Philippine Studies (INPS)
Published by
International Network for Philippine Studies (INPS)
Cover and Book Design by Lukas Mak

Table of Contents

[Title Page](#)

[Copyright Page](#)

[Preface](#)

[Our Beloved Party Celebrates | its First Anniversary under the Supreme Guidance | of Marxism- Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought](#)

[Tribute to the Great Communist Mao Zedong](#)

[Basic Principles of Marxism-Leninism: A Primer](#)

[The Role of the Church in Social Change](#)

[Ideologies in the Philippines](#)

[Sophism of the Christian Social Movement](#)

[Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought | as Guide to the Philippine Revolution](#)

[Reaffirm the Communist Manifesto](#)

[Ideology and Religion in the Philippines](#)

[Development, Current Status, and Prospects | of Maoist Theory and Practice in the Philippines](#)

[Significance and Relevance of the Communist Manifesto to the Continuing Struggle | of the Filipino People](#)

[The CPP on Maoism, New Democratic Revolution, China and the Current World Order](#)

[Build the Bolshevik-type of Party and the Revolutionary Mass Movement](#)

[Keynote Address to the Global Launch | of Marx@200 Celebration](#)

[Questions on Mao Zedong Thought/Maoism](#)

[Interview on the Frankfurt School | and Critical Theory.](#)

[A Comment on Dialectical Materialism, | Idealism and Mechanical Materialism](#)

[Some Questions on Dialectical Materialism](#)

[Lenin at 150: Lenin Lives!](#)

[General View of Lenin's Theory on Modern Imperialism as Indispensable Integral Part | of his Revolutionary Legacy.](#)

[On Dialectical Materialism: | First of a Series of Webinars | on Marxism-Leninism-Maoism](#)

[On Historical Materialism: | Second of a Series of Webinars | on Marxism-Leninism-Maoism](#)

[On Scientific Socialism: | Third of a Series of Webinars | on Marxism-Leninism-Maoism](#)

[On Trotskyites and other Slanderers](#)

[On the Origin of the Family, Private Property, | and the State by Friedrich Engels](#)

[Discussion of Anti-Dühring by Friedrich Engels | Part I: Philosophy.](#)

[Discussions on Anti-Dühring by Friedrich Engels | Part II: Political Economy.](#)

[Discussion of Anti-Dühring by Friedrich Engels | Part III On Socialism](#)

[Discussions on Socialism: | Utopian and Scientific | by Friedrich Engels](#)

[On the Question of Ideology and Political Power](#)

[On Practice and on Contradiction](#)

[On the Correct Handling of Contradictions | among the People](#)

[Combat Liberalism](#)

[On the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution | Fourth Episode of Mao Series](#)

[On Proletarian Stand and Outlook | Second Episode: Introduction to | Marxism-Leninism-Maoism](#)

[Dialectical and Historical Materialism: A Review | Third Episode of Marxism-Leninism: | An Introduction](#)

[Significance of the Paris Commune of 1871 | and its Relevance to the World Proletarian Revolution](#)

[Stand for Socialism against Modern Revisionism](#)

Preface

As the revolutionary theory of the proletariat, Marxism-Leninism-Maoism seeks not only to interpret the world but, as Marx pointed out, also to change it. In this regard, Lenin stressed that without revolutionary theory there can be no revolutionary movement. In learning theory, proletarian revolutionaries give the highest importance to Marxist-Leninist-Maoist philosophy. Having the materialist-scientific outlook and applying dialectical materialism facilitate the understanding of all matters and the solution of problems in the revolutionary process.

Background in Learning Theory

As early as in 1958, we who prepared to found the Student Cultural Association of the University of the Philippines (SCAUP) studied and advocated the resumption of the Philippine Revolution of 1896 and its elevation to the new democratic revolution under the leadership of the proletariat, with a socialist perspective; and in accordance with the era of modern imperialism and the world proletarian revolution.

We were determined to apply the theory of Marxism-Leninism on Philippine history, society and revolution but, in the face of the Anti-Subversion Law, we carried out discreetly the direct study of Marxist-Leninist philosophy, political economy and social science among the SCAUP members.

We read and studied the Marxist-Leninist books that we could get hold of mainly from private collections. We took down notes and made outlines for discussion in secret study groups. Regarding philosophy, we pored over *The German Ideology* by Marx and Engels, *Anti-Duhring* and *Dialectics of Nature* by Engels and *Materialism and Empirio-Criticism* by Lenin, "On Contradiction", "On Practice" and "Where Do Correct Ideas Come From?" by Mao.

The SCAUP was in the forefront of the struggle for academic freedom and civil liberties against the Anti-Subversion Law from 1959 onward. It organized the demonstration of 5000 students against the so-called Committee on Anti-Filipino Activities (CAFA) on March 15, 1961.

As chairman of the SCAUP, I engaged in an open debate with the head of the UP English Department on the curriculum and syllabus on the subject of Great Ideas. I demanded that the works of Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin and Mao be included for study and the reduction of the overwhelming amount of works of religious thinkers.

The success of the anti-CAFA mass action in 1961 to protest the anticommunist witchhunt further emboldened the SCAUP to declare that it studied the semicolonial and semifeudal conditions and prospects of the new democratic revolution in the Philippines in relation to the theory and practice of the revolutions in China and in Southeast Asia.

When I was in Indonesia in 1962, I made arrangements for Marxist-Leninist literature to enter the Philippines discreetly. This was very much in demand when we discussed Philippine and international issues in study groups and open meetings. We wished to be guided by the pertinent basic principles of Marxism-Leninism.

As early as 1963, we further studied these principles as we sought to understand the ideological and political degeneration of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the issues in the Sino-Soviet ideological dispute. We promoted the systematic study of the Marxist-Leninist theory and practice among the university students and the young workers, peasants, teachers and other professionals.

After Kabataang Makabayan was formed on November 30, 1964, we the communist cadres at the core of this comprehensive youth organization became ever more determined to avail of the theory of Marxism-Leninism as the guide to action in doing social investigation, carrying out mass work, building communist party branches and groups and pursuing the new democratic revolution.

The Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution in China from 1966 onward served to underscore Mao Zedong Thought as the further development of Marxism-Leninism. We studied avidly Mao's theoretical and practical contributions to philosophy, political economy, social science, rectification movement, people's war, and the theory of continuing revolution in socialist society.

By 1966 the communist cadres among the workers, peasants and the youth were ready to sum up and analyze the errors of the old merger party of the Communist Party of the Philippine Islands

and the Socialist Party that had brought it close to extinction. We noted that each of the Lava brothers (Vicente, Jose and Jesus), who had led the old CPP, was first of all ideologically subjective idealist, a deviant from the materialist-scientific philosophy and dialectical materialism and therefore prone to opportunism in politics.

In the First Great Rectification Movement from 1966 onward, we pointed out that the error of subjectivist idealism resulted in the Right opportunism of Vicente Lava (retreat for defense policy and welcoming the return of US imperialism); “Left” opportunism of Jose Lava (military adventurist policy of winning in two year’s time without undertaking painstaking mass work); and the Right opportunism of Jesus Lava (liquidation of the people’s army in 1955 and liquidation of the old merger party of the CPPI and SP in 1957).

Ideology in Building the CPP and Cooperating with Noncommunists

We started to carry out the rectification movement in preparation for the reestablishment of the Communist Party of the Philippines (CPP). For this purpose, I drafted “Rectify Errors and Rebuild the Party”. This signified the break of the proletarian revolutionary cadres from the old communist party under the persistent control of the Lava revisionist clique which had earlier opposed an earlier draft of this rectification document.

The CPP Constitution and Program for a People’s Democratic Revolution in 1968 proclaimed the theory of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism as the guide to the Philippine revolution. This theory would also be proclaimed as likewise the guide of the New People’s Army (NPA).

It guided the writing of *Philippine Society and Revolution* in 1969, all major CPP policies and decisions and the basic, intermediate and advanced courses of study on the Revolutionary School of Mao Zedong Thought under the CPP Central Committee.

In this book *On the Philosophy of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism*, the “Basic Principles of Marxism-Leninism: A Primer” presents not only the basic principles but also the stages of their development from the time of Marx and Engels to those of Lenin and Stalin and most recently that of Mao: Marxism in the era of free competition of capitalism, Leninism in the era of modern imperialism and

proletarian revolution and Mao Zedong Thought or Maoism in the era of socialism confronting imperialism revisionism and all reaction.

By 1981 to 1982, I had the opportunity in prison to write down this primer and had it smuggled out. It sums up the content of the theoretical education of the Party cadres and members since the Party's reestablishment. It is now a basic text in the theoretical and political education of all CPP cadres and members.

In contrast to most of the 1960s when Catholic ultra-reactionaries who called themselves Christian Democrats, Christian Socialists or social democrats were among those in the forefront of the US-instigated anticommunist crusade, the Christians for National Liberation (CNL) emerged more prominently as advocates of ecumenism, cooperation and dialogue with nonbelievers and became a major part of the National Democratic Front of the Philippines and the movement against the US-supported Marcos fascist dictatorship.

In fact, the CNL had a major role in encouraging the religious leaders and flock of the Catholic and other Christian churches to stand up for human rights and call on the people to overthrow the Marcos dictatorship in 1986. Most of the people that converged on Edsa in 1986 were Christians who responded to the call of Cardinal Sin and other Christian leaders and at least 20 per cent of the people belonged to the national democratic organizations as hard core of the uprising. At the same time, 85 per cent of the people that directly confronted the presidential palace belonged to the labor, youth and urban poor contingents of the national democratic movement.

It is of great interest to the people that this book deals with the historical and current relations of those who adhere to Marxism-Leninism-Maoism and those who adhere to two other major ideologies in Philippine society, Christianity and bourgeois liberalism. At the philosophical level, there are the basic principles that completely differentiate Marxism-Leninism-Maoism from either of these two. But at the political and social level, there are grounds for dialogue and cooperation for those who are patriotic and progressive.

After my release from prison as a result of the Marcos downfall, I was invited to several ecumenical dialogues on human rights, peace,

social justice and development in the Philippines and abroad. Among the most important lectures that I wrote were those pertaining to Christianity and its relation to later ideologies, such as bourgeois liberalism and Marxism. Two of the lectures are included in this book.

I spoke on the role of the church on social change before the National Secretariat on Social Action of the Catholic Bishops Conference of the Philippines in Manila in 1986, on ideologies in the Philippines before the Task Force on Ideology of the World Council of Churches in Geneva in 1988 and on Ideology and Religion before Filipino Catholic priests and nuns from The Netherlands, Belgium and Austria in Amsterdam, in 2005. The Centre for Liberation Theologies of the Faculty of Theology and Religious Studies of the Katholieke Universiteit in Leuven, Belgium invited me to deliver a lecture on the new democratic revolution through protracted people's war at the Forum for Liberation Theology in 2014.

As in the First Great Rectification Movement from 1966 onward, the Second Great Rectification Movement from 1992 onward involved rooting out the subjectivist error that resulted in the Right opportunist error of converting the NDFP as the New Katipunan in the frame of bourgeois liberalism and "Left" opportunism of urban insurrectionism, military adventurism and premature regularization of the NPA. The subjectivist error was the presumption that the Philippines was no longer semifeudal but industrial capitalist and had no need for the strategic line of protracted people's war.

Included in this book are two contents which serve to show how comprehensively and profoundly the CPP has adopted Maoism. These are my paper titled "Development, Current Status and Prospects of Maoist Theory and Practice in the Philippines" which I delivered to the Conference on Maoism at the Jan van Eyck Academie, Maastricht, in 2012; and my interview with the *New Culture Magazine* of the Communist Reconstruction Union of Brazil, with the title "On the CPP, Maoism, New Democratic Revolution, China and the Current World Order" in 2014.

I respond in this book to questions about Maoism as the theoretical guide of the CPP, which are raised by Prof. Regletto Aldrich D. Imbong in an email interview in 2019 in connection with his academic work. We discuss Maoism as the third stage in the

development of the universal theory and practice of the revolutionary proletariat, the great contributions of Mao and the six components of Maoism and the stray claims of Abimael Guzman or Gonzalo, Alain Badiou and Slavoj Zizek about Mao and Maoism.

Reviewing and Further Developing Basic Principles

I include in this book my “Comment on Dialectical Materialism, Idealism and Mechanical Materialism”. This short paper expresses concisely the quintessence of dialectical materialism in opposition to both idealism (objective and subjective) and to mechanical materialism. I take into account the leap from divinism to humanism in the Renaissance and in the epochal advance from Newtonian physics to Einsteinian physics and to further knowledge and application of quantum physics.

Quantum physics recognizes the unity and distinction of the particle and the wave and reaffirms Einstein’s equation of energy to mass times the speed of light as well as the Marxist concept of matter and its mode of existence. I also take note of the tremendous advance of the technological application of quantum physics in further raising the social character and productivity of both collective labor and the means of production, distribution and communications, aggravating the crisis of overproduction in monopoly capitalism and making socialism necessary more than ever before.

I am delighted that my comment on dialectical materialism has prompted Professor Regletto Aldrich Imbong to interview me on the formulation of dialectical materialism in relation to Feuerbach and Hegel, the basic principles and laws of materialist dialectics and the misinterpretations about Mao and Maoism by the avowed Maoist Alain Badiou on the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution as a “novelty” and the dispensability of the Communist Party and by the blatantly anti-Maoist Slavoj Zizek on the principles of contradiction and practice.

I am also delighted that Prof. Jerry D. Imbong has also raised questions on the hodgepodge of subjectivist philosophers belonging to the Frankfurt School. I get the opportunity to expose the main anti-Marxist and anticommunist thrust of the school, as represented especially by Martin Heidegger of Nazi infamy and Hannah Arendt’s “anti-authoritarianism” which makes monopoly capitalism the golden

mean between fascism and communism, like the anti-radicalism of the American Seymour Martin Lipset.

The Frankfurt School seems to have lost its anticommunist mission of critiquing Marxism under the cover of promoting social and critical theory and applying socialism after being pushed to the morass of liberalism and social democracy by the success of modern revisionism in restoring capitalism in the Soviet Union and China and the rise of neoliberalism of the Austrian and Chicago schools in the world capitalist system since the 1980s. Now that neoliberalism is in a state of bankruptcy, the intensifying anti-imperialist and democratic mass struggles are ushering in the resurgence of the world proletarian-socialist revolution.

The current Covid-19 pandemic has been a bane to the proletariat and people of the world, who lose employment and incomes, become poorer and more vulnerable to the grave scarcity or lack of medical and other social services. But in dialectical materialism, what is baneful can be a boon because the extremely oppressive and exploitative conditions drive the broad masses of the people to rise up against those few who have unjustly extracted superprofits from them and accumulated wealth and power against them.

While so many people have been idled by the lockdowns due to the pandemic, the ND Online School of Anakbayan-Europa, Paaralang Jose Ma. Sison and so many other organizations have organized webinars on the philosophical works of Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin and Mao and on the current Philippine and global issues. And they have encouraged so many people to participate in the webinars and thereafter to circulate the videos of the webinars and to publish the texts of the webinars as done here in this book, with the focus on Marxist-Leninist-Maoist philosophy.

As guest speaker and respondent to the questions in webinars, I have had the opportunity of writing down the texts of my presentations and answers and publishing them in this book. I have re-read the classic works and have reviewed and developed further what I lectured on extemporaneously on the basis of outlines and notes, since a long time ago in secret study groups of student youth, workers, peasants, women, professionals and so on.

The latter half of this book on philosophy includes discussions on the basic principles of the materialist-scientific outlook, dialectical materialism, historical materialism, epistemology, political economy and scientific socialism as well as the history and current circumstances of the world proletarian revolution, its victories, its setbacks and its foreseeable resurgence due to the worsening crisis of imperialism and the rise of anti-imperialist and democratic mass struggles in the direction of socialism.

Jose Maria Sison
CPP Founding Chairman
May 1, 2021

Our Beloved Party Celebrates its First Anniversary under the Supreme Guidance of Marxism- Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought

First published in Ang Bayan, Vol. II, No. 1, January 15, 1970

Our beloved Party, the Communist Party of the Philippines, celebrates with boundless joy the first anniversary of its reestablishment under the supreme guidance of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought. All proletarian revolutionary cadres and all Red fighters of the New People's Army seriously review today a whole year of revolutionary struggle to further strengthen their determination to fulfil definite tasks in the year ahead. They wish to serve the people better and advance the revolution more effectively by adopting the style of hard work and simple living; and using criticism and self-criticism to achieve the best results.

The most important achievement of the Communist Party of the Philippines during the past year is its embodiment of the truth that Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought has taken root in the practice of the people's democratic revolution in the Philippines. Proletarian revolutionary cadres have succeeded to reestablish the Party after a long period of struggle against modern revisionism, subjectivism and opportunism to clear the ground of such counterrevolutionary rubbish that the bourgeois reactionary line of the Lavas, Tarucs and Sumulong has strewn about in the old merger party of the Communist and Socialist Parties. As a result of the rectification of old and persistent errors, the strong foundation for

proletarian revolutionary leadership in the people's democratic revolution has been laid.

Not only has the Communist Party of the Philippines upheld the theory of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought but has also started in accordance with such a powerful theory to engage in the practice of armed revolution against armed counterrevolution. The principal activity of the Party now is developing the armed struggle in the countryside in a protracted way and upon the basis of steadfast political mobilization of the masses against US imperialism, the comprador big bourgeoisie, the landlord class and the bureaucrat capitalists. Because of its firm revolutionary class standpoint, the Party and its army, the New People's Army, are now subjected to the most hysterical, vicious and futile attacks of the reactionary armed forces directed by US imperialism and by the Marcos puppet regime.

Starting early on the road of armed revolution, the Communist Party of the Philippines is truly performing its role as the most advanced detachment of the working class and the entire Filipino people. It has opened the correct way for people's war in the Philippines at a time that US imperialism, Soviet social-imperialism and the Philippine reactionary government are inextricably sunk in the most serious political and economic crisis. It has taken a definite and firm step in the worldwide preparedness against war.

It is correct for the Party to fight resolutely the fascist regime of the Marcos reactionary clique which has been resorting to counterrevolutionary dual tactics to camouflage the abuses and atrocities it is widely perpetrating against the broad masses of the people both in the cities and the countryside.

Marcos describes himself as nationalist but actually he is a fascist puppet of US imperialism and the chief representative of the most rabid local reactionaries. Marcos describes himself as a protector of democratic rights but actually he attacks the broad masses of the people, especially the peasant masses, with all the force he can command.

He talks of repealing the Anti-Subversion Law but actually he is plotting to destroy the Communist Party of the Philippines with the use of military force and reformism. He talks of independence in foreign relations but actually he is taking every step to implement

locally the dictates of the counterrevolutionary alliance of US imperialism, Soviet social-imperialism and Japanese imperialism against the people, communism and China.

The Marcos reactionary clique has become so desperate that it is seeking to manipulate certain pseudo-revolutionary groups against the Communist Party of the Philippines. But the diehards of these pseudo-revolutionary groups are increasingly isolated everyday as the ideological and political work and the revolutionary armed struggle directed by the Party are exposing them to public hatred and shame. Efforts to sow intrigues and spread slander against the Communist Party of the Philippines and the New People's Army have miserably failed.

First, the Lava revisionist renegade clique is disintegrating as fast as the Soviet social-imperialists are exposing their true evil nature. Second, the Taruc-Sumulong gangster clique is already beset with numerous quarrels among its criminal ringleaders and reactionary allies over their loot. Third, the fake "revolutionary council" has been exposed as a mere handful of broker and careerists maliciously usurping the names of people's organizations. Fourth, the motley bunch of petty bourgeois anarchists and reformists imitating the American "New Left" has become as confused as ever and the greater number of student and intellectual activists are moving rapidly towards the Party.

The Communist Party of the Philippines has achieved so high an ideological, political and organizational unity that it has unanimously and resolutely decided to wage revolutionary armed struggle. That is because it puts Mao Zedong Thought in command of everything. The Party has successfully brought together all proletarian revolutionaries with all the Red fighters who have heroically persisted in armed struggle for a long period of time.

It has been fortified by the resounding triumph of the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution and the Ninth National Congress of the Chinese Communist Party. It has learned positive lessons from all Marxist-Leninist parties and organizations that have steadfastly adhered to Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought. It has also learned valuable lessons from the negative examples of parties and

groups which had at first condemned modern revisionism only to defect or veer towards it later.

The Communist Party of the Philippines calls on all its cadres and members at every level and in every unit of work in local areas as well as in the New People's Army to intensify Party building. As everyone knows, Party building involves ideological, political and organizational building. The importance of ideological work, making Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought the guide to all our activities, is made even more urgent by the enemy intensification of counterrevolution. We must always solve our practical problems and march forward by using the correct theory and thereby giving life to it. This is the best and only way of persisting in revolutionary struggle.

Mass mobilization on the basis of a revolutionary class line is the objective of all our political efforts. We must grasp the mass line in order to get the majority at every step and isolate the enemy diehards. The Party has made the initial steps in organizing the basic Party and people's organizations all over the country. The urgent task now is to enlarge and deepen the mass base of the Party through persistent mass work and concrete military struggle.

Every step that is taken to bring up the level of armed struggle must always be related to the degree of success achieved in Party building and political work, especially among the oppressed masses of workers and peasants. Failure to do so spells defeat or setback. At the moment, the Party and the people's organizations we have set up in the countryside are coming under the acid test of reactionary violence. That the enemy is attacking us only proves that we are doing well in our revolutionary work.

The enemy has the foolish wish of suppressing us at an early stage. That only goes to show that it is in panic, that he is hysterically in fear of Mao Zedong Thought, the ideology that enable us persist in revolutionary struggle. We must continue to fight. But to be able to continue fighting we must fight even better and more vigorously. In order to be invincible, we must always take the revolutionary class line in the countryside, that is to say, we must link up with the poor peasants and farm workers, the semi-owner

peasants and all other semiproletarians. They are the superlative allies of the Filipino proletariat.

So that the revolutionary armed struggle that we are preparing and initiating at several strategic points in the countryside will succeed, we must create the broadest national united front to isolate the enemy and put him at the weakest position for our mortal blows. We must make use of the national united front to create a revolutionary high tide nationwide and to prepare the subjective conditions for linking up the several revolutionary base areas that we are bound to develop in the protracted course of the armed struggle. As the rebellious spirit of workers, peasants, the petty bourgeoisie and progressive sections of the national bourgeoisie rise ever higher, the objective conditions for the enemy classes continue to become graver and more insoluble. US imperialism and the Marcos puppet regime are increasingly oppressing and exploiting the broad masses of the people. Both the national situation and the international situation are in such a hopeless mess for US imperialism, Soviet social-imperialism and all reactionaries.

Long live Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought!

Long live the Communist Party of the Philippines!

Long live the Filipino people and the Philippine revolution!

Long live the Filipino working class!

Tribute to the Great Communist Mao Zedong

September 25, 1976

Comrade Mao Zedong belongs to the immortal company of great communist leaders – Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin. He has left to the proletariat and people of the world a legacy that will shine forever. His teachings and the fruits of his teachings are indispensable to the ultimate victory of communism.

Comrade Mao Zedong comprehensively and brilliantly inherited, defended and developed Marxism-Leninism. He integrated this universal theory of the revolutionary proletariat with the concrete practice of the Chinese revolution and won resounding victories of world historic significance against imperialism, opportunism and modern revisionism and all reaction. He made great contributions to the development of the fundamental scientific teachings of Marxism and Leninism in the course of triumphantly guiding and leading the new democratic and socialist revolutions in China.

His greatest and most unique achievement lies in putting forward the theory of continuing revolution under proletarian dictatorship and in personally initiating and leading the first great proletarian cultural revolution to consolidate the dictatorship of the proletariat, prevent the restoration of capitalism in socialist society and ensure the onward march of mankind towards communism in the historical epoch of socialism.

The revolutionary victories of the Chinese people under the proletarian revolutionary line of Comrade Mao Zedong up to the present means that at least one-fourth of humanity are steadfastly on the road of socialism, that the dictatorship of the proletariat is consolidated in a country as vast as China and that imperialism, social-imperialism and modern revisionism have no future but doom.

Mao Zedong Thought sums up the proletarian revolutionary teachings and work of the great communist Mao Zedong and points

to the latest peak in the unceasing development of the theory and practice of the revolutionary proletariat. It proceeds from the stages of Marxism and Leninism. And thus we speak today of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought.

The New Democratic Revolution

Comrade Mao Zedong was among the founders of the great, glorious and correct Communist Party of China on July 1, 1921 under the guidance of Marxism-Leninism. And thus the Chinese revolution clearly entered the stage of the new democratic revolution, a bourgeois-democratic revolution under the proletariat and its revolutionary vanguard, and became linked with the world proletarian-socialist revolution.

The salvos of the October Revolution of 1917 led by the great Lenin had brought Marxism-Leninism to China. In the course of the May 4th Movement in 1919, the young revolutionaries of China had started to study and seek guidance from Marxism-Leninism as a way out of the defeats and humiliation suffered by the Chinese people in the hands of the imperialists and their local accomplices in the revolutionary struggles since the Opium War in 1840.

Comrade Mao Zedong used the Marxist-Leninist stand, viewpoint and method in examining the history and circumstances of China. Making a thoroughgoing analysis of what was then a semicolonial and semifeudal society, grasping the basic class contradictions therein, he was able to make clear the targets, tasks, motive forces, character and perspective of the Chinese revolution. In this regard, he wrote “Analysis of Classes in Chinese Society”, “Report on An Investigation of the Peasant Movement in Hunan” and other works which were the result of concrete social investigation and study of historical forces in the course of revolutionary struggle.

He pointed out that the imperialists and their local running dogs – the warlords, big landlords and big compradors – were the targets of the revolution. He defined the tasks of the revolution were the armed overthrow of the reactionary state and the national liberation and social emancipation of the people, especially the peasant masses whose struggle for land constituted the main content of the democratic revolution.

Among the motive forces of the revolution, he pointed to the proletariat as the leading class, the peasantry as its closest and most reliable ally, the urban petty bourgeoisie as another reliable ally and the national bourgeoisie as still another ally with a dual character. He referred to the character of the revolution as new democratic because it was no longer part of a world bourgeois-capitalist revolution but of the world proletarian-socialist revolution and it sought to prepare for and bring about a socialist revolution in China.

Comrade Mao Zedong pointed out that the three basic weapons of the Chinese revolution in seizing political power were: a communist party using the Marxist-Leninist revolutionary theory and the style of being closely linked with the masses; a people's army under the leadership of such a party; and a united front of all revolutionary classes under the leadership of such a party.

Through the twists and turns of the new democratic revolution, Comrade Mao Zedong always put forward the ideological and political line to put the Party on the correct road. Under his leadership, the Party defeated the Right opportunist line of Chen Duxiu, the "Left" opportunist lines of Chu Chiubai and Li Lisan, the "Left" and then Right opportunist line of Wang Ming and the splittist line of Zhang Guotao.

Chen Duxiu did not believe that the proletariat could lead the revolution and believed that a bourgeois republic must first be established under the Guomindang. He surrendered to the Guomindang all independence and initiative of the Chinese Communist Party in the united front during the First Revolutionary Civil War, cast away the leadership of the Party over the revolutionary armed struggle and hankered for parliamentary struggle under a bourgeois republic. On the other hand, Chu Chiubai believed that by relying on the proletariat alone power could be seized through putschist methods. Both opportunists did not recognize the peasant masses as the main force behind the leadership of the proletariat and took every occasion to denigrate them.

During the Agrarian Revolutionary War, when they took turns at usurping the leadership of the Party, Li Lisan and Wang Ming considered the middle forces as "the most clever enemy" of the

revolution and opposed the entire bourgeoisie. They did not recognize the necessity of a protracted people's war in the countryside and they acted according to the erroneous line that the faster they could take on the cities by armed force the better, without regard to base-building in the countryside. Later on, Wang Ming would swing to Chen Duxiu's line of surrendering all independence and initiative to the Guomindang during the War of Resistance Against Japan.

After leading the Autumn Harvest Uprising in August 1927, Comrade Mao Zedong created the first revolutionary rural base and the first detachment of the Red Army of Workers and Peasants in the Jinggang Mountains and carried out agrarian revolution. The troops of the Nanchang Uprising of August 1, 1927 that signaled the armed resistance to Chiang Kai-shek's betrayal of the revolution came to merge with Comrade Mao Zedong's forces in April 1928.

Under the leadership of Comrade Mao Zedong, the Red Army of Workers and Peasants defeated the first, second and third counterrevolutionary campaigns of "encirclement and suppression" launched by the Guomindang reactionaries. Guerrilla warfare advanced in many other parts of China. Comrade Mao Zedong summed up the experience and wrote such important works as "Why Is It That Red Political Power Can Exist in China?", "The Struggle in the Jinggang Mountains", "On Correcting Mistaken Ideas in the Party" and "A Single Spark Can Start Prairie Fire".

When Wang Ming usurped the leadership of the Party from 1931 to 1934, he caused the biggest damage to the Party, the people's army and the people's revolutionary cause. Ninety percent of the Party's forces in the Red areas were destroyed and almost 100 percent in the White Areas. The Red Army was compelled to make the Long March.

It was only in January 1935 at the Zhunyi Conference of the Political Bureau of the Central Committee that the correct line and leadership of Comrade Mao Zedong became established in the entire Party. Comrade Mao Zedong took full command of the Long March and successfully brought it to northern Shanxi, despite Zhang Goutao's splittism. The Red Army marched 25,000 li, conducted

mobile warfare along the way and went through the most difficult obstacles to reach its destination.

Comrade Mao Zedong rebuilt the people's army into a powerful fighting and political force. He consistently applied the line of building rural bases, carrying out land reform and encircling the cities from the countryside until such time that conditions are ripe to seize the former in a general offensive. He raised the armed leadership of the Party and repeatedly defeated the enemy in the countryside.

From his Jinggang days to the victorious conclusion of the new democratic revolution, Comrade Mao Zedong wrote a systematic body of military writings which proved him a great theoretician and great commander of people's war. His mastery of military science was inseparable from his mastery of materialist dialectics and Chinese society. Wang Ming and others made disastrous errors in China's armed revolution because of their ignorance of all these.

Comrade Mao Zedong wrote the works *Problems of Strategy in China's Revolutionary War*, *Problems of Strategy in Guerrilla War Against Japan*, *On Protracted War* and *Problems of War and Strategy*, among others which included many directives of decisive importance.

From Yen-an, Comrade Mao Zedong was able to successfully call for a broad united front against the Japanese fascist invaders. The line was to develop the progressive forces, win over the middle forces and isolate the diehard forces. This was also to take advantage of contradictions, win over the many, oppose the few and destroy the enemies one by one.

Unlike in the united front in the First Revolutionary Civil War, when Chen Duxiu committed the grave error of "all unity and no struggle" with the Goumindang, Comrade Mao Zedong advocated unity and struggle in the united front in the Revolutionary War of Resistance Against Japan. He also admonished that "all struggle and no unity" would be erroneous and that the struggle would have to be launched on just grounds, to the advantage of the revolutionary forces and with restraint.

To guide the united front, Comrade Mao Zedong wrote "The Situation and Our Tasks in the Anti-Japanese War After the Fall of Shanghai and Taiyuan", his report to and concluding speech at the

Sixth Plenary Session of the Sixth Central Committee, “On Policy “ and other important works.

The entire Revolutionary War of Resistance Against Japan was a great occasion for the Communist Party of China to take initiative in uniting the Chinese people in one revolutionary struggle and build a powerful people's army and rural bases independent of the Guomindang. But if the Guomindang reactionaries refused to join the united front, they would have thoroughly discredited and destroyed themselves too soon. And indeed, they became more isolated each time that they undertook an anticommunist onslaught, instead of fighting the common enemy.

Comrade Mao Zedong did not only concern himself with laying down the timely practical policies that created and built up the political, military economic and cultural forces and bulwarks of the revolution but he also wrote works which constitute significant new contributions to the development of Marxism-Leninism as a theory and which laid stress on the ideological building of the Party.

We refer to his philosophical works, “On Practice” and “On Contradiction”; “Talks at the Yen-an Forum on Literature and Art”; and the works “Reform Our Study”, “Rectify the Party's Style of Work” and “Oppose Stereotyped Party Writing” which served as materials in the great rectification movement in Yen-an that strengthened the Party on the eve of the Seventh Party Congress, the Japanese defeat and the civil war launched by the US-Chiang clique.

At the Seventh Party Congress in April 1945, Comrade Mao Zedong made his report “On Coalition Government” and set the political line of boldly mobilizing the masses and expanding the people's forces so that under the leadership of the Party the aggressors would be defeated and New China would be established. The congress was a congress of victory and unity, inspiring the hundreds of millions of Chinese people. Upon the victory of the war of resistance, the army led by the Party was already one-million strong and the liberated areas had expanded to include a population of 100 million.

US imperialism wanted to put one over the Chinese people and thus plotted to rig up a government, which would temporarily include the Communist Party but which would be nothing more than a

government of the Guomindang reactionaries. Comrade Mao Zedong pointed out that under the circumstances then it was necessary to counter counterrevolutionary dual tactics with revolutionary dual tactics and that to go to the Chongqing negotiations was tit-for-tat struggle. Not to give the imperialists and the local reactionaries an advantage, he directed the revolutionary forces to prepare themselves and went to the negotiations to expose to the entire nation the true character and intentions of the US-Chiang clique.

At this time, Liu Shaoqi harped on the capitulationist line that China had entered "a new stage of peace and democracy". He prated that the main form of struggle of the Chinese people would have to change from armed struggle to nonarmed parliamentary struggle. He wanted to surrender the people's army and the revolutionary bases to Chiang Kaishek and become an official of the reactionary government.

When the Guomindang reactionaries proceeded to unleash the counterrevolutionary civil war, the Chinese Communist Party, the People's Liberation Army and the broad masses of the people were fully prepared. Chiang Kai-shek's eight million troops were wiped out and defeated in the People's War of Liberation. The entirety of China was liberated, with the exception of Taiwan and other small islands.

The Chinese people won the new democratic revolution against imperialism, feudalism and bureaucrat capitalism under the revolutionary line and leadership of Comrade Mao Zedong. This was a victory not only of the Chinese people. It was a victory of the entire people of the world. A full quarter of humanity in an immense territory freed itself from the imperialist ambit of oppression and exploitation. Not only was the imperialist front in the East greatly breached but imperialist domination throughout the world was also severely undermined and weakened.

The liberation of the Chinese people was not merely an objective fact favorable to the world revolution. Comrade Mao Zedong's revolutionary teachings spread throughout the world, among the revolutionaries and oppressed peoples and nations. China's example as well as militant acts and pronouncements against US imperialism and all reaction stirred the people of Asia, Africa and

Latin America and the rest of the world to expand and intensify their revolutionary struggles.

On the consideration alone that he victoriously led a quarter of humanity towards liberation in a new democratic revolution, Comrade Mao Zedong easily stood out even then as a great communist leader and as a great revolutionary figure in the history of mankind. New China is the monument to his greatness and nothing can ever efface this fact.

The Socialist Revolution

Comrade Mao Zedong founded the People's Republic of China on October 1, 1949. The new democratic revolution had been basically completed upon the seizure of political power. And the socialist revolution began. The dictatorship of the proletariat, taking the form of the people's democratic state, was established.

On the eve of nationwide victory, at the Second Plenary Session of the Seventh Central Committee, Comrade Mao Zedong had clearly stated that the principal contradiction in socialist China would be the contradiction between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie and had warned that after wiping out the enemies with guns there would still be the enemies without guns who should never be lightly regarded. He put forward the basic socialist line of the proletariat. Opposed to this line, Liu Shaoqi went around saying that there was "merit in exploitation."

The People's Liberation Army with its several millions of troops, following the absolute leadership of the Chinese Communist Party, promoted the line and policies of the Party among the masses, suppressed the counterrevolutionaries and became an ever more effective fighting, political and work force.

All bureaucrat capital, which comprised most of modern industry, was confiscated and turned into state-owned socialist enterprises. The land reform movement fully deprived the landlord class of its feudal property, mobilized hundreds of millions of poor and lower-middle peasants and laid the basis for the growth of cooperative relations. Concessions with clear limits, in the interest of the toiling masses, were given to the national bourgeoisie and petty bourgeoisie.

The first trial of strength between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie occurred in 1951-52. The movement was launched against the three evils of corruption, waste and bureaucracy within the Party and government organizations, and another related one against the five evils of bribery of government workers by the bourgeoisie, tax evasion, theft of state property, cheating on government contracts and stealing economic information for private speculation.

These movements, together with the movement to suppress the counterrevolutionaries, once more put the proletariat on top of the bourgeoisie, guaranteed the victory of the struggle to resist US aggression and aid Korea and ensured the rapid rehabilitation of the national economy.

Under Comrade Mao Zedong's leadership, the Chinese Communist Party and the Chinese people proceeded to smash in 1954 the Gao Gang and Yao Shi anti-Party alliance and in 1959 the counterrevolutionary clique of Hu Feng who had come out with an antisocialist program for art and literature. Starting with the exposure of certain reactionary films promoted by the bourgeois Rightists, a series of struggles was launched against bourgeois ideas.

Comrade Mao Zedong laid down the general line in the period of transition. Its essence was to solve the system of ownership of the means of production so that the socialist system of ownership or the system of owner by the state and system of collective ownership by the working people would become the economic base of China. This was a necessary and important step to further consolidate the dictatorship of the proletariat.

In agriculture, mutual aid teams with some elements of socialism and initial cooperatives with semisocialist character up to advanced socialist cooperatives were promoted. In capitalist industry and commerce, the state ordered the private enterprises to process and produce goods and bought and sold all their products; it also used private enterprises to buy and sell commodities for the state. Eventually, the private enterprises were transformed into joint state-private enterprises and payments of fixed interest on the estimated value of property were made to the private owners in accordance with the policy of redemption.

The socialist transformation of agriculture, handicrafts and capitalist industry was carried out step by step and was coordinated with the suppression of the counterrevolutionaries as well as bourgeois Rightists who had sneaked into the Party and with the patient education of "Left" elements who wished the transformation to be accomplished at one blow.

The hidden traitor Liu Shaoqi raised the slogan that "the new democratic order should be consolidated" during the early fifties. He also went around reducing the number of cooperatives and prating about "mechanization before cooperation". Comrade Mao Zedong promptly opposed Liu's Right deviation by writing a series of works, including "On the Problem of Agricultural Cooperation", to set the correct line.

When the socialist transformation of the ownership of the means of production was in the main completed in 1956, Liu Shaoqi and his gang loudly pushed the revisionist theory of the "dying out of class struggle" by claiming that the contradiction between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie has been basically resolved" and that the "contradiction between the advanced socialist system and the backward productive forces" was the principal contradiction. They meant to say that the relations of production were no longer a problem, that class struggle had become finished and that all that needed to be done was to develop the productive forces.

Their revisionist line was but a restatement of the "theory of productive forces" of Bernstein and Kautsky and they smuggled it into the decision of the Eighth National Congress of the Chinese Communist Party. They acted as representatives of the bourgeoisie and local agents of the Soviet modern revisionists within the Communist Party.

Comrade Mao Zedong wrote his great work "On the Correct Handling of Contradictions Among the People." This debunked the revisionist fallacies and set the correct line for the entire historical period of socialism in China. This became the basis of his theory of continuing revolution under the dictatorship of the proletariat.

He pointed out that although in the main socialist transformation had been completed with respect to the system of ownership, there were still remnants of the overthrown landlord and comprador

classes, there was still a bourgeoisie; and the remolding of the petty bourgeoisie had just started. He clearly stated that the class struggle was by no means over and that the class struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, the class struggle between the different political forces, and the struggle in the ideological field between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie would continue to be long and tortuous and at times would even become very acute.

He pointed out that the basic contradictions in socialist society were still those between the relations of production and the productive forces and between the superstructure and the economic base. He stated that though socialist relations of production had been established and were in harmony with the growth of productive forces they were still far from perfect, and this imperfection stood in contradiction to the growth of the productive forces. He added that apart from harmony as well as contradiction between the relations of production and the developing productive forces there was harmony as well as contradiction between the superstructure and the economic base.

In 1957, a great mass struggle was launched against the bourgeois Rightists who had taken advantage of the Party's rectification campaign. This clearly proved that the class struggle was a continuing process in socialist society.

Comrade Mao Zedong set the general line of going all out, aiming high and achieving greater, faster, better and more economical results in building socialism and launched the great leap forward and the people's commune movement in 1958. Under this line, the principle of making agriculture the basis and industry the leading factor was set and a series of principles of "walking on two legs" were laid down.

The initiative of both the central government and the localities was given full play. While using the industry on the coastline, industrial construction in the interior was accelerated. Agriculture and industry; light industry and heavy industry; and big, medium-size and small enterprises were developed simultaneously. And, of course, the organization of the people's commune was enthusiastically undertaken by the revolutionary masses.

At the Eighth Plenary Session of the Eighth Central Committee in August 1959, Peng Dehuai rabidly opened up against the general line, the great leap forward and the people's commune. He was promptly repulsed and defeated. Subsequently, Liu Shaoqi and his gang also opposed the line when they thought that they could take advantage of economic difficulties resulting from three consecutive years of natural calamities and the Soviet revisionist clique's perfidious acts of tearing up contracts and withdrawing its experts.

They pushed for the extension of plots for private use, the expansion of free markets, the increase of small enterprises with sole responsibility for their own profits or losses and the fixing of farm output quotas for individual households with each on its own. They also pushed for the liquidation of the struggle against imperialism, revisionism and the reactionaries and for reduction of support and assistance to the world revolution. This was at a time that the US imperialists, the Soviet revisionists and the Indian reactionaries were intensifying their anti-China activities.

Comrade Mao Zedong's line, the great leap forward and the people's commune overcame all difficulties, pushed forward socialist construction in a big and all-round way and debunked everything that the bourgeois Rightists and the imperialists and revisionists had claimed. The Chinese people demonstrated to the entire world that they could continue to forge ahead precisely because they maintained their independence and initiative and gave full play to self-reliance and hard struggle as they did in the revolutionary base areas during their new democratic revolution.

At the Tenth Plenary Session of the Eighth Central Committee in September 1962, Comrade Mao Zedong called on the entire Party never to forget class struggle. He pointed out that socialist society covers a considerably long historical period and that in this long historical period there are still classes, class contradiction and class struggle, there is the struggle between the socialist road and the capitalist road and there is the danger of capitalist restoration.

After the plenary session, Comrade Mao Zedong wrote "Where Do Correct Ideas Come From?" "to criticize the bourgeois idealism and metaphysics of Liu Shaoqi. The mass movement to study and apply the works of Comrade Mao Zedong advanced rapidly.

Following the call of Comrade Mao Zedong, the Party launched an attack in the ideological field, particularly in the areas of the Peking Opera, ballet and symphonic music, and as a result the heroic forms of the workers, peasants and soldiers emerged on the stage.

Comrade Mao Zedong once more warned the whole Party in 1963 that if classes and class struggle and the dictatorship of the proletariat were forgotten, then it would not be long, perhaps only several years or a decade, or several decades at most, before a counterrevolutionary restoration on a national scale would inevitably occur, the Marxist-Leninist Party would undoubtedly become a revisionist party, a fascist party, and the whole of China would change its political color.

When the massive socialist education movement was launched in 1964, Liu Shaoqi tried to confuse and derail the class struggle, so as to promote his own revisionist line, by babbling that the principal contradiction was the "contradiction between the 'four cleans' and the 'four uncleans'" and "the intertwining of the contradictions inside and outside the Party."

Stressing the correct thesis that the principal contradiction in the socialist period is between the two classes and the two roads, Comrade Mao Zedong sharply pointed out that the target of the socialist education movement were those Party persons in authority taking the capitalist road.

In 1965, he launched the criticism of the play *Hai Rui Dismissed From Office*. This signaled the great counterattack of the proletariat on the bourgeoisie whose representatives within the Party had usurped portions of the dictatorship of the proletariat and had resorted to all sorts of tricks to attack Comrade Mao Zedong's proletarian revolutionary line and prepare public opinion for the restoration of capitalism.

The Soviet revisionist renegades were already completing a decade of openly restoring capitalism in the homeland of the great Lenin since the 20th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. The first half of the sixties was marked by intense open struggle between the Marxist-Leninists led by Comrade Mao Zedong and the Chinese Communist Party and the modern revisionist

renegades headed by the Soviet revisionist renegades. This further served to shed light on the danger of capitalist restoration in China.

The Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution

Comrade Mao Zedong personally initiated and led the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution, – a political revolution waged by the proletariat against the bourgeoisie and all exploiting classes. The objective was to consolidate the dictatorship of the proletariat and prevent the restoration of capitalism by revolutionizing the superstructure of the socialist society in line with what emerged fully as Comrade Mao Zedong's theory of continuing revolution under the dictatorship of the proletariat.

As this great revolution started, Liu Shaoqi and his gang tried to turn it into a "purely academic discussion." But the "Circular of May 16, 1966", prepared under Comrade Mao Zedong's direction, called on the entire Party to beware of people like Khrushchev nestling within the Party. The Eleventh Plenary Session of the Eighth Central Committee approved in August 1966 the "Decision Concerning the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution" which again pointed to Party persons in authority taking the capitalist road; and Comrade Mao Zedong issued his big-character poster, "Bombard the Headquarters!" Liu Shaoqi's bourgeois headquarters was shaken from the base to the rafters and eventually collapsed under the crushing blows of the masses. Portions of the proletarian dictatorship usurped by the capitalist roaders were wrested back.

Through the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution, the great toiling masses, youth and soldiers of China gained profound revolutionary experience and became tempered as successors to the proletarian revolutionary cause. Every aspect of the superstructure was revolutionized and the broad masses of the people learned the fundamentals of Marxism-Leninism and how to deal with the affairs of the state and specific problems in every sphere of social activity. China became one great school of hundreds of millions of people studying and applying Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought. Under the impetus of the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution, they created many socialist new things and made great strides in production and preparedness against war, natural calamities and other possible disasters. It was not only the

bourgeoisie in China which suffered an unprecedentedly grave defeat but also the imperialists and social-imperialists who had hoped that China would someday change her color.

In 1969 the Soviet social-imperialists ran berserk and made violent incursions into China's territory. These were quickly repulsed on the spot and came to nothing but a futile attempt to divert attention from the great historic significance of the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution. US imperialism, which was bogged down in its war of aggression in Vietnam, could also see no further than defeat in the face of this great revolution.

Under the leadership of Comrade Mao Zedong, the Ninth Party Congress summed up the experience of the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution and called on the broad masses of the people to unite to win ever greater victories. Lin Biao tried to sabotage the congress when he, together with his sidekick Chen Boda, made a draft of a political report stating that the main task after the congress was to promote production. Of course, this draft was rejected by the Central Committee because it was opposed to Comrade Mao Zedong's line of putting revolutionary politics in command of production and other things.

Lin Biao was consistently rebuffed by the movement to criticize revisionism, rectify the style of work and study the works of Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin and Mao. At the Second Plenary Session of the Ninth Central Committee, he launched a counterrevolutionary coup d'etat. Failing in this, he plotted an armed counterrevolutionary coup d'etat in an attempt to assassinate Comrade Mao Zedong. Failing again, he came to no good end in his attempt to escape to the Soviet Union.

Comrade Mao Zedong led the Party and the people in continuous class struggle after the victory over the Lin Biao armed conspiracy and assassination attempt. He directed the Tenth Party Congress to sum up the struggle against the Lin Biao anti-Party clique and reaffirm the Party's basic line. He successively directed the movement to criticize Lin Biao and rectify the style of work, the movement to criticize Lin Biao and Confucius, the movement to criticize the novel of capitulationism *Water Margin* and the movement to grasp the principle of restricting bourgeois right. He also started

the great debate on the revolution in education which eventually uncovered the revisionist line and maneuvers of the unrepentant Deng Xiaoping.

On the eve of his demise, Comrade Mao Zedong was still able to lead the movement to repulse the Right deviationist wind whipped up by Deng Xiaoping to reverse the correct decisions on the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution. He presided over the overthrow of this unrepentant and incorrigible revisionist who sought to discredit the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution and seize power on behalf of the bourgeoisie. The Party and the broad masses of the people rose up to assert the supremacy of the proletarian line and made clear that class struggle is the key link which should be grasped to promote unity and stability as well as production and modernization and which should not be subordinated to or put at par with any of these.

Comrade Mao Zedong's theory of continuing revolution under the dictatorship of the proletariat is bound to repeatedly and progressively consolidate the dictatorship of the proletariat and prevent the restoration of capitalism in China. This is an invincible weapon in the hands of the Party, proletariat and the rest of the working people in China.

It is obvious that among the great communists Comrade Mao Zedong had the advantage of studying and summing up the latest historical experience of the international proletariat and several socialist countries, including those that turned revisionist. There is nothing surprising at all why it was possible for him to see clearly the content of the whole historical epoch of socialism and to arrive at and develop on the basis of Marxism-Leninism the theory and practice of the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution to consolidate the dictatorship of the proletariat and prevent the restoration of capitalism.

Comrade Mao Zedong was a champion of proletarian internationalism. He stood and worked for unity and close cooperation among the socialist countries and the Marxist-Leninist parties and gave unselfish support to the revolutionary movements of the oppressed peoples and nations. His overriding concern in firmly pushing forward the socialist revolution and socialist

construction in China was to serve not only the Chinese people but also the people of the world and thereby uphold the great cause of communism.

Comrade Mao Zedong courageously opposed the betrayal of Marxism-Leninism and the restoration of capitalism in the Soviet Union and the rise of Soviet social-imperialism. He consistently fought for the revolutionary interests of the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America and the rest of the world against US imperialism, Soviet social-imperialism and all forms of reaction. He vigorously supported the outstanding struggles of the Korean and Indochinese peoples against the bitterest wars of aggression launched by US imperialism in the period after China's own liberation.

Under Comrade Mao Zedong's great statesmanship, New China won resounding diplomatic victories. In his time, she established diplomatic relations with the overwhelming majority of countries under the Five Principles of peaceful coexistence. Her legitimate rights in the United Nations were restored. Within and outside the United Nations, she counted herself among the developing countries of the third world and conjoined with them in common struggles against imperialism, colonialism and hegemonism in a deliberate effort to help develop the third world peoples and countries as the main force of the international united front.

So long as the Chinese Communist Party and the Chinese people of various nationalities continue to unite in upholding and applying the teachings of Comrade Mao Zedong, they will not only continue to advance in their own socialist revolution and socialist construction but will continue to make ever greater contributions to the advance of the world revolution.

Mao Zedong and the Philippine Revolution

The Communist Party of the Philippines was reestablished on the theoretical foundation of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought. We draw guidance from the progressively continuous teachings of the great communists Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin and Mao.

Learning from Comrade Mao Zedong is indispensable to us as a Marxist-Leninist party, especially because we are wading a new democratic revolution in a semicolonial and semifeudal country. His teachings guide us in our new democratic revolution and will further

guide us in the ensuing socialist revolution. Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought is the microscope and telescope of the Philippine revolution.

Mao Zedong Thought is not simply the integration of Marxism-Leninism and the concrete practice of the Chinese revolution. It is a further development of Marxism-Leninism as a universal theory. We as a Marxist-Leninist party will always strive to integrate Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought and the concrete practice of the Philippine revolution.

On several occasions, Comrade Mao Zedong personally expressed and demonstrated his concern for the advance of the Philippine revolution. He had the best wishes for the revolutionary victory of the broad masses of the people under the leadership of the proletariat and the Communist Party of the Philippines. His memory and teachings will forever be treasured by our people. He will always live in our minds and hearts.

We have already conveyed to all our Chinese comrades and to the Chinese people through the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China our deepest grief over Comrade Mao Zedong's demise and we have also expressed to them our determination to continue drawing strength from his teachings.

Long live Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought!

Long live the proletariat and people's of the world!

Long live the world proletarian-socialist revolution!

Long live the Philippine revolution!

Eternal glory to Comrade Mao Zedong!

Basic Principles of Marxism-Leninism: A Primer

1981-1982

Introduction

Marxism is a comprehensive ideology, ranging from philosophy to strategy and tactics. It seeks not only to interpret the world but to change it. It is acclaimed as universal, serving as guide and general method of cognition and practice in both natural and social sciences.

It is a system of ideas or ideology that guides the organized conduct of the working class and the people as well as proletarian parties and states in building socialism and carrying out the anti-imperialist movement. This ideology has inspired and impelled the rapid social, economic, scientific and cultural progress of socialist countries in a matter of a few decades. It has adherents of no mean magnitude and significance in the third world and in the capitalist countries.

In summing up Marxism, Lenin cited philosophy, political economy and social science as its three basic components. Describing Marxism as a development of revolutionary theory and practice on the high road of civilization, he pointed to the fact that Marx and Engels based themselves on the most advanced sources of knowledge during their time.

Marx and Engels applied their critical-creative faculties on German philosophy (especially on the materialist Feuerbach and the idealist Hegel); on British political economy (especially on the classical economists Adam Smith, David Ricardo, etc.); and on French social science (especially on the democratic revolutionaries and utopian socialists).

In pointing to political economy, specifically *Das Kapital*, as the core of Marxism, Lenin clearly recognized its significance as the most profound explanation for an entire historical epoch, that of capitalism. Marx explains the emergence, development and maturation of capitalism in a comprehensive and thoroughgoing manner.

Up to the present, the theory and practice of Marxism is known to have undergone three stages of development.

The first stage covers the period when Marx and Engels clarified the laws of motion in free competition capitalism that led to ever increasing concentration of capital; and when revolutionary activities (not even led by Communists or Marxists) ranged from the 1848 revolutions through Marx's ideological leadership in the International Working Men's Association (First International) to the first successful armed revolution of the proletariat, the Paris Commune of 1871, which lasted for over two months.

The second stage covers the period when Lenin clarified the growth of capitalism into imperialism and the Bolshevik revolution won and gave way to the building and consolidation of socialism in one country. Stalin carried on the theoretical and practical work of Lenin for a long period.

The third stage covers the period when socialism exists in several countries and Mao Zedong Thought confronts and clarifies the problem of revisionism and restoration of capitalism in some socialist countries. Even as imperialism and the world capitalist system are in rapid decline, the problem of revisionism has also arisen in socialist countries. Mao put forward the theory and practice of continuing revolution under proletarian dictatorship.

It may be observed that although Marxism or Marxism-Leninism is a theory based on the fundamental teachings of Marx and Engels, it is continuously developing, in stride with the ever changing world and with the particularities of countries. Marxism today is the acclaimed guide to the world transition of capitalism to socialism and, in semicolonial and semifeudal countries particularly, the completion of the democratic revolution and transition to socialism.

Chapter 1. Dialectical Materialism

Marxist philosophy is otherwise known as dialectical materialism. It assumes that reality is material (constituted by particles) and that consciousness arises and proceeds from matter; and accounts for development or change in terms of the laws inherent to matter as well as the interaction of matter and consciousness, peculiar to man.

It may sound redundant and trite to speak of reality as material or as consisting of matter. But we must recall that for long periods in the

history of philosophy the Platonic and Augustinian kind of objective idealism held sway and dictated that reality is ideal or consists of ideas and that the material, sensible things are but a reflection and poor copy of that reality.

Even in the present scientific milieu there is the view posed by subjective idealism, especially along the line of the empiricist Hume, that reality is but a mental construct of the sense data of the individual human perceiver. There is the denial of the material object of the physical sciences, which object is put at par with the mere belief in the supernatural.

A. Materialism

To understand dialectical materialism, let us first clarify its root word materialism. The best way to do so is to clarify the meaning and relationship of matter and consciousness in a general manner.

At the outset, however, let us make short shrift of the kind of materialism that preachers, reactionary politicians, landlords and the leading lights of the bourgeoisie often inveigh against but in fact always indulge in. This is supposed to be greediness, money-grubbing, gluttony and all kinds of selfish vices of which they themselves are guilty.

To Marxists, materialism is the outlook and methodology that correctly understands the nature and composition of the universe and the relationship of matter and human consciousness.

Matter is a general term that embraces things constituted by particles, existing in certain modes and measurable in space and time; it is the physical object of human perception and cognition. Consciousness ranges from sensations to thoughts or ideas.

Matter is the source and basis of consciousness. Consciousness is the product and reflection of matter. It is in this sense that we begin to speak of matter as being primary, while consciousness is secondary.

Thought itself is an electrochemical phenomenon emanating from specially arranged matter called the human brain. But, while thought is secondary to matter, it is the highest product of matter. Insofar as it is correctly reflective of the laws of motion in matter, it is capable of interacting with and transforming things faster than nature can on its own without human intervention.

Unlike mechanical materialism, which reduces things and processes to the laws of mechanics, Marxist materialism stresses the comprehensive capability of man in transforming nature and society. It guides and integrates the advances made by natural and social sciences.

Whether we refer to common day experience or to geological history, matter precedes consciousness in time. Before we can venture to think or speak of anything, we assume the existence of the thing that is the object of our interest.

Natural science shows that homo sapiens or cognitive man is only some 50,000 to 60,000 years old. The earth was bereft of human consciousness and yet this planet existed. One can only be astounded by the enormous amount of time involved in the sequence of inorganic matter, organic matter and the differentiation of flora and fauna down to the differentiation of the hominid (manlike ape) and homo sapiens.

We can therefore easily assert that matter can exist independently of consciousness while the latter cannot exist independently of the former. When Marxists refer to objective reality, they speak of things as existing independently of whatever one may think.

It is common notion that matter is finite while consciousness is infinite. It results from a failure to distinguish correct from incorrect ideas. Correct ideas are a reflective approximation of objective reality. They cannot go beyond the material facts. They tend to trail behind the material events or phenomena.

Even fantasies are a mere distortion of reality or jumbling of parts of reality. The idea of an infinite self-subsistent supernatural being has been invented in the same manner as Mickey Mouse by Walt Disney. If one studies the history of the various religions, one cannot fail to see the concept of the supernatural as a mythological creation of human imagination.

The four major religions existing to this day maintain values that belong to the slave society. These were perpetuated as the suffocating ideology of feudal societies. While Marxism philosophically opposes religion, it politically tolerates it in the recognition that superior scientific ideas will prevail in the long run

through persuasion, social practice and the benefits of science and technology. Marxism carries over from liberal democracy the principle of upholding the freedom of thought and belief.

For further discussion on Pre-Marxist Materialism and Idealism, please refer to Appendix 1, at the end of this article.—Editor

B. Materialist Dialectics

Pre-Hegelian dialectics simply means argumentation in the abstract, or abstract argument counter abstract argument. This is exemplified by the Socratic dialogues as written by Plato and by the similarly metaphysical coordination and disputation of fixed ideas (dogmas) in theological circles.

Materialist dialectics is the signal achievement of Marxism. Marx and Engels drew the most advanced and correct ideas from the best of idealist philosophy and materialist philosophy of their time, especially in Germany where philosophic activity was at its peak. They set Hegelian dialectics aright and put it on a materialist basis as partly indicated by Feuerbach. The result is an original and epoch-making advance in philosophy.

Hegelian dialectics asserts that development is first of all the self-development of thought before it is realized in history or in the material world. What makes Hegel the most outstanding idealist philosopher is that he dynamicized the arid, static and lifeless dialectics of all previous idealism and took into account the development of the material world.

Feuerbach correctly pointed out that ideas are merely the sensuous reflection of the material world in human perception. He fell short of the Marxist comprehension of the endless interaction between cognition and reality and the capability of man for critical-revolutionary activity.

While it may be said that Marx and Engels put Hegelian dialectics on a materialist basis, they did not simply adopt his formula of thesis, antithesis and synthesis, which ends up in synthesis as final perfection. But rather they asserted that change is an endless process because anything at any stage always consists of contradictory aspects.

The most fundamental meaning of Marxist materialist dialectics is that things by their very essence are in the process of constant

change. So Marxists say, nothing is permanent except change. But this does not mean that the things of nature change only by themselves without human direction and participation. It is precisely because of man's increasing scientific understanding of and mastery over nature and his society that the processes of change can be well directed and hastened.

Materialist dialectics or the law of contradiction is the law of motion inherent in matters. The first law means that things run into their opposite in the full course of development. For instance, capitalism started as free competition, in contradiction with mercantilism but has eventually become monopoly capitalism.

The second law means that in everything there are two opposite aspects. One is the principal aspect that determines the basic character of the whole thing. The other is the secondary aspect which is needed by the principal one but which continuously struggles to assume the principal position.

For instance, the capitalist class and the proletariat are in the same thing, the capitalist system. They need each other and at the same time struggle against each other in the course of development. In so far as everything, including capitalism, comes to pass, the struggle of the two classes is permanent and absolute, while their unity within the same system is temporary and relative.

The third law means that change may at first be conspicuously quantitative or non-qualitatively incremental but a point is reached at which the rise in quantity results in what is called a qualitative leap. In other words, evolution precedes revolution. Reforms precede revolution.

The three laws of dialectics are interrelated and integral, and may be summed up into the law of contradiction or the law of the unity of opposites.

The law of contradiction is universal in that it embraces all things and processes at every stage and phase of development; and that it is also particular in that there are specific laws of motion peculiar to different things, knowledge of which laws of motion leads us to the appropriate methods of handling them.

In everything there is the principal and secondary aspects. In complex things and processes, there is one principal aspect but

among other several aspects there is always one next in importance which may be identified as the secondary aspect.

For instance, in capitalist society, the capitalist class is principal aspect and is most directly contradicted by the working class as secondary aspect, even as there are intermediate classes and strata, making the whole situation complex.

Several kinds of contradictions may be at work in the same thing or process. To determine the basic operation of the thing or process is to determine the principal contradiction and secondary contradiction. Thus, contradictions can be solved one after the other; and the solution of the principal contradiction or problem leads to the solution of the next.

Contradictory aspects constitute an identity in the sense that they are bound either in cooperation or in struggle, under given circumstances; and also that if the secondary aspect replaces the principal one from the ruling position, strength merely passes from the former to the latter.

C. Theory of Knowledge

Social practice is the basis and source of knowledge. The latter is the reflection and approximation of social practice. However, knowledge gained from social practice leads to a higher level of practice which in turn leads to a higher level of knowledge. The spiraling process is endless. As Mao depicts this as advancing in waves.

Social practice embraces three things: 1) production; 2) class struggle; and 3) scientific experiment. All these, involve the collective experience of large numbers of people.

Production, which is the struggle against and conquest of nature, began with the advent of man and has differentiated him from all other animal species. In all times past and in all times to come, man is ever involved in the struggle to understand and master nature for productive purposes and for widening his freedom. The general level of production determines the general level of knowledge and the kind of society possible.

Class struggle arose with the advent of exploiting and exploited classes; primitive classless society, preoccupied mainly with the mysteries of nature, lasted for several tens of thousands of years.

Class society is only some 5,500 years if we base ourselves on the findings of archaeology, anthropology and history. This kind of society is characterized by the appropriation of the economic surplus (over and above subsistence of the mass of real producers) by a small section of the population. Consequently, it is characterized by the resistance of the deprived and exploited mass of real producers.

One kind of exploiting class society after another arose and passed away. The slave system led to the feudal system. Each reigned for thousands of years. Capitalism arose from feudal society some hundreds of years ago. Presently, it is trying to perpetuate itself in the developed countries and spread to the underdeveloped countries where there are still significant vestiges of feudalism.

Capitalism cannot last for as long a period as the previous social formations because it has created the very conditions and means for its relatively rapid supplantation by a non-exploitative class society, socialism. Science and technology for mass production have been greatly developed by capitalism. It is obvious that the masses through the modern means of large-scale production are capable of satisfying their needs and raising their cultural level and yet so small a class, the capitalist class, maintains an exploitative social system that allows it to privately appropriate and accumulate the social wealth rapidly.

Class struggle is far more accelerated now than at any stage in the history of civilization, especially because for the first time an exploited class struggles not only for its own emancipation but also for that of other exploited classes and strata. Out of the intensified many sided struggle between socialist and capitalist countries, among capitalist countries themselves, between the imperialist and developing countries; and the class struggle within every country, knowledge and material progress are making rapid strides.

Scientific experiment had its rudimentary beginnings in slave society but was suppressed due to the hegemony of religious dogmas, especially in medieval times. Following the rise of humanist (as against divinist) ideas in the Renaissance, scientific experiment flourished in the 16th and 17th centuries. Since then, the progress of science has accelerated astoundingly.

According to Mao, the process of knowing basically involves two stages: 1) the perceptual or empirical and 2) the cognitive or rational. Perceptual knowledge is one derived from the gathering of raw data or facts through sense perception and social investigation. Out of these, some ideas can be formed to be brought back to practice and to improve it. Consequently, knowledge of a higher level can be drawn from this improved practice. Decisions, judgments and stable conclusions would arise. These are called rational knowledge.

This process is a continuous and spiraling one. While social practice is the basis and source of knowledge, it is also the testing ground and method for verifying the validity, invalidity or inadequacy of that knowledge. Practice guided and enriched by correct theory is more productive; and it leads to the further development of theory.

Truth can be derived only from the facts. But without letting the ideas rise to a higher level through social practice, these ideas remain narrow, one-sided and fragmented. One runs into the error of empiricism.

On the other hand, correct knowledge or proven theory can become rigid, lifeless and false when it stops to develop in accordance with changing conditions or when new conditions and new facts are simply construed to fit old ideas in the manner of cutting the feet to fit into an old shoe. This is the error of dogmatism.

Truth is both absolute and relative. It is absolute only in the sense that certain ideas are basically and stably correct in applying on a certain set of conditions. But because conditions keep on changing, truth or correct ideas are also relative. There is no final, cut-and-dried formula for social transformation. Also in the physical sciences, Newtonian physics has had to advance to Einsteinian physics. The former retains a certain limited validity but the latter has become the comprehensive explanation so far for physical phenomena.

Marxism, as founded by Marx and Engels, would have become a lifeless dogma, were it not for its further development by Lenin, Stalin, Mao and other subsequent thinkers and leaders in accordance with changing conditions.

Marxism holds that the struggle for freedom is an endless one. Freedom is but the recognition of necessity and the ability to transform reality. Every development gives rise to new necessities

and problems that man needs to master and solve if freedom is to be advanced. Even basically correct solutions lead to new problems at a new and higher level of development. There is no such thing as a society of final perfection. Such a utopia is an impossibility.

Even after the final defeat of exploiting classes and those who wish to restore exploitation, even after a society of economic superabundance has been achieved, the infinitude of matter and complexity of relations continuously provide humans with problems to solve. There will always be a struggle between correct and incorrect ideas.

A society of perfect harmony would mean the end of humanity. Man would die of boredom and stagnation. anticommunists do not actually speak of Marxism when they say that communists, in wanting to eliminate poverty and social inequalities, are advocating an impossible utopia where man would cease to be challenged and to take initiative to widen his won freedom.

As envisioned by Marxists, socialism is a whole historical epoch that results in the elimination of private ownership of the means of production and the withering away of the state as a violent, coercive instrument of class rule. But even as communism will be rid of class exploitation and oppression, there will be public authorities and there will be friendly competitions between individuals and groups not in terms of profit-making or the rat race of the salariat but in terms of serving the entire people and achievements in science, arts, literature, technology, etc. Man, as we know now in overwhelming numbers, will be lifted from being preoccupied simply with earning his daily subsistence and will have abundant opportunities for social service and dignified self-fulfillment.

Chapter 2. Historical Materialism

Historical materialism may be briefly defined as the application of dialectical materialism on the study of the various forms of society and their development from one form to another. It focuses on that part of nature or material reality where the conscious, social activity and development of man is involved. It delves into the social sciences, rather than into the natural sciences.

Historical materialism studies and deals with the fundamental terms of the existence of societies and their social development. It

seeks to comprehend the material base and superstructure of any society and the interaction between the two, while a certain form of society exists and carries the potential or is in the actual process of changing or being changed into another form. It links dialectical materialism to political economy and other aspects of social study.

Historical materialism uncovers and shows the most essential laws of motion that operate in all and in each of human societies and that govern their development, from their initial growth through maturation to decline and either replacement by a new and higher form of society or retrogression to a lower one.

In the entire life of mankind so far, there have arisen several forms of societies in a generally ascending order. Chronologically and progressively, these are: 1) primitive communal society; 2) slave society; 3) feudal society; 4) capitalist society; and 5) socialist society. Communist society, a classless society, is projected by Marxists as the form of society that would eventually follow socialist society.

We shall follow mainly the historical experience of Western Europe because this is where capitalism and socialism appeared for the first time in a series of social transformations.

A. The Material Base of Society

The material base of society is its mode of production or economic system. This consists of the forces and relations of production.

The forces of production include the means of production and the people in production. The means of production include the tools of production and the available natural resources which are the object of human labor. The people in production include the actual producers of wealth with a certain level of skills.

The relations of production refer to the organization of production or division of labor, the common or private ownership of the means of production and the distribution of the products of labor. In primitive communal society, some simple division of labor existed but such division did not yet evolve into classes of exploiters and exploited. It was in succeeding forms of society that classes have evolved. The division of labor did not only become sharper but owing to the evolution to private ownership of the means of production, also an

ever sharper division developed between definite classes of exploiters and exploited and correspondingly in the distribution of the products of labor.

In general, the forces of production determine the relations of production and may be considered primary. But at certain times, the relations of production play the primary role either in hastening or restricting the growth of the forces of production.

In general, the mode of production as a whole determines the form of society, including the character of non-economic activities in the superstructure. However, such non-economic activities interact with and have a powerful influence on economic activities. We shall discuss this more when we study the superstructure of society.

The full significance of the mode of production needs to be recognized. It is often times taken for granted or deliberately obscured. No society whatsoever is possible without it. And such higher things in life as philosophy, politics, science, the arts and letters, lifestyle and the like can exist without the necessary material base supporting them.

It is through production that man has differentiated himself from other animals and has steadily gained mastery over the spontaneous forces of nature. The prehensibility of the hands, bipedalism, the acquisition of language and the development of the brain and thinking are the triumphs of man in tens of thousands of years of crude productive labor.

According to progressive anthropologists, man made himself. This statement is made in repudiation of the myth in the Genesis that Yahweh created him whole and placed him at first in Eden without having to sweat and labor.

The forces of production in primitive communal society was at an extremely low level. The Paleolithic savage society had for its most potent tools of production crude stones and was dependent on hunting, fishing and picking fruit. Typically, this kind of society consisted of a nomadic clan. It lasted for several tens of thousands of years before the neolithic society could emerge.

The neolithic or barbaric society had for its most potent tools of production polished and sharpened stones and the bow and arrow. Subsequently, it developed husbandry, tillage, basketry, pottery, the

use of the cartwheel and the smelting of soft metals (tin and copper). Typically this kind of society consisted of a tribe. Social development accelerated but society still lasted a few tens of thousands of years.

The level of the productive forces was so low that it could not produce a significant surplus for so long. The smallness and limited productive capacity of society limited the surplus it produced. The surplus product was not sufficient for a part of society to be able to form itself into an exploitative class to appropriate and increase that surplus. Stones as tools of production were available to everyone and it was impossible for any class to gain exclusive ownership or control over them.

Although society had not yet divided into exploiting and exploited classes, it certainly was no paradise as man had to contend with the harshness of nature only with crude tools. There may have been father figures, matriarchs or leaders in clans or tribes, aside from priests or medicine men. However, these individuals did not comprise an exploitative class. They themselves had to take part in labor.

It took some 50,000 or 60,000 years before civilization emerged, with the slave society as its first form. By civilization, we mean the existence of literacy, metallurgy and class-divided society. The earliest slave societies now known to archaeology, anthropology and history hark back to some 6,000 years ago. These include the Mesopotamian and Elamite societies (dating back to 3500 BC), Egyptian (3000 BC) and Chinese (2500 BC). As civilized societies, they had a significant degree of urbanization and they left written records and artifacts of culture far superior to that of the primitive communal society. At least, they consisted of inter-tribal nations.

Earliest evidence available on the making and use of a hard metal, bronze (an alloy of tin and copper) as tools dates back to 3000 BC. Evidence available on the early use of iron tools dates back to 1050 BC. Bronze and iron tools became the most potent tools of slave society, especially for agriculture and construction. These could not yet be produced abundantly and thus easily lent themselves to private ownership by a definite class.

The private ownership of the means of production was also extended to the ownership of men and women as slaves, as beasts of burden. At first, this was a progressive development from the old barbaric practice of simply killing off serious offenders in society and captives of war. But eventually the ruling class in society made it a systematic and sustained practice to turn more men into slaves until these became a major means of production in society.

The Hebrew society that we know from the Old and New Testaments of the Bible was a slave society. So were our sources of ancient classical learning, the Athenian city-state and the Roman empire. The basic classes in these societies were the slave-owning aristocracy and the slaves. The economic needs of society were in the main produced by the slaves and the slave-owning aristocracy lorded over society.

In slave society, there were also the non-basic or intermediate classes like artisans, free holding peasants, the plebeians, the merchants and intelligentsia.

Just as the slave society could arise only on the basis of the productive level achieved in a barbaric society, so did the feudal society on the basis of that achieved by slave society. It took some 4,000 known years of slave civilization before feudal societies came into full existence in the Middle Ages in Europe. In China, it took 2,000 known years of slave civilization before the feudal society emerged.

Upon the breakup of the Roman Empire, under the onslaughts of revolts by slaves and subjugated nations and peoples, feudal societies emerged in Europe. With land as the principal means of production, the relations of production between slave master and slaves transformed into those between landlord and serf, with the former in control.

The slave became the serf. He could no longer be bought or sold like a beast of burden nor be subject to extremely arbitrary laws which easily cost him his life. But he was bound to the piece of land assigned to him and could not leave it unless allowed by his lord. He was obliged to pay rent to his lord.

Agriculture and husbandry greatly expanded in feudal society. Metal tools for clearing the forest and tilling the soil became more

available. Deep plowing, inter-cropping, fallowing, more efficient use of draft animals and improved irrigation were adopted.

In the early period of feudal society, the serf was given the illusion of owning the piece of land he tilled, especially when he was the one who cleared it. Thus, he was encouraged to put more land to tillage. He paid rent in the form of labor service, by devoting certain days of the week to work on the land of his lord.

Subsequently, land ownership slipped away from the serf through various devices. The distinction between land owned by serf and lord was erased and the serf was obliged to pay rent in the form of crop share. In the later period of feudal society, land rent in the form of cash was increasingly adopted as the bourgeoisie increased its role and influence in the relations of production.

The growth of agriculture encouraged the distinct growth of the handicrafts which included the production of agricultural implements, cloth and the like. Towns emerged as distinct centers of handicraft production and centers of commerce between the products of the town and the village.

The handicrafts stage of bourgeois development, characterized by the guild as a form of organization, gave way to manufacturing. No longer was a complete product made by a few men in the same small shop but a large group of men would be devoted to making only a single part of the complete product day in and day out. The relations between the guild master and artisans was replaced by the manufacturer and a mass of workers put in line according to a high degree of a division of labor.

The advance of manufacturing though still based on handicrafts made the bourgeoisie a wealthy class, influential as the moneybags in the royal court. As early as the 16th century; it was obvious that the needs of the king for funds to carry out wars to consolidate his power coincided with the needs of the bourgeoisie for a secure market. Also, their interests coincided in colonial expeditions.

The scientific advance in mechanical physics from the 17th century onward gave way to technological inventions which promoted manufacturing in an unprecedented manner in the 18th century. The best known of these inventions were the steam power and the spinning jenny. The bourgeoisie found the feudal mode of

production too restrictive and wanted to change and control the relations of production.

The French revolution brought the bourgeoisie to power for the first time in history. By the 19th century, the bourgeoisie had already come into full control of the relations of production in several countries in Europe. Either the landlord class had to compromise for gradual dissolution or be destroyed outright by political upheaval. This class could linger on in Europe, unable to resist absorption into the capitalist economy.

The advance of science and technology became even more rapid in the 19th century. It gave rise to what is now often called the Industrial Revolution. Large scale machine production or mass production became the dominant characteristic of the economic system in a number of European countries. The new powerful means of production were owned by the capitalist class; and the mass of industrial workers or proletariat increased in order to build them up. The relations of production was one basically between the capitalist class and the proletariat, and the former was in control of it.

The *Communist Manifesto* in 1848 noted that the material achievements of capitalism outstripped in a very short period those of all previous civilizations by so many times. It also pointed out that a world economy had arisen, with the capitalist countries capable of bombarding all backward countries with the commodities of capitalist production.

But the fundamental message of the Manifesto was that the capitalist class had also summoned to life its own grave digger, the proletariat. Capitalist society was increasingly being divided into two great camps, that of capital and labor. For the first time in the history of mankind, an exploited class had arisen with the capability not only of overthrowing the class that dominates it but also of linking up with other exploited classes in a struggle for emancipation in order to build a new socialist society.

In presenting the internal laws of motion of capitalism and its course of development, Marx did his greatest work in *Das Kapital*, which we shall deal with in a later chapter. In the large terms of historical materialism, Marx and Engels pointed out the social character of the means of production (which in the first place is

congealed labor) and the private character of appropriation by the capitalist class.

Marx uncovered the extraction of surplus value (unpaid value of labor above paid labor or wages) which leads up to the compelling accumulation of the means of production or productive capital in the hands of the capitalist class and the consequent relative crisis of overproduction. As a result of this, the workers are compelled to stand up and struggle for their class interests; at first through trade unions and subsequently through political parties.

Just before the end of the 19th century, capitalism grew into monopoly capitalism in certain countries. Increasingly, in the 20th century, it found in the export of capital aside from commodities the solution to the over concentration of capital. It was Lenin's turn to study and explain this new phenomenon, which he called modern imperialism, the highest and final stage of capitalist development.

He said that just as the old form of capitalism led capitalist rivalries to break out into wars, modern imperialism would lead to more bitter rivalries breaking out into larger wars. But these wars, he pointed out, are self-defeating and would lead to social upheavals and revolutionary civil war. He described modern imperialism as the eve of social revolution and called for turning the inter-imperialist war into revolutionary civil war.

The first inter-imperialist war, World War I, resulted in the victory of the first socialist revolution in the weakest of imperialist countries, Russia. World War II resulted in the victory of socialism in several countries and the rise of national movements against imperialism and colonialism in the colonies and semicolonies. In turning to modern imperialism, therefore, capitalism, has merely temporarily postponed its demise in its home grounds and has made possible not only the worldwide anticapitalist (anti-imperialist) movement but also the rise of socialism.

The socialist mode of production, in sharp contrast to the capitalist one, involves primarily the public ownership of the means of production. In the concrete circumstances of countries which have so far become socialist, however, there have been transitory concessions to private ownership of the means of production, especially in the case of the peasants and even some capitalist

entrepreneurs. All strategic industries, bureaucrat ill-gotten productive assets, capitalist farms and sources of raw materials are definitely nationalized at the inception of socialist society. In so far as there are considerable vestiges of feudalism, it is both politically and economically wise to carry out bourgeois-democratic land reform. This means the free distribution of land to the peasants. Over a period of time, their individual ownership would be raised to the level of cooperative or collective ownership.

The process of dissolving private ownership of land among the peasants is smoothed by education, the introduction of farm machines and other modern means, the development of localized industries and the increased capacity of the national industries to absorb those that may be displaced from the farms. However, in collective farms, small private plots are allotted to peasants for gardening to serve home use, private taste and some amount of localized exchange.

Concessions to some private capitalist entrepreneurs and even private traders are usually more short lived than those extended to peasants. These concessions are extended on varying considerations, depending on the concrete conditions. At any rate, the most important economic reason is that entrepreneurial and professional skills and widespread small trading facilities continue to be useful, after all the commanding heights of the economy are already socialist. It is only a foolish leadership that encourages the expatriation of people, especially when these have skills to contribute. Communist society is still too far away for any dialectical and historical materialist to be able to work out its details. It is enough to know the basic principles and outline of the communist future. Although some writings of Marx and Engels state that socialism is the first stage of communism, Lenin—favored by further proletarian revolutionary experience—said that socialism would take an entire historical epoch. At any rate, we can say that the socioeconomic, political and cultural achievements of socialism prepares the way for the communist society.

In socialist society, private profit ceases basically and then completely. But social profit takes its place. In the *Critique of the Gotha Program*, Marx thoroughly debunked the idea of “the equal

distribution of the fruits of labor” as too simple-minded and nonsense. In the socialist mode of production, the income above wages will be allotted in the following manner: 1) the expansion of productive capacity, not just simple reproduction of capital or simple replacement of depreciation; 2) increased fund for public-welfare (public housing, public transport, nurseries, hospitals, schools, theaters, libraries, parks, recreation facilities, etc.); 3) administration and 4) defense.

Private profit that under current circumstances is misallocated, frozen in unproductive assets or wasted on luxurious, conspicuous spending by a few shall cease to exist. So shall unnecessary and bloated costs of administration, like excessive salaries, allowances and bonuses for the bosses and the unnecessary costs of private economic competition and bankruptcies.

The possibility of the communist society lies in the awesome capacity of the modern means of mass production, hastened by the cumulative progress of science and technology and unfettered by the motive of private profit; in the steady increase of the real wages or the purchasing power of the workers; and in the rapid expansion of public welfare facilities. The work time can even be reduced to allow people to engage in more cultural and other worthwhile activities and thus become well integrated. Thus, work itself ceases to be a drudgery and becomes a joy.

The high-tech productive capacity of the imperialist-dominated world today is enough, to wipe out poverty. But the wealth created by the people is taken away from them through the exploitative relations of production. Myths of scarcity and limits to growth are also spread and the environment is ravaged for the purpose of private profit. If the United States of America were to turn socialist today, it will not only permanently eliminate its problem of unemployment and poverty for a considerable portion of its population (20 percent) but will facilitate and accelerate the growth of other countries by several fold.

Anyhow, high technology accelerates the crisis of overproduction in the world capitalist system and creates at a faster rate the conditions for the people’s resistance to imperialism and neocolonialism and for the irrepressible advance of socialism through the twists and turns of history. The capitalist relations of

production are becoming more and more incapable of containing the growth of the forces of production.

B. The Superstructure of Society

The superstructure of society consists of the ideas, institutions and fields of activity above the mode of production. Philosophy, the arts and sciences, politics, economic theory, jurisprudence, religion, morality and the like belong to the superstructure. The institutions, personnel and activities in the superstructure are maintained by the surplus generated by the mode of production.

The superstructure is founded on the mode of production. The former reflects the latter. In general, the material base of society determines superstructure. Thus, the level of cultural development and the dominant currents of thought in a society are expressive of the basic mode of production.

While it may be said that the mode of production is primary to the superstructure, Marxism goes further to state that they interact. At certain times, the superstructure can restrict the growth of the mode of production. And at other times, the former can hasten the latter. Just as reactionary ideas can linger on in the superstructure, progressive ideas can arise in it ahead of the actual transformation of the mode of production.

The contradictions in the mode of production are reflected in contradictions in the superstructure; and the latter influence the former. Marxism encompasses the complexity and dialectical relations of the mode of production and superstructure. It shuns economic determinism, the one-sided dictation of the economic system on the superstructure.

Of all institutions and organizations in the superstructure of a class society, the state is the highest form. It is the most powerful and most comprehensive. It claims the obedience of all inhabitants within its territory; and it has the means to enforce that obedience.

Defenders of the bourgeois state present it as a supra-class instrument for the general good and often quibble about the forms of government in order to obscure the class character of the state. Thus, the Athenian slave state is simplistically referred to as “the cradle of democracy” simply because at certain periods the general assembly or representative assembly of slave-owning aristocrats

and freemen held sway instead of an autocracy or oligarchy at the helm of government. Completely obscured is the essential fact that this so-called democracy was the rule of the slave-owning class over a great mass of slaves and other people.

In this regard, an ecclesiastical chapter in the Middle Ages might as well be called a democracy. Along this line, many bourgeois historians actually call the Magna Carta of the 13th century a milestone of democracy. In this document, the feudal monarch of England pledged himself to consulting with the feudal barons before imposing new taxes.

To the Marxists, the most important consideration in characterizing a state is what class rules. To them the state is the special instrument of class coercion over another class in order to realize a certain kind of society. It is the institution in the superstructure which preserves the relations of production in the material base of society. It consists essentially of the army, police, the courts and the prisons—the very same apparatuses that the bourgeois political theorist would point to as the guarantee to law and order for the common good.

The state arose with exploitative class society. In the long run, long period of primitive communal society, there was merely the authority of the clan, tribal leader or council of elders. The community was so small that the leaders or elders were close to their followers and together they could easily make decisions whenever they wanted to. Contrary to the idyllic presentation of primitive society, the leader could at times be abusive. But certainly he was not yet the representative of any ruling exploitative class.

All menfolk were warriors in the interest of the community and normally there was no special body of men performing military duties full time. There were simply no means of production yet which could be monopolized by any class. There was simply no surplus product to take away. The whole community had to struggle together for bare subsistence.

Considering the extremely low level of its mode of production, the primitive communal society had a very crude kind of superstructure. Apart from their practical thoughts related to production, the primitive people had superstitious beliefs ranging from animism and magic

through ancestor worship to polytheism; and made uncomplicated rhythmic melodies and flat, childlike drawings. They were not literate. The society could not generate the surplus product to support special bodies devoted to various fields of activity besides the simplest division of labor in economic production.

As we go further to discuss the superstructure of the various forms of society, take note that we seem to set one form of society from another absolutely. This is so because our main interest now is to present the basic characteristics of each type of superstructure. When we deal with social transformation, we shall give due attention to the fact that the embryo of a later form of society is necessarily found in a preceding form of society, This is true with regard to both mode of production and superstructure.

The slave-owning class built the state for the first time in civilization. Whether there was tyranny (autocracy) or a representative assembly of slave owners at its helm, the slave state maintained the relations of production whereby the slave masters dominated the slaves. This was true from the most ancient oriental civilizations down to the Roman Empire.

As a coercive instrument of class rule, the slave state saw to it that the exploited class of slaves was constantly replenished by people who could not pay their debts, violated laws against property and persons or were captured from other communities. The slave state also went into empire building for the purpose of getting slaves, booty and tribute. These empires ranged from the small one, wherein one city-state dominated a few others, to the vast one of the Romans.

With society already capable of creating surplus product, distinct institutions and activities in the superstructure developed. Such groups of individuals as politicians, scribes, administrative officers, priests, philosophers, master builders, poets, painters, sculptors, other artists and professionals arose mainly in the service of the ruling system.

For brevity, let us cite only the most outstanding achievements of slave society with great influence in the Western tradition. The Hebrews put forward through the Old and New Testaments most vigorously the concept of monotheistic religion, an advance on highly

irrational polytheism and emperor worship. The Greeks gave natural philosophy, great works of poetry (especially the epic and drama) and excellent architecture. The Romans merely elaborated on the cultural achievements of the Greeks but raised to a new and higher level the art of administration and jurisprudence.

The feudal societies that emerged from the collapse and fragmentation of the Roman Empire had, of course, the feudal state as the main feature of their superstructure. As the emancipated peoples and slaves settled down and developed a feudal mode of production, the feudal state arose to maintain the relations of production whereby a hierarchy of landed aristocrats lorded over the masses of serfs and other people.

A striking feature of the superstructure was the ideological monopoly enjoyed by the Catholic Church. During the overthrow of the Roman Empire, Christianity had managed to be on both sides of the conflict. It was the state religion of the empire since the fourth century and Christian missionaries were deployed among the subjugated nations and peoples. Bereft of any ideology or culture higher than that of their adversary, the subjugated peoples adopted Christianity. Thus, Christendom prevailed in Europe.

The Catholic clergy cultivated the union of church and state and likewise the idea that God is the source of authority. They advised the feudal rulers and instructed the children of the royalty and nobility. The ecclesiastical organization was even more extensive than the administrative system of the state. The parish was based on the village and the priests were in ways depended upon for certain functions of government, especially tax collection.

In cooperation with the church, the secular rulers had to contend not only with the clergy within society but also the papacy seated in Rome. Except for certain periods of extreme corruption, debauchery and loss of authority, the papacy was the effective international power arching over the feudal societies. The empire of Charlemagne was a flash in the pan. The Holy Roman Empire existed from the tenth century to its end in the 16th century. It was a farcical copy of the original Roman Empire in the long run but it nurtured the European feudal states under the canopy of Christendom.

In the first half of the Christian millennium, from the fifth to the tenth centuries, the Church concentrated on catechism. The highest level of education was available only to monks and it consisted mainly of the study of the Bible. Except for what served the Christian ideology, the philosophical, proto-scientific and literary works of Greece and Rome were suppressed.

As Engels would say, natural philosophy was subordinated to theology. What was most cherished in philosophy was metaphysics. To be precise, only the Augustinian adaptation of neo-Platonism (Plotinus) was propagated until the late 13th century. Thomas Aquinas made an adaptation of Aristotelianism on the basis of secondary materials, the commentaries of the Islamic scholar Averroes. No university existed in Christendom until the University of Paris was established in the 11th century. But the main fare was still theological and metaphysical. More advanced secular learning and ancient classical learning were available in either the schools of Islamic Spain, Norman Sicily and scholarly circles in Constantinople.

The Roman Catholic monopoly of the superstructure in all and each of feudal societies of Western Europe was eventually undermined by the increasing virulence of the conflict between state and secular interests, the Italian Renaissance which promoted secular humanist literature emulating pagan works of the past, the Reformation and rise of Protestant movements, the rise of scientific investigation and, of course, the rise of the manufacturing and commercial bourgeoisie. To the extent that the capitalist mode of production took hold of certain parts of Europe, the germinal bourgeoisie were conceded political rights by the feudal authorities. This occurred in divided Italy where cities which economically benefited most from the religious crusades and Mediterranean trade became republican communes and were responsible for their own economy and defense, as early as the 13th century.

But it was first during the civil war in England in the 17th century that a flourishing bourgeoisie made a powerful bid to acquire its own political power in a major European country. The French revolution was eventually the culmination of the long-drawn efforts of the bourgeoisie to gain state power for itself. Against an extremely

resistant nobility and clergy, the bourgeoisie together with the other classes of French society went on to overthrow feudal power.

In revolutionizing the feudal superstructure, the bourgeoisie promoted subjective idealism (empiricism in England and rationalism in the continent); the idea of rational, secular and scientific enlightenment and progress; liberal democracy (under such slogans as liberty, equality and fraternity) and the separation of church and state; and the economic theory of free competition (an advance on mercantilism, whereby the feudal monarch and the national bourgeoisie worked hand in hand through state trading monopolies and concessions to the bourgeoisie).

The West European bourgeoisie took advantage of the workers' armed uprising in 1848 to trounce feudal power on a wide scale and at the same time suppress the working class and carry on the Industrial Revolution further. After getting hold of state power, the bourgeoisie used it to control the working class and suppress any resistance to capitalist exploitation.

Compromising with a landed aristocracy on the wane, the bourgeoisie reverted to old ideas and recanted on its blasphemies against church and religion. Of course, it continued to avail of science and technology in pushing the growth of productive forces. But even in this regard, the advance of science and technology has been subordinated to and restricted by the process of maximizing profit. Productive forces have been destroyed repeatedly via the economic crises and wars, not to speak of the wasteful consumption in boom times which induced every consequent crisis.

In the imperialist era of capitalism, in the midst of which we are, individual freedom and free enterprise are still the catchwords of the capitalist class in its prevailing theories and propaganda. But the fact is that whole masses of individuals (the proletariat and other exploited classes) are being oppressed and exploited by capitalist states and their client-states. It is monopoly capitalism and not free enterprise that actually rides roughshod over the people in the capitalist world.

In comparison to the superstructure of feudalism, that of capitalism is definitely more advanced. Under feudalism at its best education was available only to the children of the nobility and the

bourgeoisie in schools run by clerics. Under capitalism, there is universal public education in the elementary grades or even up to high school and also state universities and there are all sorts of non-sectarian private schools at every level. The media of information and education have also vastly expanded through the advance of science and technology.

The needs of the capitalist mode of production are met by the superstructure, in terms of training more men and women in the various professions. This is not only to enhance production for profit directly or indirectly but also to throttle or mislead the exploited classes. While the upper classes of society in the capitalist world have a cosmopolitan character, the kind of “pop culture” dished out to the masses consists of trivial works that promote the individualistic values on money grubbing, sex and violence. This totalitarianism of the capitalist class over the exploited masses in the field of culture is touted as the hallmark of freedom. It is counter-posed to the revolutionary ideological and political unity of the exploited masses.

The inhabitants of the economically advanced capitalist society today can boast of a lifestyle and flashy possessions far above the income level of the workers and peasants and even the lower and middle-middle classes in the colonies and semicolonies. But it should be noted that the ability of American workers to get creature comforts, often on mortgage, rests on the imperialist exploitation of other nations, while the crisis of overproduction and capital over-accumulation does not yet result in economic stagnation and massive unemployment even in capitalist countries.

An unprecedentedly grave economic crisis is now occurring in the capitalist mode of production. This is reflected in a growing crisis in its culture. There is huge waste of resources and serious threats to mankind in the rivalry and arms race between an imperialist and social-imperialist power; cutthroat competition among the capitalist countries; the demands of the third world countries and people for emancipation and development. All these are putting every capitalist country in dire straits.

Socialist society has arisen only a few decades ago, in 1917. But it has chalked up material productive achievements that took the bourgeoisie several centuries to make. On the basis of this, a

socialist superstructure is flourishing. Even in the Soviet Union, which has retrogressed into state monopoly capitalism, it cannot be denied that what it previously achieved through socialism is so great as to enable it to continue confronting the United States in the Cold War.

Socialist societies have so far arisen in countries with a backlog of feudalism. Thus, the socialist states have taken the form of people's democracy, with the alliance of workers and peasants as the main political base. At the same time, proletarian dictatorship is exercised to disempower the exploiting classes. It is proletarian, Marxist ideology, politics and organization that prevail, even as bourgeois-democratic reforms like land reform have to be undertaken for a while in a period of transition.

The Communist Party is the chief propagator and applicator of Marxism in a socialist society and it is preeminent in the socialist state because it has been the leader in the transformation of the old society and in the continuing proletarian revolution. Thus, in China until today, various non-communist parties and associations continue to exist and are represented in the People's Consultative Council and the National People's Congress.

All the freedoms formally guaranteed in a liberal democratic constitution are carried over into a socialist constitution, with the crucial difference that the proletarian dictatorship and the basic alliance of the working class and peasantry are upheld and the bourgeoisie and the landlord class are deprived of the freedom to exploit and oppress the people under the guise of individual freedom and the right to own property, including the means of production.

While the people achieve real freedom, only a comparatively small number (a handful) of exploiters and counterrevolutionaries lose or have their freedom restricted according to their political or criminal culpability. Unlike the bourgeois state, the socialist state frankly admits that it is a class dictatorship against its class enemies even as it is the democratic instrument of the people.

Freedom of thought and belief is respected in socialist countries. Marxism maintains the scientific and optimistic view that correct ideas emerge through debate and democratic persuasion and through social practice where the ideas are tested and verified.

Within the Communist Party, no line or policy is adopted without democratic discussion. In society at large, the freedom to espouse any idea or belief is wider, short of any overt act of violence against the socialist state and counterrevolutionary effort to restore the exploiting classes to power.

The materialist-scientific outlook of Marxism is conducive to the rapid advance of science and technology, not for the sake of private profit but of social profit. What happens in the first place in the socialist transformation of the means of production is the removal of fetters imposed on them by the selfish and narrow interests of the exploiting classes. Thus, we are witness today to a China, extremely backward only three decades ago, fast approaching the most advanced standards of science and technology for agriculture, industry and defense.

The quality of life of the large masses of workers and peasants improves in accordance with the expansion of socialist production. Education at any level is open to the workers and peasants and their children without any cost. The new heroes of the culture are revolutionary workers, peasants, soldiers and intellectuals. New values run through the works of arts and letters. At the same time, learning from the past and from abroad is encouraged to serve the present needs of the socialist society.

Socialism as a form of society is still relatively new but its achievements in both material base and superstructure are already gigantic. It will take an entire historical epoch, before it passes on to communism. We can also say that socialism will outlive its purposes, the historic mission of the proletariat, at an accelerated rate when modern imperialism shall have been defeated.

The withering away of the state is pointed to by Marxists as the most decisive characteristic of the transition of socialism to communism. So long as imperialism exists and so long as there is still an internal danger of capitalist restoration, socialist societies cannot be expected to let down their guard and dissolve the instruments of coercion by which the proletariat can keep down and eliminate the bourgeoisie as a class.

Those who are capable of thinking only in terms of pre-socialist state power cannot imagine how the state could ever be dissolved.

They call this impossible and utopian. What compounds their ignorance of the Marxist definition of the state as class instrument of coercion is that they think unfairly that Marxism prescribes the end of all authority in communism. That is not Marxism but anarchism.

We can say in the most general manner that some authority will still exist in communist society. But it will certainly not be an authority with coercive apparatuses for the private gain of any exploitative class or group. Even at its early stage, socialism has already demonstrated that there can be a kind of state which still uses the coercive apparatuses against its enemies but which has put an end to productive and social relations whereby a few belonging to a narrow class can exploit masses of people belonging to another class.

Given more time, socialist society can generalize the level of living and education of the present upper-middle class. If such were the condition of the people in the whole society, is there any need for the instruments of class coercion? Crimes against property because of economic want will go down to zero. Most crimes and legal cases today relate to property and poverty.

The long period of socialism will create not only the economic conditions but also those social, political and cultural relations that will make a classless society, communism, possible.

C. Social Transformation: Revolution

A society is ripe for a radical transformation when the forces of production have grown to the point that they can no longer be contained by the relations of production. In a manner of speaking, the integuments of society are burst asunder. The socioeconomic crisis leads to a political crisis in which the ruling class can no longer rule in the old way, the people are desirous of revolutionary change and there is a revolutionary party strong enough to lead the revolution.

Under these conditions, the struggle between the ruling class and the ruled class intensifies. The ruling class tries to preserve the outmoded relations of production and mollify or suppress the ruled class. The latter is determined to overthrow the ruling class and seeks to change the old relations of production.

The class struggle rises from the mode of production to the superstructure and the whole of society. The ruling class tries to make use of the superstructure, especially the state, in order to preserve the outmoded relations of production. Likewise, the ruled class tries to make use of anything it can make use of in the superstructure and hasten to create the political and cultural means in its favor. Thus, the superstructure becomes a field of class struggle.

In the course of class struggle, reforms or revolution may occur. Under certain circumstances, the relations of production may still be adjusted and concessions granted to the ruled class. Or the ruling class may simply refuse to make reforms, even when still possible, and thus provoke a revolutionary upheaval that takes the form of armed revolution by the ruled class. Conditions may also reach such a point that mere reforms would no longer suffice to preserve the relations of production.

The ultimate weapon of any ruling class in order to retain its class rule is the state as an instrument of coercion. It is openly used to repress the ruled class when all suasive means such as the parliament and other civil institutions fail to appease the ruled class.

In the face of flagrant armed repression by the state, the ruled class is induced to resist and organize its own revolutionary party and armed force. If the ruled class does not fight, it continues to be dominated by an outmoded relations of production and by the state power of the exploiting class. But the tendency of the ruled class to struggle for its own rights and interests will still be there. If the ruled class chooses to fight and organizes an armed force, it is determined to change the relations of production and establish a completely new society.

The outbreak of an armed revolution depends on the objective conditions in the mode of production and how the two sides in the class struggle consciously maneuver in the use of the superstructure. It is also possible for the leadership of the exploited class to be coopted or defeated by the ruling class for some time so that the coopting or winning class (the ruling class) can arrange the relations of production either by way of further reaction or a series of reforms to reinforce reaction.

Reformism rejects the theory and practice of social revolution, especially that which entails the armed overthrow of the reactionary state. It is a system of thought that insists on pursuing an indefinite series of reforms to improve the incumbent exploitative and oppressive class society.

History has shown that, independent of the wishes of the reformists, the political crisis in a capitalist society can lead to the inciting moment that triggers the acceleration and climax of the revolutionary process of seizing political power. It has also shown that in an underdeveloped and semifeudal society, with a large peasant population, the chronic socioeconomic and political crisis provides the basis for a protracted people's war of encircling the cities from the countryside.

In Marxism, the armed seizure of political power by an oppressed and exploited class is the central task of revolution and is the necessary prelude to all-round social revolution. Without political power in its hands, the proletariat cannot make the social revolution. This social revolution involves essentially the total transformation of the relations of production. It also involves a prolonged process of totally transforming the superstructure, making it correspond to and thereby enhance the relations of production.

The historic revolutionary mission of the proletariat is not limited to an armed seizure of power. It extends over a long period of struggle for the change of political power to the period of socialist revolution and construction until the dawn of communism. It is bourgeois or feudalist confusion of mind or misinterpretation of Marxism to narrow down social revolution to a mere spasm of violence.

The Marxist understanding of revolutionary violence as the people's sovereign right against oppression is no different from that of the liberal-democrat. Such right is always implicitly or explicitly upheld in liberal-democratic constitutions. The only difference lies in the goals: the Marxist wants socialism and the liberal democrat wants capitalism.

Social revolution is a conscious mass undertaking. Marxism rejects a number of false theories in this regard. Among them are the theory of mechanical inevitability, the theory of spontaneous masses

and the theory that great individuals rather than the masses make history.

The theory of mechanical inevitability puts the ruled class in the passive position of not consciously doing anything to change the relations of production because it is the growth of the productive forces that will inevitably change the relations of production.

What is obscured by this theory of mechanical inevitability is the fact that the ruling class has a prior conscious control not only of the relations of production but also of the superstructure. It can one-sidedly prolong the relations of production if the exploited class does not make effective resistance. This explains why as late as the 16th century onward master-slave relations in the Americas could exist side by side with lord-serf relations as well as with capital-labor relations. Until now, there are still remnants of primitive communal, slave and feudal societies in the most backward parts of the world. In many colonies and semicolonies, feudalism and semifeudalism persist on a large scale.

The theory of spontaneous masses posits that the ruled class without any conscious leadership and without a definite ideology, programme and organized strength can transform society into a new one. This is an anarchist notion. It again obscures the prior ruling class control of the relations of production and the superstructure. To say the least, the unorganized masses are eventually rendered helpless before the highly conscious and highly organized ruling class, which is in command of a large number of armed personnel that can prevail over spontaneous mass uprisings.

The direct opposite of the theory of spontaneous masses is the theory that great individuals rather than the masses make history. The Marxist view is that the people are the motive force and makers of history and that great men as leaders are at best representatives of great mass movements. The brilliance of leaders can help hasten the advance of a movement; or the loss of such leaders can delay such an advance. But so long as a conscious, well organized mass movement exists, a structure of leadership can replace a leader as soon as he falls or is lost. Marxism requires both correct leadership and mass participation in the making of revolution.

When they speak of the people as the motive force and makers of history, Marxists mean a single leading class and the other exploited and oppressed classes rising against the ruling class. The leading class must be able to rally under its leadership other classes and strata against the ruling class.

Broad organizations and groups of various interests are aroused and mobilized against the ruling class. And the revolutionary army enlists fighters from the broad ranks of the people. To serve as the vanguard of the revolution, the leading class has a political party with a progressive ideology, political programme and a solid organization of cadres and conscious and conscientious members.

In the face of a ruling class like the bourgeoisie, which is highly conscious of its class interests and has a complex array of highly developed means either for crushing or misleading any attempt at radical social transformation, the proletariat as the leading class has to comprehend the proper relationship of people, class, party and cadres or leaders.

Let us now review social transformation as it has occurred in the history of mankind.

In primitive times, the paleolithic clan commune lagged for a painfully long period. In this regard, we can easily observe the primary role that the forces of production, particularly the means of production at this stage of human existence, played in the development of society. The neolithic society of the extended clan or tribe could arise only on the basis of the refinement and improvement of stone tools. This took another painfully long period.

The crudity and puniness of the forces of production and the reflective flimsiness of the superstructure have prolonged the process of social transformation. A long period of social evolution had to take place before there could be social revolution. Man had to struggle hard from being a blind part of nature to becoming one increasingly distinguishable from it through the growth of the forces of production.

The transition from primitive communal society to slave society was made possible on the basis of achievement in the former. In the womb of neolithic barbaric society, man started husbandry, agriculture, the use of hard metals and the conversion of social

offenders and war captives into slaves. These were the forces of production which increasingly wore out the simple division of labor during the late period of those barbaric societies that managed to graduate into the slave form of society.

The slave society firmed up and expanded the conversion of men and women into a class of slaves from the ranks of social offenders and war captives in order to produce the surplus product for the benefit of a slave-owning class and its civil retinue of priests, scribes, administrative officers and the like, and its army and other coercive apparatuses. For the first time in the history of mankind, classes arose and the state was established to maintain the political and economic power of the ruling class. The drive to increase the surplus product impelled nation-building and empire-building for expanding the ranks of slaves from war captives.

The majority of slaves were mainly deployed in the fields to till the land for the benefit of the aristocrats and freemen. Agriculture was expanded. Upon the tremendous increase of slaves, the master-slave relations of production started to become outmoded. Oppression and exploitation increased even as it became more difficult to manage so many slaves on the wide fields. The slaves started to rebel. So did the subjugated nations and peoples in the empire as they were obliged to create more surplus product for the military governor and the imperial coffers.

The class struggle between the slave-owning aristocracy and the masses of slaves intensified. As the magnates of slavery tended to accumulate slaves and land, vast numbers of landed freemen who owned a few slaves and even lower sections of the slave aristocracy were bankrupted.

The Roman Empire reached its peak in the first and second centuries but in the third century it began a protracted period of decline. The weakening and fragmentation of the empire eventually resulted in the emancipation of slaves. Either upon the victory of the revolts of slaves and subject nations or upon the adaptation of original slave owners to the feudal relations of production, large masses of slaves became converted to the status of serfs.

It should be observed that in the transformation of a slave society into a feudal one, the largest exploited class did not become a ruling

class. But it made substantial gains. It was no longer prey to customs or laws that easily cost the lives of its members. At the early stage of feudal society, the serfs were also often given the illusion of owning their own parcels of land, provided they worked on the lands of the landlords on certain days. This served to stimulate the clearing of land and expansion of agriculture.

In the feudal mode of production, land is the principal means of production and the serfs were in the main the people in production. These forces of production were subject to the relations of production dominated by the landlord class or feudal aristocracy. The tithe-collecting Roman Catholic Church was also part of the landlord class. The Pope was landlord of the so-called papal states and the monastic orders and parishes owned land in the European states and colonies. In many European countries, the church corporately became the biggest landlord.

Though several feudal states sprung from the ruins of the Roman Empire, they were dominated by a single interstate ideology and institution—that of Christianity. The church and the state were the powerful forces in the superstructure of European feudal society. They united to defend the system against common foes but they also had conflict of interests.

At the peak of feudal development, serious peasant rebel movements were already cropping up and often took the form of heretical movements. The religious crusades at first tended to absorb peasant unrest and unify the monarchies in Europe under Christianity. But in the 13th century, both the church and state took violent measures such as massacres to suppress the serfs who combined anti-feudal resistance and religious heresy.

The papacy merely manipulated the various feudal states to get what it wanted and sometimes got the short end of a conflict with a more clever secular ruler. But by the 16th century, the papacy had its own army to assert its power in the papal states and punish rebellious peasants. Against the rise of the secular humanist spirit and the outbreak of peasant rebellions in the 16th and 17th century, the church in cooperation with the state expanded the work of the Inquisition from suppressing heretics to wide-scale witch hunting. The church also repeatedly instigated religious wars against

Protestants. In Western Europe, after the so-called barbarians had settled down, no peasant movement succeeded in seizing political power from any landlord class dominating feudal society. In China, some peasant movements succeeded in taking over political power over entire feudal states but could not go beyond the feudal form of society. Their leaderships merely took over the role of the deposed landlords. As in China, the peasantry of Europe was not pushing forward any new mode of production even if the peasants were moved by clear specific grievances. They only had vague ideas of what constituted more just relations of production than what existed. They were often provoked to revolt by excessive rent, taxes and other levies. They could not propose any progressive ideology, except some alternative notions of Christianity considered heretical by the dominant church.

Within feudal society, however, a new class pushing a new mode of production and a new outlook grew. At first, a mercantile bourgeoisie arose with the towns and cities which served as centers of handicraft production and trade between town and country or between far-flung areas. Subsequently, a manufacturing bourgeoisie arose from the ranks of the mercantile bourgeoisie.

When the manufacturing bourgeoisie developed further into an industrial bourgeoisie, especially in the later part of the 18th century, the bourgeoisie was in a position to make a frontal challenge to the old feudal aristocracy for political supremacy. In previous times, the bourgeoisie had tactfully cooperated with the feudal monarchs in the consolidation of national markets and in the financing of colonial expeditions and wars.

Beside the growth of the capitalist mode of production, which had extended to capitalist farming, there had been a long period of ideological preparation for the political ascendancy of the bourgeoisie. This ranged from such development as the Italian renaissance in the 15th century through the scientific inquiries into physics in the 17th century to the French enlightenment in the 18th century.

Unlike the peasantry, the bourgeoisie stood for a new mode of production that was capable of replacing the old feudal mode and it easily adopted a progressive scientific outlook that effectively

breached and destroyed the ideological monopoly of the Church. In the French revolution, the bourgeoisie took the vanguard position and allied itself with the peasants, workers and other sections of the population to overthrow the state power of the landlord class and the authority of the Catholic Church. The political supremacy of the industrial bourgeoisie over society was established.

In capitalist society, the new class struggle is between the capitalist class and the working class. The growth of large-scale machine production and the proletariat has reached the point that the capitalist relations of production hinder rather than enhance them. The capitalist relations of production and the capitalist class can be removed and the proletariat can establish the socialist relations of production.

Unlike the peasantry, the proletariat stands for a new mode of production. As a matter of fact, the peasantry is dissolved by the expanding mode of capitalist production and has no place to go but join the ranks of the proletariat. Thus, the *Communist Manifesto* speaks of a society increasingly divided into two great camps, that of capital and that of labor.

For the first time in the history of mankind, an exploited class which does not priorly own the means of production is in the position of becoming the ruling class in a completely new form of society. It stands for a mode of production that continues to forge ahead long after the seizure of political power. Also for the first time, an exploited class cannot emancipate itself without emancipating all other exploited classes. As never before in the history of mankind, the freedom of the entire people can be achieved.

The development of the working class has undergone three stages. The first one was the machine-smashing stage when workers displaced by machines anarchically destroyed or sabotaged machines in vengeance. The second one was the trade union stage when the workers learned to organize themselves for the first time to fight for their own economic interests. The third one was the stage when the workers started to form their political parties to wage political struggles in their own class interests and in alliance with other oppressed classes in society.

In 1848, Marx and Engels wrote the *Communist Manifesto* as a programmatic guide for the workers of all countries. Without even having read this manifesto, significant numbers of workers participated in uprisings in several cities of Europe in 1848. These were quelled and bourgeois reaction reigned. Marx and Engels further laid the ideological foundation of the working class movement and participated in the work of the International Workingmen's Association (First International).

In 1871, the proletariat of Paris seized political power and it survived for a little over two months. This is a milestone in the history of Marxism as it proved the thesis of Marx that the proletariat as a class is capable of organizing itself in order to seize political power and hold it. Marx hailed the achievements of the Paris Commune, criticized its errors and drew the lessons for the future advance of the working class.

In an attempt to resolve the contradiction or class struggle in capitalist society, the capitalist class in the various capitalist countries engaged in modern imperialism. The result was that alliances and counter-alliances of capitalist countries resulted in graver crises of overproduction and world wars.

World War I led to the victory of socialism in one country. World War II led to the victory of socialism in several countries and the vigorous growth of national independence movements. To the extent that there were still vestiges of feudalism in countries that turned socialist, bourgeois-democratic reforms like land reform and concessions to national entrepreneurs were undertaken.

What makes the capitalist society radically different from all social formations is that it has internationalized its system of oppression and exploitation through modern imperialism to the point that in many countries today working-class parties have arisen to fight it and its reactionary puppets.

Chapter 3. Political Economy

Political Economy is the study of the fundamental laws of motion of the whole economy of a society. It can be sharply distinguished from the micro-economic interests of particular enterprises or industries although these, through aggregation, generalization or abstraction, are within the sphere of political economy.

The classical British economists were the first to firmly establish this subject as a definite field of study in the latter part of the 18th century and the early 19th century when commodity mass production, particularly the capitalist mode of production, was rising to a dominant position in the leading European economies. The growing complexity of a commodity system of production demanded systematic study.

Of the classical economists, Adam Smith in his *Wealth of Nations* (1776) made the most comprehensive and coherent presentation of capitalism at the stage of free competition. Strongly opposing mercantilist strictures imposed by the state, he put forward the theory that self-interest and free competition make the market a self-regulating mechanism for the efficient allocation of resources, the continuous accumulation of capital and the attainment of the common good.

Adam Smith pointed to labor as the source of value in the commodity but was overwhelmingly concerned with the important role of the market. David Ricardo elaborated on the labor theory of value and was concerned with the differing interests of the workers, entrepreneur and landlord and with how utterly unjust it was that a share should go to the unproductive landlord whose claim is based on sheer traditional private ownership of land. He perceived the injustice done by the landlord to the capitalist but he fell short of perceiving the injustice done by both capitalist and landlord to the worker.

To this day, bourgeois economists like religious fundamentalists preach free competition or free enterprise despite the fact that capitalism has long developed into a system of gigantic monopolies. However, due to the recurrent and ever worsening economic crisis, bourgeois economists in varying degrees would welcome the intervention of the capitalist state in the economy through fiscal and monetary policies and measures.

As a result of the Great Depression of the 1930s, the Keynesian idea of using the state to salvage capitalism from economic crisis, restoring the equilibrium of demand and supply through public works, has become an outstanding part of the gospel truth of bourgeois political economy. Previously, since the middle of the 19th century,

John Stuart Mills had lucidly endorsed state intervention for reasons of redistributive justice.

As it has evolved from the works of the classical economists, bourgeois political economy has by and large stood for the perpetuation of the capitalist system, the principle of private profit and private ownership of the means of production, the subordination of the production system to the distribution system, the obfuscation of the ultimate source of incomes (profit, wages, interest, rent, etc.) and the myth of free enterprise even in the face of monopolies dominating capitalist society.

Marxist political economy is a more comprehensive and deepgoing study of the laws of motion of capitalism than bourgeois political economy. Karl Marx laid its foundation in *Das Kapital* (Vol. I published in 1867) and this covered the genesis, development and decline of capitalism and pointed to the possibility of socialism. To delve into the internal laws of motion of capitalism, he concentrated on the production system rather than on the distributive system and proceeded from the analysis of the commodity as the cell, the basic organic unit, of the capitalist mode of production rather than that of the market phenomena as bourgeois political economy does.

Marx laid bare the fundamental laws of motion that impel free competition to develop toward the concentration of capital and create the very forces that are bound to bring about socialism. However, the development of Marxist political economy did not end with him. Building further on the theoretical foundation laid by Marx, V.I. Lenin concentrated on monopoly capitalism in his *Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism*. Still Marxist political economy did not cease to develop. It has come to encompass the building of several socialist economies. In brief, Marxist political economy ranges from Marx' theoretical writings to the building of socialism.

But in this chapter, we shall tackle only the following: 1) Marx' critique of capitalism; 2) Lenin's critique of monopoly capitalism; and 3) the decline of capitalism and US imperialism. We reserve to a later chapter a full discussion of socialism. An appendix is provided as a backgrounder on pre-industrial capitalism or the primitive accumulation of capital since the chapter concentrates on industrial capital as Marx and Lenin did.

(Appendix 2: On Pre-Industrial Capitalism and the Primitive Accumulation of Capital)

A. Marx' Critique of Capitalism

Karl Marx dealt mainly with the capitalist mode of production at its industrial stage, when commodity mass production gained dominance in the leading economies of Europe. He had a great advantage over the classical economists (whom he studied thoroughly in conjunction with the enormous amount of economic data available at the British Museum) in that capitalism developed more fully than before and was therefore more open to comprehension. He could go as far as to analyze the financial system of capitalism as never before by his predecessors in the study of the political economy.

At any rate, in his critique of capitalism, he started with the analysis of the commodity, using critically and developing further the labor theory of value which had been put forward by Adam Smith and David Ricardo and which the former had borrowed from the philosopher John Locke of the 17th century. Like his predecessors, Marx affirmed that the value of the commodity is the amount of labor time expended on its production. Labor time remains to this day a measure of labor power used in production.

To focus on the commodity as the starting point of analysis is absolutely precise. It affirms the primacy of production over distribution in the study of a certain mode of production. Commodity mass production is what differentiates capitalism from all previous economic systems, which had been basically natural economies highly dependent on nature or land—the original source of wealth and characterized by self-sufficiency or subsistence in small localities.

To be called a commodity, a thing must have use value and exchange value. Use value means that the thing can satisfy a human want. Exchange value means the thing can be exchanged in the market for another thing that normally involves the same amount of labor power. If one unit of a certain commodity takes one day of work to make, it will exchange for two units of another commodity each of which takes a half day to make.

In the commodity mass production that characterizes capitalism, no worker can lay claim to having produced an entire product. If we were to measure the amount of labor power that goes into the making of a commodity, we have to go into abstracting or averaging the various standards of labor time or rates of productivity that go into the making of the commodity in a given society. Thus, we speak of socially necessary average labor time that goes into that commodity.

Labor power itself is a commodity in the capitalist system. Its value is the amount of socially necessary average labor time to produce the basic necessities (wage goods) to maintain and reproduce the worker and his family. In the labor market, the capitalist buyer of labor power offers the price of labor power, which is called the wage—the value of labor power in money terms.

By and large, the capitalist class gives the working class a subsistence wage. This should cover at the least the barest physical needs of the workers to keep them coming back to work and also to maintain a class as the source of labor. To hold the line, the workers themselves insist on a minimum wage level. When business is good, increments may even be made so as to raise the level of productive skills among the workers.

It is to the interest of the capitalist class to allow the maintenance and reproduction of the working class. Labor power is the sole commodity that is capable of reproducing itself and all other commodities. Capital by itself cannot produce anything. Historically, it is but an accumulation of labor power. It is congealed labor power. In the production of new commodities, no new value is created by the machines and raw materials. Their old values are merely transferred into the new commodities. New added values can only come from the labor power of the workers attending to the machines and raw materials.

The capitalist class extracts its profits from the process of production itself. The workers required to work for a period longer than it takes to produce the equivalent of the wages paid to them. The difference between the total value that the workers create and the wages that they receive is what is called surplus value or unpaid

labor. This is the source of industrial and commercial profit, interest payments and land rent.

To extract a larger amount of surplus value, the capitalists lengthen the working day and depress the wages. This is called absolute surplus value. During the period of the primitive accumulation of capital which went on for centuries and extended into the first half of the 19th century, the work day ranged from 18 hours to 12 hours at extremely low wages.

The capitalists can also shorten the work day and raise wages. But they resort to such methods of raising productivity as the speed-up, especially as a result of the introduction of the conveyor belt; extremely high production quota and the nonfulfillment of which cuts into wage; systems of rewards and punishment that motivate the worker to put more work in less time; and the like. In this case, relative surplus value is what is extracted.

As a result of the increasing use of machines and worker resistance to the long work day, this was reduced to 12 hours in the greater part of the 19th century until it was further reduced to 10 hours in the late part of the century. The eight-hour work day is largely a 20th century achievement of the international proletariat.

Though the capitalist class needs the workers as the source of new values in production, from which profits can be obtained, there is always a considerable portion of the working class that is unemployed either due to a lag in the absorption of displaced peasant by industry in a developing economy or due to the disequilibrium in the fully developed economy. These unemployed are called the reserve army of labor. The more they are, the more they tend to press down the level of wages and increase the surplus value obtainable from those employed.

The larger is the surplus value, the higher is the rate of labor exploitation. The rate of surplus value, also called the rate of exploitation, is arrived at by dividing the amount of surplus value by the amount of wages paid.

It is the theory of surplus value that radically differentiates Marxist political economy from bourgeois political economy. It shows that profits are extracted from the process of production, particularly from

surplus value. It likewise shows that exploitation of the working class is rooted in the process of production and not in the market.

Though the leading classical economists Smith and Ricardo had affirmed the labor theory of value, they did not develop it to the extent that Marx did. After them, the general run of bourgeois economists, especially in the 20th century, have obscured it or completely negated it by asserting the primacy of the market mechanism over the productive process and by claiming the profits are made in the market in the difference of buying and selling price and vice versa.

According to Marx, it is certainly important for individual capitalist enterprises to take into account buying and selling prices. But in the market no new material values are created. And in the entire economy, total values in production are equal to total prices in the market.

What is self-serving for the capitalist class and its economists in adducing to the market as the source of profit is to conceal the process of exploitation in capitalist production and in the whole history of capital. Capitalists can claim that their investment simply generates employment one-sidedly at a fair price settled in the market, without anything being taken from the workers beyond what has been fairly paid for. Also, the industrial capitalist class can ante up the merchants as the scapegoats when an economic crisis sets in and is manifested in the form of serious price fluctuations.

Consequent to the fact that they extract surplus value from the total value created by workers and that they thereby accumulate capital, the capitalists compete with each other to raise their productivity and achieve economies of scale. More goods are produced in less time and at less cost. Those who fail to adopt more efficient methods of production are priced out of the market.

At an early stage, the competition is essentially one of raising capital. The winners can raise more capital than the losers. This capital is divisible into two parts: 1) constant capital which consists of the means of production (capital equipment, raw materials, plant site and the like;) and 2) variable capital which is the fund for wages.

But as the competition rages and goes from one round to another, this is the ever increasing trend to raise the organic

composition of capital, that is to say, constant capital. After all, the winners in the competition swallow up the loser through mergers and other forms of absorption, There is always a need for the competing capitalists to build up constant capital in order to consolidate their position and to raise productivity further.

Constant capital is raised at the expense of variable capital. The labor-saving machines displace the workers. In the heat of competition, the capitalists also think that they can improve their competitive position and raise their profits by reducing the variable capital. At first, this means that they depress the wages. Eventually, they reduce their work force by acquiring labor-saving machines, in effect, increasing constant capital.

The competing entrepreneurs or firms act anarchically in pursuit of their respective profit-seeking interests. They are out to trounce each other. Each fails to understand that by reducing variable capital and laying off workers each is actually reducing the source of new values and in effect profits.

The result is the tendency of the rate of profit to fall. The profit rate is determined by dividing the surplus value by total capital (constant capital plus variable capital). If constant capital is increased but variable capital is diminished, the amount of surplus value is reduced and the profit rate is likewise reduced.

The high productivity of capital goods and capitalist competition reinforce each other to produce goods at low prices in comparison to those produced in backward modes of production. Commodities are sold at production prices, equivalent to cost of production plus a small and dwindling average profit. The average profit is small and dwindling due to the diminution of variable capital in the process of production.

Variable prices of a certain commodity which arise in the market in the course of competition even up at the level of production price. A capitalist might underprice his product in order to undercut his competitor. But when he has gained the upper hand, he raises his price and recoups what he has "lost." Thus, the variable prices even up at the level of the production price.

Capitalist production is basically divisible into two departments: department I which produces the means of production or capital

goods; and department II which produces the articles of consumption.

In the race to raise the organic composition of capital, the competing capitalists build up department I. But then, greater production under this department leads to still greater production under department II. This comes into contradiction with the diminution of variable capital or wage fund.

The increasing supply of the articles of consumption does not jibe with increasing unemployment and diminishing purchasing power of the workers. The market, consisting mainly of workers, is narrowed by layoffs and depressed wages resulting from the competitive drive to concentrate capital. Thus, arises the crisis of overproduction, relative to the market.

Both overinvestment and underconsumption are operative in the crisis of overproduction. It is obvious that existing capital goods are capable of producing more than what the market can carry. At the same time, the workers do not have the income to purchase and consume all that is in the market. Neither can the puny number of capitalists consume what has been produced even if they are the ones who have high incomes.

The occurrence of the crisis of overproduction exposes the fatal weakness of capitalism. The economy operates far under capacity. Tremendous amounts of human and material resources go to waste. Commodities are even destroyed in order to adjust the supply to the constricted market. The reserve army of labor becomes so large that it no longer simply presses down the wages but cuts down effective demand. Both employed and unemployed are restless and tend to unite against the capitalist class.

The crisis of overproduction becomes an occasion for the big capitalist firms to swallow en masse the smaller firms that go bankrupt. The drive towards even greater concentration of capital continues unabated. The economy becomes revived after so much waste and after the winning capitalists have grown so much bigger than before and start to rehire the unemployed. A period of boom follows only to end up in another bust which is worse than the previous one. This again leads to a higher concentration of capital in firms fewer than before.

The crisis of overproduction necessitates the use of the state in shoring up the capitalist system and appeasing or subduing the proletariat. At worst for the system, the crisis exacerbates the class struggle and is liable to lead to a revolutionary civil war and the victory of the proletariat. There is also the likelihood that the crisis leads to an international war. However, Marx was not yet able to elaborate on this possibility.

Marx sometimes was criticized by some bourgeois economists who have not even read him for supposedly predicting the collapse of capitalism in the offing, perhaps within the 19th century, in one fell swoop. This is nonsense. Marx was dealing with large historical forces and processes that could not be reduced to a timetable.

Other bourgeois economists, however are astonished that he was able to predict the rise of monopolies to a dominant position in the capitalist system although at the time that he wrote *Das Kapital* a mass of small enterprises still characterized that system. The emergence of socialism in 1917 should be even more astonishing.

Marx correctly laid bare the laws of motion of capitalism and showed why and how free competition leads to concentration of capital; and the crisis of overproduction recurs and becomes worse at each recurrence; thus prompting the working class to take ever greater revolutionary efforts. Subsequent developments have verified all these.

Marx pointed to the rise of the working class first as a class in itself and then as a class for itself. As a class for itself, it first formed the trade unions to fight for its economic interests and then the political party to fight for its political interests and also for those of others exploited in capitalist society. He indicated sufficiently why and how the proletariat will eventually depose the capitalist class and replace the capitalist mode of production with a socialist one.

B. Lenin's Critique of Monopoly Capitalism

As Marx scientifically predicted, free competition in his time (mid-19th century) actually led to the high concentration of capital in the hands of a few capitalist firms during the last three decades of the 19th century. Capitalists of Europe, the United States and Japan made an outcry for the expansion of the market in view of their limited home markets.

The British capitalist magnate Cecil Rhodes, the American politician Theodore Roosevelt and men of letters like Rudyard Kipling and even Victor Hugo were among the most raucous in calling for imperialist expansion and placing every part of the world in the capitalist network. They frankly admitted the capitalist motives even as they couched these in the rhetoric of civilizing the world. They echoed the clichés of old-type mercantilist colonialism and applauded the bloody adventures of modern imperialism.

Great Britain, the leading capitalist country, did not only have its old colonies (India, what are now Pakistan and Bangladesh, Ceylon [Sri Lanka], what is now Malaysia, Australia, Egypt, parts of Latin America, etc.) but also acquired the largest share in the late 19th century rush to colonize Africa. It consolidated the largest spheres of influence in China.

Next only to Great Britain as the largest imperialist power was France. It had its old colonies, which included Indochina, and acquired the largest share in Africa next to Great Britain. Small capitalist countries like the Netherlands and Belgium also had substantial colonial holdings. The former had Indonesia as the largest possession and the latter, the Belgian Congo.

Strong latecomers to capitalist development like the United States, Germany and Japan participated in the rush to acquire colonies. Notwithstanding its large frontier in the west, its acquisitions from colonial powers (Spain and France) in North America and its hegemony over the main part of South America, the United States provoked Spain into a war in order to seize Puerto Rico, Cuba and the Philippines and sided up to Great Britain in order to have a share of the imperialist action in China.

Germany got some portions of Africa, spheres of influence in China, some Pacific islands, coveted large portions of Eastern Europe and got into complex entanglements with Russia and Austria. The Alsace-Lorraine areas taken from France by Germany as a result of the war of 1871 continued to be a bone of contention between the two countries. Japan held Formosa (Taiwan) and Korea as colonial possessions and a sphere of influence in North China.

Russia, the weakest of the capitalist countries, held on to large territories seized from China and was at odds with Japan in this

area. It also coveted large portions of Eastern Europe and was at odds with the old Austro-Hungarian and Ottoman empires.

At the beginning of the 20th century, there was no longer a part of the world that was not in the international network of capitalism. The capitalist countries had drawn in the rest of the world as they competed for markets of surplus commodities, sources of raw materials, fields of investment, spheres of influence and positions of strength. The monopoly capitalists were out to relieve capitalist society of its capital glut, relative overproduction and class contradictions by being able to exploit the people in colonies and semicolonies.

Among the first to put out studies on modern imperialism, as a phenomenon distinguishable from the old mercantilist colonialism which had been a part of the primitive accumulation of capital, were the avowed Marxist German economist Rodbertus and the German revolutionary Rosa Luxemburg. The British economist John Hobson picked up ideas from them and pursued the subject further but did not go beyond denunciations of the abuses of modern imperialism.

In his *Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism*, V.I. Lenin surpassed all his predecessors' writings on the subject by analyzing it so comprehensively and so profoundly that he came to the conclusion that it was the last stage of capitalism and the eve of socialist revolution. Moreover, he was the theoretician and leader of the first socialist revolution in 1917.

Lenin developed further Marx's theory of capitalist development. He proceeded to analyze the further development of capitalism into monopoly capitalism or modern imperialism. These two terms are synonymous and interchangeable. Given an understanding of the basic laws of motion of capitalism as laid out by Marx and proven by history, we can easily grasp Lenin's brief description of imperialism as the highest and final stage of capitalism or as moribund capitalism.

Let us state the five basic features of imperialism or monopoly capitalism as described by Lenin. They are as follows:

*The concentration of capital has reached the point that monopolies have become dominant in capitalist society.

*Industrial capital has merged with bank capital to become finance capital and create a finance oligarchy.

*The export of surplus capital, aside from that of surplus commodities, has gained importance of its own and is the outlet for the capital glut in capitalist countries.

*International combines of monopolies, trusts, cartels, syndicates and the like have emerged.

*The division of the world among the capitalist powers has been completed and its redivision cannot but lead to war.

In explaining the above features of monopoly capitalism, we shall often cite phenomena beyond 1917. The reason is obvious. We continue to be in the era of modern imperialism and Lenin's critique has continued to be borne out by events.

1. Monopoly means that one company or a single combination of companies controlled by a single group of capitalists dominate the main part or entirety of an industry. At the start of the 20th century, such strategic and major industries as steel, oil, coal, machine-building, chemicals, railroads, etc., were already in the hands of monopoly capitalists.

As early as 1890, public clamor in the United States against such monopoly capitalists as the Rockefellers in oil, Du Ponts in chemicals, Mellons in steel, Vanderbilts in railroad, and others came to such a high pitch that the Sherman anti-trust law was enacted. But at most the monopoly capitalists could only be summoned to administrative hearings where they were advised to merely rearrange their investments. Eventually, the law was directed more against trade unions as supposed monopolies in restraint of trade.

The era of free competition basically came to an end towards the end of the 19th century. All major fields of economic activity was dominated by the large monopoly firms and these continued to grow larger. In the era of imperialism, the monopoly firms have become even larger by extracting superprofits from the colonies and semicolonies and by continuing to engage in mergers as a result of recurrent economic crisis.

One learns something about monopoly by perusing the assets, sales and profits of such companies as the Standard Oil chain of companies, General Motors, Ford Motors, General Electric, US

Steel, Bethlehem Steel and the like. One learns that all the talk about free enterprise by bourgeois economists is all a lie.

In the late 1950s the 135 largest manufacturing corporations in the United States accounted for half the manufacturing output in the United States and that the 250 largest firms turned out a flow of goods equal in value to the output of the entire economy prior to World War II.

2. The merger of industrial and bank capital has put more capital at the disposal of the monopoly capitalists than ever before and has spawned a finance oligarchy that amasses profits not because of its entrepreneurial skills but because it simply controls and manipulates finance capital. The monopoly capitalist class hires the managers to run its productive enterprises and, as a rentier class, simply sits back to await the dividends from shareholdings.

Monopoly capitalists who own banks (Rockefellers in Chase Manhattan and National City Bank of New York; Fords in Manufacturers Hanover Bank; Mellons in Mellon Bank; Du Ponts in Chemical Bank; etc.) actually lend the money of other people (including deposits of workers) to their own industrial firms at prime rates for their expansion. And they borrow from their own banks in order to buy stocks.

In times prior to imperialism, the banks were autonomous from manufacturers and they at first specialized in extending commercial credit or handling bills of exchange. Subsequently, they extended loans for industrial projects but still retained their autonomy. Finally, in the imperialist era, the monopoly capitalists put the banks and industries under their ownership and control.

The role of monopoly capitalists as rentiers is underscored by the use of holding companies, trust funds and tax-exempt government bonds. They are further removed from the process of production and their parasitic character is starkly obvious. It is their hired financial managers who manage their mounting funds. The monopoly capitalists have no claim to income except by the backward principles of private property and heredity.

According to the Lampman 1922-1956 study (The Share of Top Wealth Holders in National Wealth, 1922-1956) 1.6 percent of the adult population in the United States owned 32 percent of all

privately owned wealth. Among the several items in the list of their wealth are 82.2 percent of all stocks and 100 percent of state and local (tax-exempt) bonds.

3. The export of surplus capital takes the form of loans and direct investments. These serve to relieve the capitalist economy not only of its capital glut but also of its surplus commodities. Loans facilitate the sale of surplus commodities, paves the way for direct investments and earn interest and becomes converted into equity upon failure of the debtor to pay the debt. Direct investments are forthright and even more effective than loans in gaining control over another economy. They establish ownership and earn profits. They facilitate the sale of surplus commodities and the acquisition of raw materials for the industries in the metropolis.

Though the initial impulse in the export of capital is to seek relief from capital glut, it results in the aggravation of the original problem because it brings home to the metropolis a much larger amount of capital, fattened by profits and interests. The monopoly capitalists at home must still look for new outlets for their capital.

In the relationship between a metropolis and its colonial or semicolonial dependent, the export of surplus capital is comparatively quite a new thing under modern imperialism. In the old-type mercantilist colonialism, when the primitive accumulation of capital was the process involved, the colonial power embarked at worst on blatant, undisguised plunder or at best a grossly unequal trade. For a change, modern imperialism is compelled by capital glut to go through the motion of making loans and direct investments.

Some amount of development, above the level achieved by old-type colonialism, occurs. But this remains superficial, lopsided and sporadic inasmuch as it is restricted by the dumping of surplus commodities on the dependent economy. The flow of investments is made in such a manner that the dependent economy remains basically a reliable supplier of raw materials and an importer of manufactured goods from the metropolis.

Thus, foreign direct investments go mainly into extractive industries and export agriculture. Loans are extended to favor this type of productive activity and to divert the client-state from promoting a well-balanced developing economy into merely

improving the infrastructures (road, bridges, ports and the like) for the purpose of reinforcing the unequal exchange of raw materials from the dependent country and manufactures from the metropolis. It is definitely not in the interest of an industrial capitalist country to allow a subservient underdeveloped economy to develop into another industrial capitalist country and another competitor.

4. According to the law of uneven development, capitalist countries differ in economic strength and they therefore take their place in the capitalist world accordingly. But according to the same law, growth and competition of the capitalist economies continue to upset every given balance of relations.

At every given time, one capitalist power may dominate another or several lesser capitalist countries, or such countries are allied for mutual accommodations and advantage in a competition against another groups of capitalist countries. However, all capitalist countries always tend to be totally united against the proletariat or against the oppressed peoples in colonies and semicolonies.

In this context, it is easy to understand why international combines of monopolies, cartels, trusts, syndicates and the like arise. To this day, as we are still in the era of imperialism, Lenin shed light on the phenomenon of transnational or multinational corporations and the alliance of capitalist countries to exploit others.

Competition always rules the relations of capitalist countries. Under conditions of peace, each capitalist economy continues to accumulate capital and is in due time afflicted by a series of worsening crises of overproduction (the business cycle). Modern imperialism has never been a complete and final solution to the basic contradictions within capitalist society.

Competition among the capitalist countries is always sharpened by a series of crises and protectionist measures. This is a competition for markets, fields of investment and sources of cheap raw materials and cheap labor. The selfish and narrow interests of each capitalist country as well as the alliances and counter-alliances among them become increasingly pronounced.

Take note that each of the last two world wars was preceded by a series of worsening economic crises and protectionist measures. In

the relations of capitalist countries, economic war precedes the shooting war.

5. At the beginning of the 20th century, there was no more part of the world that was not under the domination of a capitalist power or a number of capitalist powers. Africa had been the last continent to be fully divided among the capitalist countries. The division of the world among the capitalist powers was completed. A redivision of the world was no longer possible, without causing a war. In this regard, Lenin said that imperialism means war.

The structure of colonial possessions and areas of imperialist domination is disturbed by the ever pressing concentration of capital and economic crises in capitalist countries. A capitalist country which has a large productive capacity but which has very limited area for internal and external economic expansion is bound to press for a redivision of the world and disturb the balance of economic and political power. Those who control the arrangement are of course bound to resist.

In the period before World War I, the accumulation of capital in Germany became so large in relation to a limited market and field of investment at home and overseas. Being late in the race, it had only a few colonies in comparison to others. Thus, when economic crisis worsened, Germany became increasingly bellicose and eventually launched a war. It spearheaded the Central Powers (Austria and Italy were the others) against the allies, France, Great Britain, Serbia and the United States.

Although it lost in the war, Germany was able to save its industries by surrendering to the allies before their counter-attack on German cities. In the peace settlement, Alsace-Lorraine was given back to France, its spheres of influence in China were given to Japan and its African colonies were given to other European powers.

Soon enough, the squeeze effect of great industrial capacity and limited area for expansion surfaced and produced a Hitler. After becoming the chancellor, Hitler engaged in massive public works and military production. But while these were outlets for surplus capital, they brought a dwindling profit rate for the German monopoly capitalists. Clamoring for "living space," Germany undertook a series

of aggressive actions in Eastern and Western Europe until these led to World War I.

In Asia prior to World War II, Japan was able to build a large industrial capacity. It was encouraged by the Western powers to be a foil to Czarist Russia in the Far East and then it was allowed to have ample territory in China, Korea and Taiwan and accommodated in the Southeast Asian market. But it still became afflicted with crisis and this produced fascism as in Europe. It schemed to grab the whole of Asia for itself. Thus, it joined the Axis powers (Germany and Italy were the two others) in plunging into World War II which engulfed the whole world.

We shift to Lenin's work. Lenin concluded that imperialism is the eve of social revolution. Imperialism has not solved the basic problems of capitalism but has merely aggravated them and put them on an international scale. It has served to engender unprecedentedly powerful revolutionary movements among the proletariat of capitalist countries and the oppressed nations and peoples of the colonies and semicolonies.

Under Lenin's theory of uneven development, Russia as the weakest capitalist country could as well be the most susceptible to social revolution and it was up to the proletariat to prepare itself to carry out its revolutionary tasks. This is diametrically opposed to misrepresentations made by anti-Marxists that Marx declared in absolute terms that England being the leading capitalist country in his time was the country most ripe for social revolution of the proletariat.

To make revolution in a leading or strong capitalist country is not automatically made easier by its high level of economic development. The monopoly capitalist class in such a country is certainly equipped with more means to repress or avert a revolution than that in the weakest capitalist country.

Nevertheless, revolution always remains a possibility in any capitalist country so long as the conditions of crisis are there and the proletariat is prepared to overcome the ruling class.

Marx and Engels in their time always watched where the actual focus of revolutionary ferment was. They acknowledged the shifting of this focus and they observed both objective and subjective factors

at work that bring it about. While the social means of production in England were good for the proletariat to take over, was the proletariat ready ideologically, politically and organizationally to depose the capitalist class? With regard to Germany, a country with a large backlog of feudalism then, they said after the revolutionary tide there ebbed, a second edition of the peasant rebellion was needed for the proletarian movement to surge forward again.

The truth of Marx' critique of capitalism as well as Lenin's critique has been resoundingly proven by the victory of the first socialist revolution in the wake of World War I. The results of World War II have been even more disastrous to capitalism and imperialism: several countries have become socialist and revolutionary movements for national independence and democracy have surged forward as never before. All these have progressively constricted the area for exploitation and oppression by imperialism.

C. Decline of Capitalism and US Imperialism

Capitalism has basically followed the path of growth and decline theoretically mapped out by Marx. Thirteen years after the publication of the first volume of *Das Kapital*, the accelerated concentration of capital and elimination of free competition among a multitude of small enterprises were already too conspicuous to be denied. Before the end of the 19th century, monopolies were already dominant in the leading capitalist economies.

In only 14 years also from the publication of the monumental work of Marx, the proletariat of Paris was able to seize political power and establish the Paris Commune in the wake of the Franco-Prussian war. In only fifty years from the same point of reference, the Marxist Bolsheviks were able to seize political power and launch a socialist revolution. In terms of historic time, especially when it pertains to so fundamental a transformation of society as the elimination of private property in the means of production, the validity of Marx's theory has been proven in a relatively short period of time.

The victory of the first socialist revolution proves that capitalism, in developing further to modern imperialism, had only enlarged and worsened the basic class contradictions that Marx saw in capitalist society. One-sixth of the world became emancipated from the

clutches of capitalist exploitation. That was no small reduction of the capitalist world.

After World War II, several new socialist countries emerged in Eastern Europe and Asia. The country with the largest population (one fourth of the world) turned socialist. One-third of the world population embraced socialism. This is a massive reduction of capitalism's stomping ground.

The capitalist powers could no longer return to so many colonies and semicolonies in Asia and Africa in order to restore the status quo antebellum. Powerful national liberation movements were surging forward. In the three continents of Asia, Africa and Latin American, anti-imperialist movements were set on reducing the scope of the capitalist world.

Among the capitalist countries themselves, one half of a major capitalist power —Germany— could not be returned to the capitalist fold. In other major capitalist countries, like France and Italy, the Communist Party emerged as a major political force. The advance of the Marxist-Leninist parties and organizations to gain political power was not simply the result of the inter-imperialist wars. In periods before such wars, persevering work had been done in order to develop them as the capitalist system, went through one economic crisis after another of increasing severity.

Long before World War I, the trade union movement and working class parties worked indefatigably to strengthen themselves, broaden democracy and oppose the monopoly capitalist class. Long before World War II, communist parties worked indefatigably to develop the revolutionary forces. In China, a long drawn armed struggle was carried out against the imperialists and their local puppets.

During World War II itself, the Soviet Union effected the turning point for the whole of Europe and the world by defeating the German invaders at Stalingrad and rolling them back all the way to Germany. In Asia, the Chinese revolutionary forces led by the Communist Party tied down the bulk of Japanese troops and defeated them. In so many countries, communists took the lead in guerrilla warfare against the fascists.

World War II was created by the series of severe economic crises after World War I that culminated in the Great Depression. The capitalists and other reactionaries in countries that found themselves squeezed by the crisis resorted to anticommunist demagoguery and supporting fascist movements. Thus, Mussolini, Hitler, Tojo, Franco and so on were lifted to power.

Great Britain, the United States and France were also caught in the squeeze between overinvestment and underconsumption. But they had a wider area of maneuver to deal with the economic crisis.

The Great Depression and then World War II resulted in the massive destruction of productive forces and in political upheaval as no other economic crisis and war could in the past. The world capitalist system as a whole weakened more profoundly than ever.

After the war, however, the United States emerged as the No. 1 capitalist and imperialist power, replacing Great Britain from that position. It was the only country not damaged by the war, except for the Japanese flea bite at Pearl Harbor in Hawaii. As in World War I, it had gained enormous war profits and poured its own manpower and means into the war only in the last stage in order to pick up the spoils.

It could benefit tremendously from the reconstruction of the devastated capitalist economies. It put under its hegemony both allies and former enemy. It gained dominance in those colonies and semicolonies still vulnerable to imperialist penetration or colonial reoccupation. To cite a few examples, it was able to take over British oil interests in the Middle East and the Dutch oil interests in Indonesia; and such colonies as South Vietnam from France, and South Korea, Taiwan and the Pacific island territories from Japan.

It was able to put together the widest ever capitalist empire, larger than the British empire. The wealth and political bluster of the United States gave the Philistines the illusion that the world capitalist system was strong and invincible. Despite all its advantages over its kindred capitalist countries, the United States was faced with the problem of having to rapidly reconvert its military plants into civilian ones. At the same time, it was politically concerned with the rise of the socialist countries and national liberation movements.

Thus, it launched the Cold War in 1947 to justify a slower rate of reconverting its military plants to civilian ones. It boasted of its monopoly of the atom bomb and provoked incidents in Europe, Asia and elsewhere. It sought justification for the maintenance of increasing US military bases around the world. It was not until 1949 that the Soviet Union successfully tested its atom bomb to break the US nuclear monopoly.

In 1950 the United States launched the Korean war but this ended in a stalemate, exposing the limits of US military power. Not only were the high US casualties politically untenable. But even Eisenhower saw that the whole adventure as profitless and inflation-causing; and the military-industrial complex as becoming too powerful for civil comfort.

Kennedy reversed the austere policy of Eisenhower and started a “military” policy of heavy government spending for military purposes. Overseas military bases were beefed up. Military production and space research were intensified. US launched a war of aggression against Vietnam and suffered a historic defeat a decade later, after using up a total of USD150 billion in war expenditures. All these rising military expenditures created a gross imbalance in the US economy.

In one respect, these have been an outlet for capital glut in the United States. But at the same time, these have grossly misallocated economic resources and have created an ever mounting inflationary spiral. Military contracts, notorious especially for gold-plating, are responsible for what bourgeois economists call cost-push inflation, although they blame it solely or mainly on a high wage level and high wage demands in the United States.

The military industries draw resources to themselves and boost wage standards. Despite the lopsidedness of the US economy, the consumer industries could still expand for quite some time. A very wasteful kind of consumerism has even flourished. In addition to the inflationary activities within the American economy, the United States has been able to maintain military bases and forces abroad and conduct an extremely expensive war like the Vietnam war.

Aside from the relative exploitation of the US working class, two reasons can be cited for the US being able to go its profligate and

inflationary ways for some time. One is that it has been making a lot of profits and getting cheap raw materials abroad, especially in third world countries. Two is that it has been flooding the world with its currency through so-called aid programs, multinational firms and military bases.

There are limits to US monopoly profit-taking and abuse of currency abroad. US capitalist allies and third world countries, including client states, are increasingly at odds with US monopoly interests.

The capitalist economies destroyed or severely damaged in the last war have fully recovered since the late 1950s and are now competing with the United States in a limited world capitalist market. The point has been reached that protectionism is on the rise and the US dollar is often denounced as abusively being used for takeover purposes or unfair trade practices. The capitalist world is now often upset by a crisis of overproduction.

Recessions are occurring more often than before. Production is curtailed in order to bring the monopoly capitalist class a higher rate of profit. Though recessionary policy is intended to cut down the inflation rate, it does not achieve the purpose. But when an inflationary policy is resorted to, neither does the economy perk up from stagnation. There is now a longdrawn economic disease called stagflation, both stagnation and inflation going on at the same time. The fiscal and monetary remedies of Keynesian economics have been ineffective.

The curtailment of production in the capitalist economies has a disastrous effect on the colonies and semicolonies like the Philippines. They are so dependent on the export of raw materials and yet a stagnation or recession in the capitalist economies results in the absolute reduction of exports or in the depression of prices of exports. At the same time, they have to pay for the ever rising prices of imported manufactures.

As a result of the economic crisis in capitalist economies and the constant attempt to shift the burden of crisis to the underdeveloped colonies and semicolonies, the exploited people become restive and even client-states begin to make demands on the United States.

Thus, there is the demand for a new international economic order and the confrontation in the North-South dialogue.

But the most powerful economic action so far undertaken by some developing countries to counteract the capitalist economic crisis has come from the Organization of the Petroleum Exporting Countries (OPEC). No longer can capitalist countries get oil, the lifeblood of industries, at extremely cheap prices as before. A by-product of OPEC action, however, is the intensified difficulties of other developing countries which do not produce oil. These difficulties will press on them to assert their own independence from the imperialists in the long run.

A point has been reached in the capitalist economic crisis that the capitalist countries are competing to tap new markets in socialist countries. The latter are now purchasing new technologies previously banned from them. Even the dependent countries have been allowed to seek new markets. As early as 1969, US policy makers had seen the necessity of having economic relations with a country like China. This was perceived in close connection with the need to wind down the futile war of aggression in Vietnam. The US and other capitalist economies are now faced with an economic crisis far worse than the depression of the 1930s which started with the stock market collapse in 1929. It is becoming more and more obvious that bourgeois political economy, especially Keynesian economics, has never really solved the basic problems of capitalism that Marx and Lenin pointed out. It has only succeeded to cover it up during certain periods and at the same time prolong and deepen it.

Too much credit has been given to Keynes. The economists of Mussolini in the 1920s and Hitler in the 1930s had a prior claim to the idea of pump-priming through public works. Hoover started it in 1932. Richard T. Ely, Roosevelt's chief economist, laid out the pump-priming program of the New Deal. Despite its seeming recovery in 1935-1936 due to pump-priming, the US economy again plunged until the outbreak of World War II. It was really the war that brought about a recovery and big boom in the US, as all the other capitalist countries busied themselves with destroying each other.

Since the end of World War II, the United States has always been faced with the problem of overinvestment and overproduction. Until

the Vietnam war, recessions and recessionary trends were solved by increasing military expenditures. But the Vietnam war has already demonstrated that, while for a time the war industries reap profits at a satisfactory rate, the whole economy suffers soaring inflation.

At the moment, the United States is caught in a dilemma, whether to shy away from activities reminiscent of the Vietnam war and suffer depression or whether to face up the Soviet social-imperialism with increased military expenditures and suffer inflation. The problem is complicated by increasing competition from other capitalist economies and the adoption of anti-imperialist policies by third world countries. One thing is sure: the United States is on the path of decline. It is now turning out that the American empire is practically a flash in the pan in comparison to earlier empires.

Bourgeois economists always try to “disprove” Marx by dogmatically cutting off Marx from Lenin and by one-sidedly celebrating capitalist prosperity during boom periods in the 20th century. They should not fail to see that the world capitalist system has been disrupted and reduced by economic busts and wars that are worse in the 20th century than in the 19th century. At this very moment, the whole capitalist system is once more on the eve of a colossal depression far worse than the one in the 1930s. The danger of a world war also looms.

No genuine Marxist has yet dared to predict when capitalism will collapse. But since Marx, Marxist economists have always contended that the capitalist crisis will keep on recurring and becoming graver. It is not true as anti-Marxists who have not even read Marx, claim that Marx predicted that the world would become socialist in one big bang during his lifetime or soon after. Capitalism has declined through a series of worsening crises and wars.

Socialist economies might even prolong capitalist economies for some time by being used as a special customer or supplementary source of capital goods and new technology. But when socialist economies become stronger both by their own self-reliant efforts and through trade with capitalist countries, capitalism will eventually have a narrower market and find itself in a more difficult situation. The non-socialist developing countries also tend to cut down the

privileges of the capitalist countries in defending their legitimate interests.

The restoration of capitalism in the Soviet Union and some other socialist countries can prolong to some extent the life of capitalism in the world but in the long run will not stop the decline of capitalism and the demand for socialism. After suffering the restoration and full play of capitalism, the people would rebel someday in order to reinstitute socialism. With the emergence of the Soviet Union as a social-imperialist power, the longstanding capitalist countries can only find themselves in an even more tightened world situation. The danger of war between the two superpowers is rousing countries to choose nonalignment; and peoples and nations to assert independence and wage revolution.

Chapter 4. Scientific Socialism

Scientific socialism is the theory and practice of the modern industrial proletariat for revolutionary class struggle to emancipate itself, together with other oppressed people, and become the ruling class in lieu of the bourgeoisie; to bring about and develop a society in which the means of production are under public ownership and planned production is for the use and benefit of the people rather than for the private profit of a few proprietors; and thereby to prepare the way for the classless communist society.

The *Communist Manifesto*, drawn up by Marx and Engels for the Communist League in 1848, laid down for the first time the comprehensive theoretical foundation of scientific socialism. Previous to this, socialism was a loose term referring to various trends of thought denouncing the abuses of the bourgeoisie on the proletariat and seeking to ameliorate the condition of the latter.

The *Manifesto* in its third section identifies three forms of socialism preceding scientific socialism: 1) reactionary; 2) conservative and bourgeois; and 3) critical-utopian socialism and communism.

The reactionary socialists included the feudal socialists, the petty bourgeois socialists and the German or "true" socialists. In common, they reacted to and opposed the new historical conditions brought about by the bourgeoisie and proposed some backward model of

society. Marx and Engels regarded them as foolhardy and reactionary for wanting to turn back the wheel of history.

The feudal socialists were characteristically members of the decadent aristocracy and the clergy who took up the grievances of the proletariat against the bourgeoisie in order to advocate a return to the feudal system. The petty bourgeois socialists were representatives of the independent peasants and artisans who were in the process of dissolution and hankered for the restoration of the craft guilds and patriarchalism in agriculture. The German "true" socialists were intellectual pedants who imported French socialist literature only to rephrase this into idealistic bombast bereft of concrete analysis and obscuring the class struggle; they proposed the Philistine German intellectual of the Middle Ages as the model of humanity in general.

The conservative and bourgeois socialists included a number of economists, philanthropists and petty do-gooders who believed that the grievances of the proletariat could be redressed within the capitalist system and that anything good for the bourgeoisie was good for the proletariat. The proletariat was urged not only to stay within the bounds of bourgeois society but also to cast away all ideas of class struggle so that it can enjoy the bourgeois system as the New Jerusalem. Political movement among the workers was depreciated because it was held that mere changes in economic conditions and mere administrative reforms would suffice to improve the lot of the proletariat.

The critical-utopian socialists and communists included Henri St. Simon, Charles Fourier, Robert Owen and others who acknowledged the class antagonisms between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat but who could not as yet see in the infant industrial proletariat of the early 19th century a force capable of historical initiative or political movement. So, they believed in their separate ways that individuals like them from the ranks of the educated could transcend the class struggle and invent some form of social organization into which the workers would spontaneously and gradually enter for their own good and for the sake of social harmony. They therefore appealed to the sense of charity and philanthropy of the bourgeoisie to either support or emulate their ideas and projects of class reconciliation.

St. Simon made the most panoramic proposal for the reorganization of society. He envisioned not only a new French society run by the industrialists, philosophers, physicists, chemists, astronomers, mathematicians and other men of modern scientific learning for the benefit of the poor and actual producers in society; but also a federation of European states run along the same line.

Fourier conceived of the phalanx, a productive community where industry and agriculture were integrated, where the workers would live in harmony with the capitalist and where the proletariat would receive the largest share of the profits. For several years, he kept office daily solely to await the capitalist who would support the project. No charitable capitalist ever came.

Robert Owen was a successful capitalist himself who proved that he could increase his profits by improving the working and living conditions of his workers. He gave higher wages, shorter working hours (ten and a half hours) and better housing than was the standard followed by other capitalists. He later conceived of the home colony, a voluntary productive organization similar in many ways to that of Fourier.

Followers of Fourier and Owen put up in America several isolated communities along the lines designed by their masters. So did the followers of the utopian communist Cabet and Weitling who had previously experimented in France and Germany, respectively. All these experimental societies broke up under the pressures of the surrounding capitalist society.

Marx and Engels described the foregoing conceptions and projects as utopian building of castles in the air and fantastic pictures of the future of society, painted at a time when the industrial proletariat was still in a very undeveloped stage. But at the same time, they noted that these corresponded with the first instinctive yearnings of that class for a general reconstruction of society.

They pointed to the critical element that made the utopian socialist and communist publications full of the most valuable materials for the enlightenment of the working class. These criticized every principle of bourgeois society and in this regard proposed quite a number of practical measures such as the abolition of the distinction between town and country and of the carrying on of

industries for the account of private individuals; the conversion of the functions of the states into a mere superintendence of production; and so on.

At the time of Marx and Engels, the socialists and communists of the utopian kind had degenerated into narrow religious sects, pedantically repeating the outdated writings of their departed masters, fanatically opposing political action by the workers and becoming more reactionary as the very conditions for socialism became apparent. They could not keep pace with the growth of the proletariat and the development of historical conditions.

Engels' *Socialism: Utopian and Scientific* (actually a section of *Anti-Dühring*) elaborates on scientific socialism as the diametrical opposite of utopian socialism. Marxist socialism is scientific because it analyzes capitalism and grasps that law of motion that leads to its socialist transformation. Of all pre-Marxist forms of socialism, utopian socialism came closest to the yearnings of an infant industrial proletariat but fell far short of the theory of scientific socialism.

Scientific socialism was formulated at a time that capitalism had developed sufficiently to reveal not only its past and present but also its future. The very growth of modern industry and the proletariat could already be observed as contradictory with the capitalist relations of production. As the forces of production grew, the capitalist mode of production became increasingly marked by crisis. The *Communist Manifesto* avers that capitalism creates its own gravediggers—the proletariat and modern industry.

The most incontrovertible proof for Marxist socialism as a scientific theory is the series of victories that the proletariat has achieved under its guidance. The ceaseless advance of the revolutionary movement of the proletariat has continuously enriched and developed such a theory. The correctness of scientific socialism is today best demonstrated by the actual building and progress of socialism in several countries.

It is commonly said that class struggle is central to the theory of scientific socialism. This requires further qualification to show the full scope of Marx' development of the theory of class struggle. In a letter to J. Weydemeyer dated 1 March 1852, Marx wrote: "no credit is due me for discovering the existence of classes in modern society

or the struggle between them. What I did 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 the class struggle necessarily leads to the dictatorship of the proletariat; 3) that this dictatorship of the proletariat itself only constitutes the transition to the abolition of all classes and to classless society...”

A. Class Dictatorship of the Proletariat

The chief overall requirement for the establishment of a socialist society is the class dictatorship of the proletariat. This simply means that state power must be in the hands of the proletariat as the ruling class.

Marxism or scientific socialism frankly admits that the proletariat or socialist state is a class dictatorship, unlike the bourgeoisie which misrepresents its own state power or class dictatorship as a supraclass instrument for the common good of all classes, groups and persons.

As a class dictatorship, the socialist state is definitely turned against the bourgeoisie and other enemies of the people. The coercive apparatuses of the state are used to guarantee, consolidate and defend the socialist revolution and construction against internal and external enemies.

The socialist revolution deprives the bourgeoisie of its political power and its private ownership of the means of production. The determination of the bourgeoisie to retain these or, upon defeat, to recover these can never be underestimated.

Before a socialist society can be established, the bourgeoisie does everything in its power to prevent the victory of the proletariat. The strength of proletariat at the inception of its rule is developed and acquired through difficult struggle.

The class dictatorship of the proletariat against the exploiting classes means at the same time a socialist democracy for the proletariat and all other exploited people who have emancipated themselves. Without being able to put reactionaries and counterrevolutionaries in their proper places, the proletarian state would be incapable at the same time of guaranteeing democracy for the entire people.

The socialist constitution expressly upholds the class leadership of the proletariat on the basis of its alliance with all other democratic forces, like the peasantry, the petty bourgeoisie and the like. Decisive practical measures to favor the formerly exploited classes are spelled out in such a constitution.

The best of bourgeois liberal constitutions completely refrains from pointing to the existence of classes and class struggle. It deliberately uses abstract and universalistic references to individual rights, without class distinctions of any kind, in order to cover up and promote the effective legal right and freedom of the exploiting classes to exploit the great masses of individuals belonging to other classes and accounting for more than ninety percent of the population.

While dictatorship of the proletariat may sound terrifying to some and evoke images of arbitrary or indiscriminate acts of violence, it is in fact the state power of the proletariat to build a socialist society and prevent capitalist restoration. It is a well established principle of scientific socialism to remove the political and economic basis of class oppression and exploitation and to give even the members of the erstwhile exploiting classes the amplest opportunity to remold themselves and contribute what they can to the progress of socialist society. Only in specific cases of criminal offense are offending individuals called to account according to law.

On the basis of theory and actual experience in the building of socialism, not only exceptional individuals but entire sections of the bourgeoisie and other exploiting classes abandon their class standpoint and join the revolution. The class dictatorship of the proletariat makes political allowances for them. It has never occurred that the proletariat has ascended to power without allies. And the legitimate interests of these allies are respected; concessions are given to them in many respects for the sake of advancing the democratic and socialist cause.

Even the general run of officers and men in the defeated bourgeois army are amnestied and are provided with suitable means of livelihood upon demobilization. Enemy troops who are workers and peasants receive the same benefits that go to other members of

their class. Enemy officers and men who join the revolution any time before victory are considered bonafide fighters of the revolution.

The ultimate objective of any revolutionary party of the proletariat is to establish a socialist society. Therefore, its long-term interest is to establish the class dictatorship of the proletariat. But the fulfilment of such a long-term interest cannot be attained by a mere subjective wish of anyone or any party.

Even in an advanced capitalist country, where the issue of socialism is closer at hand than elsewhere, there are those immediate conditions and immediate interests that must be attended to before the socialist revolution becomes possible. In a semifeudal country, it is even more pressing and definite to have the bourgeois-democratic revolution as a stage for a considerable period of time before the socialist revolution becomes possible.

Under conditions that the ruling class in a capitalist country is willing to allow the Communist Party to operate legally, such opportunity should not be rejected. After all the main interest of such a party is to raise the level of consciousness of the proletariat and other people and to organize them. Reforms can also be won from time to time. Without certain conditions favorable to armed revolution, to wage it would be disastrous to the party in view of the highly urbanized character of the country and the highly centralized character of communications.

Even in a semifeudal country whose terrain is sufficiently wide for a protracted armed struggle, a communist party does not reject the opportunity to engage in legal political struggle, when such opportunity exists. Conditions can easily arise that it is to the immediate interest of promoting national independence and democracy that the Communist Party unites with the bourgeois government and the national bourgeoisie against imperialism and feudalism.

In either capitalist or semifeudal country, armed revolution is justified and is likely to succeed when objective conditions favor it and the subjective factors of the revolution are strong enough.

Objective conditions refer to the situation of the ruling system. A political and economic crisis of that system can become so serious as to violently split the ruling class and prevent it from ruling in the

old way. The ruling clique engages in open terror against a wide range of people and is extremely isolated. The people in general, including those unorganized, are disgusted with the system and are desirous of changing it.

The subjective factors of the revolution refer to the conscious and organized forces of the revolution. These are the revolutionary party, the mass organizations, armed contingent, and so on. To gauge their strength fully, one has to consider their ideological, political and organized status and capabilities.

The objective conditions are primary over the subjective factors. The former arise ahead of the latter and serve as the basis for the development of the revolutionary forces. The Communist Party cannot be accused of inventing or causing the political and economic crisis of the bourgeois ruling system.

At any rate, it is possible for the objective conditions to be favorable for armed revolution but the subjective factors of the revolution are weak. Sometimes also, it is possible for subjective factors to be strong but the objective conditions are not favorable for armed revolution. In either case, it is foolhardy to rush into strategically decisive armed confrontation with the bourgeoisie. Let us take examples of armed revolution waged by the proletariat.

Even before the Communist Party could take root anywhere, the proletariat spontaneously launched armed uprisings in many countries in continental Europe in 1848. Their actions coincided not because of any international coordination but because of a severe political and economic crisis that swept Europe. The ideological, political and organized strength of the proletariat was still very inadequate. Thus, the bourgeoisie was able to take advantage of their actions to serve its own end against the aristocracy even as it also quelled the proletariat in the name of law and order.

In 1871, the political and economic crisis of France was exacerbated by its defeat in the Franco-Prussian war. The workers of Paris dared to seize power from the bourgeoisie with the very same arms given them as national guards. They were able to hold power for two whole months and thus proved for the first time the capability of the proletariat in acting as a progressive ruling class. They passed many progressive measures.

The Paris Commune that they established fell because of those weaknesses and errors that Marx would subsequently analyze. Among these were that they were not able to link up with the rest of the French people, they did not completely reorganize the state machinery, their Central Committee passed power too soon to a popularly elected representative assembly, they did not pursue immediately the weak bourgeois government in retreat, they overlooked the possibility that the bourgeois armies of France and Prussia would unite against them, and so on.

Until the outbreak of World War I, the bourgeoisie of all capitalist countries appeared to be able to put the proletariat under control and assuage the class struggle, notwithstanding the worsening economic crisis. It also appeared that the development of capitalism into modern imperialism had already given the bourgeoisie the leeway for mollifying the proletariat at the expense of the colonized peoples in the East. (Even previous to modern imperialism, Marx and Engels had also noted temporary solutions to the economic crisis in the destruction of commodities, exploitation of new markets or intensified exploitation of old ones, emigration of surplus labor to America and other colonies, etc.)

Developing Marxism further, Lenin pointed out that capitalism was in for bigger trouble of its own making by becoming monopoly capitalism or modern imperialism. He said that the recurrent crisis would become bigger and more disastrous and would affect not only the capitalist countries themselves but also the whole world. Indeed, a series of severe economic crises would occur soon causing a violent split among the capitalist countries and the outbreak of World War I.

Russia, the weakest capitalist country, plunged into the war and sent millions of its ill-equipped troops to the front. As two million of them died in the battlefields, the people at home increasingly suffered from starvation and deprivation of freedom. Thus, the bourgeois-democratic revolution occurred in February 1917, with the active participation and full support of the Bolsheviks. The Bolshevik-led workers of Petrograd were the vanguard in bringing down the Tsar and the Tsarist troops started to form solidly under the banner of the Bolsheviks.

The bourgeois leadership of the government succeeding the Tsarist regime committed the fatal error of continuing the war policy of the Tsar. The Bolsheviks raised the outcry for bread and freedom and for turning the imperialist war into a civil war. The workers and peasants rallied to the call and the bulk of the government troops joined the Red Army. The first Red Army was drawn from the reactionary army. Thus, the socialist revolution of October 1917 occurred.

The Bolshevik party and the people withstood and won against the reactionaries in the civil war and subsequently against the foreign interventionist forces sent in by Germany and then by the former allies of Russia.

World War I upset the balance of power. In the peace settlement following it, China was one of the backward countries where the perfidy of the winning imperialists was completely exposed to the people. The allies awarded to Japan, instead of to China, the German spheres of influence in China. This roused the Chinese youth and people to launch massive campaigns of protest against the Versailles Treaty. These actions nurtured revolutionaries who would ultimately emerge as the leaders of the Communist Party of China (CPC).

After the victory of the socialist revolution in Russia, it became clearer than ever that a democratic revolution is a distinct stage preparatory to the socialist revolution in a country where vestiges of feudalism are significant. Marx and Engels had earlier pointed out that in such countries as Germany, Poland and Russia that had considerable vestiges of feudalism, agrarian revolution would have to be dealt with in a revolution led by the proletariat. They also observed that in Poland the struggle for independence would have to be based on agrarian revolution.

The Communist Party of China was founded in 1921. It united with the Guomindang (KMT) in 1924 in order to fight the northern warlords and assert the authority of the Chinese Republic which had been betrayed by Yuan Shi-kai. After the Revolution of 1911, Sun Yat-sen had relinquished the presidency to him, who subsequently turned himself into an emperor. The KMT and CPC agreed on fighting for national independence and democracy and were

supported by Soviet Russia. At that time, no Western imperialist power was willing to support the KMT.

But after the death of Sun Yatsen, the British and American imperialists intensified efforts to woo Chiang Kaishek. He succumbed to the seduction and betrayed the KMT-CPC alliance by massacring hundreds of thousands of Chinese communists and workers in 1927. In Shanghai alone, 300,000 communists and suspects were massacred. The CPC was therefore compelled to fight back and launch uprisings.

A number of communist-led regiments broke away from the National Revolutionary Army under KMT-CPC joint command and Mao started to form peasant guerrilla units in the Chingking Mountains. The decision of the Communist Party of China to wage armed resistance was not a sudden one-sided decision but was preceded by the violent acts of Chiang in the service of the Anglo-American imperialists.

For the first time in the history of the revolutionary proletariat, the CPC demonstrated that armed struggle could successfully be waged against the pro-imperialist bourgeoisie in the specific conditions of China. Mao explained that this was possible because the imperialists were plunged in crisis and were divided against each other and that was also the situation of their respective warlord puppets in China.

However, in 1936 when the Japanese invaded Manchuria and made clear its intention of conquering the whole of China, it was the Communist Party of China which took the initiative of calling on the KMT to come to an anti-Japanese alliance and set aside the internecine warfare. Chiang refused until he was arrested by his own commanding generals in Xi'an and they compelled him to enter into a truce agreement with the CPC.

In the anti-Japanese resistance, the CPC became strong because it fought the Japanese hard. The KMT grew weak because it avoided battles against the common enemy. Chiang adopted the policy of "letting the tigers fight" (the Communists and Japanese) and launching an anticommunist onslaught whenever he had a chance. These policies proved unpopular. Popular support went to the CPC.

When the CPC and KMT went into another round of civil war from 1946 to 1949, the conclusion was clear beforehand. At the

beginning, Chiang appeared strong because he had eight million troops and the CPC had only one million troops. But any well informed observer could see that Chiang's army was conscripted and only US money and equipment propped it up while the troops of the people's army were volunteers for the revolutionary cause and were battle-tested in the war of resistance against Japan. Inflation was raging and KMT officers cheated their men of pay and rations. No wonder that entire large units of the KMT kept on shifting to the revolutionary side.

We have paid special attention to China because it accounts for a quarter of humanity and because the victory of the proletariat there has profound effects on the life of the world capitalist system in the long run. Also, we should not fail to see that the economic crisis of the 1930s brought about World War II and in turn this war led to a tremendous weakening of the capitalist system, the rise of several new socialist countries and national liberation movements.

In the period after World War II, the victory of the Indochinese peoples against US imperialism has demonstrated one more thing. The people of a small country can successfully wage a protracted armed struggle against the strongest imperialist power even under conditions where it is not involved in a world war.

The proletarian parties that have waged armed struggle are the ones that have succeeded in completing the democratic revolution and then making the socialist revolution. The army that they have built in the course of the democratic revolution becomes eventually the main component of the socialist state or the dictatorship of the proletariat.

In countries where the Communist Party has won power after World War II, the class dictatorship of the proletariat has taken the form of a people's democratic republic. Such a state must complete the bourgeois revolution and must therefore carry out bourgeois democratic reforms, especially land reform, but at the same time begin the socialist revolution.

All political parties that have supported the revolution are represented in a coalition arrangement, usually a people's consultative council, and in the people's parliament. Although the Communist Party is recognized as the leading party because of its

proven political leadership and capabilities in the revolution and its command of the revolutionary army, it makes it a point to continue encouraging the participation of allies in governmental responsibility because that is the necessary democratic and effective way of knowing problems, resolving differences and uniting the people.

Each one of the patriotic and progressive parties that continues to exist in a socialist society can propose any measure and contest the proposed measure of any other party. The Communist Party itself is bound to put its proposed measures under the test of a collective discussion. Persuasion is the rule among the representatives of the various currents of public opinion. But the coercive apparatuses of class dictatorship are applied on those who have no desire but to destroy or subvert the socialist society.

There is yet no proletarian party that has won political power and built socialism without building an army and waging armed struggle. But certainly there are also proletarian parties that operate legally under the bourgeois state and are not any less revolutionary because they cannot overstep the immediate conditions under which they can still work for the immediate interests of the proletariat and people and also under which they need to strengthen themselves, whatever the future may hold in the ever recurrent crisis of imperialism and reaction.

The Bolsheviks participated several times in the Duma even under Tsarist rule. The Communist Party of China went into a united front twice with the Guomindang government. The Laotian communists went into coalition with the neutralists and rightists in a certain period and then only with the neutralists in another period. In capitalist countries, Marxist-Leninist parties just like the revisionist parties can operate legally in the absence of conditions for armed uprising or resistance.

Every proletarian party and state must be guided by proletarian internationalism. But this does not mean that revolution can be imported or exported from one country to another. Every revolutionary struggle must take a national form because the proletariat in one country has to settle matters first of all with the bourgeoisie in the same country. The *Communist Manifesto* points this out.

Marx and Engels observed that the revolutions of 1848 were not fought in vain even as these called mainly for national independence. These pushed forward the conditions under which the proletariat of every country would struggle against the bourgeoisie within defined national limits. Proletarian internationalism was something new under conditions before 1848. The national struggles of the working class in various countries were the building blocks of proletarian internationalism as the *Communist Manifesto* called for all workers of all countries to unite.

The socialist state is a defender of the sovereignty of the nation and people. Within its national boundaries, the class dictatorship of the proletariat has all the right to deal appropriately with the bourgeoisie or with any other local class; and ward off the aggression, intervention, interference and other extraterritorial acts of an imperialist power. The assertion of national sovereignty and independence by the proletariat in power or not yet in power is a just weapon against imperialism.

At this stage of world history, only the people within each country can best know their own situation and have the right to determine their destiny. The hegemonism of the United States or the Soviet Union today is an unjust imposition on other peoples.

When the Soviet Union speaks of an “international proletarian dictatorship” it is a complete violation and a gross distortion of the Marxist theory of class dictatorship and proletarian internationalism. No state whatsoever has the right to arrogate unto itself the right to determine the fate of other states or peoples.

B. The Socialist Economy

The socialist economy has been made possible in world history by the growth of modern industry and the proletariat in capitalism. These forces of production outgrow and rend asunder the capitalist relations of production which have become their fetters. They therefore become liberated and can grow at an accelerated rate.

In a socialist society, social or public ownership of the means of production replaces private ownership. The new relations of production are made to correspond to the social character of the forces of production (the means of mass production and collective labor). The entire mode of production is revolutionized.

The proletariat uses its political supremacy to wrest step by step all capital from the bourgeoisie, to centralize all instruments of production in the hands of the state, and increase the total productive forces as rapidly as possible.

The *Communist Manifesto* lists down a number of measures for revolutionizing the mode of production in the most advanced countries but at the same time point out that these measures will be different in different countries. These measures are the following:

1. Abolition of private property in land and application of all rents of land to public purposes.

2. A heavy progressive or graduated income tax.

3. Abolition of all right of inheritance.

4. Confiscation of the property of all emigrants and rebels.

5. Centralization of credit in the hands of the state, by means of a national bank with state capital and an exclusive monopoly.

6. Centralization of the means of communication and transport in the hands of the state.

7. Extension of factories and instruments of production owned by the state; the bringing into cultivation of wastelands, and the improvement of the soil generally in accordance with a general plan.

8. Equal liability of all to labor, establishment of industrial armies, especially for agriculture.

9. Combination of agriculture with manufacturing industries; gradual abolition of the distinction between town and country, by a more equable distribution of the population over the country.

10. Free education for all children in public schools. Abolition of children's factory labor in the present form. Combination of education with industrial production, etc.

Marx' *Critique of the Gotha Program* shows how the total product of society is divided. There are the funds for 1) wages; 2) capital reproduction; 3) public welfare; 4) administration; and 5) defense. The wage system is retained but the essential difference between capitalism and socialism in this regard is that there are no more gross disparities in income and that the average level of income is deliberately made to rise above mere subsistence level. The surplus product (above wages) is no longer appropriated as private income

by any exploiting class but used for capital reproduction, public welfare, administration and defense.

In the payment of wages, the principle to be followed is “from each according to his ability, to each according to his deeds.” There are wage or salary differentials according to differences in productivity. A manager or an engineer will still get a higher wage than a skilled worker; and the latter will get a higher wage than an unskilled worker or apprentice. For sometime, the industrial proletariat will get higher wages and more benefits than the peasants. But at the very start, steps are taken to remove the gross disparities in income in the old society. The long term objective is to raise the productivity of one and all through education and training; and to actually expand production in order to steadily raise the general level of income and social services.

In considering wage differentials, we can see that the socialist society at the early stage bears the birthmarks of the old society. This cannot be avoided. Socialism has to start from the productive forces inherited from the old society. Any damage to the productive forces in case of civil war or imperialist war prior to the establishment of socialist society has also to be overcome and rehabilitated.

With social profit taking the place of private profit, a tremendous and ever increasing amount of the surplus product is released every year for the reproduction of capital. Such ills endemic to capitalism as misallocation of resources, the anarchy of competition, conspicuous consumption, the business cycle and excessive military expenditures are done away with.

National economic planning takes the place of the conflicting calculations by various private firms in the market. Production is for use rather than for private profit. The most essential and necessary commodities and projects are given priority. The internal balanced and self-reliant development of the socialist economy is carried out.

Economic planning is effective because all economic factors are under unified control and all active components of the economy at all levels report the information and recommendations to serve as basis for the plan. An economic plan is the result of the open interaction between the central planning body and lower levels. National goals are related to actual capacities. Economics acquires the precision of

an applied science. In a capitalist society, economics as well as economic planning is really a far more imprecise field of knowledge and is often a guessing game as the individual capitalist firms keep from each other and from the public production, trade, technical and other secrets in the name of private ownership and competition. Only partial information is given publicly by private firms when it serves their ends.

The expansion of public welfare facilities augments the wage system. These include public schools, theaters, libraries, housing, health care, recreational facilities, means of transport and communications, electricity, and so on. The state at various levels, economic units and mass organizations maintain initiatives in the buildup of public facilities.

In a capitalist society, the best of facilities maintained at a great cost to society are available only to the ruling classes and a few hangers on. One needs only to be reminded of exclusive schools, private hospitals, mansions, country clubs, private cars and so on in the face of mass unemployment and poverty, a large mass of out-of-school youth, shabby and limited public hospitals, slums and shanties, overcrowded parks, inadequate public transport and the like.

The cost of administration or management in the political, economic, social and cultural institutions and organizations of socialist society is quite low. That is because simplicity of administration is maintained. There are no unnecessary organizations and functions as those proliferating in a capitalist society. Political leadership and economic management are closely related in general and are actually unified in basic units of production and at a number of higher levels.

In a capitalist society, there is an administrative separation of government and the economy; and each side has a proliferation of unnecessary organs, offices and functions. On the side of government, bureaucratism is the rule. On the side of the economy, there is the anarchy of production and marketing among a number of firms which are actually involved in the same line. Worst of all, exploitation of the working people is the rule.

Defense is a necessary concern in a socialist society as we have already pointed out in our discussion of the dictatorship of the proletariat. Without defense, socialist society would be destroyed by its internal and external enemies. But the cost of defense in such a society is relatively far, far smaller than in capitalist society. Especially in the case of imperialist powers, their military expenditures are astronomical in magnitude. Worst of all, the police and military forces are used for the purpose of repression and aggression.

The military policy of a socialist state is truly defensive and is opposed to aggression from its own side or from another. The military forces are built according to the principle of the people's army. In connection with the economy, military units are actually productive units, aside from being military, political and educational units. Periodically beefing up the standing army, the youth are rotated into military service and training. The people in general are politicized and trained as militia units and are not detached from production.

With the exception of the eastern part of Germany which was mainly agricultural, none of the major capitalist countries has yet become socialist. So far only the weakest capitalist country— Russia —became socialist in the wake of World War I.

It is obvious that the sheer high development of a capitalist society does not automatically lead it to socialism. On the contrary, a strong capitalist country when afflicted with crisis is in a better position than a weak capitalist country to pass on the burden of crisis to others and prevent the overthrow of its bourgeoisie by force and deception. Thus, Marx and Engels never declared that the more advanced was a capitalist country, the more it prone it was to becoming socialist, although they recognized that the forces of production available there would be the best possible basis for socialism.

The socialist countries that have so far arisen and developed can best be appreciated by knowing their starting point and how far they have advanced from there in so short a time. Socialism on the stage of world history is still in its early stage and yet its achievements are already astounding.

The first socialist country Russia was the weakest link in the chain of imperialist powers. It had the rudiments of a capitalist economy, especially the production of steel, coal, oil, textiles and the like. But its few large cities were surrounded by a vast countryside where feudal and semifeudal relations still existed. Moreover, it suffered greatly from the effects of Tsarist participation in World War I, a civil war and the war of intervention waged by all the capitalist powers.

As soon as the Bolsheviks were able to win power, the socialist revolution began with the nationalization of land and all major industries in Russia. The soviets (committees of workers, peasants and soldiers) took charge of the economy. But because of continuous warfare, production was often disrupted and requisitioning from producers and rationing to the people became the rule.

Socialist Russia could survive only by relying on the people and playing off the capitalist powers against each other. After the war of intervention by several capitalist powers, the main point was to reconstruct and revive production immediately even if it meant taking a pause in the drive to socialize the means of production. Thus, the New Economic Policy (NEP) was decided on to give concessions to rich peasants, small and middle entrepreneurs and traders.

As soon as the economy was reconstructed and revived, the first of the five-year plans started. As the pioneering socialist country, Russia found it necessary to put the stress on heavy and basic industries. In agriculture, the state and collective sectors were developed. Within the collective sector, cooperativization and the introduction of farm machines were considered as the key factor in dissolving private ownership of land among the peasants. In certain areas for a short while, the rich peasants opposed the agricultural collectivization by slaughtering animals and destroying facilities. But the combination of socialist industry and the agricultural collectivization and mechanization prevailed.

To get new technology from abroad, Russia during the 1920s dealt with private American companies which were hungry for expanded sales and also with the continental European countries which continued to suffer from economic crisis. Great Britain the No.

1 defender of capitalism then was the most stubborn in opposing the growth of socialism in Russia. In the 1930s because of the Great Depression, Soviet trade with the capitalist countries expanded tremendously. But in the total effort at developing socialism, the benefits from foreign trade constituted a small and supplementary part. It was the great political and economic mobilization of the people that built socialism.

By the time that Germany invaded the Soviet Union, the industrial and agricultural capacity of the latter had already been developed in depth. Even as the invaders occupied large chunks of Soviet territory, the Red Army could build up the strength to roll them back. The American lend-lease came late and was a mere drop in the bucket compared to the armaments turned out by Soviet industries.

The Soviet counteroffensive against the German war machine was the most decisive factor in defeating Nazi Germany and the scourge of fascism and liberating the people of Europe and beyond. As a result, people's democracies and socialism could be established in Eastern Europe and East Germany.

The biggest blow that capitalism and imperialism suffered in the aftermath of World War II was the liberation of China. Socialism arose and the capitalist spheres of influence could no longer be restored. The country with the biggest population went out of the orbit of capitalist exploitation.

Free distribution of land to the landless tillers was thoroughly carried out all over China. The modern industries, capitalist farms and sources of raw materials were taken over by the state. These immediately placed the state in a commanding position in the entire economy. These had been owned by the imperialists and comprador big bourgeoisie before liberation.

In the case of imperialists like the British and French, who were willing to negotiate payment for their assets, China accommodated them and made satisfactory settlement. They stood to gain more from continued trade than demanding high compensation or the right to own property within China. On the other hand, the United States took the attitude of rabid anti-communism at all costs and declared a policy of embargo on China.

In the case of capitalists closely tied in with the Chiang ruling clique, practically all of them had fled China and there was absolutely no reason to talk business with them. As they were traitors and participants in corruption in government, their properties were liable for seizure. But in the case of capitalists who supported the anti-Japanese struggle and also the struggle for liberation, they were given concessions.

They were encouraged to enter into joint venture arrangements (the so-called joint state-private enterprise) with the government. The main interest of the state was to keep the industries going and expanding, without any disruption, especially because the work of reconstruction coincided with the Korean war.

Eventually, after some years, the policy was adopted to freeze private capital and to give the capitalists fixed interest payments rather than profits. All that the state would need to do is to enlarge the share of the state in the joint enterprise and to apply the law abolishing the inheritance of capital funds and means of production. In his lifetime, the law-abiding capitalist can live in comfort and send his children to school and see his children get jobs appropriate to their merit and ability. There was no need for them to depend on inheritance.

Petty and middle entrepreneurs have also been encouraged to go into joint enterprises with the state. Just as in the case of large joint state-private enterprises, the entrepreneurial and managerial skills learned in the old society are properly channeled and further developed. The state provides credit and additional equity for the development of these enterprises until the capital of the private investors becomes a very small portion of total capital. Phasing out private capital is the ultimate objective, at least within one generation.

The inheritance laws allow the bequeathal of durable articles of consumption but not of means of production and large amounts of capital. The petty and middle entrepreneurs were assured, as were the bigger entrepreneurs, that their children get free education and appropriate jobs within socialist society.

After the distribution of land in land reform, agricultural cooperation rose from the stage of mutual aid and labor exchange

through the stage of cooperatives to the stage of the people's communes. Dissolution of private ownership of land among the peasants was done through the development of cooperatives, capital construction, introduction of machinery, development of rural industries and side occupations and absorption of peasants trained to become workers into modern industries beyond the commune level. Ownership of the redistributed land would pass from individual ownership peasants to shares in the cooperative and further on to the commune at its highest level of development.

Apart from the land worked in common at the commune, the peasants were allotted private plots on which they could produce what they want and which they could dispose of in any manner to augment their incomes. There are free markets where they can sell their surplus private produce.

The long-term objective of any socialist society is to develop the forces of production to the point that all industries and agriculture are along the line of modern industry and are under public ownership. One five-year plan after another has been adopted and carried out to rapidly develop a modern economy.

Improving on the Soviet experience, the Chinese assert that agriculture is the base of their socialist economy while industry is the leading factor and have been consciously developing light industries to address immediate consumer and producer needs and bridge the gap between heavy industries and agriculture. Pricing policy has been used consistently to ensure rising income for the peasants though still lower by some small degree than that of the proletariat on the basis of productivity.

It took China only three years to reconstruct itself from the ravages of the last world war and the civil war. This was accomplished despite the requirements for the Chinese volunteers in the Korean war. From 1952 to 1958, the basic socialist transformation of the relations of production was accomplished. At the same time, the forces of production grew rapidly.

China made still larger strides in all-round economic development by following the strategic line of the Great Leap Forward. This enabled China to overcome the natural calamities, the imperialist blockade and the Soviet revisionist sabotage of hundreds of

industrial projects. Because it pushed socialist development forward, it was viciously attacked as a failure by the capitalist West and the Soviet Union.

From then on, the rapid progress of the Chinese socialist economy could no longer be denied. During the period of the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution (GPCR), still greater progress continued to be made in socialist revolution and construction. The cultural revolution under proletarian dictatorship involved class struggle against the residual and recrudescing bourgeoisie and caused the revolutionization of the mode of the production and superstructure in order to combat revisionism, prevent capitalist restoration and consolidate socialism.

The ratio of industry in industrial-agricultural output value has increased from 30 percent percent in 1949 to 74.4 percent percent in 1978. Steel output has increased 200 times since 1949. The machine-building industry supplies 80 percent percent of the equipment of the basic industries. Oil-fuel-power industries are self-sufficient. Grain output has increased 2.5 times since 1949; and cotton output, 4.9 times since 1949.

With its present drive for modernization of industry, agriculture, science and defense, China expects that in another two decades it shall be in the front ranks with the United States and the Soviet Union. Its industrial capacity has already gone past the level of Great Britain. This is being premised on the rejection of the achievements of the Great Leap Forward and the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution.

Grave dangers loom ahead for the cause of socialist revolution and construction because the capitalist-oriented reforms being undertaken and the integration of China in the world capitalist system can bring about the full restoration of capitalism and the bourgeois class dictatorship in China. Mao pointed out a long time ago that the ascent to a higher stage of social development from a lower exploitative kind of society involves revolutionary violence but a descent from a higher to a lower of social development can occur through peaceful evolution.

C. Transition to Communism

Scientific prediction is possible only on the basis of the available facts and the laws of motion that can be drawn from them. In social science, a prediction can only indicate the general direction of events in view of many variables. To venture into details about a long future could easily result in wrong guesses or even fantasies.

Marx and Engels could only indicate the general direction of events on the basis of the facts of capitalist society and the laws of motion that they discovered therefrom. They defined the basic principles of socialist revolution and construction and anticipated the general outline on the basis of their study and critique of capitalism and imperialism. With regard to the transition of socialism into communism, they prognosticated the withering away of the state, the emergence of classless society, the massive and rapid growth of productive forces and the all-round development of human civilization.

The withering of the socialist state or class dictatorship of the proletariat means the steady dissolution of the coercive character of political authority. By then, there shall have been a lessening and finally a disappearance of the need for a distinct class, the proletariat, to hold in check another class, the bourgeoisie, with the use of the coercive apparatuses of the state like the army, police, courts and prison.

The advance of socialism, especially in its mode of production, is expected to dissolve the very conditions that create such antagonistic classes as the proletariat and the bourgeoisie. A generalization and equalization of conditions occur for the benefit of one and all. It is not an impossible dream to anticipate the growth of productivity to the point that all members of society need to work for a far lesser number of hours than now and have more time for other creative endeavors in private and in public.

One knows exactly how the bourgeoisie is differentiated from the proletariat in capitalist society. By their right of ownership in the means of production and by extracting profits for themselves, the bourgeoisie lives a more comfortable and even luxurious life while the proletariat is consigned to the drudgery of a long daily work routine and the coarse conditions of poverty and misery. Certainly, one cannot fail to see the benefits derived by the working class by

succeeding through struggle to reduce the working day progressively from 16 hours to eight hours, although the worker still remains exploited in capitalist society.

The attainment by all of the material conditions enjoyed by an educated middle class family relying on high salaries and not on private ownership of the means of production is not an impossibility. While this is an impossibility for the working class under capitalism, socialism can bring this about because the growth of productive forces and all-round social development are no longer restricted as in capitalism.

Modern industry is capable of wiping out poverty overnight. But capitalism would rather manipulate and restrict the forces of production in order to exact a high rate of profit.

Marx pointed out clearly the problems that socialism in transition to communism would have to solve. These are the contradictions between the vestiges of the past and the new socialist society, between town and country or industry and agriculture and between mental and physical work.

The contradictions between the vestiges of the past and the new socialist conditions can be solved by further developing the achievements of socialist revolution and construction. The contradiction between the town and country or industry and agriculture can be solved by bringing mechanization and the amenities of urban life to the countryside and building smaller cities integrated with rural life. The contradiction between physical and mental work can be solved by expanding educational and other cultural facilities, increasing real wages and reducing the workday for all.

Since Marx, it has been generally understood that the mode of production can be developed to such a point that the income of producers will no longer be decided according to their productivity. There will be such a superabundance of public facilities and articles of consumption that it will become embarrassing for anyone to talk or think of being deprived and disadvantaged regarding these things.

By then, the principle of distribution in society shall have become "from each according to his ability, to each according to his needs." Needs here means all kinds —economic, social, cultural and so on.

The productive level of society is such that the satisfaction of needs will no longer be restricted by one's earning capacity.

There is the reactionary argument that in socialist society people would become lazy because they can never hope to own the means of production. Those who argue this way forget that in an exploiting society like capitalism it is those who work the hardest who do not own any means of production. And it is those who do no work that own these.

There is as well the argument that in communist society people would also become lazy because all their needs will be satisfied. Those who argue this way think that money grubbing in capitalist society is the best possible kind of life. These are certainly more worthwhile challenges and more fulfilling endeavors than working for one's subsistence. People do not become so much more stupid when their daily necessities are satisfied that they would refuse or fail to do their assigned work at greatly reduced hours. In fact, work is no longer a drudgery in communist but a joy like study or sports.

The logic and pretensions of the bourgeoisie should not be confused with the communist milieu. In communist society, the average man has the opportunity to develop a well integrated personality by daily having enough time for work, study and leisure which may be used for cultural activity, entertainment, sports, further study or scientific experimentation.

The law of contradiction will continue to operate in communist society. It will have its own problems to solve. For one thing, the struggle to understand wisely, use and harmonize with nature will continue. There will be a struggle between correct and incorrect ideas and between the old and the new. To the extent that man still remains ignorant of many things, because of the infinitude of matter, man will still have to struggle for greater freedom from that ignorance. Man will continue to be challenged by problems and moved by a desire to solve them.

Those who say that Marxism envisions communism as a final form of society, which is Eden regained, do not actually know Marxism. It is simply impossible to have a final society of perfect harmony. New forms of struggle in communist society will arise.

Communism itself is destined to be supplanted by a new form of society.

The actual building of socialist societies since 1917 has made clear that there is no smooth sailing from socialism to communism. It is not a simple case of developing continuously the forces of production.

The development of the socialist mode of production is indeed the basic part of the preparation for communist society. But there are problems involving the class dictatorship of the proletariat and the entire superstructure of society. To obscure these problems would even adversely affect the mode of production.

Lenin was the first to say categorically that socialism entails a whole historical epoch, not a brief transitory period. The building of socialism itself is not a simple case of unilaterally doing what is to be done in the mode of production in one's own country. The dictatorship of the proletariat must be consolidated to guard against dangers and to put limits on the concessions that still need to be given to backward elements.

The defeated bourgeoisie in a country multiplies its resistance to the rule of the proletariat tenfold and retains countless connections with the international bourgeoisie. Old ideas, old customs and old habits persist for a long time. Petty production which is allowed for sometime engenders the bourgeoisie anew. Bureaucrats in the state are also liable to divorce themselves from the masses and become a new bourgeoisie.

In 1936 Stalin made the mistake of proclaiming that classes and class struggle had ceased to exist in the Soviet Union and that a classless society of the whole people had been achieved. This was quite a grave error because it obscured the problem that there were still classes and class struggle and because it supported the tendency to misconstrue contradictions among the people as contradictions between the people and the enemy.

Because it became very easy to misrepresent as a contradiction between the people and the enemy any contradiction on issues, it followed easily to adopt harsh administrative measures against a considerable number of people. An injustice could be easily committed. Even when a measure was justly taken, it was something

performed by the state organs above the masses who should have been involved in class struggle.

Stalin also said, "Technique decides everything." This depreciated the role of political mobilization. It encouraged the idea that the cadres and experts knew what was best and the people could be simply told what to do. This undermined the role of the proletariat and other working people in decision-making. There is no substitute for a democratic interaction between leaders and masses, even as centralism holds after a decision has been made. The principle of democratic centralism means that centralized authority is based on democracy.

It was under the cover of the notion that there were no longer classes and class struggle in the Soviet Union that the modern revisionists were able to gradually usurp power in the organs of the state, public organizations and in the superstructure as a whole. It was too late when Stalin realized his error in 1953, a year before his death. In 1957 the modern revisionists were able to openly seize power for themselves under Khrushchov. They declared that the Soviet state was no longer a dictatorship of the proletariat but a state of the whole people and the Communist Party, a party of the whole people. The proletarian class standpoint was abandoned.

Subsequently, they put out an overextended 20-year program to build the material and technical foundation of communism. They said that it was all a matter of economics and technology that communism would be achieved and that the international communist movement should be subordinated to the accomplishment of such a program. They put out the line of peaceful coexistence, peaceful transition and peaceful competition to the chagrin of revolutionary forces fighting for national liberation against colonialism and imperialism.

In 1965, Brezhnev replaced Khrushchov. He maintained the line that inside the Soviet Union there was no more need for the dictatorship of the proletariat and that the Soviet state was only for defense against imperialism. He pursued further the Khrushchovite line of restoring capitalism in the Soviet economy. He recentralized the economic activities that Khrushchov had decentralized in order to promote bureaucrat monopoly capitalism and the arms race.

State officials continued to raise their salaries, allowances and luxury facilities. Industrial and farm enterprises were individually put on a profit-for-itself basis. Managers could get large salaries and bonuses for themselves and were given the power to hire and fire workers on such a basis. The private plots of peasants were enlarged and free markets were increased and encouraged. The effect was neglect of collective farms and Soviet agriculture went into shambles. Eventually, private teams could operate large farms for their own private profit.

The means of production in the Soviet Union are still in the main owned formally by the public. But the bureaucrats, particularly the monopoly bureaucrat bourgeoisie, are now running a state monopoly capitalist economy and are privately aggrandizing themselves in many devious ways. Their incomes can compare with capitalists in capitalist countries, while workers find the level of their income decreasing. Unemployment has also been increasing.

As early as during the time of Khrushchov, the Soviet Union exposed the pernicious character of its foreign relations. Unable to make China submit to its ideological stand, it withdrew its experts from China and tore to pieces the blueprints for hundreds of projects. It was discovered subsequently, however, that the Soviet Union had been delivering shoddy and overpriced capital goods and other commodities to China.

The worst in foreign relations came when Brezhnev took over. Unlike Khrushchov, he has been openly bellicose. In 1969, the Soviet Union invaded Czechoslovakia and openly installed its puppets. Since then, the Soviet Union has been called social-imperialist. Social-imperialism means socialist in words but imperialist in deeds. This corresponds to its domestic social-capitalism and social fascism, that is to say, capitalism and fascism in the name of socialism.

Learning from the experience of the international proletariat, especially in the Soviet Union, Mao Zedong wrote a thoroughgoing class analysis of socialist society, *On the Correct Handling of Contradictions among the People*. He stated categorically that in socialist society classes and class struggle persist and showed how these could be handled, making a distinction between contradictions

among the people and those between the people and the enemy. He laid stress on the consolidation of the dictatorship of the proletariat and the ideological remolding of the intellectuals among others.

Subsequently, he put forward the theory of continuing revolution under the dictatorship of the proletariat and put it into practice in the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution in order to combat revisionism, prevent the restoration of capitalism and consolidate socialism. The key point in this theory is the proletarian class struggle and the repeated revolutionization of the entire socialist superstructure so as to prevent modern revisionism or the restoration of capitalism.

Mao held that as in the Soviet Union the revisionists first subvert the superstructure and prepare public opinion for the restoration of capitalism. Subsequently, it takes only a coup to seize political power. Thus, the restoration of capitalism can be undertaken in a relatively peaceful way. To put back the proletariat in power would entail an armed revolution.

The revisionists in socialist society belittle and oppose the proletarian class struggle and revolutionization of the superstructure. In the Soviet Union, they claim that the proletariat has already fulfilled its historic mission of building socialism by way of saying that there is no more need for struggle, in China, they claim that there is already a withering away of the class struggle and that the people are practically through with it. They consider the sheer development of the productive forces as adequate in the march towards communism.

To bring about communism, not only the mode of production should be revolutionized but also the superstructure. The revolutionization of the latter would enhance the former, and vice versa. The interaction of the two would bring about the rapid progress of socialism towards communism. As socialist society is continuously revolutionized, the only other condition to consider would be the external factor of imperialism.

Communism cannot arise so long as imperialism exists. No socialist state can bring down its guard so long as the bourgeoisie abroad can choose to launch aggression, intervention and the like. An important objective of the theory of continuing revolution under the proletarian dictatorship is also to frustrate the hope of the

imperialists that on the third or fourth generation after a successful revolution there is a restoration of the old society.

Imperialism is definitely declining. But the rise of modern revisionism can result in the restoration of capitalism and in the temporary defeat of the socialist cause. The restoration of capitalism in the Soviet Union and elsewhere does not really reinforce the world capitalist system but can aggravate its crisis in the long run.

The phenomenon of modern revisionism and the gradual restoration of capitalism can afflict the former socialist countries and can result in worse conditions for exploitation and oppression for the working people of the world. Worse conditions of crisis, repression and aggression will arise. But precisely these shall generate a new wave of revolutions led by the proletariat against the bourgeoisie. The epochal struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie will continue until imperialism is defeated and the cause of socialism can advance towards communism.

Appendix 1: Pre-Marxist Materialism and Idealism

In the history of western philosophy, there has been a constant struggle between materialism and idealism. The starting point of materialism is matter, going on to consciousness. That of idealism is consciousness. The objective idealist goes so far as to say that consciousness, in the form of supernatural beings, is capable of independent existence from material reality. The subjective idealist affirms only that which is humanly perceivable and denies or doubts the existence of God but at the same time has the same attitude towards the material object.

Rudimentary materialism dominated pre-Socratic philosophy, with its proto-scientific hypothesis. The rudimentary materialist in the pre-Socratic period who is most appreciated by Marxists is Heraclitus for his hypothesis on the process of change internal to matter. In post-Socratic philosophy idealism as propounded by Plato and Aristotle prevailed.

Plato posited that a hierarchy of ideas topped by the Absolute Idea is the original reality from which things are mere copies. Although he engaged in more empirical studies, Aristotle also posited that “substantial forms” take precedence over matter. However, he pointed out that the form resides in material things.

Although Plato and Aristotle prevailed in the post-Socratic period, the materialist philosopher Democritus taught the hypothesis that atoms are the building blocks of matter. He is the other rudimentary materialist most appreciated by Marxists.

In the Middle Ages, from the fifth to the 13th century, adoption of Platonic metaphysics (through the writings of Plotinus) by Augustine into Christian theology prevailed. In its purest form, this was called realism, which posited that the universal idea precedes the thing. Opposed to it was nominalism, which asserted that the universal idea as name comes after the thing.

As if to strike a balance between the two, Aquinas adopted Aristotelianism into Christian theology. In the 13th century this would only serve to increase the philosophic ferment within the Church. Nominalism would later develop into Ockhamism, verging on the empiricism of the modern era. William of Ockham advocated the discarding of realism because it created too many things from one thing.

For instance, if you have one horse before you, you could speak of its animal-ness. That is supposed to be one ideal entity. Then you can speak of horse-ness; that is another entity. This business of claiming too many essences before the actual horse is confusing, according to Ockham. The so-called "substantial form" of Aristotle was used to perpetuate Platonic idealism.

Christian Platonic-Aristotelian philosophy came increasingly under the attack of more outrightly materialistic philosophies in the 17th century. These coincided with the series of scientific experimentations of Copernicus, Galileo, Newton, etc.

In England, there was the empiricist philosophy of Francis Bacon and John Locke. Both assumed the existence of material objects even as they asserted that human perception and observation lead to knowledge. It is for this that they are the empiricists better appreciated by Marxists than the empiricists Berkeley and Hume who asserted that reality consisted only of sense data and denied the material object.

In 17th century continental Europe, it was rationalist philosophy which emerged, spearheaded by Rene Descartes who affirmed the existence of matter as the object of scientific investigation and cast

doubts on the philosophic authority of the Church beyond the spiritual realm. He depicted the universe as a clock made by God to run on its own. In the 18th century, the philosophies of France ranged from the deistic rationalism of Voltaire to the atheistic, mechanical materialism of Holbach.

Marxist materialism would subsequently criticize mechanical materialism as too narrow for reducing all material things and processes to mechanics, underestimating the all-round capability of man and thus giving room for the intervention of some supernatural being.

But this mechanical materialism which described man himself as a machine was progressively significant in that it affirmed the capability of man to explain the world in scientific, materialist terms. The mechanical materialists were influenced and limited by the level of scientific achievement in their time, especially the experiments of Galileo and the mechanical laws of Newtonian physics.

In the 19th century, Marxism would be able to avail of a far greater amount of scientific achievements in various fields and at the same time learn from the most radical and advanced progress of idealism in Hegelian dialectics.

Appendix 2: On Pre-Industrial Capitalism and the Primitive Accumulation of Capital

Though Marxists give full credit to capitalism as an economic advance on feudalism, it exposes the gross inhumanity by which it first accumulated its capital. The primitive accumulation of capital is dealt with in *Das Kapital*. But the focus is on industrial capitalism, when commodity production has become dominant in society.

The seed of capitalism grew within the womb of feudal society. Within a predominantly natural economy (mainly dependent on land), commodity production developed gradually for a long period.

Before commodity production in the form of industrial capitalism became the dominant mode of production in the 19th century, it went into two stages: the handicrafts stage; and the manufacturing stage of several hundreds of years in Europe.

The craft guilds were the basic producing units in the towns that emerged during the Middle Ages. Under the direction of the guild

master in a small shop, each of the artisans made a complete product with simple handy tools which he personally owned.

It was in the late Middle Ages, particularly in 13th century Italy, that pre-industrial manufacturing started to develop. The basis was still handicrafts but these were brought to a higher level of productive organization or division of labor. Day in and day out a set of workers would do one limited part of the whole process as other sets of workers did their respective parts of the whole process. Production was faster and larger in scale in comparison to the craft guild.

As manufacturing gained ground, the craft guilds were elbowed out. The artisans lost hold of their petty tools and were compelled to join the assembly line in the factory system.

Manufacturing matured and started to glide into industrial capitalism in the late 18th century. This was hastened by new inventions like the steam engine and spinning jenny.

The handicraft and manufacturing stages may be lumped together as the period of the primitive accumulation of capital. The historical origins of the industrial capitalist class and the working class could be traced to this. The manufacturing capitalist effectively deprived the artisan of his tools and amassed capital from the most inhuman forms of exploitation.

The period of the primitive accumulation of capital did not simply mean the adoption of more efficient means and organization of production. There is a whole expanse of inhuman exploitation perpetrated by the manufacturer and merchant.

In the factory system, men, women and children were made to work for as long as 16 to 18 hours on the average and even 20 hours in extreme cases. Down to the first half of the 19th century, this work time standard was extended. The wages were extremely low so that even children far less than ten years old had to work. The work place was unsanitary and so cramped that workers could easily be killed or injured by machines. Physical punishments were inflicted on workers. Their living quarters were like pig sties.

The growth of pre-industrial manufacturing caused the enclosure movement. Peasants were forced out of the land as this was turned into pasture lands for sheep (wool was the object of interest) and specialized production of technical crops (cotton, beet, potato, etc.).

As the peasants were forced out of the land, they had to compete for jobs from the manufacturers. There were always too many for a few jobs, thus depressing their wage conditions. Paupery and banditry were rampant from the 16th century onward. Large-scale peasant rebellions also occurred in the 17th century.

The manufacturing class and the feudal monarch cooperated in carrying out a mercantilist policy. The manufacturer was interested in the consolidation of the national market against competitors in other countries and also against unruly feudal barons who exacted tolls at so many points on the road and in water ways. The interest of the manufacturer coincided with the king's interest in a consolidation of his political power and in financial support from the manufacturers and merchants for his wars.

Mercantilism was also the main economic motive of the colonial expeditions since the 16th century. At first, the object of interest in the colonies were gold, spices and other exotic products. Subsequently, the metropolis decided to produce commercial crops in these colonies for its benefit.

Not only the native peoples were forced to cultivate the commercial crops (like tobacco, sugar, cotton, pepper and the like). But in South and North America where there was a shortage of native Indians willing to work under the whip, slaves had to be gotten from Africa by force by all the colonial powers. Incidentally, even in this, the fine excuse was to expedite the Christianization of the black heathens. The Portuguese Jesuits became very active in the slave trade, especially after they caused the death of thousands of Indians in Brazil when they put them in concentration camps. □

The Role of the Church in Social Change

**Address before the Staff of the National Secretariat for Social Action (NASSA) of the Catholic Bishops' Conference of the Philippines (CBCP)
April 1986**

The Catholic church has played a key role in social change in the Philippines. It has taken major initiatives and effected results of great profundity and comprehensiveness in every aspect of social change — moral, political, economic and cultural.

The church came with Spanish colonialism more than four centuries ago. It was under royal patronage. It may be said to have been an instrument of colonial policy and an adjunct and complement of the brutal conquest of the people. And it may also be said to have been a civilizing force and a practical utilizer of colonialism as a means of carrying out the overriding spiritual mission.

At any rate, the Catholic church teamed up with Spanish lay authorities in building a colonial and feudal society out of the less developed and disparate native communities and in running a theocratic state from the sixteenth to the 19th century.

What stands out in the revolutionary anticolonial and democratic consciousness of the people is that as a temporal or historical institution, the Catholic church, especially the friars, engaged in oppression and exploitation and that the officialdom of this church was determinedly against liberal reforms and then far more vigorously against the Philippine Revolution of 1896 whose main line was separation and independence from Spain.

But the church was also composed of people who owed loyalty to it as a religious institution. And there were leaders of the church—like Father Burgos—who inspired patriotic sentiments as they

demanded respect for the rights of native secular priests and suffered injustice.

There were priests who joined and took active part in the Philippine revolution. Father Aglipay stood out as vicar general of the Philippine revolutionary army and as an active guerrilla leader against the US war of aggression. There is more than enough basis in Philippine history for Filipino priests to formulate and espouse a theology of liberation.

Through the Malolos Constitution, the Philippine revolution and the Filipino people established the liberal democratic principle of separation of church and state, as well as the freedom of thought and belief. But in both principle and practice, the relationship of church and state would remain problematic.

The claim of the church to moral authority over the flock can easily encompass political, economic, social and cultural issues controversial to the state or any entity outside of the state. Most bothersome to all those who stand for social progress and justice is that the institutional church and most of its leaders have a reactionary class character and tend to be akin to and enmeshed with the system of oppression and exploitation in the country at every stage of Philippine history.

The friar estates were a major cause of the Philippine Revolution of 1896. Though these are no longer a dramatic issue at present, the church and its officialdom are widely regarded as a bulwark of reaction and anticommunism in the service of US imperialism and the local exploiting classes. The church is often seen as a mundane investor in big comprador banks and firms, a landlord and a service institution for the exploiting classes.

The church assumes and presents itself as being above the existence of classes and class struggle and draws inspiration on social justice from the Holy Scriptures and the social encyclicals. But critics continue to point out that the first of the two great commandments is used to obscure the second and sanctify or legitimize social injustice.

It is often said by both believers and nonbelievers that were the institutional church and its officialdom to promptly and decisively use their material and moral power and influence in denouncing the

grossest forms of injustice, especially foreign and feudal domination, such injustices would not last long.

It has been observed that Spanish colonialism lasted for centuries and that US imperialism has dominated the Philippines for close to a century because the church does not care to use its great moral power in favor of the Filipino nation but instead makes itself available as a witting or unwitting tool of oppression.

For a change, the Catholic church and the Catholic Bishops Conference of the Philippines have lately gained tremendous prestige from the issuance of the pastoral letter that declared the Marcos regime's lack of moral basis and legitimacy soon after the snap election and from Cardinal Sin's call for the people to protect the breakaway forces of Enrile and Ramos and in effect make their own uprising last February 22 to 25.

But acute observers still note that the Catholic church and the bishops would have prevented the US-Marcos regime from oppressing the Filipino people for so many years had they denounced it in the clearest terms of justice within the first two years of the fascist dictatorship. It took a long time before a pastoral letter could be issued to denounce Marcos tyranny at its roots.

We know for a fact though that the progressives among the priests, nuns and bishops have been a minority and that it had to take time to bring the middle roaders and the conservatives to a consensus of making a fundamental denunciation of the fascist dictatorship. And even now, conservatives can accept the overthrow of the despot Marcos only in the manner of reacting to and seeking to preempt armed revolutionary action by the people.

Nevertheless, despite the overthrow of the tyrant, the process of dismantling all the structures of the fascist dictatorship and restoring democratic rights is still incomplete and needs to be finished. At the same time, the basic problems of US imperialism, feudalism and bureaucrat capitalism remain to be solved and must be solved. So long as these continue to afflict the people, fascist dictatorship continues to have a basis for reemerging and armed revolution is bound to expand and intensify.

The thrust of my discussion is to suggest to the progressives within the church to increase their ranks, strive to change the pro-

imperialist and reactionary character and tendencies of the institutional church and officialdom and let the entire church become both a spiritual and social instrument for the liberation of the oppressed and exploited people.

There is an ample basis in the teachings of the church, in the tradition of Filipino revolutionary priests and in the example of Catholic religious leaders elsewhere for the religious progressives of today to persuade the bishops, all priests and nuns and the entire laity to take an active part in the just and noble movement to complete the struggle for national freedom and democracy.

Ideologies in the Philippines

Opening Statement in the Dialogue with the World Council of Churches

Task Force on Ideologies, in Geneva, March 2, 1988

I am honored to be given this opportunity to share views and experiences with you regarding ideologies and how these touch the lives of the people.

I appreciate your recognition of the fact that ideologies can serve either the oppression and exploitation of the people or the struggle for their liberation and the transformation of their social life for the better. I appreciate even more your concern to seek the way of greater freedom, justice, peace and development through a study of various ideologies.

Let me make clear at the outset that when I use the term ideology, I simply refer to the study of ideas in general or to a definite system of ideas.

As I have been informed beforehand, I should discuss ideology in the historical and current social context that I know best. This is the Philippine context.

There have been three great ideologies or systems of thought in the Philippines. These are objective idealism, subjective idealism and dialectical materialism.

Objective idealism has come to the Philippines mainly in the form of theology. This is the ideological form of religious belief. It is the system of ideas pertaining to the existence, nature and attributes of God as well as to the relations of God with human and other creatures.

Islam came ahead of Christianity by at least two centuries to what is now southwestern Mindanao. It was brought from neighboring countries by Muslim teachers who followed the trail of Muslim traders. They propagated the faith among the various ethnolinguistic communities now called the Moro nation.

Islam became not only the spiritual light but also the ideological, social and moral guide to the sultanates. It has been a strong rallying point for the Moro people's resistance to Spanish colonialism and other later intrusions, such as those of the US imperialists, the Japanese fascists, and the Manila reactionary government.

At present, the Moro National Liberation Front (MNLF), the Moro Islamic Liberation Front (MILF) and other organizations uphold Islam as the key component in their programs of people's struggle for Moro self-determination. These organizations invoke Islam and muster the religious sentiment to unite the Moro nation.

Christianity came with Spanish colonialism in the sixteenth century to the Philippines. The mercantilist impulse of a manufacturing type of capitalism merged with the religious missionary zeal. The sword and the cross were complementary devices in the subjugation of the Filipino people.

The religious orders were under royal patronage and were obligated to serve Spanish colonialism. They took charge of local administration, amassed wealth and became exceedingly powerful for more than three centuries. A theocratic state prevailed. The theology of colonialism asserted that it was better to put the natives under the rigors of colonialism than to let them remain as heathens or as possible converts of Islam.

The Spanish friars benefited from colonial violence even as they used gentle persuasion to propagate the Catholic faith. The idols of *anito* worship were smashed and burnt. But the missionaries replaced them with a brilliant array of the statues of Christ, Mary and the saints.

It was inevitable for the missionaries to preach about the dignity of the human person and equality in the eyes of God and other high-minded principles and to provide the native priests with the tools of Platonic and Aristotelian conceptualization and argumentation.

Inevitably, after centuries, the secularization movement arose to protest the discrimination against native secular priests and clamor for the assignment of parishes to them as curates. The conflict within the church was so bitter that it led to the frame up and martyrdom of Burgos, Gomez and Zamora—the event of 1872 which incited national sentiment to arise among the people.

As an ideological and institutional force, the Roman Catholic Church—personified by the ubiquitous Spanish friars—was a major participant in the oppression and exploitation of the people. Its vast landholdings and commercial operations, its arbitrary hiking of land rent and fees for religious services and its constant involvement in political and administrative affairs became as detested as the heavy tax burden, the trading monopolies and other impositions of the lay colonial authorities.

Frontal criticisms against the dominant religious institution were first coherently done by the Filipino liberal reformists in the 1880s and then in the strongest terms by the Filipino liberal revolutionaries in the 1890s.

Subjective idealism had seeped into the country in the form of rationalist thought from continental Europe through Masonic lodges as well as in the form of notions of liberal reforms in the wake of the opening of the Philippines to foreign trade with industrial capitalist countries in the 19th century.

But it was in the last two decades of the 19th century that subjective idealism mainly in the full form of bourgeois liberal philosophy—a political philosophy—would become increasingly expressed in the writings of the reformists in the 1880s and the revolutionaries in the 1890s.

The period of liberal enlightenment, the period of intellectual gestation for a liberal revolution, was brief. But the liberal ideology found its social base in a nascent bourgeoisie, essentially intelligentsia and merchant, and was as powerful as it could inspire the just, national and democratic demands of the people who were aroused in the first place by extreme colonial and feudal oppression and exploitation. Thus, the liberal ideology could guide the Philippine Revolution of 1896.

Among the most important objectives of this revolution were: separation from the colonial power and the establishment of an independent republican state, the institution of a bill of rights for the citizens, the break-up of the religious landholdings and the separation of church and state. The institutional church was united with the colonial power in reacting to the revolution. But there were the Filipino priests and the multitudes of Christians who sided with

the revolutionary movement and found no unbridgeable gap between the revolution and their faith. As a matter of fact, they saw themselves as the true Christians fighting for justice and the Spanish religious authorities as malefactors of iniquity.

The intervention of the United States stopped the revolution on its track. Here was a new colonial power, driven by monopoly capitalism or modern imperialism. But it prettified itself with the liberal slogans of individual freedom and the free marketplace of ideas and goods. Bourgeois liberalism was coopted as the colonial and feudal society of the 19th century was transformed into the semifeudal society of the 20th century.

Since then, a certain type of liberalism—conservative and pro-imperialist—has prevailed over the progressive revolutionary liberalism of the heroes of 1896. The US and the local reactionary classes have been able to concede certain liberal reforms within the framework of imperialist domination, the unequal exchange of raw material exports and manufactured imports and the generation of knowledge and skills to serve the semifeudal conditions.

There may be so many species of subjective idealism emanating from the United States and home ground. But to this day, the main manifestation of subjective idealism is the political philosophy of liberalism coupled with the economic philosophy of free enterprise. These ideologies or systems of thought seek to camouflage the reality of foreign and feudal domination.

The ideology of anticommunism which has been whipped up by the United States dishonestly invokes liberalism and Christianity in order to promote imperialist and landlord interests and suppress the national and democratic demands of the people.

Even the fascism of Marcos based on the worst of bureaucratic big comprador-landlord interests and inspired by the very specific ideology of national security would be misrepresented as a liberal democratic revolution and seek to ride on religious sentiment. Seeking to restore the status quo ante 1972, the Aquino regime also touts itself as the champion of liberal democracy and Christianity.

Especially before Pope John XXIII and the Second Vatican Council, the papacy has inveighed against both the ideologies of liberalism and Marxism and against both the social systems of

capitalism and socialism and has proposed Christianity as being above and beyond these as the comprehensive directive force in the lives of the people.

But in fact, the Catholic Church in the Philippines is a major owner of stocks in big comprador firms and retains extensive landholdings and is a vociferous defender of a social system dominated by US monopoly capitalism and the local exploiting classes.

High officials of this dominant church have participated in the campaign to generate anticommunist hysteria and have gone so far as to endorse the vigilante groups and death squads and cover up the barbarities of the US "low intensity" conflict scheme during the Marcos fascist and Aquino regimes.

Catholic schools and mass media propagate not only their religious belief but also the ideas and methods of capitalism. There is an unholy alliance of medievalism and imperialism in the Philippines.

In the Philippines today, there are various anticommunist ideological concoctions using Christianity to justify or obscure imperialist and feudal domination and oppose the national and democratic demands of the people. These ideological concoctions using the emotional appeal of religious prejudice are purveyed by religious dignitaries, the fake Left consisting of the so-called Christian democrats and social democrats, the Opus Dei and the so-called Jesuit Mafia, headed by Father Archie Intengan, Raul Manglapus and Norberto Gonzalez; the upper class and middle class charismatic movements and the lower class fanatical groups.

Let me now turn to dialectical materialism or Marxist philosophy. At least since 1930, which was the year of the first founding of the Communist Party of the Philippines (CPP), this ideology has been propagated in the Philippines. It has found a social base in the modern industrial proletariat that has grown within the semifeudal social context.

Since the reestablishment of the Communist Party of the Philippines in 1968, Marxism has been effectively propagated in an unprecedented way on a nationwide scale in both urban and rural areas. The rapid propagation and application of this ideology on

Philippine conditions are favored by the ever worsening crisis of the domestic social system and that of the world capitalist system; and by the rise of national liberation movements and socialist societies.

Those who adhere to Marxism in the Philippines regard it not as a set of dogmas to be imposed on the people but as a guide to action which can be effective only as it can make a concrete analysis of concrete conditions.

Filipino Marxists are conscious of the fact that there is a disparity between general principles and the specific realities; and the constant need to integrate the two through concrete analysis of realities in varying scales. While a certain position, tasks and methods can be drawn from an analysis at a given time, the ultimate test of correctness in thinking lies in social practice.

It is the analysis of the Communist Party of the Philippines that the social conditions in the Philippines are semicolonial and semifeudal; and that therefore the character of the Philippine revolution at this stage is national democratic and not yet socialist. Defined as the targets of the revolution are US imperialism and such exploiting classes as the comprador big bourgeoisie and the landlord class; and the forces of the revolution are the working class, peasantry, urban petty bourgeoisie and the national bourgeoisie.

The modern industrial proletariat is the most advanced productive and political force and is therefore the leading class in the process of social revolution. But it is a minority class in the Philippines. There is the need for the broad popular unity of all patriotic and progressive classes, sectors, parties, groups and individuals to attain national liberation and democracy.

The popular unity required to win the national democratic revolution will also be required to achieve socialist revolution and construction. It is in connection with building this popular unity to solve mundane social problems that Marxists can have fruitful dialogue and cooperation with Christians and other people who are patriotic and progressive.

There may be different philosophical and theological outlooks and methodologies. But there is a common ground for discussing economic, political, cultural, moral and other problems and deciding to solve them in the interest of the entire people. There are

irreconcilable fundamental and philosophical differences between Marxists and Christians on the first great commandment. But certainly, the Christians can seek to achieve fruitful dialogue and cooperation in connection with the second great commandment.

I am happy to point to the fact that the ever growing Christians for National Liberation (CNL) is a major ecumenical organization within the framework of the National Democratic Front. There are also the various Christians and Christian organizations running the risk of fighting aboveground in defense of the oppressed and exploited people.

All of these patriotic and progressive Christians are keeping to a fine revolutionary tradition that was seen in the old democratic revolution and are making new contributions of great historic significance in the ongoing people's struggle for liberation and development.

Marxists are proud of the fact that their revolutionary theory and their achievements in social practice seek to put together the best of human achievements and are on the high road of civilization. They are open to understanding and learning from past and current ideologies and social systems. They also welcome those who are not Marxists and seek to understand and learn from them.

The Marxists, Christians and progressive liberals can work together to seek scientific explanations for natural and social phenomena, uphold the people's democratic right to assert their sovereignty by any necessary means against national and class oppression and exploitation, promote individual freedom under conditions that there is no foreign or class oppression and exploitation, retain the principle of separation of church and state, foster freedom of thought and belief, push forward land reform and industrial development, and realize a better world of freedom, justice, progress and peace.

I am conscious of the fact that my opening statement is somewhat sweeping. I hope that this can facilitate further discussion not only in large terms but more importantly in concrete terms.

Sophism of the Christian Social Movement

September 4, 1968

[This article is being appended to “Ideologies in the Philippines” by way of showing the initiators of the reactionary sections of the Catholic Church and the tremendous odds that the Christians for National Liberation confronted in the late 1960s and 1970s. The reactionary side of the Catholic Church included not only those who speak and act within the bounds of the ruling social system but also those who pretended to be as progressive socialists but were engaged in sophistry.]

I

Clerical quarters in the Philippines today are trying to strengthen the political influence of the Catholic Church. The cursillo movement, patterned after its Spanish counterpart under the fascist regime of Franco, has been instituted among high government officials and lower government personnel in various departments among the comprador and landed wealthy and the middle class affluent enough to pay the exorbitant fees, and lately at the lower levels of Philippine society through a system of sponsorship. In an attempt to build up its influence among the majority class of the peasantry, the most numerous church has sponsored and launched the National Rural Development Congress. Correspondingly, the Federation of Free Farmers is engaged in intensified reformist work in some rural areas.

The Catholic Church has always played a big role in Philippine politics since its importation during the Spanish colonial regime. As a matter of fact, it played the dominant role in the dark feudal era of the Philippines. It was only as a result of the Philippine revolution of 1896 that the Catholic Church has taken a more cautious and oftentimes covert participation in Philippine politics. At any rate, it

has always played an active role overshadowed only by the more raucous conduct of the bourgeois parties and politicians.

The Philippine revolution instituted the liberal principle of the separation of church and state but this principle has been circumvented in many ways. At present, under the pretext of fighting communism and taking a competitive position vis-à-vis the Iglesia ni Kristo (INK), the Catholic Church is increasingly taking an open, direct and active role in Philippine politics.

It is in the context of this development that the emergence of a Christian “democratic” movement, now under the name Christian Social Movement, is to be evaluated properly. Current attempts by Raul Manglapus, president of the Christian Social Movement, to introduce this kind of movement reveal the determination of clerical quarters to build up a political party, a Christian socialist party based on the traditional following of the dominant church. As a song goes, the second is like the first. Participate in modern clerical affairs, in the fashion of loving thy neighbors, only to serve old feudal and bourgeois ends. Drum up the utopia of New Jerusalem through pseudo-Left rhetorics, and exorcise the armed “demons” of the revolution!

Christian “socialism” or Christian “democracy” as an ideology had its early beginning in Europe in a period early enough for Marx to be able to classify it as a reactionary feudal socialism in the *Communist Manifesto*. Starting as the views of aristocrats, some clerics and conservative men of politics and letters, it evolved with papal sanction upon the issuance of the encyclical *Rerum Novarum* by Pope Leo XIII in 1891. Further on, this movement was ideologically guided by *Quadragesimo Anno* of Pope Pius XI in 1931. Lately, following closely one after the other, *Mater et Magistra* and *Pacem in Terris* of Pope John XXIII and *Populorum Progressio* of Pope Paul VI came out to adjust further the stand and views of the Catholic Church to the modern world and the political milieu and activities of Christian democratic parties, now sharply in competition with the Left.

The Christian democratic and Christian socialist parties and the papal encyclicals came in the backwash of the advance of scientific socialism advocated by Marx and Engels. Almost half a century after

the publication of the *Communist Manifesto* in 1848, the Vatican begrudgingly accepted the right of trade unionism and firmly condemned the idea of socialism. It would take more than another half a century for Pope John XXIII to accept the term “socialization” but guardedly so as to mean the old-time corporativism or syndicalism of the Catholic Church that Mussolini used to the detriment of the Italian working class. Now, more than half a century after Lenin’s study of imperialism, Pope Paul VI, in *Populorum Progressio*, criticizes “neocolonialism” and the “imperialism of money” and advocates in vague terms the “development” of Asia, Africa and Latin America. It would now appear that the Christian democratic or Christian socialist parties have all the scriptures to endorse their mission of utopian incantations.

It was the late Catholic philosopher Jacques Maritain, however, who provided the overriding integralist neo-Thomist philosophy to guide the activities of Christian democratic or Christian socialist parties in a period marked by the basic ideological struggle between bourgeois ideology and Marxist-Leninist ideology. Christian “democracy” or Christian “socialism” is philosophized as the “third force” in the present struggle between capitalism and socialism. Ascribing atomized individualism to capitalism and “totalitarianism” to Marxist socialism, Christian “democracy” is supposed to uphold the “human person” under theo-philosophic principles and also to work for Christian “socialism” that is neither individualistic nor collectivistic but personal in the Christian sense.

While the Christian “democrats” have ferociously tried to hinder the advance of scientific socialism as a revolutionary movement, it could merely take superficial verbal digs at capitalist society which it utopianly avows to reform structurally from within. In practice, Christian “democrats” are defenders of capitalism against scientific socialism and are utopian and hypocritical neofeudalists with their fundamental religious bias. They speak of peaceful social revolution and they obscure the objective class struggle between the exploiters and the exploited whom they try to reconcile through “communitarianism,” their principle of “distributing wealth” without disturbing the property rights and state power of the exploiting classes.

Using the concept of Christian humanism or universal humanism, the Christian “democrats” wish to take the “intermediate steps” of inspiring the personal Christian “revolution” within every member of the exploiting classes and of the entire society. They wish to inspire the capitalist class to sell shares to the workers and share profits and also the landlord class to agree to the establishment of cooperatives which it can control. They do not wish the exploiting classes to be deprived of the property and political power that they possess. They merely act as agents of the stock exchange and the banks. They wish to overlay class antagonisms with incantations of humanism and love only to preserve the privilege of the oligarchy to commit systematic violence, exploitation and other acts of class hatred against the masses.

Christian “democracy” or Christian “socialism” is one of the worst varieties of unscientific socialism which smacks of feudalism. It is even more impossible than Robert Owen’s and Charles Fourier’s bourgeois concept of personal philanthropy. It has long been exposed for its sophism and reactionary character throughout the world.

After taking some roots in Western Europe and in Latin America in the 1920s, Christian “democracy” is belatedly being peddled by Manglapus and his big comprador-landlord gangmates in contemporary Philippine society. These efforts to propel the Christian “democratic” movement are being made anachronistically at a time that the Christian “democratic” parties of Europe are desperately trying to forestall the impending collapse of capitalism and are being fast isolated by the people.

However, the Christian “democratic” parties in Latin America are being held up as models by Manglapus and his gangmates for the obvious reason that our country, the Philippines, has basically the same semicolonial and semifeudal conditions as the Latin American countries. Also, all these countries have – in common with the Philippines – the Catholic Church as the dominant religious organization. Principally, it is because of the latter reason.

The oft-repeated statement of Manglapus is that there is no ideology and direction in Philippine politics and, by implication, he is providing it with one now. This is a Jesuitical, seemingly true but

dishonest statement. There can be no class society as that of the Philippines which would be lacking in ideology and direction. It is a bourgeois and feudal kind of ideology and direction that have reigned in Philippine politics. Because of our semicolonial and semifeudal conditions and because of the ruthless exercise of reactionary state power to exclude the free operation of any other political party with a truly different ideology, the Nacionalista Party and the Liberal Party, including their special ramifications like the Progressive Party of the Philippines and now the Christian Social Movement, have persisted as the ideological and political tools of those imperialist, comprador and feudal forces that maintain them financially and politically.

What Manglapus obviously means by there being no ideology in Philippine politics is the lack of a political party that is guided by the theo-philosophic principles of Christian "democracy" and comparable in strength to the more established Nacionalista Party and Liberal Party. It is his wish that aside from those big comprador-landlord parties there should be another one in the reactionary political arena, one with the veneer of Christian ideology.

The attempts to build up a Christian "democratic" party or Christian "socialist" party are being made at a time that the reactionary forces in the Philippines fear the breakdown of the present state and the possible rebuilding of the Communist Party of the Philippines as a fighting force. US imperialism and its local lackeys are trying to make direct and open use of the Catholic Church against the people, revolution and communism. In this regard, it is pertinent to recall the role of the Christian "democratic" parties in Western Europe after World War II when the prospect of proletarian seizure of power was undermined by the Marshall Plan, by the internal political operations of the Christian "democratic" parties and by the revisionist errors of old communist parties themselves. It is also relevant to refer to the intensified activities of Christian "democratic" parties in Latin America in line with the Kennedy "Alliance for Progress." The 1965 electoral victory of the Christian "democrats" headed by Eduardo Frei Montalva in Chile is being played up today as an example of seizing the initiative from a "communist" movement.

While Christian “democrats” cover up their essentially anticommunist role by making pretended denunciations of liberal capitalism, they cannot deny that it is their constant practice and goal to serve as a reactionary neutralizing force or roadblock to the advance of a truly progressive and revolutionary movement. In practice, the Christian “democratic” parties have always helped to preserve the reactionary state while squeezing out some special concessions for clerical institutions. May we ask how much social revolution has been effected by the Christian “democratic” parties in Italy, France, Germany, Chile, after political leaders have won the highest seats in the bourgeois government?

II

While the Christian “democratic” movement takes a principally anticommunist and antipeople stand, it tries secondarily to take an antiliberal and anticapitalist stand. In the Philippines, it has as its main task to take an antiliberal stand because of the widely accepted principle of separation of church and state that has been established since the old national democratic revolution of 1896. That the Christian “democratic” movement should engage actively in the political arena stands to threaten this principle of separation of church and state, among others.

It is still fresh in the minds of the people how clerical quarters have struggled to gain the ideological upper hand in public schools through the introduction of religious instruction and through efforts to prevent the passage and then the implementation of the Noli-Fili Law which is a liberal measure. It is through this type of struggle that those who now lead the Christian Social Movement have shown to what extent they are antiliberal. They are antiliberal because they are profeudal in their ideological conviction. However, they cannot be wholly antiliberal because of changes wrought in society by modern imperialism. So, they are the staunchest advocates of “people’s capitalism.” In their attitude towards the land problem, they are not truly antifeudal. They merely wish to forestall an agrarian revolution under proletarian leadership by goading the big landlord class to adopt capitalist methods of production. But there is a great difference between the wishes of the reactionaries and the laws of motion of the present society.

It is hypocritical for Christian “democrats” to say loudly that their party is independent from the Catholic Church and is truly ecumenical. Even if they say that they depend mainly on a “nonconfessional” base and even if actually they take superficial measures to have the ceremonial or supplementary participation of non-Catholics, the fact remains that their obvious and admitted source of support is the traditional following of the Catholic Church. If the integralist philosophy of Jacques Maritain is to be thoroughly realized by them, the re-fusion of church and state, if it were only possible now even through coup d’etat or some other devious ways, is not something that the Christian “democrats” will reject. The Christian “democratic” movement does not make it clear as a matter of principle that the separation of church and state will always be respected; it has only avowed the pluralism of intermediate organizations. There is no guarantee that pluralism will be unilaterally tolerated because of the sectarian conviction that a single theo-philosophy is to be followed for “freedom” to exist. The motivation and historical circumstances of the Christian “democratic” movement must be grasped in this regard.

While world and Philippine historical circumstances now make it difficult for a re-fusion of church and state, attempts to achieve it are calculated to exercise a regressive effect on the national democratic movement. Obscurantism and bigotry of the feudal type can no longer be as brazenly dominant as during the Spanish colonial-feudal era. Though they interrupted the revolution of 1896, the US imperialists have conceded the old national democratic principle of breaking up the theocratic unity of church and state. But certainly, the church has worked out and can still work out certain sinister combinations with US imperialism to preserve the present semicolonial and semifeudal conditions as the base for a feudal and imperialist culture.

However, an anticlerical tradition has arisen in the Philippines in line with the old world liberal revolution and the revolution of 1896, precisely because of the institutional abuses of the ideological and material powers of the church. The *frailies* of the Spanish colonial era were powerful at the very autocratic core of the feudal state and at every center of the colonial regime. They owned wide expanses of

landed estates, they collected taxes and donations, engaged in usury and managed and restricted the lives of communities in the manner that provoked sporadic uprisings among our people until the national revolution of 1896 came.

Since property relations in the Philippines have not changed with the coming of US imperialism, the material power of the church has remained intact after the defeat of the Philippine revolution of 1896. It has merely come into combination with US imperialism. The Catholic Church and those political leaders who have taken advantage of the customary flock of the Church have acted as a social force within Philippine society to help preserve the unjust property relations that favor the big bourgeoisie and the landlord class. The feudal ideology has been the handmaiden to imperialist ideology on the material basis of a combined imperialist and feudal exploitation of the Filipino people.

The advocates of Christian “democracy” or Christian “socialism” have often declared their modern nontraditional character and their independence from the Catholic Church as a traditional force. But why don’t we investigate the material underpinnings of their incumbent political influence and of what is to become their political power? The Christian “democrats” make much out of their avowals of Christian cleanliness and purity in a “holier-than-thou” fashion. But an analysis of their social position would certainly reveal that they are bound by the present social system which they wish to reform internally.

There is a great deal of deviousness on the part of politicians like Raul Manglapus who have long engaged in bourgeois politics to embark on a movement of sorts under the smokescreen of a “revolutionary” Christianity and to build a political following on the actual basis of the traditional clerical following. This is an attempt to take advantage of the semifeudal base in the country and the traditional pietism in the superstructure only to buttress the semicolonial and semifeudal arrangement prevailing. The Christian “democrats” wish to exploit the religiosity of the Knights of Columbus, the devout, Catholic school students, the superstitious among the populace and electors disgusted with the other

reactionary and bigger parties like the Nacionalista Party (NP) and the Liberal Party (LP).

In his career as a politician, Manglapus in seeming acts of radicalism and with a great deal of phrasemongering about “social revolution,” “revolt against tradition” and “faith in the Filipino people” has talked of the bankruptcy of the two most established reactionary political parties and the need for a third alternative party. Nevertheless, as a third party experiment, his Progressive Party of the Philippines did not at all provide a political program radically different from those of the NP and the LP. On the other hand, the circle associated with the Progressive Party of the Philippines has always exposed its true class character by its coterie of financial supporters and by its shifting collaborations with the two most established reactionary political parties.

Raul Manglapus himself is in reality an epitome of bourgeois reactionary politics. In contravention of his own pronouncements, he violated the constitutional prohibition against electoral overspending and was found out to have done so by the Electoral Tribunal. This is the political dishonesty that is most widely recognized in the Philippines. By this time, the superficial glow of the Christian crusader should be wearing off Manglapus.

Manglapus has never yet made any fundamental criticism of the present social system or of the forces of US imperialism and feudalism. He has merely criticized the “lack of ideology” among the other established political parties and what he calls the “neocolonial” role of the government.

What he means, however, by the “neocolonial” role of the present government is that there is supposed to be an overconcentration of powers in the central national government. Thus, he calls for “decentralization” in line with the accepted Christian “democratic” program of government.

Talking of centralization and decentralization of governmental power without reference to US imperialism and the domestic classes that actually wield both economic and political power is a lot of nonsense. The national bureaucrats of Malacanang are not powerful by themselves, by the sheer perversity of law or by their own personal wishes. They are powerful only to the extent that they are

the chief representatives or political agents of the imperialists, the big compradors and the landlords in the Philippines. Manglapus has never uttered any objection to the highest bureaucrats for being mere servitors of US imperialism and the local exploiting classes. His attacks against "centralization per se" is nonsensical and reactionary because he does not question the real central power, the class dictatorship put up by the foreign monopolies, the big compradors and the landlords. He obscures the fact that it requires both centralized and widespread powers of the masses to break up the central dominance of the exploiting classes. Manglapus is seriously concerned with the centralization of government but not with the centralization of the Catholic Church. He is thoroughly consistent with the Christian "democratic" principle of "autonomism," which is wishfully calculated to weaken the secular institutions so as to strengthen the centralized clerical institutions on the most parochial basis, including sectarian schools and other sectarian business enterprises which enjoy the constitutional class benefits of "charitable and religious" organizations.

That Manglapus advocates "free enterprise" means that he obscures the reality of foreign monopolies; he also obscures the actual central power of the foreign monopolies, the comprador bourgeoisie and the landlord class behind the Philippine government. Even when he declaims against the excesses of liberal capitalism, his real purpose is to obscure the reality of monopoly capitalism. He is so much unlike some Christian "democratic" leaders in Latin America who make more pretense in calling for a "nationalist" economic development. In the case of Manglapus, there is less of such pretense so that he belongs to the "right of center" even within the verbal range of Christian "democracy," a rightist ideology.

Being an advocate of "free enterprise," especially during the time of his collaboration with Macapagal, Manglapus does not violate the Christian "democratic" economic program of "economic humanism."

"Economic humanism" recognizes private property as its key ingredient and "base of the new responsibility in the new era." This is affirmed by the local Christian "democrats."

Christian “democracy” envisions distribution of wealth through what it calls “communitarianism” in urban enterprises and “cooperativism” in land without violating the right of private property of foreign monopolies, compradors and landlords. This is utterly ridiculous. Concentration of wealth, if they are not broken by a social revolution entailing the replacement of reactionary state power, will remain as they are, ever accumulating. By its long record of pronouncements and actions, Christian “democracy” has fundamentally stuck to the line of private property being the key ingredient of its “economic humanism.”

“People’s capitalism” which Manglapus, an urban landlord, and Dr. Salvador Araneta, a strikebreaker, have been battling for is perfectly in line with the Christian “democratic” principle of private property and “communitarianism.” “People’s capitalism” is supposed to make every worker a “capitalist,” a co-owner of the enterprise, through the process of selling petty shares to the workers and profit-sharing. But can a big mass of small shareholders become capitalists if they hardly have enough to live on unlike the real capitalists who live high on their dividends? In the Philippines where the workers do not have much personal savings and generally live in squalor, how can they assume the status of capitalists? Is “people’s capitalism” not a nasty device of capitalists for directly getting the savings of workers, instead of borrowing from banks at a certain interest rate?

Is this not a form of taxation conducted directly by the capitalists on the masses of workers? Is this not creating the legal fiction that workers are no longer workers but capitalists who are no longer entitled to their democratic right to strike against their “own” enterprise? Was it not the Church-supported corporativism and syndicalism of Mussolini that deprived the Italian workers of their democratic rights? Have the Aranetas found more justification from Christian “democracy,” “communitarianism” and “people’s capitalism” to give low wages, bust unions in their enterprises and raid the state’s financing institutions in the name of the workers as has been their well-known wont? Manglapus and his Christian humanist supporters seem not to recognize the nature of capitalism, that private capital can never be distributed evenly but is always

accumulating in the hands of the few, that among capitalists themselves there is cutthroat competition and monopolization and that between capitalist and working class there is exploitation and class antagonism.

If workers were to give percentages of their wage directly to the capitalists, the well-entrenched capitalists would have increased finances to manipulate bigger business empires with less investments of their own. It is already bad enough that finance capitalism has already developed through the manipulation of banks controlled by a few who maintain business empires. The modern corporate structure, which is benefited by the selling of shares to a big mass of people, easily enables a few real capitalists to control an entire firm or business empire by merely controlling 10 percent of either.

In battling for a land reform program of the type of the Agricultural Land Reform Code, Manglapus is in line with the Christian “democratic” principle of “cooperativism.” This code word provides all the loopholes for landlords to save their own class. These loopholes include the area-by-area proclamation of leasehold system; the uncertain opportunities for land expropriation; “just compensation” for landlords; the establishment of cooperatives with open chances for landlords, rich peasants and the banks to control them; the landlords adopting capitalist methods; the priority purchase of idle and less economic lands from landlords; and the sheer political, financial and technical refusal and inability of the reactionary government to make a genuine land reform program.

If the original demand of Manglapus to require the high interest rate of 12 percent on loans taken from the Agricultural Credit Administration were enacted, the right of landlords to hold their private property in land would be far more secure than they are now as secure as before the enactment of the bourgeois land reform code because they would be the ones who can most easily pay the high interest charges. The most important gain that Manglapus and his ilk have gotten from the present type of government land reform code is that they have already quite succeeded in fooling a big number of so-called peasant leaders and peasant organizations.

If landlord power, like imperialist and comprador power, is not broken, the base for depriving and exploiting the masses of the people will continue to exist. “Communitarian profit-sharing” will only be used to support the big bourgeoisie and “cooperativism” in land will only result in the national preservation of the landlord class.

The imperialist presence of the United States in the Philippines is both a domestic and foreign policy matter. It so affects basic national reality and policies that none should wonder why the youth and the masses today are fast rising against it. But what do Christian “democrats” in Latin America and those represented by Manglapus think?

Eduardo Frei Montalva, the notorious spokesman and chieftain of Christian “democracy” in Latin America, says that cooperation with the United States is “fundamental” for the “economic development and future prosperity” of Latin America as well as for the “wellbeing of its peasant, industrial and mining masses.” He warns that those who encourage “hatred” between North America and Latin America are sacrificing the people. In his seat of power, Frei Montalva is today suppressing the masses of workers, peasants and students because they dare to fight resolutely against US imperialism and the landlords. He covers up his own class hatred by speaking loud about the class hatred of the oppressed.

Raul Manglapus acts in the shadow of the Christian “democrats” of Latin America. He also makes no clear and basic opposition to US imperialism. He and his disciples declare themselves merely against free and preferential trade. They take the reactionary side on the question of parity rights (the Parity Amendment in the Philippine Constitution and the Laurel-Langley Agreement); the US-RP Military Bases Treaty; the US-RP Mutual Defense Pact; the US-RP Military Assistance Pact; the presence of US monopolies and their superprofits; the US war of aggression in Vietnam and elsewhere; and so many other issues that have been agitating the masses of the people and youth of this land.

III

In our study of Christian “democracy” or Christian “socialism” which is the fountainhead of Raul Manglapus’ “revolutionary” rhetorics, we have found its political and economic “programs” to be

more of exorcism against the “evils of communism and collectivization” than programs of social revolution and its actions to be basically in defense of the class dictatorship and property rights of the imperialists, compradors and landlords and the special privileges of the Catholic Church. There is a great deal of expressed good intentions and cosmic generalizations about man and faith in the statements of Christian “democrats.” This would have been less begrudged, because of their patent falsehood, but the Christian “democrats” would even go so far as to use the dishonest Jesuitical trick of borrowing phrases from the Left to attack the Left.

Christian “democracy” or Christian “socialism” offers no clear analysis of the material conditions that obtain in a semicolonial and semifeudal country like the Philippines. Manglapus, like his fellow Christian “democrats” everywhere, puts “moral questions” above the material in his idealist and unscientific approach to the problems of society. This approach cannot grasp the laws of motion of matter in nature and society. This approach cannot arrive at what it takes to transform a social system on the basis of class conflicts between the exploiters and the exploited. It would rather wait for every individual in the exploiting classes and in the entire society to make individual and internal “revolution.” It shuns philosophically the truth that social formations have leaped from one lower stage to a higher stage precisely because of class struggle and class ideology, without the intervention of any divine will or any incantation of Christian humanism. The Christian “democratic” idea of “social revolution” is actually indefinite evolution within the semicolonial and semifeudal social system. By its rigid commitment to peaceful change, it is actually committed to the indefinite preservation of the status quo and to the prevention of genuine social revolution.

We propose a political movement with no religious bias, Christian or otherwise. We call for the correct political movement, a national democratic movement of a new type different from the old one of 1896 because it is under the leadership of the working class. Because this national democratic movement that we propose is under proletarian leadership, its revolutionary accomplishment leads on to a socialist revolution.

At this moment, we must firmly grasp the truth that the joint puppet dictatorship of the exploiting classes of big compradors and landlords under US imperialism must be replaced by the united front dictatorship of the proletariat, peasantry, urban petty bourgeoisie and national bourgeoisie.

Instead of Christian “socialism,” we must first carry out the new-democratic revolution in the direction of scientific socialism within the framework of the world anti-imperialist and proletarian revolution. We must take advantage of all the political advances in this world revolution as the conditions for the accomplishment of our immediate tasks of national democratic revolution in our semicolonial and semifeudal society.

We must apply the universal truth of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought in the concrete practice of the Philippine revolution. We must comprehend scientifically the present stage of our national history and our present world historical context. There lies the best possibility for social revolution. Therein we see the irrepressible advance of the working class and its genuine party, together with the semiproletariat and petty bourgeoisie, against the forces of US imperialism and its domestic cohorts, the comprador bourgeoisie and the landlord class.

Only by an investigation of our material conditions can we determine scientifically what are our problems and also the means by which we can solve them effectively. It is futile to be prating constantly about the “original sin” and all the personal wrongs that “man” has been committing as the Christian “democrats” would prefer to do. Let us consider the irreconcilable contention of classes that make a class society such as ours so dynamic and so predisposed to social revolution.

Social revolution will never occur through wishful thinking, praying or declaiming for the Christian humanism of every person, unless the concrete conditions of Philippine society are analyzed correctly for the purpose of social revolution. Neither can social revolution be achieved by solely or mainly restricting oneself or one’s party or movement to peaceful change within the exploiting society through such measures as “communitarianism” and “cooperativism,”

which merely reinforce the political and economic power of the foreign monopolies, big compradors and landlords.

Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought as Guide to the Philippine Revolution

**Contribution to the International Seminar on Mao Zedong
Thought, November 6-7, 1993**

Proletarian revolutionary cadres reestablished the Communist Party of the Philippines on December 26, 1968 and proclaimed Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought as their theoretical guide. The CPP armed itself with the most powerful ideological weapon of the world's proletariat for analyzing the revolutionary history and circumstances of the Filipino people, for resuming the new-democratic revolution through people's war and for looking forward to the socialist future up to the threshold of communism. Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought is the microscope and telescope of the Philippine revolution.

After the crushing defeat of the revolutionary movement in 1950 and for nearly a decade afterwards, the revolutionary road had been enveloped in darkness both by the power of US imperialism and the local exploiting classes of big compradors and landlords and by a long chain of unrectified grave errors and shortcomings. Were it not for the adoption of Mao Zedong Thought as its theoretical guide, the Communist Party of the Philippines could not have been reestablished and the revolutionary movement of the Filipino proletariat and people could not have been resumed. Mao Zedong Thought served to illumine the road of armed revolution.

The great victory of the Chinese revolution in 1949 breached the imperialist front in the East in a big way and resounded in the Philippines. But this was also the time that the revolutionary forces were being brought to destruction by the Left opportunist Jose Lava leadership of the old merger party of the Communist Party and the Socialist Party. What followed the defeat of the revolution in 1950

was a decade of intense reaction, made more acute by the Cold War and McCarthyism.

In the period of defeat, the Jesus Lava leadership of the old CP-SP merger party swung to a Right opportunist line and the followers of this line continued to be influenced by the Browderite line of "peace and democracy" and were further influenced by the rise of Khrushchovite modern revisionism. The proletarian revolutionary cadres therefore faced tremendous odds in striving to continue the unfinished Philippine revolution along the new-democratic line.

The works of Comrade Mao Zedong were scarce in the Philippines before the decade of the 1960s. As early as the late 1930's and during World War II, some of his works on the united front and armed struggle were already available to the comrades in the Chinese bureau in the Philippines. But these remained in the Chinese original. It would be through the efforts of the proletarian revolutionary cadres themselves that the works of Comrade Mao Zedong became readily available, with the assistance of Indonesian and Chinese comrades, at the time of the Great Leap Forward and subsequently the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution.

The Filipino communists necessarily read and studied the works of Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin and Mao. They recognized that the teachings of Mao proceeded from the basic principles laid down by his great predecessors and were a further development of the revolutionary theory of the proletariat in the particular conditions of China as well as the world. They also recognized in 1966 that the stage of Mao Zedong Thought could be reached because of the earlier stages of Marxism and Leninism.

Marx and Engels laid the theoretical foundation of Marxism by putting forward for the first time the basic principles of dialectical materialism; the critique of capitalist political economy; and scientific socialism in the era of free competition capitalism. Lenin further developed the three components of Marxism in confrontation with the bourgeois subjectivists and classical revisionists and together with Stalin realized the stage of Leninism through the establishment of the Soviet Union as a proletarian dictatorship and through the sustained process of socialist revolution and construction until the

emergence of several socialist countries in the era of modern imperialism and socialist revolution.

Mao Zedong Thought emerged as the third stage in the development of Marxism when Mao confronted the problem of modern revisionism and capitalist restoration already evident in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe as well as in the manifestation of the same problem in China. He put forward the theory of continuing revolution under proletarian dictatorship in order to consolidate socialism, combat modern revisionism and prevent the restoration of capitalism and successfully put the theory into practice for the first time, from 1966 to 1976.

But the teachings of Mao pertaining to the new-democratic revolution had the most powerful immediate influence on the Filipino proletarian revolutionaries for the simple reason that those teachings had a strong relevance to the social conditions in the Philippines and showed the way to make the new-democratic and socialist stages of the Philippine revolution. Further on, Mao Zedong Thought provides the theory and practice of continuing revolution under proletarian dictatorship until it becomes possible to defeat imperialism and attain communism on a global scale. Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought is the most comprehensive and profound guide of the Filipino proletarian revolutionaries, the reestablished Communist Party of the Philippines and the Philippine revolution with regard to the analysis of Philippine history and society; the first great rectification movement from 1967 to 1969; the reestablishment of the Communist Party of the Philippines; the revolutionary struggle from 1968 to 1980; the revolutionary struggle from 1980 to 1991; the second great rectification movement from 1992 onward; the Philippine revolution in the new world situation; and the socialist and communist future of the Filipino people.

1. The Analysis of Philippine History and Society

In 1959, a few young men and women, independent of the old merger party of the Communist and Socialist Parties, started forming study circles to read and study the works of Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin and Mao Zedong that could be gotten from secret collections. They initially did so amidst the open and legal studies about the problems of national independence and democracy. The Marxist-

Leninist works that they read included the *Communist Manifesto*, *Socialism: Utopian and Scientific*, *Wages, Prices and Profit*, *The Three Sources and Three Component Parts of Marxism*, *Imperialism: The Highest Stage of Capitalism*, *Two Tactics of Social Democracy*, *State and Revolution*, *The Foundations of Leninism*, the *Analysis of Classes in Chinese Society* and *Talks at the Yanan Forum on Art and Literature*.

The most avid students of Marxism-Leninism read and studied *Das Kapital*, *The Dialectics of Nature*, *Materialism and Empirio-Criticism*, *History of the CPSU (Bolsheviks)*, *Short Course*; the first edition of the Soviet-published *Fundamentals of Marxism-Leninism* and the *Selected Works of Mao Zedong*. The volumes of the selected works of the great communists began to reach the Philippines in 1962. To get hold of Marxist reading materials in the period of 1959-62 was by itself an achievement in view of the anticommunist hysteria and repressive measures since the end of World War II.

The objective of the beginners in the study of Marxism-Leninism was to seek solutions to what they perceived as the fundamental problems of the Filipino people, use Marxism-Leninism to shed light on the history and concrete circumstances of the Filipino people and find ways to resume the Philippine revolution and carry it out until victory. In the study of Marxism-Leninism, with special reference to the Philippine revolution, they sought to grasp the three components of Marxism, which are materialist philosophy, political economy and scientific socialism as laid down by Marx and Engels, developed by Lenin and Stalin and further developed by Mao Zedong.

The beginners in the study of proletarian revolutionary theory were exceedingly receptive to Mao's teachings because of their proven correctness and success in so vast a country neighboring the Philippines and their recognized applicability to the to the Philippines. The most read works of Mao Zedong were *On Contradiction*, *On Practice*, the *Analysis of the Classes in Chinese Society*, *The Role of the Chinese Communist Party in the National War*, *Problems of Strategy in Guerrilla War Against Japan*, *On Protracted People's War* and *On New Democracy*.

In the light of Mao's teachings, the Filipino proletarian revolutionaries could define clearly the periods of Philippine history; the precolonial communities until the 16th century; the colonial and feudal society until the end of Spanish colonialism; the colonial and semifeudal society under US imperialism until 1946; and the semicolonial and semifeudal society which has continued to this day since 1946.

The semicolonial and semifeudal character of present-day Philippine society is basically similar to that of China before the 1949. This is a society ruled by the joint class dictatorship of the comprador big bourgeoisie and the landlord class, which are subservient to the foreign monopoly bourgeoisie. The basic oppressed classes are the working class and the peasantry, which in the main produce the surplus product appropriated by the basic exploiting classes. The intermediate social strata are the urban petty bourgeoisie and the middle or national bourgeoisie.

The social economy is mainly agrarian, semifeudal and preindustrial. There is some import-dependent manufacturing undertaken by the imperialists and the big compradors but there are no basic industries producing basic metals, basic chemicals, machine tools and precision instruments to qualify the Philippines as a "newly industrializing country". The economy is principally dependent on agricultural production for domestic staples and exports; and secondarily on the production of raw minerals for export. Even today, import-dependent and low value-added manufacturing for reexport is a showy but negligible part of the economy, providing little or no net income for the country because of transfer-pricing.

Correspondent to the semicolonial and semifeudal character of Philippine society, a national democratic revolution is required in order to liberate the Filipino people from foreign and feudal domination. It is a democratic revolution of a new type because it is no longer led by the bourgeoisie but by the proletariat in the historical context of modern imperialism and proletarian revolution or the world proletarian-socialist revolution; and it can proceed from the democratic revolution to the socialist revolution under the class leadership of the proletariat.

The motive forces of the revolution are the working class comprising about 15 percent of the population; the peasantry, at least 75 percent; the urban petty bourgeoisie, about 8 percent; and the middle bourgeoisie, about one percent. These are the motive forces of the revolution fighting to overthrow such class enemies as the comprador big bourgeoisie and the landlord class that comprise fractions of one percent of the population.

The working class is the leading class because it is the most advanced productive and political force. For this class to carry out its historic mission, it must have an advanced detachment such as the Communist Party of the Philippines, armed with the revolutionary theory of the proletariat and pursuing the general political line that can arouse, organize and mobilize the broad masses of the people against the enemies of national and social liberation.

The proletariat through the Party overcomes its being a minority in the population and draws the overwhelming majority of the people to the revolutionary cause by linking up with the peasant masses in order to develop them as the main force of the revolution and form the basic worker-peasant alliance encompassing at least 90 percent of the people. The proletarian revolutionary cadres deployed in the countryside rely mainly on the poor peasants, lower-middle peasants and farm workers, win over the middle peasants and neutralize the rich peasants, take advantage of the splits between the enlightened and despotic landlords in order to isolate and destroy the power of the latter.

In pursuing the antifeudal class line, the proletarian revolutionary cadres and the peasant masses must fulfill the main content of the new-democratic revolution, namely the solution of the land problem. To do so, they have to carry out revolutionary armed struggle, land reform and massbase building as integral components of the protracted people's war in the new-democratic revolution.

The semicolonial and semifeudal society is in chronic crisis. On the basis of this concrete fact, the armed revolution can and must be waged. The peasant masses are an inexhaustible source of support for the people's war led by the proletariat through its advanced detachment, the Communist Party. The countryside provides the revolutionary forces with a vast field of maneuver for its growth in

stages and accumulation of strength until it becomes possible to seize the cities. Even while the enemy is still well entrenched in the cities, Red political power can be built in the countryside.

The urban petty bourgeoisie is a smaller minority of the population than the proletariat. But this stratum of the bourgeoisie is highly instrumental in assisting the exploiting classes to rule society. It is highly influential in society. It is therefore absolutely necessary to win over sections if not the entirety of it in order to tilt the balance in favor of the revolutionary movement. The urban petty bourgeoisie is relatively the most exploited stratum of the bourgeoisie. In going over to the side of the revolution, it can become a basic force of the revolution.

The middle or national bourgeoisie is another bourgeois stratum, far thinner than the urban petty bourgeoisie. It is economically and politically weak, particularly in the Philippines, due to the lack of basic industries. It has a dual character. In pursuit of its legitimate but selfish interests, it is capable of opposing imperialism and feudalism. But at the same time, it participates in the exploitation of the working classes, wishes to gain power for itself and distrusts the masses. However, it can still be induced to become a positive force of the revolution, if the proletariat through the Communist Party of the Philippines has, in the first place, successfully built the basic worker-peasant alliance and, in the second place, won over the urban petty bourgeoisie.

It is also part of the revolutionary class line in the armed struggle and the united front to take advantage of the splits among the factions of the reactionary classes of the big compradors and landlords. The internal contradictions of the exploiting classes weaken their class rule and indirectly aid the advance of the revolutionary movement. When internecine conflicts arise among the reactionaries, it becomes possible to further isolate and range the widest array of forces against the ruling clique, which is usually the most reactionary and the most subservient to the foreign monopoly capitalists.

In the simplest of terms, the program of the new-democratic revolution is to overthrow foreign and feudal domination and to effect national liberation and democracy. Upon the nationwide seizure of

political power, the new-democratic revolution is basically completed and the socialist revolution can begin. We therefore speak of two stages in the ongoing Philippine revolution: national democratic and socialist. These are continuous but distinct stages.

In the course of winning power through the new-democratic revolution, the prerequisites for subsequently making socialist revolution are prepared and developed. The state that arises after the nationwide seizure of political power takes the form of people's democracy which is founded on the basic worker-peasant alliance. But the new state is under the leadership of the proletariat and at its core is the proletarian dictatorship.

The capital and landed assets of the imperialists and the local reactionary classes are nationalized or put into the public sector. All strategic enterprises, main sources of raw materials and main 6 lines of distribution are likewise put into the public sector or placed under state ownership. The agrarian revolution is completed and cooperativization is carried out in stages. Socialist industries are built and socialist education is carried out. Concessions are extended to the petty bourgeoisie and the middle bourgeoisie for a certain time but the consistent and relentless objective is to realize the socialist transformation.

In most of the 1960's the proletarian revolutionary cadres learnt the principles of the new democratic revolution from the teachings and successful experience of the Chinese revolution led by Comrade Mao Zedong. These encompass the character of Philippine society and the current stage of the revolution, the motive forces and targets, the tasks, and the socialist perspective of the revolution.

II. The Gestation of the Communist Party of the Philippines, 1959-68

It is quite easy for anyone with a high degree of book learning to read Marxist-Leninist works; but to absorb the revolutionary ideas and apply them on the concrete conditions of the Philippines is another matter. The proletarian revolutionary cadres who studied Marxist-Leninist works sought from the very beginning to initiate the revolutionary mass movement. They knew that it was the only way that the revolutionary ideas could become a material force in the Philippines.

The period of 1959-68 may be described as that of rekindling the anti-imperialist and antifeudal mass movement and gestating a new communist party. These had been destroyed in the 1950s. In the absence of the revolutionary mass movement, the US imperialists and the local reactionaries were unchallenged in promoting all sorts of organizations to preempt its resurgence.

The single event that broke the long period of reaction and began to inspire the resurgence of the mass movement was the demonstration of 5000 students, mostly from the state university, to oppose and stop the anticommunist witchhunt in 1961. The witchhunt was an attempt to enforce the Anti-Subversion Law which had been enacted in 1957 to threaten with the death penalty anyone who dared to propagate Marxism-Leninism and resume any communist activity. Ironically, the law challenged and incited the youth to rise up in protest and to take interest in what would emerge as the national democratic movement.

The young proletarian revolutionaries initiated the mass protest action, without direction from the underground remnant of the old merger CP-SP party. Following their success, they expanded their study and organizing activities from the University of the Philippines to other Manila universities and proceeded to take leadership over student governments and campus publications. While openly promoting the general line of the national democratic revolution they also secretly organized Marxist-Leninist study groups.

Taking notice of the militant progressive movement and the initial efforts of the youth militants to link up with the progressive workers' and peasants' organizations, the general secretary of the CP-SP merger party, Jesus Lava, invited the representative of the youth militants and the representative of the progressive trade unions to become members of the old CP-SP merger party and also to become members of its executive committee in late 1962. Following the Lava dynastic tradition, he also appointed to the five-person committee two of his nephews who were not at all linked to any kind of mass movement.

The young proletarian revolutionaries linked up in earnest with the veteran cadres and masses in the progressive trade unions and peasant associations. The mass movement of the youth, the workers

and peasants, grew steadily. The Kabataang Makabayan was formed in 1964 as a comprehensive mass organization of students, young workers, young peasants and young professionals. Two legal labor federations and several unions became militated under the banner of the Lapiang Manggagawa (Workers' Party) in 1963 (renamed Socialist Party in 1964). The peasant movement reemerged under the name of Malayang Samahan ng Magsasaka (MASAKA) in 1963.

The young proletarian revolutionary cadres were the most active in promoting the study of the works of Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin and Mao and in creating Party groups within the mass organizations and Party branches in localities to serve as the revolutionary core of the mass movement. They were also the most militant in launching workers' strikes and mass actions to expose and oppose the antinational and antidemocratic policies of the reactionary government.

The *Progressive Review* started to be published in 1963 and had a circulation of only 1000 to 2000 copies; but it was the most important periodical in clarifying economic, political and cultural issues along the national democratic line. As separate speeches in pamphlet form or in the 1967 book form, *Struggle for National Democracy*, using the Marxist-Leninist stand, viewpoint and method, became the most important material for propagating the national democratic line. Also of great significance in reflecting the mass struggles in the 1960s were the leaflets and pamphlets issued for various mass actions. A compilation of these will show comprehensively the march of progressive events along the national democratic line.

Despite the estrangement of the Lava clique in the old CP-SP merger party from the remnants of the people's army that disobeyed Jesus Lava's 1955 policy of liquidating the people's army, the young proletarian revolutionaries developed relations with the cadres and commanders of the remnant people's army by supplying them with revolutionary propaganda and with Marxist-Leninist works, especially of Comrade Mao Zedong. The strongest Kabataang Makabayan chapters outside Manila in the 1960s were in Central Luzon. Thus, it was possible for the young proletarian revolutionaries to keep in

touch with the remnants of the people's army, despite the Lavas' aversion to them.

In the old merger party, the young proletarian revolutionary cadres who studied and acted according to the teachings of Comrade Mao Zedong succeeded in taking the ideological, political and organizational initiative. They created Party branches and caused the revolutionary mass movement to resurge. For a time, the scions of the Lava dynasty pretended to go along with the revolutionary line. But in December 1965, inner Party struggle began to simmer over fundamental issues when the representative of the young proletarian cadres presented the general report which the executive committee had assigned him to draft.

The general report appropriately sought to present and analyze the history of the old merger party and to explain the major errors and shortcomings that had led to the debacle of the revolutionary movement in the 1950s. Its main thrust was to rectify the serious errors and shortcomings and point to the necessity of resuming the armed revolution. Although the report was openly and honestly presented in accordance with the assignment, the scions of the Lava dynasty reacted bitterly and one of them made a motion to make the report a mere memorandum supposedly to assist him in making a new draft which he would never do. And worse, he proceeded to spread intrigues against the drafter of the report and against the revolutionary line.

The inner-Party struggle revolved around the issues of Lavaite subjectivism and opportunism, and Soviet-centered modern revisionism. Inspired by the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution, the proletarian revolutionary cadres held their ground even more firmly and upheld the line of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought. It became inevitable that in April-May 1967 the proletarian revolutionary cadres decided to leave the old CP-SP merger party and to start preparing for the reestablishment of the Communist Party of the Philippines under the theoretical guidance of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought.

At this juncture, it is helpful to review certain points in the history of the original Communist Party which was established in 1930 and which became the CP-SP merger party in 1938. The reestablished

CPP highly respects Comrade Crisanto Evangelista, the founder of the original CPP. He was the most formidable leader of the trade union movement in his time. Credit must be accorded to him for having had the wisdom and courage to pioneer the formation of the revolutionary party of the proletariat and for seeking to integrate the theory and practice of Marxism-Leninism with concrete Philippine conditions.

However, he had limited opportunities and therefore limited achievements in building the CPP ideologically, politically and organizationally. Soon after its establishment, the Party was outlawed and came under severe repression. Evangelista wrote propaganda about the class struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie in general terms, about the factories as command posts of the revolution, and about the "communist paradise" to come but he was not able to define clearly the line of the new-democratic revolution and to build a nationwide revolutionary party of the proletariat. He tended to concede that the struggle for national independence was already being satisfied by the decolonization process being undertaken by the US and the local reactionaries. He saw the peasant struggle as a struggle for reforms but did not yet see the peasant masses as the main force for carrying out a new-democratic revolution through people's war under the leadership of the proletariat.

In 1935, the underground Communist Party was joined by Dr. Vicente Lava who had learned his Marxism from the Browderite Communist Party of the USA. He eventually became the leader of the second line of leadership which was supposed to replace the first line led by Crisanto Evangelista in case this would be wiped out by the enemy. The notion that the struggle for national liberation could be accomplished through parliamentary struggle was reinforced. So was the notion that the struggle for democracy was one of demanding civil liberties and had nothing or little to do with the substantive democratic question of land.

In 1937, the CPP was legalized, as a result of domestic and international calls by communist and bourgeois-democratic forces for a Popular Front against fascism and also as a result of the pretense of the Commonwealth government for a program of social justice

amidst the grave economic crisis generated by the Great Depression. The CPUSA played a key role in pressing for the legalization of the CPP and the release of its leaders from domestic exile. In 1938, the CPP merged with the Socialist Party of the Philippines, which had arisen in 1932 and had continuously remained legal, essentially as an agrarian party. This merger was fraught with problems as it automatically incorporated into the CPP so many peasant militants who had not undergone any study of Marxism-Leninism.

The CP-SP leaders who constituted the first line of leadership were all arrested by the Japanese fascists in Manila in February 1942. They suffered martyrdom after refusing to call on Party members to capitulate to and register with the enemy. Thus, Vicente Lava, the first of a series of three brothers who became general secretaries, assumed the position of general secretary in March 1942.

He conceived of the Barrio United Defense Corps and presided over the formation of the People's Army against Japan (Hukbong Bayan Laban sa Hapon) on March 29, 1942. But Vicente Lava was basically a Right opportunist. After the Japanese military onslaught on Mt. Arayat in whose vicinity the squadrons (companies) of the people's army were concentrated, he pursued the "retreat-for-defense" policy, which concretely meant the excessive fragmentation of the Huk squadrons into small teams of three to five armed members and merely echoed the "wait-and-see" policy dictated by the United States on pro-US Filipino guerrillas to serve merely as the eyes and ears of the US military intelligence and not to actively wage armed struggle far ahead of the return of the US military forces.

Until September 1944, the most successful fighting Huk units were the platoons that disobeyed the "retreat-for-defense" policy. The Central Committee of the CP-SP merger party corrected this wrong policy but only when the US military forces were about to land in the Philippines. The Huk squadrons were re-formed to take advantage of the retreat of the Japanese troops to the mountain provinces of Northern Luzon and to seize power at the municipal and provincial levels in Central Luzon just before the arrival of the US troops. Lava admitted his error and agreed to its correction. But he

pushed another Right opportunist policy – that of welcoming the US military forces, the formal grant of national independence, the installation of a neocolonial puppet republic; and preparing for the conversion of the people's army and armed peasant movement into a veterans' organization and a legal peasant organization for the purpose of waging parliamentary struggle.

Lava pushed the Browderite line of "peace and democracy" and Right opportunist leaders of the CP-SP merger party and the Hukbalahap ran for positions in the big comprador-bourgeois and landlord congress under the banner of the Democratic Alliance in 1946 when the United States shifted from direct colonial to semicolonial rule. But even as they genuinely won their seats in Congress, these known leaders of the CP-SP merger party and their allies were kicked out from their seats in Congress on trumped-up charges of fraud and terrorism.

In the countryside, the US Counterintelligence Corps, the Philippine Constabulary and the civilian guards perpetrated massacres in order to wrest back political power and put the land back under landlord control in Central Luzon. Right opportunists worse than Lava (Pedro Castro and Jorge Frianeza) gained the upper hand in the leadership of the CP-SP merger party, pushed the line of collaborating with the Roxas puppet regime and agreed to the registration of Hukbalahap fighters.

Under these conditions, Jose Lava, the second of the Lava brothers to become the secretary general of the CP-SP merger party, took the initiative of fighting the Right opportunists and called for the resumption of the revolutionary armed struggle in 1948. But he took the "Left" opportunist line of achieving military victory within two year's time, with no more than 2,500 fighters to start with and with no plan for mass-base building. Inconsistently in 1948 and 1949, the Huk commander-in-chief Luis Taruc was allowed to negotiate for general amnesty.

Following the discovery of the scheme of the reactionary regime to murder the underground leaders who surfaced under the amnesty agreement, Jose Lava pushed harder for the line of "all-out armed struggle" against the Quirino puppet regime in 1950. He speculated that there would be a geometric progression of spontaneous popular

support against the brutality and corruption of the Quirino regime and that other armed uprisings promised as by the Nacionalista Party politicians – the former Japanese puppet president Jose Laurel and Eulogio Rodriguez.

Two thousand fighters of the people's army were concentrated in military camps in the unpopulated forests of the Sierra Madre mountain range. In August 1950, they launched coordinated attacks on enemy forces on a wide scale. But in October 1950, the entire Political Bureau led by Jose Lava was captured in Manila. The second coordinated offensive slated for November 1950 could not be carried out. Instead, the 30 army battalions newly equipped and trained by the United States were taking both strategic and tactical offensives against the forest military camps of the people's army in a purely military situation favorable to the enemy.

The "Left" opportunist Jose Lava leadership never bothered to work out the line of the new democratic revolution and the integration of revolutionary armed struggle, land reform and painstaking mass work for a protracted people's war. After the 1950 debacle, Jesus Lava (brother of Vicente and Jose) became the Party general secretary. He also failed to consider and work out the requirements of a protracted people's war. Both Jose and Jesus Lava suffered from the petty bourgeois mentality of wishing for an easy way to seize political power without fully and seriously studying the realities and weighing all the necessary factors in the revolutionary struggle.

In the case of Jesus Lava, he briefly wished to continue armed struggle and then took a Right opportunist line and proceeded to adopt policies seeking to liquidate the people's army and subsequently the CP-SP merger party. He tried to liquidate the remnants of the old people's army in 1955 by calling on them to turn themselves into "organizational brigades" for parliamentary struggle and, subsequently, the Party itself by devising in 1957 what he called the "single-file" policy of dissolving every Party collective and ordering Party members to form single files and receive his political transmissions from his isolated Manila hideout.

The old merger party practically ceased to exist in late 1950s. There was not a single existing Party branch in late 1962. The general secretary Jesus Lava was completely isolated from any

mass movement. He had been drafting his political transmissions from 1955 to 1962 on the basis of clippings from the bourgeois press. He had no significant connections with any mass movement or with the remnants of the people's army which continued to exist as roving rebel bands in the plains of some provinces in Central Luzon.

Meanwhile, among the remnants of the people's army, there were the cadres and commanders who persevered in serving the peasant masses and there were also others who degenerated into banditry and running protection rackets in Angeles City adjoining the US Clark Air Force Base and compromising with the landlords in the class struggle between landlords and peasants. This latter type of the remnants of the people's army, most represented by the Taruc-Sumulong gangster clique, also became the target of criticism and repudiation by the proletarian revolutionaries and by the New People's Army.

There was the crying need to reestablish the Communist Party of the Philippines and the people's army. This was realizable only because the proletarian revolutionaries had already grasped the theory of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought through which they could make the correct analysis of Philippine history and society and the criticism and repudiation of previous grave errors of the Lava brothers and the Taruc-Sumulong gangster clique and proceed to wage the new-democratic revolution.

III. The Revolutionary Struggle, 1968-1979

The Lava revisionist renegades wished to impose their line of indefinite parliamentary struggle on the proletarian revolutionaries and the people. Their line was engendered by their own bourgeois subjectivist and opportunist world outlook and by the line of the Soviet revisionist renegades. The two-line struggle between the proletarian revolutionaries and the Lava revisionist renegades became so intense that the latter threatened to inflict physical harm on the former. It was necessary for the proletarian revolutionaries to break away from the counterrevolutionary revisionists in April 1967, to wage a vigorous campaign of criticism and repudiation of the Lava revisionist renegades and reestablish the Communist Party of the

Philippines under the theoretical guidance of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought.

It took more than two years to prepare for the reestablishment of the Party. The preparations included consolidation meetings of the proletarian revolutionaries, consultations with Party members and mass activists and drafting of the documents of reestablishment: Rectify Errors and Rebuild the Party and the Constitution and the Program of the CPP. The Congress of Reestablishment had only twelve delegates (one in absentia) representing only a few scores of Party members and candidate-members in the trade unions and the youth movement. They had the support of a few hundreds of advanced mass activists and an urban mass base of nearly 15 thousand workers and youth. Soon after the reestablishment of the Party in 1968, the proletarian revolutionaries linked up with the good part of the remnant people's army with a rural mass base of 80 thousand peasants in the second district of Tarlac in Central Luzon.

On March 29, 1969, on the 27th anniversary of the founding of the People's Army Against Japan, the Party established the New People's Army and promulgated the Rules of the NPA. This entailed the criticism and repudiation of the Taruc-Sumulong gangster clique which had become discredited with its unprincipled and criminal activities. The NPA started with only sixty fighters, with nine automatic rifles and 25 inferior firearms. Expansion cadres for Northern Luzon, Southern Tagalog and the Visayas were trained from February to May 1969. The first expansion team was dispatched to Isabela province. In May 1969, the Central Committee of the CPP held a plenum to study further the strategy and tactics of people's war and also the peasant movement, and to include in its ranks peasant cadres and battle-tested Red fighters. The plenum decided that Tarlac and the whole of Central Luzon would serve as the resource base for nationwide expansion.

In both urban and rural areas, the reestablished CPP inherited the fine revolutionary tradition of the proletariat as well as the senior and middle-aged cadres of the long-drawn workers' and peasants' movement. The mass organizations of workers, peasants and youth condemned both the Lava revisionist group and the Sumulong gangster clique and fully criticized and repudiated the long

unrectified grave errors of subjectivism and opportunism and the blatant degeneration of these renegades. The Lava revisionist renegades prated about parliamentary struggle as the main form of struggle but it was the proletarian revolutionaries who actually continued to lead the legal democratic movement. In fact, the revolutionary armed struggle inspired and served to strengthen the legal struggle.

From the very beginning, the objective of the proletarian revolutionaries was to create a nationwide Party organization with a cadre and mass character, deeply rooted among the working people and building a people's army waging protracted people's war and recruiting most of its fighters from the peasantry. The proletarian revolutionaries recognized that the people's army would be in a vulnerable position if it existed only in a small part or even in a much larger part of the plains of Central Luzon. They understood the necessity of developing guerrilla zones at various strategic points in the Philippine countryside and archipelago as soon as possible. Thus, from the very outset, members of the Party Central Committee were assigned particular regions to pay attention to and cadres for nationwide expansion were given politico-military training.

Even as it resumed the revolutionary armed struggle in earnest, the Party continued to lead the legal democratic mass movement in the urban areas. All sorts of legal mass organizations sprouted among the workers, peasants, youth, women, cultural activists, teachers and other professionals. In April 1969, the Party led a legal peasant demonstration of 15,000 in Manila and another one of 50,000 in Tarlac. In the first quarter of 1970, it was able to conduct weekly converging marches and demonstrations against the US-Marcos regime over a comprehensive range of domestic and international issues, including the US war of aggression in Vietnam. The participants ranged in number from 50 thousand to 100 thousand youth and workers per mass action. The First Quarter Storm of 1970 served to strengthen all the patriotic and progressive mass organizations, especially the Kabataang Makabayan, on a nationwide scale. The timely statements of the Party, later compiled in the book *The First Quarter Storm of 1970*, gave direction to the militant urban mass movement.

The urban-based Kabataang Makabayan acted as the seeding machine of the national democratic revolution all over the archipelago. It became the most important source of cadres who were immediately deployable for mass work. The Party accelerated its urban mass work. It encouraged the formation of new progressive unions and trade union federations such as KASAMA and PAKMAP and the transformation of reactionary unions into progressive ones. It built mass organizations among the urban poor and among the poor fishermen. It enlarged the KM chapters in urban poor communities as well as in colleges and high schools. It formed various types of organization among teachers, creative writers, artists, scientists and technologists, health workers, lawyers and other professionals.

Simultaneous to the militant mass actions in Manila and scores of other cities, the NPA intensified its armed tactical offensives in the second district of Tarlac. This enraged the enemy which accelerated search-and-destroy operations with the full force of a division and a wide network of paramilitary units against the barely 200 fighters of the NPA. By December 1970, the enemy declared that the NPA had been finished off. The NPA in Central Luzon was indeed in an extremely difficult situation due to the overwhelming concentration of enemy military strength. But unknown to the enemy, the work of expansion in Cagayan Valley had already resulted in a far wider mass base in Isabela province and which extended to Nueva Vizcaya and Quirino provinces. Also, revolutionary work had started in the Cordillera provinces.

Amidst the fierce revolutionary struggle, the Party was able to run courses of study on Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought and on the basic documents of the Party. It would be able to reproduce eventually seven volumes of its own selections from the works of Mao Zedong as well as the works of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin. It was able to put out *Ang Bayan* which published reports on and analyses of the ongoing revolutionary struggle in the Philippines and abroad and made critiques of the ruling system and US imperialism.

After the reestablishment of the Party, the earliest and most sustained work that emerged from the revolutionary struggle was *Philippine Society and Revolution* (in its 1969 mimeographed form). Inspired by Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought and using the

Marxist-Leninist stand, viewpoint and method, the book traced the basic strands of Philippine history, defined the basic problems of the Filipino people and clarified the class strategy and tactics of the new democratic revolution.

The ideological struggle against modern revisionism was kept up against the Lava revisionist renegades, the American revisionist renegade William Pomeroy and against their Soviet revisionist renegade masters, Khrushchov and Brezhnev. The sizable collection of antirevisionist articles by the CPP is now a major part of the treasury of the proletarian revolutionary struggle.

As a result of the decisions taken by the August 1970 meeting of the Political Bureau in the forest region of Isabel, The *Organizational Guide and Outline of Reports* was formulated to explain the principles and methods of making social investigation, building the Party, the people's army, mass organizations and organs of political power and making reports on the situation and activities. The Organization Department of the Party took vigorous efforts to recruit Party members from the ranks of the revolutionary mass activists that had emerged from the First Quarter Storm of 1970 and ensuing mass actions and to urge the new Party recruits and the mass activists to take assignments in the rural areas. In the urban areas, Party recruitment and education among the youth was done mainly through the schools for national democracy, undertaken by organization-education teams of the Kabataang Makabayan and other organizations.

In April 1971, the Central Committee held its Plenum in the forest region of Isabel. As a result of this, the Rules for Establishing the People's Government and the Revolutionary Guide to Land Reform were formulated; and the work of nationwide expansion of the Party and the people's army was pushed further. The membership of the Party had risen to more than 1000 members. The mass base in Cagayan Valley was already 300,000. The revolutionary armed struggle was started in the Partido district of Camarines Sur. By 1972, expansion cadres were creating Party organizations and guerrilla zones in eight regions of the country: Northern Luzon, Central Luzon, Southern Tagalog, Bicol, Eastern Visayas, Central Visayas, Western Visayas, and Mindanao. United front work at

various levels assisted the emergence and development of the revolutionary armed struggle.

Following up the suspension of the writ of habeas corpus in 1971, the US-Marcos regime imposed martial rule on the Philippines in 1972 and suppressed all the aboveground progressive mass organizations. Hypocritically, Marcos announced that he wished to "save the republic" and "build a new society" in the face of the severe crisis of the ruling system and the newly-emergent armed revolutionary movement. He claimed that the NPA had 10,000 rifles. At this point in time, however, the Party had only 2000 Party members, the NPA had only 300 full-time fighters with automatic rifles, hundreds of militia units, thousands of part-time guerrillas and local militia and a rural mass base of less than 400 thousand under local organs of political power and an urban mass base of some 50,000.

With the outlawing of the progressive mass organizations and the manhunt for their leaders, the Party decided to deploy to the countryside the Party members and mass activists who had been forced underground. However, the capacity of the rural Party organizations and the people's army to absorb them was limited. So, quite a number were encouraged to further develop the urban underground or start underground work in their home provinces, irrespective of the presence or absence of revolutionary forces. In 1973, the Preparatory Commission of the National Democratic Front adopted the 10-point program of the NDF and provided a framework for uniting the progressive mass organizations which had been forced underground as well as other possible allies.

Some petty-bourgeois commentators with superficial and partial knowledge of CPP history denigrate the people's war being waged by the reestablished Party as merely a dogmatic copy of that led by Mao Zedong. They cannot grasp that in accordance with the teachings of Mao Zedong, the CPP applies the theory of Marxism-Leninism on the concrete conditions of the Philippines and consequently the concrete development of the Philippine revolution has its unique features. There are indeed, basic similarities and common adherence to basic principles. The social conditions in the Philippines and pre-1949 China are basically similar and therefore

the corresponding character of the revolution is similar. There are the common basic principles such as that painstaking mass work must be done and popular support must be gained as the inexhaustible and invincible base of the Party and the NPA, that the people's army must grow from small to big and from weak to strong over a protracted period of time and follow a probability course of strategic defensive, strategic stalemate and strategic offensive. And while the NPA is on the strategic defensive, it must wage tactical offensives in order to accumulate strength and build Red political power in the countryside until it becomes possible to seize political power in the cities and on a nationwide scale.

At the same time, there are marked dissimilarities between the Philippine and Chinese people's war, such as that the NPA had to start with guerrilla squads and not with large forces breaking away from the national army of the CPC-KMT alliance, that the main form of struggle in the strategic defensive is guerrilla warfare and not regular mobile warfare, that the minimum land reform program of rent reduction and elimination of usury is being carried out before the maximum program of land confiscation, that a single imperialist power overextended all over the world dominates the Philippines and not several imperialist powers at odds with each other inside the country through their respective puppets as in China, that China is a vast country where the Long March could take place while the Philippines is a medium-sized archipelagic country in which the short marches can add up to long marches and that, of course, international conditions are now different.

The CPP made timely criticisms of both dogmatism and empiricism and both adventurism and conservatism in the revolutionary struggle. It criticized the formalistic and ritualistic use of Marxist-Leninist terminology without providing the concrete facts on the basis of social investigation and mass work. It also criticized adventurist tendencies and the tendency of some cadres to look to foreign military assistance as a decisive factor in winning victory as well as tendencies of conservatism in mass work and armed struggle. It constantly called for a self-reliant revolutionary armed struggle, integrating armed struggle, land reform and mass base

building and coordinating urban and rural work within the framework of the new-democratic revolution.

In 1974, it was clear that the great overall achievement of the Party was building itself and the NPA on a nationwide scale. Party membership rose to 4,000. The Party had well-consolidated guerrilla zones at so many strategic points favorable for guerrilla warfare on a nationwide scale. It had a wealth of experience in people's war in terms of positive and negative experiences and overall success. The isolation of the main military units of the NPA in Isabela due to heavy enemy concentration and due to the grave error of keeping these units in the forest region after the enemy's forced mass evacuation of the people was more than compensated for by the nationwide expansion of the Party and the people's army.

On the basis of social research and the abundant experience in the armed revolution, "Specific Characteristics of People's War in the Philippines" was written in 1974. This was a comprehensive and thoroughgoing application of Mao Zedong's theory and strategic line of protracted people's war in the Philippines. It carried a number of propositions that clarified the way to wage armed revolution in the Philippines and raised the fighting confidence of the Party members and Red fighters to a new and higher level.

Among the important propositions were that, aside from the use of the countryside and the rough terrain as a wide room for maneuver, the archipelagic character of the country can be converted from being a disadvantage to being an advantage for further dividing the forces of the enemy so long as the correct revolutionary class line and mass work are carried out in the struggle. The slogan, "major islands first, minor islands next," was put forward. The principle of centralized leadership, ideological and political, and decentralized operations was adopted.

Open mass work and secret Party work flourished in the trade union movement from 1969 to 1972. Under conditions of martial rule, the progressive labor federations and trade unions were suppressed. So, work in the trade unions were carried out underground from 1972 onward. But in 1974, the workers' strike movement came to life, starting with the La Tondeña strike and spreading to 300 workplaces all over the country. It became clear that the workers'

movement would become the main force in forthcoming mass struggles in the urban areas. The urban poor communities were also becoming militated, uncowed by frequent enemy zoning operations or raids.

The student movement began to stir anew, demanding democratic rights and the restoration of student governments and publications which were suppressed by martial rule. Simultaneously, the capacity of the Party organizations in the rural areas to absorb manhunted Party personnel and mass activists increased greatly. Thus in 1974, the Party could dispatch more of them to the countryside.

By the end of 1975, Party membership nationwide had risen to 5000 and the NPA had 1000 full-time fighters with automatic rifles and a thousand more with inferior firearms. On the basis of the discussions and decisions of the plenum of the Central Committee in December 1975, a comprehensive and deepgoing summing-up and rectification document, Our Urgent Tasks was drafted in 1976 and published in the first issue of Rebolusyon in the middle of that year. This systematized the principles, methods and steps in building the mass organizations, the local organs of political power, the people's army and the local Party branches. This document distilled the most successful experiences of the revolutionary cadres and combated the wrong ideas and wrong methods in carrying out the armed revolution. The draconian situation in the country persisted.

By 1976, it was clear that the NPA on a nationwide scale was approaching the phase in which guerrilla fronts would multiply, with platoons as centers of gravity, and in which frequent and widespread platoon-size offensive operations could be launched against the enemy. Previously, these were rare and could be launched in only a few places. Well-consolidated guerrilla zones and even stable guerrilla bases were becoming more defined in contrast to the guerrilla zones in areas of expansion. Previously, guerrilla zones meant a cluster of a few barrios. Now, entire municipalities had become guerrilla zones. These guerrilla zones or several municipalities comprised the guerrilla fronts.

One squad of the NPA often sufficed to effect control of a municipality and often divided into armed propaganda teams in order

to do mass work. This was possible because the rural municipality usually has a police force of ten to twenty-five men and the regular troops of the enemy (constabulary and army) simply do not have the force to maintain superior presence in every one of the 1500 municipalities and cities of the Philippines. On the basis of the expansion and consolidation of the mass base and the multiplication of the NPA guerrilla squads over time, it became possible to form platoons as centers of gravity and as strike forces in guerrilla fronts.

Since the beginning of the armed struggle, the creation of new guerrilla zones or expansion work had been the most challenging and most dangerous work. It could be done best only when there was a consolidated guerrilla zone from which to expand or, in a completely new area, when mass work was done without the premature show of arms. Errors in carrying or showing arms without prior mass work were paid for in blood by comrades, as in Zambales from 1969-71, Negros in 1969, Antique in 1972 and Mindanao in 1972, to cite only a few cases.

From 1970 onward, there were cases of grave errors involving the premature formation of absolutely concentrated companies, the purely military viewpoint and mountain-stronghold mentality. The first one was that of a premature company-size formation in 1970 in the sparsely wooded areas of Tarlac-Zambales which was completely wiped out in one tactical encirclement by the enemy resulting in the loss of at least 60 high-powered rifles. In 1973, an ill-armed company formation disintegrated under the blows of the enemy in Nueva Vizcaya. The remnant platoon proceeded to Quirino province and built itself up into a full company formation through rapid armed tactical offensives but without consolidation and expansion through mass work. Eventually, this company failed to withstand the counteroffensive of overwhelmingly superior enemy forces in 1975. In Sorsogon province in 1974, another full company which had rapidly grown from armed tactical offensives, but without solid mass organizing, also failed to withstand a powerful enemy counterattack.

The worst cases of prematurely concentrated company formations included the case of two well armed companies in the Isabela forest region from 1972 to 1976. The regional Party committee and army command (especially those who were members

of the Central Committee) insisted on staying in the forest region, despite the forced mass evacuation of the people. The two companies put themselves in an isolated and passive position, allowing the enemy to use the Cagayan river to cut them off from the masses, despite the instructions of the Central Committee for them to follow the example of the NPA platoon in Tumauni, slip out of the enemy encirclement, redeploy into smaller units and move towards the masses in Cagayan Province. In the Northern Luzon Party Conference in 1977, a thoroughgoing criticism of the error was made by the Central Committee and by the cadres and commanders of the region themselves.

From 1976 to 1979, the regional Party organization and people's army in Eastern Visayas (particularly Samar island) showed the way to create a wide and deepgoing mass base and to build the revolutionary forces on this basis: Each guerrilla zone was taken care of by an NPA squad and on the scale of the guerrilla front, platoon-size tactical offensives were frequently undertaken. Municipal police forces and paramilitary units were disarmed and small detachments of regular troops were wiped out frequently. Thus, the Party and the people's army in Samar island became the model of revolutionary armed struggle throughout the country.

On the whole, the CPP was successful in waging the armed revolution from 1968 to 1979. The growth of the revolutionary forces was gradual and steady but cumulative. The municipal police forces, the paramilitary units at the barrio level and small detachments of regular enemy troops became the prime targets of NPA operations. Never was there an instance that a regional Party or army organization was decimated. In the twists and turns of the armed revolution, there were separate instances when grave losses were incurred by leading organs at various levels and by particular local forces. But on a nationwide scale, the revolutionary movement grew in strength and advanced from year to year. Even during the exceedingly difficult period of 1972-73, when martial rule had been recently imposed, the Party and other revolutionary forces were able to preserve themselves and grow on a nationwide scale.

While the decade of the 1970s was characterized by revolutionary successes from year to year, there were already

certain unhealthy tendencies manifested at the level of the NPA national operational command. There was the notion spread by the head of the NPA national operational command up to 1976 that no stable base areas could arise in the Philippines before the total liberation of the country and that foreign military assistance was an absolute necessity for winning victory. At the 1975 Plenum of the Central Committee, there was also a Rightist demand from another cadre to withdraw Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought from the masthead of Ang Bayan as well as the categorical term, anti-Marcos reactionaries, previously used to refer to such big comprador-landlord politicians as Benigno Aquino. From his previous insistence in 1976 that small teams of three to five armed fighters (reminiscent of the 1942 "retreat-for-defense" policy) should be the model for mass and guerrilla work, still another prominent cadre of Central Luzon swung in 1977 to the "Left" opportunist line that a company be concentrated out of the measly total of 105 armed personnel of the entire region.

Also in 1977, the questioning of the Marxist analysis of Philippine society as semicolonial and semifeudal started. A few cadres were impressed by the big-comprador infrastructure-building and fake land reform programs of the US-Marcos regime and misconstrued these as promoting urbanization and industrialization. They even considered the export of cheap Filipino labor and engineering skills to the Middle East as an overflow of Philippine economic development. These comrades could not see that Marcos was not putting up basic industries and not carrying out land reform but was aggravating the agrarian, semifeudal and preindustrial character of the Philippine economy.

The US-Marcos technocrats, with their theory of development; the Lava revisionist renegades, with their theory of noncapitalist development; the exponents of dependent capitalism; and the recipients of funds from the Australian Trotskyites were active in spreading the notion that the multinational firms and banks were out to turn the Philippines into a foreign-owned industrial base. All these served to stimulate the tendency of some Party cadres to speculate that the analysis of Philippine society as semicolonial and semifeudal was already outdated, notwithstanding the actual deepening and

aggravation of the semifeudal character of the Philippine economy due to excessive foreign borrowing for anti-industrial purposes.

In 1978, the thrust of the questioning of the Party's correct description of the character of Philippine society was to put forward the idea of making a leap from the early substage of the strategic defensive to the advanced substage and accelerating the victory of the Philippine revolution by deploying more cadres for armed city partisan warfare and for a potential urban insurrection. The 1945 uprising and the 1968 Tet offensive in Vietnam and the 1979 final offensive in the Nicaraguan revolution were taken out of historical context and used to denigrate the theory and strategic line of protracted people's war. Although the NPA had only around 1500 full-time Red fighters with automatic rifles, the Central Committee declared that preparations had to be made for the leap from the early to the advanced substage of the strategic defensive. Thus, it designated "war fronts", administratively coalesced guerrilla fronts and created new command levels (even if unnecessary). This line of thinking ran counter to the need for multiplying platoons as centers of gravity and multiplying the number of guerrilla fronts.

From 1976 to 1980, there was a rapid nationwide growth of the Party, the people's army and the mass base as a result of the strong foundation built under the guidance of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought and such definitive documents as the founding documents of the Party and the NPA, *Philippine Society and Revolution*, "Specific Characteristics of People's War in the Philippines" and "Our Urgent Tasks". As regards the NPA, its Red fighters with automatic rifles grew in number up to 2000 or by 100 per cent because of the tactical offensives carried out by platoons and oversized platoons. They benefited from an expanding and consolidated mass base in which land reform and other mass campaigns for the benefit of the people were conducted.

Abroad during this period, the essentials of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought were being negated and reversed in China. The depreciation of Mao Zedong in his own homeland tended to influence a few Party cadres in the central leadership. Although no member of the Central Committee ever dared to frontally attack the theory and strategic line of people's war, it became fashionable for a

few members of the Central Committee and some central staff organs to propose the "innovation" on the strategic line of protracted people's war by putting forward the line of urban insurrectionism and the premature formation of absolutely concentrated NPA companies.

At the same time, the US Central Intelligence Agency financed and instigated its Filipino assets in Katipunan ng Demokratikong Pilipino in the United States to spread the propaganda in the Philippines that the way to victory in the Philippines was to drop Mao's theory and strategic line of protracted people's war. To camouflage their US imperialist connections, they proposed having the military and financial assistance of the Soviet Union as the decisive factor in the victory of the Philippine revolution.

IV. The Revolutionary Struggle, 1980-1991

Regarding the period of revolutionary struggle from 1980 to 1991, the most recent comprehensive and important documents of the Communist Party of the Philippines to read and study are: "Reaffirm Our Basic Principles and Rectify Errors," "General Review of Important Events and Decisions, 1980-1991" and "Stand for Socialism Against Modern Revisionism". These documents approved by the 1992 Plenum of the CPP Central Committee strongly reaffirm Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought as the guide to revolutionary action under the leadership of the CPP as well as to the current rectification movement, the second great one since the first in the period of 1966-69, for the purpose of overcoming deviations, errors and shortcomings and reinvigorating the Party and the revolutionary mass movement.

In the period of 1980-83, the revolutionary movement advanced at a rate faster than in any year in the 1976-79 period. Party membership increased annually by almost 4000. Basic Party units were established in the barrios, factories, schools, communities, in the people's army and mass organizations. In 1982, there were 34 platoons as centers of gravity of guerrilla fronts and more than 200 squads at the base, doing mass work. An annual average of 800 to 900 rifles were confiscated from the enemy by squads and platoons.

By the end of 1983, the armed strength of the NPA was 5000 automatic rifles. To this day, the record shows that most of the NPA's weapons have been seized from the enemy by the squads and

platoons. In 1982-83, guerrilla fronts covered almost entire provinces and big portions of regions. Those of Mindanao, Samar, Negros and Bicol covered two-thirds to three-fourths of the total land area and total number of barrios. All guerrilla fronts in the country extended to well-populated areas, including environs of town centers, along highways, seashore and plains. In 1983, the majority of regions had two or three big and relatively stable guerrilla fronts. Tactical offensives by the NPA echoed each other all over the archipelago. Land reform and other mass campaigns thrived in the guerrilla fronts.

In the 1980-83 period, the legal democratic movement in both urban and rural areas steadily developed. Then it rose rapidly to an unprecedented level in the entire history of the revolutionary movement in 1983, following the assassination of Benigno Aquino and continued to surge until the Marcos fascist dictatorship was overthrown in 1986. It continued to grow until 1987. The contradictions within the ruling clique had led to the assassination in 1983 of Marcos' arch political rival Aquino and consequently the split of the reactionary armed forces between the Marcos-Ver and the Enrile-Ramos factions.

The rapid advance of the revolutionary armed struggle and the legal democratic movement and rapid increase of armed strength was the result of a number of factors: (1) the strong foundation of the revolutionary movement developed in the 1970s; (2) the perseverance of the revolutionary forces along the correct line in most regions, in accordance particularly with the founding documents of the Party, Specific Characteristics of People's War in the Philippines, Our Urgent Tasks and the Basic Party Course; and (3) the rapid worsening of the crisis of the ruling system, which exacerbated not only the contradictions among the reactionaries but even within sections of the ruling clique.

Throughout the period of 1980-91, the correct line was upheld by the overwhelming majority of Party cadres and members and in most regional Party committees and organizations. But certain erroneous currents, which had started in the late 1970s to run among a few elements in the Central Committee and certain central staff organs, took shape and force through certain "Left" and Right opportunist

lines in the 1980 Central Committee Plenum to challenge, undermine and reverse the correct line. In this Plenum, much time was devoted to questioning the Party's long standing analysis of Philippine society as semicolonial and semifeudal with the end in view of modifying the strategic line of protracted people's war, giving more importance than ever to revolutionary work in the urban areas and effecting the leap from the early to the advance substage of the strategic defensive through urban insurrections. It was asserted that the Philippines was more industrialized and urbanized than pre-1949 China and that therefore urban revolutionary struggles had a bigger role to play in the Philippines than in China in the past. The urban population of 40 per cent was arrived at by adding the population of the chartered cities and poblaciones (town centers).

In the 1981 meeting of the Political Bureau, the tasks of accomplishing both the leap from the early to the advance substage of the strategic defensive and moving on to the "strategic counteroffensive" and "regularization" were laid down. In 1982, the Mindanao Commission adopted the line of urban insurrectionism and military adventurism under the inspiration of the 1981 Political Bureau meeting. In its 1983 meeting, the Political Bureau, elaborated on the line of "strategic counteroffensive" and "regularization". It presupposed the accomplishment of the advance substage of the strategic defensive, described it as the second substage and called for carrying out the strategic counteroffensive as the third and final substage. Third and fourth class municipalities were classified as urban areas and as initial targets for uprisings.

The term "strategic counteroffensive" was a misnomer which meant the "Left" opportunist wish to accomplish far more than what the given forces of the revolution could permit. It overrated the role of armed urban insurrections in opposition to the strategic line of encircling the cities from the countryside. In fact, third and fourth class municipalities are categorizable as rural. Even the city of Yen'an was rural relative to the city of Xi'an or faraway Shanghai. The line of "regularization" meant creating more layers of the Party bureaucracy and filling up the positions with Party members, without undertaking the corresponding theoretical and political education. It also meant – for the people's army – additional levels of command

and further staffing, premature formation of larger units and aiming for an intensification of the war through regular mobile warfare, irrespective of the general level of development. The term "full-time Red fighters" was reinterpreted to mean separation from mass work and preoccupation with military tasks.

Even while the central leadership pushed the wrong line, the overwhelming majority of Party cadres and members adhered to Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought, studied the founding documents of the Party, the basic Party study course along this line, studied Specific Characteristics of People's War in the Philippines and Our Urgent Tasks. In 1982, a definitive article, On the Philippine Mode of Production, argued against the misconception about the character of the Philippine economy. In 1983, another article, "On the Losing Course of the Armed Forces of the Philippines", argued against premature verticalization of the people's army and pointed out its potential damage to the mass base. These articles were circulated to oppose the wrong line.

It took some time before the wrong line from the central leadership could be put into practice extensively. In the early 1980s the revolutionary forces in Samar and Negros continued to demonstrate that it was possible to intensify armed struggle while attending to mass work. Running counter was the attempt to put up a battalion in Samar. But the central leadership decided to disband it and redeploy the most capable cadres to other regions. Learning lessons from bitter experiences in the 1970s, the forces in Northern Luzon, Bicol, and Western Visayas paid close attention to mass work and gradually developed their armed strength by launching tactical offensives with platoons and squads. Even the forces in Mindanao generally followed the pattern of the other regions until 1982. With the exception of two platoons, the forces of Central Luzon persisted with squads and small teams in carrying out revolutionary work in the plains.

The line of "strategic counteroffensive" and "regularization" encouraged the more blatant militarist line of combining urban insurrectionism with military adventurism in Mindanao from 1982 to 1984. This line exaggerated the urbanization and industrialization of the Philippines in general and Mindanao in particular, in effect

wrongly praising the US-Marcos regime for supposedly developing and industrializing the country. It also wrongly presupposed that the Party had neglected urban revolutionary work, notwithstanding the fact that the Party had consistently developed and led the urban-based legal democratic movement. It put forward the idea that urban insurrection, prepared by armed city partisans and by sweeping propaganda and ultimately accomplished by the spontaneous masses, was the highest form of political struggle and that the people's army was a purely military force and was secondary to the armed urban insurrection. It also exaggerated the international work of the Party as a decisive factor for winning the revolution.

The erroneous line of combining urban insurrectionism and military adventurism was aggressively carried out in Mindanao from 1982 to 1984. Sweeping contact and propaganda work was done in the urban areas, armed city partisan warfare was intensified and people's strikes were carried out by busing in peasants or using NPA units to set up "checkpoints". Solid mass organizing was neglected and underground cadres in the narrow and small provincial cities exposed themselves to the enemy. In the countryside, fifteen absolutely concentrated NPA companies were rapidly formed from 1983-85. Fifty percent of the Red fighters were absorbed by the main regional guerrilla units (companies) and another large percentage were absorbed by secondary regional guerrilla units (usually platoons). These left a very few squads doing mass work, especially because they were converted into supply units of the main units. By 1984, the prematurely formed companies in absolute concentration had been put in a passive and isolated position both by the self-imposed drastic shrinkage of the mass base and the intensified strategic and tactical offensives by the enemy. Most of the time, these companies were preoccupied with logistical problems and were vulnerable to enemy attacks.

As a result of precision raids by the enemy on the urban underground and the military defeats of the absolutely concentrated NPA companies, the "Left" opportunists explained away the setbacks as the work of deep penetration agents. Thus, hysteria set in and led to the Ahos campaign in 1985. This bloody witchhunt was approved by the 1985 Executive Committee of the Mindanao Commission and

was carried out by the so-called caretaker committee. It allowed the torture and execution of suspects without sufficient evidence. It victimized hundreds upon hundreds of Party members, Red fighters, mass activists and allies.

At no time had the enemy killed as many CPP members, NPA fighters, mass activists and allies in so short a time and demoralized so many others. Party membership in Mindanao dropped from 9000 to 3000, the mass base decreased by more than 50 percent and the armed strength of the people's army fell from 15 companies and 30 platoons to two companies and 17 platoons.

There were definitely some deep penetration agents because of the loose recruitment policy along the wrong line of combining armed urban insurrectionism and military adventurism. But Ahos campaign was not the way to pinpoint them. On the other hand, it was the way for the real enemy agents to cause further destruction and to conceal themselves. Above all, the Party cannot permit the violation of the basic rights of Party members and Red fighters as set forth by the Party Constitution and the Rules of the New People's Army as well as the basic democratic rights of the people guaranteed by the Bill of Rights in the Rules for Establishing the People's Government.

In 1984, the first national military conference was held by the national military staff of the NPA. It adopted the line of urban insurrectionism and military adventurism, which was already resulting in gross setbacks in Mindanao. The line was pushed chiefly by the chief of staff who had just been promoted from his position as NPA commander in Mindanao on the basis of the false reputation of having achieved great military victories. The Executive Committee and Military Commission uncritically approved the results of the military conference.

The NPA chief of staff and the members of the Executive Committee of the Mindanao Commission who were at the same time members of the Central Committee withheld from the 1985 Central Committee Plenum information about their erroneous line, the gross setbacks in 1984 and the Ahos campaign. They misrepresented themselves as cadres of a successful line and arrogantly demanded the withdrawal of the strategic line of protracted people's war in favor

of the line of combining urban insurrectionism and military adventurism.

The Central Committee repulsed the demand by invoking the fact that the strategic line of people's war was still in the Constitution and Program of the Party but failed to withdraw and correct the line of "strategic counteroffensive" which fathered the disastrous "Left" opportunist line in Mindanao. Instead, the Plenum put forward a three-year program of "developing/making" the NPA "as a regular army", building the factors of regular mobile warfare, maximizing the advantages of guerrilla warfare and "intensifying the war" towards the "strategic counteroffensive". In effect, the strategic line of protracted people's war was discarded, despite lip service to it.

In the absence of a factual assessment and correct evaluation of the situation in Mindanao, the highest officials of the Executive Committee of the 1985 Mindanao Commission kept their high positions and were promoted to higher positions of central leadership (Political Bureau, Executive Committee and Military Commission). Thus they gained the position which enabled them to further push their erroneous and disastrous line on a nationwide scale, especially because they bandied about their line as exceedingly successful in Mindanao. Their obsession was to create 36 absolutely concentrated companies and several battalions throughout the country by 1987. In July-August 1987, the NPA general command bypassed the territorial Party committees and ordered a so-called nationally coordinated offensive. It consisted of 600 big and small attacks on enemy hard points and wasted ammunition and other resources.

From 1986 to as late as 1990, one regional Party organization after another was pushed to adopt a variant of insurrectionism or putschism. In the formation of the premature and unsustainable larger military formations, the mass base drastically shrank and the situation became purely military as the enemy launched brigade-size offensives and at the same time fielded "special operations teams" (SOTs) to conduct psywar and intelligence operations in the guerrilla fronts. The enemy could effectively carry out its war of quick decision and gradual constriction because in the first place the "Left" opportunist line had played into its hands.

The gross error of the "Left" opportunists can be seen in the fact that they had reduced the number of squads and armed propaganda teams doing mass work and therefore reduced the mass base as the area of maneuver for the people's army, while the enemy was the one fielding "special operations teams" in order to create his "mass base" with the help of the local reactionary government, local police, paramilitary forces and religious fanatical cults. Since 1984, the enemy had been deploying brigades to concentrate on areas known as bastions of the NPA, to try to "clear and hold" and then to "consolidate and develop" them through small-unit operations. But the enemy left unattended far larger areas of the country and has never achieved control without gaps over any guerrilla front.

The loss of mass base meant the loss of political and material support of the masses for the people's army as well as the loss of capability to collect taxes from the relatively enlightened sections of the exploiting classes. The resulting loss of self-reliance strengthened the notion among the "Left" opportunists that the revolutionary movement could be supported by gangster activities in the urban areas and by foreign military and financial assistance. While still the NPA commander in Mindanao up to 1984, the 1984-91 head of the NPA national military staff conducted gangster activities, combining NPA armed city partisans with elements of criminal syndicates to carry out robbery hold-ups and kidnap-for-ransom. These were not authorized by the Party at the appropriate level. He spread the wrong notion that the people's army had a separate machinery from the Party. He also considered foreign military assistance as the factor that would decide the fate of the revolutionary movement and that without such assistance, the revolutionary movement would suffer stagnation or retrogression.

From 1984 onward, the national military staff (later called "general command") of the people's army based itself in Manila in accordance with the line of combining urban insurrectionism and military adventurism. The head of the national military staff preoccupied himself with so-called special operations, including gangster activities in Manila and other urban areas in the country, and seeking foreign military and financial assistance. After the overthrow of Marcos in 1986, he further justified his basing in Metro

Manila by claiming to be ever on the alert for "a sudden turn of events" for "seizing opportunities" towards urban insurrection. In fact, he was overseeing and participating in gangster activities and in corruption at the customs bureau of the reactionary government. He sought to separate the people's army from the absolute leadership of the Party and pretended to command the units of the people's army all over the country by radio transmissions from Manila. Later, he escalated gangster activities independently or in collaboration with certain elements in the Manila-Rizal Party committee and the Visayas Commission.

By 1985, there was already a conspicuous degree of ideological degeneration among some members of the Central Committee. This was the result of the sheer disappearance of Marxist-Leninist study courses and reading materials, the rampancy of eclecticism, the depreciation of Mao Zedong Thought, the baseless questioning of the Marxist-Leninist analysis of Philippine society, the underrating of the Philippine revolutionary experience in people's war and the propagation of urban insurrectionism and military adventurism. Elements who never seriously studied and applied Mao Zedong Thought rated the examples of movements for decolonization and against despotic rule higher than the accomplished two-stage Chinese revolution and the already rich experience of the new-democratic revolution with a socialist perspective in the Philippines.

The line of seeking foreign military and financial assistance from the Soviet party and its allied parties had been pushed since 1982. It had a "Left" opportunist objective of accelerating the victory of the Philippine armed revolution through the importation of heavy military weapons. But in fact it had a Rightist content as it meant deviating from the antirevisionist line of the Party. As early as 1984, the "general command" of the NPA was already dispatching couriers to contact pro-Soviet parties abroad to seek military and financial assistance without full information given to the Executive Committee of the Central Committee.

In 1985, a proposal was made at the 9th Plenum of the Central Committee to consider the Soviet Union a socialist country. But the Central Committee decided to subject the proposal to further study. However, there was already a paper of the International Liaison

Department as well as a study commissioned by the central leadership picturing the Soviet Union as a socialist and no longer a social-imperialist country and the Soviet party as a Marxist-Leninist, no longer a revisionist party. The Brezhnev ruling clique was hailed as a champion of proletarian internationalism. It was praised for achieving military parity with the United States and for giving assistance to national liberation movements and third world countries.

The "Left" opportunists who pushed the line of combining urban insurrectionism and military adventurism at the central and regional levels of the Party based themselves in the urban areas, notwithstanding the development of consolidated and stable guerrilla base areas and their proclaimed desire to build companies and battalions. The urban-basing is a clear manifestation of the greater value given to urban insurrectionism; it was the clearest point of departure for violating the strategic line of protracted people's war. If the "Left" opportunists had been more interested in building larger military formations, even if premature, than in wishing for an armed urban insurrection, they would have positioned themselves in the countryside rather than in the cities.

While the revolutionary forces in Mindanao suffered gross setbacks between 1984 and 1986, those in Luzon, (especially Northern Luzon) and the Visayas regions continued to make advances in the revolutionary armed struggle until 1987 and made up to a great extent for the big losses in Mindanao. However, the overall rate of growth for the entire movement declined from 1984 to 1987. As a result of the nationwide promotion of the "Left" opportunist line of combining urban insurrectionism and military adventurism, the revolutionary forces registered overall negative growth from 1987 to 1990. Relative to 1986, Party membership declined by 15 percent, the number of barrios covered by local organs of political power by 16 percent and, worst of all, the membership in rural mass organizations by 60 percent as a result of both errors and enemy action. The rifle strength of the NPA continued to grow but the rate of growth dropped to that of 1976-78. Cadres at the provincial, front and district levels were lost. A large percentage of the consolidated barrios were also lost.

From 1986 onward, one interregional or regional Party committees after another was pushed to build absolutely concentrated companies and adopt some insurrectionist and putschist plan. But most of the interregional commissions and regional Party committees and army commands eventually complained of the unreasonable targets imposed on them by the "Left" opportunists with regard to the formation of NPA companies and launching of offensives. Some of them were forced by circumstances to make adjustments in the years 1988-91. As late as 1987, the Political Bureau endorsed the rapid increase of absolutely concentrated companies and considered peasant uprisings within two years as the way to advance the peasant movement. In 1988, however, the central leadership noticed the decline of the mass base and heeded the demands of certain regions to allow them to redeploy the Red fighters and pay attention to mass work. Thus, it had a strong basis for starting to criticize the imbalances in revolutionary work and call for painstaking mass work and solid mass organizing.

The 1988 Party anniversary statement, which briefly summed up the 20-year history of the Party, criticized the imbalances in revolutionary work. In 1989, conferences on mass work were held at regional and interregional levels and a large portion of the NPA forces were redeployed for mass work, especially for recovery and expansion. The 1989 Party anniversary statement called for rectification, the further strengthening of the Party and the intensification of the people's revolutionary struggle. Like that of 1989, the 1990 Party anniversary statement clearly identified and criticized the errors of "regularization" and verticalization of the forces at the expense of developing the horizontal forces in stages and called for extensive and intensive guerrilla warfare on the basis of an ever widening and ever deepening mass base. The struggle between the proletarian revolutionary line and the bourgeois opportunist line intensified within the central organs of the Party. The "Left" and Right opportunists tried and succeeded in certain regions to block the documents of the central leadership which carried the correct line.

In 1990, the Political Bureau nullified the erroneous concept of "strategic counteroffensive" and put a stop to its implementation; but inconsistently it approved the results of the National Military Command Conference due to pressures by the "Left" opportunists. The trend in 1990 and 1991, however, was for the proletarian revolutionaries to defeat the wrong line and unscrupulous maneuvers of the "Left" opportunists. The Military Commission of the Central Committee and the Political Department of the NPA, in cognizance of the problems confronting the people's army, moved to hold the First National Conference on the Political Work of the New People's Army in March-April 1991, which basically adhered to the proletarian revolutionary line. In 1990 and 1991, the rapid narrowing of many guerrilla fronts was stopped. The people's army was further redeployed for mass work. There was a significant recovery of the mass base.

By the middle of 1991, the "Left" opportunist line was basically defeated at the level of the central leadership on the basis of the incontrovertible facts about its disastrous character and results and as a consequence of the assertion of the proletarian revolutionary line. But defeating the "Left" opportunist line also involved defeating the Right opportunist line in 1990 and 1991 because the most persistent and most malicious elements pushed the Right opportunist line of class collaboration, reformism and capitulationism for the avowed purpose of reaching the "Left" opportunist goal of armed urban insurrection irrespective of or even without the development of the people's war.

The questioning and denial, since 1986, of the character of Philippine society as semicolonial and semifeudal society in chronic crisis gave rise not only to the "Left" opportunist line of urban insurrection and military adventurism but also to the Right opportunist line of "regularization", "strategic counteroffensive", reformism, capitulationism and liquidationism. Some of the chief opportunists could flip-flop from one type of opportunist position to another or make schemes which metaphysically combine the two, usually pushing a Right opportunist line in practice and at the same time wishing for an armed urban insurrection at the expense of the revolutionary mass movement in both urban and rural areas.

In common with the "Left" opportunists, the Right opportunists gave the utmost importance to urban legal struggles and to urban-basing. They considered urban-based legal struggles – not the revolutionary armed struggle – as the principal form of revolutionary struggle. As early as 1978- 79, one group of Right opportunists in the Manila-Rizal Party organization provoked a struggle with the central leadership by insisting on the participation of the Communist Party of the Philippines in the farcical elections held by the US-Marcos regime.

The debate was erroneously formulated as one of choosing between participation and boycott. The central leadership failed to resolve the debate at a level of principle higher than the boycott-participation dichotomy which certain elements in the Manila-Rizal Party committee wanted to dictate. The Party could have declared the 1978 elections as a farce and still allowed the legal progressive forces to use the elections as an opportunity to expose and oppose the fascist dictatorship. Disciplinary measures were meted out to the elements in the Manila-Rizal Party organization who generated struggle mania and ultra-democratic actions and made physical threats.

These elements disrupted the Manila-Rizal Party organization. After the disciplinary actions were taken against these unruly elements, another group of Right opportunists in charge of the urban mass movement and the united front was able to seize the opportunity to push its own Rightist line in the national capital region (NCR). They strengthened their position by their access to Western bourgeois and religious funding agencies and by using these funds to create urban-based offices and promote the line that sheer urban legal struggle and building urban institutions and coalitions could advance the revolution.

The Plenum of the Central Committee in 1980 encouraged the exponents of "Left" and Right opportunism to espouse urban insurrectionism and parliamentarism, respectively, by allowing both opportunists to spread doubts about the strategic line of people's war. The Politburo meeting in 1981 went further in favoring both types of opportunism. The "Left" opportunists were allowed to lump together and reject both liberal democrats (petty-bourgeois) and the

anti-Marcos reactionaries (big comprador-landlord politicians) as "bourgeois reformists" along the line of monopolizing victory in the antifascist struggle, which was anticipated as forthcoming. At the same time, the Right opportunists were allowed to spread their own notion of "broad legal alliances" which aimed at playing down the revolutionary forces and tailing after the anti-Marcos reactionaries.

In 1981, the Right opportunists were already proposing the replacement of the vanguard proletarian party with a "vanguard front" called the New Katipunan. But the Party repulsed this blatantly liquidationist proposal. At any rate, the Right opportunists proceeded to realize their concept of "broad legal alliance", which meant denying or concealing the role of the Party in the antifascist struggle, kowtowing to and carrying the sedan chair for the anti-Marcos reactionaries and diluting the national democratic program. They preoccupied themselves with high level meetings and sweeping propaganda calls. They drew cadres from the countryside to the cities and recruited those whom they called "national democrats" to staff their offices.

The Right opportunist line ran so deep that "national democrats" (those who accepted the general line of the new-democratic revolution) from the ranks of the mass activist were enrolled into the Party without any Marxist-Leninist education and that only a few of these recruits were sent from the cities to the countryside. Party recruitment and education were sparsely undertaken in the course of the flow of the legal democratic movement in the period 1983-86 which occurred due to the long pent-up popular hatred against the fascist dictatorship and the sustained public outrage at the Aquino assassination. Instead, cadres were attracted and drawn from the countryside to the cities and from work at the grassroots level in both urban and rural areas to higher levels, without replenishment at the grassroots level.

Following the overthrow of the Marcos dictatorship, there were recriminations within the Party over the boycott policy taken by the central leadership, particularly the Executive Committee of the Central Committee in the 1986 snap presidential elections. The Political Bureau decided that the boycott policy was a major tactical error and the Party chairman was compelled to resign. But the Right

opportunists continued to insist that the error was a strategic one that occurred due to the commitment of the Party to the strategic line of people's war and not due to a "Left" opportunist and sectarian illusion that the Party could win victory through a boycott. In collaboration with anti-Party pseudoprogressive petty-bourgeois groups, they insisted that the Party should de-emphasize or stop the revolutionary armed struggle as the main form of struggle and emphasize the legal forms of struggle in the new situation in order to be in a better position to gain power sooner through elections or insurrection.

Among those who also took this line were the "Left" opportunists who had committed grave errors resulting in the 1984-86 disaster in Mindanao. They overstated the boycott error as the biggest error in the entire history of the Party in order to conceal their far greater errors and crimes in Mindanao. They even went to the extent of saying that the Party could have seized or taken a major share of political power had it been prepared for the Edsa uprising and had it not been obsessed with the strategic line of people's war. Subsequently, from 1986 onward, they used the Edsa uprising as an argument for both parliamentarism and urban insurrectionism and as a possible model for effecting social revolution.

They failed to understand the Edsa uprising as merely an anti-authoritarian uprising and not a social revolution. It was a phenomenon whose course and outcome were chiefly determined by the US and the reactionary forces even as the forces of the Left and the spontaneous masses hated the tyrant and participated in his overthrow. The proletarian revolutionaries put forward Philippine Crisis and Revolution and Continuing Struggle in the Philippines to expose the counterrevolutionary character and weaknesses of the US-Aquino ruling clique and to clarify the line of the revolutionary struggle amidst the confusion whipped up by the "Left" and Right opportunists. The Party study course on Lenin was also put forward to counter the opportunists and was combined with the study of the people's war in China. But this was sporadically undertaken and was not followed up by a more comprehensive and thoroughgoing campaign of Marxist-Leninist education.

From 1986 onward, the Right opportunists who advocated parliamentarism pure and simple as well as those who combined parliamentarism with urban insurrectionism collaborated with the promoters of anticommunist petty bourgeois currents outside the Party, such as the Christian democrats, bourgeois populists, the pro-imperialist liberals, the old-type revisionists and the Trotskyite petty-bourgeois socialists in caricaturing and attacking the Party's strategy of people's war. By 1988, the Right opportunists began to openly adopt Gorbachovite revisionism and to babble about the "marginalization of the class struggle" and the need to get rid of working class leadership and the revolutionary principles of Marxism-Leninism to achieve "openness" and "democracy"

It was from 1986 onward that the limits of peace talks with the enemy, electoral politics, parliamentary struggle and foreign-funded NGOs became clearly demonstrated as the pseudoprogressive petty-bourgeois groups remained marginal and inconsequential and became no more than tails of the big comprador-landlord politicians. But the Right opportunists became more aggressive from year to year in pushing their reformist, pacifist and capitulationist line and in attempting to undermine the legal democratic movement. By 1988, it was clear that they had already sabotaged the legal mass movement in conjunction with the exponents of urban insurrectionism with whom they collaborated in drawing away personnel and resources from solid organizing among the basic masses and from Marxist-Leninist education.

The legal democratic movement peaked in 1986 and began to slow down in 1987, especially among the workers, peasants, fishermen, urban poor, women and teachers. The Right opportunists specialized in misdirecting personnel and resources towards building foreign funded institutions and coalitions out of the same pool of legal organizations and steering them towards parliamentarism and reformism. The most talented youth were also influenced to veer away from the mass movement. At the same time, the "Left" opportunists in the urban areas departed from solid mass organizing and concentrated on forming small groups of armed city partisans and ordering these to go into indiscriminate killings that provoked the enemy to assassinate mass activists and suppress the most militant

mass organizations, especially in urban poor communities in 1987 and 1988.

However, from 1988 onward, upon the increasing frustration and bankruptcy of the "Left" opportunist line of combining urban insurrectionism and military adventurism, a conspiratorial, factionalist and splittist bloc of Right and "Left" opportunists increasingly promoted Gorbachov's revisionist line in certain central staff organs, certain regions and Party groups within certain institutions.

In 1990, the Right opportunists tried to usurp the authority of the central leadership and sought to liquidate the Party and the revolutionary movement through a series of maneuvers. They tried to do away with the Executive Committee of the Political Bureau as the daily collective leading organ of the Party. They sought to replace the Party as the center of the revolution with the NDF. At the same time, they tried to change the NDF program from one of new-democratic revolution into one of bourgeois nationalism, pluralism and mixed economy; and convert the NDF from a united front or alliance into a mix-up of member-organizations and individual members.

They peddled the concept of the "anti-imperialist democratic front" which meant combining the Left, Middle and Right against the US-Aquino regime. They pushed the line of going Right supposedly in order to reach the goal of urban insurrection (medium-term plan) and promoted the line of capitulation and pacifism on the question of peace. They also tried hard to entrap the legal progressive forces into the capitulationist framework of the "multisectoral peace advocates" and people's caucus and convert them into a "third force" between the revolutionary movement and the reactionary government. They tried to remove the Central Committee as publisher of *Ang Bayan* and used a number of issues to espouse the Right and "Left" opportunist lines and actions and to hail Gorbachov as "a communist renewing socialism" even as he was already unmasking himself as an anticommunist completely restoring capitalism.

Within the organs of the central leadership, the proletarian revolutionaries struggled against the ideas of the "Left" and Right opportunists who tended to support each other. From year to year on

one major issue to another since 1988, the opportunists were beaten through reasoning on the basis of the facts of the disastrous results of their erroneous ideas. In 1990, they took advantage of the dislocation and difficulties of the central leadership due to enemy pressure and tried to go on a rampage of usurping authority and promoting their counterrevolutionary Rightist line. But in 1991, they were basically repulsed and beaten. Towards the end of 1991, the chief advocate of parliamentarism and urban insurrection prepared four long letters addressed to the general membership attacking the central leadership which by then was securely in the hands of the proletarian revolutionaries. The central leadership undertook a series of decisions to assert the proletarian revolutionary line and resolved to launch a comprehensive and thoroughgoing rectification movement in the Party.

In reaction to the rectification movement, the ringleaders of the "Left" and Right opportunists have thoroughly exposed themselves as a counterrevolutionary Rightist group, using anticommunist, anti-Stalin slogans and serving as special psywar and intelligence agents of the US-Ramos regime after trying in vain to decapitate, discredit, disintegrate and destroy the Party and the revolutionary movement through factional, splittist and wrecking activities. The most vicious counterrevolutionary Rightists who attack the rectification movement include those who have committed not only serious ideological, political and organizational errors but also serious criminal offenses against the Party and the people. They have thoroughly exposed themselves and are now the target of criticism and repudiation by the Party rank and file.

Despite the serious deviations and errors committed by the "Left" and Right opportunists for a long time without prompt correction and which are only now being comprehensively and thoroughly rectified, the all-round strength of the Party and the revolutionary movement remains formidable and in varying respects is equal to the level of 1983 or 1984. The Party has several tens of thousands of members both in rural and urban areas and is deeply rooted among the toiling masses of workers and peasants. There are millions of people in the armed revolutionary movement and the legal democratic movement under the leadership of the Party. Most of these people are covered

by the organs of political power both in rural and urban areas. They are in the mass organizations of workers, peasants, youth, women, professionals and other people. There are the Party branches in factories, farms, schools and communities and the Party groups in institutions and mass organization.

The New People's Army is under the absolute leadership of the Party. The strength of the people's army includes several thousands of full-time Red fighters, with automatic rifles and other high-powered weapons. These weapons are nearly 100 percent seized from the enemy through tactical offensives. The Red fighters are augmented by part-time guerrilla squads, the militia and self-defense units. The Party is at the core of and leads the organs of political power and the rural-based mass organizations. The Party also leads the united front. This encompasses the organs of political power, the National Democratic Front and legal alliances based on class and sectoral interests and major national issues.

V. Rectification Movement under Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought: 1992 Onward

A comparison between the period of 1968-77 and the subsequent period of 1978-91 shows that in the former period deviations, errors and shortcomings were promptly and thoroughly criticized and repudiated in the light of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought; while in the latter period the most serious deviations and errors arose, accumulated and hardened within central leading and staff organs without being promptly criticized and rectified, thus increasingly undermining and violating the theory and practice of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought. Subjectivism and opportunism ran rampant within the Party as a result of the slackening of ideological vigilance and militancy along the proletarian revolutionary line.

At the root of all the ideological, political and organizational deviations, errors and shortcomings within the Party was the diminution and in certain areas even disappearance of the study and conscious application of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought. When the ideological line is not correctly and clearly defined and

followed, then all kinds of deviations, errors and shortcomings can thrive. Preoccupation with practical work from day to day, without the guidance of theory leads to unhealthy currents, degeneration and grave losses.

At the end of 1991, the proletarian revolutionary cadres and the entire Party membership recognized the urgent need for a comprehensive and thoroughgoing rectification movement. The first and main rectification document, Reaffirm Our Basic Principles and Rectify Errors was drafted and together with other rectification documents was processed by the Executive Committee, the Political Bureau and the Central Committee, one after the other in 1992. It is based on scores of major documents and hundreds of other documents over a period of several years, reflecting the democratic interaction of the central leadership with lower Party organs and organizations through direct investigations, consultations, reports and minutes of conferences and meetings at various levels of the Party.

The most important task in the rectification movement is theoretical education in Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought. The rectification movement is mainly and essentially an education movement. After a long period of neglecting theoretical education, the Party is compelled to make a new start in accordance with the principle that there can be no revolutionary movement without a revolutionary theory. But this time, the Party is endowed with a far greater amount of revolutionary experience, both positive and negative, than that which the proletarian revolutionaries had in 1967 to 1969, during the first great rectification movement. There is also far greater confidence because there is now a far greater number of Party cadres and members and they are determined to overcome the deviations, errors and shortcomings.

In this education movement, the most important study materials are Reaffirm Our Basic Principles and Rectify Errors, the supporting document, General Review of Important Events and Decisions from 1980 to 1991 and Stand for Socialism Against Modern Revisionism. The first two documents focus on deviations, errors and shortcomings in the Philippine revolutionary struggle and the third document deals with the revisionist deviation, explains the

phenomenon of modern revisionism and capitalist restoration, firms up the resolve to achieve the national democratic and socialist stages of the Philippine revolution, combats the ideological offensive of the imperialists and their anticommunist petty-bourgeois camp followers and points to the bright socialist and communist future of mankind.

Even as these documents are the result of the study and analysis of accomplished facts and are based on democratic discussions within the Party, these are open and subject to the endless dialectical process of study and practice. So, the lower Party organs and organizations are being encouraged to further sum up and analyze their experience in the light of these documents, drawn by the central leadership in the exercise of its duty to provide ideological and political leadership to the entire Party organization and the revolutionary movement. In giving life to the principle of democratic centralism, the Party follows the dictum of Mao Zedong Thought, "from the masses to the masses" of the Party membership through the appropriate organs and units of the Party.

In view of the prolonged period in which theoretical education has been diminished or neglected in the entire Party, there is currently the drive to reproduce the classic works of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought and basic Party documents along the proletarian revolutionary line within the Party, promote immediately the reading and study of these by all Party collectives and to undertake a three-level program of study: basic, intermediate and advance. In the past, there was either a scarcity or complete lack of these Marxist-Leninist study materials. At the same time, where and when there were some studies, these were sporadic and either incomplete or lopsided. To correct such a situation, the cadres in charge of education are instructed to push the three-level program of study.

The basic Party course seeks to instill the spirit of serving the people, self-sacrifice, combating liberalism and proletarian internationalism and to provide an initial understanding of dialectical and historical materialism, a comprehensive grasp of Philippine history, the basic problems of Philippine society, the new-democratic revolution and the current rectification movement.

The intermediate Party course seeks to develop the ability of the Party cadres and members to analyze their own experience and the experience of their particular collectives and the entire Party organization in actual revolutionary struggle – in Party building, army building and united front building, economic work and cultural work, in the light of the basic central and regional documents of rectification and, above all, in the light of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought. Comparative studies are also made within the framework of the national revolutionary struggle and of the world proletarian revolution, in accordance with Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought. The main thrust is to study the experience of the Party and the essential and relevant works of Comrade Mao Zedong.

The advance Party course seeks to provide a thoroughgoing, comprehensive and deepgoing understanding of the three stages of Marxism, Leninism and Mao Zedong Thought in materialist philosophy, in the critique of capitalism and revisionism, in the grasp of socialist political economy, and the strategy and tactics of the proletariat in the new-democratic and socialist stages of the revolution and in continuing the revolution under proletarian dictatorship in socialist society until communism can arise. The objective of the advance Party course is to create a corps of senior and middle-level cadres capable of leading the Philippine revolution now and in the long future.

Theoretical education in the CPP is not formalistic. It is integrated with the concrete practice of the Philippine revolution. There is a wealth of experience and an accumulation of problems to solve in the ongoing revolutionary practice of the Party cadres and members. The living study of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought is most intense when confronting the long unrectified and deepgoing deviations and errors of the past and the current serious problems. The rectification movement is absolutely necessary. Otherwise, the Party cannot overcome the long accumulated problems and the drive of the imperialists and the petty-bourgeois anticommunists to destroy it through ideological and psychological warfare in combination with the most brutal military means.

The current circumstances for pushing Marxist-Leninist theoretical education are exceedingly favorable. Firstly, the

subjectivist and opportunist currents that have been pushed by unremolded petty-bourgeois elements within the Party have been frustrated in actual revolutionary practice and have been basically defeated by the central leadership through its basic rectification documents and by the entire Party membership through further study and analysis of their experience. Secondly, the disintegration and collapse of the revisionist ruling parties have in a big way cleared the way for the advance of the proletarian revolutionary cadres who are armed with Mao Zedong Thought. Thirdly, the crisis of the world capitalist system is rapidly worsening and the imperialists and their retinue of petty-bourgeois anticommunists are now embarrassed by their own triumphalist propaganda about their "victory over socialism". Their straw-figure socialism is in fact modern revisionism and bureaucrat capitalism masquerading as socialism.

The old and new Filipino revisionists (Gorbachovites), bourgeois populists, liberals and neoliberals, the petty-bourgeois socialists, Christian-democrats, social-democrats, Trotskyites, insurrectionists and militarists who have hitched a ride on the anticommunist ideological and political offensive of the imperialists and who have separately and jointly mocked at Marxism-Leninism and at the CPP have dramatically exposed themselves as a small band of anticommunist counterrevolutionaries by their own proclamations and actions. They draw their slogans from the antiquated arsenal of the Cold War by declaring themselves as an anti-Stalinist alliance and by acting directly and indirectly in collaboration with and in support of the US- Ramos regime.

Since the late 1970s, the most blatant attack on the line of the CPP has been on its analysis of Philippine society as semicolonial and semifeudal. It took the form of ceaseless questioning without respect for the facts. This was followed by the proposal to change the strategy and tactics of the new-democratic revolution, especially in the sphere of armed struggle, under the guise of innovating on, refining and adjusting strategy and tactics. Thus, the "Left" opportunist line of "regularization" and "strategic counteroffensive" as well as of combining urban insurrectionism and military adventurism; and the Right opportunist line of liquidationism, reformism, capitulationism and pacifism were pushed.

By way of rectification in the field of political education, such works as *Philippine Society and Revolution*, "Specific Characteristics of People's War in the Philippines", "Our Urgent Tasks", *On the Mode of Production in the Philippines*, *Philippine Crisis and Revolution*, "Continuing Struggle in the Philippines" are being put forward as study materials concerning the character of Philippine society, the character of the ongoing stage of the Philippine revolution, the motive forces, the targets, the tasks, the socialist perspective of the Philippine revolution.

To rectify the grave error of militarism, there is now a wide recognition of the need to develop extensive and intensive guerrilla warfare with a widening and deepening mass base in the entire stage of the strategic defensive of the people's war. There is now a clear recognition that the drive to form NPA companies and battalions interfered with and prevented the full development of platoon-size forces and operations and the multiplication and consolidation of the guerrilla fronts; unduly lessened the number of guerrilla squads and armed propaganda units as the horizontal forces for mass work and the sustainable guerrilla platoons and companies as centers of gravity of guerrilla fronts and regions, respectively; shallowed and narrowed the mass base; and resulted in intolerable logistical burden on the masses because of the top-heavy structure of the NPA.

Thus, a major point in the rectification movement is the redeployment of the forces of the NPA. The main thrust is to have only 25 to 30 percent of NPA personnel in platoons and companies serving as centers of gravity (rallying points and strike forces) from the level of the guerrilla fronts upward; and 70 to 75 percent of the personnel serving in local guerrilla squads, subdivisible into armed propaganda teams for mass work under favorable conditions (where enemy forces are not concentrated). The NPA retains the capacity to launch offensives involving various sizes (small teams, squads, platoons, companies and upward) according to the level of development and concrete circumstances.

Even the centers of gravity are to be in relative concentration when not in an offensive mode, so that they can also participate in mass work and other nonmilitary work. The center of gravity goes for

absolute concentration only when conducting tactical offensives, politico-military training, security duty, tax enforcement, and other similar operations. A big number of guerrilla squads are now deliberately spread out in order to expand and consolidate the existing guerrilla fronts, recover lost ground and open and develop new areas of work. At the same time, these guerrilla squads can be drawn in like a net by the center of gravity to muster the superior strength for annihilating or disarming an enemy target.

The drive to prematurely build NPA companies and battalions in violation of the line of extensive and intensive guerrilla warfare has resulted in gross setbacks. There is therefore a return to the period before the full development of platoon-size forces and operations and multiplication and consolidation of the guerrilla fronts was aborted. It is wrong to form prematurely larger units, fight in the way that the enemy wants us to fight and thus play into his hands. Thus, the line of "strategic counteroffensive" and "regularization" and its worst application in the line of combining urban insurrectionism and military adventurism have been criticized and repudiated.

There is no mystery about the apparent success of the enemy with its offensive strategy or war of quick decision and its tactics of gradual constriction. Due to his far superior military forces, it suits him to deploy brigades in order to concentrate on a guerrilla front or a province and then tries to convert his strategic advantage into tactical advantage by using special operations teams for intelligence and psywar purposes and also well-informed and well-armed platoons, companies and battalions for specific offensive operations. He can be successful only if in the first place the NPA forces in his target area have given up the strategy and tactics of guerrilla warfare that is widely and deeply based among the people in a protracted people's war. The copy-cat special operations teams can be successful only insofar as the NPA has previously given up mass work and the expansion and consolidation of the mass base.

Through correct redeployment and mass work, the NPA can go back to the strategy and tactics which yielded the most weapons by launching only those offensives that can be won. It can disarm the paramilitary forces and the local police and wipe out small units of the regular enemy forces. It can evade the superior enemy forces

that it cannot yet defeat. Instead of trying to hit the large forces or hard points of the enemy, it can wait for in ambush or lure in the small part of the enemy force that it can beat. The NPA can defeat the reactionary armed forces only piece by piece and thereby accumulate strength over time.

The CPP's revolutionary experience has proven again and again that people's war cannot be developed without the full and widespread realization of the minimum land reform program, consisting of rent reduction, elimination of usury, raising of farm wages, restitution of grabbed land, improving prices of farm products, increasing agricultural production and promotion of sideline occupations, and rudimentary cooperation through exchange of labor, work animals and tools. Land reform is undertaken along the antifeudal line, with the proletarian cadres relying mainly on the poor and lower middle peasants and farm workers winning over the middle peasants, neutralizing the rich peasants and taking advantage of the splits between the enlightened and despotic landlords in order to isolate and destroy the power of the latter. The antifeudal line is within the framework of the entire new-democratic revolution.

It is worthwhile to review and improve the Revolutionary Guide to Land Reform on the basis of the rich experience in the antifeudal struggle. The main content of the new-democratic revolution is the solution of the land problem, up to the confiscation of landlord property and free distribution of land in the maximum land reform program. But this program is best carried out after the realization of the minimum land reform program on so wide a scale that the potentially unified landlord class and the enemy troops can no longer effectively counter the confiscation of land with the massacre of the peasant leaders and masses. Undoubtedly the best time to carry out the maximum land reform program is when the enemy is defeated over extensive liberated areas or when the entire country is already liberated.

Without a comprehensively organized mass base, the Party and the people's army cannot thrive and advance. Thus, the organs of political power are necessarily set up. These are supported by the mass organizations of workers, peasants, women, youth, cultural

activists and children. From these organizations, working committees to assist the organs of political power are created and put in charge of public education, mass organizing, self-defense, land reform, production, finance, health, cultural activities, arbitration and so on. Where there is a strong mass base, there can be a strong Party and deep reserves for the people's army through such augmentative forces as the self-defense units, militia and local guerrilla forces.

Dual political power exists in the Philippines today. One is the revolutionary government in the guerrilla fronts. And the other is the reactionary government still entrenched in the cities. The revolutionary government can be expanded and consolidated only through the integral factors of revolutionary armed struggle, land reform and mass base-building. If the Party gives up any of these factors, the revolutionary movement begins to shrink and fail. When the territory of the revolutionary government grows, that of the reactionary government shrinks.

To prevent such phenomena as Ahas campaign and other instances of anti-informer hysteria from recurring, the system of law and justice in the revolutionary movement is being developed, with the proper legal and judicial code and trained personnel to apply these. Since the beginning, the Party and the revolutionary movement have been committed to the development of a democratic system of law and justice. There is an accumulation of decisions and rules pertaining to these. Since 1972, the Rules for Establishing the People's Revolutionary Government has laid down a bill of rights which guarantees the civil and political rights of the people.

There is a crying need for proletarian revolutionary cadres in the countryside because for a long period of time, there was a reverse flow of Party cadres and members (especially experienced ones) from the rural areas to the urban areas, propelled by the "Left" opportunist line of combining urban insurrectionism and military adventurism and by the Right opportunist line of reformism and parliamentarism. The Party is once more stressing the importance of revolutionary work in the countryside because it is here where the armed strength is accumulated and developed to overthrow the ruling system and because the guerrilla fronts are in dire need of certain competent personnel that only the cities can provide.

The urban-basing and repeated arrests in 1988 to 1991 of the former NPA "general command" in Metro Manila and certain regional commands are negative examples for the entire Party and the people's army. The rectification movement repudiates the previous practice of the "general command" and some regional army commands to base themselves in urban areas under such pretexts as operating radios, computers and other high-tech equipment, leading both the rural based people's army and armed city partisans or waiting for a sudden turn of events in the urban areas. Certainly so-called special operations, which in fact deteriorated into gangsterism, is an impermissible reason for urban basing. The eventual control of town and provincial centers shall be the result of the wave-upon-wave advance of the revolutionary forces.

There is the Party organization that properly belongs to the urban areas. From the underground, it leads the legal democratic mass movement, which has a defensive character. The entire Party is repudiating the previous error of being carried away by the "Left" opportunist illusion which regards armed city partisan warfare and armed urban insurrections as the decisive factor for advancing or winning the revolution or by the Right opportunist illusion which regards reformism and parliamentarism or any combination of Right and "Left" opportunism or by a flip flop from one to the other as likewise the decisive factor for advancing or winning the revolution. Any muddleheadedness in this regard is impermissible because it has proven to be very costly.

For a considerable period of time, the legal democratic mass movement will play an important role in the development of the revolutionary armed struggle but it shall be a role secondary to the revolutionary armed struggle being carried out in the countryside. It means that the legal democratic forces in the urban areas cannot by themselves overthrow or radically transform the ruling system even if on certain occasions the unarmed uprising of the people as in 1986 is capable of causing the downfall of one reactionary ruling clique and replacing it with another reactionary ruling clique. In a country like the Philippines, it takes more than an armed or unarmed urban uprising to defeat the entire reactionary armed forces, bring down the entire ruling system and make social revolution. Through the

process of protracted people's war, the revolutionary forces develop the strength not only to overthrow the entire ruling system but also to basically complete the new-democratic revolution and start the socialist revolution.

The pull of both the "Left" opportunist line of urban insurrectionism and the Right opportunist line of reformism on Party cadres and members to stick to the urban areas even when they can no longer operate effectively in the urban areas have wrought serious damage to the urban-based Party underground and legal democratic mass movement as well as to the armed revolutionary movement in the countryside. The Party is systematically dispatching Party cadres and members and revolutionary activists to the countryside in order to help raise the level of revolutionary work in the countryside and not only to put into relatively safer conditions in the countryside those who can no longer work effectively in the urban areas. There is a lot of catching up to do in dispatching fresh revolutionary cadres and activists to the countryside in order to respond to the crying need for them there.

Certain anticommunist elements wish to induce the Party to take the road of counterrevolutionary reformism. They claim that the people have gotten tired of waging armed resistance against their oppressors and exploiters and that by implication prefer to suffer in silence the violence of oppression and exploitation indefinitely. They prate about deemphasizing the people's war or even altogether abandoning it. The best proof of the fallacy and chicanery of this counterrevolutionary line is that the pseudoprogressive petty-bourgeois groups like the revisionists, bourgeois populists, petty-bourgeois socialists, liberals and neoliberals, Christian democrats and the like have remained small, marginal and inconsequential. They seem to be larger than they are only when they are used as tools of anticommunist propaganda by the ruling system and by foreign anticommunist agencies. The legal mass movement that has a national democratic character is still led by the proletarian revolutionary party. Were the CPP to terminate or diminish the people's war, then it would become impotent and marginalized like these anticommunist petty-bourgeois groups.

Those who are pushing the counterrevolutionary reformist line also make a hue and cry about peace at any cost to the people and to the revolutionary cause. They wish pacifism to take hold of the revolutionary forces and thereby liquidate them. These reformist elements wish to appropriate the name of the people for their own counterrevolutionary purposes under the pretext of being the "third force" between the reactionary government and the National Democratic Front but they have exposed themselves completely by going so low as to provide intelligence briefings and psywar support to the US-Ramos regime and collaborate with the agents of the regime in holding anticommunist rallies.

The Party and the entire revolutionary mass movement are systematically smashing the counterrevolutionary line being peddled by the alliance of the anticommunist petty-bourgeois that echo the anti-Stalin slogans of the US imperialists and that actively assist the US-Ramos regime, especially in intelligence and psywar. By unmasking these elements, all Party members and mass activists can raise the level of their consciousness and militancy. These anticommunist petty-bourgeois groups have incorporated into their ranks the frustrated ringleaders of urban insurrectionism and military adventurism and criminals who have engaged in bloody witchhunts, gangster activities and intelligence service to the enemy.

To further develop the urban-based legal democratic mass movement, the Party continues to do painstaking mass work among the workers, urban poor, poor fishermen, students, youth, women, the professionals, and the small and medium businessmen. The work in the trade unions, urban poor communities, student movement, institutions and so on results in solid mass organizations and secret Party branches and groups. And the masses are aroused, organized and mobilized along the national democratic line on the issues that most affect their lives.

The rectification movement combats and rejects the pernicious suggestion from various pseudorevolutionary quarters that the working class must give up its vanguard role or that the Party must be liquidated in favor of a united front at first dominated by petty-bourgeois groups but ultimately serving the imperialists, the big compradors and landlords. There would have been no revolutionary

movement at all in the Philippines now if not for the leadership of the working class through its advanced detachment, the Communist Party of the Philippines. Those who say otherwise have no other intention but to undermine, sabotage and destroy the revolutionary movement.

It is the CPP's continuing achievement that its organization is nationwide and deeply rooted among the masses of the workers and peasants. It is a Party with a cadre and mass character. The quantity and quality of the Party membership are examined. The ideological and political quality is examined first of all. Those who do not come up to the standards are given special attention to become truly qualified as Party members. Those who do not wish to raise the level of their qualifications through ideological and political studies and practical work are allowed to leave the Party.

There is a new resolve to increase the proportion of Party members with worker and peasant status to at least ninety percent and to reduce the proportion of those from the petty-bourgeois intelligentsia, not by turning away those who are willing to remold themselves but by positively accelerating the recruitment of members from the toiling masses. The all-round strength of the membership of the Party is drawn from and tested in the revolutionary mass moment. The advance elements in the revolutionary mass movement are invited to become candidate-members. Emphasis is on the recruitment of the advance elements from the working class movement, from the people's army and the peasant movement and from the intelligentsia.

Party leading organs and units take responsibility for and plan the systematic recruitment of candidate-members and their development into full Party members within the prescribed period of candidature. It is a long-running shortcoming of the Party that the mass activists of the national democratic movement are recognized and yet are not being invited to become candidate-members and that in the case of those invited as candidate-members, they are not developed to become full Party members within the prescribed period. An individual Party member can recommend a mass activist to become a candidate-member. It is subsequently the responsibility of the Party unit receiving the recommendation to see to it that a cadre verifies

the personality and record of the recommendee and see to it that he or she becomes a full Party member by taking the basic Party course and fulfilling trial work.

The practice of assessing and evaluating work and making criticism and self-criticism is being reinvigorated and encouraged in every leading organ and in every unit. The leading organs are required to take responsibility for and take initiative in the promotion of criticism and self-criticism even after the successful end of the current rectification movement.

The principle of democratic centralism is upheld. It means that centralized leadership is based on democracy and the latter is guided by the former in accordance with the theory and practice of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought. Both bureaucratism and ultrademocracy are being combated. There is inner Party democracy but at the same time there is Party discipline. Exponents of ultrademocracy have recently exposed themselves as inveterate liquidationists and anticommunists.

To guard against bureaucratism, the leading organs consist of elected representatives of lower Party organs and organizations and are not cut off from but continuously interact with them in order to gather facts and recommendations from below, through direct investigation, reports, consultations, and study and work conferences. All leading organs up to the National Party Congress are required to meet as regularly as possible in accordance with the provisions of the Party constitution. Thus, the experience of the Party can be promptly summed up and the tasks can be defined.

At the same time, the phenomenon of independent kingdoms, factionalism or autonomism is being vigorously combated. The most rabid opponents of the rectification movement have tried to destroy the Party by whipping up ultrademocracy or anarchy. They wish to decapitate and disintegrate the Party and thereby preempt their grave accountability. The so-called "freedom of criticism" long ago criticized by the great Lenin is rejected. Any communist party, whether out of power or in power loses its proletarian revolutionary character when it admits into its ranks alien elements and allows them to promote petty-bourgeois and other antiproletarian ideas and actions within the Party.

While the ringleaders of the "Left" and Right opportunists were still formally in the Party, they sought to liquidate the leadership of the working class and the Party. The "Left" opportunists wanted to do away with the absolute leadership of the Party over the New People's Army. They demanded that the NPA have a separate machinery independent of the Party so that they could freely push their line of urban insurrectionism and military adventurism and conduct "special operations", including gangster activities. The Right opportunists wanted to liquidate the Party as the vanguard and center of the revolution, replace it with a bogus united front and reduce the Party to a member organization, giving up its independence and initiative and subordinating itself to a majority of petty-bourgeois groups and individuals that depict the Party as an unwelcome "authoritarian" entity. The Party has smashed both types of opportunists by issuing the directive on the Relationship of the Party with the NPA and the United Front.

The problem of security for the Party, especially in the urban underground, has become complicated and aggravated by the treachery of a handful of "Left" and Right opportunists who have become outright enemy agents, engaged not only in a campaign of slander and lies against the Party but also assisting the enemy in so-called keyhole operations. The Party is therefore reorganizing its personnel, shifting a number of them to the countryside and, most important of all, recruiting more Party members in order to render useless the previous information level of the renegades.

As a result of the current rectification movement, the Communist Party of the Philippines can be expected to become stronger ideologically, politically and organizationally. The rectification movement is guided by Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought. It seeks to reinforce the foundation of the Party, enhance the victories already won, overcome deviations, errors and shortcomings and raise to a new and higher level the fighting will and capabilities of the Party and the people against the enemy. It is a method learned from Mao Zedong in strengthening the revolutionary party of the proletariat. It is a major component of Mao Zedong Thought.

VI. Prospects of the Philippine Revolution under the Guidance of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought

So long as the ruling system in the Philippines remains semicolonial and semifeudal, there is the urgent need for the new-democratic revolution and there is the fertile ground for the growth in strength and advance of the armed revolutionary movement of the people. The chronic crisis of the system makes the protracted people's war possible and necessary. And this crisis is ever worsening.

The fundamental causes that gave rise to the Marcos fascist dictatorship persist. The shift from the rule of Marcos to that of Aquino and then to that of Ramos has entailed the aggravation and deepening of the crisis from one level to another. Foreign monopoly capitalism, domestic feudalism and bureaucrat capitalism still ride roughshod over the people and are intensifying the oppression and exploitation of the people.

The US imperialists instigated Marcos to unleash the open rule of terror in 1972 in order to eliminate the newly-resumed armed revolutionary and to have a free hand in imposing neocolonial economic policies on the people. The result was nationwide expansion of the armed revolutionary movement and the aggravation of the Philippine agrarian backwardness and an insatiable addiction to foreign loans for anti-industrial purposes.

To preempt the rising hatred of the people and the surge of the armed revolutionary movement, the US imperialists had to foment a big split in the reactionary armed forces in order to cause the downfall of its puppet. Under the Aquino regime, further splits within the reactionary armed forces occurred and the economy further slid down after a brief seeming recovery. Under the Ramos regime, the new chieftain of the reactionaries bases himself on only 23.5 percent of the vote and desperately flaps about to serve the greed of his imperialist masters and his own clique and to appease his political rivals within the exploitative system. The regime knows no way by which to maintain its rule but to beg for foreign investments and

loans and escalate total war which combines utmost brutality and psychological warfare.

The chronic socioeconomic and political crisis is guaranteed to worsen by the internal laws of motion of the ruling system. These mean the relentless oppression and exploitation of the people by the exploiting classes of the comprador big bourgeoisie and the landlord class, the ceaseless contradictions among the reactionary factions and the irrepressible resistance of the people. The ultimate doom of the ruling system is ensured by the perseverance of the people in their armed revolutionary movement.

The current regime is at a loss as to how to draw from domestic and foreign sources the wherewithal for its maintenance. The people have been sucked dry of their sweat and blood for the benefit of the imperialists and the local reactionary classes. At the same time, it has become absurd for the imperialists to be further extending loans that can never be repaid. New loans are still being incurred to cover the chronic deficits and increasingly to pay the debt service.

After crowing about the triumph of neocolonialism and the triumph of capitalism over revisionist bureaucrat capitalism, the three centers of the world capitalist system (the United States, Japan and Western Europe) no less are conspicuously afflicted by the crisis of overproduction. The unprecedented development of high technology and abuse of finance capital in corporate speculation and neocolonialism in the period after World War II has deepened and aggravated the general crisis of capitalism, including the economic and financial devastation of the third world and former Soviet bloc countries. The field for maximizing profits has shrunk due to the ruin of the countries floundering in foreign debt. The Philippines is a prime example of the floundering loan-client.

The laws of capitalism continue to drive the winning monopolies in the industrial capitalist countries to adopt higher technology that raises their own profit and productivity rates but kills jobs of both blue and white collar workers and drives down the profit and productivity rates of their entire national economies. The abuse of finance capital since the sixties has brought about supermonopolies and has ravaged the neocolonies. Now, monopoly capitalism is at a loss as to how to dispose of surplus goods and services it produces amidst the

wasteland of neocolonialism, bankrupt bureaucrat capitalism and the ongoing mass unemployment even in the centers of the world capitalist system.

All major industrial capitalist countries are now engaged in the reconsolidation of their national and regional positions and in the redivision of the global market, sources of raw materials and fields of investment. The trend among the supermonopolies is to restrain themselves from extending productive investments as well as loan capital for nonproductive purposes to countries like the Philippines. Under these circumstances, the promise of the Ramos regime to turn the Philippines into a "newly-industrializing country" is a mere pipe-dream. Even the "tigers" of East Asia, including the coastal provinces of China, are now feeling the adverse effects of the contraction of the American consumer market and the impending shift to Mexico of the low value-added manufacturing-for-reexport under the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA).

The gravity of the crisis of the world capitalist system can be seen not only in the conditions of economic depression in industrial capitalist countries and the priorly long-running economic and financial ravages of neocolonialism in the third world and the former Soviet-bloc countries but also in the rising and widescale rampages of nationalism, fascism, racism, ethnocentrism, religious fundamentalism and other blatant factors of political crisis in the wake of the global economic crisis.

The worsening crisis of the world capitalist system and that of the domestic ruling system converge, interact and help each other to generate an ever worse crisis in the Philippines and guarantee the favorable conditions for protracted people's war. The global crisis of capitalism now tends to draw simultaneously the attention of the imperialist forces to so many "trouble spots" (the former Yugoslavia, Central Asia, Somalia, Angola, Haiti, Kampuchea, and so on) of their own making even as they wish to focus on and mop up the remaining anti-imperialist states like the People's Democratic of Korea and Cuba and the armed revolutionary movements led by Marxist-Leninist parties.

For 25 years already, the United States, Japan and Western Europe have directly and indirectly poured resources into the armed

counterrevolution in the Philippines. But this has proven futile. The armed revolution continues to exist and grow. The desire of the imperialist powers to extinguish the Philippine armed revolution is ever growing but their capability to do so is not limitless.

The Communist Party of the Philippines looks forward to the resurgence of the anti-imperialist and socialist movements as a result of the unprecedented crisis of the world capitalist system. It is the internationalist duty of the CPP to uphold the torch of armed revolution and wage protracted people's war self-reliantly in order to help bring about such resurgence on an unprecedented scale. There can be no better way than this for the Communist Party of the Philippines to carry out the principle of proletarian internationalism.

The Communist Party of the Philippines engages mainly in bilateral relations with parties, organizations and movements abroad on the basis of ideological-political understanding of Marxism-Leninism as well as on the basis of anti-imperialist political solidarity. The Party also participates in multilateral seminars and conferences that may forge agreements, resolutions or declarations as a result of consensus and unanimity.

In foreign relations, the Party upholds the principles of mutual respect for independence, equality, noninterference, cooperation and mutual benefit. The Party is interested in the international propagation of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought through ideological-political exchanges. It is also interested in broad anti-imperialist solidarity, irrespective of the ideological stand of those involved.

The perspective of the new-democratic revolution in the Philippines is socialist. In the first place, the new democratic revolution can be won only because the leading force is the working class, the main force is the peasantry and the additional basic revolutionary force is the urban petty bourgeoisie. The revolutionary forces are waging the new-democratic revolution, working hard, struggling fiercely and making sacrifices essentially because they want the current revolution to lead to socialism rather than to capitalism.

The theory of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought guides the Communist Party of the Philippines and the Filipino people in the

struggle to achieve the new-democratic and socialist stages of the Philippine revolution. Moreover, this theory provides the basic principles and the foresight of continuing revolution under proletarian dictatorship in order to consolidate socialism, combat modern revisionism and prevent the restoration of capitalism in socialist society until imperialism is defeated on a global scale and communism becomes possible.

The disintegration of the revisionist ruling parties and revisionist-ruled social systems and the worsening crisis of the world capitalist system vindicate the full scope of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought, including Mao's successful practice of the new-democratic and the socialist revolution; his critique of imperialism, modern revisionism and neocolonialism; and his theory and pioneering practice in applying the theory of continuing revolution under proletarian dictatorship through the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution. With a comprehensive and profound understanding of Mao Zedong Thought, the proletarian revolutionaries of the world cannot be assailed by doubts about the future of socialism and communism and cannot be misled by any kind of revisionism.

The time has come for the proletarian revolutionaries who uphold Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought to seize the revolutionary initiative. They can grow in strength and advance on the fertile ground provided by the worsening crisis of the world capitalist system and by the proven bankruptcy of modern revisionism.

While the protracted people's war continues, the Party, the people's army and the organs of political power and the revolutionary mass organizations can continue to exist and grow in strength until they can seize the cities on a nationwide scale. On the way to total victory in the new-democratic revolution, the revolutionary forces and the people achieve definite and tangible victories and enjoy definite gains. The moment the revolutionary forces capitulate, they are reduced to small and inconsequential entities at the mercy of the imperialists and the exploiting classes; the organs of political power already established would disappear. The people under the leadership of the Communist Party of the Philippines cannot be any inferior to their ancestors who fought the colonialists for more than 300 years to reach the old democratic revolution.

It is a great victory that the revolutionary movement led by the Communist Party of the Philippines has already attained in a far shorter time a level of strength and a scale far greater than that reached by any previous revolutionary movement in the entire history of the Philippines. The accumulated strength and experience of the current revolutionary movement must proceed to a new and higher level.

The accumulated achievements and experience of the Party in the new-democratic revolution are abundant and rich. These are bound to become far more abundant and richer upon the basic completion of the new-democratic revolution and the start of the socialist revolution. The protraction of the people's war provides an ample opportunity for the wider and deeper development of the revolutionary forces and for more favorable conditions in the world.

The Filipino people have won brilliant victories in revolution because they are led by the Communist Party of the Philippines under the guidance of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought. Modern revisionism has become discredited and most revisionist regimes, including the Soviet Union, have collapsed. Soviet-sponsored regimes that arose by coup d'état in the 1970s have disappeared. So have been those regimes established by petty-bourgeois-led insurrection. Anticolonial movements dependent on Soviet social-imperialism have gone into neocolonial compromises, reminiscent of 1935 and 1946 in the Philippines. In contrast, the Philippine revolution continues to stand as a pillar of resolute armed revolution against imperialism and the local reactionaries.

But Filipino communists should not become conceited and complacent about their current position in the world proletarian revolution. They have no choice but to work harder, fight more fiercely and be prepared for further sacrifices because the imperialists and the reactionaries are now exerting more efforts to defeat and destroy the Philippine revolution by every foul means. At the same time, there is hope that the widespread social turmoil will lead to the resurgence of the anti-imperialist and socialist movement on a global scale.

In leading the Philippine revolution, the Communist Party of the Philippines consciously integrates the theory and practice of

Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought. When it follows the proletarian revolutionary line, the Party marches from victory to victory. But wherever and whenever this line is violated, the revolutionary movement suffers setbacks. Consequent to the rectification movement that is now being carried out, the Party is enhancing its ideological, political and organizational strength, overcoming deviations, errors and shortcomings and is raising to a new and higher level the fighting will and capabilities of all the revolutionary forces and the broad masses of the people against imperialism and the reactionaries.

[Published in *Mao Zedong Thought Lives; Essays in Commemoration Mao's Centennial (1993)* Jose Maria Sison & Stefan Engel, General Editors. 1995 pp 83-128,]

Reaffirm the Communist Manifesto

**Address to the New Communist Party of the Netherlands
May 1, 1998**

More than 150 years into the foretold struggle between capital and labor, between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat, the *Communist Manifesto* is here reaffirmed. While the communist goal of classless society remains unrealized the ruling class cannot escape the worsening crisis of its own system. The proletariat can only take so much oppression and exploitation and will keep on waging class struggle to overthrow the bourgeoisie and build socialism.

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

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

General Principles of the Communist Manifesto

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

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

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

Since the overthrow of the feudal system, the modern bourgeoisie has ruled capitalist society. It has used science and

technology and exploited the proletariat. In the process it has surpassed and dwarfed the achievements of all pre-capitalist societies put together.

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

The history of capitalism has been characterized by spasms of expansion and contraction. There were the commercial crises of the 19th century. And there have been far graver crises and far more terrible inter- imperialist wars and wars of aggression brought about by monopoly capitalism in the 20th century.

There is a fundamental contradiction between the social character of large-scale commodity production and the private mode of appropriation. The bourgeoisie accumulates capital by extracting surplus labor from the proletariat. Exactly when production rises and the competition among the capitalists intensifies, the capitalists push down the wage and living conditions of the proletariat in order to counter the falling rate of profit. Thus, the market contracts and the crisis of overproduction leads to the massive destruction of productive forces.

Capitalism has reduced society into two great camps, the few who own the means of production and the many who do not and are obliged to sell their labor power in order to subsist. The bourgeoisie consolidates its national market but ceaselessly seeks in the name of free trade to expand the global market, acquire colonies and dominate other people in order to counter crisis and unwittingly or objectively prepare the conditions for a graver crisis.

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

Communists constitute the advanced detachment of the proletariat. By all means, they link themselves with the entire proletariat. They are needed to fulfill the leading revolutionary role

and historic mission of the proletariat, to understand the course of history and to set the line of march for the entire proletariat.

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

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

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

It does not suffice for communists to recognize and lead all the forms of class struggle of the proletariat. The revolutionary essence of the *Communist Manifesto* is to seek the overthrow of the class dictatorship of the bourgeoisie and install the class dictatorship of the proletariat through the class struggle.

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

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

The Achievements of Communists since 1848

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

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

The *Communist Manifesto* set forth the general principles of scientific communism. It contended with the bourgeois and other reactionary forces in Europe trying to frighten the public with nursery tales about the "spectre of communism". It also contended with the various brands of unscientific socialism, those deceptive versions pushed by the feudalists, the petty-bourgeois and the German idealists, the unabashedly conservative or bourgeois and the naive and kindhearted ones of critical- utopian socialism and communism.

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

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

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

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

Free competition capitalism of the 19th century developed into monopoly capitalism or modern imperialism as the dominant force of the 20th century. Lenin inherited, extended and further developed Marxism. He contended with the revisionism, social chauvinism and social pacifism of the social-democratic parties in the Second International.

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

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

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

Stalin pursued the line of socialist revolution and construction. Under his leadership, the Soviet state and people created a powerful

industrial foundation and a collectivized and mechanized agriculture. The educational and cultural system was expanded and it produced within a short period of time the largest contingent of professionals and technicians for socialist construction.

The Soviet Union thrived with a population on one-sixth of the world's surface while the imperialists were stricken with the Great Depression and were driven by their contradictions to the second inter-imperialist war. The Soviet proletariat and people overcame the Nazi German aggression at great cost and proceeded to lead the great counteroffensive against the fascist forces of monopoly capitalism.

In the course of the second inter-imperialist war, communists in so many countries in the world excelled in fighting and defeating the forces of fascism and laid the basis of people's democracies and socialist states. Thus, before the 100th anniversary of the *Communist Manifesto*, communist and workers' parties were in the process of coming to power and consolidating it in several countries. More than one-third of the world's population would be free from the imperialists and the local reactionaries.

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

But alas the new bourgeoisie through the Khrushchov revisionist clique overthrew the proletariat in the Soviet Union in 1956. So did the revisionist cliques in Eastern Europe. For a certain period Mao and Hoxha stood up together for Marxism-Leninism and combated modern revisionism.

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

In 1975, US imperialism was categorically defeated in its war of aggression against the Vietnamese and other Indochinese peoples. For the United States, defeat in this war was far worse than that in the Korean war, which had ended in a stalemate. The US was stricken by a deepening economic crisis which signaled a strategic decline.

But in the latter half of the 1970s, the line of Mao was reversed in China. Soviet bureaucrat monopoly capitalism went into stagnation. And the imperialist alliance headed by the United States had succeeded in entrapping most countries in the third world in the web of neocolonialism.

In the entire 1980s, the dogma of free trade or neoliberalism was anachronistically touted by monopoly capitalism. The restoration of capitalism was speeded up in all the revisionist-ruled countries, including the Soviet Union and China, under the slogan of reforms. From 1989 to 1991, the revisionist rulers were toppled, public assets were brazenly privatized and social turmoil occurred in the former Soviet-bloc countries. The Soviet Union itself disintegrated.

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

As we celebrate the 150th anniversary of the *Communist Manifesto*, we recognize more clearly than ever before that the monopoly bourgeoisie and all its camp followers cannot escape the worsening crisis of their own system. The retrogression of monopoly capitalism to the most naked forms of oppression and exploitation, using the antiquated slogans of liberalism and "free market" has led to an unprecedentedly grave new world disorder.

The revolutionary movement of the proletariat and the people against imperialism and for socialism is beginning to surge forward once again. Communists are preparing for greater battles and greater victories ahead.

Continuing Struggle of the Proletariat

On the 150th anniversary of the Communist Manifesto, the proletariat and the rest of the people of the world confront the

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

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

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

Within the imperialist countries, the basic contradictions between capital and labor, between the monopoly bourgeoisie and the proletariat, is becoming acute. The rise of productivity through higher technology has accelerated the accumulation and concentration of capital and the drive for higher profits.

The most profitable monopoly firms excel at downsizing their labor force in order to maximize their profits. They have the easiest access to finance capital generated by the state, private finance monopolies and multilateral finance agencies.

Unemployment and reduction of real wage levels have led to the contraction of the domestic market of the imperialist countries and in an ever worsening crisis of overproduction. Thus, only the successful monopoly firms register extremely high profits, while many others are unsuccessful and go bankrupt or are absorbed by other firms. There is the general tendency for growth and profit rates of entire national economies to fall.

The entire monopoly bourgeoisie has the illusion that it can solve its problems by accelerating the privatization of public assets, deregulation against public interest and trade and investment

liberalization. It has run amuck in trying to dismantle the social measures and social pretenses of its own state and to blame the proletariat for the ravages of the system of monopoly capitalism. The injury and insult being heaped upon the proletariat are an outrage. This is the prelude to revolutionary resistance.

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

But the shrinkage of the domestic and foreign markets drive the imperialist powers to compete against each other, despite the interweaving combinations of monopoly interests through multinational firms and banks. The greatest shrinkage of the market has occurred in the overwhelming majority of countries which have remained dependent on raw-material production for export. They have been stricken with the crisis of overproduction in this line of production since the 1970s. They have been crushed by the deteriorating terms of trade and foreign debt and forced to go into austerity and abject misery.

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

At first, the revisionist-ruled countries that have rapidly pushed the privatization of public assets appeared to be new fields of investment for the global expansion of capital. But China has undermined its own industrial foundation and has become dependent on the export of low value-added products of which there is now global overproduction. The former Soviet- bloc countries have

destroyed most of their industries and have become dumping grounds of surplus product and speculative capital from the West on top of a smaller amount of productive capital to exploit local cheap labor. Their economies continue to break down.

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

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

As a consequence of the ravages of neocolonialism, social strife has been flaring up in the underdeveloped countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America and in the former revisionist-ruled countries, particularly in the former Yugoslavia and parts of the former Soviet Union. In the current period, US imperialism and Zionist Israel are waging more wars of aggression on the Middle East and elsewhere in order to fill the vacuum left by the collapsed Soviet Union and generate superprofits for the US military-industrial complex.

Countries that are assertive of their national independence and their socialist cause are resisting US imperialism. The toiling masses of workers and peasants in certain countries are led by communist and workers' parties and are waging armed revolution. These parties are significant because they hold high the revolutionary essence of Marxism-Leninism and are inspirational examples in the current transition from a period of global setbacks for the toiling people to a new period of revolutions led by the proletariat on an unprecedented scale.

In the countries where socialism was betrayed by revisionists and which are on a ceaseless course of social and economic

degradation, new communist and workers' parties are arising to reassert the revolutionary legacy of the proletariat and to respond to the challenge of armed revolution against the big bourgeoisie.

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

Contradictions among the imperialist powers are increasingly conspicuous. Their economic competitions and political rivalries are sharpening. The danger of an inter-imperialist war approaches upon conditions of global depression, the rise of fascist forces within the imperialist countries and collisions of interest among the imperialist powers in the dominated countries.

Private and state monopoly capitalism exist together, even as the monopoly bourgeoisie has shifted the stress of its policy from Keynesian to neoliberalism. The monopoly bourgeoisie always uses its own state as the instrument of its class dictatorship to oppress and exploit the proletariat and the people within national boundaries. Farther afield, the imperialist states and the business corporations that they serve dictate upon the client states and impose conditions that escalate the oppression and exploitation of the people.

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

From the 1930s to the 1970s, the imperialist powers used the state in economic activity in order to counter economic crises, wage global war, reconstruct war-ravaged economies, conduct the Cold War and arms race, launch wars of aggression and undertake pseudo-development programs in the former colonies. But since the

1980s, they have shifted to a so-called neoliberal policy of “free trade”.

In so short a time, the fear of stagflation in the 1970s has transmuted into a fear of global deflation and depression in current times.

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

In the backwash of the social turmoil in China in 1989 and the disintegration of the Soviet-bloc revisionist regimes and the collapse of the Soviet Union itself from 1989 to 1991, the conservative bourgeoisie and rabidly anti- communist elements of the petty bourgeoisie have made a strident chorus about the futility of socialism and the class struggle of the proletariat.

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

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

But no matter how strident or subtle is the anticommunist propaganda and no matter how powerful the anticommunist influence of the high- tech mass media, the schools, churches and the like, the proletariat and the masses of the people are confronted with the intolerable conditions of oppression and exploitation and the ever worsening crisis of the capitalist system and are driven by their

own interest to wage revolutionary class struggle against monopoly capitalism and aim for socialism.

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

Right now, certain parties and organizations persistently specialize in misrepresenting themselves as “socialist” and “communist” and in opposing the revolutionary essence of the *Communist Manifesto* and the teachings of the great communist thinkers and leaders. They continue as part of the political variety show of the monopoly bourgeoisie and they stand guard to block the resurgence of the revolutionary movement led by genuine communist and workers’ parties.

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

Communists have a wealth of experience to avail of in overthrowing the class enemy, building socialism, combating classical and modern revisionism and striving to prevent the restoration of capitalism. The next upsurge of the world proletarian revolution will entail learning well the lessons of the past and taking full account of new conditions.

The process of raising the level of theory and practice of communists to a new and higher one is an endless process, within the historical epoch when communists are needed to arouse, organize and mobilize the proletariat and the oppressed peoples and nations in fulfilling its historic mission of building socialism until the ultimate goal of communism is reached.

Ideology and Religion in the Philippines

Lecture to Filipino Catholic priests in The Netherlands,
Belgium and Austria
May 7, 2005

The subject given to me for discussion today is quite general and large. We need to reduce the scope to something more manageable. I propose that we take up the three ideologies that are historically most influential in the Philippines or have demonstrably most affected the Filipino people. These are Christianity, bourgeois liberalism and Marxism.

I use the term ideology, to mean the study of ideas or a system of ideas. For the purpose of our study, I shall make some differentiation of the aforesaid three ideologies at the philosophical level, by referring to their respective basic weltanschauung (world view) and some basic tenets.

We shall not go deep into philosophical questions, like ontology, epistemology, or even ethics as such from any viewpoint. But we shall discuss how each of these three ideologies has taken some material, institutional or social force in the Philippines and how significantly it has influenced and affected the Filipino people.

We may discuss briefly how the ideologies are irreconcilable at the philosophical or theological level and likewise how they are open to dialogue and cooperation. We can discuss how these ideologies have materialized in the Philippines and have resulted in friendly or unfriendly relations among their adherents. The ultimate purpose of the study is to prove that dialogue and cooperation among adherents of different ideologies are possible and desirable, especially at the social level for the common benefit of the people.

I. Christianity

Some Christians say that there is a Christian philosophy in several respects but other Christians may say rigorously that

Christianity is essentially not an ideology or philosophy but a set of religious beliefs that the best of philosophy cannot totally explain. For instance, how can human reason explain completely the Trinitarian mystery of three persons in one God? At any rate, I think that all Christians hold the view that Christian theology is the rational study of God and related religious questions.

St. Augustine said that it is alright for Christians to avail of philosophy so long as belief in the existence of the Supreme Being is affirmed a priori. Thus, he made use of Platonic philosophy (as interpreted by Plotinus) in order to assert the existence of God prior to all creation and shed light on other fundamental doctrines of the church. Later in the Middle Ages, St. Thomas Aquinas in his theological work made use of Aristotle to deal more elaborately with the relations of the divine and the mundane.

From the point of view of Marxists, it is idealism of the objective type to believe in any supernatural being existing objectively and independently of and prior to material reality. Christian believers consider material reality as God's creation. At any rate, they stand for the combination of faith and good works as they follow the first great commandment "to love God above all" and the second great commandment "to love thy neighbor as thyself."

Christianity came to the Philippines with Spanish colonialism in the 16th century. The early Christian fathers acted in the service of the church and the Spanish crown. They served as the chaplains of the expeditionary forces and as missionaries to Christianize the natives and persuade them to accept Spanish colonial rule. In a manner of speaking, it was true that the sword and cross combined to subjugate the people.

The colonialists used divide-and-rule tactics. They recruited native troops from one part of the country to quell the rebellious natives elsewhere. But they also made use of the friars to persuade the natives to submit to the colonial authority. They made use of the catechism, the mass and the confessional box to great effect. They followed the line of reasoning that it was better to colonize and Christianize the natives than to let them be as pagans or as Muslims.

Spanish colonialism could last for so long in the archipelago because of the network of friars in parishes and convents. These

provided a widespread base for the development of the central administration in Manila and the galleon trade between Manila and Mexico. The Spanish religious orders gained authority and wealth. A theocracy veritably came to exist.

Within the first century of Spanish colonial rule, the Spanish friars successfully pushed the formal abolition of slavery and the *encomienda* system. But the feudal system of land ownership by the religious orders and native landlords had already expanded. Serfdom took the place of the pre-colonial system of small scale patriarchal slavery. *Corvee* labor was required for public works.

The religious orders engaged in works of charity. They used these as the reason and the base for playing a major role in the galleon trade. They made money on the cargo space allocated to them. When agricultural production for export and foreign trade flourished in the 19th century, the religious orders arbitrarily expanded their landed estates and exacted higher rent from the tenants. Thus, the people became outraged.

Before the middle of the 19th century, most of the *indios* and mestizos who reached the university level studied for the priesthood. But upon the growth of foreign trade, local production and domestic commerce, more students could afford to reach the university to study not only for the priesthood but also for such other professions as law and medicine.

The increase of secular priests among the *indios* and mestizos eventually led to the secularization movement led by Fathers Burgos, Gomez and Zamora who demanded that the religious orders turn over the parishes to the secular priests. These three priests were garroted in 1872 after having been convicted of the false accusation of masterminding the Cavite mutiny. Their martyrdom ignited an unprecedented wave of national sentiment against the injustice. The moral authority of the colonial authorities, lay and clerical, came into question in the minds of the people.

In the 1880s well-to-do families sent their children to study in Europe for several reasons, like getting a better kind of higher education and avoiding the repressiveness of the state and friar-controlled university. The students who went to Spain started the propaganda movement for reforms within the colonial framework.

Although they were reformists, they served as the conveyor of bourgeois liberal ideas from Europe to the Philippines.

In the 1890s the revolutionary current surged in the Philippines. The armed revolution led by the Katipunan of Andres Bonifacio broke out in 1896. It called for separation from Spain. It was inspired by the bourgeois liberal ideas of the French revolution. It stood for national independence, republicanism, separation of church and state, public educational system and the promotion of industry, agriculture and trade.

The Catholic Church hierarchy and the religious orders served Spanish colonialism to the end. But the Filipino secular priests in general were either supportive of or sympathetic to the revolution. Father Gregorio Aglipay joined the Filipino revolutionaries and became the vicar general of the revolution after Bishop Nozaleda sent him as emissary to them.

In both phases of the Philippine bourgeois-democratic revolution, first against Spanish colonialism and then against US imperialism, Filipino priests actively participated by rallying the people to the revolutionary cause and by being the most effective collectors of resources for the revolutionary government and army. After the Malolos constitution was promulgated in 1899, Apolinario Mabini had to propose to the cabinet the suspension of the provision on the separation of church and state for fear that this would prevent the clergy from doing logistical work for the revolutionary movement.

After Spanish authorities surrendered Intramuros (the walled city of Manila) to the US military forces in 1898, the United States and Spain signed the Treaty of Paris under which the US purchased the Philippines from Spain for 20 million US dollars and Spanish corporations and citizens, including the Spanish religious orders, retained their property rights in the Philippines. This was the big compromise between the outgoing and incoming colonial powers.

In the course of the Philippine revolution, the Filipino secular priests came in control of the parishes and the convents abandoned by the friars. After the revolution, the religious orders would recover from their losses by concentrating on their convents and schools and by taking missionaries from the US and Ireland to suit the circumstances of the US colonial rule. The Society of Jesus was

quickest at taking in a mix of Spanish, American and Irish Jesuits. The Augustinians and Dominicans were slower in recomposing their religious personnel.

The US colonial administration expropriated large tracts of land from the religious orders for redistribution at a price to the tenants. The religious orders sent a part of their cash income to their Rome headquarters and used another part to invest in big comprador operations run by the rich Spanish families, Roxas, Ayala and Soriano. Thus, the church became a major part of the comprador big bourgeoisie ruling the semifeudal society. To this day the Bank of the Philippine Islands is a major factor of big comprador collaboration between the church and the old Spanish super-rich.

As the US colonial government established the public school system and encouraged Protestant missions to enter the Philippines, the Catholic Church and the religious orders (including new ones from the US) developed their own educational system at various levels. They used both the churches and the schools to retain their role as the dominant church in the Philippines. Through the Catholic schools, they combined in the curricula religious instruction with the subjects of bourgeois liberal education and training.

In the social encyclicals since *Rerum Novarum*, the Popes present the Church as above Marxism and liberalism or above socialism and capitalism and as being in favor of some idealized medieval guild system. But in Catholic schools in the Philippines, there is in fact a partiality to capitalism and bourgeois liberal ideas, especially in courses in business, accounting, law, economics, political science and other social sciences. The Church believes that the encyclicals would help the members of the exploiting classes to have a social conscience and to cope with the social discontent and mass movements of the working people.

In the second half of the 1930s, the Commonwealth government president Quezon raised the slogan of social justice and offered cooperation to progressive organizations in order to deal with the social discontent and the threat of fascism. Fascist-minded Spanish Dominican friars openly provoked President Quezon when they had the school band play a Spanish fascist march when he visited his Letran alma mater. A fascist-minded American Jesuit also used the

Chesterton Guild to make radio broadcasts of anti-Bolshevik propaganda.

During my years in high school at the Ateneo de Manila in the 1950s, the Jesuits there were quite rabid in pushing Cold War propaganda and were proud of the Jesuit-educated Senator Joseph McCarthy of witch hunt notoriety. They called then Senator Claro Mayo Recto a “crazy communist.” Jesuit-trained anticommunists like Manuel Manahan and Raul Manglapus were the rah-rah boys of the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) handpicked by President Magsaysay.

I was deeply pleased when Fr. Hilario Lim rebelled against the Jesuit Order and, together with other priests belonging to other religious orders, advocated the Filipinization of the Catholic religious orders. I helped him to speak in the University of the Philippines (UP) and other universities. I was very glad to do so because I saw the colleges and universities run by the foreign-controlled religious orders as the hotbeds of the most reactionary ideas, intolerant of patriotic and progressive ideas.

The influence of Catholic thinking extended into the supposedly nonsectarian and liberal University of the Philippines, when I was a student and then a young teacher. The Catholic militants among the faculty and students tended to overreach. At one time, I denounced the authorities in my department for overloading a course on great ideas with the writings of such Catholic thinkers as Cardinal Newman, G. K. Chesterton, Hilaire Belloc, Pierre Teilhard de Chardin, the neo-Thomists Jacques Maritain and Etienne Gilson, and totally ignoring those of Marx and Engels.

Cardinal Santos and other bishops endorsed the martial law proclamation of Marcos in 1972 and called for giving the latter a chance to undertake “reforms.” But I had high hopes that the pro-imperialist and reactionary big comprador-landlord character of the institutional church could be counteracted from within. The Christians for National Liberation (CNL) was then budding forth.

I expected that the CNL could take more courage and strength by availing of the tradition of the revolutionary clergy in the old democratic revolution and the progressive provisions in the social encyclicals of Pope John XXIII and Pope Paul VI. The CNL became

a major organization in the National Democratic Front of the Philippines (NDFP) in 1973. By 1974 the progressive clergy was ready to openly support the La Tondeña strike and subsequent strikes and to press Cardinal Sin and other bishops to speak up against the human rights violations being perpetrated by the Marcos fascist regime.

The patriotic and progressive clergy and church people did splendid work in participating in the struggle to expose, oppose, isolate, weaken and overthrow the Marcos fascist dictatorship. They demonstrated that their faith in God is in harmony with their determination and passion to serve the people. After all, the teaching of the church requires that faith and good works must go together.

II. Bourgeois liberalism

What Marxists may describe as the philosophy of subjectivist idealism, using the perception or cognition of the individual as the starting point, reached the Philippines mainly in the form of the political philosophy of bourgeois liberalism. This was imbibed by the propagandists of the 1880s and adopted definitively by Andres Bonifacio and other revolutionary leaders in the 1890s through their reading of books about the Enlightenment and the French revolution and liberal constitutions from abroad in order to confront the colonial and feudal situation in the Philippines.

This bourgeois liberalism is more in the tradition of French rational philosophy bannered by Descartes (*cogito, ergo sum*) than British empiricism. The Cartesian deduction is that God created the world and left it like a clock to function by itself. Whether it is that of John Locke or David Hume, British empiricism is preoccupied with the question of appearance and reality and the aspect of perception in human consciousness. The Lockean type of empiricism presumes a material substratum, while that of the Hume type presumes reality as nothing but the complex of sense data.

At any rate, bourgeois liberalism as it has come to the Philippines upholds the Declaration of the Rights of Man, the principles of liberty, equality and fraternity, science and democracy, freedom of thought and belief, enlightenment and education.

Our Filipino revolutionary forefathers drew the ideas of bourgeois liberalism from their original sources in continental Europe. If we look

for earlier conveyors of bourgeois ideology other than the reformist propagandists of the 1880s, we can look at the records of the free masons in the 19th century.

In connection with the French revolution, exponents of bourgeois liberalism divided into two, the Jacobins who were determined to end the ancient regime by armed revolution and the Girondists who wanted to peacefully morph the monarchy into a constitutional one. A similar dichotomy occurred in the Philippines, with Jose Rizal seeking to establish the reformist *La Liga de los Compromisarios* and Andres Bonifacio, the revolutionary Katipunan.

Revolutionary ideology may come from abroad because the revolutionary movement developed there ahead and won power earlier. But it is not only a matter of subjective borrowing from abroad. The ideas must first of all be applicable to the general level of social development and motivate the local revolutionary class and the people to wage revolution.

In struggling against the colonial and feudal situation, the nascent bourgeoisie adopted bourgeois liberalism as the guiding ideology rather than Marxism, which then was also available. It was fine enough that the Filipino people and revolutionary forces pioneered the bourgeois democratic type of revolution in colonial Asia.

The Philippine revolution won resoundingly against Spanish colonialism. The revolutionary leaders and government produced political writings and adopted and implemented policies, which reflected the Filipino people's conditions, needs, demands and aspirations for national independence, democracy, social justice and all-round social progress. But US imperialism intervened and launched a war of aggression against the Philippine republic.

To succeed, it used not only superior military power and tremendous economic resources but also ideological and political deception. To justify the aggression, it claimed to bring Christianity and democracy to the Filipino people. It proclaimed a policy of benevolent assimilation. It was monopoly capitalism on the rampage but used the Jeffersonian slogans of liberal democracy to deceive and co-opt the bourgeois leadership of the revolution.

Bourgeois liberalism bifurcated in the Philippines. One was the progressive kind still held onto by those who sought to pursue the

revolutionary struggle for national independence. The other was the pro-imperialist reactionary kind that became increasingly dominant as the official signboard of the US colonial regime.

The false claim to liberalism by the imperialist power had some semblance of truth because it had the leeway to carry out certain changes that appeared to make the Philippines freer and more progressive than under the decrepit colonial and feudal system under Spain. The US colonial regime established the public school system. It expanded the system of transport and communications. It carried out some amount of land reform, which at first was impressive. It allowed the peasants free movement either to have homesteads in frontier areas or become farm workers in the expanding export-oriented plantations. It opened the mines. Its corporations established some manufacturing enterprises.

The US was indeed a modern imperialist power that could make direct investments and impose loans on the Philippines for the purpose of bringing about a semifeudal economy and drawing superprofits from it. Even after its proclamation of the defeat of the Philippine revolution, the US prohibited the public display of the Philippine flag and suppressed other manifestations of Filipino patriotism. At the same, because the popular demand for immediate, absolute and complete independence could not be silenced, the US kept on promising the grant of national independence on the precondition that the Filipino leaders and people submitted themselves to the new colonial power and fulfilled their training in "democracy."

American teachers came in large numbers to teach in public schools at various levels. The University of the Philippines was proclaimed as a nonsectarian liberal institution of higher learning. In the Philippine Normal School and the regional teacher training schools John Dewey's books were used as textbooks. His utilitarian brand of pragmatist philosophy was thus propagated. It asserts that only through experimentation and practical results can the truth or meaning of a proposition be proven.

The US colonial regime developed the public school system to assure itself of personnel for the expanding bureaucracy and the professions. It also pushed the pensionado system, which involved

the sending of Filipino bureaucrats and academics to the US for further education in various professions. Thus, in education, government, politics, professions and other spheres, Filipinos with a pro-US colonial mentality ultimately outnumbered those who held allegiance either to the previous colonial and clerical authorities or to the Philippine revolution.

By 1946 when it granted nominal independence to the Philippines and turned it into a semicolony, the US was confident that it had adequately trained puppets to replicate themselves in the political, economic and cultural fields. A bourgeois liberal constitution had been made since 1935 in the name of a commonwealth government, in preparation for the neocolonial republic. The economy was securely semifeudal, under US hegemony and run by the big compradors and landlords. Politics and the bureaucracy up to the national level could be turned over to the politicians of the big compradors and landlords.

The educational system and mass media spread the ideas, information and entertainment that jibe with the US-controlled semicolonial and semifeudal system. The US uses scholarships and travel grants under US official agencies (e.g. Fulbright, Smith-Mundt, US State Department, AID, etc.) and US private philanthropic foundations (e.g. Ford, Rockefeller, etc.,) in order to influence and control the thinking of the politicians, mass media personnel, academicians, cultural workers, the intelligentsia in general and the masses. US commercial films and pop music have a strong impact on the minds of the people.

The “free marketplace of goods and ideas” is the most repeated liberal slogan used by the defenders of the status quo to describe the system. The glorification of the market is founded on bourgeois liberal philosophy and is sustained by the view of Adam Smith that the social good is attained through the invisible hand of self-interest in the market.

The semicolonial political system controlled by foreign monopoly capitalism, domestic feudalism and bureaucrat capitalism is called a “liberal democracy.” The semifeudal economic system is variably called “free enterprise,” “market economy” and the like. The US and the Filipino puppets play semantical games to deceive the people.

From one puppet regime to another, they describe as land reform what amounts to an offer of commercial sale of land at a prohibitive price for the landless poor. They describe as industrialization the establishment of reassembly and repackaging plants to serve domestic consumption as in the 1950s or the export market in current times.

They scoff at the proposal of national industrialization on the basis of local resources as “backward integration” and putting up raw-material mills and sweatshops for low-value added semi-manufacturing for export as “forward integration.” Since the neoliberal shift of economic policy stress to “free market globalization, the puppet regimes have played up the myth of the “free market” to obscure the need for development through national industrialization and land reform.

In the final analysis, the semicolonial and semifeudal system is a system of violence. This includes the daily violence of exploitation in factories, farms and service lines and the conspicuous brutal force for assaulting striking workers and protesting people and for suppressing the people’s revolutionary movement. The imperialists and reactionaries justify such violence in various clever ways.

Since the launch of the Cold War after World War II, they have used the spectre of communism as supposedly destructive of freedom in order to justify the anticommunist hysteria and witch hunts and the violent suppression of the patriotic and progressive mass movements. Despite the successful bloody suppression of the people’s revolutionary movement in the early 1950s, the US imperialists and reactionaries proceeded to enact the Anti-Subversion Law of 1957 for the purpose of conducting an anticommunist witch hunt. According to its main proponent, Rep. Joaquin Roces, the real main drafters of the law behind the scenes were an American Jesuit priest teaching at the Ateneo de Manila and the political secretary of the US embassy.

As earlier pointed out, a socioeconomic, political and legal compromise or alliance exists between the forces of imperialism and reaction and the institutional church. This partnership provides the widest base for the most effective kind of anticommunist propaganda. In philosophical and theological terms, a close kinship

exists between the church and the secular oppressors and exploiters. Of course, the relationship of the ideas and their history needs to be examined if we hope for a change of situation or direction for the better.

The anticommunist propaganda of the Cold War and the Anti-Subversion Law prepared the climate for the emergence of the Marcos fascist dictatorship and the persistence of the most reactionary policies against the working people in the post Marcos regimes. Once more in a big way the US-instigated “permanent war on terror” emboldens pro-US bourgeois governments all over the world to adopt the open rule of terror under the pretext of anti-terrorism and drives the US to unleash preemptive strikes and wars of aggression.

Before, during and after the Cold War, the US imperialists and their puppets have used all forms of anticommunist propaganda, ranging from the crudest military psywar and political rabble rousing to the most sophisticated intellectual and philosophical anticommunist lines of thinking in universities, seminaries and the like. I have mentioned some basic positions and variants in bourgeois subjectivist philosophy. It is not necessary to try mentioning all of them here. They are too many. They are churned out daily by the university presses that publish doctoral dissertations. It is in the nature and method of subjectivist philosophy to be one-sided, fragmentary, self-indulgent, narrow-minded, too shortsighted sometimes and too farsighted at other times.

Certain bourgeois philosophical trends have influenced academics and professionals in the Philippines. They do not spread right away to the mass media and to the masses. But they serve to reinforce the more secular kind of bourgeois subjectivism such as liberalism. They include logical positivism, existentialism, phenomenology, art for art’s sake in aesthetics, behaviorism, behavioralism, structuralism, post structuralism, post-modernism and relativism. So much philosophizing has been done in the service of the Cold War and modern revisionism by those who present themselves as Marxists, Neo-Marxists or quasi-Marxists but who are actually anti-Marxists.

We can discuss any of the major or minor bourgeois subjectivist philosophies if you can raise the point or question pertinent to our topic today. None of these subjectivist philosophical trends has more influence and effectiveness in Philippine society than the political philosophy of liberalism.

III. Marxism

As a system of ideas established by Marx and Engels, Marxism has three basic components: the philosophy of dialectical materialism, political economy as critique of the capitalist system and social science revolving around the concepts of class struggle and the class dictatorship of the proletariat. Each component is supposed to have come from the best sources at the time of Marx and Engels.

To develop dialectical materialism, Marx and Engels studied German philosophy, particularly the works of Hegel and Feuerbach. Hegelian dialectics was the best of idealist philosophy as it sought to explicate development, even if through the thought process of thesis-antithesis-synthesis, which is to be realized subsequently in history. The problem with this concept of the self-development of thought was that it does not originate from material reality and it ends with a “final perfection” in the form of the “transcendental state.”

With the help of the materialist ideas of Feuerbach, Marx turned Hegel upside down to establish the philosophy of dialectical and historical materialism, which recognizes matter as the starting point and which explains development through the contradictions within matter as well as contradictions between matter and consciousness. Engels tried to explain the laws of contradiction in terms of the natural sciences. Marx thoroughly applied the law of contradiction (materialist dialectics) in his works, especially his critique of the capitalist economy.

To develop Marxist political economy, Marx studied British political economy, particularly Adam Smith and David Ricardo who recognized labor as the source of value. The labor theory of value is not original with Marx. What is original with him is the penetrating study of the commodity as the basic cell of the capitalist economy and the definition of the theory of surplus value. The surplus value is the unpaid labor from which the industrial capitalist gets his profit and pays interest to the bank and rent to the landowner.

To develop the Marxist social science, Marx and Engels studied French social science (particularly the democratic-minded historians and writers) from which they drew the concept of the class struggle. They developed this further to the level of the concept of the class dictatorship of the proletariat. They asserted that the class dictatorship of the bourgeoisie (the bourgeois state) must first be overthrown in order to establish the class dictatorship of the proletariat (the socialist state).

According to a labor historian, the acclaimed founder of the Philippine trade union movement Isabelo de los Reyes came back to the Philippines at the beginning of the 20th century from his imprisonment in Barcelona, bringing with him the works of Marx and the anarcho-syndicalists. At that time, Marxism was already the dominant trend in the European trade union movement. But it would take some decades before Marxism came to be adopted by a definite Philippine organization as the ideological guide to action.

The Communist Party of the Philippine Islands (CPPI) was first established by Crisanto Evangelista and other working class leaders in 1930. It categorically adopted Marxism as the revolutionary guide to action. It was inspired by the Bolshevik revolution and the Third International. At the same time, it was well founded on the circumstances of the Filipino people and achievements of the Philippine working class movement. It directed the proletariat and the people to fight for their rights and interests.

Like the early Christians persecuted by imperial Rome, the Filipino communists were persecuted by the colonial regime of US imperialism. A few months after the founding of the CPPI, the colonial authorities disrupted a peaceful mass rally of the workers and urban poor. Then, they falsely accused the CPPI leaders of sedition and had them arrested, imprisoned and convicted for sedition. They banned the CPPI until President Quezon of the Commonwealth government agreed, for the sake of promoting his call for social justice and supporting the international popular front against fascism, to release the CPPI leaders and allowed the CPPI to operate legally in 1937.

Even when it was banned, the CPPI did everything it could to develop the mass movement of the workers and peasants. It

continued to do so after regaining legality in 1937 and going into a merger in 1938 with the Socialist Party (SP) headed by Pedro Abad Santos. When they occupied Manila in 1942, the Japanese fascists arrested and murdered Evangelista and Abad Santos, respectively chairman and general secretary of the merger party of the CPPI and SP.

The people's army led by the merger party was patriotic and independent of the other guerrilla forces who had sworn allegiance to the US within the USAFFE framework and who were ordered by MacArthur to wait for the return of US military forces. It fought the Japanese occupation fiercely. It carried out land reform. It established democratic organs of political power up to the provincial level in Central Luzon.

But upon US reconquest of the Philippines, the US puppet troops viciously attacked the revolutionary forces and people, despite the declared policy of the merger party to welcome the return of the Commonwealth government and participate in the neocolonial republic to be established. The US imperialists were hellbent on retaining and expanding economic, political, military and cultural control over the Philippines under the cover of the nominal grant of independence.

The merger party launched what it called an all-out armed struggle to win power in two year's time. The US-propped puppet government broke the backbone of the armed revolutionary movement in the first two years of the 1950s. In 1957 it enacted the Anti-Subversion Law in order to destroy every trace of Marxist ideology, politics and organization by penalizing any vestige, substitute, extension or successor of the old merger party of the CPPI and SP. But conditions in the Philippines continued to deteriorate at the expense of the working people and broad masses due to the oppression and exploitation perpetrated by foreign monopoly capitalism, domestic feudalism and bureaucrat capitalism.

The patriotic and progressive mass movement, generated by the forces of the workers, peasants, youth, women, professionals, religious and others, became resurgent in the 1960s. In 1968 the Communist Party of the Philippines was reestablished under the guidance of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought and on the

basis of opposing modern revisionism, rectifying errors in the history of the merger party and setting forth the tasks for waging revolution.

The reestablished CPP is of the view that it has benefited from the three basic components of Marxism and from the contributions of Lenin, Stalin and Mao to develop them. It has learned from the lessons of carrying out socialist revolution and socialism under Lenin, Stalin and Mao as well as from the negative lessons of revisionist betrayal. It considers as matters of the utmost importance Mao's penetrating analysis of the law of contradiction, epistemology and social practice and his theory of continuing revolution under proletarian class dictatorship to consolidate socialism, combat revisionism and prevent the restoration of capitalism.

However, in terms of the class analysis of Philippine history and current circumstances, the reestablished CPP considers as an advance on its predecessor CPPI and the merger party of the CPP and SPP its explication of the semicolonial and semifeudal conditions, the need of a new type of national democratic revolution led by the proletariat, the friends of the revolution such as the toiling masses and the middle social strata, the enemies such as the exploiting classes of big compradors and landlords, the basic tasks of struggling for national liberation and democracy and the socialist perspective.

The CPP has been able to strengthen itself ideologically by upholding and applying Marxism-Leninism, politically by pursuing the general line of new democratic revolution through protracted people's war and organizationally by adhering to the principle of democratic centralism. It has overcome errors and shortcomings through rectification movements and criticism and self-criticism. It has also surmounted tremendous odds through hard work, arduous struggle and sacrifices.

It has succeeded in building its own nationwide organization among the toiling masses, the people's army, the democratic organs of political power, the mass organizations and various types of alliances. It has prevailed over a 14-year fascist dictatorship that aimed to destroy it as well as over succeeding regimes. It has prevailed over the ideological, political and military attacks unleashed by all these puppet regimes under US direction.

Sometime ago, the imperialists, their puppets and other camp followers have claimed that the history of humankind has reached its end in capitalism and liberal democracy and cannot go any further towards socialism. They have obscured the work of the modern revisionists in undermining and destroying socialism for decades and exaggerated the role of Reagan and the Pope in this regard.

They have gone so far as to claim that the success of neocolonialism in undermining and negating the national independence of the backward countries has rendered futile the struggle for national independence against imperialism, its neoliberal pretense of “free market globalization” and its neoconservative drive for wars of aggression in a bid to impose a Pax Americana on the people of the world in the entire 21st century.

Let me say with scientific certitude and revolutionary optimism that so long as the people are oppressed and exploited they will resist and fight for a new and better world. They will fight for national liberation, democracy and socialism. Indeed, as oppression and exploitation are now worsening, the people’s resistance is steadily spreading and intensifying throughout the world.

IV. Relations of Marxism, Christianity and Liberalism

In this concluding part of my presentation, let me discuss how Marxism, Christianity and liberalism can be related to each other in certain terms. To facilitate my discussion, let me proceed from the viewpoint of Marxism. I think that you expect that from me.

Marxists recognize that Christianity, liberalism and Marxism have appeared on the high road of civilization in that historical sequence in the world and in the Philippines. Each of these is supposed to offer something radically new and progressive relative to something old and reactionary in a certain period of history.

Christianity asserts the dignity of the human person, freedom of conscience and love of and service to others. These are principles that made Christianity radically new and progressive relative to those of the period of slavery. But Christendom and its theocratic presumptions became suffocating relative to the advance of science and the Enlightenment, the rising aspirations of the bourgeoisie and the common people who began to demand a new society, the

separation of church and state and a comprehensive definition of rights, including the freedom of thought and belief.

In Philippine history, Christianity has had its positive and negative manifestations. Marxists acclaim the secularization movement and the Gomburza martyrdom, the partisanship of the Filipino secular priests to the Philippine revolution, the Christians for National Liberation, the outstanding resistance of the priests, nuns and church people against the Marcos fascist dictatorship and their continuing participation in the struggle for national liberation and democracy. These are in contrast to the long colonial history of the Catholic Church and its continuing institutional service and attachment to the secular powers of the semicolonial and semifeudal society.

Marxism appreciates the progressive role of the bourgeoisie against feudalism in world history. It honors the revolutionary bourgeois liberalism that guided the old democratic revolution. It continues to consider as a basic force of the revolution the urban petty bourgeoisie, which advocates a patriotic and progressive kind of liberalism. However, it upholds the leading role of the proletariat in the new democratic revolution. It condemns the pro-imperialist and reactionary kind of liberalism. It criticizes and repudiates bourgeois rule and the bourgeois concept of freedom.

In bourgeois liberalism, the democratic rights and freedoms are attributed to the individual in the abstract. The difference between exploited and exploiting classes is glossed over. The difference between the ownership of the means of production and the ownership of the means of subsistence is obscured by the generalized right to own property as means to pursue happiness. The difference between oppressor countries, as colonialists and imperialists, and the oppressed peoples and nations, is not at all taken into account in the bourgeois bill of rights.

What Marxism requires is that aside from guarantees for the rights of the individuals and groups there must be guarantees for the rights of the exploited class of individuals against the class of exploiters. Further there must be guarantees for the rights of the entire people or nation against imperialism, neocolonialism and colonialism. Marxists fight for a new state and new constitution that

guarantees freedom from oppression by a class, state and foreign oppressors.

It is already well proven in history that Christians, liberals and Marxists can live together, dialogue and cooperate with each other for the common good of the people. They can enjoy in common the freedom of thought and belief. They can coexist without giving up their distinctive philosophies and beliefs. In the course of the new democratic revolution, the CPP has been leading the process of building various revolutionary forces (people's army, organs of political power, mass organizations, alliances etc.) in which Marxists, Christians, liberals and people of other persuasions live in harmony and cooperate. They can stand on the same common social ground and negotiate and agree on social, economic, political and cultural guiding principles and policies that are beneficial to all.

In recent times, they were able to unite against the Marcos fascist dictatorship, oppose its grave human rights violations and overthrow it in 1986. Once more they were able to unite against the corrupt Estrada regime and removed it from power in 2001. Right now, they are considering how to oust the Arroyo regime. They can agree on the most resolute and militant course of action for the good of the entire people. They can go as far as overthrow the current unjust ruling system and replace it with a patriotic and democratic government.

It is possible, desirable and necessary for Marxists, Christians and liberal to dialogue, cooperate and work together in the struggle for national liberation, democracy, social justice and all-round development. Those who do not comprehend or who lag behind in comprehending this proposition can be persuaded through patient reasoning. There are no other methods than information, education and well-reasoned persuasion for raising the level of common understanding and cooperation.

But of course there are rabid anticommunists, pro-imperialists and die-hard reactionaries. If their position is a matter of conviction or opinion, they have the right to hold on to it and there is no other way to deal with them but through debate or dialogue. It is an entirely different matter if they wield and use state power to suppress the Marxists and other people. The problem of armed counterrevolution

is different from counterrevolutionary thinking and has to be dealt with differently.

But even when there is already a clash of arms, peace negotiations are possible. Thus, the National Democratic Front of the Philippines (NDFP) has agreed to undertake peace negotiations with the Government of the Republic of the Philippines (GRP). The substantive agenda includes respect for human rights and international humanitarian law, social and economic reforms, political and constitutional reforms and the end of hostilities and disposition of forces.

If the pro-imperialists and die-hard reactionaries succeed in scuttling the peace negotiations, it only means that they want to settle the civil war through the application of the so-called purely military solution. They are carried away by the Bush line of permanent "war on terror." The revolutionary forces and people have to prepare against the worst in order to be able to hope for the best.

Development, Current Status, and Prospects of Maoist Theory and Practice in the Philippines

**Conference on Maoism, Jan van Eyck Academie, Maastricht
September 5, 2012**

Introduction: Definition of Maoism

The Communist Party of the Philippines (CPP) was reestablished on the theoretical foundation of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism on December 26, 1968. Since 1995, it has officially used the term Maoism as synonym for Mao Zedong Thought. The adoption of the term is due to language alignment in relation to Marxism-Leninism rather than due to any change of meaning or line in relation to Mao Zedong Thought. Since September 3, 1993 in his message to the Symposium on Mao Zedong Thought in Manila, the CPP founding chairman has referred to adherents of Mao Zedong Thought as Maoists.

The Communist Party of the Philippine stands by its definition of Mao Zedong Thought or Maoism as the third stage in the development of the theory and practice of the revolutionary proletariat towards the ultimate goal of communism. The ongoing stage of Maoism proceeds from the previous stages of Marxism and Leninism, respecting and upholding the theoretical and practical achievements of each stage, extending and developing them further and making new achievements.

Maoism has arisen thus far as the highest stage in the development of the theory and practice of proletarian revolution by confronting the problem of modern revisionism and putting forward the theory and practice of continuing revolution under proletarian dictatorship through cultural revolution in order to combat revisionism, prevent the restoration of capitalism and consolidate socialism. Among the many great achievements of Mao, the

aforesaid theory and practice constitutes his greatest. This inspires hope for a socialist and communist future against imperialism, revisionism and reaction.

Mao is indubitably correct in identifying the revisionism of degenerates in power in socialist society as the most lethal to socialism, and in offering the solution that succeeded in China for ten years before it was defeated in 1976. The disintegration of the Soviet Union and the full restoration of capitalism in revisionist-ruled countries in the period of 1989-91 have vindicated Mao's position on the crucial importance and necessity of the struggle against revisionism and the theory of continuing revolution under proletarian dictatorship.

The Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution (GPCR) can be regarded as the prototype for the ample realization of the theory of continuing revolution in socialist society, like the Paris Commune of 1871 was the prototype for the proletarian class dictatorship that won victory in the October Revolution of 1917. Proletarian revolutionaries can be confident that they are forearmed with the theory behind the GPCR and the experience gained from it in order to face the challenge of revisionism in socialist societies.

Maoism encompasses the major contributions of Mao to further develop such basic components of Marxism as philosophy, political economy, and social science as first laid down by Marx and Engels in the period of free competition capitalism and the rise of the modern industrial proletariat in the 19th century. Maoism also encompasses Mao's major contributions to further develop Lenin's earlier theoretical and practical achievements in developing the aforesaid components and to carry forward the great victory of Lenin and Stalin in socialist revolution and construction in the era of modern imperialism and proletarian revolution.

In philosophy, Mao made a penetrating study of the unity of opposites as the most fundamental law in materialist dialectics. He explained the wave-like alternating and interactive advance of theory and practice, and social practice (i.e., production, class struggle and scientific experiment) as the source of knowledge. In political economy, he based himself on the Marxist critique of capitalism and the Leninist critique of modern imperialism, learned from the Soviet

experience in socialist revolution and construction, and put forward a political economy of socialism that sought to improve on the pioneering experience of socialist revolution and construction in the Soviet Union.

In social science, Mao followed the teachings of Marxism and Leninism that class analysis is applied on a class society, that class struggle is the key to social progress and that class struggle in bourgeois society must lead to the class dictatorship of the proletariat over the bourgeoisie in the attainment of socialism. Mao's class analysis of the semicolonial and semifeudal society enabled the Chinese Communist Party to win the people's democratic revolution with the correct program and strategy and tactics, and proceed to the socialist revolution.

Subsequently, his class analysis of Chinese society in the period of socialist revolution and construction showed the correct handling of contradictions in such society. He reiterated the Leninist thesis that classes and class struggle would continue to exist in socialist society, that the resistance of the defeated bourgeoisie would increase 10,000-fold, and that it would take a whole historical epoch for the proletariat to completely defeat the bourgeoisie. He was well grounded in recognizing the threat of modern revisionism in China and the need for the theory of continuing revolution under proletarian dictatorship.

Mao stressed the necessity and importance of working class leadership through the Party and the basic alliance of the working class and peasantry in the new democratic revolution. He posited that the semicolonial and semifeudal society is in chronic crisis, and that the huge peasant population in the countryside serves as the basis for the strategic line of protracted people's war and establishment of the revolutionary organs of political power even while the reactionary state still sits in the urban areas.

He developed further the Leninist theory and practice of Party building and pushed forward the rectification movement as an educational method through the mass movement for rectifying major errors and strengthening the Party by raising the revolutionary consciousness and capabilities of the Party and the masses. The

rectification movement in the Party was the seminal basis for the conception of the cultural revolution in socialist society.

Mao pointed out that the bourgeoisie, after being politically and legally deprived of the private ownership of the means of production, retreats to the cultural realm to survive and make new recruits even among the children of the working people being educated under the socialist system. The cultural sphere can thus become the breeding ground for bourgeois subjectivist ideas, revisionism and retrogression, unless an indefinite series of proletarian cultural revolutions are undertaken.

Mindful of the way modern revisionism arose in the cultural sphere and then the political sphere in the superstructure in the Soviet Union, Mao put forward the theory and practice of continuing revolution under the dictatorship of the proletariat through the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution from 1966 to 1976. This involves a process of revolutionizing the relations of production and the superstructure through a mass movement led by the proletariat and its party.

Development of Maoism in the Philippines

Prior to the reestablishment of the Communist Party of the Philippines in 1968, we the proletarian revolutionaries in the Philippines adhered to the teaching of Lenin that there can be no revolutionary movement without revolutionary theory, and that the first requisite in Party building is ideological building. We applied the revolutionary theory of Marxism and Leninism in the formulation of the basic documents of the Congress of Reestablishment: "Rectify Errors and Rebuild the Party," "Constitution of the Communist Party of the Philippines" and "Program for a People's Democratic Revolution."

We read and studied the works of Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin and Mao. These included the *Communist Manifesto*, *Das Kapital*, *Wages, Prices and Profit*, *Anti-Dühring*, *Critique of the Gotha Program*, *Civil War in France*, *What Is to Be Done*, *Materialism and Empirio-Criticism*, *State and Revolution*, *Two Tactics of Social Democracy*, "Left Wing" Communism: An Infantile Disorder, *Imperialism: the Highest Stage of Capitalism*, *Foundations of Leninism*, *Short History of the CPSU*, *Selected Works of Mao Zedong*, *the Polemics on the*

General Line of the International Communist Movement, the little Red Book of quotations from Mao and major documents of the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution.

We sought to understand Marxist-Leninist philosophy, political economy, social science, the history of the international communist movement, and the strategy and tactics of the Russian and Chinese revolutions, the then ongoing Vietnamese revolution and other revolutions. With the aid of theoretical studies, we tried to understand the history and situation of the world, the Philippines and the old Communist Party of the Philippine Islands established in 1930 and merged with the Socialist Party (SP) in 1938. We read and studied the documents of the old communist party before and after its merger with the socialist party.

We adopted the theory of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism as the guide to revolutionary action. We considered it as the fruit of the long revolutionary experience of the world proletariat under the guidance of Marxism-Leninism, and as the latest, most comprehensive, most profound and most effective instrument for analyzing the history and circumstances of the Filipino people and for setting forth the tasks to accomplish the people's democratic revolution in preparation for the socialist revolution.

We sought to integrate Maoism with the concrete conditions of the Philippines and with the concrete practice of the Philippine revolution. In this regard, we applied materialist dialectics and class analysis in summing up and analyzing the history of the Filipino people, defining the basic character of Philippine society and recognizing the need for a people's democratic revolution. These were clearly stated in the basic documents of the Congress of Reestablishment and would be further developed in the book of Amado Guerrero, *Philippine Society and Revolution*, first published in mimeograph form in 1969 and subsequently in several more editions and translations to this day.

We were inspired and guided by Mao's class analysis of the semicolonial and semifeudal society. Thus, we were able to understand the character of Philippine society and clarify the need for the people's democratic revolution, the class leadership of the proletariat, the basic alliance of the workers and peasants against

the joint dictatorship of the comprador big bourgeoisie and landlord class servile to foreign monopoly capitalism, the united front policy, the strategic line of protracted people's war, and the socialist perspective. With the aid of Mao's teachings on the building of the Party, the people's army and the united front, we were able to sum up and analyze the history of the old Communist Party. We criticized the defective ideological foundation of the merger of the communist and socialist parties and mainly the bourgeois subjectivism and major Right and "Left" opportunist errors of the succession of Lava brothers who became general secretary of the Party. Ultimately, we decided to break away from the old party in 1966 and launched in 1967 what is now known as the First Great Rectification Movement (FGRM) that laid the basis for the reestablishment of the Communist Party in 1968.

We issued the basic document of the rectification movement, "Rectify Errors and Rebuild the Party," both to criticize and repudiate the errors of the Lava revisionist renegades and to proclaim the urgent necessity of waging the people's war along the general line of people's democratic revolution against US imperialism and the local exploiting classes of big compradors and landlords. We committed ourselves to building the three great weapons of the revolution, namely, the Party as the advanced detachment of the proletariat, the revolutionary armed struggle on the basis of the worker-peasant alliance, and the united front of patriotic and progressive forces.

We criticized and repudiated the Right opportunist line of Vicente Lava, which was responsible for breaking up the people's army into small armed teams of only five members under the "retreat for defense" policy in 1942, generating pessimism and passivity during the war of resistance against Japan, subordinating the people's army to the US strategic plan to reconquer the Philippines and subsequently welcoming reconquest by the US in 1945, echoing the Browderite "peace and democracy" slogan of the Communist Party of the USA, and demobilizing the people's army for parliamentary struggle within the framework of the 1946 puppet republic.

We criticized and repudiated the "Left" opportunist line of Jose Lava, which called for waging "all-out armed struggle" and "winning victory in two year's time," without paying attention to painstaking

mass work and land reform, overestimating the so-called “geometric progression” of the people’s army due to the people’s growing hatred for the corruption of the regime of Elpidio Quirino in 1949, basing the main force of the people’s army in a series of isolated camps in the unpopulated areas of the Sierra Madre mountain range, and launching one wave of offensives and ultimately failing to overcome the enemy counteroffensive in a situation that became purely military.

We criticized and repudiated the “Right” opportunist line of Jesus Lava, which consisted of ordering the conversion of the people’s army into “organizational brigades” for legal struggle in 1955, liquidating the Party branches with the “single file policy” in 1957, disconnecting the party leaders from the remaining units of the people’s army, and failing to generate even a legal mass movement. When we the proletarian revolutionaries started to join the old Communist Party in 1962, not a single Party branch existed. We were the ones who formed the Party branches in localities and Party groups in mass organizations in the 1960s.

The First Great Rectification Movement under the guidance of Mao Zedong Thought provided a sound basis for formulating the “Program for the People’s Democratic Revolution,” and the “Constitution of the Communist Party of the Philippines.” In preparing the founding of the New People’s Army on March 29, 1969, we drew inspiration from the victorious people’s war in China and the war of national liberation in Vietnam against the US war of aggression in order to formulate the Rules of the New People’s Army. We criticized and repudiated the Taruc-Sumulong gangster clique for usurping authority over remnants of the old people’s army as well as for perpetuating the mentality and practice of roving rebel bands.

The process of reestablishing the CPP was interconnected with the world proletarian revolution and the struggle against imperialism, modern revisionism and all reaction. We upheld Marxism-Leninism against modern revisionism, which was first espoused by Khrushchov and then by his successor Brezhnev. We had an adequately full view of the ideological debate between the Chinese Communist Party and the Soviet Communist Party. We avidly read and discussed the polemics between the two parties. We sided with

the Marxist-Leninist anti-revisionist position of Mao and the Chinese Communist Party.

We studied how modern revisionism had developed to dominate the Soviet Union and other communist parties in Eastern Europe and elsewhere and how the danger of modern revisionism had also emerged in China. On such grounding, we welcomed the theory and practice of the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution. We took a Marxist-Leninist position against modern revisionism not only on the basis of studying the pertinent events abroad but also on the basis of the struggle against the Lava revisionist renegades who were acting under the influence of the Soviet-centered modern revisionism.

Since 1963, we had criticized and repudiated Khrushchov's bourgeois populist notions of the "party of the whole people" and "state of the whole people" which denied the proletarian character of the Soviet party and state; and his bourgeois pacifist views, such as "peaceful transition to socialism" which denied the necessity of revolutionary violence against counterrevolutionary violence, "peaceful economic competition" which gave primacy to economic struggle over political struggle and "peaceful coexistence" which was overstated as the general line of the international movement and not simply the policy governing the diplomatic relations of socialist states with other kinds of states, irrespective of ideology and social system.

The Lava revisionist renegades sought to prevent the criticism of the serious opportunist errors of the Lava brothers from 1942 onward, and used the Khrushchovite notion of "peaceful transition" to buttress their position that there must be an indefinitely long period of legal struggle leading to the general offensive in the form of uprisings. The proletarian revolutionaries took the position that the legal mass movement—especially that of the workers and peasants which they had already started to develop—must serve as the basis for organizing the people's army and starting the people's war. We argued that the semicolonial and semifeudal society was in chronic crisis and that the countryside and the peasantry could provide the physical and social terrain for building the people's army and accumulating strength in stages in accordance with Mao's teaching on the strategic line of protracted people's war.

We studied how among various ways the Khrushovite revisionists breached the socialist system by decentralizing the economy and making enterprises and collectives autonomous and individually responsible for their cost and profit accounting, and how in contrast the Brezhnevite revisionists subsequently recentralized major enterprises along the line of state monopoly capitalism in order to assure the central authorities of funding and the ability to engage in the arms race. We studied how the socialist system had been built and how the revisionists were dismantling it in the philosophical, socioeconomic, political, military and cultural spheres.

The CPP Congress of Reestablishment in 1968 was attended by twelve delegates (with one in absentia) representing around 80 Party cadres and members. These led hundreds of advanced mass activists who were being prepared for Party membership, and most of whom were leading trade unions and mass organizations of urban poor, peasants, women, youth, professionals and cultural workers. The total number of the organized urban mass base nationwide was at least 30,000. Party membership rose by the hundreds from 1968 to 1971, reaching the 2,000 level in 1972 and 4,000 in 1974. The Party members came mainly from the trade unions, urban poor community associations and peasant organizations, and from the Kabataang Makabayan (Patriotic Youth).

The Party established the New People's Army on March 29, 1969 by combining the proletarian revolutionaries and the good elements of the old people's army who had broken away from the Taruc-Sumulong gangster clique. The Party central leadership based itself in the second district of Tarlac province where the good remnants of the old people's army had a mass base of 80,000 in several municipalities. Here the New People's Army started with 60 Red fighters armed with only nine automatic rifles and 26 inferior firearms. Despite starting from scratch, we were optimistic because of the justness of our revolutionary cause and because we were inspired by Mao's teaching that we could grow from small to big and from weak to strong.

The Party cadres and the armed propaganda teams spread out to do mass work in the countryside of Tarlac and nearby provinces. They formed the barrio (village) organizing committees as the

temporary appointive organs of political power. They established the revolutionary mass organizations of workers, peasants, women, youth, children and cultural activists. Drawing the best elements from the mass organizations, Party branches were established as the leading force in the locality and the barrio revolutionary committees were established as elected bodies and as the relatively stable organs of political power.

The Party led the organs of political power and the mass organizations supported them in undertaking mass campaigns and activities related to mass education, mass organizing, land reform, production, health and hygiene, arbitration, and cultural work. To augment and assist the people's army, the militia units were formed in the villages and all able-bodied men and women in mass organizations served as self-defense units. When a platoon-size strike force was subsequently formed, it coordinated daily with the local guerrilla units, armed propaganda teams and the militia units.

On the basis of the strong mass base, the New People's Army was able to launch an increasing number of tactical offensives against the enemy. The offensives were carried out by teams, squads and a platoon-size strike force. Through these offensives the NPA increased the number of its automatic rifles from only nine in 1969 to more than 200 by the end of 1970. The enemy reacted with the 5,000-strong Task Force Lawin consisting of army, police and paramilitary forces. Known peasant leaders in every village were assassinated. It became a daily and nightly occurrence for the enemy to raid 5 to 10 villages at every given time with the aim of locating the Party central leadership.

Even prior to the formal founding of the New People's Army, politico-military training was conducted from January to March 1969 in order to prepare the deployment of a few politico-military cadres to a few provinces in other regions for opening new guerrilla zones. The most successful of these expansion efforts were in the province of Isabela in Northeast Luzon. The three politico-military cadres assigned there created a mass base of 150,000 before the end of 1970. In view of the bigger mass base and the better terrain for guerrilla warfare, the Party central leadership began to transfer to Isabela in 1970.

In the forest region of Isabela, hundreds of politico-military cadres were trained for expansion within the region and nationwide. The Party and the mass organizations in Manila and other parts of the country sent cadres there for politico-military training and participation in mass work. The trained politico-military cadres were redeployed to establish or strengthen regional Party committees and NPA regional commands in all regions of the Philippines from 1972 to 1974. Ten regional Party and army organizations had been formed by 1974 and these increased to fifteen before 1977 as a result of the division of the Mindanao island organization into several regional organizations.

The NPA used and improved upon the strategy and tactics of guerrilla warfare and methods of expansion and consolidation which had been successfully tried out in Tarlac and Isabela. By the 1975 plenum of the CPP Central Committee, the nationwide strength of the NPA had reached more than 1,000 high-powered rifles, with the full-time Red fighters augmented by the people's militia and the self-defense units of mass organizations. The Party employed the policy of united front for armed struggle in order to take advantage of violent splits among the reactionaries, to open new guerrilla zones, and to acquire weapons and other forms of support from allies.

Under the direction of the newly reestablished Party, the urban-based mass movement expanded more rapidly and became more militant than ever in Manila and on a nationwide scale. It led to the First Quarter Storm of 1970. In Metro Manila alone, for three months weekly mass actions of from 50,000 to 100,000 people marched from several directions and rallied at major public places and in front of the presidential palace, Congress and the US embassy in order to condemn the anti-people, anti-national and antidemocratic policies and acts of the US-directed Marcos regime. The demonstrations spread to provincial capitals and cities. Their principal slogans included: "Dare to struggle, dare to win!"

"People's war is the answer to martial law!" Amado Guerrero wrote the First Quarter Storm, a series of articles, to track and define the protest mass actions against the three evils of US imperialism, domestic feudalism and bureaucrat capitalism.

The US-Marcos regime tried with brute force to suppress the First Quarter Storm and the subsequent protest mass actions until 1972. It suspended the writ of habeas corpus on August 21, 1971 and then proclaimed martial law on September 21, 1972 in order to impose a fascist dictatorship on the people. This compelled the legal forces of the national democratic movement to go underground and encourage their activists to participate in the people's war. The Party steadily developed its strength in the underground and encouraged indoor and outdoor protest actions.

On April 24, 1973, the Preparatory Commission of the National Democratic Front issued the 10-Point Program of Revolutionary Action (or NDF Manifesto: Unite to Overthrow the US-Marcos Dictatorship) for developing the united front in support of the revolutionary armed struggle, thus signaling the founding of the National Democratic Front (NDFP). The NDF succeeded in creating its own cells and it focused on united front work among aboveground unions and peasant associations not identified by the enemy as Party-led, among associations of urban petty-bourgeois intellectuals and professionals, among the religious and among the anti-Marcos reactionary politicians. In 1975 the Party and NDF underground in Manila carried out the La Tondeña strike which sparked off strikes in 300 workplaces nationwide. The Christians for National Liberation in the NDF played a key role in helping the workers to defy the fascist authorities.

The years from 1968 to 1977 may be considered as the foundational years of the CPP, the NPA and the NDFP under the guidance of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism. The early development of the revolutionary forces was guided by the basic documents in the reestablishment of the CPP, the NPA and the NDFP, and by Philippine Society and Revolution. The Party was focused on waging the revolutionary armed struggle as the main form of struggle while it continued to encourage and revitalize the legal urban mass movement even with the fascist dictatorship ruthlessly ruling the country.

For the purpose of ideological building, the Party translated and published the short classic works of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin. It arranged and published handy volumes of Mao's works under

seven general headings: *On Class Analysis and Social Investigation, On Party Building, On Building the People's Army, On Armed Struggle, On the United Front, On Economic Work and Land Reform, and On Propaganda and Cultural Work*. These were translated into Pilipino, the national language. Regional Party organizations translated them into the regional lingua franca and disseminated them within their areas of responsibility.

The CPP issued the "Organizational Guide and Outline of Reports" in 1971 to guide mass work and require prompt and accurate reporting of results. The "Summing Up of the First Three Years" in 1972 showed the results of the various aspects of the revolutionary struggle. The CPP promulgated in 1972 the "Guide for Establishing the People's Democratic Government" as the people's constitution to serve as framework for the organs of political power. It also promulgated in 1972 the "Revolutionary Guide for Land Reform." Amado Guerrero's "Specific Characteristics of People's War" in the Philippines was issued in 1974, drawing on our experience in applying the strategic line of people's war in our archipelagic country. As a result of the 1975 Plenum of the Central Committee, "Our Urgent Tasks" was issued in 1976 to further clarify the ideological, political and organizational line and tasks and show the methods for accomplishing them.

The decisions and directives of the Central Committee and other central organs, the reports to the Central Committee on the regional investigation of social conditions and revolutionary work, the exchange of communications between higher and lower organs of the Party leadership and other writings of Party cadres and members are a rich source of information on how the CPP applied Marxist-Leninist-Maoist theory in the practice of the Philippine revolution. *Ang Bayan* served as the official publication of the Central Committee for news reporting and analysis of domestic and global events and issues. Special pamphlets carried important articles. Subsequently, *Rebolusyon* was published as the theoretical and political organ of the Central Committee.

From 1969 to 1977, the Party established regional Party organizations and regional commands of the NPA: Northeast Luzon, Northwest Luzon (including Cordillera), Central Luzon, Manila-Rizal

(national capital region), Southern Tagalog, Bicol, Western Visayas, Central Visayas, Eastern Visayas, and several regions of Mindanao. These covered the entire country. Tarlac and Isabela set the pattern for opening and developing guerrilla zones, which basically involved creating the mass base and commencing land reform, showing to the masses the necessity and importance of the people's army in the elimination of despotic landlords, local tyrants and bad elements, and proceeding to tactical offensives against the enemy armed forces carried out by teams, squads and platoons of the NPA.

Guerrilla zones were established in areas favorable for guerrilla warfare. They were consolidated to become guerrilla bases through painstaking mass work, land reform, and the building of the organs of political power and the mass organizations. Subsequently, clusters of guerrilla zones and guerrilla bases were consolidated to become the guerrilla front, with the district Party committee and the guerrilla platoon serving as the main strike force and center of gravity for the relatively dispersed squads and armed propaganda teams. Millions of people were in the guerrilla fronts. The NPA in Mindanao was the first to adopt the term "guerrilla front" and to build main guerrilla units and secondary guerrilla units.

In 1976 the NPA platoons in the region of Eastern Visayas were showing to the entire revolutionary movement how to launch frequent tactical offensives in an extensive and intensive guerrilla warfare on the basis of an ever widening and deepening mass base, with the use of platoons against municipal police forces and small army detachments, and accumulate weapons rapidly despite ferocious enemy campaigns of encirclement. The Party central leadership considered it wise to multiply the platoons on a nationwide scale for the purpose of delivering effective blows against the enemy forces and seizing weapons.

Comrade Mao's strategy and tactics of people's war, as applied by the "Specific Characteristics of People's War in the Philippines," and as practiced by the Party cadres and NPA commanders and Red fighters, ensured the self-reliant advance of the revolutionary armed struggle in the country. The archipelagic character of the Philippines did not confound the Party. It was considered merely as an initial disadvantage but eventually a long-term advantage.

The expanse of the countryside, the archipelagic and mountainous character of the Philippines allowed the Party to divide and disperse the strength of the enemy armed forces by giving utmost importance to the principle of centralized ideological and political leadership and decentralized operations, the principle of self-reliance, and the principle of advancing in phases and eventually in stages in the people's war. By 1977 the NPA had established more than 30 guerrilla fronts nationwide, on terrain favorable for guerrilla warfare.

In an effort to supplement and boost the self-reliant conduct of people's war, two attempts were made to import weapons in 1972 and 1974. The first one was partially successful but in the main failed; and the second attempt completely failed. The Party summed up and drew lessons from these negative experiences. Without a common land border with a helping state, the people's army would have to practice the principle of self-reliance by seizing arms from the enemy forces and making the reactionary armed forces its unwitting chief transport and supply officer.

The Party summed up and analyzed its conduct of people's war and practiced criticism and self-criticism to correct errors and improve methods and style of work. Among the notable errors criticized were the introduction of firearms without prior mass work in Negros Occidental in 1969, bypassing the Visayan peasants and going straight to the hill tribes in Mindanao from 1972 to 1973 and the concealment and passivity of two full companies of the NPA in the Isabela forest region from 1972 to 1974. The Party learned lessons from setbacks and the death or capture of Party cadres and Red commanders at various times. The revolutionary movement on the whole kept on advancing, despite some major errors and setbacks. The capture of no less than the Chairman of the Party Central Committee in 1977 did not dampen or disrupt the advance of the people's war.

The CPP, NPA and other revolutionary forces in every region have a long and rich story to tell about how in their formative years they grew in strength and advanced against tremendous odds, how they combined the armed struggle and united front, how they coordinated the legal and illegal forms of struggle, how they at

certain times committed serious errors, suffered setbacks and overcame these through criticism and self-criticism, actual rectification and revitalization. Time prevents me from giving even only a summary of the story of every region. I can only give the salient points in the development of Maoism in the Philippines.

In the period from 1978 to 1986, the strength of the revolutionary forces continued to grow due to their adherence to the teachings of Mao and the leadership of the CPP, and of course due to the Filipino people's increasing hatred for the Marcos fascist dictatorship. The armed revolutionary movement in the countryside grew steadily. In 1978 the mass movement in urban areas engaged in widespread open mass protests, including noise barrages in the national capital region and provincial cities. It was growing steadily until the Marcos regime assassinated Benigno Aquino in 1983. The Party seized the opportunity to undertake the broadest possible united front and generate the rapid upsurge of the urban mass movement. The broad masses of the people rose up in their millions to bring down the fascist regime in 1986.

The largest mass organizations in the protest mass actions belonged to the national democratic movement. At the same time, the NPA intensified its tactical offensives against the enemy. The CPP applied the policy of the broad united front in order to isolate and destroy the power of the US-propped Marcos fascist regime. It relied mainly on the basic worker-peasant alliance, gave full play to the alliance of the progressive and patriotic forces and made a temporary alliance with unreliable reactionary groups like those of Aquino and others. After the fall of Marcos, the Aquino regime was obliged to release all political prisoners but later on claimed that the revolutionary movement had nothing to do with the overthrow of Marcos.

Party membership had risen to more than 30,000 by 1986. The guerrilla fronts had increased to more than 60 in 14 regions outside the national capital region. In most regions of the country, the organs of political power and rural-based revolutionary mass organizations thrived. A total of seven million people were in guerrilla fronts. The armed strength of the NPA increased to more than 5,000 high-powered rifles in 1983. The growth of the people's army decelerated

because of the errors of “Left” opportunism. The NPA strength was recorded at 5,600 at the time of the 1985 Plenum of the Central Committee. This increased to 6,100 in 1986.

Relative to the military strength of the enemy, the strength of the NPA was far smaller but it was augmented by the tens of thousands of people’s militia with inferior firearms, and by the hundreds of thousands of self-defense units of the revolutionary mass organizations. Contrary to persistent claims of the enemy armed forces and the bourgeois mass media, the NPA never reached 25,000 high-powered rifles in the 1980s.

Even while the strength of the CPP, NPA, NDFP, the organs of political power and mass organizations grew from 1978 onward because of the excellent Maoist foundation of the CPP and the perseverance of the Maoist proletarian revolutionaries, anti-Maoist elements in high positions in the CPP started to generate subjectivist and opportunist lines, especially from 1981 onward. They spread the subjectivist line that the Philippine economy was no longer semifeudal but semicapitalist, in effect claiming that the big comprador-landlord Marcos fascist regime had industrialized and urbanized the Philippines by some 40 percent.

The detained founding Chairman of the CPP was able to make in 1982 the long interview, “On the Mode of Production in the Philippines,” to counter the subjectivist line and to sustain with statistics and analysis the position that the Philippine economy was still agrarian and semifeudal. The interview served to support the proletarian revolutionaries in holding their ground and stopping the subjectivist line from spreading and gaining the upper hand in the entire Party. In 1983 he wrote in “The Losing Course of the Reactionary Armed Forces” that NPA strength could grow very rapidly upon reaching the critical mass of 5,000 high-powered rifles but warned against premature verticalization or the formation of unsustainable larger units.

“Left” and Right opportunist lines bifurcated from the subjectivist line. The “Left” opportunist line was stronger than the Right opportunist until 1987. The new Party leadership misconstrued the early phase of the strategic defensive—the phase at which the people’s war still was—as the advanced phase, and aimed to

undertake what it inappropriately called the phase “strategic counteroffensive” as the final phase of the strategic defensive ushering in the strategic stalemate. The rhetorical “advance” in the people’s war concealed the fact that in 1978 the strength of the people’s army was around 1,500 high-powered rifles. It was still a period in which the example of building platoons and using them for frequent offensives as in Eastern Visayas, particularly Samar, still needed to be replicated in other regions.

Impetuosity afflicted not only the central leadership but also the regional leadership in Eastern Visayas when it decided in 1979-80 to build companies and two battalions. But the regional leadership was dissuaded from carrying out its plan and was directed to expand in the region by using platoons and to make its tested cadres available to the central leadership for redeployment to help other regions, especially Negros, Panay and Mindanao. In the entire country as a whole, the Party and the NPA were able to expand the mass base and wage successful tactical offensives.

The central Party leadership was not able to carry out its so-called “strategic counteroffensive”. However in 1981, the Mindanao Commission invented its own brand of military adventurism, which it called the Red Area-White Area (RAWA) strategy. It decided that the time was past for mass work and that it was time to build in Mindanao 15 NPA companies as a purely military force as soon as possible by putting together the smaller NPA units which had been doing mass work. At the same time, it considered the armed city partisans and the spontaneous masses in the cities as the politico-military leading force for winning the revolution through urban insurrection. Carried away by impetuosity, underground Party cadres participated openly in mass actions dubbed as people’s strikes.

The first three companies showed good military results in offensives against the enemy. But as more companies and more staff units were formed, the mass base became weakened and eventually eroded. At the same time, the companies became vulnerable to enemy attacks as they were easily sighted by enemy informers and army reconnaissance teams. When the policy of prematurely forming NPA companies resulted in enemy successes at ambushing the NPA units and when urban underground cadres were

being raided and captured or killed, the Mindanao Commission resorted to blaming “deep penetration agents” (DPAs) as the cause of the setbacks instead of reviewing and casting away the wrong policy. In 1985, the caretaker committee of the Mindanao Commission decided to launch a hysterical putschist campaign supposedly to ferret out and rid the region of so-called DPAs. It called the campaign Kampanyang Ahos, which turned out to be a criminal bloody witchhunt within revolutionary ranks.

The grave errors of “Left” opportunism were not promptly rectified and led to successful enemy attacks and such anti-informer hysteria as Kampanyang Ahos [Garlic Campaign] in 1985 to 1987 in Mindanao and at various times the so-called June breakthrough in Manila, anti-DPA campaigns in Northern Luzon and Negros island and Operation Plan Missing Link in the Southern Tagalog region.

The advance of the armed revolution was undermined and slowed in various areas for certain periods. The premature formation of big military units resulted in the neglect of mass work and the contraction of the mass base. Lacking a deep and wide mass base, and with greatly reduced flexibility and mobility, the big NPA units became more vulnerable to enemy detection and attack. For the most part of the 1980s, it was the turn of the Bicol regional Party organization to provide the exemplary well-balanced development of the Party, the people’s army and mass base among the regional organizations.

Right opportunism reared its ugly head in 1980, when the so-called popular democrats proposed to convert the National Democratic Front into a “New Katipunan” by taking out the leadership of the proletariat, supposedly to make the united front more attractive to the bourgeoisie. A new draft program that diluted the revolutionary content of the previous program and echoed the bourgeois ideas of the Dengist counterrevolution in China was put forward but was opposed and shelved. A proposal was also made to reconsider the character of the Soviet Union as a social imperialist power in order to facilitate approach to the Soviet Union and its allies for military assistance.

The Right opportunists were stopped from pushing the proposal to change the character of the NDF and dilute its program. Their

move was easily repudiated by the proletarian revolutionaries as the people's war intensified towards the overthrow of the fascist dictatorship in 1986. But after the fall of Marcos, the Right opportunists overstated the boycott policy of the Party leadership in the 1986 presidential snap election as a strategic error and whipped up recriminations against the central leadership. They were openly grateful to the US-directed Aquino regime for the so-called democratic space and sought to ingratiate themselves with the Aquino regime.

Following his release from prison, the founding chairman of the CPP delivered a series of 10 lectures, titled *Philippine Crisis and Revolution*, at the University of the Philippines in 1986. It was intended to counter and clear up the confusion being sown by the "Left" and Right opportunists about the downfall of Marcos and the character of the Aquino regime, and more importantly to update *Philippine Society and Revolution* and clarify the new situation and the new tasks of the revolutionary movement. The compiled lectures served to firm up the revolutionary principles and raise the fighting spirit of the Party and the revolutionary movement in the face of the attempts of the Aquino regime to carry out a scheme of destroying the movement through a combination of violence and deception.

By this time, the "Left" opportunists had conjoined with the Right opportunists to exaggerate the boycott error as the worst error of the CPP, in order to cover up the far more disastrous character and consequences of their grave errors of principle and line and their crimes in the anti-DPA witchhunts. They were prating that only urban insurrections and importation of arms could successfully counter the gradual constriction of guerrilla fronts under the enemy's war of quick decision.

After the failure of their policy of so-called nationally coordinated operations in 1987-88, which consisted almost entirely of harassment operations and which wasted a lot of ammunition, the "Left" opportunists were basically a spent force and became dispirited and defeatist. Some of them joined the Right opportunists in praising Gorbachov for his "new thinking" and then celebrating the full restoration of capitalism of the revisionist-ruled countries from 1989 to 1991. Together they started to jockey for staff positions in

various reactionary parties and in various agencies of the reactionary government.

In the years from 1988 to 1991, the Party surveyed the extent of the loss of the revolutionary mass base as a result of the self-constricting line of the “Left” opportunists. It became clear in 1991 that the loss of the mass base had reached 60 percent nationwide. The handful of “Left” opportunists who were incorrigible increasingly became anti-CPP, anti-Mao and anticommunist. They collaborated with the incorrigible Right opportunists in anticommunist propaganda and racketeering in NGOs funded by the imperialists and local reactionary politicians. In 1991, the Party Central Committee prepared for the Second Great Rectification Movement by drafting its most basic document, based on the reports and recommendations of lower Party organs and organizations.

Current status of Maoism in the Philippines

The current status of Maoism in the Philippines can be understood and appreciated only by observing how the Maoist theory has been successfully applied to the concrete practice of the Philippine revolution in the new democratic stage, how it has been used to confront and overcome tremendous odds in the objective situation and solve problems in the development of the Party and other revolutionary forces; and how it has guided all the revolutionary forces to preserve themselves, grow in strength and advance.

It has been a great historic feat for the CPP to have overcome the tremendous attempts of the US imperialists and the local reactionary forces to destroy the Party and the entire revolutionary movement with the use of task forces (Lawin and Saranay) against the NPA supposedly to “nip it in the bud” from 1969 to 1972, the 14-year long fascist dictatorship of Marcos from 1972 to 1986 and the succession of pseudo-democratic regimes which have pretended to give “democratic space” to those who seek national independence and democracy but have never ceased to use brutal campaigns of anticommunist and antipeople suppression.

The CPP has been guided well by Maoist theory that the new democratic revolution, through the strategic line of protracted people’s war, is the correct and just response of the people to the joint dictatorship of the big comprador and landlord classes ruling the

semicolonial and semifeudal society under the hegemony of US imperialism. It is well proven that the US and the local exploiting classes have been unable to defeat the revolutionary movement of the people with the use of violence and deception.

In more than four decades of revolutionary armed struggle, the CPP has been able to lead and build the people's army, the organs of democratic power in the countryside, the revolutionary mass organizations, and the united front of patriotic and progressive forces. On the basis of the ever growing mass base, the CPP has been able to establish Party branches in the localities. Under its leadership, the people's democratic government is growing against the reactionary government and the ruling system in chronic crisis.

The reactionary government is compelled to recognize the revolutionary government by engaging in peace negotiations with the National Democratic Front of the Philippines (NDFP). A series of foreign governments (Dutch, Belgian and Norwegian) have facilitated the peace negotiations. In the light of international law, the NDFP negotiates with the Manila government on an equal footing as a co-belligerent in a civil war. In this regard, the CPP founding chairman has clarified the NDFP framework of negotiations in "Two Articles on the People's Struggle for a Just Peace." "The Hague Joint Declaration" sets the mutual framework of peace negotiations between the NDFP and the Manila government. The NDFP has asserted in its Unilateral Declaration of Undertaking to Apply the Geneva Conventions and Protocol I the existence of the revolutionary organs of political power as constituting the people's democratic government. So far, the peace negotiations have resulted in the Comprehensive Agreement on Respect for Human Rights and International Humanitarian Law, signed and approved by the principals of the negotiating parties in 1998.

The revolutionary forces and people led by the CPP adhere to the principle and line that the struggle for a just and lasting peace is exactly the struggle for national liberation and democracy. Peace negotiations can succeed only if such struggle of the people is fulfilled. The revolutionary forces cannot be led astray by false illusions about the peace negotiations. Instead, they have been able to avail of the peace negotiations as a means to put forward just and

reasonable demands for social, economic and political reforms for the immediate and long-term benefit of the Filipino people and have been able to broadcast internationally the program for a people's democratic revolution and to expose the anti-national and antidemocratic character of the Manila government.

Consequent to the long-term subversion and betrayal of socialism by modern revisionism and the complete victory of the capitalist counterrevolution in China, Soviet Union and other former socialist countries, the US imperialists and the Filipino reactionaries have been prating that socialism is hopeless and that history cannot go beyond capitalism and liberal democracy. They have tried to demoralize the people and the revolutionary forces with the assertion that there is no more socialist country to aid them and that there is no other way but to capitulate to imperialism and its reactionary stooges.

But thanks to the teachings of Mao on the new democratic revolution, on the principle of self-reliance and on the mass line, the revolutionary movement of the Filipino people has been able to grow in strength and advance without having to depend on material assistance from abroad. More than 98 percent of the NPA armed strength comes from fighting the enemy. Less than two percent comes from donations by local allies. Again, thanks to Mao's proletarian revolutionary line against modern revisionism since the latter half of the 1950s, the CPP has been founded on the line of upholding Marxism-Leninism and opposing modern revisionism.

All revolutionary forces of the Filipino people comprehend the degeneration and ultimate disintegration of socialism in countries ruled by the modern revisionists. They are further armed with the Maoist theory of continuing the revolution under proletarian dictatorship in socialist society. They are not only well-grounded in the practice of the new democratic revolution but have the foresight to build socialism and combat the danger of revisionism and capitalist restoration. The socialist revolution commences upon the basic completion of the new democratic revolution through the nationwide seizure of political power.

A revolutionary party of the proletariat like the CPP is subject to the law of contradiction at every stage of the revolution. It must be

alert to the incessant need to struggle against the bourgeoisie that exerts influence from the outside or manages to creep into the Party through unremolded or retrogressive petty bourgeois elements who misrepresent petty bourgeois ideas as proletarian ideas and attack the Marxist-Leninist-Maoist line either subtly or crudely.

Being well versed on the teachings of Mao, the CPP was in a position in 1992 to identify, criticize and repudiate the major errors of subjectivism and opportunism from 1980 to 1991 that were aimed at undermining and liquidating the Party and the revolutionary movement. It successfully launched the Second Great Rectification Movement (SGRM) in 1992, with the overwhelming support of the Party cadres and members who have remained loyal to the Party and Marxism-Leninism-Maoism.

Exactly at the time that the incorrigible opportunists imagined that they could deliver the death blow to the CPP, the central leadership issued the rectification documents: "Reaffirm Our Basic Principles and Rectify Errors," "General Review of Major Events and Decisions from 1980 to 1991" and "Stand for Socialism Against Modern Revisionism." Indeed, without the Second Great Rectification Movement, the CPP and the entire revolutionary movement would have disintegrated from within, as openly wished by a US intelligence asset collaborating with and pushing the incorrigible opportunists.

Instead, the Maoist proletarian revolutionaries carried out the Second Great Rectification Movement from 1992 to 1998 as a campaign of theoretical and political education to reaffirm basic revolutionary principles, criticize and repudiate the major subjectivist opportunist errors, and revitalize the revolutionary forces and movement. The SGRM also involved practical measures to counter the wrecking operations by the highly-placed degenerates and renegades; to recover the personnel and resources misappropriated and messed up by them; to reorient and redeploy cadres; and to revitalize the entire Party and revolutionary movement.

In presenting the current status of Maoism in the Philippines, it is necessary to take up the ten issues raised in the Second Great Rectification Movement and to narrate the positions and actions taken by the Party and the consequences. The issues are the

following: 1) the theory and practice of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism; 2) the anti-revisionist line; 3) the semifeudal and semicolonial character of Philippine society; 4) the general line of new democratic revolution; 5) the Party as the vanguard force; 6) protracted people's war and guerrilla warfare; 7) revolutionary class line in the united front; 8) principle of democratic centralism; 9) the socialist perspective; and 10) proletarian internationalism.

1) Upholding the theory and practice of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism

The CPP took note that the subjectivists and opportunists had deliberately put aside the study of the theory and practice of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism within the organs and units in which they were supposed to be Party cadres. They stopped such study in order to impress and bamboozle other Party members that they had better ideas, which were actually drawn from non-Maoists and anti-Maoists. They displayed an eclectic array of anticommunist petty bourgeois ideas.

Under the pretense of refining, improving or even surpassing Marxist-Leninist theory, they put forward the subjectivist line that Philippine society was no longer semifeudal but "semicapitalist" and proceeded to put forward all sorts of harebrained notions to make quick and easy the process of taking power and effecting social revolution. The "Left" opportunists offered armed urban insurrection and military adventurism in lieu of protracted people's war. And the Right opportunists offered legal struggle and reformism as the protracted way for making the ruling system ripe for overthrow.

Among the "Left" opportunists were military putschists who fancied themselves as generals of large army units without a mass base and urban insurrectionists who wanted to mimic the anti-authoritarian insurrection in Nicaragua. At the start of the SGRM, the exponents of these variants of "Left" opportunism were already discredited by their dislike for the study of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism, well-known failures and criminal acts and were exposed as alien to the Party.

But some "Left" opportunists occupying high positions in the Party committee in the national capital region sought to stop the SGRM and in the process exposed thoroughly their Trotskyite notion

that the urban uprisings of workers made unnecessary the strategic line of encircling the cities from the countryside for a protracted period. They had been able to camouflage their Trotskyite position previously by paying lip service to people's war, until they thought that they had enough anti-Maoist following within the CPP.

Among the Right opportunists were exponents of bourgeois populism, liberalism, social democracy, Gorbachovism and Trotskyism. All of them concurred with the "Left" opportunists" on the subjectivist notion that the Philippine economy ceased to be semifeudal and had become "semicapitalist" upon their presumption that a significant increase of industrialization and urbanization had been accomplished under the big comprador-landlord economic policy of the US-directed Marcos fascist regime.

They invoked and mimicked Gorbachov's "new thinking" and claimed that anticommunist thinking could strengthen the Communist Party and the new democratic revolution. They used empiricist, reformist and revisionist thinking and simply cussed as "orthodox" and "fundamentalist" the basic principles of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism. They posed as sophisticates in justifying eclecticism and touting a petty bourgeois supermarket of ideas in a futile attempt to swamp the theory and practice of proletarian revolution.

The Central Committee of the CPP issued the basic rectification documents in order to confront and defeat the incorrigible subjectivists and opportunists. In addition, the founding chairman of the CPP issued the article, "Critical and Creative Tasks of the Rectification Movement in the Communist Party of the Philippines." This further clarified the rectification movement as a process of education and the tasks to be carried out in order to raise further the revolutionary consciousness and fighting capabilities of the Party and the people.

To uphold the theory and practice of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism, the Second Great Rectification Movement re-instituted the three levels of study courses for Party cadres and members. To become full Party members, candidate members are required to finish the primary course, which integrates the Maoist theory with the history and circumstances of the Filipino people. The intermediate course involves the systematic study of Maoist theory and comparative

study of revolutions in various countries. The advanced course involves the study of philosophy, political economy, social science, strategy and tactics, and the history of the international communist movement from the writings of Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin and Mao.

The Second Great Rectification Movement revived the critique and repudiation of modern revisionism and its latest variants, especially neorevisionism. It exposed and opposed the neoliberal economic policy, the security policy of military intervention and aggression, cultural imperialism and related policies of US imperialism. It criticized and condemned all the major trends of anticommunist petty bourgeois thinking, including liberalism, neoliberalism, bourgeois populism, social democracy, Gorbachovism, and Trotskyism.

The living study of Maoism is encouraged above all. It means applying Maoism in social investigation and decision-making in order to solve current problems in the revolutionary struggle. Major domestic and international issues are discussed and resolved in the light of Maoist theory. The Party publishes statements and resolutions on issues and informative and analytical articles and books. These are published in the website <www.philppinerevolution.net>. Audio-visual productions and illustrations of study materials are used to facilitate the theoretical and political studies of Party cadres and members who come from the working class and peasantry and have limited formal education.

2) Pursuing the anti-revisionist line

The US imperialists and the Filipino reactionaries were beside themselves gloating over the social turmoil in China, the disintegration of the revisionist regimes in Eastern Europe, and the collapse of the Soviet Union in the period from 1989 to 1991. They boasted that the CPP would weaken and disappear because supposedly it had no more foreign benefactors.

In fact, the CPP soberly regarded these events as vindication and verification of Mao's anti-revisionist line and prediction that modern revisionism would lead to full capitalist restoration. The CPP raised even higher its appreciation for Mao's theory and practice of continuing revolution under proletarian dictatorship to combat revisionism, prevent the restoration of capitalism and consolidate

socialism. Those incorrigible opportunists who had claimed that Gorbachov's perestroika and the Dengist counterrevolution were meant to save and strengthen socialism were thoroughly discredited and embarrassed.

The Filipino Maoists laughed at the absurdity of the US imperialists and Filipino reactionaries in pretending to forget that the CPP was established under the guidance of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism, that it was founded on the line of opposing modern revisionism, that it arose and developed self-reliantly, and that it understood and was enlightened by the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution. Nevertheless, the CPP gave serious attention to the continued attempts of the incorrigible opportunists to spread within the Party their bourgeois liberal, Gorbachovite and Trotskyite interpretations of the disintegration of the revisionist-ruled systems and collapse of the Soviet Union in the period from 1989 to 1991.

It was of crucial importance that Armando Liwanag published "Stand for Socialism against Modern Revisionism" in 1992 to explain the long struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie in socialist countries, and how socialist revolution and construction had advanced until the modern revisionists succeeded in usurping power and carried out capitalist restoration. The modern revisionists captured and kept power for the purpose of capitalist restoration by casting away the revolutionary class struggle, by using the "theory of productive forces" against the socialist relations of production and promoting bourgeois and backward modes of thinking and behavior in the superstructure.

Most importantly, Liwanag's work clarified how monopoly capitalism would continue to be stricken by ever-worsening crisis and engender ever greater resistance by the proletariat and people. The anti-imperialist struggle of the people and the class struggle of the proletariat against the bourgeoisie would go on to make way for socialism and communism. This renewed and strengthened the resolve of the entire Party to pursue the anti-revisionist line and dismiss as rubbish the outlandish claims that there is no alternative to capitalism or that history cannot go beyond capitalism and liberal democracy.

Filipino Maoists are proud to be among the proletarian revolutionaries upholding Marxism-Leninism-Maoism against imperialism, revisionism and reaction amidst the worsening crisis of the world capitalist system. The total bankruptcy of the US-instigated neoliberal policy of “free market” globalization has brought about a protracted global depression and the increased tendency of the imperialist powers to whip up state terrorism and unleash wars of aggression. Revolution is bound to reemerge as the main trend in the world as all major contradictions intensify.

3) Confronting the semifeudal and semicolonial character of Philippine society

The incorrigible subjectivists and opportunists claimed that the Philippine economy was no longer semifeudal in order to attack the general line of new democratic revolution through protracted people’s war. The CPP thoroughly debunked the claim and stressed the fact that the Marcos fascist dictatorship aggravated and deepened the underdeveloped and agrarian character of the economy by directing resources away from national industrial development and genuine land reform.

The economy remains pre-industrial and semifeudal. It continues to be plundered and impoverished by imperialist powers headed by the US and by the local exploiting classes of big compradors in cities and landlords in the countryside. The post-Marcos regimes have further aggravated the underdeveloped character of the Philippine economy and have further devastated the environment by following the neoliberal economic policy which dictates labor flexibilization, trade and investment liberalization, privatization of public assets, deregulation, and denationalization.

Industries that exist are dependent on imported equipment, components and fuel. The so-called manufacturing industry involves mere assembly of imported components for reexport. In fact, the share of manufacturing in the gross national product has dropped drastically since the shift from import-substitution manufacturing to export-oriented manufacturing. Major issuances of the CPP and the book co-authored by the CPP founding chairman with Julie de Lima, *Philippine Economy and Politics*, maintains that the Philippine economy is semifeudal.

Since the time of the Ramos regime from 1992 to 1998, key incorrigible Right opportunists have declared that the issue of national sovereignty is passé, blatantly denying the semicolonial character of the ruling system. They argue that it is pointless to assert national sovereignty under the US-instigated policy of neoliberal globalization. They endorse this policy even as from time to time, they pretend to criticize some of its worst features only to beg that these be reformed or improved.

They have become racketeers in non-government organizations (NGOs) and intelligence consultants of some US agencies and the Manila government. Many of them are now close advisors of the current Aquino regime on how to use psychological warfare against the revolutionary movement, within the framework of the US-designed counterinsurgency program Oplan Bayanihan. Some hold key positions in government agencies concerned with media manipulation, phony anti-poverty work, covering up human rights violations, sabotaging peace negotiations, and whipping up the anti-China scare in order to justify and facilitate US military intervention in the Philippines.

4) Carrying out the general line of new democratic revolution

True to the teachings of Mao, the CPP carries out the new democratic revolution through protracted people's war against the semicolonial and semifeudal ruling system of the big compradors and landlords subservient to US imperialism. The leading class of the revolution is the industrial proletariat. It maintains a basic alliance with the peasantry as the main force of the revolution. It wins over the urban petty bourgeoisie to form the alliance of the basic forces of the revolution. It wins further the national or middle bourgeoisie to form a patriotic alliance.

The three great weapons of the new democratic revolution are: the proletarian revolutionary party, the people's army, and the national united front. They have brought about the revolutionary strength of the people by arousing, organizing and mobilizing them. The people's democratic government keeps on growing in the countryside, challenging the reactionary government of big compradors and landlords, and displacing this in a growing number of localities.

The organs of democratic political power have been built in more than 110 guerrilla fronts, covering extensive portions of 70 of the 81 Philippine provinces, more than 800 of the nearly 1,500 municipalities, and thousands of the more than 40,000 villages in the country. They are supported by mass organizations of workers, peasants, women, youth, children, cultural activists, teachers and other professionals and the broad masses of the people.

Nothing is being done by the US and the local reactionary classes to change the character of Philippine society. Thus the general line of the Philippine revolution stands. The neoliberal economic policy continues to aggravate and deepen the agrarian and semifeudal character of the Philippine economy. The crisis of the world capitalist system continues to ravage the economy. The ruling reactionaries are so desperate that they allow 100 percent foreign-owned corporations to exploit and plunder the natural resources and destroy the environment. The private-public partnership program, especially in infrastructure projects, is reminiscent of the similar imperialist-big comprador program of the Marcos fascist regime.

The current US-Aquino regime is obsessed with seeking to destroy the revolutionary movement through Oplan Bayanihan, and has completely sabotaged the peace negotiations by violating agreements already made between the NDFP and the Manila government. It refuses to do its part in addressing the roots of the civil war and paving the way for a just and lasting peace through mutual agreements on basic social, economic and political reforms. It refuses to take up the offer of the NDFP for an immediate truce and alliance for the purpose of achieving national independence, people's democracy, national industrialization and land reform, and an independent foreign policy of peace and development.

5) Building the Party as the vanguard force of the proletariat and the people

The Party is the advanced detachment of the working class. It is the vanguard force of the proletariat and people. It bears the responsibility of the working class to lead the people's democratic revolution and to bring it forward to the socialist revolution. Being the most progressive and most productive force, the working class has the historic mission of bringing about the socialist revolution.

The CPP adheres to the teachings of Mao regarding the building of the revolutionary party of the proletariat ideologically, politically and organizationally. The ideological line of the CPP is Marxism-Leninism-Maoism. Its current political line is the new democratic revolution through protracted people's war. Its organizational line is democratic centralism. By applying Marxism-Leninism-Maoism on the concrete conditions of the Philippines and on the concrete practice of the Philippine revolution, the CPP has become the largest and strongest revolutionary party of the proletariat in the entire history of the Philippines.

Through the SGRM, the CPP has reaffirmed all its basic principles and revitalized itself ideologically, politically and organizationally. It has emphasized the living study of Maoism through the concrete analysis of concrete conditions for the purpose of waging revolution. At the same time, it has strengthened the formal study courses to ensure ascending levels of revolutionary practice and theoretical knowledge. It has advanced politically by wielding the people's army and the united front effectively. It has strengthened the Party as an organization deeply rooted among the toiling masses nationwide.

Under the SGRM from 1992 to 1998, the CPP underwent a process of all-round strengthening by consolidating and expanding the ranks of the Maoist proletarian revolutionaries while combating and rectifying the major errors of subjectivism and opportunism in the 1980s, and rebuilding those parts of the Party that were damaged or destroyed by the incorrigible opportunists and renegades. These were defeated and they left the Party in grouplets before the end of 1994. Many of those who had been previously misled and confused criticized them as well as themselves.

The CPP increased its Party membership at a cumulative rate from 1994 onward in response to the demands of mass work and campaigns, people's government and revolutionary armed struggle. Solid Party organizing has been demanded on the basis of solid mass organizing. The most advanced activists are encouraged to join the Party. According to a recent report, CPP Party membership has increased from the level of 50,000 as of 2009 to the current level of 100,000. Under the SGRM from 1992 to 1998, the CPP

underwent a process of all-round strengthening by combating and rectifying the major errors of the 1980s to 1991.

The CPP has announced the plan to increase its membership to 250,000 in connection with the overall plan to advance the people's war from the stage of the strategic defensive to the strategic stalemate. The current policy is to boldly expand the Party without letting in a single undesirable. Acceptance of the Party Constitution and Program for a People's Democratic Revolution suffices for an applicant to become a Party candidate member. Full membership comes by performing duties in a Party branch or group, and finishing the basic Party study course within the period of candidature.

6) Waging the protracted people's war and guerrilla warfare

The SGRM criticized and repudiated the "Left" opportunist line of presuming that enough mass work had been accomplished and that the point had been reached to build absolutely concentrated companies and battalions, with adequate staff units at various levels, in order to accelerate the victory of the Philippine revolution. The Party pointed out that the revolution would be lost if it gave up mass work and its political superiority over the enemy and placed itself in a purely military situation, fought the way the enemy does and allowed the enemy's military superiority to prevail.

The SGRM also criticized and repudiated the Right opportunist line that armed struggle should be reduced and made secondary to the legal democratic mass movement. The Party pointed out that the revolutionary armed struggle was the principal form of struggle for seizing political power and that the depreciation, decrease and debilitation of this form of struggle would surely lead to defeat. Indeed, as Mao emphasized, the people have nothing without a people's army.

Under the SGRM from 1992 onward, the Party took vigorous efforts to stress the correct line of people's war in the entire people's army in accordance with Mao's teachings. In commands and units influenced or affected by the "Left" opportunist line, the Party reoriented, reorganized and redeployed the Red commanders and fighters. The prematurely formed NPA companies and battalions were reduced to platoons or oversized platoons in order to serve as the center of gravity for platoons, squads and teams that were

dispersed over a wider area for maintaining and developing intimate links with the masses.

Consequently, the NPA grew in strength and advanced. This was manifested by the increase of tactical offensives and by the ability to capture enemy officers, up to senior level ranks. On the downside in certain areas, as a result of prolonged mass work, made difficult by previous errors and anti-informer hysteria, inertia developed in certain NPA units as these tended to over-concentrate on mass work and be conservative with regard to planning and carrying out tactical offensives. By and large, the NPA has overcome conservatism and is availing of the mass base for intensifying the people's war nationwide.

Under the absolute leadership of the Party, the New People's Army has become the largest and strongest revolutionary army since the defeat of the Philippine revolutionary army in the Filipino-American war of 1899-1902. The politico-military training of the Red commanders and fighters includes learning the teachings of Mao on people's war and the strategy and tactics of guerrilla warfare. The NPA has thousands of Red fighters with high-powered rifles, and is augmented by tens of thousands in the people's militia and hundreds of thousands in self-defense units within the mass organizations. It is operating in 110 to 120 guerrilla fronts which covers large portions of 70 of the 81 provinces in the Philippines.

It is carrying out extensive and intensive guerrilla warfare on the basis of an ever widening and deepening mass base, firmed up by carrying out land reform and building organs of political power and mass organizations. It is seeking to bleed the enemy to death by an ever rising number of tactical offensives and to foil enemy campaigns of encirclement with the tactics of counter-encirclement on the scales of the guerrilla front, inter-front, regional and inter-regional. It is determined to bring the people's war from the strategic defense to the strategic stalemate according to a five-year plan. It aims to develop the rudiments of regular mobile warfare on the basis of guerrilla warfare. It plans to bring the level of its armed strength to 25,000 high-powered rifles and to increase the number of guerrilla fronts to 180.

The Party branches, the organs of political power and the mass organizations are consciously assuming appropriate functions in localities in order to allow units of the people's army to devote more time to politico-military training and to waging tactical offensives. In this connection, the self-defense units in mass organizations can perform appropriate security functions. The people's militia acts as the local police force and may undertake certain combat functions that are well within their capabilities. At any rate, units of the people's army rotate at performing combat, training, mass work, production and cultural work so that they continue to be closely linked to the masses.

As the CPP has announced, the NPA will intensify not only the tactical offensives to wipe out enemy units. It will also subject to attrition enemy units, facilities and convoys. To make more land available for land reform, protect the environment and conserve natural resources for future industrialization, the NPA is striving to dismantle plantations, logging and mining operations that belong to foreign companies and big compradors. It is also determined to arrest and submit to the people's court system those human rights violators, plunderers, drug operators and other criminals liable for the most serious offenses which are being condoned and committed by the reactionary authorities.

7) Pursuing the revolutionary class line in the united front

The SGRM asserted the necessity of class analysis and class struggle, the leadership of the working class and the revolutionary class line in the national united front. It combated the Right opportunist line of seeking to delete the working class leadership from the program of the National Democratic Front with the avowed objective of attracting more people and further encouraging bourgeois middle forces to join the revolution. It also rejected the proposal of some "Left" opportunists to replace the vanguard role of the Party with that of the united front.

The Party pursues the policy of the united front for the purpose of advancing the armed struggle, serving the interests of the broad masses of the people, and reaching and mobilizing the masses in their millions. As explained in 1998 in "The Requirements of the Revolutionary United Front" by the CPP Chairman Armando

Liwanag, the united front encompasses an echelon of alliances under the revolutionary leadership of the working class, such as the basic alliance of the workers and peasants, the progressive alliance of these toiling masses and the urban petty bourgeoisie, the patriotic alliance of the aforesaid progressive forces with the national bourgeoisie, and the temporary and unstable alliance with those reactionary forces that are against the enemy, which is either the most reactionary force at a given time or an invading imperialist power.

The revolutionary class line runs through the strategic line of encircling the cities from the countryside and accumulating armed strength here until the revolutionary forces and the people gain overwhelming capability for a strategic offensive to destroy the last holdouts of the enemy, seize the cities one after the other and take power nation-wide. The antifeudal united front belongs to the national united front; the working class and its party rely mainly on the poor peasants and farm workers, win over the middle peasants, neutralize the rich peasants, and take advantage of the splits among the landlords in order to isolate and destroy the power of the despotic landlords.

In any alliance with the national bourgeoisie or sections of reactionary classes opposed to the enemy, the Party and the working class have to exercise independence and initiative in order to avoid being compromised in anything unacceptable or being caught flatfooted in case of betrayal. The objective is to defeat one enemy after another, gain strength in the process, and become capable of winning greater victories in the anti-imperialist and class struggles.

As in the overthrow of the Marcos fascist regime in 1986, the CPP once more successfully applied the policy of the broad united front, which extended to having a temporary alliance with unreliable reactionary allies, in order to isolate and overthrow the corrupt Estrada regime from 2009 to early 2001. The objective is to take advantage of the contradictions among the reactionaries, defeat one enemy after another and strengthen the revolutionary forces in the process. However, the CPP did not succeed in overthrowing the more brutal, more corrupt and more hated Arroyo regime due to the

US dictation to the anti-Arroyo reactionaries to refrain from the extra-constitutional ouster of the sitting president and to use the elections as method for regime change and also due to shortcomings of the legal progressive forces in the implementation of the broad united policy.

It is not a fixed rule that the CPP uses the broad united front policy to target only the ruling reactionary clique. It is possible to use such policy to target and terminate the US domination of the Philippines and have a temporary alliance with the ruling clique for the purpose. But so far every ruling reactionary clique has been a craven puppet to US imperialism and had refused to take an anti-imperialist and patriotic position and enter into an alliance with the revolutionary forces.

In the course of peace negotiations, the NDFP has repeatedly offered to forge with the Manila government an immediate truce and alliance in order to realize the Filipino people's aspiration for complete national independence and real democracy. But the puppet rulers have no shame and are incapable of taking the patriotic and progressive path. So far, their intention in going through the peace negotiations is to cosmeticize or prettify their anti-national and antidemocratic character and goals. They even have the gumption to seek vainly the capitulation and pacification of the revolutionary forces.

8) Following the principle of democratic centralism

The SGRM criticized and repudiated the bureaucratism and commandism that the incorrigible opportunists had exercised over CPP organs and units under their authority, as well as the ultra-democracy and anarchy that they indulged in for a long time in relation to higher organs. Their anarchy peaked as they formed factions and intensified their opposition to the Party and the rectification movement. Ultimately, they blatantly brought themselves out of the Party and exposed their degenerate and renegade character.

The Party follows the organizational principle of democratic centralism. This is centralized leadership based on democracy and democracy guided by centralism. The essence of centralism is adhering to Marxism-Leninism-Maoism and unifying and

concentrating the will of the Party and the masses for waging the revolution. Democracy is the process by which opinions and recommendations are expressed and decisions are taken. In every collective, the individual must follow the decision of the majority. The higher organ relies on the lower leading organs for reports and recommendations. The lower organs and organizations are subordinate to higher ones and must follow their decisions.

In every organ of the Party, decisions are made by the majority or by consensus. There is freedom to discuss issues and present facts and arguments in order to arrive at decisions for improving work and work style, achieving better and bigger results and advancing the revolutionary struggle. Once a decision is taken, there is collective discipline to follow and implement the decision. A decision may be reconsidered only upon the presentation of new facts and new arguments that were not previously available or not fully considered.

All individual Party members are subordinate to the collective and the entire Party. An individual may continue to hold his or her own opinion against a decision but must follow and implement it. Freedom is necessary for presenting the facts and arguments and for discovering the truth and arriving at the best possible decision. At the same time, centralized leadership and collective discipline are necessary to concentrate the will and strength of the Party in order to defeat the enemy and advance the revolution.

Democratic centralism is not merely a set of rules governing the organizational relationship between the individual and the collective and the minority and the majority. It ensures the entire Party's revolutionary commitment and unity under the Party program and line. No faction or individual is allowed to remain in the Party while opposing the basic principles and program of the Party. Any individual or group is free to leave the Party when it can no longer accept such principles and program. It is a matter of democratic right of the Party to uphold, defend and promote these.

9) Looking forward to the socialist revolution

The SGRM exposed the fact that the incorrigible opportunists had degenerated into anti-socialists and anticommunists. They were united in seeking to liquidate the Party but fragmented into various grouplets espousing bourgeois populism, liberalism, neoliberalism,

social democracy, Gorbachovism and Trotskyism. They echoed the imperialist propaganda that the socialist cause is impossible and hopeless, and that there is no alternative to capitalism. The worst of them went into racketeering in imperialist-funded NGOs and joined the reactionary government as anticommunist propagandists and research analysts and spies of the reactionary intelligence services.

The Party steadfastly disseminated in 1992 "Stand for Socialism against Modern Revisionism," showing the glorious achievements of socialism and the way the modern revisionists subverted and destroyed it. The Party stressed that the class struggle of the proletariat and the bourgeoisie would continue, and that the proletariat would successfully lead the people to national liberation, democracy and socialism in the era of modern imperialism and proletarian revolution. The CPP founding chairman made in 1994 a long interview on "Socialism and the New World Order" to counter the claims of the US about the demise of the socialist cause and the perpetuity of Pax Americana.

The aspiration for a socialist future cannot be suppressed for as long as the proletariat and people are exploited and oppressed. They are compelled by the imperialists and their lackeys to wage resistance against intensifying oppression and exploitation as the crisis of monopoly capitalism worsens. Mao has shown proletarian revolutionaries the way to fight the imperialists and local reactionaries, build socialism, combat revisionism, prevent the restoration of capitalism, and ensure the development of socialism towards the goal of communism.

Since the period of 1989-1991, a new world disorder has arisen, with one major country or region of the world capitalist system after the other plunging into a severe socioeconomic and political crisis. The neoliberal economic policy has continued to intensify exploitation and result in an ever-worsening crisis of overproduction due to the overaccumulation of capital by the monopoly bourgeoisie and its finance capitalist cream. The global depression now is comparable to the Great Depression which brought about fascism and the second world war.

Bourgeois states have become more repressive than ever before. Under the pretext of anti-terrorism, they engage in state terrorism

against the people. The imperialist powers have launched wars of aggression against certain countries that do not submit to their dictates. At any rate, they are increasingly at odds with each other as the worsening crisis impels them to struggle for a redivision of the world. The working class movement is resurgent in major industrial capitalist countries and the broad masses of the people are rising in the underdeveloped countries.

10) Carrying out the Philippine revolution in the spirit of proletarian internationalism

The SGRM criticized the notion that the Philippine revolution can advance only with material support, especially military assistance, from abroad. This notion was spread by some of the “Left” opportunists who had sought to get foreign assistance from 1980 to 1987 and became defeatist when they could not secure such assistance. It was contrary to what the CPP had previously decided in accordance with Comrade Mao’s teaching that the people must wage revolution self-reliantly. They should not be dependent on foreign assistance, whether it is available or not.

The CPP is waging the Philippine revolution in the spirit of proletarian internationalism. The revolution is for the benefit of the proletariat and people of the Philippines as well as of the world. It is proud to engage in an armed revolution at a time when the proletariat and people of the world are suffering from the consequences of the colossal betrayal of socialism by the communist and workers parties that succumbed to modern revisionism; and the destructive multi-pronged offensives of the US and other imperialist powers. It hopes that the Philippine revolution can inspire the people of the world to rise up and wage revolution. It has described itself as a torchbearer of the world proletarian revolution at a time that this has suffered a serious setback and is in an historic trough.

The CPP took a leading role in the preparation and holding of the International Seminar on Mao Zedong Thought on the 100th birth anniversary of Mao Zedong in Germany in 1993. The seminar issued the General Declaration on Mao Zedong Thought which summed up the theoretical and practical achievements of Mao and pointed to his theory and practice of continuing revolution under proletarian

dictator- ship as his greatest achievement and his legacy for the continuance of the socialist cause. The long article of CPP Central Committee Chairman Armando Liwanag titled “Marxism-Leninism-Maoism as Guide to the Philippine Revolution” is part of the book compilation of seminar contributions titled *Mao Zedong Thought Lives!*

The CPP has participated and taken a prominent role in the annual International Communist Seminar in Brussels, the International Conference of Marxist-Leninist Parties and Organizations and other international gatherings of communist and workers’ parties. It has made major contributions by way of sharing its experiences and ideas and helping to illuminate the road of the international communist movement and the world proletarian revolution. The CPP has shown interest in close relations with other Maoist parties in the world and is in general aware of their strengths and weaknesses. But it does not limit its relations to any of the existing Maoist parties. It seeks to develop relations with all communist and workers’ parties under the auspices of proletarian internationalism and/or anti-imperialist solidarity.

It is interested in building a broad international united front of anti-imperialist forces of national liberation, democracy and socialism. It recognizes the need for the widest possible exchanges of ideas and experiences, mutual learning and cooperation among all revolutionary forces of the world, for the purpose of advancing the anti-imperialist movement and the world proletarian revolution.

The CPP shares its ideas and experiences worldwide. For this purpose, it uses the internet and sends delegations to international forums, seminars and conferences in order to explore and arrive at resolutions of common understanding and practical cooperation for fighting and defeating imperialism and all reaction and in the process strengthening the anti-imperialist movement and the international communist movement.

The CPP is known to discuss with other communist and other workers parties the possibility of organizing a new Communist Internationale. But it has not declared that there are already conditions for its formal establishment. It looks forward to the time that such conditions would arise. It is of the view that in the

meantime the revolutionary parties of the proletariat must wage revolution, strengthen themselves in their respective countries and seek to establish revolutionary states in order to pave the way for the organization of a new Communist Internationale.

III. Prospects of Maoism and the Philippine revolution

Prospects for the further development of Maoist theory and practice in the Philippines are bright. The proletariat and people of the Philippines can be confident of completing the new democratic revolution and proceeding to the socialist revolution. Such optimism is based on the following factors: the worsening crisis of global capitalism and the domestic ruling system of big compradors and landlords, the advances being made in the democratic revolution in the Philippines as well as in the anti-imperialist and socialist movements around the world, and having Maoism as the compass of revolution—from winning the new democratic and socialist stages of the revolution to combating revisionism and consolidating, developing and advancing socialism towards the ultimate goal of communism.

The adoption of higher technology has intensified the contradiction between the social character of production and the private character of appropriation in the capitalist mode of production. The neoliberal policy of “free market” globalization has served to accelerate the crisis of overproduction and the overaccumulation of capital by the monopoly bourgeoisie and finance oligarchy. The wanton abuse of finance capital in a futile attempt to override the crisis of overproduction has led to a severe economic and financial crisis comparable to the Great Depression in the 1930s. The entire world economy is afflicted by depression. The imperialist powers have been unable to stop the descent of the global economy from one level of crisis to another.

The imperialist powers and their client states are intensifying repression of the toiling masses of workers and peasants, and even the middle social strata, and trying in vain to stop their mass protests and resistance. The imperialists are whipping up currents of fascism, xenophobia, racism and religious bigotry in order to obscure the roots of the capitalist crisis. The legal and political infrastructure for fascism and state terrorism has been set up and is increasingly

being used. The imperialist powers are stepping up war production, war mongering and the actual launching of wars of aggression, which have been so far directed mainly against resource-rich underdeveloped countries assertive of national independence and countries opposed to the US-Zionist combine in the Middle East.

Despite their attempt to override their contradictions by uniting against the oppressed peoples and nations in underdeveloped countries, the imperialist powers are driven by the worsening crisis of global capitalism to a struggle among themselves for a redivision of the world. The full reintegration of China and Russia into the world capitalist system is a major factor in cramping the space for the imperialist powers, in worsening the global crisis and in intensifying inter-imperialist contradictions. Major differences of position and interest have arisen between the Western imperialist powers on the one hand and China and Russia on the other hand.

The crisis of the world capitalist system is aggravating the crisis of the semicolonial and semifeudal system in the Philippines. The economy is depressed as a result of decreasing income from its raw material exports and low value-added reexports; and mounting foreign and local debt obligations. The export of contract workers is increasingly being pressed down by the depression and anti-migrant policies and propaganda in host countries. Unemployment, reduced incomes, soaring prices of basic commodities and services, deterioration of social services and the frequent calamities caused by wanton plunder of natural resources and destruction of the environment are aggravating the poverty and misery of the broad masses of the people.

The social and economic crisis inflicts intolerable suffering on the toiling masses of workers and peasants and an increasing number of the people among the middle social strata. It incites them to wage various forms of resistance. The legal democratic mass movement is growing in strength by engaging in strikes and mass protest actions. The soil has become more fertile than ever before for the further growth and advance of the revolutionary armed struggle for national liberation and democracy.

The political crisis of the ruling system is sharpening as a result of the worsening socioeconomic crisis. The struggle for power and

bureaucratic loot is intensifying among the reactionaries at various levels. Every regime that arises tends to monopolize power and the economic spoils, and to intimidate or coopt the intrasystemic opposition. The rival political factions compete for the support of the foreign monopoly firms and big compradors and landlords. They also compete for armed strength by collaborating with various factions within the reactionary armed forces and national police and by building their own private armies. The revolutionary forces can have unstable and unreliable reactionary allies whenever possible in order to isolate and defeat the main enemy at every given time.

It is highly probable for the CPP to realize its plan of advancing the people's war from the strategic defense to the strategic stalemate in the next five to ten years. The strength of the CPP, NPA, NDFP, the organs of political power and mass organizations shall have increased several-fold. The frequency of tactical offensives on a national scale shall have also increased several-fold. The alliance and mutual support between the NDFP and the revolutionary forces of the Moro people shall have become ever more firm and more productive.

Even now, US military intervention in the Philippine is increasing under the pretext of combating terrorism and containing China. It is going to be more conspicuous and more offensive. The revolutionary forces and the people are doing their best to gain the most from the civil war in order to prepare against a US war of aggression. They are preparing the ground, the forces and the strategy and tactics to defeat US forces of aggression and attain retribution for the killing of 1.4 million Filipinos by the US from the beginning of the Filipino-American War in 1899 until 1913.

The military force that the US can concentrate on the Philippines can be mitigated by intensified armed struggles against the US elsewhere, and by fiscal constraints due to its ever-worsening economic and financial crisis. The US is already overextended by its overseas military bases and forward stations, and by wars of aggression directed mainly against the oppressed peoples of the world and against countries that are assertive of national independence.

The world proletarian revolution will surely advance in the years to come as the major contradictions in the world intensify and

preoccupy the US and its imperialist allies. The contradictions between the imperialist powers and countries assertive of their national independence, among the imperialist powers themselves, and between labor and capital in the imperialist countries and on a global scale are intensifying, resulting in greater disorder and more upheavals and are generating favorable conditions for the anti-imperialist and socialist movements in the world and in particular for the new democratic and socialist stages of the Philippine revolution.

Marxist-Leninist theory can fully explain how the four major contradictions work to rend global capitalism asunder and thus can guide the revolutionary parties of the proletariat and the people in winning their respective new democratic and socialist revolutions. The Maoist theory of continuing revolution under proletarian dictatorship, to combat revisionism, prevent the restoration of capitalism and consolidate socialism provides the answer to those who question the capability of the proletariat to learn from the betrayal and reversal of socialism by modern revisionism and to uphold, defend and develop socialism onward to communism.

Significance and Relevance of the Communist Manifesto to the Continuing Struggle of the Filipino People

February 21, 2013

It is an honor for me to be invited as main speaker by the Diosdado Fortuna Academy, a political workers' school in the Southern Tagalog region that aims to provide educational programs for workers and professionals in order to help arouse, organize and mobilize them against the ruling semicolonial and semifeudal system.

I extend warmest greetings of solidarity to the organizers and delegates of this forum in celebration of the 165th anniversary of the publication of the *Communist Manifesto*. I welcome the opportunity to discuss the significance and relevance of this great historic document to the continuing struggle of the Filipino people for national liberation and democracy.

I wish to deal with the topic in two ways. First, I present the *Communist Manifesto* as having set forth the fundamental principles that guide the working class in revolutionary struggle until now and as having clarified the colonial conditions that beset the Philippines in the 19th century. Then, I present how the great communist leaders after Marx and Engels have extended and developed the teachings in the *Communist Manifesto* in applying them to the conditions of the 20th century and thereafter.

Significance and Relevance of Communist Manifesto

In writing the *Communist Manifesto*, Marx and Engels applied their materialist-scientific outlook and method of analysis on the social history of the world and on the concrete conditions of free competition capitalism in 1848 in England. Consistently, they saw the

existing forces of production (means of production and people in production) as the basis of the relations of production and the whole mode of production as the base of the social superstructure (politics, law, culture, philosophy and the like).

Applying materialist dialectics, they traced the changes in social systems through changes in the mode of production and superstructure from the tens of thousands of years of classless primitive communal life to class-dominated society, advancing from slavery to feudalism and further on to capitalism. They observed that since the advent of exploiting and exploited classes history has been that of class struggle.

The great constructions in the capitalist stage of social development have dwarfed all those in previous civilizations. Marx and Engels saw that the capitalist class needed the working class to work with the machines in order to engage in large-scale production and obtain huge profits by extracting surplus value (unpaid labor above wages) from the workers. The capitalists maximized their profits by increasing their constant capital (plant, equipment and raw materials) and decreasing the variable capital for wages.

The more they produced for the profit-making capitalists, the more the industrial workers suffered from the reduction of real wages and mass layoffs every time the crisis of overproduction broke out. To cope with the rising level of exploitation, the workers became more aware of themselves as a class in itself and established trade unions for the purpose of economic struggle. Subjected to the escalation of oppression, they became more aware of themselves as a class for itself and established political parties to challenge and even seek to overthrow the capitalist class.

Marx and Engels described the capitalist class as having produced the industrial proletariat as its own gravedigger. They pointed out that the workers must struggle for their class empowerment and thus win the battle for democracy. The workers must overthrow the bourgeoisie and its system of wage slavery in order to realize the historic mission of building socialism. The class dictatorship of the bourgeoisie must be replaced by the class dictatorship of the proletariat.

In the *Communist Manifesto*, Marx and Engels saw the domestic and international contexts of the class struggle between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat. They pointed to the increasing division of society into the camps of the bourgeoisie and proletariat amidst the intensifying contradictions among the capitalists in a capitalist country as well as among capitalist countries, the increasing dissolution of the peasantry and the artisans and the brutal exploitation of the working people in colonies by the colonial powers.

Marx and Engels issued the clarion call, "Workingmen of all countries, unite!" They declared that for the first time in the history of mankind an exploited class, the industrial proletariat, had arisen with the capability of liberating itself and other exploited classes, making a radical rupture from the millennia of private ownership of the means of production and paving the way for socialism and communism.

They stressed the justness and necessity of the dispossessed more than 90 percent of the people taking back for their common benefit the social wealth which they had created but which had been taken away from them by the bourgeoisie. They also declared that the workers in the capitalist countries could not be free unless the people in the colonies were also freed.

They observed that the industrial capitalist countries departed from the state policy of mercantilism, which had involved sheer plunder in the colonies, by raising the slogan of "free trade" to bombard the colonies with manufactures and take greater volumes of raw materials from them. In any case, colonialism continued as a method for the primitive accumulation of capital in addition to the proletarianization of the peasants and the extraction of surplus value from the proletariat.

At this point, we can say that the *Communist Manifesto* is highly significant and relevant to the Filipino people's democratic revolution because this is led by the proletariat and has a socialist perspective. It clarifies the leading revolutionary role of the proletariat in the domestic and international context and in both the national democratic and socialist stages of the Philippine revolution. It sheds light on the colonial background of the Philippines and consequently

on the semicolonial and semifeudal situation. National and social liberation through the new democratic revolution under the class leadership of the proletariat can proceed to the socialist revolution and ultimately to communism.

Validity of the Communist Manifesto

Even as the *Communist Manifesto* was written in the time of free competition capitalism, the critique of the capitalist form of society and the principles of proletarian class struggle and class dictatorship of the proletariat as requisites for socialism remain valid. Lenin upheld, extended and further developed the teachings of Marx and Engels in the *Communist Manifesto* by taking into account the development of free competition capitalism into monopoly capitalism or modern imperialism and the rise of proletarian revolution.

In the first half century (1848-1898) since the publication of the *Communist Manifesto*, the teachings it carried were validated for the first time by the seizure of political power by the proletariat who established the Paris Commune in 1871. Even as this was defeated after two months, it would become the prototype of the proletarian revolution. Marx studied its strengths and shortcomings to further illumine the road of proletarian revolution. In the last decade of the 19th century, Marxism became the main ideological and political trend in the European trade union movement.

In the second half century (1898-1948) since the publication of the *Communist Manifesto*, Lenin made the critique of monopoly capitalism as moribund capitalism and extremely aggressive imperialism. He defined the era as one of modern imperialism and proletarian revolution, replacing the world bourgeois-capitalist revolution with the world proletarian-socialist revolution. He linked the proletarian revolution to the national liberation movements in a new clarion call, "Workers and oppressed peoples and nations of the world, unite!"

In his theory of the uneven development of capitalism, Lenin saw the possibility of the victory of the proletariat over the bourgeoisie at the weakest points of the world capitalist system. As a result of the first inter-imperialist war, the Great October Socialist Revolution arose in 1917 in Russia, the weakest link among the imperialist powers. Under the auspices of the Third Communist International,

the Communist Party of the Philippine Islands was established in 1930 and aimed to continue the unfinished Philippine revolution for national liberation and democracy.

The US colonial regime suppressed the party a few months after its establishment. This would be legalized in 1936 in line with the anti-fascist Popular Front against Japan. The second inter-imperialist world war resulted in the formation of a people's army under the leadership of the merger party of the Communist and Socialist Parties. But the success of the revolutionary movement was limited by the Right opportunist error called "retreat for defense" policy.

World War II resulted in the victory of the anti-fascist forces and national liberation movements and in the emergence of several socialist countries in Eastern Europe and Asia. The proletarian-socialist revolution reached a new peak. The national liberation movement was also spreading in Asia, Africa and Latin America. Within only 100 years, the teachings of the *Communist Manifesto* became the effective guide to revolutionary action of the proletariat and people in several socialist countries and in the international anti-imperialist and socialist movements.

In the Philippines, attempts to continue the revolution were frustrated by the "Left" opportunist line of "victory in two years' time" in 1949-50 and the Right opportunist line of liquidating the people's army in 1955 and the merger party in 1957. But the ever worsening conditions of exploitation and oppression in the semicolonial and semifeudal system fueled the people's desire to struggle for national liberation and democracy and the victories of socialism and national liberation movements abroad continued to inspire hope among the Filipino people.

Within the first decade of the third half century (1948-98) since the publication of the *Communist Manifesto*, the revolutionary movements led by the communist and workers' parties continued to win victories. The Chinese revolution won victory under the leadership of the Chinese Communist Party and breached the imperialist front in the East. One third of humanity was governed by communist and workers' parties. This was an advance from the Soviet Union occupying one-sixth of the earth. The Korean people

fought the US aggressors, inflicting severe losses on them and compelling them to accept an armistice.

However, within the Soviet Union, Khrushchovite revisionism arose after the death of Stalin and subsequently caused a split with Marxism-Leninism in the international communist movement in the 1950s and 1960s. Brezhnevite revisionism and social-imperialism followed to aggravate the bourgeois degeneration and crisis of the Soviet Union and the revisionist regimes in Eastern Europe. Even as the Chinese Communist Party led the Marxist-Leninists against modern revisionism, certain social factors and worship of everything Soviet (including revisionism) persisted to generate Rightism and revisionism in China and counter the proletarian revolutionary line of Chairman Mao.

In the decade of 1966 to 1976, he put forward the theory and practice of continuing the revolution under proletarian dictatorship in order to combat revisionism, prevent the restoration of capitalism and consolidate socialism through the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution. Soon after his death, the Chinese revisionists headed by Deng Xiaoping Ping carried out a coup in order to pave the way for capitalist-oriented reforms and integration in the US-dominated capitalist world. The total defeat of US imperialism by the Vietnamese in 1975 was overshadowed by the restoration of capitalism in the revisionist-ruled countries.

The full restoration of capitalism was accelerated and completed by Gorbachov, Deng Xiaoping Ping and other revisionist traitors to the socialist cause. The years of 1989 to 1991 saw the social turmoil in China, the disintegration of the revisionist regimes in Eastern Europe and the collapse of the Soviet Union in 1991. The world proletarian revolution suffered a temporary defeat and took a retreat. Becoming the sole superpower, the US imperialism intensified a multi-pronged offensive against the proletariat and people of the world.

Fortitude of the Communist Party of the Philippines

Still within the third half century since the publication of the *Communist Manifesto*, the Communist Party of the Philippines has upheld this great document of proletarian revolution as its red banner. It has been inspired by all previous victories of the anti-

imperialist and socialist revolutions. Since its reestablishment on December 26, 1968, the Party has been guided by Marxism-Leninism-Maoism. It has held on to the revolutionary conviction that the proletariat and people of the world will continue to struggle and win victories.

It has adhered to the three basic components of Marxism as laid down by Marx and Engels in philosophy, political economy and social science. It has learned from the Marxist-Leninist theory and practice of socialist revolution by Lenin and Stalin in the Soviet Union. It has learned from the theory and practice of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism by Mao in the great victories of the new democratic revolution through a protracted people's war in a semicolonial and semifeudal country, socialist revolution and construction and the theory and practice of continuing revolution under the dictatorship of the proletariat.

When the full restoration of capitalism in the revisionist-ruled countries was accomplished in the years of 1989-91, the Communist Party of the Philippines (CPP) had benefited so greatly and so profoundly from the theory and practice of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism that it had the fortitude to carry out the Second Great Rectification Movement, to make a clear stand for socialism against modern revisionism and to persevere in the new democratic revolution through protracted people's war and in the direction of socialism.

The CPP expressed complete contempt for the imperialist powers and their camp followers as they proclaimed the end of history with capitalism and liberal democracy, the death of socialism and the end of the epochal struggle of the proletariat and the bourgeoisie. It also manifested contempt for the revisionists, the neorevisionists, the Trotskyites, liberals and neoliberals who chorused with the imperialist powers in gloating over the fall of the revisionist regimes and misrepresented these as failed socialist regimes. They obscured the fact that the fallen revisionist leaders, their families and friends were partaking in the full-scale privatization of public assets and could do so because of previous decades of evolving capitalism and misrepresenting revisionism as socialism.

Even before the end of the third half century since the publication of the *Communist Manifesto*, the CPP has earnestly remained in the forefront in upholding, defending and advancing the theory and practice of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism and rallying the proletariat and the people to the struggle for national liberation, democracy and socialism against the escalating imperialist offensives in the ideological, political, economic and military fields.

The Filipino proletarian revolutionaries have been resolute and militant in undertaking ideological and political struggles against the anticommunist ideas and sentiments spewed out by the academic institutions, mass media, political parties and other instruments in the service of the imperialists and the local reactionaries. They have excelled in opposing the neoliberal policy of “free market” globalization and the wars of aggression, interventions and provocations by the imperialists headed by the US. They have exposed so lucidly the aggravation of neocolonialism by neoliberalism.

Since the adoption of the neoliberal economic policy at the beginning of the 1980s in the vain attempt to overcome the phenomenon of stagflation, the US and other imperialist powers have been confronted by the ever worsening crisis of overproduction and the ever growing inability of the imperialist states and multilateral agencies to solve or alleviate it. Since the end of the Cold War, the US and other imperialist powers have used war production and wars of aggression both to make a futile attempt at solving the problem of stagnation and to grab sources of fuel and other raw materials, markets, fields of investment and spheres of influence.

The proletarian revolutionaries of today are confident that, in the fourth half century (1998 to 2048) since the publication of the *Communist Manifesto*, the world capitalist system shall be beset by graver crises, more repression and more horrendous wars and that the proletariat and people of the world will fight more determinedly and vigorously than ever for national liberation, democracy, socialism and the ultimate goal of communism.

Right now, the forces of the anti-imperialist movement and the world proletarian revolution are stirring and growing because of the worsening crisis of the world capitalist system. They will be far more

powerful and victorious before 2048, the 200th anniversary of the publication of the Communist *Manifesto*. The proletariat and people can never accept being exploited and oppressed by the imperialists and local reactionaries. They will surely resurge and score new victories in the world proletarian revolution.

By persevering in revolutionary struggle, under the inspiration of the *Communist Manifesto*, the Communist Party of the Philippines and the Filipino people have already earned the honor of being recognized as the torch bearer of revolution at a time that the proletariat and people are struggling hard to rise from the general conditions of revisionist betrayal, defeat and retreat of previous revolutionary forces and the ruthless offensives launched by imperialism and reaction.

The CPP on Maoism, New Democratic Revolution, China and the Current World Order

Interview by *New Culture Magazine*

Communist Reconstruction Union of Brazil

January 17, 2014

1. What is your position towards Mao Zedong Thought or Maoism? Are there big differences between treating the theoretical contributions of Mao Zedong to scientific socialism as “Mao Zedong Thought” or “Maoism”? What would consist in taking Maoism as the third stage in the development of the theory of the practice of the proletariat? Would Maoism get in contradiction with the contributions given by other theories of scientific socialism, like President Kim III Sung with its Juche Idea?

Jose Maria Sison (JMS): There is no difference in content between Mao Zedong Thought and Maoism. When the Communist Party of the Philippines (CPP) used the phrase Mao Zedong Thought in 1969, all the major theoretical and practical achievements of Comrade Mao were encompassed. They are also encompassed in the word Maoism, used by the CPP since the early 1990s. The phrase Marxism-Leninism-Maoism evokes continuity and advance. The appearance of the word Maoism is symmetrical to Marxism and Leninism.

Maoism has further developed all major components of Marxism and Leninism. In philosophy, Mao explicated materialist dialectics as applied by Marx in *Das Capital*, and he penetrated further and elaborated on Lenin’s reference to the unity of opposites as the most fundamental law of materialist dialectics. Previously, Engels had put forward the three laws of contradiction and Lenin focused on confronting empirio-criticism.

In political economy, Mao had an updated critique of monopoly capitalism up to bureaucrat monopoly capitalist in revisionist-ruled states, and improved on the previous theory and practice of socialist revolution and construction in the Soviet Union. He elaborated on the relationship of the mode of production and the superstructure in the long socialist transition to communism.

In social science, he pointed to the proletarian class struggle against the bourgeoisie as the key link in all the mass struggles to advance the socialist revolution. He put forward the rectification movement as the way to deal with serious errors, and to maintain and strengthen its integrity and effectiveness. He developed the strategic line of protracted people's war as the way for the peoples in underdeveloped countries to destroy the power of imperialism and reaction, and achieve national and social liberation.

But what brings Maoism to the level of the third stage in the development of the revolutionary theory and practice of the proletariat is Mao's theory and practice of continuing the revolution under the dictatorship of the proletariat through the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution, in order to combat revisionism, prevent the restoration of capitalism, and consolidate socialism.

Maoism does not reject but encompasses the principle and practice of self-reliance in Kim Il Sung's idea of Juche. It can encompass variations of emphasis on certain principles and policies in the application of scientific socialism in various countries with different historical backgrounds and circumstances. It is the constant duty of communist and workers' parties to integrate theory with concrete practice in various settings.

2. In Brazil, the theories of Mao Zedong concerning bureaucrat capitalism were not well studied. Could you explain what bureaucrat capitalism is and how does it manifest, nowadays, in the countries oppressed by imperialism?

JMS: Bureaucrat capitalism simply means the corruption of state officials who use the state for the private accumulation of capital by themselves, their families and cronies. It may involve the state directly providing them with capital resources and privileges for their private business enterprises. It may also involve the establishment

and operation of state enterprises for the benefit of private capitalists in various ways.

The government officials of the bourgeois state (and the revisionist-ruled state) are representatives and functionaries of the bourgeoisie. The high level officials are often members of the big bourgeoisie and are easily recognized as bureaucrat capitalists. These high bureaucrat capitalists recruit as their political agents and technocrats smart guys from the urban petty bourgeois intelligentsia. These hirelings can also become big bureaucrat capitalists as they rise in rank in the bureaucracy and accumulate private assets in capital and land through corrupt practices.

3. It is known that the landlord system is one of the main characteristics of underdeveloped countries. How is the agrarian situation of the Philippines nowadays? How does the survivor of the semifeudal monopoly of the land in the Philippines relates with the situation of your country as a semicolony of US imperialism?

JMS: The Philippine social economy is still underdeveloped, agrarian, pre-industrial and semifeudal. The countryside is still ruled by the landlord class, while the cities are ruled by the big compradors. The landlords are still the most numerous and widespread exploiting class, and the peasants are the most numerous and widespread exploited class in the Philippines. The landlords still own most of the land producing rice, corn, sugar and tobacco, even as foreign and domestic holders of land operate plantations producing pineapple, banana, palm oil and rubber.

The big compradors are the chief trading and financial agents of foreign monopoly firms, and are the wealthiest and most powerful in semifeudal society. They themselves are often big landlords to ensure control of agricultural exports in their hands. Thus, the cream of the ruling class is often referred to as the big comprador-landlord class. This is the class that dominates the present semifeudal economy, in contrast to the overwhelming dominance of the landlord class in the feudal economy of the past, up to the end of the 19th century.

It was the US colonial regime that started the semifeudal economy and put the comprador big bourgeoisie in the top ruling position among the natives and mestizos at the beginning of the 20th

century. By the time that the US shifted from colonial to semicolonial rule in 1946, the semifeudal ruling class of the big comprador-landlords had become well-developed. They became the principal trustees of the US, and their political agents took charge of the bureaucracy from top to bottom.

4. The Communist Party of the Philippines has as one of the components of its political line the accomplishment of the New-Democratic Revolution through the Protracted People's War, where the people's political power is built through the protracted armed struggle and the encirclement of the reactionary power of the old bourgeois State. What measures does the Communist Party of the Philippines take in the liberated areas, where it is at the head of all political, economic and cultural life? How are the liberated areas capable of sustaining themselves for so long in the face of the armed offensive of the old State? What is the extent of Red political power in the Philippines? What are the perspectives for the expansion of the liberated areas?

JMS: The general line of the Communist Party of the Philippines is the people's democratic revolution through protracted people's war against US imperialism and the local exploiting classes of big compradors and landlords. The political aim is to achieve national liberation, establish the people's democratic state, and proceed to socialist revolution. The economic aim is to complete the land reform, industrialize the country, develop socialist industry, and agricultural cooperation. The cultural aim is to develop a national, scientific and mass system of culture and education.

The CPP is the advanced detachment of the working class and leads the revolution. It builds its branches in factories, farms, schools, offices and communities. It has organized the New People's Army as the main organization for defeating the enemy and overthrowing the ruling system. It has built aboveground and underground mass organizations of workers, peasants, youth, women, professionals, cultural activists, and so on. The National Democratic Front encompasses the underground revolutionary forces in the united front. Towards building the people's democratic government, local organs of political power are being established.

The revolutionary forces and people carry out genuine land reform and turn backward villages into political, economic, social and cultural bastions of the revolution. Despite enemy campaigns of military suppression, the armed revolutionary movement has become strong by integrating Party leadership, armed struggle, and mass base building. Red political power now exists in more than 110 guerrilla fronts with millions of people in substantial portions of 71 of the 81 Philippine provinces.

The perspective and plan of the revolutionary movement is to advance from the stage of strategic defensive to that of the strategic stalemate by increasing the number of guerrilla fronts to 200, CPP membership to 250,000, the number of Red fighters with automatic rifles to 25,000, the membership of the mass organizations by the millions, and the strength of the organs of political power at the village, municipal and provincial levels.

5. Is there still any performance of revisionist organizations in the Philippines? Do they have any influence among the masses? How does the CPP relate with these revisionist organizations?

JMS: The revisionist party now calls itself the CPP-30. It has been rendered small and inconsequential as a result of the anti-revisionist criticism and repudiation by the Maoist party since the 1960s. It has failed to shake off its notoriety for having been a running dog of the Soviet revisionist clique since the 1960s, and for having openly capitulated to the Marcos fascist dictatorship in 1974. It does not have any significant mass following. Its main activity is showing up in revisionist gatherings abroad to slander and vilify the CPP, NPA and NDFP. The CPP gives the revisionists a rebuff every time that they make an attack.

6. We know that, after the death of Mao Zedong in 1976, a right-wing sector led by Deng Xiaoping emerged as the leadership of the Communist Party of China and initiated a series of policies that the Chinese government calls "reform and opening-up". The emergence of this line in the power meant the end of the Cultural Revolution and the beginning of the capitalist restoration. Do you agree with the idea that nowadays China would be an imperialist country? Or that, even with all the changes, it still plays a positive role in the international arena?

JMS: Indeed, the Dengist counterrevolution resulted in the restoration of capitalism in China and its integration in the world capitalist system. By Lenin's economic definition of modern imperialism, China has become imperialist. Bureaucrat and private monopoly capital has become dominant in Chinese society. It is exporting surplus capital to other countries. Its capitalist enterprises combine with other foreign capitalist enterprises to exploit third world countries and the global market. China colludes and competes with other imperialist countries in expanding economic territory, such as sources of cheap labor and raw materials, fields of investments, markets, strategic vantage points and spheres of influence.

However, China has not yet engaged in a war of aggression to acquire a colony, a semicolony, protectorate or dependent country. It is not yet very violent in the struggle for a redivision of the world among the big capitalist powers, like the US, Japan, Germany and Italy behaved in joining the ranks of imperialist powers. It is with respect to China's contention with more aggressive and plunderous imperialist powers that may be somehow helpful to revolutionary movements in an objective and indirect way. China is playing an outstanding role in the economic bloc BRICS and in the security organization Shanghai Cooperation Organization beyond US control.

7. Some Latin American countries, like Venezuela and Bolivia, are facing political transformations in which sovereignty is affirmed and the contradictions with US imperialism is deepened. In the Venezuelan case, the Bolivarian government even speaks about transition to socialism. How do you evaluate those processes?

JMS: The policies of Venezuela and Bolivia that are anti-imperialist, assertive of national independence, and promotive of social reforms and socialist aspirations are admirable and deserve support. They deliver blows to imperialist hegemony and create opportunities for the advance of the revolutionary party of the proletariat and the popular masses. But it is doubtful whether the current enlightened and benevolent leaders of the Venezuelan and Bolivian government can carry out a socialist revolution without defeating the violent resistance of the imperialists and the local reactionaries.

8. The crisis in Syria was a theme that gained much repercussion in the year of 2013, as a consequence of the direct maneuvers of US imperialism to enact a war against this country. It is known that these maneuvers were barred because of an unfavorable international conjuncture. In your opinion, which role would play a direct offensive against Syria in the logic of the US policy of world domination? How do the defeats suffered shake the positions of the main imperialist power in the world geopolitics? What is the meaning of the cooperation between China and Russia to prevent a new alibi for war of the US government?

JMS: China and Russia have made effective moves within and outside of the UN Security Council to prevent the US from bombing Syria and from igniting a regional war. By standing up for the national independence of Syria as well as Iran, they gain points from third world states. Thus, they increase their weight in dealing with the US and other imperialist powers in terms of inter-imperialist contention as well as collaboration.

The avoidance of war as a result of the diplomacy of Russia and China on the US is welcome. At the same time, it is the lookout of Syria and Iran for allowing the US and its agents to enter freely their territories to search and inspect sites of chemical and nuclear stocks and activity. Also, it is not improbable that, someday, the US and its allies will bomb Syria and Iran on grounds of failing to comply with agreements. Agreements with the US did not render Yugoslavia, Iraq and Libya immune to US aggression.

Build the Bolshevik-type of Party and the Revolutionary Mass Movement

**Message of Solidarity to the Japan-Philippines Committee
for the Celebration of October Revolution Centenary
September 10, 2017**

On behalf of the International League of Peoples' Struggle (ILPS), I wish to convey warmest greetings of solidarity to the Japan-Philippines Committee for the Celebration of the Centenary of the Great October Socialist Revolution (GOSR) and to all the distinguished guests and other participants in the celebration in Tokyo today. We in the ILPS congratulate the committee for organizing this event in cooperation with BAYAN-Japan and ILPS-Japan Committee.

In view of the persistent and worsening crisis of the world capitalist system and the need to unite and strengthen the working class movement for socialism against imperialism, the theme of the celebration is highly significant and timely: "Celebrate the lessons of the Great October Socialist Revolution! Onward with the struggle of the working class to defeat imperialism and build a socialist world!"

We are still in the era of modern imperialism and proletarian revolution, especially because of the revisionist betrayal of socialism which resulted in the full restoration of capitalism in previous socialist countries in the years of 1989 to 1991. But the full integration of China and Russia as major capitalist powers in the global economy has resulted in the intensification of inter-imperialist contradictions and the struggle for a redivision of the world.

The US is becoming desperate in trying to stop its strategic decline in an increasingly multipolar world. The neoliberal economic policy imposed by the US on the proletariat and people of the world has made more frequent and more harsh the crisis of overproduction because of the ever tightening squeeze on the incomes of the working people. The wanton resort to the abuse of finance capital or

the runaway generation of debt at the government and corporate levels has only served to aggravate the crisis of global capitalism.

Up to now, the imperialist powers have been at a loss as regards to dealing with the roots and consequences of the financial meltdown of 2008. The ever worsening economic and financial crisis of global capitalism has resulted in the actual spread and further threats of aggressive wars. US has been most culpable for this phenomenon, especially under its so-called neoconservative policy of full spectrum dominance. War production, deployment of overseas military forces and wars of aggression are a major part of the US economy and are aimed at maintaining and expanding economic territory and geopolitical influence.

All major contradictions in the world are intensifying: those between capital and labor in the imperialist countries, those between the imperialist powers and the oppressed peoples and nations, those between the imperialist powers and countries that assert their national independence and social aspirations and those among the imperialist powers themselves.

The forces of imperialism and reaction always seek to pass the burden of crisis to the working people and even to the middle social strata. The broad masses of the people are undergoing intolerable suffering and are therefore waging various forms of resistance.

The lessons that we can and must learn from the Great October Socialist Revolution are abundant and are of decisive importance. The revolutionary party of the proletariat must be built in Japan and the Philippines, as in other countries. Such a party is the advanced detachment of the proletariat in successfully carrying out the struggle for democracy and the consequent struggle for socialism. It is a party like the Bolsheviks determined to smash the bureaucratic and military machinery of the bourgeois state and to ward off the misleading currents of chauvinism, opportunism, reformism and revisionism.

The revolutionary party of the proletariat can lead the revolution only by setting correctly the ideological, political and organizational line. In the final analysis, the correctness of the line can be verified only by the growth, advance and victory of the revolutionary mass movement. The revolution is a mass undertaking aimed at seizing

political power from the bourgeoisie. To win a revolution, we must learn how the Bolsheviks carried out legal mass struggles, did revolutionary work even in reactionary institutions (including the Tsarist army), organized the soviets of workers, peasants and soldiers and formed the Red Guards and the Red Army.

In Japan as well as in the Philippines, the revolutionary party of the proletariat and the broad masses of the people must unite to fight and defeat US imperialism and its local reactionary allies. For such purpose, the party must build revolutionary trade unions and the mass organizations of other exploited classes and sectors of society, the self-defense committees based in communities and mass organizations, the people's army, the local organs of political power, the alliances and the domestic and international solidarity networks.

Long live the Great October Socialist Revolution!

Learn lessons from the October Revolution!

Build the Bolshevik-type party and the revolutionary mass movement!

Advance the revolution and aim for the victory of socialism!

Long live the proletariat and people of Japan and the Philippines!

Long live proletarian internationalism and international solidarity of peoples!

Keynote Address to the Global Launch of Marx@200 Celebration

May 5, 2018

Dear Comrades and Friends,

It is a great honor for me to deliver the keynote address to the global launch of the celebration of the 200th birth anniversary of Karl Marx in Manila and Mexico under the sponsorship of the International League of Peoples' Struggle and other organizations this May 5. Within the month, the ILPS is also co-sponsoring a similar event in Milan, Italy.

The celebration of the life and works of the great communist Karl Marx will last for one whole year. It shall include study conferences and seminars to produce books, art works, mass meetings and protest actions on urgent major issues, art and cultural exhibits and performances.

The theme of the celebration is "Change the world!" (as in Marx's epitaph in Highgate Cemetery). This is the abbreviated form of No. 11 of the Theses on Feuerbach, which states "The philosophers have merely interpreted the world in various ways, the point however is to change it."

We must celebrate the continuing validity and vitality of the revolutionary teachings of Karl Marx. Let us comprehend and instill in ourselves the fundamental principles of Marxism that he and his comrade Friedrich Engels laid down in the era of free competition capitalism.

Marx developed the theory of proletarian revolution on the high road of civilization. He drew from the most advanced sources of knowledge of his time in order to formulate the three components of

Marxism: materialist philosophy, political economy and social science.

He studied German philosophy, especially the idealist Hegel and materialist Feuerbach. He adopted the scientific materialist outlook and formulated materialist dialectics as the laws of contradiction in nature and society and as the method of thinking and acting by putting the erstwhile metaphysical dialectics on a materialist basis, not just the perception of sensuous reality but up to the critical-revolutionary activity to change social reality.

He applied dialectical materialism on social history and founded historical materialism to explain the transformation of one form of society to a higher one through the contradictions of the mode of production and the social superstructure and through class struggle. He traced the progressive sequence of the primitive communal society, slavery, feudalism, capitalism, socialism and communism.

He studied British political economy, especially the exponents of the labor theory of value, Adam Smith and David Ricardo, in order to write *Das Capital*, his colossal and penetrating critique of capitalism. He studied the commodity as the cell of largescale machine production and as the embodiment of labor power and came up with the theory of surplus value to explain exploitation, with surplus value (unpaid labor) as the source of industrial profit, bank interest and land rent) in the very process of capitalist production.

He traced the accumulation of capital through profit-making by the capitalist competitors, the speedier growth of constant capital in plant, equipment and raw materials over variable capital for wages, the tendency of the profit rate to fall, the crisis of overproduction in relation to the decline of real wages and consumer demand and the desperate use of finance capital and colonial expansion to maintain the industrial capitalist economy.

He studied French social science, especially the revolutionary democrats and the utopian socialists. He recognized the series of class struggles in history as the cause of social transformation. He appreciated the class struggle of the proletariat as the key to the democratic mass struggle for socialism and combated the voluntarism and wishful thinking that characterized utopian socialism.

He ascribed to the French revolutionary democrats the earlier conception of class struggle and asserted that his contribution is the conception of class struggle as one leading to the class dictatorship of the proletariat in socialist society. The core of the theory of scientific socialism is the overthrow of the class dictatorship of the bourgeoisie by that of the proletariat, as well explicated in the *Communist Manifesto* in 1848.

This is the best known of the works of Marx and Engels. It was written in connection with the Communist League. It presaged the Europe-wide uprisings of the workers and peasants but did not yet directly exercise influence among them. Marx and Engels were active in the First International, the International Workingmen's Association. Members of this association took part in the Paris Commune of 1871.

This revolutionary event created the prototype of the proletarian class dictatorship.

It made achievements worthy of praise and emulation but was not thoroughgoing enough, as well explained by Marx in the *Civil War in France*. It lasted for a little over two months until it was drowned in blood by the bourgeoisie. It has bequeathed to us the lesson that the workers' state can live and grow stronger for as long as it can smash the bureaucratic and military machinery of the bourgeois state.

The influence of Marxism would spread faster through the Second International, with Engels propagating Marxist theory and practice after the death of Marx on March 14, 1883. By the last decade of the 19th century, Marxism became dominant in the European working class movement, both in the social democratic parties and trade unions.

Only with a firm grasp of the fundamental principles laid down by Marx and Engels can we understand the theoretical and practical advance of the revolutionary proletariat to Leninism in the era of modern imperialism and proletarian revolution and appreciate the victories in establishing and building socialism in one country and then in several countries, in connection with the ever worsening general crisis of capitalism and inter-imperialist wars.

Likewise, our grasp of Marxism and Leninism is necessary for our understanding of Maoism as a great effort to combat modern revisionism, prevent capitalist restoration and consolidate socialism. By adhering to Marxism-Leninism-Maoism, we can continue to fight imperialism, modern revisionism and reaction. We can understand that the world capitalist system continues to decay and decompose from one major crisis to another, despite the previous temporary success of modern revisionism in undermining and disintegrating socialism in the Soviet Union, China and other countries.

US imperialism boasted of being the sole unchallenged superpower after the Soviet Union collapsed and the Cold War ended. But it accelerated its strategic decline by carrying out its neoliberal economic policy and neoconservative policy of escalating war production and aggressive wars. The increase of capitalist powers competing for markets and political hegemony has resulted in unprecedentedly intensified inter-imperialist contradictions and crisis conditions that are favorable for the resurgence of the revolutionary movements for national liberation, democracy and socialism.

Thus, we speak today of the continuing validity and vitality of Marxism and its further theoretical and practical development. We benefit increasingly from the teachings of Marx and Engels and then from the great successors like Lenin, Stalin and Mao. And we shall further benefit from the teachings and leadership of their subsequent successors and the revolutionary parties of the proletariat that continue to fight and strive to defeat imperialism, revisionism and all reaction and aim for socialism as the dominant social system in the world and as the preparation for the communist future.

Long live the memory and teachings of Karl Marx!

Long live Marxism-Leninism-Maoism!

Long live all the genuine communist and workers' parties!

Long live the world proletarian-socialist revolution!

Long live the proletariat and oppressed peoples!

Questions on Mao Zedong Thought/Maoism

By Prof. Regletto Aldrich D. Imbong (RADI)
for Prof. Jose Maria Sison (JMS)
November 18, 2019

1. *RADI: In a recent publication of the Communist Party of the Philippines (CPP) entitled “Anniversary Statements (1992-2017),” I found out that it was only during the 26th anniversary of the CPP in 1994 that the term Maoism appeared (not in 1992 and 1993, as far as the said publication is concerned). Previous statements, like the “Rectify Errors, Rebuild the Party,” in 1968 merely mentioned Mao Zedong Thought, despite the fact that Chairman Gonzalo of the Communist Party of Peru in 1983 supposedly affirmed the universality of Maoism. Can you please enlighten me with the CPP’s appreciation of Maoism and the seemingly delayed upholding of the CPP of Maoism’s universality?*

JMS: The adoption of the word Maoism, instead of Mao Zedong Thought, by the Communist Party of the Philippines is a matter of transcription and symmetry alongside the terms Marxism and Leninism. It is a reaffirmation of the earlier CPP recognition of the great contributions of Mao (under the rubric of Mao Zedong Thought) to the development of Marxism-Leninism in philosophy, political economy, party building (especially the rectification movement), the people’s war and the proletarian cultural revolution in socialist society.

In the course of his leadership of the Communist Party of China (CPC) and the Chinese revolution, Mao together with his Chinese comrades had the modesty of being averse to glorifying himself by the term Maoism. In the literature of the Chinese CP, you will find summary references to his contributions in ideology and policy as “Mao’s thinking” and “Mao’s thought”. It was only in the course of the

Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution that “Mao Zedong thought” graduated to “Mao Zedong Thought (with a capital T).

By that time, the CPC had already acclaimed Mao Zedong Thought as representing the third stage in the development of the universal revolutionary theory of the proletariat. Thus, it is false to say that Gonzalo was the first to sum up or synthesize the teachings of Mao or his theory and practice as constituting the third stage in the development of Marxist theory and practice. The foundation for the Marxist theory and practice of people’s war was already established in the Leninist stage when the October revolution of 1917 shifted from the cities to the countryside in the civil war and war against foreign intervention.

Regarded as Mao’s most important achievement to constitute the third stage of the development of Marxist theory and practice was not his theory and practice of protracted people’s war but that of continuing revolution under proletarian dictatorship through cultural revolution to combat revisionism, prevent capitalist restoration and consolidate socialism. (Considered as the first stage in the development of Marxism was the formulation of its fundamental principles and critique of free competition capitalism by Marx and Engels. And the second stage of Leninism was the further development of Marxism by Lenin in the era of modern imperialism and proletarian revolution).

Before Mao died, he had achieved all theoretical and practical contributions that he was capable of in order to achieve the third stage in the development of Marxism. But the CPC called this the stage of Mao Zedong Thought. In the early years of the GPCR there was even an overenthusiastic notion within the CPC that after the solution of the problem of modern revisionism “imperialism was heading towards total collapse and socialism was marching towards world victory”. But Mao himself cautioned in 1969 that it would take another 50 to 100 years to reach that desired goal.

Soon after Mao’s death in 1976, the Dengist counterrevolution overthrew the proletariat in China. The Chinese state and CPC changed their class character. But they have continued to refer to Mao Zedong Thought formally and ritualistically, despite the official condemnation of the GPCR as a total catastrophe and the full-blast

capitalist restoration and teaming up of China with US imperialism in promoting neoliberal globalization.

It is to the credit of Gonzalo that he took the initiative in 1983 to use the term Maoism, instead of Mao Zedong Thought, by way of posthumously showing a higher appreciation of Mao at least for some of his great accomplishments and for acclaiming Mao's theory and practice as third stage in the development of Marxist theory and practice. But it is absurd to assert that because of Gonzalo's "synthesis" he is responsible for making Maoism "universal" or that the universality of Maoism is reduced to the "universality of protracted people's war" and the prescription for a "militarized party."

As I have earlier pointed out, Mao himself constituted in his own lifetime Mao Zedong Thought or Maoism by making great contributions to the development of Marxism-Leninism in philosophy, political economy, party building (especially the rectification movement), the people's war and the proletarian cultural revolution in socialist society. Mao Zedong Thought has gained universal significance long before Gonzalo called it Maoism. The universal significance of Mao Zedong Thought or Maoism does not depend in any way on Gonzalo who has not really summed up all the great achievements of the great Mao.

The worshipers of Gonzalo use his coinage of the term Maoism to evaluate him as the greatest Maoist after Mao. They should take him to account for his own conduct of leadership in his own country, his "Left" opportunist line before his capture in 1992 and Right opportunist line soon after his capture. These conflicting opportunist lines have brought about the decline of the people's war in Peru. And the mystique about him as being responsible for "synthesizing" Maoism should not be used as an ax against those who continue to wage people's war. Kautsky did not prove himself any better than Lenin when he protested that Lenin's ideas were not Marxism but Leninism. He was the first among all people to utter the term Leninism against Lenin himself.

2. RADI: In the same 1994 anniversary statement mentioned in the previous question, the latter equated Mao Zedong Thought with Maoism (as stated, Mao Zedong thought OR Maoism), a criticism which is likewise charged by Dem Volke Dienen in First Critical

Remarks about the Role of the Communist Party of the Philippines in the International Communist Movement (see <http://demvolkedienenen.org/.../2726-first-critical-remarks...>) You have given the explanation that “there is no difference in content between Mao Zedong Thought and Maoism” in an interview by the New Culture Magazine of the Communist Construction Union of Brazil. For the Dem Volke Dienen, however, if both Mao Zedong Thought and Maoism were terms having the same content, there would be no difference as well in either saying Marxism or Marx Thought, or Leninism or Lenin Thought. However, the “ism” in Maoism has to be distinguished as it means the systematization and closed development of all the three components of Marxism “to a higher level and to a higher truth” and not merely as an individual contribution of a Chinese communist. What is your response to this critique?

JMS: I had the good fortune of being in China in August 1966, when the GPCR was just beginning and Mao was being evaluated, appreciated and defended against his detractors and in relation to his great Marxist-Leninist predecessors. I had very enlightening conversations with members of the CPC Central Committee and the highest responsables of the CPC Higher Party School. They summed up the great achievements of Mao under the term Mao Zedong Thought, such as the following:

a. In philosophy, Mao elaborated on and developed Lenin’s identification of the unity of opposites (divide into two) as the most fundamental law of materialist dialectics. He did so in such essays as *On Contradiction*, *On Practice*, *Where Do Correct Ideas Come From?* and *On the Correct Handling of Contradictions Among the People*. He applied materialist dialectics in gaining higher knowledge from the dialectics of theory and practice, in carrying out the new democratic revolution through people’s war and undertaking socialist revolution and construction.

b. In political economy, Mao had the advantage of learning positive and negative lessons from Stalin’s policy of socialist industrialization and agricultural cooperation, the revisionist reversal of socialist revolution and construction and leading self-reliant socialist revolution and construction by using the basic and heavy

industries as the lead factor, agriculture as the base of the economy and light industry as the bridging factor under conditions of imperialist blockade, revisionist betrayal and other adversities.

c. In social science, Mao developed further the theory and practice of the new democratic and socialist stages of the Chinese revolution. But his most important achievement in social science was in recognizing the problem of modern revisionism and the continuing fact of classes and class struggle in socialist society and in adopting solutions. He put forward a series of campaigns to uphold, defend and advance socialism, such as the anti-Rightist campaign, the Great Leap Forward, the socialist education movement and ultimately the cultural revolution as he faced increasing resistance from the revisionists and capitalist roaders.

d. In party building, Mao adopted and developed further Leninist teaching on building the proletarian vanguard party. He excelled at developing the rectification movement as the campaign for educating the Party cadres and members in Marxist-Leninist theory and practice, as the method for identifying the errors and weaknesses and for saving the patient from the disease and as the way for the Party to better serve the masses, mobilize them, let them acquire power and come under their supervision.

e. In people's war, Mao had already demonstrated how the toiling masses of workers and peasants could defeat an enemy that was superior in military equipment and trained personnel through the strategic line of protracted people's war by encircling the cities from the countryside in semicolonial and semifeudal countries. By winning the new democratic revolution through people's war, the revolutionary proletariat and the people gain the power to proceed to socialist revolution.

f. The theory and practice of continuing revolution under proletarian dictatorship through the GPCR was regarded as the greatest epoch-making contribution of Mao. It was aimed at combating modern revisionism, preventing capitalist restoration and consolidating socialism. Even as the GPCR would be defeated by the Dengist counterrevolution, it still confirms and explains how socialism can be subverted and destroyed from within. Such a lesson will guide the forthcoming socialist revolutions.

Before, during and after the founding of the Communist Party of the Philippines (CPP), the foregoing six components of Mao Zedong Thought or Maoism were already acknowledged and propagated in CPP publications and grasped by CPP cadres and members. What the Gonzaloites are doing is to tear apart Mao Zedong Thought or Maoism and exaggerate protracted people's war as prescription for all countries under all circumstances and require militarization of the party as the principal or essential elements of Maoism. This is not Maoism but a grotesque Gonzaloite distortion of Maoism.

In other articles, I have already pointed out that the Gonzaloites have well proven themselves as mere charlatans by claiming that protracted people's war can be done in industrial capitalist countries and by not doing any single armed tactical offensive anywhere for decades to prove their point. The militarization of the party is an anti-Maoist notion which runs counter to the principle that the Party, as the ideological and political leading force, commands the gun. In its Second Great Rectification Movement, the CPP opposed and defeated the "Left" opportunists who wanted to subordinate the Party to the army.

3. *RADI: Contemporary leftist philosophers like Alain Badiou, Slavoj Zizek, and Jodi Dean affirm the communist idea (although they have various interpretations of this idea) but strikingly glaring among them is their divergences in terms of the question of political organization which can be commonly described as a clear surrender of the Leninist vanguard party. Badiou, for example, a self-proclaimed Maoist and an heir to the May of 1968 of France, argues for a "politics without a party." Dean, on the other hand, argues for the necessity of a party but a party in an international level, not anymore the traditional state-bound communist party of the past that clearly claim as its aim the seizure of political and state power from the bourgeoisie. What is your insight in relation to the question of political organization in winning the struggle for communism and what was Mao's or Maoism's important contribution to this problem?*

JMS: It is absurd for Badiou to argue for "politics without a party". He is intellectually and practically a subjectivist and anarchist who seeks to disorganize the masses and lead them to the predominance of bourgeois parties and the bourgeois state. He is out of the world

of class struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie. Definitely, he is not a Maoist even if he proclaims himself to be a Maoist.

The first great socialist state would not have been established had there been no Bolshevik party to lead the toiling masses of workers and peasants in overthrowing the reactionaries and seizing political power. Without the CPC, the Chinese proletariat and people would not have succeeded in winning the new democratic and socialist stages of the Chinese revolution.

Jodi Dean is somewhat better than Badiou in recognizing the need for a revolutionary party. But while being internationalist, the proletarian revolutionary party has to win the revolution within national boundaries. For Lenin and the Bolsheviks to win the Great October Socialist Revolution, they had to oppose the social pacifism and social chauvinism of the Second International.

It is relevant to recall that the Third International or Comintern tried to run a world party with local communist parties as national sections. But came 1943 the Comintern had to dissolve itself because it could not communicate and instruct or advice the CPs who were engaged in the bitter anti-fascist wars. Consequently, the principles of equality, independence and mutual support and cooperation were adopted in the comradely relations of communist and workers' parties.

In the fierce struggles against the well-organized bourgeoisie and imperialist powers, the proletariat as the leading class in the revolution must have a political party. It must have a party to define the correct ideological, political and organizational line for defeating the enemy. It must grow in strength by being intimately linked to the toiling masses. It must arouse, organize and mobilize them in their own best interest. The mass base generates the mass activists and the best party cadres and masses. The party can defeat the enemy and win the revolution only with the participation and support of the masses.

We can learn from Mao and Maoism how to build the Party ideologically, politically and organizationally, how to do social investigation and mass work, how to arouse, organize and mobilize the toiling masses and how to avail of the people's war and the

united front to reach and mobilize the masses in their millions. Mao taught us how to use the rectification movement in order to correct errors and shortcomings and thereby further strengthen the Party. He insisted on the mass line of mobilizing the masses and gaining strength from them from one stage of the revolution to a new and higher stage.

Some petty bourgeois intellectuals have the high flown disdain for nation-states and political parties. But these are progressive products of history in relation to the backward conditions of colonial and feudal domination. And for the proletariat to defeat the bourgeois states and parties, it must create the socialist state under the leadership of the proletarian revolutionary party. Before the classless communist society can be achieved, socialist states and communist parties are needed to fight and defeat imperialism and the local reactionary classes.

I need not comment on Slavoj Zizek because you do not raise any specific point about him. You do not have to. He is a chameleon and charlatan who poses as a philosopher, flip-flops from pro-Stalin to anti-Stalin statements and plays with phrases like a child playing with his toys. I suggest that you look into how Noam Chomsky describes him.

4. RADI: Alain Badiou interprets the Great Cultural Proletarian Revolution (GPCR) as a novelty as it is the first revolution to happen in a socialist state in the same way that the Paris Commune was the first revolution to happen in a capitalist state. However, in his reading of the GPCR, Badiou reinforces his stand of the “politics without a party” as the Communist Party of China then (and now) became intertwined with state power, the machinery which he claims must be abolished rather than seized. In this way, his notion of emancipatory politics advances the claim of a politics “at a distance from the state,” claiming that restraint rather than seizure should now be the model of contemporary political procedures. What is the correct Maoist view concerning the relation between the party and the state? Can we say that the Mass Line constituted a significant contribution to this problem?

JMS: There would have been no GPCR as a “novelty” for Badiou had there been no CPC that established a socialist society that was

being subverted by the capitalist roaders and that needed the GPCR to combat the capitalist roaders and consolidate socialism. The Dengist counterrevolution defeated the GPCR precisely because the revisionist or capitalist roaders were able to retain and eventually enlarge their power and authority within both the Party and state.

As shown in the examples of the Soviet Union and China, when the ruling party of the proletariat is undermined by modern revisionism and the capitalist roaders, the character of the state changes from socialist to capitalist. In the first place, no socialist state and society can ever arise and develop if there were no revolutionary party of the proletariat that leads the people's army and the masses in overthrowing the bourgeois state.

During the GPCR, the most extensive kind of democracy arose, with Mao rallying the masses of Red Guards, the proletariat and the people to bombard the bourgeois headquarters in the Party and state and calling on the Party and the People's Liberation Army to support the Left. Under the leadership of the CPC, revolutionary committees arose to lead the masses in communities, factories and farms. But in the course of the class struggle, the Rightists and the ultra-Leftists also generated an anarchy of factions behind which the capitalist roaders maneuvered to retain their positions in the CPC and state in collaboration with the Centrists in order to defeat the GPCR ultimately.

It is in accordance with Maoism or the teachings of Mao that the CPP has strengthened itself ideologically, politically and organizationally and has built the mass movement as its base and at the same time the local organs of political power as the embryos of the future people's democratic state. The sum of these local organs of political power may be considered the provisional revolutionary government of the workers and peasants. These organs of political power can be formed only because there are the Party, the people's army, the mass organizations and the united front that support and enable them.

5. RAD: In my dissertation, I argue that contemporary communist hypothesis must consider three terms, each of which are dialectically related with each other: party, state, and mass movement. I argue further that the possibility of communism could only be if the nature

of the party is “a party in scission,” that is, a party which, while utilizes state power to suppress reaction, also immerses itself with the mass movements. What is Maoism’s greatest lesson to the question of political organization (a question which Lenin brilliantly answered in What is to be Done)? Did Maoism modify, in one way or another, the question of vanguard leadership (especially if we take into account the lessons of the GPCR)?

JMS: You are on the correct track by considering the party, the state and mass movement, which are dialectically related to each other. Even if only one of these is lacking or is weak, it is impossible to achieve the full development of socialism, which is the precondition to communism. If there is no genuine communist party, there can be no socialist revolution and no socialist state to establish.

If there is no socialist state, there is no way to promote the forces and factors of socialism and pave the way to communism. Without the class dictatorship of the proletariat, there is no way to suppress reaction and to prevent the bourgeoisie from reemerging and taking power. At the same time, the ruling communist party or socialist state cannot survive and progress without relying on the mass movement.

Mao adhered to the Leninist concept of a vanguard party representative of the proletariat as the most advanced political and productive class that is most interested in socialism. In the course of the new democratic and socialist stages of the Chinese revolution, Mao and the CPC had ample time and opportunity to develop the CPC as the leading force and the various types of forces that brought about the Chinese socialist state.

In an all-round way, the CPC benefited from the line of relying and trusting the masses and constantly arousing, organizing and mobilizing them in communities and work places in the course of fighting the enemy and building a socialist society. The Party was in the lead and at the same time at the core of mass formations. In both ways, it drew strength from the masses.

It is also pertinent to mention that, after the death of Lenin, Stalin and the CPSU carried forward Leninism in Party building, mass mobilization and in socialist revolution and construction. He built a powerful socialist state that could defeat fascism and subsequently

challenge US imperialism and the world capitalist system. He carried out well the Leninist task of promoting the building of communist parties in many countries through the Comintern.

The Chinese revolution would not have won victory and would not have established the Chinese people's democratic state (gliding into the socialist state) if not for the vanguard role of the Chinese Communist Party, the mobilization of the masses, the use of the people's army to destroy the reactionary state and the readiness of the people to build further as the new democratic government the local organs of political power established in the course of people's war.

Interview on the Frankfurt School and Critical Theory

By Prof. Jerry D. Imbong
April 6, 2020

I am Jerry D. Imbong, a faculty member of the Visayas State University (VSU), Baybay City, Leyte. I teach Social Science subjects. I am also a member of CONTEND and a core group member of the Philippine Ecumenical Peace Platform (PEPP). At present, I am doing research about your ideas on Marxism, Leninism, and Maoism as they are applied in the concrete Philippine conditions.

Your numerous published works (including articles available online) have significantly helped me in my research. However, there are some topics which I failed to find from available sources I mentioned above, specifically, with regards to your views on Critical Theory (CT). Hence, I would greatly appreciate it if you can share with me your insights on the following questions:

1. What are your views on the ideas of the leading representatives of the Frankfurt School? You don't have to discuss their ideas one by one but you can just give your insights on the founding of the Frankfurt School, its goals and its influence on the Leftist politics.

JMS: The Frankfurt School is described as a school of social theory and critical theory associated with the Institute for Social Research at Goethe University Frankfurt. The institute was founded in 1918 and was funded by the wealthy doctoral student Felix Weil who wished to solve the problems of implementing socialism.

The reputation of the institute as Marxist was enhanced by the participation of Georg Lukacs and Karl Korsch in the early years of the institute. But from the beginning to the present, we can describe the school as homogeneously a school of idealist subjectivism,

which involves at the same time the heterogeneity of its leading representatives.

The school proclaims as its goal: to make an academic and public critique of society in an interdisciplinary way and to change society by proposing ways of social development and promoting rational institutions. It is opposed to both capitalism and Marxism-Leninism. Both are supposed to hold ideologies incapable of solving the problems of the 20th century. It is eclectic by seeking philosophically to critique and learn from Marx and so many more idealist philosophers, including Kant and Hegel.

Like the social democratic party of Germany, the leading representatives of the Frankfurt School are petty bourgeois subjectivists and bourgeois liberals using as garbs anti-capitalism and socialism with a mix of positive and negative references to Marx and Marxism. Germany is a country that is unique for having the proletarian revolutionaries, the petty bourgeois liberals and fascists competing to appropriate the name of socialism.

2. Which ideas or themes of the Frankfurt School and Critical Theory do you support? Which do you oppose? Why?

I appreciate any school seeking to critique and change society. In the first place, Marx has taught us that we must engage in revolutionary critical-practical activity to change society and that there are various philosophies to interpret the world but the point is to change the world. He made a critique of the German idealist ideology and the capitalist political economy and produced dialectical materialism, laid bare the laws of motion of capitalism and paved the way for scientific socialism.

But in its long existence of more than 102 years, the Frankfurt School has done much of critiquing at the philosophical level from an idealist and subjectivist viewpoint and has not been a factor or party to the changing of society. Contrary to its proclaimed purpose of making a new society out of the morass of the Weimar Republic, the school has been at the most an intellectual gadfly to the movements led by communist, social democratic and fascist parties in Germany.

Some major representatives of the Frankfurt School make interesting reading when they critique capitalism. They provide good insights in literary criticism and sociological analysis as they face up

to the bitter facts of capitalist reality. They make a good critique of the culture industry in the capitalist system. There is nothing new in this critique, however, because Marx has long pointed out that the dominant cultural activity in the superstructure reflects the economic and political dominance of the ruling class.

Despite its avowed purpose of critiquing and changing society, the various stalwarts of the Frankfurt School stand aloof from social conditions by generating their own subjectivist philosophical jargon and then debating these abstract terms among themselves in texts after texts. They have no sure footing in materialist-scientific philosophy, especially when they exaggerate individual psychology and linguistics and play down the importance of economics and politics in social analysis. And they avoid the reality of classes and class struggle and have disdain for the subjective forces (party, mass organizations and the like) that take advantage of the objective crisis conditions to make social revolution.

3. What are your criticisms of the Frankfurt School and CT?

The stalwarts of the Frankfurt School render a special service to the capitalist system of oppression and exploitation by misinterpreting or taking out of context the terms of Marxism and its further developments in revolutionary theory and practice. They perform the role of trying to confuse and outflank the Marxists. And in a puerile way, they seem to forget that they adhere to their own philosophy or ideology when they redefine the term ideology to make it a pejorative expression beyond its simple meaning of being a system of ideas and the study thereof.

Erich Fromm has the distinct achievement of applying dialectics by trying to split the young Marx from the more mature Marx. The notion is spread that the young Marx was more humane by being a Hegelian idealist in dealing with the issue of alienation. But the discussion by Marx in his early philosophical and economic manuscripts is all about how the capitalist class alienates the surplus value from the working class, makes congealed or dead labor dominate living labor and proceeds to dominate the process of oppression and exploitation in an all-round way.

There are times when the Frankfurt school is in an embarrassing position, such as when in its early years, Herbert Marcuse proposed

“Heideggerian Marxism” as the guiding thought for the school. But before Marcuse could drop his newly-minted ideology, Heidegger declared his loyalty to Hitler and joined the Nazi Party in 1933. Adorno debated with Marcuse and opposed “Heidegger Marxism” but the debate was all about the esoteric terms of individuality and identity as cloning from an abstract category, not about Heidegger’s irrationality of joining the Nazi Party.

The Frankfurt School loves to present itself as distinctively anti-authoritarian. But associates of the school like Hannah Arendt have been useful tools of US imperialism in the Cold War. By drawing an ideological and political spectrum, with fascism at one end and communism at the other end, implying that monopoly capitalism is the golden mean at the center on a sham Aristotelian plane.

The anti-authoritarianism of the Frankfurt School is no different from the anti-radicalism of Seymour Martin Lipset who puts US imperialism at the “democratic” and “moderate” center between the Radical Right and the Radical Left. Both diagrams are perverse with the obfuscation of the fact that the monopoly bourgeoisie uses fascism as its weapon after liberalism and social democracy prove to be ineffective in opposing and suppressing the forces of the Left and socialism.

Under the pressures of neoliberal globalization, leading representatives have tended to exaggerate their subjectivism and float in the backwash of social democracy and liberalism. Adorno and Horkheimer have withdrawn the purpose of changing society. Habermas has put forward a paradigm change to linguistic intersubjectivity to render “objectless” the dilemmas of idealist subjectivist philosophy.

There seems to be a loss of mission in critiquing Marxism because modern revisionism has been quite effective in revising and junking Marxism and in subverting and destroying socialism in the Soviet Union and China. But wait for awhile, as in the 20th century, the economic and financial crises are becoming more frequent and worse and are intensifying inter-imperialist contradictions and generating the conditions for the resurgence of the proletarian class struggle and the world proletarian revolution.

A Comment on Dialectical Materialism, Idealism and Mechanical Materialism

April 14, 2020

Dialectical materialism is a precise expression for the Marxist materialist philosophy as opposed to both idealism (objective and subjective) and to mechanical materialism. Materialist dialectics takes into account the materiality of the universe as well as the contradictory factors in the balances and transformations within nature and society and in the interactions of society and nature.

The dialectical materialist adopts the materialist and scientific outlook and the mode of cognition and practice that gives due attention to the dialectical or interactive relation of human consciousness and material reality, especially in the process of social transformation, and debunks the supernatural as well as the subjectivist as the sole or main determinant of reality and the transformation of social reality.

Dialectical materialism seeks to comprehend both the natural and social sciences, study how materialist dialectics (with its laws of contradiction) applies in any field of scientific knowledge and understand scientific knowledge as both products of social practice and being consequential to social reality and social transformation. Dialectical materialists are ever obliged and ready to learn from social investigation as well as scientific experiment.

Dialectical materialism is ever interested in and enlightened by the entire range of natural sciences. It appreciates the basic laws of motion in various types of natural phenomena as an explanation and confirmation of the materiality of the universe. In the dialectical materialist explanation of Mao, a piece of stone cannot take the place of the egg and bring forth a chicken, no matter the amount of

temperature applied and no matter how much praying by the objective idealist and wishing by the subjective idealist.

The fundamental principles of dialectical materialism as laid down and clarified by Marx and Engels, benefited from the rise of humanism against divinism during the Renaissance and the rise of scientific and rational thought from the 16th century onward. Philosophy became increasingly shorn of the superfluous Platonistic, idealistic and divinistic categories among the most advanced thinkers. It became clear that matter is the object of scientific investigation.

Dialectical materialists appreciate Newtonian physics as a great scientific advance in its own time and remains useful in building houses and bridges and in making and operating electro-mechanical processes. But it rejects mechanical materialism and sheer empiricism as much as it rejects objective idealism as philosophy and as the basis of or guide to social science. Thus, dialectical materialists have put forward materialist dialectics as the interaction of human consciousness and material reality.

Dialectical materialists appreciate the advance of scientific knowledge, such as the epochal one from Newtonian to Einsteinian physics. The latter gives us a more intimate knowledge of the atom, the materiality of energy and the realm of astral physics. Pertinent to quantum physics, Einstein demonstrated that the photons in a wave of light strike and disturb the electrons of a targeted object in photography.

Quantum physics verifies that particles are in waves and that the particle and wave are two sides of the same physical phenomenon, in the same way as matter and energy as well as photon and light. It debunks the attempt of some idealist scientists and philosophers to spiritualize the wave and make the particles subordinate to it and make these less essential or less important.

There is double absurdity in the statement that “scientific developments, especially in quantum physics, are increasingly in relative correspondence with the spiritual belief systems of what Engels called primitive communist societies. There is an attempt to misrepresent Engels as having been an idealist and as having asserted the scientific validity of spiritual belief systems where in fact

he saw through such unscientific belief systems as reflections of social practice and the given level of speculation in primitive communal societies.

The great Mao made no rupture from dialectical materialism when he answered the question, Where do correct ideas come from? His answer is a brilliant summation and amounts to an enrichment or development of Marxist philosophy, particularly in the epistemology of dialectical materialism. He declares and explains that the source of knowledge is social practice, consisting of production, class struggle and scientific experiment.

The three terms are well sequenced historically: primitive and more advanced societies exist and develop on the basis of production as human activity, class struggle impels and propels the maintenance and change of class-divided societies and scientific experiment enables the scientific and technological development that leads to social development.

In our time the application of quantum physics has generated information technology to accelerate production, communications and distribution of goods to favor the monopoly bourgeoisie and its financial oligarchy, especially during the decades of the neoliberal policy regime. But the adoption of higher technology has made more frequent and worse the economic crisis (the crisis of overproduction) and the financial crisis (the abuse of credit) of the capitalist system.

Consequently the deepening and worsening of the crisis of the world capitalist system has generated among the proletariat and people the outrage and desire for revolution. The recurrent rounds of crisis have become the opportunity for building the mass movement and revolutionary forces. And the higher technology for maximizing profit and accelerating the private accumulation of capital provides the tools for arousing, organizing and mobilizing the masses at a faster rate than ever and eventually for building socialism at new and higher technical and cultural level.

Dialectical materialists always seek to learn from the laws of natural science in order to shed light on the materiality of the objective conditions and subjective factors interacting in social reality and social transformation. And in the realm of social science, they learn best and most from the impact on and consequences of the

advances in science and technology to society. But they never seek to replace with any notion of dialectical materialism any scientific law or process discovered and proven in the process of scientific experiment or technological innovation.

Some Questions on Dialectical Materialism

Interview with Prof. Jose Maria Sison (JMS)
By Prof. Regletto Aldrich D. Imbong (RADI)
April 16, 2020

With reference to a previous article of Prof. Jose Maria Sison's "A Comment on Dialectical Materialism, Idealism, and Mechanical Materialism"

RADI 1. I would like to start by asking you the relation between objective matter and subjective consciousness. You also emphasized this in your commentary when you mentioned the "interactive relation of human consciousness and material reality." Dialectical materialism (DM) – a term which was introduced by a successor of Marx and Engels, Joseph Dietzgen, and was first used by Georgi Plekhanov – argues the priority of matter over consciousness. It was Friedrich Engels later on who developed the distinction between "those who asserted the primacy of spirit to nature" as belonging to the camp of idealism and "the others, who regarded nature as primary, belong to the various schools of materialism." Georg Lukács, in his History as Class Consciousness, charged that Engels ignored the idealistic dimensions of Marx's notion of practice, referring to Marx's first thesis to Ludwig Feuerbach. Here, it is said, is how Marx sees the object-constituting function of the subject (and its consciousness). Can you give a comment on this?

JMS: Let me quote the first of the eleven Theses on Feuerbach by Marx: "The chief defect of all hitherto existing materialism – that of Feuerbach included – is that the thing, reality, sensuousness, is conceived only in the form of the *object or of contemplation*, but not as *sensuous human activity, practice*, not subjectively. Hence, in contradistinction to materialism, the *active side* was developed

abstractly by idealism – which, of course, does not know real, sensuous activity as such.

Feuerbach wants sensuous objects, really distinct from the thought objects, but he does not conceive human activity itself as *objective* activity. Hence, in *The Essence of Christianity*, he regards the theoretical attitude as the only genuinely human attitude, while practice is conceived and fixed only in its dirty-Judaical manifestation. Hence he does not grasp the significance of ‘revolutionary’, of ‘practical-critical’, activity.”

Feuerbach does not go beyond mechanical materialism even by affirming human sensuousness and remains confined to conceiving the material thing, the reality and sensuousness as mere object of contemplation. Marx points out the significance of objective practical-critical revolutionary human activity beyond recognizing human activity in terms of sensuous or even thought objects. Thus, Feuerbach remains entrapped by the idealist depictions of human activity as a subordinate to the Christian deity or to the Platonic Idea. Of all objectively existing things, conscious human activity is capable of understanding things and changing them through analysis, class struggle and social revolution and through scientific discoveries and technological advances that raise the level of production.

The materiality of nature or the universe, existing objectively and independently of human consciousness, came far ahead of the evolution of humankind and its consciousness. Thus, from the materialist philosophical position, we can speak of the primacy or priority of matter over consciousness. But we are dialectical materialists precisely because conscious human activity has been able to maintain and develop in stages social formations and scientific knowledge about nature and society.

The fullness of Marxist philosophy in dialectical materialism rests on the recognition of the objective reality and the conscious human activity acting upon it to effect social transformations and scientific advances. Dialectical materialism deals not only with the interaction of matter and consciousness but also seeks to understand the inner laws of motion in various general categories and specific forms of natural and social phenomena.

RADI 2. I want to raise this time a question related to Alain Badiou's and Slavoj Zizek's notions of dialectics or contradiction. These will have to do with the concept of negation of negation, a topic which was rather not elaborated in your recent article. I will start with Badiou. In his "Affirmative Dialectics: From Logic to Anthropology," Badiou explained his aim of proposing "a new dialectical framework which is not a return to the young Karl Marx or Georg W. F. Hegel, but is neither the negative dialectics of [Theodor] Adorno..." Badiou thought that the "problem today is to find a way of reversing the classical dialectical logic inside itself so that the affirmation, or the positive proposition, comes before the negation instead of after it." Hence, his concept of the event is the radical opening of a new possibility (not yet the new itself) which needs to be affirmed by a subjective body. This subjective body develops the consequences of the event and forms of negation – revolt, struggle, destruction – naturally happen. The negation is a result of the new subjectivity (affirmation) and not the other way around. Is the priority of the subjective over the negative a distortion of the basic tenets of DM? What are the practical implications of Badiou's view?

JMS: It is good that your first question gave me the opportunity to stress the point of Marx that human activity ranges up to the critique of a certain kind of society, the conscious practical struggle against it and the revolutionary founding of a new kind of society. These entail certain positive assumptions about a new leading class, revolutionary theory, political program, development of subjective forces and mass movement in order to negate a certain social order, change the balance of forces and overthrow the existing ruling system. It is wrong to ascribe to Marx some simple and shallow kind of negation. In *Das Kapital*, he engaged in a massive and profound critique of the capitalist political economy, expose the laws of motion in capitalism and advocate socialism.

Marx and Engels were critical of Hegel as an idealist but appreciated him as the best among the idealist philosophers for using dialectics to account for change in the material world. But they did two things to the Hegelian negation of the negation. First, they turned it upside down and put it on a materialist basis and did away with the idealism and metaphysics of the Hegelian notion that there

is self-development of thought before its realization in history. Second, they also junked the Hegelian notion that negation of the negation leads to a permanent synthesis in the Prussian state as the highest of social and political development. They have bequeathed to us the dictum that there is nothing permanent but change.

In our understanding of historical materialism, which is the application of dialectical materialism on social development, we know that the unity of opposites exists in every social formation that humankind has developed. While the given balance of the opposites obtain for a certain period in order to maintain a certain form of society, the struggle of opposites grows and moves in the direction of a new kind of social formation because the balance of the opposites and the conditions change and make the persistence of the old social formation untenable. Thus, humankind has moved forward through primitive communes, feudalism, capitalism and socialism.

RADI 3. Zizek, in his introduction to his book Mao: On Practice and Contradiction, criticized Mao's notion of dialectics. Mao rejected Hegel's notion of the negation of negation in his Talk on Questions of Philosophy. He explained that "Engels talked about the three categories, but as for me I don't believe in two of those categories." He only believed in the unity of opposites as the most basic law while the "transformation of quality and quantity into one another is the unity of opposites quality and quantity." Mao argued that "the negation of negation does not exist at all." Because of this, Zizek charged that Mao committed a theoretical mistake by not recognizing that the negation of the negation is not merely a compromise but the only true negation. Hence, Zizek further charged that this serious mistake of Mao led him to a "bad infinity" where he remained in "fixed notional oppositions" whereby he is "unable to formulate the properly dialectical self-relating or notional determinations." Zizek argued that this practically led Mao to open up the field even to the enemy, referring to the same Talk of Mao mentioned above where he let some elements to "go in for capitalism." Here Mao expressed how "society is very complex." He then rhetorically asked "if one only goes in for socialism and not for capitalism, isn't that too simple?" and "wouldn't we then lack the unity of opposites?" What do you think was the theoretical and practical reasons why Mao rejected the

negation of negation? What is your comment on this critique of Mao's notion of dialectics? What are the practical implications of Zizek's critiques?

JMS: Certainly, as a Marxist-Leninist, Mao rejected the Hegelian notion of negation of negation because of its idealist basis and its direction towards a permanent synthesis. But contrary to the wrong ascription to Mao that he rejected even the Marxist materialist concept of the law of negation of negation, he is well known to have declared that everything runs towards its opposite and even communism is not the end of social development. Even when classless society is achieved, there will be a continuing struggle between the new and the old to advance social development.

It was Lenin who first spelled out the unity of opposites as the main and most essential law of contradiction in his *Materialism and Empirio-Criticism* but did not reject the two other laws declared by Engels (negation of the negation and transformation of quantity to quality). Mao elaborated on the law of unity of opposites by referring to it and applying it in his works *On Contradiction*, *On Practice*, *On the Correct Handling of Contradictions* and *Where Do Correct Ideas Come From?* I daresay that Marx used thoroughly the law of unity of opposites in his critique of capitalism and in the *Communist Manifesto* as he dealt with the contradictions of the forces and relations of production and the class struggle between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat and prognosticated the revolutionary direction towards socialism.

It is not wrong at all for Mao to talk about the complexity of realizing and advancing socialism. Like Lenin, who adopted the New Economic Policy to revive the Soviet economy and overcome the consequences of civil war and foreign intervention and the limitations of "war communism" (rationing), Mao had to complete first the bourgeois democratic reforms (especially land reform), allow joint state-private companies and use the commanding heights of the economic to realize the basic socialist transformation of society. Even as the socialist revolution and construction advanced, the imperialists imposed economic and military blockade on China and Soviet modern revisionism seeped into Chinese society via certain leaders who worshiped whatever came from the Soviet Union, the

huge number of Chinese students and worker trainees who went to the Soviet Union before the Sino-Soviet split.

But of course, there ought to be an explanation why diehard capitalist roaders like Deng Xiaoping could be rehabilitated and even returned to the highest level of power instead of being retired and pensioned off. The Rightist Dengists and the Centrists collaborated to have their way in adopting the policy of capitalist-oriented reforms and opening up to and reintegrating in the world capitalist system. It will take a long discussion on how socialist China became capitalist. But in response to your question it is enough for me to say that no one can blame Mao for the systematic capitalist restoration in China just because he rejected the Hegelian notion of negation of the negation.

RADI 4. In your article, you discussed the implications of DM with quantum physics and the latter's role in the advancement of technology in general. There are philosophers of technology influenced by critical theory, like Andrew Feenberg, who argued for a democratic intervention in technology as a response to the crises technology has brought alongside with itself. Here, rather than operating the transformation on the economic level, what Marx called as the structure of reality, Feenberg proposed an intervention on the level of design, development, and engineering of technologies. Some proposed value-sensitive designs (VSD) in the engineering of things. What is your comment on this kind of intervention in relation to the dialectics between materialism and idealism?

JMS: The capitalist ruling class will always use the state, the private corporations, academic institutions and specialized research agencies and institutes to favor the kind of scientific research and technological development that are profitable and that serve to protect and expand capitalist interests in the name of national security. It is easy to make statements about making an intervention for "value-sensitive designs" in the engineering and social production of things. But it is certainly far more difficult to push the adoption and realize such designs in capitalist society.

The progressive pro-people scientists, technologists and engineers can in their own work places and professional associations propose better technology and better products that are

beneficial to the people and friendly to the environment. But they need to make their demands in concert with the organizations and movements of the toiling masses and the middle social strata to have better chances of success in achieving any significant result. Best of all, while working for immediate reforms, they must struggle for socialism. It is only in a socialist society where scientific research, technological development and social production can be directed and used for the benefit of the people and the environment.

RADI 5. I have read many of your works since I was still an undergraduate philosophy student. What rather struck my attention is the relatively rare discussion or elaboration on topics concerning the abstract or philosophical issues of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism. Your latest commentary, on dialectical materialism, idealism, and mechanical materialism, for me, is a rather unusual twist given your track record in publications. Can you share the rationale behind this inclination with the philosophical this time?

JMS: I have done a bit of writing on philosophical issues of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism. I have written a book-length primer on the basic principles of this theory in philosophy, political economy and social science. I plan to publish a book on philosophy which is a compilation of occasional articles. I have read and lectured a lot more than I have written on philosophy. I have much experience in discussing philosophy in Marxist study groups since 1958 and of course in the advanced course of the Communist Party of the Philippines. I have always tried to apply Marxist philosophy in my analysis of social, economic, political and cultural conditions and the need for revolutionary social transformation.

RADI 6. In his eleventh thesis to Feuerbach, Marx said that philosophy has interpreted the world in various ways, the point, however, is to change it. Engels, likewise, in the Anti-Dühring, argued how “the final causes of all social changes and political revolutions... are to be sought, not in the philosophy, but in the economics of each particular epoch.” I am a vice-president of a philosophical association in the Philippines and I have been steadfastly challenging my colleagues to speak up especially in these dark times of our history (I was able to publish a related commentary in The Inquirer entitled Wanted Philosophers). I am

inspired by other professional organizations in sociology and anthropology, for example, who have released relevant statements concerning the pressing issues that the people and the country face. What should be the role of philosophy and philosophers today? Can dialectical materialism be a helpful method in doing philosophy today? How? Or should philosophy and philosophizing be altogether abandoned as it seems to be an irrelevant discipline today?

JMS: The eleventh thesis of Marx is valid and compelling: that “philosophy has interpreted the world in various ways, the point, however, is to change it”. Philosophy is at best a guide to revolutionary practice. The statement of Engels that “the final causes of all social changes and political revolutions... are to be sought, not in the philosophy, but in the economics of each particular epoch” is likewise valid and compelling. It is only by understanding the contradictions at the economic base or mode of production in a certain society that we come to know the exploiting and exploited classes and the conditions that generate social changes and political revolution.

The role of philosophy and philosophers is to propagate among the people the outlook that the revolutionary solution is to be found in the problematic social reality, lay bare the basic contradictions in society and provide the method of thinking and acting to arouse, organize and mobilize the revolutionary forces against the counterrevolutionary forces not only at the economic base of society but also in its superstructure of politics, ideology, culture and morality.

Certainly, dialectical materialism is always needed to explain how a current society has come from the past and how it will be transformed to a new and better society. Marxist philosophy must be the guide to social analysis and social action for the purpose of revolutionary transformation. Otherwise contrary philosophies, idealist or subjectivist, will fill the vacuum and mislead the revolutionary leadership and the people.

Lenin at 150: Lenin Lives!

**In Celebration of the 150th birth anniversary
of V.I. Lenin on April 22, 2020**

Dear Comrades and Friends,

I thank the International League of Peoples' Struggle (ILPS) for inviting me to keynote the event titled, "Lenin at 150: Lenin Lives!," to commemorate the 150th birth anniversary of Vladimir Ilyich Ulyanov, or V.I. Lenin in Amsterdam on March 28. But the event has been aborted due to the rule of safe distancing, travel restrictions and other disruptions consequent to the Covid-19 pandemic.

The soonest and most appropriate alternative for me is to publish my paper on April 22, Lenin's date of birth. I have also proposed to the organizers of the event to publish the other commemorative papers in a timely manner. All the papers can be collected and published as a book and launched in a gathering of the authors and their readers at the appropriate time.

The pandemic is regrettable but serves us well as a subject for study in connection with Lenin's teachings on imperialism and the proletarian revolution. It coincides with, exposes further and aggravates the rapidly worsening crisis of the ruling system. It underscores the total bankruptcy of unbridled private greed under neoliberalism against the public good.

Even before the pandemic occurred, the world capitalist system was already on the verge of a big financial and economic crash. The indicators were the unsustainable debts of households, corporations and central banks, the overaccumulation and inflation of assets in the hands of the monopoly bourgeoisie, the depression of production and wage incomes and the increasing austerity measures adopted on a world scale.

The pandemic has considerably contributed to the worsening of the crisis of the world capitalist system. And it has exposed how the neoliberal economic policy has escalated the exploitation of the

working people, how it has deprived them of sufficient public health systems by eroding these with privatization and how it has led to repressive measures and further loss of income and social services during a severe health crisis.

The forces of fascism are also using the pandemic, general lockdowns and business disruptions as pretext to take center stage, push for and impose emergency powers and military takeovers of civilian functions, heighten repressive measures and jostle for diminishing resources, thus creating a more explosive mix that could lead to more violent inter-imperialist rivalries and internal political wrangling among ruling class factions.

But the increasingly intolerable conditions of oppression and exploitation drive the proletariat and the broad masses of the people to wage the revolutionary struggle against imperialism and all reaction. In most countries affected by the pandemic, daily difficulties of the people in coping with the fast-developing health crisis, socioeconomic crisis, bureaucratic venalities and repression, and ruling-class rivalries are driving the masses to quickly grasp the basic flaws of the capitalist-imperialist system and embrace the need for system change. We can expect more widespread and more intense people's struggles in the months and years to come.

In the midst of this turbulent period, it is highly appropriate and urgently necessary that we revisit the great Lenin's immense historical legacy regarding: (1) the importance of building a strong working-class movement, (2) the importance of revolutionary theory, and (3) the value of strategy and tactics appropriate to current conditions in each country.

It is of high importance and urgent necessity that we discuss the crucial role, the theory and strategy and tactics of the working class movement at this time when the crisis of the world capitalist system is conspicuously worsening and sharpening all major contradictions in the world.

I refer to such contradictions as those between labor and capital, those between the imperialist powers and the oppressed peoples and nations, those between the imperialist powers and states that assert national independence and the socialist cause and those among the imperialist powers.

The current crisis of the world capitalist system is generating the intolerable conditions of oppression and exploitation and is driving the proletariat and the rest of the people in both imperialist and non-imperialist countries, developed and underdeveloped, to wage various forms of mass resistance.

Since last year, we have seen the upsurge of the mass protests against neoliberalism, state terrorism, wars of aggression and destruction of the environment. The inciting moments of the mass protests are of wide variability but that they are manifestations of the crisis and bankruptcy of imperialism and all reaction.

The ongoing anti-imperialist mass struggles have the potential of bringing about the resurgence of the world proletarian revolution. In this regard, we need to review the philosophical and political teachings of the great Lenin to seek guidance in knowing what must be done to ensure the revolutionary advance of the proletariat and people of the world.

We must comprehend and deepen our understanding of the philosophical framework of dialectical materialism and the proletarian revolutionary standpoint that provided Lenin with the scientific outlook and sharpest tools of analysis and methods of work to advance the revolutionary tasks in his own time.

1. The importance of building a strong working-class movement

In the era of free competition capitalism in the 19th century, Marx and Engels studied and laid bare the laws of motion of capitalism and predicted that the recurrent crisis of overproduction would lead ultimately to the proletariat burying the class dictatorship of the bourgeoisie and establishing socialism.

It looked like monopoly capitalism or imperialism would prolong the life of capitalism in the 20th century without any serious interruption. But Lenin led the Great October Socialist Revolution to victory in Russia, at the weakest link of the chain of imperialist powers. Thus, he confirmed in theory and practice the conditions that defined the era of modern imperialism and the world proletarian revolution.

We owe to Lenin the teaching that for the proletarian revolution to win victory the crisis of the ruling system must be so severe as to

disable the bourgeoisie from ruling in the old way, the people are desirous of revolutionary change and the revolutionary party of the proletariat must be strong enough to lead the revolution.

There is no debate that a revolutionary mass movement of the workers and the broad masses of the people is necessary. But there must be a strong revolutionary party of the proletariat to lead the revolutionary mass movement. It must be the vanguard party to ensure the defeat of the bourgeoisie and the socialist direction and future of the movement.

Lenin clearly established, in the last decade of the 19th century, that the class consciousness and potential energy of the Russian proletariat were fast-growing and overtaking the influence of the liberal bourgeoisie, which was becoming a mere appendage of Tsarism and imperialism, and of the petty-bourgeoisie which tended to romanticize the peasantry. Lenin's early ideological struggles against the Narodniks and "legal Marxists" had a great practical impact in the work of laying the foundations of the revolutionary working-class party and mass movement.

Lenin wrote *What Is To Be Done* in 1902 in order to clarify what is the vanguard party of the proletariat and how to go about building it. It must have a revolutionary theory and political program by which to mentor, lead and guide the revolutionary mass movement. It must consist of the most conscious and most militant individuals from the mass movement, who are organized and well-disciplined under the principle of democratic centralism.

Lenin opposed the line that the working class movement would spontaneously move in the direction of socialism and that it was only a matter of coordinating the trade unions. He argued and fought for the line that there should be a vanguard party of the proletariat, dedicated to bring about socialist consciousness among the workers and wage the revolutionary struggle to emancipate the working class and the rest of the people by overthrowing the class dictatorship of the bourgeoisie.

Lenin opposed the line of Martov that trade unions should compose the proletarian revolutionary party. He argued that the party cannot arise from the confines of the trade union movement and from the spontaneous economic struggle about wages and hours of

work. He stood up for the line that the party must be led by professional revolutionaries, conscious and disciplined under the principle of democratic centralism. Thus, such new type of a party must come from the “outside” of the trade unions and go inside the working class and the entire mass movement.

At the Second Congress of the Russian Social-Democratic Labour Party (RSDLP) in 1903, Lenin was in the minority in the early sessions until the Jewish Social Democrats (the Bund) walked out. He and his followers gained the majority (and the name Bolsheviks) over the minority (Mensheviks) in the split of the party. Especially after the Revolution of 1905, the split widened over the revolutionary role of the proletariat and over how to respond to the mix of repression and limited reforms from the Tsarist regime. The split was later finalized at the Prague Conference of the Bolshevik Party in 1912.

Lenin’s emphasis on building the party’s core of professional revolutionaries, unrestrained by the narrow confines of the trade union movement, did not mean that he belittled the economic and other union-based struggles of the working class and those of non-proletarian toiling masses as well. He warned that the revolutionary party, even the most clandestine, must not be mere conspiratorial work of “a few dozen who can overturn the world” but who are detached from the practical mass movement. From their early St. Petersburg days onward, Lenin and his comrades sought out countless ways of reaching out to the toiling masses in order to gradually build the revolutionary party and its mass base.

At first through secret Marxist study circles and workers’ literacy classes—in one of which he met his future wife and lifelong comrade Nadezhda—then later through underground newspapers such as *Iskra* and its network of correspondent-agents, Lenin showed the fledgling party how to organize the practical movement through all-Russian propaganda and agitation, effectively bypassing Tsarist police repression and other limitations. Under Bolshevik leadership and Lenin’s guidance, the workers’ mass movement grew by leaps and bounds through the unions, through representatives in the Duma, and through such channels for extensive propaganda-

agitation as the Bolshevik daily newspaper Pravda, especially from 1912 onward.

We must understand the historical sequence of the industrial workers arising from the need of the bourgeoisie to employ them, put them to work and extract profits from them. Thus, they become a class in itself and consequently for the purpose of economic struggle they become a class for itself by organizing the trade unions. But for the proletariat to achieve the highest level of consciousness and activity for itself, it must have a revolutionary party that does not only make immediate economic and political demands but aims to overthrow capitalism and establish socialism.

Such a party must consist of cadres and members who assume the tasks of studying the objective social conditions and realizing the ideological, political and organizational requirements for building itself. It cannot arise spontaneously from the trade unions or from the spontaneous mass struggle. But of course, if it is indeed the revolutionary party of the proletariat, it must draw the majority of its cadres and members from the working class and the rural proletariat and must carry forward their rights and interests as well as those of the entire people.

The Bolsheviks could not have led the Great October Socialist Revolution to victory had they not differentiated themselves from the Mensheviks in 1903. The bourgeois democrats, the Mensheviks and the Socialist Revolutionaries had the head start in constituting the Provisional Government after the overthrow of the Tsar. But the Bolsheviks led by Lenin had the correct line, the resoluteness and militancy to extend their leadership over the soviet of workers and soldiers to the widespread soviets of the peasants in winning the October revolution, Civil War, the war against foreign intervention and all subsequent struggles to expand and consolidate Red political power.

Relative to the ongoing mass protest actions worldwide, there must be a revolutionary party of the proletariat to lead them from one victory to another. Otherwise they will simply run against the wall of reaction and become dissipated. Before the current mass protest actions, we have seen so-called leaderless movements like the Occupy Movement disintegrate and fade away. In the first place,

sections of such “leaderless” movements have been heavily influenced by supra-class notions that belittle the distinct role or even just the continued existence of the proletariat as a class while bloating up the appeal of so-called “intersectional” activism. But of course, the example of mass uprisings and the energy generated can be availed of by the revolutionary party of the proletariat in order to advance the revolution.

We must also guard against anarchist and fake “Maoist” groups that have the notion of creating or leading the mass movement by spouting ultra-Left slogans and merely seek to drive spontaneous mass protests into artificial explosions and conspiratorial heroics and which sideline or belittle the long-term and painstaking mass work and other legal-democratic actions and alliances required to sustain and further develop the workers’ and allied sectors’ mass movements.

As Lenin said in his work *Left-Wing Communism—an Infantile Disorder*:

The first questions to arise are: how is the discipline of the proletariat’s revolutionary party maintained? How is it tested? How is it reinforced? First, by the class-consciousness of the proletarian vanguard and by its devotion to the revolution, by its tenacity, self-sacrifice and heroism. Second, by its ability to link up, maintain the closest contact, and—if you wish—merge, in certain measure, with the broadest masses of the working people—primarily with the proletariat, but also with the non-proletarian masses of working people. Third, by the correctness of the political leadership exercised by this vanguard, by the correctness of its political strategy and tactics, provided the broad masses have seen, from their own experience, that they are correct.

On the other hand, these conditions cannot emerge at once. They are created only by prolonged effort and hard-won experience. Their creation is facilitated by a correct revolutionary theory, which, in its turn, is not a dogma, but assumes final shape only in close connection with the practical activity of a truly mass and truly revolutionary movement. (Lenin CW, Vol. 31 pp. 24-25)

II. The importance of revolutionary theory in the revolutionary movement

Lenin declared that without revolutionary theory there can be no revolutionary movement. Marx and Engels formulated the fundamental principles to lay down the foundation of Marxism and the world proletarian revolution. Thus, the Bolsheviks adhered to Marxism. But to make the proletarian revolution even more effective in his own time and for posterity, Lenin further developed Marxism and made his own theoretical contributions in philosophy, political economy and social science.

He wrote *Materialism and Empirio-Criticism* in 1909 to further explain dialectical materialism and contend with subjectivist idealism that is systematically narrowed down and limited to the empirical basis required by science and is presented as the third-party philosophy between materialism and idealism. The philosophical work is important because it debunks the bourgeois subjectivists who invoke empiricism and science to obscure the objective reality and inner contradictions of problematic social phenomena to be solved and deny the conscious capability of the people to solve the problems and change the status quo.

Lenin advanced our understanding of dialectical materialism by identifying the unity of opposites as the most fundamental among the laws of contradiction at work in society and nature and in the social and natural sciences. The simple expression of this is to divide one into two. One should not be dumbfounded by anything whole that is impressive or sacralized. Anything whole in the real world can be dissected, analyzed and critiqued. At the same time, anything that appears static, or anything that apparently emerges randomly from chaos, can be deeply understood in the movement of opposites that lurk within it. With his consciousness of the unity of opposites, Lenin was sharp and profound in his examination and analysis of events and issues in society and on both revolutionary and counterrevolution sides.

Consequent to reading and studying *Das Kapital*, he proceeded to study the Russian economy and wrote the *Development of Capitalism in Russia* in 1899. He recognized the character of Russia

as a military-feudal type of imperialism, with a rising bourgeoisie establishing industrial enclaves and impacting on the rural communes. And he identified the industrial proletariat as the most progressive productive force capable of winning political power with the support of the peasant masses and leading the people to socialism.

He had a comprehensive grasp of the bourgeois democratic and socialist stages of the Russian revolution and the principles of socialist revolution and construction against the capitalist system. He always spelled out socialism as the ultimate goal at every point in the revolutionary advance of the Bolsheviks and the proletariat. It was the objective of achieving socialism that motivated the Bolsheviks to oppose and overthrow the bourgeois Provisional Government of Kerensky and his allies.

Even as he was preoccupied with the demands of leading the Bolsheviks under conditions of imperialist war, he was able to write *Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism* in 1916 and publish it in 1917. He explained the plundering, aggressive, decadent and the moribund character of monopoly finance capitalism and the struggle for a redivision of the world among the imperialist powers. He also pointed out that the socialist parties of the Second International turned social chauvinists in support of the war policy of their respective imperialist countries because said parties represented the labor aristocracy serving as the tail of the big bourgeoisie.

Despite having to lead the Bolsheviks in the intensifying struggle for political power and despite the threats to his life and liberty, Lenin was able to write *State and Revolution* in 1917. It was a timely work to explain the class character of the state and revolution and to inspire and guide the Bolsheviks and the proletariat in intensifying the class struggle for socialism against the Kerensky government. It was a master work for future generations to learn that the essence of revolutionary struggle of the proletariat is to seize political power and build socialism.

After seizure of political power by the Bolsheviks, Lenin had to confront the inadequacies and difficulties in maintaining “war communism” which involved requisitioning food from the peasants and rationing under war conditions. He had to adopt the New

Economic Policy (NEP) as an expedient measure to respond to the peasant demand for compensation and give concessions even to the rich peasants, the traders and entrepreneurs in order to revive the economy ruined by the inter-imperialist war and the counterrevolutionary war. He adopted such a policy to save the rule of the Bolsheviks and the proletariat, stay on the road to socialism and prepare for advance.

Lenin had an unquenchable thirst to further his theoretical and practical understanding of the proletarian revolution and various contradictions in society, and led the Bolsheviks in raising the party's capacity to combine theory and practice. The sheer volume and scale of his lifelong contributions are reflected in his prolific output of books, pamphlets, articles, party and state documents drafted by him, unpublished manuscripts, extensive commentaries and marginal notes on works by other authors, including statistical yearbooks and other informative materials. Much of his teachings and insights remain resonant and enlightening to current-day revolutionaries.

Our appreciation of Lenin's contributions include his principled personal conduct, comradely mien, simple lifestyle, and strict work regimen, which are not as easily measured as his written works and official acts as leader of the Bolshevik party and Soviet state but have been unassailable facts in his many biographies, except the worst anticommunist ones. These are integral to his teachings and have inspired the respect and admiration of succeeding generations of revolutionaries.

To be able to lead the socialist revolution and construction effectively, Stalin learned from Lenin the principles and general methods of carrying them out. Lenin always explained in the context of preserving and strengthening the revolutionary forces and preparing the way for a further advance whenever there was the need to adopt a certain policy or course of action that involved a retreat or appeared to delay the advance of socialism.

He had the foresight to found the Third or Communist International against the social-chauvinist Socialist International as early as 1919. It was a necessary step to amplify the victory of the October Revolution, reject the revisionist line of the Second

International, encourage the revolutionary movement under the spirit of proletarian internationalism and widen the latitude for the consolidation of Soviet power. But he also had diplomatic flexibility in approving the Brest-Litovsk Treaty to consolidate power and neutralize further attacks by the imperialist powers.

He exercised profound theoretical leadership in founding and steering the Soviet state through its early years of development, as well as engaging in its most critical tasks and practical policy questions, until his work was cut short by severe illness and death in 1924. The same was true in his exercise of leadership within the Third International.

Relative to the current wave of mass protests against imperialism and reaction on a global scale, we must learn from the history of the Bolsheviks that they could win victory because of the theoretical and practical leadership of Lenin. He applied his own dictum that the revolutionary mass movement can become strong and advance further if there is a revolutionary theory that can guide the masses and there is the revolutionary party of the proletariat that upholds and applies such theory to the revolutionary struggle against the counterrevolutionary state of the bourgeoisie.

III. The value of strategy and tactics appropriate to current conditions in each country

Ahead of Lenin, Plekhanov held the view that the Russian revolution needed to pass through the bourgeois democratic stage before the socialist stage because the industrial proletariat in Russia was still a small minority class, incapable of carrying out a socialist revolution immediately. The Mensheviks took the line that the bourgeois democratic revolution had to be led by the bourgeoisie which would develop capitalism further and thereby enlarge the industrial proletariat.

Indeed, the industrial proletariat amounted to a small percentage of the Russian population and was in a few enclaves in an ocean of feudalism and medievalism. But Lenin asserted that the proletariat and its revolutionary party could lead the Russian revolution in both the bourgeois democratic revolution and socialist stages by having

for its main ally the peasantry, win over the middle social strata and take advantage of contradictions among the reactionaries in order to overthrow Tsarist rule. Thus, he set the revolutionary class line in drawing up the strategy and tactics of the Russian revolution.

In the February revolution of 1917, the leaders of the bourgeois democratic parties, the Mensheviks and the peasant-based Socialist Revolutionary Party had the initiative in taking power and installing the Provisional Government. They were supported by the Petrograd soviets of workers and soldiers which were then led by the Mensheviks and Socialist Revolutionaries who bowed to the bourgeois leadership of Kerensky.

Upon his arrival in Petrograd in April 1917, Lenin called for all power to the soviets even as the soviets of workers, peasants and soldiers were still under the leadership of the Mensheviks and Socialist Revolutionaries. But he persuaded the Bolshevik Party Central Committee to approve his line and program: to withhold support from the Provisional Government and win a majority in the soviets in favor of soviet power.

He proposed that upon its establishment the Soviet government would begin immediate negotiations for a general peace on all fronts and the soviets would confiscate the landlords' estates without compensation, nationalize all land, and divide it among the peasants. And the government would put privately owned industry under strict control for the benefit of labor.

From March to September 1917, the Bolsheviks successfully engaged in propaganda and agitation and eventually gained the majority in the soviets. The Kerensky government became discredited by the breakdown of the economy and deterioration of the living conditions of the workers, peasants, and soldiers and the refusal of Kerensky to withdraw from the war and complete the revolution. He could only feebly promise a freely elected constituent assembly upon the return of order.

Lenin and the Bolsheviks won the support of the soviets and the masses as they demanded peace, land, and bread. By September, the soviets elected a Bolshevik majority in the Petrograd Soviet and in the soviets of the major cities and towns throughout the country.

The line and program put forward by Lenin proved to be correct and successful.

The stage was already set for the seizure of political power in October. But Lenin still had to take grave personal risk by slipping into Petrograd in order to attend the secret meeting of the Bolshevik Party Central Committee to persuade his comrades to prepare for the seizure of political power. The plan was to muster the support of soldiers and sailors and to train the Red Guards, the Bolshevik-led workers' militia, for carrying out the October revolution.

After the overthrow of the Provisional Government, the Bolsheviks and their Left Socialist Revolutionary allies became the absolute majority of the Second All-Russian Congress of Soviets. Consequently, the delegates voted overwhelmingly to accept full power and elected Lenin as chairman of the Council of People's Commissars, the new Soviet Government, and approved his Peace Decree and Land Decree.

In forging the Brest-Litovsk Peace Treaty with the Central Powers, the Soviet Government was prepared to fight and defeat the Russian counterrevolutionary armies led by former Tsarist allies and the foreign interventionists from the Allied Powers. The soviets of workers, peasants and soldiers became a bulwark of revolutionary strength as the fighting moved from the cities and trunklines to the expanse of the countryside. The Leninist line of upholding and respecting the right of the non-Russian nationalities to national self-determination enabled the formation of the Soviet Union as a multinational federation.

Lenin founded the Third International in order to unite all workers of the world for the cause of socialism and proletarian internationalism and fight against imperialism, revisionism and all reaction. It aimed to encourage the proletarian parties to wage revolution or at the least counter aggression by the imperialist powers against the Soviet Union. Shortly after the death of Lenin, the Soviet Union was recognized by most governments. In the long run, the Comintern had great success in inspiring the rise of communist parties capable of establishing several socialist countries and leading national liberation movements in colonies and semicolonies.

Relative to the anti-imperialist organizations and movements that are now involved in the worldwide mass protests, we must understand that for the revolutionary movement to win victory against imperialism and establish socialism it must have a revolutionary class line and the correct strategy and tactics in order to build the strength of the basic revolutionary forces led by the proletariat, win over allies and take advantage of the splits among the class adversaries at home and abroad in order to isolate and defeat the enemy.

Lenin and the Bolsheviks applied the theory and practice of Marxism in the concrete conditions of Russia in order to arrive at the correct strategy and tactics and win the revolution in the biggest country of the world. So would the Communist Party of China and other proletarian revolutionary parties apply Marxism-Leninism in their respective countries and win the revolution among one-third of humankind.

Leninism's valuable legacy of universal applicability includes the deepgoing class basis of strategy and tactics in terms of identifying and accurately characterizing the contradictions among classes, how these have changed from one historical stage to the next, how these are expressed in the arena of economic, political and ideological struggles, in the specific roles of party platforms and movements. Lenin's significant contributions to the peasant-agrarian and national-colonial questions have been of immense value to succeeding generations of revolutionaries worldwide.

So many proletarian parties have drawn lessons of strategy and tactics from Lenin and his worthy successors Stalin, Mao and others. They creatively applied these lessons to their own victorious revolutionary movements. The treasury of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism, rather than remain static, has thus been tremendously enriched by genuine Marxist-Leninists in the past several decades amidst the changing global conditions, including the setbacks suffered by the world proletarian revolution and despite the global offensives of the imperialist bourgeoisie.

Proletarian parties that are seriously preparing for or actually waging armed revolution understand that many other aspects and elements of strategy and tactics must be worked out in the context of

concrete conditions prevailing in their respective countries, which may vary widely from country to country. These may include questions on agrarian or pre-industrial conditions, certain new elements of capitalist development or imperialist control, changing characteristics of the land and people, growing and waning geopolitical factors, and so on—which will impact strategy and tactics and be of wider interest when shared and discussed between or among parties.

We are now in transit to the great resurgence of anti-imperialist struggles and the world proletarian revolution. We look forward to the application of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism by proletarian revolutionary parties in more countries than ever before. We expect these parties to achieve unprecedentedly greater victories for the cause of socialism.

The epochal struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie and between socialism and imperialism continues. So long as the proletariat and people of the world are oppressed and exploited, they will rise up time and again in order to liberate themselves from the shackles of oppression and exploitation.

Celebrate Leninism and the 150th birth anniversary of the great Lenin!

Carry out the revolution under the leadership of the proletariat!

Long live Marxism-Leninism-Maoism!

Long live the world proletarian revolution!

Long live proletarian internationalism and the solidarity of all peoples!

General View of Lenin's Theory on Modern Imperialism as Indispensable Integral Part of his Revolutionary Legacy

**For Online Discussion on Lenin's Legacy and Imperialism,
sponsored by ILPS-Australia
May 27, 2020**

Dear Comrades and Friends,

By the time that Lenin wrote *Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism* in 1916, he had already made major contributions to the development of Marxism in the fields of philosophy, political economy and social science.

I wish therefore to present first how Lenin's theory on modern imperialism is related to and interconnected with his previous and prospective works that would together comprise his entire revolutionary legacy. Then, I proceed to focus on this theory, its implications and consequences in the socialist revolution in Russia and in the entire world in the time of Lenin. Thereafter, I discuss the implications and consequences on a world scale since the time of Lenin.

1. In Relation to the Entire Legacy of Lenin

The master work of Lenin in philosophy is *Materialism and Empirio-Criticism* which he wrote in 1909 to uphold the materialist-scientific outlook on objectively existing material reality and explain dialectical materialism as a mode of knowing and changing society and nature. He delved into how the general laws of contradiction operated in the particular laws of motion in particular forms of social and natural phenomena.

He identified the law of the unity of opposites as the most fundamental law of contradiction. He further explained that the unity

that gives character and form to a certain entity is temporary and relative because such entity is subject ultimately to change because of the permanent and absolute contradictoriness of the opposites. He also pointed to differences in similar entities and stressed the need for analysis of concrete conditions. He further pointed to the variations and uneven development of similar social and natural phenomena.

As regards to class struggle in exploitative society, the contradictions between exploiting and exploited classes are irreconcilable even as that society undergoes certain stages of development that seem to preserve indefinitely the character and form of society as dictated by the ruling exploitative class. But the exploited class that needs and demands liberation from the fetters of the old society is the driving force for revolutionary change and this can be accelerated by the rise of the subjective forces of the revolution. In *What Is To Be Done?* which Lenin wrote in 1901 and published in 1902, he stressed the need for a vanguard revolutionary party of the proletariat.

At the age of 19, Lenin read and studied *Das Kapital*. He proceeded to study the Russian economy and eventually wrote the *Development of Capitalism in Russia* in 1899. He noted the emergence of industrial capitalism in Russia with the rising bourgeoisie establishing industrial enclaves and impacting on the rural communes. At the same time, he observed the persistence of a military-feudal type of imperialism represented by the Tsar and the widespread landed nobility.

Tsarism welcomed the rise of industrial capitalism and the capitalist class as well as the service of the intelligentsia and the liberal bourgeoisie to the empire. Lenin identified the industrial proletariat as the most progressive and most productive political force for revolutionary change with the potential for winning political power with the support of the peasant masses and leading the people to socialism. His study of the political economy of Russia was closely linked to his study of state and revolution in connection with his purpose of carrying out a socialist revolution by the proletariat.

Even as the imperialist powers were frenziedly preparing for World War I, the first inter-imperialist war, Kautsky the leader of the

Second International put forward in 1914 the theory of ultra-imperialism or super-imperialism, which he presumed as the way for the imperialist powers to override their conflicts and even develop the underdeveloped countries. As the inter-imperialist contradictions heated up, the revisionists of the Second International acted as social chauvinists and social imperialists in supporting the war budgets of their governments even as they posed as social pacifists.

But Lenin was consistent regarding monopoly capitalism or imperialism as a moribund, decadent, bellicose and aggressive system. He had no illusions about imperialism as a benign and peaceful force. He saw it as the intransigent enemy of the proletariat and peoples of the world and he anticipated the inter-imperialist war to break out. In this connection, he saw the fatal weaknesses of the Russian ruling system in getting involved in the war and called on the proletariat and the people to turn the imperialist war into a revolutionary civil war.

Lenin's study of the political economy of Russia and the role played by his country in the world of imperialist powers and inter-imperialist conflicts provided a sound foundation for the social science of pursuing the class struggle and revolutionary transformation. He was able to formulate the general line and strategy and tactics of pursuing first the bourgeois democratic stage of the revolution under the leadership of the proletariat and immediately proceeding to the stage of socialist revolution.

Ahead of Lenin, Plekhanov projected the bourgeois democratic and socialist stages of the Russian revolution. But he and the Mensheviks thought that the bourgeoisie must lead the bourgeois-democratic revolution and develop capitalism before the proletariat can perform the revolutionary class leadership. Through the February revolution and Kerensky government, the bourgeoisie was able to take power but not to keep it as the government continued to be involved in the inter-imperialist war and could not solve the grave deterioration of the Russian economy.

The Bolsheviks performed the role of the vanguard party of the proletariat armed with the correct revolutionary theory and with the political line demanding peace, bread and freedom. It was able to gain the majority in the soviets of workers, peasants and soldiers

and was able to overthrow the Kerensky government and replace the class dictatorship of the bourgeoisie with that of the proletariat. Upon the seizure of political power by the Bolsheviks and the proletariat, the Great October Socialist Revolution began with the establishment of the class dictatorship of the proletariat on the basis of the worker-peasant alliance.

II. Lenin's Theory on Modern Imperialism

Lenin's theory on imperialism was of crucial importance in sharpening the understanding of monopoly capitalism by the Bolsheviks for the purpose of waging revolution in Russia and turning the imperialist war into a revolutionary civil war as well as for countering the opportunism being spread by the revisionists of the Second International to confuse the people about the nature of imperialism and to justify the social democrats in collaborating with and supporting the monopoly capitalists in their respective countries.

Lenin made it absolutely clear that the Kautskyite social democrats were wrong in supporting imperialism in any way and denounced them for being social imperialists, socialist by word and imperialist by deed. He categorically declared imperialism as the irreconcilable enemy of the proletariat and the people. Most important of all, in putting forward his theory on imperialism, he defined the world era as that of modern imperialism and proletarian revolution and urged the proletariat and peoples of the world to wage revolution in order to defeat and prevail over imperialism.

In opposition to Kautsky and the revisionists of the Second International, Lenin stressed that imperialism was the highest and final stage in the development of capitalism as an oppressor and exploiter of the proletariat and people and was not in any way a factor for making peace among the conflicting imperialist powers and for raising the development of the underdeveloped countries. He exposed monopoly capitalism as a decadent, moribund, bellicose and aggressive form of capitalism.

He observed that monopoly capitalists deployed direct and indirect investments in the colonies, semicolonies and dependent countries. It did so not to develop these countries but to extract higher profits in an uneven and spasmodic way and leaving in the wake of its economic plunder worse levels of devastation and

underdevelopment. In his study of imperialism, he showed how the economic and social development of the world became more uneven than before.

At any rate, Lenin defined the five features of imperialism as follows:

1. monopoly capitalism has become dominant in the economy and society of a country;
2. there is a merger of industrial and bank capital to form the finance oligarchy;
3. the export of surplus capital gains importance over the traditional export of surplus goods;
4. monopoly firms combine across imperialist countries in the form of cartels and syndicates and;
5. the domination of the world by colonial and imperialist powers has been completed and violent inter-imperialist conflicts keep on arising due to the struggle for a redivision of the world.

In an imperialist country, one or a few monopoly firms have prevailed over competitors and have accumulated capital to the extent of controlling the entirety of every major industry in contrast to the past when there was a multiplicity of smaller companies in the free competition capitalism in most of the 19th century. In pre-imperialist times, the banks used to be mainly an instrument of merchants for trading. But in the advent of imperialism, industrial capital and bank capital have merged in order to muster investments more rapidly and on a larger scale for enlarging the productive and trading capabilities of the monopoly firms.

The export of surplus capital gains importance over the traditional export of surplus goods as greater super-profits are to be gained not only from the expansion of foreign direct investments but even more so from the more parasitic and exploitative loan capital extended to the countries that are ever suffering from trade and budgetary deficits. As the weak and inferior kind of imperialist country, Russia was a prey to the Western creditors and was easily dictated upon against its own interest to plunge into an inter-imperialist war.

Monopoly capitalist firms form alliances among themselves in order to beat the competition within a country or on the scale of several countries in one global region or in the world at large. They

use the states of their respective countries to compete and conflict with other states in the struggle for a redivision of the world in terms of cheap sources of raw materials and labor, fields of investment, markets and spheres of influence. Two blocs of imperialist countries oppose each other, escalate the level of aggression and move towards a situation that led to the World War I and World War II.

The victory of the Great October Socialist Revolution confirmed that the world was not only that of modern imperialism but also that of the world proletarian revolution. It also confirmed that imperialism is the final stage of capitalism and the prelude to socialist revolution, as demonstrated in the Russian revolution and establishment of the Soviet Union by the proletariat led by Lenin and the Bolsheviks. A bulwark of the world proletarian revolution arose as a result of the first inter-imperialist war.

It was with far-reaching foresight that Lenin directed the formation of the Third International or Comintern in order to supplant the bankrupt and discredited Second International of social imperialists, social chauvinists and social pacifists and to propagate, carry out the communist and proletarian revolutionary line to fight and defeat imperialism in its home countries, colonies, semicolonies and dependent countries and ensure the rise of socialist countries through the class leadership of the proletariat against imperialism and all reaction.

III. Epoch-Making Consequences and Relevance

The consequences of Lenin's teachings on modern imperialism and proletarian revolution are epochal and far reaching. Stalin carried forward the socialist revolution and construction in the Soviet Union, proving that socialism is possible in one country and building it as a powerful force against imperialism, fascism and all reaction. The Comintern succeeded in propagating the Marxist-Leninist principles, policies and line in the ideological, political and organizational fields on an international scale.

After a short period of relative peace and stability among the imperialist countries in the 1920s, the world capitalist system was again shaken by a grave economic and social crisis from the Great Depression of 1929 onward, leading to the rise of the fascist states and the eventual war between the Allied Powers and the Axis

Powers in World War II. It was mainly an inter-imperialist war but the defeat of the fascist powers was effected mainly by the Soviet Union in Europe and by the armed revolutionary movements led by the communist and worker's parties in China and in other countries.

The happy outcome of the second inter-imperialist war was the victory of socialism in several countries in Europe and Asia and the rise of national liberation movements in Asia, Africa and Latin America. At the peak of the revolutionary wave in the middle of the 1950s, one third of humankind was under the leadership and governance of the working class and its revolutionary party in several countries, in contrast to the pre-war situation when the Soviet Union accounted for one-sixth of the surface of the earth.

But unfortunately, the scourge of modern revisionism afflicted the Soviet Union and ultimately caused its collapse in 1991 after decades of undermining socialism and restoring capitalism. Comrade Mao analyzed and explained the phenomenon of modern revisionism and put forward the theory and practice of continuing revolution under proletarian class dictatorship in order to combat revisionism, prevent capitalist restoration and consolidate socialism. But the Dengist counterrevolution in China made a successful coup in 1976.

Because of the revisionist betrayal of socialism in the Soviet Union, China and elsewhere, we are confronted with a world situation in which the imperialist powers appear to reign without serious challenge by the proletariat and the socialist cause. But under these conditions, the teachings of Lenin on imperialism and proletarian revolution are even more valid and relevant than ever before.

The temporary setbacks inflicted to the socialist cause by the modern revisionists and their imperialist masters still place humankind in the era of modern imperialism and proletarian revolution, in contrast to the overoptimistic slogan in the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution that imperialism was already heading for total collapse and socialism was marching towards world victory. Mao himself cautioned in 1969 that it would take a hundred more years to reach such situation. Indeed, it will take a whole historical

epoch for socialism to advance and defeat imperialism in order to reach the threshold of communism.

After the death of Mao and the reversal of his proletarian revolutionary line, China adopted and implemented capitalist reforms and opened up to the US and the world capitalist system for integration. After the mass uprisings against inflation and corruption in Beijing and other cities in 1989, China became more driven to seek collaboration with the US and other capitalist countries, sought to liquidate completely the people's war in Southeast Asia under the slogan of peace and development and became the main partner of US imperialism under the policy of neoliberal globalization, especially after China joined the World Trade Organization (WTO) in 2001.

By maintaining a two-tiered economy of state monopoly capitalism and private monopoly capitalism, China has been able to take advantage of the economic, trade and technical concessions from the US in a big and rapid way by using state planning and mobilizing state financial resources, state corporations and private companies to achieve strategic economic and military goals of production.

On its part, US imperialism has accelerated its strategic decline by financializing its economy, outsourcing mainly to China the production of consumer products and vital components of capital goods because of cheap labor there, increasing US direct investments there, pampering the military-industrial complex with gilded contracts for the production of high-tech weaponry and wasting huge human and material resources and more than USD six trillion in maintaining overseas military bases and engaging in ceaseless wars of aggression.

Now, the US is stepping back from its close all-round strategic partnership with China, accusing it of manipulating its two-tiered economy against the US and other capitalist countries, stealing technology from the US and other patent owners, creating and spreading COVID-19 and collaborating with Russia, Iran, Cuba, Venezuela and other countries to undercut and defeat US sanctions against them. In brief, the US now regards China as its main economic competitor and chief imperialist rival.

The crisis of the world capitalist system has been worsening in an unprecedented way since the financial crisis of 2008. This has resulted in the depression and volatility of the world economy. The causes of the crisis have never been solved even as a new and graver crisis has come about to wreak further havoc on the world economy. The global neoliberal policy regime is unraveling as imperialist powers are increasingly becoming protectionist and prone to unleash state terrorism and wars of aggression. Inter-imperialist contradictions are growing and sharpening.

As the main imperialist rivals, the US and China are trying to lead their respective blocs of imperialist power and preserve as well as expand their respective economic territories in the struggle for a redivision of the world. Wars of aggression and counterrevolution are increasing. We hope that the revolutionary movements of the people led by the proletariat can become strong enough to frustrate and defeat the tendency of the imperialist powers to unleash wars, shift the burden of crisis to the oppressed peoples and nations in underdeveloped countries and further plunder and destroy the environment.

On Dialectical Materialism: First of a Series of Webinars on Marxism-Leninism-Maoism

Questions by Anghelo Godino

Answers by Jose Maria Sison

Anakbayan-Europe NDLine Online School

August 9, 2020

1. We can sum up Marxism in three basic components: philosophy, political economy, and social science. We will discuss these three components for the duration of this series. Let us start with philosophy, which, in Marxism, is dialectical materialism. What were the political and economic landscape and dominant philosophical ideas during the time when Marx introduced dialectical materialism?

JMS: Politically, there were sharpening class tensions between the rising bourgeoisie and the people on one side and the monarchy and the landed aristocracy on the other side in Europe. While the bourgeoisie and monarchy could either clash as in the French Revolution of 1788-1789 or compromise as in England, there were also sharpening class contradictions between the rising bourgeoisie and the proletariat which manifested in the workers' uprisings of 1848.

It was a time where free competition capitalism developed fastest in certain countries under the impetus of the Industrial Revolution and the bourgeoisie benefited from the primitive accumulation of capital and the application of science and technology in industry and agriculture. The primitive accumulation of capital included the plunder of colonies, the rapid proletarianization of peasants and the extremely long hours of work, from 12 to 16 hours or even more in factories.

The dominant philosophical ideas were idealist, rationalist in continental Europe and empiricist in England. Marx and Engels turned upside down and put on a materialist basis what was then the most developed idealist philosophy, that of Hegel who accounted for change with the use of dialectics. They also made use of Feuerbach's materialism, whose recognition of sensuous human activity they brought to the level of critical-practical revolutionary activity.

Marx and Engels had German philosophy as their basic source in developing their dialectical materialist world outlook and method of knowing and acting. Consistent with their philosophy, they had British political economy as their basic source of knowledge for their critique of the capitalist economy and comprehension of its internal laws of motion. They had French social science as their major source of knowledge about the class struggle and the social revolution.

2. Let us clarify what materialism means in Marxist philosophy, as it might have another connotation in present times. What is materialism and what is the relationship of matter and consciousness?

JMS: From ancient times to the present, the basic struggle in philosophy has always been between materialism and idealism. As Engels simply put it, whether you are materialist or idealist depends on which is your starting point. If your starting point is matter, then you are a materialist. If your starting point is consciousness, then you are an idealist. It is therefore important to know the correct relationship of matter and consciousness.

Science has shown that the emergence of homo sapiens came quite recently, some 60,000 years ago, in the long evolution of nature. Thus, non-thinking matter arose far, far ahead of human consciousness. On this basis, the materialist declares that matter precedes consciousness in time but consciousness is the highest development of matter. But the objective idealist argues that a supernatural being with its divine consciousness preceded and created the material universe.

Of course, the materialist can shoot back that humankind has been the one responsible for creating or imagining the supernatural,

from animism through polytheism to monotheism. The subjective idealist can butt in to say agnostically that he is indifferent to what came first, matter or consciousness, and lays stress on sense data, personal experience and empirical investigation and analysis; and tries to make a positivist appropriation of science for seeing reality through appearances. There is a dizzying plethora of subjective idealist philosophies, appropriating a mechanistic kind of materialism but also flying off into metaphysics. The most bizarre generate their ersatz special vocabularies allusive of psychiatry or linguistics.

3. How about the word dialectics, what does that mean?

JMS: Dialectics can be understood narrowly as simply the exchange of arguments and counter-arguments as in the Socratic dialogues. But in Hegel's development of idealist philosophy in the 19th century, he posited the self-development of thought through thesis and anti-thesis resulting in synthesis which is a new and higher kind of thesis. This idealist dialectical process of ideational change is supposed to be realized subsequently in historical and social change.

Marx and Engels adopted the concept of dialectics but put it on a materialist basis and rejected the idealist basis. They also rejected the Hegelian notion of the dialectical process of leading to the synthesis as the final and highest point of development. They put forward the law of contradiction as existent and operating in material objects and in the process of knowing them. Engels put forward three basic laws of contradiction or materialist dialectics: the negation of the negation, the interpenetration or unity of opposites and the quantitative change to qualitative change.

Marx thoroughly applied materialist dialectics in the critique of the capitalist political economy. He observed and analyzed all the contradictory factors in the capitalist economy: between capital and labor and within capital as well as within labor to understand how changes occur within the capitalist system and how the class struggle between the bourgeoisie and proletariat would take the direction of installing the proletariat as the new ruling class and establishing socialism.

4. Marx and Engels developed dialectical materialism. How did it differ from the dialectics of Hegel and materialist basis of

Feuerbach?

JMS: For having a materialist basis, the dialectics of Marx and Engels differs from that of Hegel, which has an idealist basis. Change arises from the contradictions within material objects or societies and not as a mere copy or reflection of the thinking process of any kind of supernatural spirit or human intellect.

Furthermore, change does not end with the Hegelian synthesis or with the Prussian state as the highest realization of thought in history. Marxist dialectical materialists assert that change is permanent. Even the classless society of communism, which is a tremendous advance from capitalism through socialism, is not the end of history.

The materialism of Feuerbach radically departs from idealist philosophy and recognizes the conscious and sensuous character of humans but falls short of dialectical materialism, which entails the critical analysis of society and the revolutionary activity of the masses in order to make a fundamental change of society.

5. The essence of dialectical materialism is that everything is in the process of constant change. Can you explain this process? What is the basis of change?

JMS: Even before the appearance of homo sapiens on earth, the process of constant change in nature has been going on through the law of contradictory motions among the sub-atomic particles, atoms and molecules; and among the biggest objects such as the oceans and continents through climatic changes and movements of tectonic plates. Scientists have shown the geological changes, the big epochal climatic changes and the development of flora and fauna on earth.

While the process of constant change in nature is evolutionary and relatively slow, the process of constant change in society is comparatively rapid and revolutionary from one stage of social development to another because of the cognitive ability of homo sapiens to learn from social practice, which includes production, class struggle and scientific experiment.

Primitive communal societies took more than 50 to 60 thousand years to exist but it took only some 6000 years for human society to develop from slave society through the feudal society to capitalist

society. The advance of society has been more conspicuously cumulative, especially since the advent of metallurgy, literacy and class struggle. Capitalism started to grow in the handicrafts and manufacturing in the city states of the Mediterranean in the 13th century and look at how capitalism grew even faster upon the adoption of electro-mechanical and chemical processes since the Industrial Revolution.

6. In order for us to understand better, please give us concrete examples of the following three laws of dialectics, namely: 1) the negation of the negation, 2) the unity of opposites, and 3) the law of quantitative to qualitative change.

JMS: To explain negation of the negation: There is no social formation or phenomenon that is not preceded by its opposite and that is not subject to negation that leads to a new formation or phenomenon. Capitalism was previously a negation of feudalism and in turn capitalism is subject to negation by socialism.

To explain the unity of opposites: Contradictory factors, such as capital and labor or the bourgeoisie and the working class, are bound up together and their relative unity and temporary balance determine the character of capitalist society under the rule of the bourgeoisie. But the bourgeoisie and working class have contradictory interests and the class struggle ensues and when the working class succeeds in defeating the bourgeoisie, it becomes the new ruling class in a socialist society.

To explain the law of quantitative to qualitative change: Substantive quantitative changes must occur to result in qualitative changes. Take water for instance, at 1 degree to 100 degrees Celsius, it is stable as liquid. Below one degree, it becomes ice and beyond 100 degrees, it starts to steam and evaporate.

In the process of social change, workers' strikes and mass protests can result in reforms and retention of the capitalist system but the crisis can become so serious that the capitalist ruling class cannot rule in the old way and becomes even more oppressive and exploitative, then the masses wage revolution to overthrow the ruling system and establish socialism.

7. What is meant by the law of contradiction being universal and particular?

JMS: In being universal, the law of contradiction applies to all of nature and society or the general category of particular categories and things. At the highest level of generalization, the law of contradiction applies to the study of all natural and social sciences. But as you go down to more particular categories of things and fields of study the contradictions to deal with take different forms.

Let us start with the general relationship and contradiction between society and nature. Society is part of nature and uses nature in production and in the maintenance of society. The relationship between nature and society can be friendly or unfriendly depending on the handling by society of contradictions as well as harmonies with nature. It is now increasingly a problem that the system of monopoly capitalism has abused and plundered the environment to an extent that catastrophe is imminent and threatens the very existence of human society.

For a long time in the life of human society, the primitive communal life persisted. There was no class struggle but a very low kind of social practice and life of hard struggle against the vagaries of nature, with the most rudimentary tools and methods of production. Upon the advent of class society, the law of contradiction takes the form of the class struggle, mainly between the slave-owning class and the slaves in society, between the landlords and the serfs in feudal society and between the capitalists and the working class in capitalist society.

8. What are principal and secondary aspects?

JMS: In any kind of class society, there are several kinds of contradictions at work. Let us take the case of the current Philippine society. We often say that the Filipino people are waging a revolutionary struggle for national and social liberation. National liberation takes into account domination by foreign monopoly capitalism, especially US imperialism. Social liberation takes into account the more direct oppression and exploitation inflicted on the people by the local exploiting classes of big compradors, landlords and bureaucrat capitalists who also act as agents of foreign domination.

Because the US has relinquished direct political rule since 1946, the Filipino people confront the local ruling system and engage in a

civil war with it in order to achieve the people's democratic revolution through protracted people's war. But if US imperialism launches a war of aggression against the Philippines, then the Filipino people wage mainly a war of national liberation and identify US imperialism as their principal adversary on top of its local puppets. The main form of contradiction changes from civil war to a national war against foreign aggression.

9. Can you please tell us a concrete example of how several contradictions can be at work at the same time in the same thing or process?

JMS: In the explanation that I have just made, I spoke of handling the national contradiction with foreign monopoly capitalism and domestic social contradiction and applying the highest form of revolutionary struggle, be it civil war or national war against foreign aggression. We determine the principal and secondary contradictions, depending on circumstances, even as several types of contradictions co-exist and the Filipino people struggle against foreign and local adversaries in varying degrees.

10. Is there anything that is not in the process of change?

JMS: All things are always in a process of change, that may be observed with the use of instruments or that is imperceptible to the naked eye for a while and then becomes conspicuous when a qualitative change occurs. We always have to deal with a contradiction or set of contradictions in order to strengthen the revolutionary movement and advance it towards victory.

But that which may be considered an external factor in relative terms can become an obvious internal factor in the process of revolutionary war. I have already explained US imperialism possibly becoming an outright aggressor. China is another possible outright aggressor. It has already occupied and militarized the seven artificial islands in the exclusive economic zone of the Philippines.

11. Let us also discuss the theory of knowledge. According to Marx, social practice is the basis and source of knowledge. What did he mean by that? And what exactly is social practice?

JMS: Indeed, social practice is the basis and source of knowledge. Mao has explained in a comprehensive and simple way the basic elements of social practice in "Where Do Correct Ideas

Come From?" From production, class struggle and scientific experiment. From time immemorial, man has differentiated himself from other animal species by engaging in production with the tools that he himself has fashioned and thereby surviving and advancing to higher forms of production.

As societies have grown in size and class societies have developed, the class struggle has become the impetus to higher levels of social practice and knowledge. To be able to rule society and overcome domestic and external adversaries, the exploiting classes have compelled the exploited classes to produce the surplus product for sustaining and developing the mode of production and the superstructure of society.

On the basis of the advance of science and technology, the capitalist system has made far greater material and cultural achievements as well as far bigger wars than previous forms of societies. But the capitalist system has been able to grow only with oppression and exploitation of the working class. But the working class has become armed ideologically, politically and organizationally to be able to dig the grave of the capitalist system and establish the socialist system.

12. Mao also contributed to the theory of knowledge, and stated that there are two processes for acquiring knowledge: 1) the perceptual or empirical and 2) the cognitive or rational. Can you explain what these processes are?

JMS: By perceptual or empirical process, he meant doing concrete investigation and gathering the facts, the sense data from your perception and experience. Mao said that without investigation and without the facts, you have no right to speak. You have to go to the peasant masses to learn from them about their dire conditions, their needs and demands. Thus, you learn and acquire the factual basis for arousing, organizing and mobilizing the peasant masses for agrarian revolution.

By cognitive or rational process, he meant analyzing the facts, drawing the truth from the facts and making conclusions and judgments. On the basis of adequate concrete information that you have at a given time, the leading organ or collective unit can make

the plan and set forth the tasks for arousing, organizing and mobilizing the peasant masses for agrarian revolution.

The higher level of knowledge is applied in revolutionary practice to raise its level of development. The higher level of revolutionary practice leads to the development of a higher level of knowledge. There is a wave-like advance in the alternating rises in the levels of revolutionary theory and practice. There is a dialectical interaction of rising knowledge and rising practice.

13. What are empiricism and dogmatism and what are the dangers of both?

JMS: Empiricism means limiting knowledge to the personal experience of an individual or a small group and not drawing further knowledge from the collective practice and accumulated knowledge of the entire Party and revolutionary movement. Empiricism prevents understanding the various requirements of the revolutionary movement and the general direction that the movement must take. Because of the narrow-mindedness, fragmentariness and short-sightedness that empiricism breeds, the empiricist can go blind and astray politically.

Dogmatism can be simply book worship without any social investigation and analysis and simply mouthing jargon and generalities without understanding the concrete meaning of the terms used in reading materials and discussions. The dogmatists may sound the most learned with big words or appear most revolutionary by urging everyone to leap into communist society but they are ignorant of the hard work and struggle that it takes to advance the revolution from one stage to another.

The phrase monger or windbag flies over the concrete reality and over the ideological, political and organizational tasks needed to carry out and lead the masses. The dogmatists deny the stages and phases that the revolutionary movement go through in order to advance surely and steadily. They can mislead others to an adventurist or putschist line and then upon its failure they make them lose confidence in the revolution.

14. Dialectical materialism and the theory of knowledge – why are they relevant today?

JMS: The study of dialectical materialism and the theory of knowledge is always necessary and relevant. Dialectical materialism provides us with the materialist-scientific outlook and the method of thinking and acting to understand and solve problems and fight the enemy more effectively than ever. The Marxist theory of knowledge guides us in obtaining and accumulating knowledge from revolutionary practice and gaining further knowledge to improve our work and style of work and achieve bigger and better results in the revolutionary struggle.

No revolution led by proletariat can advance without ideological building of the communist party through the study of dialectical materialism and Marxist theory of knowledge and related matters. There is a calibration of studies through basic, intermediate and advanced courses in the communist party. There are refresher and post-curricular studies by organs and units of the party. There are continuous studies in the course of work and studying current problems and issues.

It is always the duty of the cadres and members to promote and realize the curricular and extracurricular studies of newer or younger party members. This is the best way to ensure the consolidation and advancement of the party and the revolutionary movement. When we learn in concrete terms the friends and enemies of the revolution and the principles, policies and line of the revolutionary movement, we are well guided in our revolutionary practice and we are encouraged to carry out our tasks in the service of the people and their revolution.

On Historical Materialism: Second of a Series of Webinars on Marxism-Leninism-Maoism

Questions by Anghelo Godino

Answers by Jose Maria Sison

Anakbayan-Europe NDLine Online School

August 16, 2020

1. Today, we will discuss historical materialism. It is the application of dialectical materialism (which was our last topic) on the study of the various forms of society and their development from one form to another. Nothing is permanent except change—this also applies to society. What are these different forms of society that we have had so far?

JMS: In about 60,000 years of existence, humankind has developed five major forms of society in the following sequence: primitive communal, slave, feudal, capitalist and socialist. The classless primitive communal society took 90 per cent of human existence to develop from old stone age to new society, from nomadic clans to settled tribes and further on to inter-tribal alliances and societies that began to use metals, especially bronze, for production and war and engaged in agriculture and animal husbandry.

In the most recent 10 percent percent of human existence, some 6000 years, class society has prevailed and has changed quite more rapidly than primitive communal society and in a cumulative way because of the development of the mode of production and superstructure of society. There is a discernible sequence of the different forms of societies because a certain form of society cannot arise without germinating first in the womb of a previous form of society.

The universal law of contradiction is at work in every form of society and in the transition from one form of society to another. But different forms of society can co-exist, interlap and overlap over varying geographical scales. Just consider how the settler colonial society of the US imposed itself on the native American tribes (and then used African slaves to make feudal plantations and create the big agriculture surplus to export some of it to England and import modern equipment to build industrial capitalism.

2. Historical materialism also seeks to comprehend the interaction between the material base and the superstructure of society. What is meant by the material base of society?

JMS: The material or economic base of society is otherwise called the mode of production in the exact terminology of Marxism. It consists of the forces of production and the relations of production. The forces of production in turn consist of the people in production and the means of production available to them. In class society, the relations of production are determined by the class that privately owns the means of production, organizes the people in production and distributes the means of subsistence to those who toil.

As regards to the interaction of the mode of production and the superstructure, the former arises or develops in time ahead of the latter which however in further time can either delay or accelerate the development of the productive forces, depending on the main current or character (reactionary or revolutionary) of the relations of production and the entire superstructure. In due course, we can further discuss the interaction of mode of production and superstructure after we explain the content of the latter.

3. The mode of production is significant in society. It consists of the forces of production and the relations of production. What are these? And can you please give examples on the role of the mode of production in the development of society from one form to the other?

JMS: In slave society, the slave owning class owned the metal tools, land, work animals and other means of production. They also owned the slaves and used them as beasts of burden to produce the biggest amount of surplus. They had power of life and death over the slaves, gave meager rations and appropriated all the products of their labor. Slavery was perpetuated due to inheritance of status,

failure to pay debts, commission of felonies and captivity in wars, abductions and trade.

In countries where slavery evolved to feudal society, the slave owners used the slaves to open and cultivate large agricultural lands. These would be called the latifundias in the ancient Roman empire. Then, it became unwieldy for the slave owners to manage the slaves on vast lands and who could slacken in their assignments or even run away. Thus, the so-called enlightened slave owners opted to become feudal lords and turned the slaves into rent-paying serfs.

In feudal society, the people in production that produced the biggest amount of surplus, especially with deep plowing that used metal instruments, were the serfs who worked on the agricultural land or who tended to the animal farms owned by the landlords. The landlords allotted pieces of land for the serfs to till and obliged them to pay rent and render extra services.

In the womb of feudal society, handicrafts, trading and other sideline occupations based in the towns developed and gave birth to the bourgeoisie who emerged from the ranks of the masters of the handicrafts guilds and from the traders between town and countryside. From the stage of handicraft workshops where the individual artisans could make whole products, manufacturing developed with ever higher division of labor among the workers. Still further on, industrial capitalism arose with large-scale machine production, using electro-mechanical and chemical processes and concentrating larger numbers of workers in factories, mines and other work sites.

In socialist society, the private ownership of the means of production is replaced by state and collective forms of ownership. Class exploitation by the capitalist class ceases. State economic planning ensures the growth and improvement of the productive forces in accordance with priority given to satisfying the basic needs of the people and expanding production. Agriculture is the basis of the economy and the basic and heavy industries are the lead factor, with light industry producing the consumer and producer goods for households. The growth of the economy is aimed at raising the wage

level and the people's standard of living and paving the road to communism.

4. How about the superstructure of society? What is meant by that?

JMS: The superstructure consists of the political and cultural institutions, organizations, ideas, practices and social relations above the mode of production at the base of society. It is sustained by a major part of the surplus product created by the exploited class. It reflects the dominant interests of the ruling class. It encompasses all the personnel, instruments and methods for coercing or molding the mentality of the people to give loyalty to the incumbent social order.

The highest form of political organization in the superstructure is the state. It seeks to perpetuate the law on the ownership of the means of production of the social order. For the purpose, it uses persuasive political methods as well as the use of organized violence. The state becomes conspicuous as an instrument of class oppression, consisting of such apparatuses of coercion as the army, police, courts and prisons, whenever the ruling exploiting classes uses it to suppress just demands for reforms and revolutionary movements.

The cultural institutions and organizations, ideas and practices express the interests of the ruling class, the dominant religions, the formal education available, the history and characteristics of dominant and related ethnolinguistics communities. They serve to endorse and support the ruling system and captivate the thoughts and sentiments as well as the traits, customs and habits of the people.

5. What is the relationship between the mode of production and the superstructure?

JMS: The ruling class in any society controls both the mode of production and the superstructure and use them to perpetuate their class dominance. The mode of production is in charge of the economic wherewithal of the society and provides the economic surplus for maintaining and expanding the superstructure.

The working people are responsible for sustaining the facilities, lives and activities of the politicians, the military and police, the

philosophers, the academicians, scientists, priests, artists and creative writers who inhabit the superstructure. The superstructure involves a few political and cultural personages but they are attended to and assisted by many more people who belong to the exploited and oppressed classes.

When the forces of production grow to such an extent that they run against the existing relations of production, the class struggle becomes conspicuous and becomes reflected in the various aspects of the superstructure. As I have earlier pointed out, the mode of production arises or develops in time ahead of the superstructure which however in further time can either delay or accelerate the development of the productive forces, depending on the main current or character (reactionary or revolutionary) of the relations of production and the entire superstructure.

6. Can you please discuss the superstructure of the various forms of society?

JMS: The political and cultural institutions, ideas, social relations and practices in the superstructure reflect in general the mode of production, especially the relations of production. While the superstructure evokes mainly the political and cultural dominance of the ruling class, it also reflects in due time the growth and advance of productive forces and growing resistance of the exploited class to the dominant relations of productions as well as to the dominant political and cultural relations.

In the superstructure of slave society, the state arose as an instrument of class rule. It consisted of the government with distinct agencies, with personnel for decision-making and for administering society and most importantly with the apparatuses of coercion which enforced the laws to maintain slavery. In the institutions of learning and in cultural works, the idealist kind of philosophy was favored against the materialist kind. The rulers invoked supernatural authority to legitimize their rule even as there were political and cultural mechanisms where the freemen could participate.

In the superstructure of feudal society, the state was the principal instrument of the monarchy and the feudal aristocracy who drew power for their ownership of land and control over the serfs. In Europe, the Roman Catholic Church became a powerful partner of

the state. It gained power by blessing and legitimizing the feudal system and by accumulating land and other properties. But contradictions and tensions could arise now and then between the church and state even as these collaborated in influencing and dominating the minds and behavior of the people. In the long course, the resistance of the serfs often invoked the scripture and the liberal bourgeoisie arose to invoke science and reason against the feudal system.

In the superstructure of capitalist society, the state is the class dictatorship of the bourgeoisie. It has developed further as a system of organized violence against the proletariat and other exploited classes as well as an instrument of persuasion and conjuring the illusion of democracy through elections and parliamentarism, for making the laws and mechanisms to perpetuate private ownership of capital and land and for engaging in colonialism and eventually modern imperialism. To develop and draw more profits, the bourgeoisie used science and technology, built academic institutions and even instituted public education more than the feudal system did in order to serve the expanding industry, businesses and government.

In the superstructure of socialist society, the state is the class dictatorship of the proletariat to stand for upholding and developing socialism and defending the people against the bourgeoisie and imperialism. The institutions and organizations are expanded tremendously and they promote the materialist-scientific outlook, methodology and morality of socialism. The proletariat as the leading class is dedicated to building socialism as the first phase of communism or as a phase transitory to communism.

7. When can we say that a society is ripe for radical transformation?

JMS: It was Lenin who clarified when a society is ripe for radical transformation. First, the society is already stricken by a crisis that is so severe that the ruling exploitative class can no longer rule in the old way. Second, the people are desirous of revolutionary change. And third, a revolutionary party has arisen and developed to be strong enough to lead the revolution.

In the time of Lenin, Russia was ripe for revolution when Tsarism and then the bourgeois government of Kerensky could not extricate

themselves from imperialist crisis and war, the broad masses of the people and the soviets of workers, peasants and soldiers wanted revolution and the Bolshevik Party was strong enough and ready to lead the revolution.

The semicolonial and semifeudal ruling system in the Philippines is in a chronic socioeconomic and political crisis. The oppressed and exploited people are therefore desirous of revolutionary change. And the Communist Party of the Philippines (CPP) has grown from small to big and from weak to strong on a nationwide scale and is strong enough to carry on the people's democratic revolution through protracted peoples' war.

8. What are the roles of the mode of production and the superstructure in the process of the transformation of society?

JMS: The mode of production starts to become outmoded when the forces of production have grown so much as to strain and tend to break the existing relations of production. When the working class grows so big because of the growth of industrial production, the capitalist ruling class can no longer solve the recurrent and ever worsening crisis of overproduction, even by resorting to monopoly capitalism, fascism and war, then the conditions are ripe for revolution by the working class.

But the class struggle is not limited to economic struggle in the mode of production or economy, it must also become a class struggle in the superstructure, in the political and cultural fields. The class struggle in the superstructure whips up and inflames the overall class struggle. The capitalist class thinks it can limit the class struggle to the confines and premises of his factory over issues of wages and working hours. But the workers gain more freedom of action and gain political power through political and cultural organizations and movements of the entire working class and the rest of the exploited people.

9. Is transformation of a society possible if the class being ruled does not fight?

JMS: No radical or significant transformation of society is possible if the class being exploited and ruled does not fight or remains weak because of objective limitations due to material conditions or they are not aroused, organized and mobilized to fight

effectively. Even if in ancient times, the slave society could evolve into a feudal society, there were the slave revolts and slave runaway to persuade the slave masters that it was more clever and profitable to convert the slaves into serfs.

In the feudal society of France, the liberal bourgeoisie was able to win the liberal democratic revolution and seize power from the monarchy and landed aristocracy by raising the rags of the poor plebeians and serfs as their flag and actually availing of their anti-feudal class hatred and mobilization in the revolution.

But now, there is the industrial proletariat, an exploited class that is the most productive and politically progressive force and that has the potential for taking power from the bourgeoisie and other exploiting classes and for allying itself with and emancipating all other exploited classes. This is a class for carrying out the radical rupture from the millennia of private ownership of the means of production, which has been the basis of exploitative class society.

10. Is having a vanguard party required for social transformation? Has society not been changed before by mere spontaneous uprising? What is the importance of a leading party?

JMS: In the current world era of modern imperialism and proletarian revolution, it is absolutely necessary to have a vanguard proletarian party to lead the revolution in any society ruled by the industrial monopoly bourgeoisie as in capitalist countries or by the comprador big bourgeoisie as in the semicolonial and semifeudal Philippines. Anywhere in the world in the current era, no proletariat and people can wage a revolution against the domestic bourgeoisie without taking into account the intervention or aggression of the international bourgeoisie or at least a bloc of imperialist powers.

The proletariat is the class that has the ideological, political and organizational strength and resources to lead the revolution against the big bourgeoisie and has close relations with the peasantry and other exploited classes as allies. In slave society, the slaves engaged in uprisings against their slave masters but did not have all the necessary means and conditions for leading the transformation to next possible form of society, feudalism.

In the long feudal history of China, there were big peasants uprisings but there were yet no conditions for feudalism to advance

to capitalism. Then when a peasant uprising succeeded in overthrowing a feudal dynasty, it merely served to install a new feudal dynasty. In modern times, peasant uprisings can help a liberal democratic revolution as in France in 1788-1789 or the peasants can ally themselves with the proletariat to make the socialist revolution as in Russia and then in China in the era of modern imperialism and world proletarian revolution.

11. Please explain how social transformation has occurred in the history of mankind – from primitive communal, slavery, feudalism, and capitalism. And how certain are we that the next social transformation will be towards socialism?

JMS: In all major social transformations, from primitive communal society to the various forms of class society, the universal law of contradiction was at work and took various forms in accordance with the concrete conditions. In primitive communal society, significant contributions occurred quite slowly in tens of thousands of years because of the most underdeveloped mode of production.

It took a lot of time to advance from the old stone age to new stone age, from the savage period of the nomadic clans and the barbaric period of the tribes. And it also took a lot of time to advance from barbaric period to class society through the development of bronze tools and the settled agriculture of intertribal societies. The progress of social development depended on what kind of instruments of production the people had at a given time.

By the time that so-called civilization came, starting with the slave society as the first form of class society, social progress could become much faster than before because of well-developed metallurgy, agriculture, animal breeding, more people, the rise of literacy and numeracy and advances in the division of labor, together with the class division of society between the few owners of the means of production and the many who did not own such means and had to work for others in order to survive and subsist.

As the means of production advanced so did the number of people in production and at the same time improved their productive skills. When the growth of productive forces breaks the existing relations of production, a new form of society is on the way and the class struggle intensifies in class society and becomes reflected by

and becomes dialectically interactive with the class struggle in the political and cultural aspects of the superstructure.

We have seen in a few centuries how industrial capitalism has made achievements in economic and social development several times far greater than all previous forms of society with the use of electro-mechanical, chemical and biological processes. Quantum physics has brought about further advances in the application of science in both the mode of production and superstructure. Unfortunately, the monopoly bourgeoisie uses all these advances for exploiting the proletariat and other working people, worsening the crisis of overproduction and unleashing state terrorism and wars of aggression.

After all the irrationalities and injustices under neoliberalism in the last four decades, the toiling masses of workers and peasants are rising up in anti-imperialist and democratic struggles for a socialist future. The crisis of the world capitalist system is now rapidly worsening. And the only way to overcome the dangerous escalation of inter-imperialist contradictions is for the proletariat and peoples of the world to unite and intensify their struggles against imperialism and all reaction. We are now in transition to the resurgence of the world proletarian revolution.

On Scientific Socialism: Third of a Series of Webinars on Marxism-Leninism-Maoism

Questions by Seyra Rico

Answers by Jose Maria Sison

Anakbayan-Europa NDLine Online School

September 6, 2020

1. *What is scientific socialism? You have stated three other forms of socialism: reactionary, conservative and bourgeois, and critical-utopian. How is scientific socialism different from them?*

JMS: Scientific socialism is the theory and practice of the modern industrial proletariat for revolutionary class struggle to emancipate itself, together with other oppressed people, and become the ruling class in lieu of the bourgeoisie; to bring about and develop a society in which the means of production are under public ownership and ensures a planned production for the common good of the people rather than for the private profit of a few; and thereby to prepare the way for the classless communist society.

The *Communist Manifesto*, drawn up by Marx and Engels for the Communist League in 1848, laid down for the first time the comprehensive theoretical foundation of scientific socialism. Previous to this, socialism was a loose term referring to various trends of thought denouncing the abuses of the bourgeoisie on the proletariat and seeking to ameliorate the condition of the latter.

The *Manifesto* in its third section identifies three forms of socialism preceding scientific socialism: 1) reactionary; 2) conservative and bourgeois; and 3) critical-utopian socialism and communism.

The reactionary socialists included the feudal socialists, the petty bourgeois socialists and the German or “true” socialists. In common,

they reacted to and opposed the new historical conditions brought about by the bourgeoisie and proposed some backward model of community, like the monastery or the guild system in feudal society. Marx and Engels regarded them as foolhardy and reactionary for wanting to turn back the wheel of history.

The conservative and bourgeois socialists included a number of economists, philanthropists and petty do-gooders who believed that the grievances of the proletariat could be redressed within the capitalist system and that anything good for the bourgeoisie was good for the proletariat. The proletariat was urged not only to stay within the bounds of bourgeois society but also to cast away all ideas of class struggle so that it can enjoy the bourgeois system as the New Jerusalem.

The critical-utopian socialists and communists included Henri St. Simon, Charles Fourier, Robert Owen and others who acknowledged the class antagonisms between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat but who could not as yet recognize the infant industrial proletariat of the early nineteenth century as a force capable of historical initiative or political movement.

So, they believed in their separate ways that individuals like them from the ranks of the educated could transcend the class struggle and invent some form of social organization into which the workers would spontaneously and gradually enter for their own good and for the sake of social harmony. They therefore appealed to the sense of charity and philanthropy of the bourgeoisie to either support or emulate their ideas and projects of class reconciliation.

St. Simon made the most panoramic proposal for the reorganization of society. He envisioned not only a new French society run by the industrialists, philosophers, physicists, chemists, astronomers, mathematicians and other men of modern scientific learning for the benefit of the poor and actual producers in society; but also a federation of European states run along the same line.

Followers of Fourier and Owen put up in America several isolated communities along the lines designed by their masters. So did the followers of the utopian socialists Cabet and Weitling who had previously experimented in France and Germany, respectively. All

these experimental societies broke up under the pressures of the surrounding capitalist society.

Marx and Engels described the foregoing conceptions and projects as utopian building of castles in the air and fantastic pictures of the future of society, painted at a time when the industrial proletariat was still in a very undeveloped stage. But at the same time, they noted that these corresponded with the first instinctive yearnings of that class for a general reconstruction of society.

They pointed to the critical element that made the utopian socialist and communist publications full of the most valuable materials for the enlightenment of the working class. These criticized every principle of bourgeois society and in this regard proposed quite a number of practical measures such as the abolition of the distinction between town and country and carrying on industries for the account of private individuals; the conversion of the functions of the states into a mere superintendence of production; and so on.

At the time of Marx and Engels, the socialists and communists of the utopian kind had degenerated into narrow religious sects, pedantically repeating the outdated writings of their departed masters, fanatically opposing political action by the workers and becoming more reactionary as the very conditions for socialism became apparent. They could not keep pace with the growth of the proletariat and the development of historical conditions.

Engels' *Socialism: Utopian and Scientific* (actually a section of *Anti-Dühring*) elaborates on scientific socialism as the diametrical opposite of utopian socialism. Marxist socialism is scientific because it analyzes capitalism and grasps the law of motion that leads to its socialist transformation. Of all pre-Marxist forms of socialism, utopian socialism came closest to the yearnings of an infant industrial proletariat but fell far short of the theory of scientific socialism.

Scientific socialism was formulated at a time that capitalism had developed sufficiently to reveal not only its past and present but also its future. The very growth of modern industry and the proletariat could already be observed as contradictory with the capitalist relations of production. As the forces of production grew, the capitalist mode of production became increasingly marked by crisis.

The *Communist Manifesto* avers that capitalism creates its own gravediggers—the proletariat and modern industry.

The most incontrovertible proof for Marxist socialism as a scientific theory is the series of victories that the proletariat has achieved under its guidance. Socialist revolution and construction succeeded in the Soviet Union, China and other countries until modern revisionism was able to subvert socialism and restore capitalism.

2. What is class dictatorship? Why is that the main requirement for the establishment of a socialist society?

JMS: The chief overall requirement for the establishment of a socialist society is the class dictatorship of the proletariat. This simply means that state power must be in the hands of the proletariat as the ruling class in order to ensure socialist democracy for the proletariat and the entire people.

Marxism or scientific socialism frankly admits that the proletariat or socialist state is a class dictatorship, unlike the bourgeoisie which misrepresents its own state power or class dictatorship as a supraclass instrument for the common good of all classes, groups and persons. As a class dictatorship, the socialist state is definitely turned against the bourgeoisie and other enemies of the people. The coercive apparatuses of the state are used to guarantee, consolidate and defend the workers' state and the people's democratic rights, socialist revolution and construction against internal and external enemies.

The socialist revolution deprives the bourgeoisie of its political power and its private ownership of the means of production. The determination of the bourgeoisie to retain these or, upon defeat, to recover these can never be underestimated. Before a socialist society can be established, the bourgeoisie does everything in its power to prevent the victory of the proletariat. The armed strength of the proletariat at the inception of its rule is maintained and developed in the face of persistent threats from the domestic and international bourgeoisie.

3. Can democracy be practiced within a society with a class dictatorship of the proletariat?

JMS: The class dictatorship of the proletariat against the exploiting classes means at the same time a socialist democracy for the proletariat and all other exploited people who have emancipated themselves. Without being able to put reactionaries and counterrevolutionaries in their proper places, the proletarian state would be incapable of guaranteeing democracy for the entire people.

The socialist constitution expressly upholds the class leadership of the proletariat on the basis of its alliance with all other democratic forces, like the peasantry, the petty bourgeoisie and others in the process of socialization. Decisive practical measures to favor the formerly exploited classes are spelled out in such a constitution. The Bill of Rights of the socialist constitution guarantees the basic rights and fundamental freedoms of individuals, groups, local communities, sectors, the former exploited classes and the entire nation.

The best of bourgeois liberal constitutions completely refrains from pointing to the existence of classes and class struggle. It deliberately uses abstract and universalistic references to individual rights, without class distinctions of any kind, in order to cover up and promote the effective legal right and freedom of the exploiting classes to exploit the great masses of individuals belonging to other classes and accounting for more than ninety percent of the population.

4. How necessary is armed struggle in obtaining class dictatorship? And when is a country ripe for armed struggle?

JMS: Armed struggle is necessary because the ruling bourgeoisie will never give up its state power and private wealth voluntarily and give way peacefully to the proletariat and people who are determined to build socialism. In either capitalist or semifeudal country, armed revolution is justified and is likely to succeed when objective conditions favor it and the subjective factors of the revolution are strong enough.

In the process of waging armed struggle, the proletariat forms the revolutionary army which is the main component of state power. This army defeats the reactionary army and allows the proletariat and the people to build both the civil bureaucracy and the military machinery of the class dictatorship of the proletariat. This class dictatorship is the workers' state which defends itself, the people and socialist

society from the attempts of the bourgeoisie to subvert or overthrow it.

In a semicolonial and semifeudal country like the Philippines, the people's democratic revolution with a socialist perspective must win victory first before commencing the socialist revolution under the auspices of the people's democratic republic at the core of which is the proletarian class dictatorship. Even in an industrial capitalist society, the proletariat must first win the struggle for democracy before it can conduct armed revolution to seize political power.

In an industrial capitalist country, objective conditions are ripe for armed struggle when the crisis of the ruling system disables the ruling class from ruling in the old way and the subjective forces of the revolution are strong enough to carry out uprisings to disintegrate and dismantle the reactionary army and other coercive apparatuses of the state. So far in history, the industrial capitalist countries have been most resistant to armed revolution, unless they engage in war among themselves and conditions arise for a revolutionary uprising like the Paris Commune of 1871.

Under the conditions of the inter-imperialist World War I, the Bolsheviks seized power through uprisings in the cities of Petrograd and Moscow but the fighting shifted to the countryside in the civil war and in the war against foreign intervention after the uprisings in Petrograd and Moscow. In semicolonial and semifeudal countries which are stricken by chronic crisis, the proletarian revolutionaries can avail of the vast area of maneuver in the countryside to wage a protracted people's war. This is well proven in the history of China and other countries

Objective conditions refer to the situation when the political and economic crisis of the ruling system becomes so serious as to violently split the ruling class and prevent it from ruling in the old way. Factions of the ruling class fight among themselves. The ruling clique engages in open terror against a wide range of people and is extremely isolated. The people in general, including those unorganized, are disgusted with the system and are desirous of changing it.

The subjective forces of the revolution refer to the conscious and organized forces of the revolution. These are the revolutionary party,

the mass organizations, armed contingent, and so on. To gauge their strength fully, one has to consider their ideological, political and organized status and capabilities. The armed contingent of the revolution may be small at the beginning but the process of armed revolution can destroy and disintegrate a far larger reactionary army.

The objective conditions are primary over the subjective factors. The former arise ahead of the latter and serve as the basis for the development of the revolutionary forces. The Communist Party cannot really be accused of inventing or causing the political and economic crisis of the bourgeois ruling system. The crisis arises from the internal contradictions of the ruling system. The armed revolution arises from the crisis conditions, the escalating conditions of oppression and exploitation and the eventual necessity of the people's resistance.

5. Different countries have different sociopolitical situations. You have described the Philippines as semifeudal and semicolonial. Can you describe what this means? Why is the Philippines not capitalist?

JMS: The terms semicolonial and semifeudal describe Philippine society. Semicolonialism is a distinctly political term that refers to the lack of full national independence of the Philippines and to the continuing control of the Philippines by the US and its imperialist allies. It is a longstanding term from Lenin who spoke of colonies, semicolonies and dependent countries being subordinate to the imperialist powers.

Like the term semicolonialism, semifeudalism comes from Marxist-Leninist literature describing the Chinese economy before the victory of the Chinese revolution in 1949. It is used to describe economies that have long been dominated by the commodity system of production and no longer by a natural economy of feudalism. But it is a merchant bourgeoisie rather than an industrial bourgeoisie that is the chief ruling class based on land ownership or in partnership with the landlord class.

If you wish, you can use the expressions semifeudal capitalism or big comprador capitalism to denote the economic dominance of the comprador big bourgeoisie in the Philippine economy. It is wrong to mean or insinuate that the Philippines is already industrial capitalist when one says that it is capitalist and not semifeudal. The

Philippines still imports its capital equipment from the industrial economies.

Semifeudalism is a precise term with a definite content. It is a kind of a non-industrial or pre-industrial and agrarian economy in which the comprador big bourgeoisie has arisen as the wealthiest and most powerful exploiting class from feudal haciendas as resource base for exports and in combination with the landlord class. Influenced by bourgeois economists, right wing social democrats and Trotskyites, some people think that it is a term that has never been valid or has outgrown its validity.

They think that an economy has to be exclusively feudal or capitalist. They do not understand that in its world history capitalism grew out of the womb of feudalism, first in the form of the handicraft business, some light manufacturing and the merchants trading between town and country before industrial capitalism surged forth as the dominant form of capitalism with the steam engine and then with the electro-mechanical equipment.

Semifeudalism is a term that refers to a kind of economy that evolved from feudalism and became starkly conspicuous in the 20th century in the Philippines with the rise of the comprador big bourgeoisie as the chief exploiting class in collaboration with the landlord class. Big compradors have long been big landlords who base themselves on their large landed estates and use these to produce crops for export in exchange for the importation of finished products from abroad.

The big comprador Ayala family and related families have not only owned banks and trading companies but have also owned or managed big landed estates in Calatagan and Nasugbu, Batangas and elsewhere since the beginning of the 20th century. In recent times in the 21st century, the recently deceased Eduardo Cojuangco owned the United Coconut Planters Bank (UCPB) and came to own the gigantic big comprador firm San Miguel Corporation but he also owned some twenty haciendas in various provinces in the Philippines (Tarlac, Pangasinan, Isabela, Negros, Palawan, Agusan, Albay and so on).

6. The Communist Party of the Philippines (CPP) is waging a two-stage revolution. Why is a bourgeois-democratic revolution

necessary for a semifeudal country in order to advance to socialism? Is it not possible to advance to socialism without this stage?

JMS: It is necessary to carry out first the new type of bourgeois-democratic revolution or otherwise called the people's democratic revolution with a socialist perspective under the leadership of the proletariat because the semicolonial and semifeudal conditions require that you must fight and defeat the forces of foreign monopoly capitalism, domestic feudalism and bureaucrat capitalism. In the course of waging the people's democratic revolution, the proletariat builds the people's army, the revolutionary mass organizations, the national united front and the local organs of political power which constitute the provisional revolutionary government.

When political power is seized by the proletariat from the reactionaries and thereby the people's democratic revolution is basically completed, then the socialist revolution can commence immediately with the use of the proletarian dictatorship for seizing the commanding heights of the economy and securing the country and people from any further attacks from the imperialists and the reactionaries. Socialism is impossible and is not the immediate issue under conditions where the proletariat and the people are still under foreign and feudal domination and must first end this through people's war along the line of the new type of bourgeois-democratic revolution.

7. How will the dictatorship of the proletariat be achieved after a bourgeois-democratic revolution?

JMS: In the course of the bourgeois democratic revolution of the new type or what I have been calling the people's democratic revolution, the apparatuses of the class dictatorship of the proletariat or the worker's state are built. By the time that the bourgeois democratic revolution is basically completed through the seizure of political power, these apparatuses of state power shall already be well-developed in the hands of the proletariat even as the proletarian dictatorship may take the form of people's democratic dictatorship in a transition period.

In the course of the people's war, the people's army is developed by the proletarian revolutionary party as the main component of the future workers' state or what may be otherwise called class

dictatorship of the proletariat. The people's militia is also developed as the police force. The system of people's courts is developed. The organs of political power learn to prosecute, try, judge and detain or punish those proven or convicted as counterrevolutionaries and other criminals according to law.

8. *Let us talk about socialist economy. Can you talk about the main changes that need to be made from capitalist to socialist economy?*

JMS: The socialist economy has been made possible in world history by the growth of modern industry and the proletariat in industrial capitalism. These forces of production outgrow and rend asunder the capitalist relations of production which have become their fetters. They therefore become liberated and can grow at an accelerated rate.

In a socialist society, social or public ownership of the means of production replaces private ownership. The new relations of production are made to correspond to the social character of the means of production. The entire mode of production is revolutionized. The proletariat uses its political supremacy to wrest step by step all capital from the bourgeoisie, to centralize all instruments of production in the hands of the state, and to increase the total productive forces as rapidly as possible in a planned way.

The *Communist Manifesto* lists down a number of measures for revolutionizing the mode of production in the most advanced countries but at the same time point out that these measures will be different in different countries. The experiences of the Soviet Union and China in carrying out socialist revolution and socialist construction are the best historical examples to study and learn from.

Marx' *Critique of the Gotha Program* shows how the total product of society is divided. There are the funds for 1) wages; 2) capital reproduction; 3) public welfare; 4) administration; and 5) defense. The wage system is retained but the essential difference between capitalism and socialism in this regard is that there are no more gross disparities in income and that the average level of income is deliberately made to rise above mere subsistence level and is planned to rise ever higher. The surplus product (above wages) is no longer appropriated as private income by any exploiting class but

used for capital reproduction, public welfare, administration and defense.

9. *Can you explain more the concept of “from each according to his ability, to each according to his deeds,” among the working people and the government and economic officials?*

JMS: In the payment of wages, the principle to be followed is “from each according to his ability, to each according to his deeds.” There are wage or salary differentials according to differences in productivity. A manager or an engineer will still get a higher wage than a skilled worker; and the latter will get a higher wage than an unskilled worker or apprentice.

For a certain period, the industrial proletariat will get higher wages and more benefits than the peasants but the latter will soon be benefited by collectivization and mechanization. At the very start, steps are taken to remove the gross disparities in income in the old society. The long term objective is to remove gross disparities in incomes that result in class differences and keep on raising the general level of the incomes and the quality of life.

Certainly, the extremely high salaries for high government officials and high executives of the state and private corporations in the past will be immediately ended. They are reduced in line with the state policy of spreading the available social benefits and mustering the resources for further socioeconomic development, instead of favoring the few bureaucrats and technocrats as in the past when they were coddled by the big bourgeoisie and landlords to assist them in oppressing and exploiting the people.

But the government and economic officials shall be provided with salaries commensurate to their education, training and contributions. They can gain new motivation and new morality from socialist education. It is good policy to treat them fairly and justly and win them over to the socialist revolution. Otherwise, they will emigrate and it will be more costly to hire foreign experts.

10. *How will the economic planning be different from the economic planning during capitalism?*

JMS: National economic planning takes the place of the conflicting calculations by various private firms on the basis of the capitalist market. Production is for use rather than for private profit.

The most essential and necessary commodities and projects are given priority. The internal balanced and self-reliant development of the socialist economy is carried out.

With social profit taking the place of private profit, a tremendous and ever increasing amount of the surplus product is released every year for the reproduction of capital. Such ills endemic to capitalism, such as the motive of private profit against social need, misallocation of resources, the anarchy of competition, conspicuous consumption, the business cycle and excessive military expenditures are done away with.

Economic planning is effective because all economic factors are under unified control and all active components of the economy at all levels report the information and recommendations to serve as basis for the plan. An economic plan is the result of the open interaction between the central planning body and lower levels. National goals are related to available resources and actual capacities.

Economics acquires the precision of an applied science. In a capitalist society, economics as well as economic planning is really a far more imprecise field of knowledge and is often a guessing game as the individual capitalist firms keep from each other and from the public the timely and accurate information on production, trade, technical and other data and process which they consider trade secrets. In the name of private ownership and competition, only partial information is given publicly by private firms when it serves their ends.

11. Defense will be an important concern in a socialist society. Will the cost be as huge as during capitalist society?

JMS: Defense is a necessary concern in socialist society. Without defense, socialist society would be destroyed by its internal and external enemies. But the cost of defense in such a society is relatively far, far smaller than in capitalist society. Especially in the case of imperialist powers, their military expenditures are astronomical in magnitude. Worst of all, the police and military forces are used for the purpose of repression and aggression.

The military policy of a socialist state is truly defensive and is opposed to aggression from its own side or from another. The military forces are built according to the principles of the people's

army. In connection with the economy, military units are actually productive units, aside from being military, political and educational units. Periodically beefing up the standing army, the youth are rotated into military service and training. The people in general are politicized and trained as militia units and are not detached from production.

The people's defense is their own home base strength against the aggressor and it is further strengthened by proletarian internationalism, international solidarity with all other peoples and diplomacy and friendly relations with other states and countries on the basis of mutual respect for independence, equality, mutual cooperation and benefit.

12. Can concessions be given to capitalists in a socialist economy? If so, how do we make sure they don't grow and dominate the economy? Maybe you can give us examples from China's experiences.

JMS: After the people and the people's army led by the revolutionary party of the proletariat defeat the enemy and take power, the workers' state or the people's democratic state takes over the commanding heights of the economy such as the existing industries, lines of transport and communications and sources of raw materials.

But conditions might require that transition measures are taken in order to revive the economy as soon as possible and to avail of what positive contributions can be made by the rich peasants, traders, the middle bourgeoisie as in the New Economic Policy (NEP) under Lenin and even the big compradors who are required to follow the example of the national bourgeoisie in joining state-private corporations and thereby complying with state policy.

Lenin adopted the New Economic Policy in order to revive the economy as soon as possible after the devastation resulting from the civil war and by the war of foreign intervention. Thus, the rich peasants and small and medium entrepreneurs and traders were allowed to operate from 1922 to 1928. Stalin ended the NEP to launch the first five year plan to build socialist industry and carry out the collectivization and mechanization of agriculture.

In much of its first decade, China also had a transition period of overcoming war damage, inflation and corruption, supporting the Korean people and combating US aggression and basic socialization of the economy. This was accompanied by the operation of joint state-private corporations to integrate and absorb the capital of the bourgeoisie. Payment of dividends was phased out after a number of years.

In the Soviet Union, the bourgeoisie resurged from the ranks of the private entrepreneurs, traders and rich peasants during the New Economic Policy. But this social strata came under restraint when Stalin launched the policy of socialist industrialization and the collectivization and mechanization of agriculture. Then the Left Opposition of Trotsky to push the bourgeois line that socialism was impossible in one country and the Right Opposition of Bukharin pushed the other bourgeois line that the New Economic Policy must continue and that capitalism must be further carried out.

In China, Liu Shaoqi and the like pushed the bourgeois line in the late 1950s that the “national democratic economy” must first be developed before there is ground for socialism and that the national capitalists must not be phased out but further given concessions. They also opposed the Great Leap Forward which was planned to counter the natural calamities, the imperialist embargo and the Soviet Union tearing up previous agreements and contracts with China due to the Sino-Soviet ideological dispute. Under Mao’s leadership, China prevailed with the socialist line over the Chinese revisionists and capitalist roaders who persisted until the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution (GPCR) became necessary in 1966.

In the process of socialist revolution and construction, the Communist Party as advanced detachment of the proletariat issues the principles and policies to prevent bureaucratic corruption and to have a definite plan for phasing out concessions given to the capitalists, to keep on advancing the socialist revolution and construction and develop socialist education, culture and morality. We must learn from the error of Stalin in declaring prematurely the end of classes and class struggle in 1935 and mishandling class contradictions within socialist society and depending on administrative measures.

We must also learn from Mao's theory and practice of cultural revolution under proletarian dictatorship in order to combat modern revisionism, prevent the restoration of socialism and consolidate socialism as well as from the errors of the Chinese Communist Party of allowing the return to power of revisionist renegades like Deng Xiaoping who pretended to have been rehabilitated. The danger to socialism comes not only from the imperialists but also from internal elements who are remnants of the old bourgeoisie or who emerge in socialist society by first adopting the petty bourgeois mode of thinking while they are in school and then climbing their way to higher positions in the Party, state, economy and cultural institutions while becoming revisionists and bourgeois.

13. Previously socialist country have turned into or become imperialist countries in history. Where do we draw the line between a leading party that is still pushing for a socialist cause and a party that is transforming into an imperialist one?

JMS: When the modern revisionists take over power in a socialist country as in the Soviet Union from 1956 onward, they make breaches on the socialist system in order to introduce capitalist reforms supposedly to strengthen socialism as Khrushchov did. By the time of Brezhnev, his own pack of modern revisionists turned social-imperialist and centralized resources to enlarge bureaucratic corruption and to engage in the arms race with the US as the other superpower in the Cold War.

Khrushchov made his counterrevolutionary revisionist coup in the Soviet Union after the death of Stalin. So did Deng Xiaoping in 1976 after the death of Mao. He declared the GPCR as 100 percent catastrophic and proceeded to adopt the line of outright capitalist reforms and opening up to the capitalist world. He made China the main partner of US imperialism in carrying out the neoliberal policy of imperialist globalization. China became an imperialist power.

For a while Mao's theory and practice of continuing revolution under proletarian dictatorship through cultural revolution gave hope to proletarian revolutionaries and won most of the time through twists and turns in the ten-year course of the GPCR from 1966 to 1976. While the GPCR posed correctly the problem of modern revisionism and unfolded the basic principles and methods for combating

revisionism, still the revisionist capitalist roaders headed by Deng were able to defeat the GPCR, restore capitalism and make China an imperialist power.

The defeat of the GPCR, which spelled the victory of capitalism in China over socialism, only means that we need to learn positive and negative lessons from the entire process of socialist revolution and construction up to the end of the GPCR in China in the same way that proletarian revolutionaries learned positive and negative lessons from the victory and defeat of the short-lived Paris Commune of 1871 and from the much longer life and greater consequentiality of the Soviet Union.

14. How will the transition from socialism to communism take place?

JMS: With regard to the transition of socialism into communism, Marx and Engels prognosticated the withering of the state, the emergence of classless society, the massive and rapid growth of productive forces and the all-round development of human civilization.

The withering of the socialist state or class dictatorship of the proletariat means the steady dissolution of the coercive character of political authority. By then, there shall have been a lessening and finally a disappearance of the need for a distinct class, the proletariat, to hold in check another class, the bourgeoisie, with the use of the coercive apparatuses of the state like the army, police, courts and prison.

The advance of socialism, especially in its mode of production, is expected to dissolve the very conditions that create such antagonistic classes as the proletariat and the bourgeoisie. A generalization and equalization of conditions occur for the benefit of one and all. It is not an impossible dream to anticipate the growth of productivity to the point that all members of society need to work for a far lesser number of hours than now, have a basic income that assures a comfortable and productive life and have more time for other creative endeavors in private and in public.

One knows exactly how the bourgeoisie is differentiated from the proletariat in capitalist society. By their right of ownership in the means of production and by extracting profits for themselves, the

bourgeoisie lives a more comfortable and even luxurious life while the proletariat is consigned to the drudgery of a long daily work routine and the rough conditions of poverty and misery. Certainly, one cannot fail to see the benefits derived by the working class by succeeding through struggle to reduce the working day progressively from sixteen hours to eight hours, although the worker still remains exploited in capitalist society.

The attainment by all of the material conditions enjoyed by an educated middle class family relying on high salaries and not on private ownership of the means of production is not an impossibility. While this is an impossibility for the working class under capitalism, socialism can bring this about because the growth of productive forces and all-round social development are no longer restricted as in capitalism and are enhanced by the rapid advance of science and technology, provided the monopoly capitalist attack on the environment is prevented.

Modern industry is capable of wiping out poverty overnight. But capitalism would rather manipulate and restrict the forces of production in order to exact a high rate of profit. Marx pointed out clearly the problems that socialism in transition to communism would have to solve. These are the contradictions between the vestiges of the past and the new socialist society, between town and country or industry and agriculture and between mental and physical work.

The contradictions between the vestiges of the past and the new socialist conditions can be solved by further developing the achievements of socialist revolution and construction. The contradiction between the town and country or industry and agriculture can be solved by bringing mechanization and the amenities of urban life to the countryside and building smaller cities integrated with rural life. The contradiction between physical and mental work can be solved by expanding educational and other cultural facilities, increasing real wages and reducing the workday for all.

Since Marx, it has been generally understood that the mode of production can be developed to such a point that the income of producers will no longer be decided according to their productivity. There will be such a superabundance of public facilities and articles

of consumption that it will become impertinent for anyone to talk or think of being deprived and disadvantaged regarding these things.

On Trotskyites and other Slanderers

**Tsikahan with Tito Jo: On Trotskyites and Social Democrats
Questions by Host Anghelo Godino,
Anakbayan-Europa, NDLine Online School
September 9, 2020**

1. Before we progress to our week's topic, let us try to define some terminologies that should help the viewers understand our discussion. Tito, what is Trotskyism and who was Leon Trotsky? In the Philippines, the National Democratic Movement is long brushing with the Social Democrats; who are these National Democrats and Social Democrats, how did they arise in the Philippine political spectrum?

JMS: Trotskyism is a petty bourgeois anticommunist ideology which masquerades as more Left than the communist parties that have built socialist societies and have led anti-imperialist and democratic mass struggles towards the goal of socialism. Leon Trotsky had no grounding on materialist dialectics and political economy; and did not have a proletarian revolutionary stand and thus flip-flopped from ultra-Left to Right opportunism and back on political issues. He opposed Lenin and the Bolsheviks on all major issues in the revolution, such as the new type of party, class dictatorship of the proletariat, the worker-peasant alliance, the sequence of democratic and socialist revolution, and so on.

A primer for CPP cadres and members titled, *Special Study on Trotskyism*, defines Trotskyism in the following terms:

“It is an ideological and political petty-bourgeois trend hostile to Marxism-Leninism and to the international communist movement. It conceals its opportunist essence with radical, left-wing slogans. Trotskyism arose within the Russian Social Democratic Labor Party at the beginning of the 20th century as a form of Menshevism. It was named for its leader, Leon Trotsky (real name Lev Davidovich

Bronstein, 1879-1940). It is carried over to the 21st century by adherents known as Trotskyists or Trotskyites.”

Lenin described Trotsky in the following words:

“Trotsky has never yet held a firm opinion on any important question of Marxism. He always contrives to worm his way into the cracks of any given difference of opinion, and desert one side for the other.”

He explained further:

“Trotsky was an ardent Iskraist from 1901 to 1903. At the end of 1903, Trotsky was an ardent Menshevik, i.e. he deserted from the Iskraists to the Economists. ...In 1904 and 1905, he deserted the Mensheviks and occupied a vacillating position, now cooperating with Martynov (the Economist), now proclaiming his absurdly Left ‘permanent revolution’ theory.”

Trotsky had his final undoing when the Bolsheviks expelled him after he pontificated about the impossibility of building socialism in one country, opposed the socialist revolution and construction in the Soviet Union and engaged in counterrevolutionary activities. He led the so-called Left Opposition, while Bukharin led the Right Opposition. They attacked the socialist line from the flanks. The more vociferous Trotsky made anti-Stalinism his trade mark.

Trotsky and his Trotskyite followers have served the fascists in World War II and the US and other imperialist powers before, during and after the Cold War by spreading lies and slanders against the communist parties and revolutionary mass movements, which they simplistically attacked as Stalinist. For instance, only recently in his diatribe against both the old Communist Party and the new Communist Party in the Philippines, the Trotskyite Joseph Scalice accuses the old Communist Party of Stalinism even after the Lavaite remnants of that party became revisionist and anti-Stalin like the Trotskyites when it sided with the CPSU after the Sino-Soviet split in the 1960s and more so when it collaborated with the Marcos fascist regime from 1972 to 1986.

For several decades already, the Trotskyites from the US, Western Europe, Japan and Australia have formed grouplets of Trotskyites in the Philippines. These have tried to worm their way into the Communist Party of the Philippines (CPP) and the

revolutionary movement and have failed miserably. These grouplets quarrel among themselves but they directly and indirectly assist the reactionary government, especially the current Duterte terrorist regime, in slandering the CPP and red-tagging leaders and members of the patriotic and democratic forces of the national democratic movement.

The national democratic movement is a mass movement of workers, peasants, indigenous peoples, women, youth, professionals and other people in the Philippines who demand and struggle for full national independence, democracy, social justice, economic development through genuine land reform and national industrialization, cultural progress and international solidarity with all peoples against imperialism and all reaction. The national democratic movement is inspired by the Philippine Revolution of 1896 against Spanish colonialism and by all revolutionary struggles of the Filipino people against US imperialism and the local exploiting classes.

After the defeat of the armed revolutionary movement in the early 1950s, the Student Cultural Association of the University of the Philippines (SCAUP) became the starting point of a renewed national democratic movement. It further developed into the comprehensive youth organization, Kabataang Makabayan (KM), which embraced the students and the young workers, peasants and professionals. Together with trade unions and peasant associations, KM became the strongest nationwide base for the reestablishment of the Communist Party of the Philippines in 1968.

The so-called social democrats (soc-dems) in the Philippines are not really the same as the classical social democrats in Europe who have garbed their petty bourgeois liberalism and pacifism with the language of Marxism or the bourgeois laborism of the labor aristocracy. They used to be called clerico-fascists up to the 1960s because of their religious sectarianism and glorification of feudal institutions as models of good society. Subsequently, they called themselves social democrats like the US puppet Nguyen van Thieu in Vietnam, using a hodgepodge of religiosity, liberalism, social reformism and anti-communism, which they used for attacking the

anti-imperialist and democratic forces in the national democratic movement.

The antecedent of the soc-dems was the Christian Social Movement, whose leader Raul Manglapus gained national prominence as propagandist for the CIA-supported presidential candidate Ramon Magsaysay and who occupied high positions in the reactionary government. The most notorious of the soc-dems in recent times is Norberto Gonzales of the Nagkakaisang Partido Demokratiko Sosyalista ng Pilipinas (NPDSP) who became national security adviser and then defense secretary of the Arroyo regime and was responsible for fouling up the GRP-NDFP peace negotiations, teaming up with General Esperon in the series of terror campaigns called Bantay Laya I, II and III and requesting the US government to designate the CPP, the New People's Army (NPA) and myself as terrorists.

2. In the 2016 election, Duterte claims that if he wins, he will be the first socialist president of the Philippines. Many said that because of this statement and the supposed "support and aid" he provided for the ND movement, particularly in Mindanao, that the communists endorsed and supported his presidential bid. Is this true? And by the definition of socialist, is Duterte a socialist?

JMS: The Trotskyites are grossly lying when they claim that the CPP supported the presidential candidacy of Duterte. The CPP is banned from the electoral exercises of the reactionary government and as a matter of principle the CPP is waging a people's democratic revolution through people's war and is building the revolutionary government of workers and peasants in the guerrilla fronts.

BAYAN MUNA and others in Makabayan Bloc, well-known electoral parties of the national democratic movement, supported the presidential candidacy of Grace Poe and not Duterte. In this regard, the Trotskyites are also grossly lying. And desperately grasping for a semblance of evidence of ND support for Duterte before and after the 2016 presidential elections, they cite the diplomatic and tactful words and gestures to Duterte encouraging him to engage in peace negotiations and cooperate in realizing the People's Agenda.

Before, during and after the 2016 presidential elections, nobody in his right mind believed Duterte when he said that he was Left and

socialist. The most discerning knew that he was the candidate of big comprador-landlord dynasties and former presidential plunderers with links to the US and Chinese imperialism, especially the Marcos, Arroyo and Estrada families. In his entire political life, Duterte has never explained what he meant by calling himself a socialist. Definitely, he is not socialist in any sense by word or deed.

3. Duterte has killed over 30,000 Filipino people under the War on Drugs. Our country is now on the second spot as Asia's deadliest country to be activists. A certain contributor to the World Socialist Website wrote that the CPP called on the revolutionary forces to cooperate with Duterte's War on Drugs and published it in Ang Bayan, calling the Party and the entire ND movement "enabler." What can you say about this?

JMS: In principle, before and after Duterte became president, the CPP has always been for the solution of the drug problem as a health problem and for cracking down on the drug lords, especially at the top level of illegal manufacturers, smugglers and governors and generals who were protectors. The CPP has always wished that the drug problem be solved the way Comrade Mao did in the early years of the People's Republic of China.

As soon as it was clear that the Duterte regime was listing and killing the urban poor as drug users and drug peddlers, Comrade Oris as spokesman of the CPP and NPA condemned Duterte's bogus war on drugs in July 2016, the very first month of Duterte's presidency. Since then, the CPP has been the most outstanding in condemning Duterte for using the bogus drug war to intimidate the people and install himself as the supreme drug lord. The Trotskyites make themselves complicit with Duterte in the drug trade and in his commission of grave crimes by trying to discredit the CPP and trying to disable it from fighting Duterte on the issue of illegal drugs and extrajudicial killings.

4. In the beginning of the Duterte administration, he seemed to be really bringing the change that he promised. Duterte appointed Leftist personalities in his cabinet such as Ka Paeng Mariano, Liza Maza, Joel Maglunsod, and Judy Taguiwalo. Because of this, speculations arose such as the Left, by that the Party – is already turning revisionist. Some say that the ND movement is forming a

coalition government with the Duterte administration. Do you subscribe to this? Why did the Left allow the appointment of these personalities? How is it beneficial to the people they are serving?

JMS: When Duterte said publicly that he wanted to appoint communists to his cabinet and government agencies, I answered him publicly that he could not appoint persons to the cabinet or other government positions as representatives of the CPP or the National Democratic Front of the Philippines (NDFP) because the peace negotiations and the people's war were still going on. And I told him publicly, he could appoint people to positions on the basis of individual merits of being patriotic, competent, honest and diligent.

The Trotskyites and other anticommunists are red-tagging the persons that you have mentioned by insisting that they were appointed as communists to government position by Duterte. They pretend to be more revolutionary than the revolutionaries by dishing out the lie that the CPP engaged in coalition with the Duterte by letting him appoint patriotic and progressive people to his cabinet.

Scalice is a big liar for claiming or insinuating that the CPP coalesced with and supported the Duterte regime. The people's war went on and is still going on. Only a liar can try to make it appear that the armed conflict or civil war is a form of coalition or mutual support. The Trotskyites and other anticommunists, in their comfortable bureaucratic and academic chairs, utterly fail to make themselves appear revolutionary by casting brazen lies and false accusations against the CPP exactly at a time that the Duterte regime is intensifying its murderous rampage on the people and their revolutionary movement against the regime.

5. Will the Left be open to a coalition government with Duterte or any administration for this matter? How do you see the alliance with the Liberals at this point? Conversely, if the Left will ally with the Liberals or form a coalition government, what would it mean? Will it not veer from its principles?

JMS: Since May 2017, when Duterte aborted the fifth round of the GRP-NDFP peace negotiations, he has done everything to prevent serious peace negotiations. On November 23, 2017, he formally terminated the peace negotiations and on December 5, 2017 he designated the CPP and NPA as 'terrorist' organizations.

Subsequently, he formed the National Task Force to End Local Communist and Armed Conflict (NTF-ELCAC) to eliminate the CPP and the armed revolution and he has licensed himself to engage in state terrorism in the name of anti-terrorism. There is no longer any basis for peace negotiations and there is absolutely no prospect of coalition with the Duterte regime.

If you mean by Liberal the Liberal Party, it is premature to talk about forming a coalition government with them even as there is a basis for discussing and forming a formal or informal alliance against the Duterte regime. At the same time, there are soc-dems, militarists and other rabid anticommunists around Robredo who are bent on opposing such alliance. The US is also cultivating her as successor to Duterte and coaxing him to resign or simply finish his term. The possibility of a coalition government with the Liberals can arise only if they take power from Duterte under the pressure of mass actions and then engage the NDFP in peace negotiations. The success of such peace negotiations can be the basis for a coalition government. Otherwise, there is no basis.

6. Joseph Scalice who claims to be a Philippine historian wrote that the CPP is a "reactionary nationalist ideology of Stalin and its Maoist variant," and even goes as far as saying that socialism is off the agenda in countries like the Philippines, which he said is belated-capitalist. What does he mean by belated-capitalism and is socialism really off the agenda?

JMS: Joseph Scalice is merely parroting the old line of Trotskyism that communist parties can only be nationalist if they seize power in one country after another and carry out socialist revolution and construction as Stalin and Mao did. The Trotskyites follow the crazy idea of Trotsky that it is impossible to build socialism in one country. But Stalin and Mao built socialism. What kind of a historian is Scalice who denies the great historic achievements of Stalin and Mao.

With regard to the oppressed peoples and nations still fighting for national liberation and democracy against imperialism and the local exploiting classes in semicolonial and semifeudal countries, the Trotskyites deny the necessity of the new-type bourgeois democratic and socialist stages of the revolution and have the perverse notion

that being anti-imperialist is necessarily being bourgeois nationalist and winning over the national bourgeoisie, even as an unstable and unreliable ally, to the anti-imperialist alliance is necessarily merging with it and even being subservient to this social stratum. The Trotskyites are totally dishonest in misrepresenting communist revolutionaries and they obscure and cover up imperialism as the enemy of the proletariat and the people.

Actually, the Trotskyites and the pseudo-social democrats in the Philippines say that the Philippines is already 'industrial-capitalist' and no longer semifeudal, that socialism should be the immediate issue in the revolutionary agenda and that the CPP is being nationalist for first engaging in the people's democratic revolution. But the Trotskyites are self-contradictory because they do not like socialism in one country. And the reformist social-democrats wish to conserve the exploitative system while improving the lot of the workers.

These imbeciles do not understand that semifeudalism is a form of capitalism dominated by the comprador big bourgeoisie in combination with the landlord class in subordination to foreign monopoly capitalism. They also do not understand that the people's democratic revolution with a socialist perspective has first to defeat the forces of foreign and feudal domination before the proletariat and the people can obtain the basis and the power to begin the socialist revolution and construction.

7. One of the most hackneyed arguments against the ND movement by the Trots and the Liberals is on Stalinism. According to them, Stalin's notoriety should not be celebrated or looked up to and yet the ND movement pays respect to this man. How should we respond to such claims? Why do the Left draw lessons from Stalin's experiences? As Filipino activists, what can we actually learn from him?

JMS: Stalin as the leader of the Bolshevik party engaged in socialist revolution and construction in the Soviet Union twice over (first before World War II, then again after the war) and inflicted the most fatal blow on fascism during World War II. Roosevelt and Churchill had high praises for Stalin until the US and Britain launched the Cold War out of fear that the rise of several socialist

countries and national liberation movements was endangering the world capitalist system. During World War II, the Trotskyites collaborated with the fascists in Germany, Spain, the US, the Soviet Union, Indochina, Latin America and elsewhere.

The Trotskyites and the Liberals are against Stalin for the most despicable reasons. The CPP appreciate highly Stalin's great achievements in socialist revolution and construction and in defeating Nazi Germany but is critical of him for prematurely declaring the end of classes and class struggle in socialist society in 1935. As a consequence, Stalin failed in correctly handling contradictions among the people and failed to preempt the rise of modern revisionism. I have written extensively on these issues. You and our listeners can read my piece titled *Stand for Socialism against Modern Revisionism*.

8. Tito, these Trots seem to be delving more on their attacks against the Philippine Left instead of exposing and opposing the tyrant that is Duterte. Why do they do this? Why do they seem to devote their time trying to bring down the Left movement instead of uniting against the common enemy?

JMS: The Trotskyites expose themselves as counterrevolutionaries by concentrating their attacks on the CPP and the revolutionary movement and red-tagging the legal forces of the national democratic movement, while these are now in the forefront of the struggle to oust Duterte from power. The Trotskyites are practically special agents of the Duterte terrorist regime.

In a perverse and absurd way they hold the most resolute and consistent anti-Duterte forces responsible for Duterte's crimes. This is a case of blaming the victims in order to minimize the culpability of the culprit and save him. The Trotskyites practically support the all-out war of Duterte against the people and revolutionary movement. Even if sometimes they shed crocodile tears over the martyrs murdered by Duterte, the Trotskyites make themselves complicit with him in his bloody crimes and they insinuate that the martyrs deserve their death for having "supported" him.

They are like their cultist idol Trotsky who fled the Soviet Union to attack Bolsheviks and the socialist cause. He and his followers have specialized in the role of posing as more revolutionary than the

revolutionaries and then attacking the revolutionaries to favor the people's enemy. Trotskyites are traitors to the proletariat and the people. They are barefaced swindlers whose highest ambition is to sell information and analyses to anticommunist foundations, research groups and intelligence agencies.

9. Scalice went on with his lecture on August 26, during this lecture he showed what he called proof of the Left's support to Duterte. There were photos, quotes from you, and other Leftist personalities, even. To clarify this, does the Left really think that Duterte could bring hope? If you did so in the past, what changed? Scalice is not the only one using the past interviews, pictures and whatnot to support their allegation, a lot of anticommunists and Trots are using it as well. Do you have anything to say to them? To what extent should the Left support or commend the positive decisions of the Duterte or for this matter, any reactionary personalities?

JMS: The NDFP has long been engaged in peace negotiations since 1992 when the The Hague Joint Declaration was mutually approved by the NDFP and GRP principals in order to set the framework of purpose, agenda and methods for the peace negotiations. The purpose is to address the roots of the armed conflict, arrive at comprehensive agreements on social, economic and political reforms and thereby lay the basis for a just and lasting peace. The NDFP has stood by its revolutionary principles and policies and has never capitulated to the GRP, from the time of Ramos to Duterte.

Together with the CPP, NDFP and so many peace advocates from religious and nonreligious organizations and mass organizations, I made statements to encourage Duterte to engage in peace negotiations because he himself asked for the peace negotiations, made promises about amnestying and releasing all political prisoners; and declared that he was ready for social, economic and political reforms.

The GRP-NDFP peace negotiations have been characterized by diplomatic dialogue and principled objections of the NDFP to repeated attempts of the GRP to maneuver the NDFP into a position of capitulation. The NDFP has always rebuffed such attempts and thus the peace negotiations have been interrupted by the enemy so

many times. It is utterly stupid for Scalice to pick out diplomatic statements and gestures of the NDFP and mine and disregard the firm adherence of the CPP and NDFP to revolutionary principles and the continuance of the people's war. Duterte has never stopped his all-out war against the revolutionary movement and the latter has never stopped its people's war. Only a Trotskyite and fake historian can deny such a glaring fact.

If for instance, I spurned Duterte's plea for peace negotiations from the beginning, the same anticommunist Trotskyites and Liberals would attack me as dogmatist, unreasonable and bellicose. The CPP and NDFP actually put Duterte under the test to prove whether or not he was for a just peace. And he was exposed as refusing a just peace, while the NDFP was able to publicize its program of social, economic and political reforms for a just peace. You have to be inside the peace process and on the side of the NDFP to know how Duterte came to be distrusted as early as in October 2016 when he refused to amnesty and release all political prisoners.

10. The Trots say that there is no longer a need for protracted people's war—encircling the cities from the countryside is a romanticism of an obsolete belief. They even say that now more than ever, the world is ready for a spontaneous and synchronous revolution. Why was it wrong a few decades ago and why is it still wrong now? Is it still wrong even in the present context of the Philippine society where Duterte is extremely unpopular?

JMS: The Trotskyites expose themselves as counterrevolutionary agents of US imperialism and the Filipino reactionaries by spouting the propaganda that there is no longer a need for a protracted people's war—that encircling the cities from the countryside is a romanticism of an obsolete belief.

And they repeat the old rotten line of Trotsky that revolution in any country is futile unless it is synchronized with a spontaneous and seamless world revolution. This is the stupid idea of having a permanent revolution but not having a revolution anywhere if there are no simultaneous revolutions on a world scale. At best, it is the dogmatism of wanting to reach a mountain summit without any arduous climb, waiting instead for a cable-car to magically appear. It is an outright rejection of any serious effort at making revolution.

The conditions of the Philippines are semicolonial and semifeudal and thus there is a need for people's democratic revolution with a socialist perspective through protracted people's war under the leadership of the CPP and under the guidance of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism. The CPP wields the revolutionary armed struggle as the main weapon and integrates this with agrarian revolution and mass base-building. It also wields the national united front by relying mainly on the basic alliance of workers and peasants, winning over the middle social strata and taking advantage of the splits among the reactionaries in order to isolate and destroy the enemy one after the other.

Without the people's army in the Philippines, the Filipino people have nothing. The people's war is precisely what has compelled the GRP to negotiate with the NDFP. By engaging in peace negotiations, the NDFP has succeeded in propagating the people's demands for national and social liberation even as the GRP and Trotskyite special agents of the enemy have tried to misrepresent the principles and position of the NDFP.

What is the strength of the CPP and NPA, which are belittled and scorned by the Trotskyite counterrevolutionaries who wish to liquidate the armed revolution? Let me quote a recent statement of the NPA about its current strength:

"The NPA continues to operate in more than 110 guerrilla fronts in 73 of 81 provinces across the country. It has several thousand guerrilla fighters. They are armed with high-powered weapons and small firearms seized from the reactionary armed forces, private security agencies and other sources. The NPA employs grenades, projectiles and command-detonated explosives. They also use indigenous methods of warfare such as booby traps and punji sticks. Units of the NPA operate under 14 regional operations command, which in turn are under the National Operational Command (NOC). The NPA is under the absolute leadership of the Communist Party of the Philippines through its Central Committee and Political Bureau and its Executive Committee and the Military Commission of the Central Committee."

The NPA was able to mount at least 710 military actions of various sizes from March 29, 2019 to March 29, 2020. These include

harassment, disarming, demolition, sapper and partisan operations, punitive actions, raids against enemy detachments and ambushes. Most of these actions are not reported in the bourgeois media. At least 651 enemy troops were killed, while more than 465 were wounded in action, the equivalent of around 30 platoons or two battalions of enemy troops. All regions across the country were able to contribute to these tactical offensives. Among the most significant victorious tactical offensives were those in Southern Tagalog in Luzon, in Eastern Visayas and Negros in the Visayas and in North Central and Northeast Mindanao.

11. Some critics mentioned that the CPP-NPA is losing its foothold on the toiling masses because of sheer militarism, irrelevance of its advocacies, and duration of the war it's waging. Is there a truth in it? Are the masses already impatient?

JMS: As I have already explained, the CPP and NPA are not engaged in sheer militarism. They are guided by the theory of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism and they are carrying out a program of people's democratic revolution with a socialist perspective. They have grown in strength and advanced in the revolutionary struggle because they have won the support of the Filipino people in their millions. The NPA is not only a fighting force for developing the people's political power but it is also an organization for mass work and for helping the people and the people's government in carrying out social, economic, political and cultural programs.

The CPP has excellently built itself ideologically, politically and organizationally. It is deeply rooted among the masses and exists nationwide. It leads various types of mass organizations of workers, peasants, indigenous peoples, women, youth, professionals and people belonging to various sectors. Millions of people belong to these mass organizations.

At the same time, more millions of people are under the governance of the local organs of political power that comprise the People's Democratic Government. The various mass organizations and various types of alliances support this government.

The revolutionary mass movement led by the CPP is born out of the lessons from the revolutionary history of the Filipino people and from the concrete analysis of concrete conditions. The CPP and NPA

have so far been the biggest and strongest revolutionary forces of their kind in the entire history of the Filipino people. They have created the people's democratic government, which continues to win victories against the reactionary government of big compradors, landlords and bureaucrat capitalists servile to foreign monopoly capitalism.

12. What makes Trotsky's writings so palatable, especially for philosophers and activists in Europe, especially in countries where he was exiled? He is still very popular now in France, for example.

JMS: To dispel any impression that Trotskyites are attractive in Europe or anywhere else, let me refer to Ho Chi Minh's exposure of Trotskyites as counterrevolutionary agents:

"For example, in Spain, their names are Workers' Party of Marxist Unification (POUM). Did you know that it is they who are the nests of spies in Madrid, Barcelona and elsewhere in the service of Franco? It is they who organized the famous "fifth column," agency of the army intelligence of the fascist Italians and Germans. In Japan, they are called Marx-Engels-Lenin League (MEL). The Japanese Trotskyites attract young people to their league, then reported them to the police. They seek to penetrate the Japanese Communist Party in order to destroy it from within. In my opinion, the French Trotskyites, now organized around the Proletarian Revolution Group set a goal to sabotage the Popular Front. On this subject, I think you are better informed than I am. In Indochina, Trotskyites are grouped into formations like La Lutte, War against the Japanese, Culture and Red Flag.

In my own time, as a young trade union activist in the Philippines, in the early 1960s, I became aware of the notorious Trotskyite Jay Lovestone who was being denounced by the Filipino trade union leaders as a long time agent of the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA). He exemplified the Trotskyite who wormed his way to the communist leadership and trade unions in the US in order to subsequently carry out anticommunist witch hunts against alleged communist party members and trade unionists and make intelligence reports to the CIA. Since then, I have become alert to entryism or penetration by Trotskyites into revolutionary organizations. I have come across Trotskyites in the US, Australia, Japan, France, The

Netherlands and other countries. They use a wide variety of party names and take various guises as activists and academics. And I have always managed to distance myself from them.

The writings and historical record of Trotsky appeal only to a few with a petty bourgeois mentality. The Trotskyites are very often funded and used by the imperialists to attack communist parties because of their anticommunist, anti-Stalin and anti-Mao propaganda. The Trotskyite organizations are small and easily get split when someone among them starts accusing the leaders of being Stalinist for trying to centralize the decision-making and to require discipline. They are hostile to the basic principles of Marxism-Leninism, such as the class dictatorship of the proletariat, the vanguard role of the communist party, the basic alliance of the workers and peasants and democratic centralism.

When a Trotskyite group grows relatively big, it is because it adopts a misleading name and self-description and attracts the petty bourgeois youth. But it is soon riven by factionalism and petty bourgeois wrangling. Most of those who join Trotskyite groups drop out after a short while because of internal rows, lack of revolutionary mass activity and disgust at being stridently anticommunist. At any rate, I have not seen any Trotskyite party winning revolution since Trotsky got himself thrown out of the Bolshevik party as a counterrevolutionary nearly a century ago.

Trotskyites persist as small groups railing against the truly revolutionary parties of the proletariat. They have long been exposed as using ultra-Left slogans as well as ultra-liberal and anti-Stalin slogans to mask their counterrevolutionary purposes. Because of their anti-Stalin and anticommunist views, Trotskyite groups are favorite recruiting pools of the imperialists and reactionaries for propagandists and spies against communist parties and revolutionary movements.

In the past, Trotskyite parties were relatively strong in Mexico and Sri Lanka. But they have disintegrated here because of their anticommunist ideology and political line, anarchism and adventurism, their preoccupation with slandering and attacking communist parties. At certain times, the Trotskyites appeared to be successful when they collaborated with social democratic institutions

and groups as in France or with anarchist groups in mass actions. But eventually they dwindled because of their Trotskyite cultism and sectarianism.

13. Lastly, Tito, for the sake of our viewers from Europe. One of the most common questions of Western Leftists is if there are Trotskyites in the Philippines. Are there and how do you spot one? Why is it necessary to know about Trotskyism?

JMS: There are small Trotskyite groups in the Philippines. They have been formed by various foreign Trotskyite groups based in Western Europe, Japan, Australia and the US. They have tried to penetrate the CPP but have also failed ultimately because they are exposed for suddenly opposing Marxism-Leninism-Maoism and the general line of people's democratic revolution with a socialist perspective after pretending to adhere to them.

All of the Trotskyite groups are mere babblers and are most active with publications, especially now online. They have some academics and a few unions. But they have failed to hoodwink the people and the intelligentsia. Like Trotsky their idol, they do not do serious mass work and they do not struggle against the enemy but against the revolutionaries.

They have isolated themselves with their anti-Stalinist obsession, their opposition to the people's democratic revolution as a supposedly unnecessary stage in the Philippine revolution and their preoccupation with anticommunist attacks on genuine communist parties and revolutionary movements wherever they are in the world. They can only get themselves further isolated by joining Duterte in attacking the communist revolutionaries and the patriotic and democratic forces that are now rising up.

On the Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State by Friedrich Engels

Questions By Marianne Cadiz

Answers by Jose Maria Sison

Engels Series, Anakbayan-Europe NDLIne Online School

November 1, 2020

1. *Can you tell us a bit about the background of Engels' Origin of Family, Private Property and State? And why is it important to study now, decades after?*

JMS: Following the death of Marx in 1883, Engels came across in early April 1884 the synopsis and annotations of Marx on Lewis H. Morgan's anthropological book titled *Ancient Society: Researches in the Lines of Human Progress from Savagery, Through Barbarism to Civilization*, first published in London in 1877. After reading the notes, Engels thought that Marx had wished a treatise to be written.

Thus, he set out to write *The Origin of Family, Private Property and State*. He recognized immediately the importance of writing a book on the prehistory of the family, private property and the state by applying dialectical materialism on the evolution of primitive communal society towards civilization, elaborating on the notes of Marx and evaluating the findings and conclusions of Morgan and other anthropologists.

As the literary executor of Marx, Engels considered it a duty and a delight to write *The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State*. He was gratified that Morgan's researches provided solid material for further study and development. In less than two months, he was able to publish the book on May 26, 1884.

2. *The development of family takes a parallel course as society. Can you discuss briefly what Henry Morgan's categorizations of prehistoric cultures are and how family looked like in those times?*

JMS: Morgan traced the development of society from the stage of savagery through barbarism to civilization in terms of the evolution of

the family, the scale of the community, the mode of production and the political life of the community. For every stage of development in savagery and then barbarism, he described the lower, middle and upper levels or phases of development. But for a start, let me just sum up the general characteristics of each stage.

He stated that at the stage of savagery, the family was consanguine, matriarchal and engaged in group marriage. The scale of the community was the gens or the clan. One can marry only within one's own family or clan. The married woman and all her sisters were in charge of the household and the activities in and around the house and had a position superior to the menfolk. Children could be identified as those of the mother but not always of which man as father.

The scale of the community was that of the clan. The clans were autonomous and were quite far apart from each other. Thus, in my view, the term savagery should not be understood as frequent wars among the clans and frequent acts of cannibalism. Though there was supposed to be the practice of this from the middle phase of savagery onward, the term refers more to the mode of production limited to the use of crude tools like stones, wooden clubs, spears, igniting fire by friction and the bow and arrow and mainly gathering fruit, digging tubers, fishing along streams and hunting.

The clan society was communal. Anyone elected as leader and anyone elected as the one in charge of defense could easily assemble the clan council or entire clan for deliberation and decision making on issues. Conversely, the entire clan can call on the leader and ask for the council or entire clan to assemble. There was direct democracy. No bureaucracy. Anyone could speak up and everyone listened to the speaker. And the women had authority in the meetings inasmuch as they were in charge of the households in the matriarchal society.

In the stage of barbarism, the pairing family emerged. This meant having one husband as head of the family and a No. 1 wife usually among several wives because the practice of group marriage continued either in the form of polygamy or polyandry. The key element in the rise of the pairing family was the assertion of male superiority over the wife as a result of the advance of the mode of

production and male presumption of owning the land, the cattle and the metal tools of production. Mother-right was overthrown by father-right. The man gained the prior claim over the children for bequeathing his property. This overruled the previous presumption that the woman knew best who were her children.

The scale of the community was tribal, consisting of several clans and phratries or brother tribes. Marriage among siblings became taboo and could be endogenous as well as exogenous. The social and political life was still communal and highly democratic. Any member of the tribe could still stand up in an assembly to speak up and be listened to. But it became more necessary for the council of clan representatives to meet between the meetings of the entire tribe. The differentiation of the well-to-do from those who were not began because of the emergence of private ownership of land and animals.

The most essential advances in the mode of production in the upper level of barbarism was making use of metal tools, from bronze to iron. The use of the iron ploughshare expanded agriculture. Cattle breeding also expanded. Tribes could go to war over hunting or grazing grounds or over some other issues. They could confederate to fight other tribes. They still used the primitive weapons like spears, bows and arrows but this time they used hatchets, iron knives and swords. Captives in wars were at first killed in the style of barbarism but eventually the war victors thought it was wiser to spare the lives of captives and turn them into slaves. Waging war became a way of taking slaves. Thus, barbarism paved the way for slave society and the start of civilization.

In civilization, the advances in the mode of production were so much greater from slave society through feudalism to capitalism. The owners of the means of production accumulated wealth and further entrenched the system of monogamous marriage and patriarchy to make sure that the men bequeathed their properties to their children. But they engaged in adultery and had sex with as many women as they pleased because of their power and wealth. And their own monogamous marriages were not characterized by sex love but prostituted by property preconditions. In contrast, the sexual love

among the proletarians were not motivated and bound by such preconditions.

3. *Marx and Engels discuss a lot about consanguinity. What does “consanguinity” mean and what is meant by the “consanguine family”? What are some examples of Morgan’s observation of the “systems of consanguinity”?*

JMS: In his study of the Seneca Iroquois tribe, Morgan could only observe vestiges or traces of the consanguine family. In the consanguine family, there was inbreeding within the same nuclear family. Siblings could be married and procreate. What was taboo was sexual relations between parents and children. In his study of the Punaluan family in Hawaii, he saw more manifestations of group marriage. The women ran a house to which the men could come and go. But the Punaluan family prohibited the sexual intercourse among siblings as well as among cousins. In ancient Athens, women could be known as the heterai who engaged in free love for free or for a fee.

Marx commented that the marriage of siblings was moral in the primitive past and should not be judged as immoral from the viewpoint of later societies in civilization. Engels also criticized the viewpoint of the Philistine pedants and moralists of his time to deride the practice of group marriage in primitive communal times. He saw such marriage as a phenomenon due to the material and socioeconomic conditions then obtaining, was characterized by sex love and was bereft of property and class preconditions as in exploitative class society.

Both Marx and Engels differentiated group marriage in primitive society from what are derided as adultery and prostitution in exploitative class society. On the other hand, they considered as prostitution the arranged marriages among the propertied exploitative class. Engels was glad about individual sex love among the proletarians in which the man is for the woman and equally the woman is for the man. He welcomed the prospect of women liberating themselves from the bondage of household chores by participating in industrial production after they lost their mother-right or matriarchal position in primitive society, with their previous control

over the household being turned against them as a way of subjugation.

4. Do systems of consanguinity as well as group marriage amount to promiscuous sexual intercourse?

JMS: When the consanguine families and group marriage occurred in the stage of savagery in primitive times, they were not seen by the people themselves as promiscuous sexual intercourse. They were phenomena determined by the mode of production or the economic and social conditions that I have already described. They did not yet have the kind of mode of production and the superstructure in civilization that the people now have. What some people may consider now as aberrant or immoral was quite natural, normal and moral in the stage of savagery.

Take note that the stage of savagery may be retrospectively dated as early as one million years ago in the time of *Australopithecus homo erectus* or 100,000 years ago when *homo sapiens* emerged. The civilization characterized by institutionalized private ownership of the means of production, the use of metallurgy, the existence of classes and class struggle, urbanization, literacy and the development of philosophy, religion, jurisprudence, the natural and social sciences emerged only since 3500 BC. in Mesopotamia, less than 6000 years ago in contrast to the long, long span of the stages of savagery and barbarism.

5. What, according to Engels, determines family structure? How/why did they develop these forms?

JMS: The mode of production or the economic system determined the family structure and the system of reproduction. The consanguine family, mother-right and group marriage resulted from the economic system of gathering the fruit of nature in the stage of savagery. The pairing family and the overthrow of the mother-right resulted from the further development of the economic system and the emergence of private ownership of alienable property in the stage of barbarism. The monogamous family and both patriarchy and patriarchalism became far more entrenched in civilization with the far more developed economic systems and dominance of private ownership of the means of production in the slave, feudal and capitalist systems.

6. Why and how did the Greek gens decline as the Athenian state arose? Did the same cause and process occur in the case of the gens and state in Rome?

JMS: The gentile constitution among the Greek tribes declined as commodity production and trade resulted in the urbanization and expansion of Athens and in the formation of the state of Athens. The city was divided into districts in which there was a mixture of Greeks from various tribes and an even larger numbers of artisans, slaves and foreigners. The state was formed to protect the slave-owning class and keep the slaves and the rest of the population under control as well as to conduct maritime trade and wage war.

A similar cause and process occurred in the case of the gens and the state in Rome. The city of Rome became a huge melting pot of people from various tribes and the gentile constitution declined as Rome further expanded and built an empire of unprecedented scale. The population included the state personnel, the artisans domestic and foreign traders, the plebeians and a huge number of slaves acquired through wars and trade. The state of Rome was fortified as a class instrument of the slave-owning class to keep the social order and to wage wars to maintain and expand the Roman empire.

7. What about the Gens among the Celts and Germans? How was the German state formed?

JMS: From the fourth century onward the Roman empire disintegrated as a result of the revolts of the subjugated peoples and slaves in Europe. In previous centuries, the Celts and the Germans were the most widespread and strongest tribes and had entered the Iron Age in the upper level of barbarism. The protracted struggle against the Roman empire impelled the confederation of tribes leading ultimately to the consolidation of feudal states and economies in the Middle Ages. Christianity played a key role in the consolidation of the feudal states and in the merging of Romanized communities and those communities that had resisted Roman rule.

The Germans had the largest population and fought the fiercest on the largest battlefield against the Roman army. Rome could not subdue what it called Germania, the German tribes that had retreated to the east bank of the Rhine. These became the base for prolonged resistance and the ultimate defeat of Rome. After the

collapse of Rome, the German state steadily took shape with the guidance of the Christian priests and the integration of the non-Romanized and Romanized Germanic communities. After Charlemagne and the Gauls of France consolidated Christendom in Europe, the German state under King Otto I took the lead in the Holy Roman Empire in the Middle Ages.

8. What kind of family structure, laws and state structures grew out of the industrialized capitalism of the late 19th and early 20th Centuries?

JMS: Patriarchy and patriarchalism and the monogamous marriage characterized the family structure of the industrialized capitalist society in the late 19th and early 20th century. At the time of the writing and publication of *The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State*, Victorian England brimmed with the ultra-conservatism that celebrated male supremacy and the male idols of British imperialism in sharp contrast to the subjugation of women in the industrial capitalist country and in the colonies and semicolonies dominated by British imperialism.

9. What, according to Engels, is the relation between monogamy and the overthrow of mother-right?

JMS: The overthrow of mother-right by monogamy has meant the victory of patriarchalism, the private ownership of the means of production and the series of such exploitative ruling systems as slavery, feudalism and capitalism. The natural division of labor between man and woman, such as the biological function of pregnancy and child birth, has been turned into a worsening social relation of man subjugating, and degrading the woman since the advent of the private ownership of the means of production.

In the imperialist countries today, both men and women of the working class suffer capitalist exploitation and oppression. The women suffer the additional exploitation and oppression of being either discriminated against in the workplace and overburdened by household chores, especially when neoliberalism took its toll in terms of declining employment and real incomes. In the semicolonial and semifeudal countries like the Philippines, the women suffer the triple oppression and exploitation by imperialism, feudalism and male chauvinism.

10. What did Engels mean by “The first class opposition that appears in history coincides with the development of the antagonism between man and woman in monogamous marriage, and the first class oppression coincides with that of the female sex by the male”?

JMS: The rise of private ownership of alienable property by the husband and the tradition of father bequeathing such property to the children disempowered women by requiring a switch to patrilocal residence and patrilineal descent. It began with the pairing family in the stage of barbarism. Indeed, it became the first class opposition, with the male sex oppressing the female. The monogamous marriage imposed on women by patriarchalism has pushed them down for millennia in exploitative class society. At the same time, the slave masters have imposed themselves on great numbers of women such as the slave women, the feudal lords on the womenfolk of the serfs and the capitalists on the women in the factories.

11. What conditions brought about the subjugation of women and what would be the basis for women’s liberation?

JMS: The subjugation of women began with the termination of their mother-right upon the imposition of monogamous marriage. The men used their ownership of the means of production to assert their authority.

The liberation of women is not through the restoration of the matriarchy but the conscious and determined realization of gender equality in which man and woman can freely agree to marry on the basis of mutual sex love and the common cause of fighting all kinds of oppression and exploitation. They must join the revolutionary movement and work together in order to change the ruling system and establish socialism in transition to communism.

They must enjoy all the basic democratic rights and fundamental freedoms. They must have equal rights and duties to each other and to their offspring. They must have the right to co-ownership of conjugal property. At the same time, women must have the distinct rights arising from pregnancy and nursing their children, which must be served by their husbands and the social system.

12. How will family look like after the fall of capitalism?

JMS: There will be gender equality, mutual respect and solidarity between man and woman without the divisiveness and subjugation

resulting from property preconditions and from class oppression and exploitation. The publicly-owned means of production and state planning in socialist society shall provide expanding opportunities for women to earn their own income and liberate themselves from male domination, for them to give full play to their creative capabilities and to share responsibilities with the menfolk on equal terms.

Socialism shall provide the material, social and cultural conditions for the liberation and independence of women. Having their own income and doing what they could in the public interest, they shall no longer be dependent on the men and shall no longer be bound to take all the burden of household chores. The right to one's own integrity, equality and independence in relation to the husband extends to demanding what it takes to keep the marriage sound and healthy or otherwise rescinding the marriage on grounds of incompatibility, oppression and exploitation, with due care for the children if any.

Discussion of Anti-Dühring by Friedrich Engels

Part I: Philosophy

Questions by Host Marianne Cadiz

Answers by Jose Maria Sison

Anakbayan-Europa NDLine Online School

November 8, 2020

1. General. *What is the importance of Anti-Dühring? What is the main content of the book? Briefly, who was Dühring?*

JMS: *Anti-Dühring* was written by Friedrich Engels in 1876 and was published in book form in 1878. It is a masterpiece of Marxist literature, which has educated generations of communists in the last 130 years on the fundamental ideas of scientific socialism. Lenin highly recommended the book as a 'text book' of scientific socialism.

The original title was *Herr Eugen Dühring's Revolution in Science* but later became known as *Anti-Dühring*. It was the first comprehensive presentation in a single book of the three components of Marxism: philosophy, political economy and socialism.

It was written to refute the book of Eugen Dühring, a German revisionist, that attacked the fundamental principles of Marxism and proposed his own supposedly 'scientific' theories within the Social Democratic Party of Germany. In the process, Engels explained clearly the revolutionary theories of Marxism.

I am ready to present the position of Dühring on every major issue and the corresponding refutation made by Engels. I shall quote their respective words directly very often, thus making my presentation quite easy. Due to the time limit for the discussion, I shall try to make the most essential quotations.

2. Dühring's Self-Advertisement and Promises. *How does Dühring present himself and his philosophy? How, according to him, should people regard his work and why? And what do Engels and Marx have to say about this?*

JMS: Mr. Dühring introduces himself as the man who represented the power of philosophy in his age and its immediately foreseeable development. He proclaimed himself to be the only true philosopher of today and of the “foreseeable” future. Whoever departed from him departed from truth.

He called his philosophy “the *natural* system or the *philosophy of reality*... In it, reality is so conceived as to *exclude any tendency* to a visionary and subjectively limited conception of the world.” Engels said: “This philosophy is therefore of such a nature that it lifts Herr Dühring above the limits he himself can hardly deny of his personal, subjective limitations. And this is in fact necessary if he is to be in a position to lay down final and ultimate truths, although so far we do not see how this miracle should come to pass.”

Engels quotes the very words of Dühring to show the pomposity and vacuity of his claims. According to Dühring himself, his “natural system of knowledge, which in itself is of value to the mind” has, “without the slightest detraction from the profundity of thought, *securely established the* basic forms of being.” From its “really critical standpoint” it provides “the elements of a philosophy, which is real and therefore directed to the reality of nature and of life, a philosophy, which cannot allow the validity of any merely apparent horizon, but *in its powerfully revolutionizing movement unfolds all earths and heavens of outer and inner nature.*” It is a “new mode of thought,” and its results are “from the ground up original conclusions and views... system-creating ideas... established truths.” In it we have before us “a work, which must find its strength in concentrated initiative” — whatever that may mean; an “investigation going to the roots... a deep-rooted science... a strictly scientific conception of things and men... an all-round penetrating work of thought... creative evolving of premises and conclusions controllable by thought... the absolutely fundamental.”

In the economic and political sphere Dühring promised to give us not only “historical and systematically comprehensive works,” of which the historical ones are, to boot, notable for “my historical depiction *in the grand style,*” while those dealing with political economy have brought about “creative turns,” but he would even finish with a fully worked-out socialist plan of his own for the society

of the future, a plan, which is the “practical fruit of a clear *theory going to the ultimate roots of things*” and, like the Dühring philosophy, is consequently infallible and offers the only way to salvation; for “*only in that socialist structure, which I have sketched in my Cursus der National-und Social ökonomie can a true Own take the place of ownership, which is merely apparent and transitory or even based on violence.*” And the future has to follow these directions.

Engels quoted Marx to cut down immediately the size of Dühring: “Narrowness of conception... his works and achievements in and by themselves, that is, regarded from a purely theoretical standpoint, are without any permanent significance in our domain” (the critical history of socialism), “and in the general history of intellectual tendencies they are to be cited at most as symptoms of the influence of one branch of modern sectarian scholastics... impotence of the faculties of concentration and systematization... deformity of thought and style, undignified affectation of language... anglicized vanity... duping... barren conceptions, which in fact are only bastards of historical and logical fantasy... deceptive twisting ... personal vanity ... vile mannerisms... snotty... buffoonery pretending to be witty... Chinese erudition ... philosophical and scientific backwardness”.

Part I: Philosophy

3. A Priorism. *What is Dühring’s definition or view of philosophy? And what is Engel’s comment?*

JMS: According to Dühring, philosophy is the development of the highest form of consciousness of the world and of life, and in a wider sense embraces the *principles* of all knowledge and volition. Wherever a series of cognitions or stimuli or a group of forms of being come to be examined by human consciousness, the *principles* underlying these manifestations of necessity become an object of philosophy. These principles are the simple, or until now assumed to be simple, constituents of manifold knowledge and volition. Like the chemical composition of bodies, the general constitution of things can be reduced to basic forms and basic elements. These ultimate constituents or principles, once they have been discovered, are valid not only for what is immediately known and accessible, but also for the world, which is unknown and inaccessible to us. Philosophical

principles consequently provide the final supplement required by the sciences in order to become a uniform system by which nature and human life can be explained. Apart from the fundamental forms of all existence, philosophy has only two specific subjects of investigation — nature and the world of man. Accordingly, our material arranges itself quite *naturally* into three groups, namely, the general scheme of the universe, the science of the principles of nature, and finally the science of mankind. This succession at the same time contains an *inner logical sequence*, for the formal principles, which are valid for all being take precedence, and the realms of the objects to which they are to *be applied then* follow in the degree of their subordination.

Engels refuted Dühring's apriorism in the following words: "What he (Dühring) is dealing with are *therefore principles*, formal tenets derived from thought and not from the external world, which are to be applied to nature and the realm of man, and to which therefore nature and man have to conform. But whence does thought obtain these principles? From itself? No, for Herr Dühring himself says: the realm of pure thought is limited to logical schemata and mathematical forms (the latter, moreover, as we shall see, is wrong). Logical schemata can only relate to forms *of thought*; but what we are dealing with here is solely forms of being, of the external world, and these forms can never be created and derived by thought out of itself, but only from the external world. But with this the whole relationship is inverted: the principles are not the starting-point of the investigation, but its final result; they are not applied to nature and human history, but abstracted from them, it is not nature and the realm of man, which conform to these principles, but the principles are only valid in so far as they are in conformity with nature and history. That is the only materialist conception of the matter, and Herr Dühring's contrary conception is idealistic, makes things stand completely on their heads, and fashions the real world out of ideas, out of schemata, schemes or categories existing somewhere before the world, from eternity — just like a *Hegel*."

It goes without saying that no materialist doctrine can be founded on such an ideological basis. Later on we shall see that Herr Dühring

is forced more than once to endow nature surreptitiously with conscious activity, with what in plain language is called God.

However, our philosopher of reality had also other motives for shifting the basis of all reality from the real world to the world of thought. The science of this general world schematism, of these formal principles of being, is precisely the foundation of Herr Dühring's philosophy. If we deduce world schematism not from our minds, but only through our minds from the real world, if we deduce principles of being from what is, we need no philosophy for this purpose, but positive knowledge of the world and of what happens in it; and what this yields is also not philosophy, but positive science. In that case, however, Herr Dühring's whole volume would be nothing but love's labor lost.

The perception that all the processes of nature are systematically connected drives science on to prove this systematic connection throughout, both in general and in particular. But an adequate, exhaustive scientific exposition of this interconnection, the formation of an exact mental image of the world system in which we live, is impossible for us, and will always remain impossible. If at any time in the development of mankind such a final, conclusive system of the interconnections within the world — physical as well as mental and historical — were brought about, this would mean that human knowledge had reached its limit, and, from the moment when society had been brought into accord with that system, further historical development would be cut short — which would be an absurd idea, sheer nonsense.

As with the basic forms of being, so also with the whole of pure mathematics: Herr Dühring thinks that he can produce it *a priori* that is, without making use of the experience offered us by the external world, can construct it in his head. In pure mathematics the mind deals “with its own free creations and imaginations”; the concepts of number and figure are “the adequate object of that pure science, which it can create of itself,” and hence it has a “validity, which is independent of particular experience and of the real content of the world.”

That pure mathematics has a validity, which is independent of the *particular* experience of each individual is, for that matter, correct,

and this is true of all established facts in every science, and indeed of all facts whatsoever. The magnetic poles, the fact that water is composed of hydrogen and oxygen, the fact that Hegel is dead and Herr Dühring is alive, hold good independently of my own experience or that of any other individual, and even independently of Herr Dühring's experience, when he begins to sleep the sleep of the just. But it is not at all true that in pure mathematics the mind deals only with its own creations and imaginations. The concepts of number and figure have not been derived from any source other than the world of reality. The ten fingers on which men learnt to count, that is, to perform the first arithmetical operation, are anything but a free creation of the mind.

But why all this prolixity? After Herr Dühring has enthusiastically sung the independence of pure mathematics from the world of experience, its a priority, its preoccupation with the mind's own free creations and imaginations, he says: "It is, of course, easily overlooked that those mathematical elements (number, magnitude, time, space and geometric motion) are deal only in their form, ...absolute magnitudes are therefore something completely empirical, no matter to what species they belong," ...but "mathematical schemata are capable of characterization, which is adequate even though divorced from experience."

The last statement is more or less true of every abstraction, but does not by any means prove that it is not abstracted from reality. In world schematism pure mathematics arose out of pure thought — in the philosophy of nature it is something completely empirical, taken from the external world and then divorced from it. Which are we to believe?

4. World Schematism. *According to Dühring, all-embracing being is one. What does he mean by this? What is the world schematism of Dühring? How does Engels describe and debunk it?*

JMS: Dühring declares: "All-embracing being is one in its self-sufficiency it has nothing alongside it or over it. To associate a second being with it would be to make it something that it is not, namely, a part or constituent of a more comprehensive whole. Due to the fact that we extend our unified thought like a framework, nothing that should be comprised in this thought-unity can retain a duality

within itself. Nor, again, can anything escape this thought-unity... The essence of all thought consists in bringing together the elements of consciousness into a unity... It is the point of unity of the synthesis where the *indivisible idea of the world came* into being and the universe, as the name itself implies, is apprehended as something in which everything is united into unity.”

Thus far Herr Dühring. This is the first application of the mathematical method: “Every question is to be decided axiomatically in accordance with simple basic forms, as if we were dealing with the simple... principles of mathematics.”

Engels comments: “All-embracing being is one.” If tautology, the simple repetition in the predicate of what is already expressed in the subject — if that makes an axiom, then we have here one of the purest water. Herr Dühring tells us in the subject that being embraces everything, and in the predicate he intrepidly declares that in that case there is nothing outside it. What colossal “system-creating thought”!

This is indeed system-creating! Within the space of the next six lines Herr Dühring has transformed the oneness of being, by means of our unified thought, into its unit. As the essence of all thought consists in bringing things together into a unity, so being, as soon as it is conceived, is conceived as unified, and the idea of the world as indivisible; and because conceived being, the *idea of the world*, is unified, therefore real being, the real world, is also an indivisible unity. And with that “there is no longer any room for things beyond, once the mind has learnt to conceive being in its homogeneous universality.”

This last statement is simply untrue. In the first place, thought consists just as much in the taking apart of objects of consciousness into their elements as in the putting together of related elements into a unity. Without analysis, no synthesis. Secondly, without making blunders thought can bring together into a unity only those elements of consciousness in which or in whose real prototypes this unity already existed *before*. If I include a shoe-brush in the unity mammals, this does not help it to get mammary glands.

The most comical part of the business is that Herr Dühring, in order to prove the non-existence of God from the idea of being, uses

the ontological proof for the existence of God. This runs: when we think of God, we conceive him as the sum total of all perfections. But the sum total of all perfections includes above all existence, since a non-existent being is necessarily imperfect.

Engels asserts: "The real unity of the world consists in its materiality, and this is proved not by a few juggled phrases, but by a long and wearisome development of philosophy and natural science."

But we shall see very soon that Herr Dühring's universe really starts with a being, which lacks all inner differentiation, all motion and change, and is therefore in fact only a counterpart of the idea of nothing, and therefore really nothing. Only out of this being-nothing develops the present differentiated, changing state of the universe, which represents a development, a becoming; and it is only after we have grasped this that we are able, even within this perpetual change, to "maintain the conception of universal being in a self-equal state."

My comment is that Dühring bound himself to the Absolute Idea of Plato and hard put to explain the differentiation and development of ideas as reflection of material reality he resorts to borrowing from Hegel. Engels exposes Dühring as drawing from Hegel after denouncing Hegel: "This is precisely the Hegelian nodal line of measure relations, in which, at certain definite nodal points, the purely quantitative increase or decrease gives rise to a qualitative *leap*; for example, in the case of heated or cooled water, where boiling-point and freezing-point are the nodes at which — under normal pressure — the leap to a new state of aggregation takes place, and where consequently quantity is transformed into quality."

Engels states: "Our investigation has likewise tried to reach down to the roots, and it finds the roots of the deep-rooted basic schemata of Herr Dühring to be — the 'delirious fantasies' of a Hegel, the categories of Hegelian Logic, Part I, the Doctrine of Being, in strictly old Hegelian 'succession' and with hardly any attempt to cloak the plagiarism!"

And not content with pilfering from his worst-slandered predecessor the latter's whole scheme of being, Herr Dühring, after himself giving the above-quoted example of the leap-like change

from quantity into quality, says of Marx without the slightest perturbation: “How ridiculous, for example, is the reference” (made by Marx) “to the Hegelian confused, hazy notion that quantity is transformed into quality!”

What Hegel calls the doctrine of essence Herr Dühring translates into “logical properties of being.” These, however, consist above all in the “antagonism of forces”, in opposites. Contradiction, however, Herr Dühring absolutely denies; we will return to this point later. Then he passes over to causality, and from this to necessity. *So that* when Herr Dühring says of himself: “We, who do not philosophize out of a cage,” he apparently means that he philosophizes in a cage, namely, the cage of the Hegelian schematism of categories.

Philosophy of Nature

5. Time and Space. *Can pure mathematics explain infinity of time and space? Why or why not?*

JMS: Engels declares that pure mathematics cannot explain infinity: The whole deception would be impossible but for the mathematical usage of working with infinite series. Because in mathematics it is necessary to start from definite, finite terms in order to reach the indefinite, the infinite, all mathematical series, positive or negative, must start from 1, or they cannot be used for calculation. The abstract requirement of a mathematician is, however, far from being a compulsory law for the world of reality.

For that matter, Herr Dühring will never succeed in conceiving real infinity without contradiction. Infinity is a contradiction, and is full of contradictions. From the outset it is a contradiction that an infinity is composed of nothing but finites, and yet this is the case. The limitedness of the material world leads no less to contradictions than its unlimitedness, and every attempt to get over these contradictions leads, as we have seen, to new and worse contradictions. It is just because infinity is a contradiction that it is an infinite process, unrolling endlessly in time and in space.

Let us pass on. So time had a beginning. What was there before this beginning? The universe, which was then in a self-equal, unchanging state. And as in this state no changes succeed one another, the more specialized idea of time transforms itself into the more general idea of being. In the first place, we are here not in the

least concerned with what ideas change in Herr Dühring's head. The subject at issue is not the idea of time, but real time, which Herr Dühring cannot rid himself of so cheaply. In the second place, however much the idea of time may convert itself into the more general idea of being, this does not take us one step further. For the basic forms of all being are space and time, and being out of time is just as gross an absurdity as being out of space.

An initial impulse must therefore have come from outside, from outside the universe, an impulse, which set it in motion. But as everyone knows, the "initial impulse" is only another expression for God. God and the beyond, which in his world schematism Herr Dühring pretended to have so beautifully dismantled, are both introduced again by him here, sharpened and deepened, into natural philosophy. Further, Herr Dühring says: "Where magnitude is attributed to a constant element of being, it will remain unchanged in its determinateness. This holds good... of matter and mechanical force."

6. Cosmogony, Physics, Chemistry. *What is the relationship of matter and motion? And what is Dühring's analysis of matter as opposed to Engels and other materialists?*

JMS: Matter, Herr Dühring says, is the bearer of all reality; accordingly, there can be no mechanical force apart from matter. Mechanical force is furthermore a state of matter. In the original state, when nothing happened, matter and its state, mechanical force, were one. Afterwards, when something began to happen, this state must apparently have become different from matter. So we are to let ourselves be dismissed with these mystical phrases and with the assurance that the self-equal state was neither static nor dynamic, neither in equilibrium nor in motion. We still do not know where mechanical force was in that state, and how we are to get from absolute immobility to motion without an impulse from outside, that is, without God.

Engels states as follows the position of materialists: "The materialists before Herr Dühring spoke of matter and motion. He reduces motion to mechanical force as its supposed basic form, and thereby makes it impossible for himself to understand the real connection between matter and motion, which moreover was also

unclear to all former materialists. And yet it is simple enough. Motion *is the mode of existence of matter*. Never anywhere has there been matter without motion, nor can there be. Motion in cosmic space, mechanical motion of smaller masses on the various celestial bodies, the vibration of molecules as heat or as electrical or magnetic currents, chemical disintegration and combination, organic life — at each given moment each individual atom of matter in the world is in one or other forms of these motions, or in several forms at once. All rest, all equilibrium, is only relative, only has meaning in relation to one or other definite form of motion.

On the earth, for example, a body may be in mechanical equilibrium, may be mechanically at rest; but this in no way prevents it from participating in the motion of the earth and in that of the whole solar system, just as little as it prevents its most minute physical particles from carrying out the vibrations determined by its temperature, or its atoms from passing through a chemical process. Matter without motion is just as inconceivable as motion without matter. Motion is therefore as uncreatable and indestructible as matter itself; as the older philosophy (Descartes) expressed it, the quantity of motion existing in the world is always the same. Motion therefore cannot be created; it can only be transferred. When motion is transferred from one body to another, it may be regarded, in so far as it transfers itself, is active, as the - cause of motion, in so far as the latter is transferred, is passive. We call this active motion force, and the passive, the manifestation of force. Hence it is as clear as daylight that a force is as great as its manifestation, because in fact the same motion takes place in both.

7. The Organic World. *Why does Dühring attack Darwin? So what if Darwin's theory of evolution and struggle of the fittest is akin or similar to the Malthusian theory in political economy?*

Dühring pours a lot of vitriol over Darwin's theory of evolution and struggle of the fittest by describing it as an attack on our sense of humanity and by linking it with the Malthusian theory that the population outgrows the economy. But the actual reason is that Dühring opposes materialism and dialectics. To cope with the assertiveness of material reality and development, he resorts to stealing from Hegel "the nodal line of measure relations."

According to Engels, Mr. Dühring tries to assure himself that by saying “A single and uniform ladder of intermediate steps leads from the mechanics of pressure and impact to the linking together of sensations and ideas,” he saves himself the trouble of saying anything further about the origin of life, although it might reasonably have been expected that a thinker who had traced the evolution of the world back to its self-equal state, and is so much at home on other celestial bodies, would have known exactly what’s what also on this point.

Engels adds: “For the rest, however, the assurance he gives us is only half right unless it is completed by the Hegelian nodal line of measure relations, which has already been mentioned. In spite of all gradualness, the transition from one form of motion to another always remains a leap, a decisive change. This is true of the transition from the mechanics of celestial bodies to that of smaller masses on a particular celestial body; it is equally true of the transition from the mechanics of masses to the mechanics of molecules — including the forms of motion investigated in physics proper: heat, light, electricity, magnetism. In the same way, the transition from the physics of molecules to the physics of atoms — chemistry — in turn involves a decided leap; and this is even more clearly the case in the transition from ordinary chemical action to the chemism of albumen, which we call life. Then within the sphere of life the leaps become ever more infrequent and imperceptible. — Once again, therefore, it is Hegel who has to correct Herr Dühring.”

The concept of purpose provides Herr Dühring with a conceptual transition to the organic world. Once again, this is borrowed from Hegel, who in his Logic — the Doctrine of the Notion — makes the transition from chemism to life by means of teleology, or the science of purpose. Wherever we look in Herr Dühring we run into a Hegelian “crudity,” which he quite unblushingly dishes out to us as his own deep-rooted science. It would take us too far afield to investigate here the extent to which it is legitimate and appropriate to apply the ideas of means and end to the organic world. In any case, even the application of the Hegelian “inner purpose” — i.e., a purpose, which is not imported into nature by some third party acting purposively, such as the wisdom of providence, but lies in the

necessity of the thing itself — constantly leads people who are not well versed in philosophy to thoughtlessly ascribing to nature conscious and purposive activity. That same Herr Dühring who is filled with boundless moral indignation at the slightest “spiritistic” tendency in other people assures us “with certainty that the instinctive sensations were primarily created for the sake of the satisfaction involved in their activity.”

So we get common descent after all, but only “second class.” We must rejoice that after Herr Dühring has attributed so much to it that is evil and obscure, we nevertheless find it in the end readmitted by the backdoor. It is the same with natural selection, for after all his moral indignation over the struggle for existence through which natural selection operates we suddenly read: “The deeper basis of the constitution of organisms is thus to be sought in the conditions of life and cosmic relations, while the natural selection emphasized by Darwin can only come in as a secondary factor.”

So we get natural selection after all, though only second class; and along with natural selection also the struggle for existence, and with that also the priestly Malthusian overpopulation! That is all, and for the rest Herr Dühring refers us to Lamarck. My comment is that what he rejects in the first place he accepts, when material reality and development shouts back at him, but regards this in the Platonic mode of thinking that it is secondary to the “reality” of ideas. He cannot budge from this position even when proven false by material reality and development. He pontificates:

In conclusion he warns us against the misuse of the terms: metamorphosis and development. Metamorphosis, he maintains, is an unclear concept, and the concept of development is permissible only in so far as laws of development can be really established. In place of both these terms we should use the term “composition,” and then everything would be all right. It is the same old story over again: things remain as they were, and Herr Dühring is quite satisfied as soon as we just alter the names. When we speak of the development of the chicken in the egg we are creating confusion, for we are able to prove the laws of development only in an incomplete way. But if we speak of its’ “composition” everything becomes clear. We shall therefore no longer say: This child is developing finely but, It is

composing itself magnificently. We can congratulate Herr Dühring on being a worthy peer of the author of the Nibelungen ring not only in his noble self-esteem but also in his capacity of composer of the future.

8. *The Organic World. (Conclusion).* Can mathematics be the basis of knowing the organic world as claimed by Dühring?

According to Dühring: "Ponder... what positive knowledge is required to equip our section on natural philosophy with all its scientific premises. Its basis is provided firstly by all the fundamental achievements of mathematics, and then the principal propositions established by exact science in mechanics, physics and chemistry, as well as the general conclusions of natural science in physiology, zoology and similar branches of inquiry.

Engels answers Dühring: "Such is the confidence and assurance with which Herr Dühring speaks of the mathematical and naturalistic erudition of Herr Dühring. It is impossible to detect from the meager section concerned, and still less from its even more paltry conclusions, what deep-rooted positive knowledge lies behind them. In any case, in order to create the Dühring oracle on physics and chemistry, it is not necessary to know any more of physics than the equation, which expresses the mechanical equivalent of heat, or any more of chemistry than that all bodies can be divided into elements and combinations of elements. Moreover, a person who can talk of "gravitating atoms," as Herr Dühring does, only proves that he is completely "in the dark" as to the difference between atoms and molecules. As is well known, it is only chemical action, and not gravitation or other mechanical or physical forms of motion, that is explained by atoms. And if anyone should read as far as the chapter on organic nature, with its vacuous, self-contradictory and, at the decisive point, oracularly senseless meandering verbiage, and its absolutely futile final conclusion, he will not be able to avoid forming the opinion, from the very start, that Herr Dühring is here speaking of things of which he knows remarkably little. This opinion becomes absolute certainty when the reader reaches his suggestion that in the science of organic beings (biology) the term composition should be used instead of development. The person who can put forward such

a suggestion shows that he has not the faintest suspicion of the formation of organic bodies.

Life is the mode of existence of albuminous bodies, and this mode of existence essentially consists in the constant self-renewal of the chemical constituents of these bodies. The term albuminous body is used here in the sense in which it is employed in modern chemistry, which includes under this name all bodies constituted similarly to ordinary white of egg, otherwise also known as protein substances. The name is an unhappy one, because ordinary white of egg plays the most lifeless and passive role of all the substances related to it, since, together with the yolk, it is merely food for the developing embryo. But while so little is yet known of the chemical composition of albuminous bodies, this name is better than any other because it is more general.

Our definition of life is naturally very inadequate, inasmuch as, far from including all the phenomena of life, it has to be limited to those which are the most common and the simplest. From a scientific standpoint all definitions are of little value. In order to gain an exhaustive knowledge of what life is, we should have to go through all the forms in which it appears, from the lowest to the highest. But for ordinary usage such definitions are very convenient and in places cannot well be dispensed with; moreover, they can do no harm, provided their inevitable deficiencies are not forgotten.

But back to Herr Dühring. When things are faring badly with him in the sphere of earthly biology, he knows where to find consolation; he takes refuge in his starry heaven. Dühring states: "It is not merely the special apparatus of an organ of sensation, but the whole objective world, which is adapted to the production of pleasure and pain. For this reason we take it for granted that the antithesis between pleasure and pain, and moreover exactly, in the form with which we are familiar, is a universal antithesis, and must be represented *in the various worlds of the universe* by essentially homogeneous feelings. ...This conformity, however, is of no little significance, for it is the key to the universe of sensations. ...Hence the subjective cosmic world is to us not much more unfamiliar than the objective. The constitution of both spheres must be conceived according to one concordant type, and in this we have the

beginnings of a science of consciousness whose range is wider than merely terrestrial” What do a few gross blunders in terrestrial natural science matter to the man who carries in his pocket the key to the universe of sensations?

Morality and Law

9. *Eternal Truths.* What is the basis of Dühring’s claim that there are eternal truths in morality and law? What does Engels react to it? What are the conditions and factors that determine and shape morality and law?

According to Dühring: The world of morals, “just as much as the world of general knowledge,” has “its permanent principles and simple elements.” The moral principles stand “above history and also above the present differences in national characteristics... The special truths out of which, in the course of evolution, a more complete moral consciousness and, so to speak, conscience are built up, may, in so far as their ultimate basis is understood, claim a validity and range similar to the insights and applications of mathematics, *Genuine truths are absolutely immutable...* so that it is altogether stupid to think that the correctness of knowledge is something that can be affected by time and changes in reality.” Hence the certitude of strict knowledge and the adequacy of common cognition leave no room, when we are in possession of our senses, for doubting the absolute validity of the principles of knowledge. “Even persistent doubt is itself a diseased condition of weakness and only the expression of hopeless *confusion*, which sometimes seeks to contrive the appearance of something stable in the systematic consciousness of its nothingness. In the sphere of ethics, the denial of general principles clutches at the geographical and historical variety of customs and principles, and once the inevitable necessity of moral wickedness and evil is conceded, it believes itself so much the more to be above the recognition of the great importance and actual efficacy of concordant moral impulses. This mordant *scepticism*, which is not directed against particular false doctrines but against mankind’s very capacity to develop conscious morality, resolves itself ultimately into a real Nothing, in fact into something that is worse than pure nihilism {194}... It flatters itself that it can easily dominate within its utter *chaos of* disintegrated

ethical ideas and open the gates to unprincipled arbitrariness. But it is greatly mistaken: for mere reference to the inevitable fate of reason in error and truth suffices to show by this analogy alone that natural fallibility does not necessarily exclude the attainment of accuracy" {195}.

Moral truths, in so far as their ultimate bases are understood, claim the same validity as mathematical insights. And does not Herr Dühring assert that, working from his really critical standpoint and by means of those researches of his that go to the root of things, he has forced his way through to these ultimate foundations, the basic schemata, and has thus bestowed final and ultimate validity on moral truths? Or, if Herr Dühring does not advance this claim either for himself or for his age, if he only meant to say that perhaps some day in the dark and nebulous future final and ultimate truths may be ascertained, if therefore he meant to say much the same, only in a more confused way, as is said by "mordant scepticism" and "hopeless confusion" — then, in that case, what is all the noise about, what can we do for you, Herr Dühring?[Goethe, *Faust*, Act I, Scene III ("Faust's Study").

Engels refutes Dühring by referring to the development of three co-existing moralities in his time: But how do things stand today? What morality is preached to us today? There is first Christian-feudal morality, inherited from earlier religious times; and this is divided, essentially, into a Catholic and a Protestant morality, each of which has no lack of subdivisions, from the Jesuit-Catholic and Orthodox-Protestant to loose "enlightened" moralities. Alongside these we find the modern-bourgeois morality and beside it also the proletarian morality of the future, so that in the most advanced European countries alone the past, present and future provide three great groups of moral theories that are in force simultaneously and alongside each other. Which, then, is the true one? Not one of them, in the sense of absolute finality; but certainly that morality contains the maximum elements promising permanence which, in the present, represents the overthrow of the present, represents the future, and that is proletarian morality.

But when we see that the three classes of modern society, the feudal aristocracy, the bourgeoisie and the proletariat, each have a

morality of their own, we can only draw the one conclusion: that men, consciously or unconsciously, derive their ethical ideas in the last resort from the practical relations on which their class position is based — from the economic relations in which they carry on production and exchange. But nevertheless there is great deal that the three moral theories mentioned above have in common — is this not at least a portion of a morality, which is fixed once and for all? — These moral theories represent three different stages of the same historical development, have therefore a common historical background, and for that reason alone they necessarily have much in common. Even more, at similar or approximately similar stages of economic development moral theories must of necessity be more or less in agreement. From the moment when private ownership of movable property developed, all societies in which this private ownership existed had to have this moral injunction in common:

10. Equality. *Is there absolute equality? Where did the idea of equality come from? How do Dühring and Engels differ in their stand on absolute equality?*

According to Dühring on the basis of his hypothetical germinal society of two men: “Two human wills are as such entirely *equal to* each other, and in the first place the one can demand nothing positive of the other.” This “characterises the basic form of moral justice”, and also that of legal justice, for “we need only the wholly simple and elementary relation of two *persons for* the development of the fundamental concepts of law.”

Engels refutes Dühring in the following words: The idea of equality, both in its bourgeois and in its proletarian form, is therefore itself a historical product, the creation of which required definite historical conditions that in turn themselves presuppose a long previous history. It is therefore anything but an eternal truth. And if today it is taken for granted by the general public — in one sense or another — if, as Marx says, it “already possesses the fixity of a popular prejudice,” this is not the effect of its axiomatic truth, but the effect of the general diffusion and the continued appropriateness of the ideas of the eighteenth century. If therefore Herr Dühring is able without more ado to let his famous two men conduct their economic relations on the basis of equality, this is so because it seems quite

natural to popular prejudice. And in fact Herr Dühring calls his philosophy natural because it is derived solely from things, which seem to him quite natural. But why they seem natural to him is a question that of course he does not ask.

11. Freedom and Necessity. *How do objective conditions relate to freedom? What is the relation of freedom to necessity?*

According to Engels: Freedom does not consist in any dreamt-of independence from natural laws, but in the knowledge of these laws, and in the possibility this gives of systematically making them work towards definite ends. This holds good in relation both to the laws of external nature and to those which govern the bodily and mental existence of men themselves — two classes of laws that we can separate from each other at most only in thought but not in reality. Freedom of the will therefore means nothing but the capacity to make decisions with knowledge of the subject. Therefore the freer a man's judgment is in relation to a definite question, the greater is the necessity with which the content of this judgment will be determined; while the uncertainty, founded on ignorance, which seems to make an arbitrary choice among many different and conflicting possible decisions, shows precisely by this that it is not free, that it is controlled by the very object it should itself control. Freedom therefore consists in the control over ourselves and over external nature, a control founded on knowledge of natural necessity; it is therefore necessarily a product of historical development. The first men who separated themselves from the animal kingdom were in all essentials as unfree as the animals themselves, but each step forward in the field of culture was a step towards freedom. On the threshold of human history stands the discovery that mechanical motion can be transformed into heat: the production of fire by friction; at the close of the development so far gone through stands the discovery that heat can be transformed into mechanical motion: the steam-engine. — And, in spite of the gigantic liberating revolution in the social world that the steam-engine is carrying through, and that is not yet half completed, it is beyond all doubt that the generation of fire by friction has had an even greater effect on the liberation of mankind. For the generation of fire by friction gave man for the first time control over one of the forces of nature, and thereby and

thereby separated him for ever from the animal kingdom. The steam-engine will never bring about such a mighty leap forward in human development, however important it may seem in our eyes as representing all those immense productive forces dependent on it — forces, which alone make possible a state of society in which there are no longer class distinctions or anxiety over the means of subsistence for the individual, and in which for the first time there can be talk of real human freedom, of an existence in harmony with the laws of nature that have become known. But how young the whole of human history still is, and how ridiculous it would be to attempt to ascribe any absolute validity to our present views, is evident from the simple fact that all past history can be characterized as the history of the epoch from the practical discovery of the transformation of mechanical motion into heat up to that of the transformation of heat into mechanical motion.

True, Herr Dühring's treatment of history is different. In general, being a record of error, ignorance and barbarity, of violence and subjugation, history is a repulsive object to the philosophy of reality; but considered in detail it is divided into two great periods, namely (1) from the self-equal state of matter up to the French Revolution, (2) from the French Revolution up to Herr Dühring; the nineteenth century remains “still in essence reactionary, indeed from the intellectual standpoint even more so” (!) “than the eighteenth.” Nevertheless, it bears socialism in its womb, and therewith “the germ of a mightier regeneration than was fancied” (!) “by the forerunners and the heroes of the French Revolution.”

The philosophy of reality's contempt for all past history is justified as follows: “The few thousand years, the historical retrospection of which has been facilitated by original documents, are, together with the constitution of mankind so far, *of little significance when* one thinks of the succession of thousands of years that are still to come... The human race as a whole is still very young, and when in time to come scientific retrospection has tens of thousands instead of thousands of years to reckon with, the intellectually immature childhood of our institutions becomes a self-evident premise undisputed in relation to our epoch, which will then be revered as hoary antiquity.”

Discussions on Anti-Dühring by Friedrich Engels

Part II: Political Economy

Questions by Host Anghelo Godino,
Answers by Jose Maria Sison
Anakbayan-Europa NDLine Online School
November 15, 2021

1. Engels said that political economy is a historical science. What did he mean by that? Can you briefly explain what political economy is?

JMS: According to Engels: Political economy, in the widest sense, is the science of the laws governing the production and exchange of the material means of subsistence in human society. Production and exchange are two different functions. Production may occur without exchange, but exchange — being necessarily an exchange of products—cannot occur without production. Each of these two social functions is subject to the action of external influences that to a great extent are peculiar to it and for this reason each has, also to a great extent, its own special laws. But on the other hand, they constantly determine and influence each other.

Political economy is therefore essentially a *historical* science. It deals with material that is historical, that is, constantly changing; it must first investigate the special laws of each individual stage in the evolution of production and exchange, and only when it has completed this investigation will it be able to establish the few quite general laws that hold good for production and exchange in general. At the same time it goes without saying that the laws that are valid for definite modes of production and forms of exchange hold good for all historical periods in which these modes of production and forms of exchange prevail.

Dühring states his position as follows: The relation between general politics and the forms of economic law is determined in so definite and at the same time so *original* a way that it would not be superfluous, in order to facilitate study, to make special reference to this point. The formation of *political* relationships is, *historically, the*

fundamental fact, and the *economic* conditions dependent on this are only an *effect* or a particular case, and are consequently always *facts of the second order*.

2. *Dühring believes that the political conditions are the decisive cause of the economic situation. According to him, all economic phenomena must be explained by political causes, that is, by force. What does Engels has to say about this theory?*

JMS: To arrive at his theory of force, Dühring hypothesizes that the cooperative relations between Robinson Crusoe and his man Friday, who are stranded on an island, can become oppressive and exploitative, characterized by Crusoe's use of force against Friday. There is no apparent condition, motive or rationale why there is the resort to force, except as arbitrary or even malicious will, which either one of the two stranded men could have. At any rate, Dühring arbitrarily blames Crusoe for committing the original sin of using force. And this is supposed to be the beginning of all subsequent oppression and exploitation in society. The implication is that the state as organized violence came ahead before the development of unequal and exploitative relations in the mode of production.

Dühring argues: Nothing more than this simple dualism is required to enable us accurately to portray some of the most important relations of distribution and to study their laws in germ in their logical necessity.... Cooperative working on an equal footing is here just as conceivable as the combination of forces through the complete subjection of one party, who is then compelled to render economic service as a slave or as a mere tool and is maintained also only as a tool.... A universal survey of the various historical institutions of justice and injustice is here the essential presupposition.

Engels refutes Dühring as follows: [The question arises: how did Crusoe come to enslave Friday? Just for the pleasure of doing it? No such thing. On the contrary, we see that Friday "is compelled to render economic service as a slave or as a mere tool and is maintained only as a tool." Crusoe enslaved Friday only in order that Friday should work for Crusoe's benefit. And how can Crusoe derive any benefit for himself from Friday's labor? Only through Friday

producing by his labor more of the necessaries of life than Crusoe has to give him to keep him in a fit state to work....

The childish example specifically selected by Herr Dühring in order to prove that force is “historically the fundamental fact,” in reality, therefore, proves that force is only the means, and that the aim is economic advantage. And inasmuch as the aim is “more fundamental” than the means to secure it, so in history the economic side of the relationship is much more fundamental than the political side. The example therefore proves precisely the opposite of what it was supposed to prove.

3. Was force the root of slavery and private property? Why or why not? How about the development of capitalism from feudalism – was it the political or the economical development that was decisive?

JMS: Engels asserts that production and its development take precedence over the emergence of force as a means of social control. He declares: In order to make use of a slave, a man must possess two kinds of things: first, the instruments and material for his slave’s labor; and secondly, the minimum necessaries of life for him. Therefore, before slavery becomes possible, a certain level of production must already have been reached and a certain inequality of distribution must already have appeared.

Engels proceeded to show how inequality can arise in society without force: Historically, private property by no means makes its appearance as the result of robbery or violence. On the contrary. It already existed, even though it was limited to certain objects, in the ancient primitive communes of all civilized peoples. It developed within these communes, at first through barter with strangers, till it reached the form of commodities. The more the products of the commune assumed the commodity form, that is, the less they were produced for their producers’ own use, and the more for the purpose of exchange, the more the primitive natural division of labor was replaced by exchange also within the commune, the more inequality developed in the property of the individual members of the commune.

The use of iron tools, the growth of agriculture and animal breeding and the emergence of a patriarchal system of private property in the late barbaric stage of the primitive communal society

prepared the means for keeping captives as slaves instead of killing them and for instituting the slave system. The slave masters adopted feudalism as the more favorable system for them when the landed estates expanded to an extent it was difficult to manage the slaves and prevent them from running away. Thus, the slaves were converted to serfs due to the economic considerations.

Capitalism grew within the womb of feudalism, with the development of handicrafts, manufacturing, machines, commerce and the growth of towns and cities before the bourgeoisie raised the flag of revolt against the feudal monarchy and aristocracy in France. In England and some other European countries, the bourgeoisie and the feudalists could compromise on a domestic balance of power and even collaborate in colonial adventures in the furtherance of mercantile capitalism and further primitive accumulation of capital.

4. According to Engels, force is conditioned by the economic situation, which furnishes the means for the equipment and maintenance of the instruments of force, such as the army and the navy. What examples did he state to elaborate on this?

JMS: Engels takes note of the following: “Crusoe enslaved Friday ‘sword in hand.’ From where did he get the sword? Even on the imaginary islands of Crusoe stories, swords have not, up to now, grown on trees, and Herr Dühring gives us no answer whatever to this question.” If it’s just a matter of finding a weapon, then Friday might just as easily have become the master and not the slave had he found a sword first—or better yet, a pistol!

So, then, the revolver triumphs over the sword; and this will probably make even the most childish axiomatician comprehend that force is no mere act of the will, but requires very real preliminary conditions before it can come into operation, that is to say, instruments, the more perfect of which vanquish the less perfect; moreover, that these instruments have to be produced, which also implies that the producer of more perfect instruments of force...vanquishes the producer of the less perfect instrument, and that, in a word, the triumph of force is based on the production of arms, and this in turn on production in general—therefore on “economic power,” and on the “economic order,” on the material means that force has at its disposal.

To make further fun out of Dühring's silly society of two men, let me comment that even if Friday could not find a pistol to overpower the sword all that Friday needed was to exercise his will, pretend to sleep and keep awake until he could grab the sword when Crusoe would already be in deep slumber. It takes more than the will to use force to be able to dominate a certain society or a number of countries as in colonialism and imperialism. There is the prior requirement of having an army and navy, which are equipped with the instruments of war produced by the economic system.

At any rate, Engels declares: Relations of domination arose not because someone decided one day to forcibly enslave someone else, but as a product of material changes. The growth of human productivity, particularly with the rise of agriculture, both required and made possible a surplus that could sustain larger, more sedentary populations and a greater division of labor. The most significant division of labor was that between those who performed work and those entrusted by the society as a whole with guardianship over the surplus and over the maintenance of the necessary conditions of production. At some moment, however, these functions aimed at serving society at large were transformed into positions of *lordship* over society; the guardians and dispensers of the surplus became the *controllers and appropriators* of the surplus, who then employed coercive means, when necessary, to maintain their control.

Engels also berates Dühring for considering force as an "absolute evil," the "original sin" by which all problems of society can be explained. He points out that force can also play a positive role, as "the midwife of every old society pregnant with a new one, that it is the instrument with the aid of which social movement forces its way through and shatters the dead, fossilized political forms." Engels scolds Dühring in the following manner: It is only with sighs and groans that [Dühring] admits the possibility that force will perhaps be necessary for the overthrow of an economic system of exploitation—unfortunately, because all use of force demoralizes the person who uses it. And this in spite of the immense moral and spiritual impetus which has been given by every victorious revolution!

5. *What is the Marxist theory of value? And what is Dühring's theory of value if any?*

JMS: Like Adam Smith and David Ricardo before them, Marx and Engels teach us that the value of a commodity is the average labor-time embodied by it or imparted to it by the workers. Dühring gives us as many as five theories of value: the production value, which comes from nature; or the distribution value, which man's wickedness has created and which is distinguished by the fact that it is measured by the expenditure of energy, which is not contained in it; or thirdly, the value that is measured by labor-time; or fourthly, the value that is measured by the costs of reproduction; or lastly, the value that is measured by wages.

You do not have to remember all or any these five conflicting theories and be confused by Dühring's too many theories that he offers like wild shots. He seems to hit the mark with one of the shots by mentioning "value that is measured by labour time". But Engels points out: In so far as there is a meaning in this, it is: The value of a product of labour is determined by the labor-time necessary for its production; and we knew that long ago, even without Herr Dühring. Instead of stating the fact simply, he has to twist it into an oracular saying.

It is simply wrong to say that the dimensions in which anyone invests his energies in anything (to keep to the bombastic style) is the immediate determining cause of value and of the magnitude of value. In the first place, it depends on what thing the energy is put into, and secondly, how the energy is put into it. If someone makes a thing that has no use-value for other people, his whole energy does not produce an atom of value; and if he is stiff-necked enough to produce by hand an object that a machine produces twenty times cheaper, nineteen-twentieths of the energy he put into it produces neither value in general nor any particular magnitude of value.

6. Why is Dühring's critique of Marx on simple and compound labor incorrect?

JMS: According to Dühring, Marx's theory of value is "nothing but the ordinary ... theory that labour is the cause of all values and labor-time is their measure. But the question of how the distinct value of so-called skilled labour is to be conceived is left in complete obscurity. It is true that in our theory also only the labor-time expended can be the measure of the natural cost and therefore of

the absolute value of economic things; but here the labor-time of each individual must be considered absolutely equal, to start with, and it is only necessary to examine where, in skilled production, the labor-time of other persons ... for example in the tool used, is added to the separate labor-time of the individual.

Engels refutes Dühring as follows: Marx is examining what it is that determines the value of *commodities* and gives the answer: the human labour embodied in them. This, he continues, “is the expenditure of simple labor-power, which, on an average, apart from any special development, exists in the organism of every ordinary individual... Skilled labour counts only as simple labour intensified, or rather, as multiplied simple labour, a given quantity of skilled being considered equal to a greater quantity of simple labour. Experience shows that this reduction is constantly being made. A commodity may be the product of the most skilled labour, but its value, by equating it to the product of simple unskilled labour, represents a definite quantity of the latter labour alone. The different proportions in which different sorts of labour are reduced to unskilled labour as their standard, are established by a social process that goes on behind the backs of the producers, and, consequently, appear to be fixed by custom”.

Marx is dealing here first of all only with the determination of the value of *commodities*, i.e., of objects which, within a society composed of private producers, are produced and exchanged against each other by these private producers for their private account. In this passage therefore there is no question whatever of absolute value;—wherever this may be in existence—but of the value which is current in a definite form of society. This value, in this definite historical sense, is shown to be created and measured by the human labour embodied in the individual commodities, and this human labour is further shown to be the expenditure of simple labor-power.

But not all labour is a mere expenditure of simple human labor-power; very many sorts of labour involve the use of capabilities or knowledge acquired with the expenditure of greater or lesser effort, time and money. Do these kinds of compound labour produce, in the same interval of time, the same commodity values as simple labour,

the expenditure of mere simple labor-power? Obviously not. The product of one hour of compound labour is a commodity of a higher value—perhaps double or treble — in comparison with the product of one hour of simple labour. The values of the products of compound labour are expressed by this comparison in definite quantities of simple labour; but this reduction of compound labour is established by a social process which goes on behind the backs of the producers, by a process which at this point, in the development of the theory of value, can only be stated but not as yet explained.

7. How does Dühring misrepresent Marx? And how does Engels explain what is capital and how it grows by extracting surplus value?

JMS: Dühring misrepresents Marx in the following words: “To begin with, Herr Marx does not hold the accepted economic view of capital, namely, that it is a means of production already produced; on the contrary, he tries to get up a more special, dialectical-historical idea that toys with metamorphoses of concepts and history. According to him, capital is born of money, it forms a historical phase opening with the sixteenth century, that is, with the first beginnings of a world market, which presumably appeared at that period.

Engels refutes the misrepresentation of Marx by Dühring by explaining what is capital and surplus value: In the analysis which Marx makes of the economic forms within which the process of the circulation of commodities takes place, money appears as the final form. “This final product of the circulation of commodities is the *first form in which capital appears*. As a matter of history, capital, as opposed to landed property, invariably takes the form at first of money; it appears as moneyed wealth, as the capital of the merchant and of the usurer... We can see it daily under our very eyes. All new capital, to commence with, comes on the stage, that is, on the market, whether of commodities, labour, or money, even in our days, in the shape of money that by a definite process has to be transformed into capital.” Here once again Marx is stating a fact. Unable to dispute it, Herr Dühring distorts it: Capital, he has Marx say, is born of money!

Marx then investigates the processes by which money is transformed into capital, and finds, first, that the form in which money circulates as capital is the inversion of the form in which it circulates

as the general equivalent of commodities. The simple owner of commodities sells in order to buy; he sells what he does not need, and with the money thus procured he buys what he does need. The incipient capitalist starts by buying what he does *not* need himself; he buys in order to sell, and to sell at a higher price, in order to get back the value of the money originally thrown into the transaction, augmented by an increment in money; and Marx calls this increment *surplus-value*.

Whence comes this surplus-value? It cannot come either from the buyer buying the commodities under their value, or from the seller selling them above their value. For in both cases the gains and the losses of each individual cancel each other, as each individual is in turn buyer and seller. Nor can it come from cheating, for though cheating can enrich one person at the expense of another, it cannot increase the total sum possessed by both, and therefore cannot augment the sum of the values in circulation. "The capitalist class, as a whole, in any country, cannot over-reach themselves."

And yet we find that in each country the capitalist class as a whole is continuously enriching itself before our eyes, by selling dearer than it had bought, by appropriating to itself surplus-value. We are therefore just where we were at the start: whence comes this surplus-value? This problem must be solved, and it must be solved in a *purely economic* way, excluding all cheating and the intervention of any force—the problem being: how is it possible constantly to sell dearer than one has bought, even on the hypothesis that equal values are always exchanged for equal values?

The solution of this problem was the most epoch-making achievement of Marx's work. It spread the clear light of day through economic domains in which socialists no less than bourgeois economists previously groped in utter darkness. Scientific socialism dates from the discovery of this solution and has been built up around it.

8. How does Dühring distort Marx's theory on capital and surplus value?

Dühring describes as earnings of capital the entirety of the surplus value created by labor power and he proceeds to misinterpret surplus value in the following way: "In Herr Marx's view,

wages represent only the payment of that labor-time during which the laborer is actually working to make his own existence possible. But only a small number of hours is required for this purpose; all the rest of the working-day, often so prolonged, yields a surplus in which is contained what our author calls 'surplus-value', or, expressed in everyday language, the earnings of capital. If we leave out of account the labor-time which at each stage of production is already contained in the instruments of labour and in the pertinent raw material, this surplus part of the working-day is the share which falls to the capitalist entrepreneur. The prolongation of the working-day is consequently earnings of pure exploitation for the benefit of the capitalist”.

Engels immediately tells Herr Dühring that Marx's surplus-value is not just profit or the earnings of capital. It includes profit but includes other parts, such as rent and interest. He quotes from Marx: “The capitalist who produces surplus-value—i.e., who extracts unpaid labour directly from the laborers, and fixes it in commodities, is, indeed, the first appropriator, but by no means the ultimate owner, of this surplus-value. He has to share it with capitalists, with landowners, etc., who fulfil other functions in the complex of social production. Surplus-value, therefore, splits up into various parts. Its fragments fall to various categories of persons, and take various forms, independent the one of the other, such as profit, interest, merchants' profit, rent, etc.”

Marx also points out as one of Ricardo's main shortcomings in his study of value that he “has not {...} investigated surplus-value as such, i.e., independently of its particular forms, such as profit, rent, etc.”, and that he therefore lumps together the laws of the rate of surplus-value and the laws of the rate of profit.

9. What is the particularity of land rent in England in that time? What is Dühring's idea on land rent and how does it differ from Engels'?

JMS: Engels points out that the theory of land rent is a part of political economy which is specifically English, and necessarily so, because it was only in England that there existed a mode of production under which rent had in fact been separated from profit and interest. In England, as is well known, large landed estates and

large-scale agriculture predominate. The landlords lease their land in large, often very large, farms, to tenant-farmers who possess sufficient capital to work them and, unlike our peasants, do not work themselves but employ the labour of hands and day-laborers on the lines of full-fledged capitalist entrepreneurs. Here, therefore, we have the three classes of bourgeois society and the form of income peculiar to each: the landlord, drawing rent of land; the capitalist, drawing profit; and the laborer, drawing wages.

It has never occurred to any English economist to regard the farmer's earnings as a kind of wages, as *seems* to Herr Dühring to be the case; even less could it be *hazardous* for such an economist to assert that the farmer's profit is what it indisputably, obviously and tangibly is, namely, profit on capital. It is perfectly ridiculous to say that the question of what the farmer's earnings actually are has never been raised in this definite form. In England there has never been any necessity even to raise this question; both question and answer have long been available, derived from the facts themselves, and since Adam Smith there has never been any doubt about them.

Engels make fun of the so-called "fundamental laws" that Mr. Dühring claimed to have discovered: Law No. 1. "The productivity of the economic instruments, natural resources and human energy is increased by *inventions* and *discoveries*"; Law No. 2. Division of Labour: "The cleaving of trades and the dissection of activities raises the productivity of labour"; Law No. 3. "*Distance and transport* are the chief causes which hinder or facilitate the co-operation of the productive forces"; Law No. 4. "The industrial state has an incomparably greater population capacity than the agricultural state"; and Law No. 5. "In the economy nothing takes place without a material interest".

Engel dismisses these co-called laws as mere platitudes referring to facts that have been known, recognized and spelled out by so many long before Dühring could claim them as his original discoveries. And Engels ridicules them as axioms that cannot serve as the foundation of the scientific study of political economy as previously proclaimed by Dühring.

He then proceeds to expose Dühring's ignorance of English capitalist farming and his misunderstanding of the concept and

theory of land rent: Herr Dühring comes up against both English farmer's profit and the division, based on English farming and recognized by all classical political economy, of that surplus-product into rent of land and farmer's profit, and hence against the *pure*, precise conception of rent. What does Herr Dühring do? He pretends not to have the slightest inkling of the division of the surplus-product of agriculture into farmer's profit and rent, and therefore of the whole rent theory of classical political economy; he pretends that the question of what farmer's profit really is has never yet been raised "in this definite form" , that at issue is a subject which has never yet been investigated and about which there is no knowledge but only illusion and uncertainty.

10. What is the overall and final result of Engels' analysis of Dühring's "very own system" of political economy?

JMS: Engels declares the following conclusively: What, then, is the final result of our analysis of Dühring's "very own system" of political economy? Nothing, except the fact that with all the great words and the still more mighty promises we are just as much duped as we were in the *Philosophy*. His theory of value, this "touchstone of the worth of economic systems", amounts to this: that by value Herr Dühring understands five totally different and directly contradictory things, and, therefore, to put it at its best, himself does not know what he wants.

The "natural laws of all economics", ushered in with such pomp, prove to be merely universally familiar and often not even properly understood platitudes of the worst description. The sole explanation of economic facts which his "very own" system can give us is that they are the result of "force", a term with which the philistine of all nations has for thousands of years consoled himself for everything unpleasant that happens to him, and which leaves us just where we were.

Instead however of investigating the origin and effects of this force, Herr Dühring expects us to content ourselves gratefully with the mere *word* "force" as the last final cause and ultimate explanation of all economic phenomena. Compelled further to elucidate capitalist exploitation of labour, he first represents it in a general way as based on taxes and price surcharges, thereby

completely appropriating the Proudhonian “deduction” (*prélèvement*), and then proceeding to explain it in detail by means of Marx’s theory of surplus-labor, surplus-product and surplus-value. In this way he manages to bring about a happy reconciliation of two totally contradictory modes of outlook, by copying down both without taking his breath.

And just as in philosophy he could not find enough hard words for the very Hegel whom he was so constantly exploiting and at the same time emasculating, so in the *Kritische Geschichte* the most baseless calumination of Marx only serves to conceal the fact that everything in the *Cursus* about capital and labour which makes any sense at all is likewise an emasculated plagiarism of Marx.

His ignorance, which in the *Cursus* puts the “large landowner” at the beginning of the history of the civilized peoples, and knows not a word of the common ownership of land in the tribal and village communities, which is the real starting-point of all history — this ignorance, at the present day almost incomprehensible, is well-nigh surpassed by the ignorance which, in the *Kritische Geschichte*, thinks not little of itself because of “the universal breadth of its historical survey”, and of which we have given only a few deterrent examples. In a word: first the colossal “effort” of self-admiration, of charlatan blasts on his own trumpet, of promises each surpassing the other; and then the “result” —exactly nil.

Discussion of Anti-Dühring by Friedrich Engels

Part III On Socialism

Questions by Host Anghelo Godino

Answers by Jose Maria Sison

of Anakbayan-Europa NDLine Online School

November 22, 2020

1. Can you give us an overview of Part III of Anti-Dühring on socialism?

JMS: In Part III of Anti-Dühring, Engels gives us the materialist history of the development of the ideas of socialism. This is the focus on Chapter 1 – on the Historical. In Chapter 2 – on the Theoretical, he presents the materialist conception of history and of the contradictions in capitalism. And in Chapter 3 – on Production, Chapter 4 – on Distribution and Chapter 5 – on the State, Family and Education. He refutes Dühring’s idealist conception and fantasy plans for a “new socialitarian system” detached from history and social reality.

2. According to Engels, what did the philosophers of the French Enlightenment envision? How far did the French revolution realize the Rule of Reason?

JMS: Engels states: “...the French philosophers of the 18th century, the forerunners of the (French) Revolution, appealed to reason as the sole judge of all that is. A rational government, rational society, were to be founded; everything that ran counter to eternal reason was to be remorselessly done away with. We saw also that this eternal reason was in reality nothing but the idealized understanding of the eighteenth century citizen, just then evolving into the bourgeois. The French Revolution had realized this rational society and government.”

Engels states further: “But, the new order of things, rational enough as compared with earlier conditions, turned out to be by no means absolutely rational. The state based upon reason completely collapsed. Rousseau’s Social Contract had found its realization in

the Reign of Terror, from which the bourgeoisie, who had lost confidence in their own political capacity, had taken refuge first in the corruption of the Directorate, and, finally, under the wing of the Napoleonic despotism. The promised eternal peace was turned into an endless war of conquest.”

The society based upon reason had fared no better. It became the rule of bourgeois reason, bringing about the antagonism between rich and poor, instead of dissolving into general prosperity. This had become intensified by the removal of the guild and other privileges, which had to some extent bridged it over, and by the removal of the charitable institutions of the Church. The development of industry upon a capitalistic basis made poverty and misery of the working masses conditions of existence of society. The number of crimes increased from year to year.

3. How does Engels treat the disappointing events in the French Revolution? And how does he present the conditions of the French revolution and the extent of capitalist development as limitations on the views of the utopian socialists even if well-meaning?

JMS: Engels observes: “All that was wanting was the men to formulate this disappointment and they came with the turn of the century. In 1802 Saint-Simon’s Geneva letters appeared; in 1808 appeared Fourier’s first work, although the groundwork of his theory dated from 1799; on January 1, 1800, Robert Owen undertook the direction of New Lanark.”

At this time, however, the capitalist mode of production, and with it the antagonism between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat, was still very incompletely developed. Modern industry, which had just arisen in England, was still unknown in France. But modern industry develops, on the one hand, the conflicts which make absolutely necessary a revolution in the mode of production, conflicts not only between the classes begotten of it, but also between the very productive forces and the forms of exchange created by it. And, on the other hand, it develops, in these very gigantic productive forces, the means of ending these conflicts. If, therefore, about the year 1800, the conflicts arising from the new social order were only just beginning to take shape, this holds still more fully as to the means of ending them.

The propertyless masses of Paris, during the Reign of Terror, were able to gain the mastery for a moment. But, in doing so, they only proved how impossible it was for their domination to last under the conditions then. The proletariat, which then for the first time evolved itself from these propertyless masses as the nucleus of a new class, as yet quite incapable of independent political action, appeared as an oppressed, suffering estate, to whom, in its incapacity to help itself, help could, at best, be brought in from without or down from above.

This historical situation also dominated the founders of socialism. To the crude conditions of capitalist production and the crude class conditions corresponded crude theories. The solution of the social problems, which as yet lay hidden in undeveloped economic conditions, the utopians attempted to evolve out of the human brain. Society presented nothing but wrongs; to remove these was the task of reason. It was necessary, then, to discover a new and more perfect system of social order and to impose this upon society from without by propaganda, and, wherever it was possible, by the example of model experiments. These new social systems were foredoomed as utopian; the more completely they were worked out in detail, the more they could not avoid drifting off into pure fantasies.

4. What is the Engels' comment on Dühring's view of the utopian socialists? What is Engels' evaluation of the utopian socialists Saint Simon, Fourier and Owen?

JMS: Engels dismisses as quibbling Dühring's remarks of contempt for the fantasies of the utopian socialists and his failure to recognize their concern for the poor and oppressed, their honestly good intention and efforts: "We can leave it to the literary small fry à la Dühring to solemnly quibble over these fantasies, which today only make us smile, and to crow over the superiority of their own bald reasoning, as compared with such 'insanity'. For ourselves, we delight in the stupendously grand thoughts and germs of thought that everywhere break out through their fantastic covering, and to which these philistines are blind."

Engels evaluates each of the utopian socialists Saint Simon, Fourier and Owen. He appreciates them for striving to make a better use of reason in the service of the oppressed and exploited working

men and women even as he notes the utopian character of their ideas of socialism.

Engels gives Saint Simon the credit for recognizing the French Revolution as a class war between nobility, bourgeoisie, and the non-possessors. This was, in the year 1802, a most pregnant discovery. In 1816, Saint Simon declares further that politics is the science of production, and foretells the complete absorption of politics by economics. The knowledge that economic conditions are the basis of political institutions appears here only in embryo. Yet what is here already very plainly expressed is the idea of the future conversion of political rule over men into an administration of things and a direction of processes of production — that is to say, the “abolition of the state,” about which recently there has been so much noise.

If in Saint-Simon we find a comprehensive breadth of view, by virtue of which almost all the ideas of later Socialists, that are not strictly economic, are found in him in embryo, we find in Fourier a criticism of the existing conditions of society, genuinely French and witty, but not upon that account any the less thorough. Fourier takes the bourgeoisie, their inspired prophets before the Revolution, and their interested eulogists after it, at their own word. He lays bare remorselessly the material and moral misery of the bourgeois world. He confronts it with the philosophers’ dazzling promises of a society in which reason alone should reign, of a civilization in which happiness should be universal, of an illimitable human perfectibility, and with the rose-colored phraseology of the bourgeois ideologists of his time.

Still more masterly is his criticism of the bourgeois form of the relations between the sexes, and the position of woman in bourgeois society. He was the first to declare that in any given society the degree of woman’s emancipation is the natural measure of the general emancipation. But Fourier is at his greatest in his conception of the history of society. He divides its whole course, thus far, into four stages of evolution — savagery, the patriarchate, barbarism and civilization.

Fourier, as we see, uses the dialectic method in the same masterly way as his contemporary, Hegel. Using these same

dialectics, he argues against the talk about illimitable human perfectibility, that every historical phase has its period of ascent and also its period of descent, and he applies this observation to the future of the whole human race. As Kant introduced into natural science the idea of the ultimate destruction of the earth, Fourier introduced into historical science that of the ultimate destruction of the human race.

Robert Owen had adopted the teaching of the materialistic philosophers: that man's character is the product, on the one hand, of heredity; on the other, of the environment of the individual during his lifetime, and especially during his period of development. In the Industrial Revolution most of his class saw only chaos and confusion, and the opportunity of fishing in these troubled waters and making large fortunes quickly.

He saw in it the opportunity of putting into practice his favorite theory, and so of bringing order out of chaos. He had already tried it with success, as superintendent of more than five hundred men in a Manchester factory. From 1800 to 1829, he directed the great cotton-mill at New Lanark, in Scotland, as managing partner, along the same lines, but with greater freedom of action and with a success that made him a European reputation.

His advance in the direction of communism was the turning-point in Owen's life. As long as he was simply a philanthropist, he was rewarded with nothing but wealth, applause, honor, and glory. He was the most popular man in Europe. Not only men of his own class, but statesmen and princes listened to him approvingly. But when he came out with his communist theories, that was quite another thing. To him, three great obstacles especially block the path to social reform: private property, religion, the present form of marriage.

He knew what confronted him if he attacked these — outlawry, excommunication from official society, the loss of his whole social position. But nothing of this prevented him from attacking them without fear of consequences, and what he had foreseen happened. Banished from official society, with a conspiracy of silence against him in the press, ruined by his unsuccessful communist experiments in America, in which he sacrificed all his fortune, he turned directly to

the working class and continued working in their midst for thirty years.

Every social movement, every real advance in England on behalf of the workers links itself on to the name of Robert Owen. He forced through in 1819, after five years' fighting, the first law limiting the hours of labor for women and children in factories. He was president of the first congress at which all the Trade Union stage and puts forward his claim to an "authoritative" system of a new social order — not evolved out of the historically developed material at his disposal, as its necessary result —but constructed in his sovereign head, in his mind, pregnant with ultimate truths.

5. In Dühring's "new socialitarian system," the capitalist mode of production is quite good, and can remain in existence, but the capitalist mode of distribution is of evil, and must disappear. Why is this statement wrong and harmful according to Engels?

JMS: A priori Dühring draws from his head the "universal principle of justice" to draw up his "new socialitarian system." But in fact he considers as good the capitalist mode of production in which the workers are exploited, with the capitalist extracting the surplus value. He does not mind that the capitalist exploits the workers and does not say how the latter can free themselves from exploitation. He completely ignores the fact that the value of the commodity is created by the labor power of the workers in the work place.

It is the capitalist mode of distribution which he considers evil and he asserts that the workers have the right to consume all that they produce and must be compensated accordingly. He wishes that the capitalist does not extract anything and the enterprise always remains where it begins with the capitalist standing by to watch the means of production depreciate and become exhausted. In the socialitarian system, there are no savings to be made for simple or expanded reproduction and for other requirements to maintain the enterprise. Dühring builds a pure fantasy world.

Engels points out: "Accumulation is completely forgotten. Even worse, as accumulation is a social necessity and the retention of money provides a convenient form of accumulation, the organization of the economic commune directly impels its members to accumulate privately, and thereby leads it to its own destruction."

Engels further states: “We now find that Herr Dühring’s ‘socialitarian’ system is nothing more than the carrying through of this principle in fantasy. In fact, it turned out that Herr Dühring has practically nothing to take exception to in the mode of production of England united in a single great trade association.” The utopians, we saw, were utopians because they could be nothing else at a time when capitalist production was as yet so little developed. They necessarily had to construct the elements of a new society out of their own heads, because within the old society the elements of the new were not as yet generally apparent; for the basic plan of the new edifice they could only appeal to reason, just because they could not as yet appeal to contemporary history. But when now, almost eighty years after their time, Herr Dühring steps on to the— as such — of capitalist society, that he wants to retain the old division of labor in all its essentials, and that he consequently has hardly a word to say in regard to production within his economic commune.

6. How does Engels explain the value of the commodity and the functions of production and distribution in the economy?

JMS: According to Engels: “The only value known in economics is the value of commodities. What are commodities? Products made in a society of more or less separate private producers, and therefore in the first place private products. These private products, however, become commodities only when they are made, not for consumption by their producers, but for consumption by others, that is, for social consumption; they enter into social consumption through exchange. The private producers are therefore socially interconnected, constitute a society. Their products, although the private products of each individual, are therefore simultaneously but unintentionally and as it were involuntarily, also social products.”

In what, then, consists the social character of these private products? Evidently in two peculiarities: first, that they all satisfy some human want, have a use-value not only for the producers but also for others, and secondly, that although they are products of the most varied individual labor, they are at the same time products of human labor as such, of general human labor. In so far as they have a use-value also for other persons, they can, generally speaking enter into exchange; in so far as general human labor, the simple

expenditure of human labor-power is incorporated in all of them, they can be compared with each other in exchange, be assumed to be equal or unequal, according to the quantity of this labor embodied in each.

In two equal products made individually, social conditions being equal, an unequal quantity of individual labor may be contained, but always only an equal quantity of general human labor. An unskilled smith may make five horseshoes in the time a skillful smith makes ten. But society does not form value from the accidental lack of skill of an individual, it recognizes as general human labor only labor of a normal average degree of skill at the particular time. In exchange therefore, one of the five horseshoes made by the first smith has no more value than one of the ten made by the other in an equal time. Individual labor contains general human labor only in so far as it is socially necessary.

Therefore, when I say that a commodity has a particular value, I say (1) that it is a socially useful product; (2) that it has been produced by a private individual for private account, (3) that although a product of individual labor, it is nevertheless at the same time and as it were unconsciously and involuntarily, also a product of social labor and, be it noted, of a definite quantity of this labor, ascertained in a social way, through exchange; (4) I express this quantity not in labor itself, in so and so many labor-hours, but in another commodity.

Money is already contained in embryo in the concept of value; it is value, only in developed form. But since the value of commodities, as opposed to the commodities themselves, assumes independent existence in money, a new factor appears in the society which produces and exchanges commodities, a factor with new social functions and effects. We need only state this point at the moment, without going more closely into it.

The concept of value is the most general and therefore the most comprehensive expression of the economic conditions of commodity production. Consequently, this concept contains the germ, not only of money, but also of all the more developed forms of the production and exchange of commodities. The fact that value is the expression of the social labor contained in the privately produced products itself

creates the possibility of a difference arising between this social labor and the private labor contained in these same products.

Once the commodity-producing society has further developed the value form, which is inherent in commodities as such, to the money form, various germs still hidden in value break through to the light of day. The first and most essential effect is the generalization of the commodity form. Money forces the commodity form even on the objects which have hitherto been produced directly for self-consumption; it drags them into exchange.

7. What is the material basis of socialism? How does socialism arise from the contradictions within capitalism?

JMS: Engels teaches us that socialism is not an ideal but is based on the actual contradictions of capitalism: "The new forces of production have already outgrown the bourgeois form of using them; and this conflict between the productive forces and the mode of production is not a conflict which has arisen in men's heads, as for example the conflict between original sin and divine justice; but it exists in the facts, objectively, outside of us, independently of the will or purpose even of the men who brought it about. Modern socialism is nothing but the reflex in thought of this actual conflict, its ideal reflection in the minds first of the class which is directly suffering under it—the working class."

As exploiting class, the capitalists extract surplus value from the working class. On their path of advance, working people who own their means of production are swept away. Engels explains: "[A]s soon as the means of production had become social and were concentrated in the hands of the capitalists, this situation changed. Both the means of production and the products of the small, individual producer lost more and more of their value; there was nothing left for him to do but to go to the capitalist and work for wages. Wage labor, hitherto an exception and subsidiary, became the rule and the basic form of all production; hitherto an auxiliary occupation, it now became the laborer's exclusive activity. The occasional wage worker became the wage worker for life."

The laws of commodity production dominate society. Competition also reigns in the marketplace, unplanned and anarchic beyond any individual's control. Engels explains: "These laws... enforce

themselves on the individual producers as compulsory laws of competition. At first, therefore, they are unknown even to these producers, and have to be discovered by them gradually, only through long experience. They assert themselves apart from the producers and against the producers, as the natural laws of their form of production, working blindly. The product dominates the producers.”

The laws of the market compel each capitalist to constantly revolutionize the means of production, turning “the infinite perfectibility of the machine in large-scale industry into a compulsory commandment for each individual industrial capitalist to make his machinery more and more perfect, under penalty of ruin.” These improvements in machinery, “the most powerful instrument for shortening labor-time,” which under different conditions would be a means to free the mass of people from long hours of toil, under capitalism become “the most unfailing means for placing every moment of the laborer’s time and that of his family at the disposal of the capitalist.”

Engels points out that the resulting explosion of human productivity lays the real, material foundation for a planned society based on the free development of all human beings. Instead of working more, increased productivity can mean that we all work less. He states: “Today this is no longer a fantasy, no longer a pious wish. The present development of the productive forces is already adequate as the basis on which the increase in production which must follow from the socialization of the productive forces—the abolition of the barriers and disturbing factors and of the waste of products and means of production—can reduce the time required for labor, with every individual taking his share, to what on our present conceptions would be a small amount.”

Capitalist economic expansion enslaves workers to the machine, and creates unplanned disruptions. The capitalist system goes periodically into crisis as the wage conditions depress the market and the profit rate tends to fall, as the “expansion of the market cannot keep pace with the expansion of production.” “By degrees the pace quickens; it becomes a trot; the industrial trot passes into a gallop, and the gallop in turn passes into the mad onrush of a

complete industrial commercial, credit, and speculative steeplechase, only to land again in the end, after the most breakneck jumps—in the ditch of a crash.”

Thus, the idea for solving these crises through socialist transformation comes from capitalism’s own tendency to socialize production. Engels points out: “Both the period of industrial boom, with its unlimited credit inflation, and the crisis itself through the collapse of great capitalist establishments, urge forward towards that form of the socialization of huge masses of means of production which we find in the various joint-stock companies.”

The capitalist system socializes the character of production and also creates and enlarges the modern industrial proletariat which has the motive and opportunity to revolutionize society through their collective action. Engels declares: “By more and more transforming the great majority of the population into proletarians, the capitalist mode of production brings into being the force which, under penalty of its own destruction, is compelled to carry out this revolution... The proletariat seizes the State power, and transforms the means of production in the first instance into State property.”

8. Does state ownership of industry necessarily mean the emergence of socialism? What more ought to be done to arrive at socialism?

JMS: Of course, the capitalist class can use the capitalist state to shore up the crisis-stricken capitalist economy with financial bailouts and stimulus packages and even go as far as to acquire ownership of failing enterprises. Engels points out that state ownership of industry in and of itself did not constitute socialism: “The modern state, whatever its form, is an essentially capitalist machine; it is the state of the capitalists, the ideal collective body of all capitalists. The more productive forces it takes over, the more it becomes the real collective body of all the capitalists, the more citizens it exploits. The workers remain wage-earners, proletarians. The capitalist relationship is not abolished; it is rather pushed to an extreme.”

Engels teaches us that even though states always present themselves as representatives of the whole society, in truth every state has a class character. The state actually arose “for the forcible holding down of the exploited classes in the conditions of

oppression... determined by the existing mode of production.” And he put forward the prognosis that after the working-class revolution establishes and develops socialism the road is paved for the withering of the state in the absence of any class to be held in subjection. The interference of the state power in social relations becomes superfluous in one sphere after another, and then ceases of itself. The government of persons is replaced by the administration of things and the direction of the process of production. The state is not “abolished,” it withers away.

9. How does Engels differentiate the Marxist world view from the viewpoints of Dühring?

JMS: Engels refutes Dühring’s idealist thinking and a priori propositions which are detached from history and reality. Engels lays out the Marxist world view: historical materialism. In doing so, he uses a dialectical and materialist method to explain the development of their ideas and those of the socialist movement generally. Unlike Dühring, who arrogantly looks down on all other thinkers, Marx and Engels acknowledge their debt to their predecessors.

Engels appreciates Hegel in the following words: “The whole natural, historical, and spiritual world was presented as a process, that is, as in constant motion, change, transformation, and development; and the attempt was made to show the internal interconnections in this motion and development. From this standpoint the history of mankind no longer appeared as a confused whirl of senseless deeds of violence... but as the process of development of humanity itself.”

While appreciating the dialectical kernel of Hegel’s thought as a great step forward, Engels points out the idealist character of Hegel’s philosophy: “The realization of the incorrectness of previous German idealism led necessarily to materialism, but, it must be noted, not to the simple metaphysical and exclusively mechanical materialism of the eighteenth century. Instead... modern materialism sees history as the process of the evolution of humanity, and its own problem as the discovery of the laws of this process.”

10. What are Dühring’s ideas on things like religion, education, and family? What are Engel’s critical comments?

JMS: The constitution of the future Dühringian state provides in violation of the freedom of thought and belief: "In the free society there can be no religious worship; for every member of it has got beyond the primitive childish superstition that there are beings, behind nature or above it, who can be influenced by sacrifices or prayers." A "socialitarian system, rightly conceived, has therefore... to abolish all the paraphernalia of religious magic, and therewith all the essential elements of religious worship."

Engels comments: "Religion is being prohibited. Herr Dühring, however, cannot wait until religion dies its natural death. He proceeds in more deep-rooted fashion. He out-Bismarcks Bismarck; he decrees sharper May laws not merely against Catholicism, but against all religion whatsoever; he incites his gendarmes of the future against religion, and thereby helps it to martyrdom and a prolonged lease of life. Wherever we turn, we find specifically Prussian 'socialism'."

After Herr Dühring has thus happily destroyed religion, "man, made to rely solely on himself and nature, and matured in the knowledge of his collective powers, can intrepidly enter on all the roads which the course of events and his own being open to him." Let us now consider for a change what "course of events" the man made to rely on himself can intrepidly enter on, led by Herr Dühring.

Regarding the family, Dühring prescribes the following: "The first course of events whereby man is made to rely on himself is: being born. Then, for the period of natural minority, he remains committed to the "natural tutor of children," his mother. This period may last, as in ancient Roman law, until puberty, that is to say, until about the fourteenth year. Only when badly brought up older boys do not pay proper respect to their mother's authority will recourse be had to paternal assistance, and particularly to the public educational regulations to remedy this. At puberty the child becomes subject to 'the natural guardianship of his father', if there is such a one 'of real and uncontested paternity' otherwise the community appoints a guardian."

Engels comments critically: "Just as Herr Dühring at an earlier point imagined that the capitalist mode of production could be replaced by the socialism without transforming production itself, so

now he fancies that the modern bourgeois family can be torn from its whole economic foundations without changing its entire form. To him, this form is so immutable that he even makes 'ancient Roman law', though in a somewhat 'ennobled' form, govern the family for all time; and he can conceive a family only as a 'bequeathing', which means a possessing unit."

Here the utopians are far in advance of Herr Dühring. They considered that the socialization of youth education and, with this, real freedom in the mutual relations between members of a family, would directly follow from the free association of men and the transformation of private domestic work into a public industry. Moreover, Marx has already shown (*Capital*, Vol. I, p. 515 et seqq.) that "modern industry, by assigning as it does an important part in the socially organized process of production, outside the domestic sphere, to women, to young persons, and to children of both sexes, creates a new economic foundation for a higher form of the family and of the relations between the sexes."

Dühring preaches: "Every dreamer of social reforms naturally has ready a pedagogy corresponding to his new social life." Engels comments critically: "If we are to judge by this thesis, Herr Dühring is 'a veritable monster' among the dreamers of social reforms. For the school of the future occupies his attention at the very least as much as the author's rights, and this is really saying a great deal. He has his curricula for school and university all ready and complete, not only for the whole 'foreseeable future' but also for the transition period. But we will confine ourselves to what will be taught to the young people of both sexes in the final and ultimate socialitarian system."

11. How did Engels express concisely the synthesis made by Marx? And what were his two great discoveries?

JMS: Engels declares: "It was the work of Marx to synthesize German dialectics, English economics, and French materialism into an analysis of the inner process of capitalism. This was done by the discovery of surplus value. It was shown that the appropriation of unpaid labor is the basic form of the capitalist mode of production."

He states further: "These two great discoveries, the materialist conception of history and the revelation of the secret of capitalist

production by means of surplus value, we owe to Marx. With these discoveries, socialism became a science, which had in the first place to be developed in all its details and relations.”

12. Have the teachings of Marx and Engels on socialism been proven in history after their deaths? In view of the success of modern revisionism subverting and overthrowing the proletariat, what is the socialist future?

JMS: The teachings of Marx and Engels have been proven in history, mainly with the socialist revolutions in the Soviet Union and China in the 20th century. These came about as a result of the economic crisis and wars in the era of modern imperialism and the proletarian-socialist revolution. They proved that socialism could arise from conditions of capitalist oppression and exploitation and that it could be established and developed as state and society ruled by the working class.

Although the Soviet and Chinese socialist societies have been subverted by modern revisionism, the addition of China and Russia as two major imperialist powers to the world capitalist system is now rapidly intensifying inter-imperialist contradictions and is generating the conditions for the rise of anti-imperialist and democratic struggles throughout the world and the resurgence of the world proletarian-socialist revolution.

Discussions on Socialism: Utopian and Scientific by Friedrich Engels

Anakbayan-Europa ND Online School
Questions from Anghelo Godino
Answers by Jose Maria Sison
November 29, 2020

1. *Please tell us briefly the context of the time Engels wrote Socialism: Utopian and Scientific. What was the political context at the time that pushed him to write it?*

JMS: As background, let me cite the fact that in the *Communist Manifesto* of 1848, Marx and Engels had already differentiated Scientific Socialism from Utopian Socialism of three kinds:

a. The first kind is Reactionary Socialism which includes the Feudal Socialists, the Petty-Bourgeois Socialists, and the German, or “True” Socialists. All of these groups hanker for a return to the life of the monastery and the guild and reverse the rise of the bourgeoisie and modern Industry, without recognizing the historical process the bourgeoisie represents.

b. The second kind of Socialism is Conservative, or Bourgeois, Socialism. It reflects the desire of a segment of the bourgeois to redress social grievances, in order to guarantee the continued existence of bourgeois society and promote the mutual interest of the workers and the bourgeoisie.

c. The third kind is Critical-Utopian Socialism and Communism. It originated with the first attempts of the proletariat to achieve its own class interest. The attempts were limited by the fact that the proletariat had not yet reached the maturity and economic conditions necessary for emancipation. These socialists therefore looked for social laws, projects and movements to free the proletariat.

It was 1880 when Engels wrote *Socialism; Utopian and Scientific* or extracted parts of *Anti-Dühring* in order to compose it, with the definite purpose of popularizing Scientific Socialism among the workers. Marx agreed with Engels on the need to popularize Scientific Socialism in view of the difficulty of reading the complex text of *Das Capital* and other works of Marx and the commonplace or average notions about socialism circulating which did not distinguish scientific from utopian socialism.

Engels considered it necessary for him to popularize Scientific Socialism because Dühring gained a following within the German Social Democratic Party with his kind of utopianism and fantasies most detached from material reality and social history and yet posing as scientific and mocking the fantasies of the utopian socialists. Engels therefore wrote the *Anti-Dühring* in 1876 to smash the eternal truths from the brain of Dühring and to preempt that someone would someday pose as Moses to interpret the works of Marx.

But *Anti-Dühring* was still difficult reading for the workers. Thus, Engels decided to write *Socialism: Utopian and Scientific* for easier reading. And this became overwhelmingly popular among the workers and the intelligentsia from 1880 to 1910 and had great influence among the German and Russian socialists. It was instrumental in promoting Marxism as the main current in the working class movement of Europe from the last decade of the 19th century onward.

2. What were the sociopolitical conditions that brought philosophers to develop the philosophy of socialism?

JMS: First of all, let us consider the economic aspect of the sociopolitical conditions that induced philosophers to develop the philosophy of socialism. In the time when the utopian socialists came up, the capitalist mode of production was not as yet developed as when Marx and Engels came up to put forward Scientific Socialism.

What the utopian socialists observed was the early period of the Industrial Revolution when the peasants were being rapidly dispossessed and together with the urban poor were being turned into factory workers, made to work for as long as 16 hours daily and lived in dismal conditions. They could not yet see the workers as a class capable of struggling against the bourgeoisie and taking power.

In the time of Marx and Engels from the 1840s onward, the capitalist mode of production had developed to such an extent that the great number of workers could be easily perceived as having the potential of becoming a class for itself against the bourgeoisie through the trade union movement and the revolutionary party of the proletariat. The *Communist Manifesto* signaled the advent of Scientific Socialism and proclaimed that the bourgeoisie had created its own grave diggers as it could not prevent itself from capitalist competition and the cycles of the crisis of overproduction and concentration of capital.

In the lifetime of Marx and Engels, they saw the rise of the trade union movement, the uprisings of workers Europe-wide in 1848, the Paris Commune of 1871 and the accelerated spread of Marxism in the last two decades of the 19th century. Throughout the century, the class contradictions between the capitalists and the workers and between the monarchs and the landed aristocracy on the one side and peasants and farm workers on the other side.

3. There were three main Utopians: Saint-Simon, Fourier, and Owen. What were their philosophies, briefly, and what do they have in common?

JMS: Saint Simon, Fourier and Owen were the greatest of the utopian socialists for being the closest to material reality, most critical of the bourgeoisie, most cognizant of the dismal conditions of the workers and most partisan to them and most interested in ameliorating their working and living conditions, but they were still bound by idealist philosophy and did not yet know how the proletariat could overthrow the bourgeoisie and build socialism. The influences on them ranged from the rationalism of the French Enlightenment to Hegelian philosophy.

Of these three who were relatively the best of the utopian socialists, Saint-Simon was critically most cognizant of classes and class struggle. He saw the bourgeois revolution as the conquest of political power by the propertied bourgeoisie, leaving the workers and peasants to the continuing condition of exploitation, chiefly by the capitalist class. But he could not yet propose the revolutionary solution to the capitalist domination of the working class.

Fourier had a wide range of knowledge like Saint Simon, studied and learned dialectics from his contemporary Hegel and understood the development of society from savagery and barbarism to civilization. Like Saint Simon, he was sharply critical of the capitalism and the bourgeoisie for the exploitation of the working class. And he recognized the development of history through ceaseless change and contradiction as the reflection and realization of the prior self-development of thought in the sense of Hegelian dialectics.

Robert Owen was himself a successful capitalist entrepreneur and shared with the workers whatever gains were made by the enterprise he ran. He adopted a materialist philosophy short of dialectical materialism. As he became more vocal against the capitalists, he was shunned by the European bourgeoisie. He set up experimental Communist communities but these failed. After going financially bankrupt, he devoted himself to the trade union movement and was successful in this field of work.

4. What is dialectics and why was it important in the development of philosophy?

JMS: According to Engels, dialectics consists of understanding the world as a mass of interconnections, changes and contradictions. In the fullness of his writings on dialectics, he presented the three laws of contradiction, such as the law of change from quantitative to qualitative, the interpenetration of opposites and the negation of the negation.

Together with Marx, Engels recognized the rudimentary beginning of materialist dialectics with Heraclitus in ancient Greece who had observed the process of change in things. They also recognized the highest development of idealist philosophy in Hegel's dialectics. This is the rational kernel of Hegelian philosophy which Marx and Engels adopted and applied directly on material phenomena and processes to turn the idealism of Hegel upside down.

It is useful to contrast materialist dialectics with metaphysics. Materialist dialectics can focus on a physical phenomenon but always as something interconnected with other phenomena and subject to the process of change. Metaphysics takes individual

phenomena and places them under isolated examination, separating them out and contrasting them with all other things.

But it is inadequate on its own because it does not appreciate the connections between things in their change and motion. Natural science makes extensive use of metaphysics by isolating a phenomenon, studying its composition and deriving a formula for its existence but does not show its changeability and its interconnection with all other phenomena.

5. What were the shortcomings of the Hegelian system?

JMS: What is wrong with Hegelian philosophy is its presumption that the self-development of thought precedes actual development in material reality and that the real development of things and processes is merely the reflection and realization of what has been previously thought. Hegelian dialectics seems to be correct and neat because it is applied on what has in fact materialized before the application of the formulaic sequence of thesis, antithesis and synthesis.

The synthesis is a dead end or it is celebrated as the highest point of development. Thus, Hegel considered the Prussian state as the highest and final point of historical development. In contrast, materialist dialectics assumes that all things are in a constant process of motion and change. And there is no state or condition of a material object or a material system that is not subject to change or development.

Even as Hegelian dialectics is wrong for being idealist and metaphysical in presumption, it is an advance in idealist philosophy for seeking to account for change in nature and society and for accepting that previous change has occurred, despite the presumption that it has come to be because of prior thought. Materialist dialectics is capable of looking into the contradictory aspects of things to discover their changeability.

6. What were the discoveries that paved the way of making socialism a science?

JMS: Engels said that socialism became a science, open for study and working out its details and relations after the two great discoveries he credited to Marx; namely, the materialist conception of history and the secret of capitalist production through surplus-

value. The extraction of surplus value results in the accumulation of capital and the further socialization of the forces of production.

The materialist conception of history does away with all idealist and subjectivist illusions about the status and changeability of things and presumes that everything changes and that there is nothing permanent but change. In the capitalist mode of production, the capitalists extract surplus value from the workers in order to accumulate capital and cause further developments that eventually run counter to the capitalist mode of production.

In the accumulation of capital by competing capitalists, they increase the number of workers as their potential grave diggers; they push down the wages, raise the organic composition of capital and cause the crisis of overproduction; they further concentrate capital to cause another and more serious crisis; and the trend of events make the bourgeois owners become superfluous with the increasing role of the managers and the state in running the enterprises as well as the increasing socialization of the forces production in contradiction with the system of private appropriation.

7. What is historical materialism?

JMS: Historical materialism is the application of materialist dialectics in the study of any society and its social development. The political and cultural superstructure of society and the entirety of a certain society are best understood by studying and understanding the material economic base or mode of production of that society.

According to Engels, historical materialism consists of the understanding that the forces of production are the basis of all social structure. The seeds of the capitalist economy were present in the womb of the feudal economy. The capitalist forces of production grew to run against the dominant feudal relations of production. Through the bourgeois revolutions, the bourgeoisie asserted itself politically over the feudal order.

8. What are some of the contradictions inherent to the capitalist mode of production?

JMS: As pointed out by Engels, the contradictions within economic systems lead inevitably to social contradictions. In the capitalist system, the main economic contradiction is between socialized production and private appropriation and is manifested in

the social contradiction between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie. There is the further contradiction between organization in the individual workplace and anarchy in production as a whole leads to greater proletarianization as capitalism develops, through machinery and capital expansion in a country and on a global scale.

The contradictions become intense and sharp when bourgeois relations of production become fetters to the forces of production that they have spawned. The economic and therefore social crisis bursts out. The only way to resolve this is to recognize the socialized nature of production and replace the system of private appropriation with a socialized one. The socialist revolution comes to the fore, with the working class seizing political power and placing the productive forces under their control to be planned, organized and used to their full potential by the proletariat and people.

9. While the capitalist mode of production more and more completely transforms the great majority of the population into proletarians, it creates the power which, under penalty of its own destruction, is forced to accomplish the revolution. Why is the revolution of the proletariat different from the revolution of other classes before?

JMS: The revolution of the proletariat is quite different from the revolution of other classes. For the first time in human history, an exploited class becomes the most productive and progressive political force and takes power to establish a nonexploitative social system. It emancipates not only itself but all other exploited classes, builds socialism as transition to communism and creates the conditions for the withering away of the state and the attainment of a classless society in communism. Engels describes socialism as the ascent of mankind from the realm of necessity to that of freedom.

10. Lastly, could you sum up the historical evolution laid out by Engels?

JMS: When civilization emerged from barbarism, it was on the basis of a definite mode of production characterized by such people in production as the freemen, artisans, tillers, herdsman and slaves and such means of production as iron tools, agricultural land and animal husbandry and by the relations of production dominated by the slave-owning class that acquired and accumulated the large the

amount of surplus product yielded by the slaves. This surplus product was used to maintain the needs and luxury of the slave masters as well as the slave state as the highest form of political institution and the cultural institutions and activities in the superstructure.

Feudalism grew within the womb of slave society as the agricultural land expanded, mainly with the use of slaves in opening and cultivating land. But ultimately the very expansion of agricultural land made it more difficult to control the slaves who either ran away, rebelled or joined rebellious tribes. Thus, the “enlightened” slave owners decided to become landlords and convert the slaves into serfs. As feudalism persisted, it would also pave the way for the rise of the bourgeoisie through the growth of handicrafts, commerce and the rise of towns and cities in the midst of the wide feudal estates.

Within the womb of feudalism, the capitalist mode of production grew in three stages, that of the handicrafts, manufacturing and the beginnings of machine-based industrial capitalism. As early as the stage of manufacturing from 16th to the 18th century, the feudal monarchies of Europe collaborated with the merchant capitalists in warring on each other or in carrying out colonial expeditions. By the late 18th century, the French revolution in which the bourgeoisie raised the rags of the poor (the plebeians and peasants) to revolt against the feudal system.

The bourgeoisie prevailed in France despite the twists and turns which saw the Reign of Terror, the Thermidorian reaction, the Napoleonic empire building, the restoration of the monarchy and the eventual reassertion of bourgeois democracy at home and acquisition of colonies abroad under the auspices of a well-developed capitalist economy and society. As industrial capitalism grew in certain countries in Europe and in the US and gave rise to monopoly capitalism, the class struggle between the proletariat and bourgeoisie developed and revolutionary parties of the proletariat guided by Marxism grew in importance.

The first general crisis of monopoly capitalism led to World War I and the rise of the first socialist country, the Soviet Union in 1917. The second general crisis led to the rise of fascist powers and a more destructive World War II, which resulted in the rise of China

and several other socialist countries and the liberation of many colonies and semicolonies. In 1956, it could be said that one third of humanity was already governed by communist and worker's parties. But in combination with the relentless aggression and pressures in the Cold War, the modern revisionists succeeded in undermining socialism in the Soviet Union, Eastern Europe and China.

As a result of Russia and China becoming capitalist powers, the crisis of the world capitalist system has been more frequent, more prolonged and worse. The neoliberal economic policy of imperialist globalization has unraveled, state terrorism and wars of aggression are rampant and global warming is worsening due to the plunder of the environment by monopoly capitalism. All major contradictions are intensifying: among the imperialist powers themselves, between the imperialist powers and the oppressed peoples, between the imperialist powers and countries that defend national independence and their socialist aspirations and between labor and capital in the capitalist countries.

We now observe and welcome the rise of anti-imperialist and democratic struggles all over the world and the foreseeable resurgence of the world proletarian-socialist revolution. The rapid adoption of higher technology in the capitalist mode of production has brought about graver crises of overproduction and inter-imperialist contradictions. The broad masses of the people in various types of countries are suffering from the rapid accumulation of capital in the hands of a few countries and the monopoly capitalist ruling class and from the aggravation of unemployment, low income, mass poverty and lack of social services. The revolutionary consciousnesses of the proletariat and people is rising and they have the means to communicate instantly and launch mass actions and other forms of struggle.

On the Question of Ideology and Political Power

**Reply to the Tyrant Duterte
December 1, 2020**

In his TV appearance in the Philippines last night, Duterte attacked me in a simplistic and demagogic way that I am in the movement for revolutionary change merely because of ideology and personal desire for power and not because of the people's just cause and revolutionary struggle for national and social liberation against the semicolonial and semifeudal ruling system, especially now that it is run by his extremely traitorous, brutal and corrupt regime.

Duterte is stupid or out of his mind by implying that I have an ideology while he has none. Any individual or organization that is politically significant as friend or enemy of the people has an ideology in the plain sense of having a set of ideas. Duterte has an ideology of rabid anti-communism and fascist terrorism in the service of foreign monopoly capitalism and the local exploiting classes of big compradors, landlords and bureaucrat capitalists like himself.

In sharp contrast, my ideology is the universal theory of the international proletariat, Marxism-Leninism-Maoism, and is applied on the concrete social conditions of the Philippines. I adhere to the program of people's democratic revolution which seeks to realize full national independence, genuine democracy, social justice, economic development through land reform and national industrialization, a patriotic and scientific culture; and international solidarity against imperialism, and for world peace.

The issue now in the Philippines is neither socialism nor communism. The Filipino people and the revolutionary forces are fighting for national liberation and democracy against foreign monopoly capitalism, domestic feudalism and bureaucrat capitalism. They need to win the new democratic revolution in order to have any hope for a socialist future.

By harping on their rabid anti-communism, Duterte and his political and military agents are covering up their servility to US and Chinese imperialism and the local reactionary forces. Thus, they fail to destroy the revolutionary movement. The revolutionary movement is ever growing in strength because it is addressing the basic problems of the people or the root causes of the armed conflict, especially because Duterte has chosen to terminate the peace negotiations in order to use anti-communism and state terrorism to pursue his ambition of fascist dictatorship.

Since the age of 19, I have committed myself to continuing the unfinished Philippine revolution started by Andres Bonifacio in 1896. To make this kind of commitment, one must be ready to be imprisoned, tortured or outrightly killed in the course of struggle. One cannot last long in the struggle if one is simply motivated by a personal desire for power. Such an ambition belongs to those who wish to climb the political and social ladder in the unjust ruling system and at the most to join the series of puppet presidents in what is a rogues' gallery.

Some people have told me that I have had the advantages of upper class origin, networks of influential relatives, friends and former schoolmates of high standing, some outstanding personal abilities and achievements and sociability and that I could have become president as early as at the age of 40 to 50, especially because I have been a national news maker alongside Marcos and Aquino since I was 23 years old. But I just laugh off the speculations because I knew even when I was only 18 years old that to become president you become corrupt in the rotten ruling system on the way up to the highest position of power.

In contrast to me, Duterte with mediocre qualities far below the level of the statesman has become president because of his extraordinary abilities as a demagogue, pretending to be honest even if he is extremely corrupt, pretending to be brave even if he is a coward in using superior force to kill poor people, pretending to be "Left" and "socialist" even if he is a rabid anticommunist and ultra-reactionary, pretending to be against illegal drugs even if he merely wants to become supreme drug lord and pretending to be for

independent foreign policy even if he wants to serve any imperialist power from which he can personally benefit.

My current desire is to contribute whatever I can to the patriotic and democratic struggle of the broad masses of the people and the broad united front to end the tyrannical, traitorous, brutal, corrupt and swindling Duterte regime, oust Duterte from his throne and create the conditions for a patriotic and democratic kind of government to arise and pave the way for the resumption of peace negotiations to address the roots of the armed conflict and lay the basis for a just and lasting peace. The Filipino people have no choice but to wage the new democratic revolution through protracted people's war so long as US imperialism and the local reactionary classes are hell-bent on preserving the oppressive and exploitative semicolonial and semifeudal ruling system.

On Practice and on Contradiction

First Episode of the Mao Series

Anakbayan-Europa ND Online School

Questions by Host Anghelo Godino

Answers by Jose Maria Sison

December 6, 2020

1. “On Practice” and “On Contradiction” were written by Mao Zedong in order to expose the subjectivist errors of dogmatism and empiricism in the Party. Could you briefly explain the position of the Chinese Communist Party at the time it was written and what kind of errors the party suffered from?

JMS: Mao wrote “On Practice” in 1937 in Yen-an soon after the Long March and delivered it in a series of lectures on Marxist philosophy. It clarifies its epistemology by explaining the interaction and wave-like advance of social practice and knowledge. It is one of Mao’s major philosophical works in which he made a major contribution to the development of dialectical materialism by elaborating on the unity of opposites in social practice.

It is a companion piece to another one of Mao’s major philosophical works, “On Contradiction”. Having reached Yen-an, the leadership of the Chinese Communist Party found the opportunity to consolidate its position by promoting theoretical and political education, and to prepare for revolutionary struggle not only against the Guomindang but also against the Japanese fascist threat.

Mao wrote On Contradiction also in 1937. It elaborates on the unity of opposites as the most fundamental law of contradiction and raises to a new and higher development dialectical materialism. The essay has several sections: the two world outlooks, the universality of contradiction, the particularity of contradiction, the principal contradiction and principal aspect of contradiction, the identity and struggle of aspects of contradiction, the place of antagonism in contradiction, and finally the conclusion.

On Practice/Where do Correct Ideas Come From?

2. Before Marx, materialism examined the problem of knowledge apart from the social nature of man and apart from his historical development. How did Marx change this? What does it mean that people's knowledge depends mainly on their activity in material production?

JMS: Indeed, the ancient rudimentary materialists in Greece observed natural objects and speculated on their essential composition and changeability but did not extend their philosophical concern to the social nature of man. Even in the rise of humanism and science in the periods of the Renaissance and the Enlightenment, the mechanical materialists did not extend their philosophical concern or theory of knowledge to the social nature of man. At the most, Descartes presumed the existence of God who left the material universe alone to exist autonomously.

Together with Engels, Marx formulated the philosophy of dialectical materialism to encompass nature and society and further formulated historical materialism to concentrate on human society and its stages of developments. He focused on the critique of the capitalist mode of production as the foundation, as the material base, of the entire capitalist society and its political and cultural superstructure.

3. Why is social practice the only criterion of truth?

JMS: Social practice is the only criterion of truth because it is the only process by which any assertion or proffer of truth on the same basis of some knowledge can be tested, verified and proven as the truth. Mao teaches us that social practice encompasses production, class struggle and scientific experiment and these are the sources of knowledge. There is an interaction of social practice and knowledge and there is a wave-like advance in this interaction. Raising the level of one leads to raising the level of the other.

4. What is the process of development of knowledge?

JMS: At a certain given time, you have a certain level of knowledge through reading and direct investigation and you apply this knowledge in your practice, this practice leads to a higher level of knowledge which you can apply to carry out a higher level of practice, and then this higher practice leads to a higher knowledge.

This goes on indefinitely in a wave-like manner of advancing. It is the process of developing knowledge. Previously, the spiral was the favorite Marxist diagram of the advance of social practice and knowledge. Mao preferred the wave-like advance.

5. The perceptual and the rational are qualitatively different, but are not divorced from each other; they are unified on the basis of practice. Is it possible to gain knowledge with only one way - perception alone, or logic alone? What is the relationship of Rational knowledge and perceptual knowledge?

JMS: The interaction between perceptual knowledge and rational knowledge and their wave-like advance is always necessary for a determined dialectical materialist ever ready to raise the level of knowledge. Otherwise, your knowledge will stagnate and you will fail to understand changes in the situation and make the necessary decision for solving problems and advancing the revolutionary cause.

Perceptual knowledge is what you gain by using your senses and personal experience in order to gather the facts in social investigation. This kind of knowledge is necessary for one to start building one's factual base of information but it is limited and is not the end of knowing. By using class analysis and collective discussions with comrades on a wider range of social investigation, you can arrive at rational knowledge by which you make conclusions, judgments and formulate tasks.

If you limit yourself to perceptual knowledge and do not advance to rational knowledge, you are liable to fall into the error of empiricism, limited to narrow, fragmentary and short-range knowledge. If you limit yourself to rational knowledge and cease to expand your factual or empirical base, you are liable to fall into the error of dogmatism, much given to using jargon and generalizations with outdated and dwindling facts. The errors of empiricism and dogmatism are errors of subjectivism which are anathema to dialectical materialism.

6. Practice, knowledge, again practice, and again knowledge. How is this dialectical-materialist theory of knowledge significant in the revolutionary tasks and practices of activists?

JMS: The wave-like advance of practice, higher knowledge based on practice, higher knowledge to higher practice in the dialectical-materialist theory of knowledge signifies or means the correctness or validity of the revolutionary tasks and practice of activists and the achievement of revolutionary advances and victories. If you depart from the interaction and wave-like advance of practice and knowledge, you are liable to stagnate and degenerate and cease to do your work well.

On Contradiction

7. Throughout the history of human knowledge, there have been two conceptions concerning the law of development of the universe, the metaphysical conception and the dialectical conception, which form two opposing world outlooks. Please explain these two opposing world outlooks.

JMS: This question presumes that there is a differentiation of the materialist and idealist world outlooks. If you are a materialist, your starting point is matter and the idea follows. If you are an idealist, your starting point is the idea as cause and matter is the result and you can go so far as to say that a supernatural being created the material universe. But I think your question focuses on the conception of change as in epistemology (study of knowledge) rather than on the ontology (study of the nature of things).

The metaphysical conception of the world may be the result of an outrightly idealist world outlook or from a mechanical materialist outlook. The former kind of metaphysics is easy to understand but the latter kind requires a more extended explanation because the mechanical materialists often assert that they are scientific and some of them (like the followers of empirio-criticism and logical positivism) accuse the dialectical materialists of being metaphysical for using generalizations like matter no less, despite Engels' extensive studies of the works in his time in the natural sciences and his effort to integrate these within the framework of dialectical materialism.

Mechanical materialists are like frogs in a well who perceive the water and walls of the well and see immediately the sky when they look but they do not see the environment and interconnections of the well. Indeed, in scientific investigation, the natural scientist isolates the object under study and contrasts it from all other objects. Without

rejecting the results of scientific investigation done with the metaphysical method of isolating an object under study, the dialectical materialist always takes into account the interconnections and interactions of one object with all other objects.

Quite a number of physicists spiritualized the light for a long time. And even after the discovery and development of quantum mechanics, the wave was still spiritualized and idealized to demean and degrade the photon particles or even at worst to make the particles “disappear.” But Einstein and other scientists proved that in fact, photon, as an elementary particle in constant motion with zero mass has its energy transformed into mass when it impacts another particle, with the total sum of mass and energy remaining constant through out the interaction. Thus photon is matter and energy with the wave as its mode of existence in accordance with the dialectical materialist definition of motion as the mode of existence of matter.

8. What is meant when Mao speaks of the universality of contradiction?

JMS: The law of contradiction is universal in the sense that it encompasses and operates in all material objects in nature and society, including the process of cognition and the development of knowledge in the natural and social sciences. Marxist-Leninist-Maoist proletarian revolutionary thinkers and leaders have focused on the study of the political economy and class struggle in order to advance the revolution towards socialism and communism.

But there are also among them as well as scientists who have focused on the law of contradiction in the various branches of the natural sciences within the framework of the materialist-scientific philosophy. It is the aim of the proletariat and its revolutionary party to free science and technology from the clutches of monopoly capitalism and put them in the service of society and nature after so much damage to them by monopoly capitalism.

9. How about the particularity of contradiction?

JMS: We refer to the universality of the law and to the law of the unity of opposites as the most fundamental law of contradiction. This is the biggest generalization that we can make. But there are particular forms of contradictions correspondent to particular forms of matter and to particular fields of study thereof. Particular forms of

contradictions in particular forms of natural and social phenomena are investigated and unfolded in various fields of study in the natural and social sciences which are focused on various forms of contradictions.

10. Processes change, old processes and old contradictions disappear, new processes and new contradictions emerge, and the methods of resolving contradictions differ accordingly. Can you give a concrete example to describe what Mao meant by this?

JMS: Revolutionary class struggle is a process to seize political power by armed force from the ruling class in order to emancipate the proletariat and other exploited people in capitalist society. After the proletariat seizes political power, it can build socialism peacefully, handle correctly the contradictions among the people with non-antagonistic methods and take the steps towards the ultimate aim of communism even as the socialist state needs to exist for as long as there is the threat from imperialism and reactions from the outside.

11. What does it mean and why is it important to understand each aspect of a contradiction?

JMS: It is important to understand each aspect of a contradiction, such as the proletariat as exploited class and the monopoly bourgeoisie as the exploiting class in a capitalist society so that the proletariat and its revolutionary party would know the balance of strength and know how to conduct the revolutionary class struggle from stage to stage. It becomes more important to understand each aspect of a contradictions when there is a complex set of class contradictions in society.

We need to recognize the principal and secondary aspects in contradiction. The bourgeoisie is the principal aspect and the proletariat is the secondary aspect in a capitalist society. In analyzing a complex set of contradictions, we can determine the principal and secondary contradictions.

In the semicolonial and semifeudal social system in the Philippines currently, as in China before the revolutionary victory in 1949, there is a complex set of exploiting classes like the big compradors and landlords and exploited working people like the workers and peasants and there was therefore a complex set of

class contradictions, involving the national struggle against imperialism and the democratic struggle against feudalism.

12. Why is it important to pay attention to the stages in the process of development of a thing?

JMS: Even in a well-developed industrial capitalist country, there can be no immediate big leap from capitalism to socialism just because the forces of production are well developed and have a social character. The capitalist class has the state power and other means to suppress the movement of the proletariat and the people to seize political power. As the *Communist Manifesto* has long declared, the proletariat must win the battle for democracy before being able to seize political power and establish socialism.

In a semicolonial and semifeudal country like the Philippines, the Filipino proletariat and people need to undergo the stage of people's democratic revolution through protracted people's war as a way of building the revolutionary party of the proletariat, the people's army, the mass movement, the necessary alliance and the organs of political power constituting the people's democratic revolution. The people's democratic revolution is basically completed upon the overthrow of the state power of the comprador big bourgeoisie and landlord class. Consequently, the stage of socialist revolution can begin.

13. How do we determine the principal contradiction?

JMS: When there is a complex set of contradictions, the principal contradiction is determined according to what is the main enemy in a war situation, is it a foreign aggressor or is it the reactionary state? If it is a foreign aggressor, all efforts at achieving national unity need to be exerted in order to wage a war of national liberation. If it is the reactionary carrying a war of suppression, without full scale deployment of foreign aggressor troops, the people's democratic revolution carries out the protracted people's war as in a civil war.

There is a contradiction between the Filipino nation and US imperialism together with other imperialist powers, using the local exploiting classes. When an imperialist power unleashes a war of aggression against the Philippines, as Japan did in 1941 to 1945, the Filipino people wage a war of national liberation. US imperialism is always engaged in military intervention, short of full-scale aggression

which becomes highly probable when the people's war reaches the stage of the strategic stalemate, unless the US military power is bogged down elsewhere.

When there is yet no war of aggression and the civil war is the sole or main character of the struggle between the exploited and exploiting classes, the revolutionary party of the proletariat wages protracted people's war on the basis of the worker-peasant alliance in order to encircle the cities from the countryside and accumulate political and armed strength to be able to seize power from the exploiting classes based in the cities.

14. All contradictory things are interconnected; not only do they coexist in a single entity in given conditions, but in other given conditions, they also transform themselves into each other. Can you give an example to explain what Mao meant by this?

JMS: Like Mao in China when he was engaged in the people's democratic revolution, I have already explained how in the current semicolonial and semifeudal Philippine society as a single entity there can be a complex set of contradictions. In the course of the people's democratic revolution, the class struggle between the exploited and exploiting classes can take the form of a civil war between the reactionary state and the armed revolutionary movement of the people.

If US imperialism unleashes all-out aggression against the Filipino people in order to save the puppet reactionary state, the civil war becomes transformed into a war of national liberation by the Filipino people. If the war of aggression is defeated, it means either the total victory of the people's democratic revolution or it still has to carry out a civil war against local reactionary forces. Usually, as in the case of the defeat of the US imperialism in Vietnam, the reactionary classes have no more strength to wage a civil war against the revolutionary forces of the people.

15. Why are the laws of contradiction important to be studied by activists?

JMS: The laws of contradiction must be studied by activists so that they can understand the exploiting and exploited classes as contradictory forces in Philippine society, the character of this society and the strategy and tactics to carry out the revolutionary change.

With the comprador big bourgeoisie and the landlord class still ruling and exploiting the toiling masses of workers and peasants, the character of the Philippine society is semifeudal and can be changed in a fundamental way by the people's democratic revolution through the protracted people's war.

The unity and equilibrium of any society like that of the Philippines is relative and temporary. Within that society, the class struggle between the exploited and exploiting classes is absolute and lasting and enables the exploited class to grow in strength and overthrow the exploiting class and establish a new and fundamentally just and better society is built by the Filipino people.

The reactionaries, especially the fascists, are terrified and yet try to belittle the victories and advances of the people's democratic revolution just because this has not yet overthrown the reactionary state based in the cities by more than 50 years of protracted people's war. But the Marcos fascist dictatorship, the pseudo-democratic regimes and now the Duterte terrorist regime have failed to suppress the armed revolutionary movement.

The revolutionary party of the proletariat, the people's army, the revolutionary mass organizations, the national united front and the people's democratic movement are nationwide and deeply rooted among the toiling masses. They continue to grow in strength and advance because they are led by the revolutionary party of the proletariat that correctly applies dialectical materialism in carrying out the people's democratic revolution through protracted people's war.

On the Correct Handling of Contradictions among the People

**Second Episode of the Mao Series
Anakbayan Europa ND Online School
Initial Questions by Angelo Godino
Answers by Jose Maria Sison
December 12, 2020**

1. In our last episode, we discussed Mao's On Contradiction. Today we will discuss On the Correct Handling of Contradictions among the People. Can you please provide us the context of the time that this speech was delivered by Mao?

JMS: Mao wrote "On the Correct Handling of Contradictions Among the People" in 1957. China had won total victory in the people's democratic revolution in 1949 and passed through the period of consolidation and reconstruction from 1949 to 1952 and had carried out the first five-year plan for the basic socialist transformation of Chinese economy.

Mao pointed out that there were still classes and class struggle in China. The class contradictions among the people are non-antagonistic and must be handled correctly so that they do not become antagonistic. The term people encompassed the basic toiling masses of workers and peasants and the middle social strata, including the urban petty bourgeoisie and the national bourgeoisie. There were contradictions among these social classes and strata as well as within every class and within every stratum on ideas and methods of developing socialism.

At the same time, there are antagonistic contradictions between the people and the counterrevolutionaries. There must be clear evidence against them for criminal activity so that mistakes can be

avoided. There are only a few counterrevolutionaries because of the achievements of China in socialist revolution and construction. Criminal activity of counterrevolutionaries or enemies of the people must be differentiated from the free and honest expression of ideas and views among the people.

2. In this speech, Mao tackles the contradictions that existed even after the party has seized political power. One such contradiction is the contradiction between the national bourgeoisie and the working class. It is one between exploiter and exploited, and is by nature antagonistic. How can this be transformed into a non-antagonistic one in the transformation to socialism?

JMS: Before 1957, there was a state policy to accommodate the national bourgeoisie's investments and entrepreneurial and managerial skills in joint state-private corporations and to allow them to earn dividends according to their investments. But in 1957 there was already a policy for the national bourgeoisie in the joint-private corporations to receive fixed interest on their investments and no longer dividends as their share of corporate profits.

Contradictions involved differences regarding the disposition of the profits of the joint state-private corporations and the role of national bourgeois entrepreneurs and managers who were retained to run the enterprises efficiently. The national bourgeoisie had a dual class character. It retained its exploitative class character and yet complied with state policy. There were contradictions arising from the dual class character of the national bourgeoisie but they were non-antagonistic and could be resolved through non-antagonistic methods, such as discussions, reasoning, persuasion and education.

The policy of the socialist state was to integrate the productive assets and entrepreneurial and managerial abilities of the national bourgeoisie, to dissolve the national bourgeoisie with its exploitative character in stages and to prevent it from increasing its exploitative character. In the meantime, the socialist state made sure that the profits made would be divided for the following purposes: fixed interest payment to the national bourgeois, improvement of the wage and living conditions of the workers, accumulation of funds for the expansion of the enterprise, provision for social services, administration and tax for the state.

The Communist Party and the trade unions made sure that the rights and interests of the working class were upheld, protected and promoted first of all even while the entrepreneurial and managerial abilities of the national bourgeois were availed of, subject to their reeducation in socialism and also subject to the education and training of more Party cadres and the workers in socialist management; and the students in science and engineering and other related fields in order to become the Reds experts in socialist construction.

3. The dictatorship of the Proletariat is needed to safeguard socialist construction. It uses democratic centralism as a form of governance. Could you discuss democratic centralism? How does it work and why is this type of leadership important in paving the way to socialism?

JMS: The dictatorship of the proletariat is upheld in the socialist constitution and is needed to guarantee the building of socialism and the continuance of socialist revolution and construction to achieve the ultimate goal of communism. With the Communist Party leading the socialist state in the form of the people's democratic revolution, it follows and applies the principle and method of democratic centralism in making and implementing decisions.

Democratic centralism is centralized leadership on the basis of democracy. The establishment of the facts, reports and recommendations come from the basic level of the Party, the Party branches and the masses. Decisions move up from lower to higher levels of the Party organs of leadership, Party organization and state organs for further consideration and decision-making until they reach the central levels of the Party and state leading organs where decisions are taken in the making of national policies and plans.

The policies and plans are carried out and tested in practice by the lower levels of the Party, state and the people and on varied territorial scales. All the time, the Party at all levels study and learn from the developing situation and is open to the reports, advice, criticism and supervision of the masses and the allies among the people. The democratic basis for centralized decision-making never stops.

4. The formula of "unity – criticism – unity" is the democratic method of resolving contradictions among the people. Can you give an example of how contradictions are resolved through this formula?

JMS: In making criticisms, we should be motivated by a desire to strengthen unity and improve the work and style of work for the benefit of the people along the revolutionary line of socialism. The criticism is meant to advance the revolutionary work and struggle and bring about a higher level of unity among the people, within the Party and the socialist state.

Criticisms arise when there are problems that need to be resolved because they are hampering or damaging revolutionary work and struggle. They are meant to present problems that must be analyzed and solved in order to improve the work and accelerate the advance of the revolutionary struggle. Criticisms can also arise from contradictions or problems on how to raise the level of development to a new and higher level.

When criticisms are made, these must be subjected to discussion and the methods of analysis, reasoning and persuasion are used. They therefore result both in the advancement of work and struggle and in raising the level of revolutionary consciousness and education. Raising the level of knowledge through criticisms and discussions means raising the level of practice. This is in accordance with materialist dialectics.

5. Contradictions in socialist society are fundamentally different from those in the old societies, such as capitalist society. What are the basic contradictions in a socialist society?

JMS: In socialist society, there are non-antagonistic class contradictions between the working class and the peasantry and within each of these classes with regard to benefits and deployment of resources. There are also class contradictions between the proletariat and the urban petty bourgeoisie and within this social stratum.

Especially among the intellectuals, the culture of the old society and the international bourgeoisie can still exercise an influence on them. Within the Communist Party, there can be petty bourgeois elements who have not fully remolded themselves as communists and they are liable to express subjectivist and opportunist ideas. If

not properly restricted and directed towards dissolution, the national bourgeoisie can enlarge its exploitative interest.

It has been demonstrated in the rise of modern revisionism and subversion of socialist societies that the influence of the old exploitative classes can persist or be revived if the intelligentsia and the Party cadres themselves do not engage in continuous proletarian revolutionary education concerning classes and class struggle and thus degenerate because they become alienated from the masses and become obsessed with increasing their bureaucratic privileges and emulating the international bourgeoisie.

6. Does exploitation still exist in a socialist society? What kind of exploitation and how does it differ in a capitalist society? How do we gradually eradicate exploitation?

JMS: So far in history, socialism has arisen as a result of armed revolution and armed counterrevolution in countries not as advanced economically as the most powerful imperialist powers. Thus, after the revolutionary proletariat overthrows the bourgeois state, it has to adopt transitory measures, like the New Economic Policy (NEP) in the Soviet Union from 1922 onward and China from 1949 onward to give concessions to the lesser types of exploiters.

The commanding heights of the economy like the landed estates, strategic industries, the main sources of raw materials and the principal means of transport and communications, are immediately taken over by the state. But to revive and maintain the economy, concessions are made to certain elements in society that have an exploitative character, like the small and medium entrepreneurs and traders and the rich peasants.

Concessions were given to these under the NEP in the Soviet Union until socialist industrialization and the cooperativization of agriculture were carried out through the series of five year-plans under Stalin. In China, concessions were also made to such lesser types of exploiters after then properties of big compradors, landlords and bureaucrat capitalists were confiscated. The national bourgeoisie were accommodated in joint state-private corporations.

Capitalist-roaders like Liu Shaoqi and Deng Xiaoping wanted to prolong the concessions to the national bourgeoisie indefinitely. In fact, after the defeat of the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution, the

Dengist capitalist-oriented reforms and opening up to the world capitalist system restored capitalism in China and aggrandized the bourgeoisie as the ruling class.

7. According to Mao, counterrevolutionaries must be eliminated wherever found, mistakes must be corrected whenever discovered. What are the ways to eliminate counterrevolutionaries?

JMS: Indeed, counterrevolutionaries must be eliminated so that the socialist state is secure and consolidated. But the revolutionary party and the people must be judicious in carrying out the policy of eliminating the counterrevolutionaries. They must be arrested, detained, tried and punished for criminal acts on the basis of evidence.

The mass movement is necessary to isolate the counterrevolutionaries. But due process must be followed in trying and punishing counterrevolutionaries. The Communist Party, the state organs and the people must be able to distinguish those who criticize and speak honestly against certain policies and actions and those who are really counterrevolutionaries. Mistakes must be avoided and when they occur these must be corrected immediately and the victims must be rehabilitated.

8. With the rural population comprising the majority, the role of peasants has a most important bearing on the development of our economy and the consolidation of our state power. China had successes in peasant cooperatives. Can you tell us what are cooperatives and how important is this in building socialism?

JMS: Indeed, the peasants have a decisively important role in the development of the socialist economy and consolidation of state power. They are the majority of the people and are the main democratic force. And they are the producers at the agricultural base of the socialist economy which ensures the food supply of the entire people and also provides major raw materials for light industry. Cooperativization is used by the socialist society to raise the level of economic and social development of agriculture and the peasant masses.

Starting in 1952, the development of agricultural cooperatives went through three stages in China. The first stage was characterized by [mutual aid](#) teams, involving the temporary sharing

of labor and some capital by individual households as the basic unit of ownership and production. The mutual aid teams were further organized in 1954 into agricultural producers' cooperatives. The tools, draft animals, and labor were shared on a permanent basis. Cooperative members retained their land ownership but contributed this to a common land pool.

By the end of 1956 the transformation of mutual aid teams into agricultural cooperatives was completed. Most of the cooperatives had become advanced producers' cooperatives or collectives. The members of the cooperatives no longer earned on the basis of shares of land owned. Instead, collective farm net income was divided among members mainly on the basis of labor contributions. The average cooperative was made up of 170 families and more than 700 people.

The third stage of cooperativization was the organization of the people's communes during the Great Leap Forward. The people's communes were successful in overcoming the imperialist embargo, the abandonment of projects by the Soviet Union and the natural calamities. They fulfilled the objective of the Great Leap Forward in developing collectivized agriculture as the complement of socialist industry and they also stimulated the growth of rural industries and capital construction in the rural areas. But the imperialists and the Dengist counterrevolutionaries attack the Great Leap Forward as a complete disaster.

9. In consolidating cooperatives, there are certain contradictions that remain to be resolved, such as those between the state and the cooperatives and those in and between the cooperatives themselves. What are these and how do we resolve them?

JMS: The Chinese socialist state recognized the uneven development of the cooperatives and differences in the productivity of advanced, middle and backward cooperatives and thus adjusted its tax and requisition policy accordingly. The purpose of the tax policy was to support state operations, assist the backward cooperatives and the development of industry. And the requisitioning of agricultural products had the purpose of having sufficient stocks as raw materials for manufacturing as well as sufficient food supply to cover shortfalls due to natural disasters. The state made sure that

the tax and requisitions allowed the peasant masses to improve agricultural production and raise their standard of living.

The Communist Party and the socialist state provided the direction, the planning and the financial and technical means for developing a certain level of cooperativization to a new and higher level. They also developed state farms. They made it a point to develop agriculture as the base of the socialist economy to produce food for the growing Chinese population and raw materials for light industry even as the development of heavy and basic industries as the leading factor in the development of the entire socialist economy.

10. What will happen to landlords after the Party has seized political power? How about small landlords and rich peasants?

JMS: After the Communist Party wins state power in a semicolonial and semifeudal country like China of the past and the Philippines at present, the people's democratic revolution is basically completed and the socialist revolution can begin. But the Communist Party proceeds at an accelerated rate to complete land reform as a bourgeois democratic measure in order to satisfy the peasant hunger for land and institute cooperativization as a socialist measure at the soonest possible time in connection with completing land distribution to the landless peasants.

The land of the landlords is confiscated for free distribution to the landless peasants. In the exceptional case of the enlightened landlords who have supported the revolution, they can be given the opportunity to earn a decent living and live a comfortable life commensurate to their ability and education. The rich peasants can be given the opportunity to contribute their land and means of production to the cooperatives and become cooperative members according to the rules.

11. In the building of a socialist society, everybody needs remolding—the exploiters and also the working people. How do we ensure the remolding of the bourgeoisie? How about the intellectuals?

JMS: Of course, the toiling masses of workers and peasants must continue to remold themselves. It is in their class interest that they raise the level of their revolutionary consciousness and activity in order to uphold, defend and carry forward the socialist revolution

and construction. It is their own duty as well as the duty of the Communist Party to make sure that they further remold themselves through further revolutionary education and mass mobilization, especially because they own and control all instruments of education and culture. It is a matter of course that those who belong to the exploiting classes of big compradors, landlords and bureaucrat capitalists are deprived of the right to be voted and to vote for others as well as of other civil rights that can allow them to regain political power. But if they have not committed crimes, they are tolerated, allowed to earn a living and own non-exploitative property and they can opt to be educated to support socialism.

The national bourgeoisie, the intellectuals and the rich peasants are encouraged to remold themselves. There are study courses on socialism outside of the universities and in various places and fields of social activity. The educational system is required to provide socialist education to all the students at various levels. The mass media and so many types of cultural activities can be instruments of socialist education and culture.

12. What kind of contradictions exist with the national minorities, and how should we resolve them? This is also important in the Philippines with a lot of national minorities.

JMS: The national minorities have managed to retain their autonomy, ancestral domain and their cultural characteristics by resisting effectively previous social systems and regimes. The socialist state has to respect their right to self-determination, ancestral domain and culture. It must give them the time and opportunities to raise their own level of economic, social, political and cultural development.

The national minorities occupy and live in large areas which are fertile and rich in natural resources. The socialist state should not be like the foreign corporations, the reactionary puppet state and the local exploiting classes that grab land and the natural resources from the national minorities. With their full knowledge and consent, the avilment of the land and resources in their ancestral domain must benefit them first, ahead of the rest of the Filipino nation.

13. "Let a hundred flowers blossom, let a hundred schools of thought contend" and "long-term coexistence and mutual

supervision." What do these slogans mean?

JMS: According to Mao himself, "Literally the two slogans – let a hundred flowers blossom and let a hundred schools of thought contend – have no class character; the proletariat can turn them to account, and so can the bourgeoisie or others. Different classes, strata and social groups each have their own views on what are fragrant flowers and what are poisonous weeds." But the variety of schools of thought and works of art and culture can contend and flourish so long as the principles of China's socialist constitution is the basis and framework.

The principles are as follows: 1) Words and deeds should help to unite, and not divide, the people of all our nationalities; 2) They should be beneficial, and not harmful, to socialist transformation and socialist construction; 3) They should help to consolidate, and not undermine or weaken, the people's democratic dictatorship; 4) They should help to consolidate, and not undermine or weaken, democratic centralism; 5) They should help to strengthen, and not shake off or weaken, the leadership of the Communist Party; and 6) They should be beneficial, and not harmful, to international socialist unity and the unity of the peace-loving people of the world.

Mao also explains "long-term coexistence and mutual supervision" in the following words: The slogan "long-term coexistence and mutual supervision" is also a product of China's specific historical conditions. It was not put forward all of a sudden, but had been in the making for several years. The idea of long-term coexistence had been there for a long time. When the socialist system was in the main established last year, the slogan was formulated in explicit terms. Why should the bourgeois and petty-bourgeois democratic parties be allowed to exist side by side with the party of the working class over a long period of time? Because we have no reason for not adopting the policy of long-term coexistence with all those political parties which are truly devoted to the task of uniting the people for the cause of socialism and which enjoy the trust of the people.

Combat Liberalism

Third Episode of the Mao Series

Anakbayan Europe NDLLine Online School

Questions by Edna Becher

Answers by Jose Maria Sison

December 20, 2020

1. What is the context of Combat Liberalism? What circumstances brought Mao the need to write this?

JMS: Mao wrote “Combat Liberalism” in 1937 in Yen-an in the course of the campaign on theoretical and political education. There were conditions of truce between the Chinese Communist Party and the Guomindang after the signing of the Second United Front Against Japan in December 1936. It was republished in 1942 in connection with the Rectification Movement in Yen-an.

The short article focuses on the individualistic conduct and selfish behavior of some Party members who run afoul of the collective and the principle of democratic centralism. The social basis of this unhealthy phenomenon within the Communist Party is the petty bourgeoisie. Certain members join the Party but continue to carry with them petty bourgeois “tails” and need further remolding as proletarian revolutionaries.

Some commentators expect a critique of the liberal philosophy. But in very concrete terms Mao hits the mark by criticizing individualism which is the core of petty bourgeois ideology of various types. Thus, the article is disliked or even condemned by liberals, anarchists, Trotskyites and other individualist and subjectivist trends that oppose collectivity, democratic centralism and the mass line in the revolutionary struggle.

2. Liberalism may have different meaning to some people. Can you clear up what liberalism is that Mao is tackling in this pamphlet? What is meant by that liberalism rejects ideological struggle?

JMS: Mao discusses as many as eleven manifestations of liberalism which include the following:

1) To let things slide for the sake of peace and friendship, when a person has clearly gone wrong; to refrain from argument because he is an old acquaintance...

2) To indulge in irresponsible criticism in private instead of actively putting forward one's suggestions to the organization. To say nothing to people to their faces but to gossip behind their backs...

3) To let things drift if they do not affect one personally; to say as little as possible while knowing perfectly well what is wrong, to be worldly wise and play safe and seek only to avoid blame.

4). Not to obey orders but to give pride of place to one's own opinion. To demand special consideration from the organization but to reject its discipline. This is a fourth type.

5) To indulge in personal attacks, pick quarrels, vent personal spite or seek revenge instead of entering into an argument and struggling against incorrect views for the sake of unity or progress...

6) To hear incorrect views without rebutting them and to hear counterrevolutionary remarks without reporting them, but instead to take them calmly as if nothing had happened. This is a sixth type.

7) To be among the masses and fail to conduct propaganda and agitation or speak at meetings... Forgetting that one is a Communist and behaving as if one is an ordinary non-Communist.

8) To see someone harming the interests of the masses and yet not feel indignant or dissuade or stop him but allow him to continue.

9) To work half-heartedly without a definite plan or direction; to work perfunctorily and muddle along...

10) To regard oneself as having rendered great service to the revolution, to pride oneself on being a veteran [yet] to be slipshod in work and slack in study. This is a tenth type.

11) To be aware of one's own mistakes and yet make no attempt to correct them, taking a liberal attitude towards oneself.

As Mao has correctly pointed out, all the foregoing acts of liberalism within the Party express or manifest the rejection of ideological struggle. And I wish to add that those who practice liberalism actually peddle their petty bourgeois ideology and try to obscure their own need for Marxist education. They are not humble

enough to acknowledge their need for further Marxist education if they are indeed sworn to develop themselves as Party members.

At one point in the article, Mao refers to some Party members who think that they can adhere to liberalism and Marxism at the same time. They presume that they can flip from one to the other or even mix them up. There are such eclectics who even presume that they are smarter than others because of their eclecticism. But it is not really possible to be a consistent, systematic and profound Marxist by not discarding and combating liberalism.

3. Liberalism manifests itself in various ways. One example is to let things slide for the sake of peace and friendship when a person has clearly gone wrong, and refrain from principled argument because of personal relationships. This is particularly difficult in practice. There are comrades who do criticize and argue every wrong point. In organizing, it is tricky to point out every wrong view and opinion of the masses immediately, because we don't want them to distance themselves in the start. How do we balance this and how do we weigh which is liberalism and which is not?

JMS: I do not agree that there is any wrong idea or any wrong factual claim from comrades and the masses that cannot be answered and explained in a respectful, friendly and persuasive way. In the first place, we propagate the line that in the revolutionary movement we learn from each other. It is wrong to let a wrong idea stand or pass just to avoid offending the one who expressed it.

The Marxist knows how to answer or explain how wrong an idea or claim is in a reasonable and persuasive way without insulting or running down the other side in the discussion. I have had so many students who even express rabid anticommunist ideas. But they have been intelligent enough to learn from what I explain. Sometimes, even the apparently most rabid anticommunist becomes eventually an activist or even a comrade and devoted student of Marxism.

4. Mao talks about irresponsible criticism. What does he mean by that? In our organizations, what are methods we use to conduct responsible criticisms?

JMS: Even among those who are already presumed to know the decisive importance and necessity of democratic centralism and

collectivity in Party life, there are some members who act and speak liberally or individualistically by making irresponsible criticisms at the expense of comrades who are absent or at the expense of decisions taken by collective organs and units of work.

Those who come across such irresponsible comrades should admonish them immediately to bring the criticism before the proper organ or collective. They should also be reported accordingly. Thus, the criticism is looked into before any disunity arises that obscures the issue if there is any serious one that exists.

5. Not to obey orders but to give pride of place to one's own opinions. To demand special consideration from the organization but to reject its discipline. This is also a form of liberalism. What do we do in cases that we do not agree with the orders given to us? How do we ensure democracy in our organization?

JMS: When a lower organ or a lower collective does not agree with an order from above it must send up promptly the reasons and facts why the order is wrong and should be corrected. It is wrong for any individual or even a lower organ or organization of the Party to become swell-headed and break discipline.

The relationship between higher and lower levels of organs and organizations is a dialectical and interactive. The higher level is ever appreciative of timely and more accurate reports, recommendations, criticisms and new proposals. It shuns bureaucratic centralism and commandism. The communist principle and style is to work through the collective and follow democratic centralism.

6. To be among the masses and fail to conduct propaganda and agitation or speak at meetings. This is also a form of liberalism. Can you elaborate on this and give examples?

JMS: Every time a communist is among the masses he must avail of the opportunity to conduct propaganda and agitation. There are always burning issues to take up. And there is always the need to raise the level of revolutionary consciousness and militancy among the masses. To waste the opportunity is to fail to perform a duty. It is a form of liberalism, a way of taking it easy and neglecting to carry out a task.

7. What does the saying "so long as one remains a monk, one goes on tolling the bell" mean and why is that harmful to our

organization?

JMS: This means doing the routine all by oneself and not taking a new initiative with other comrades in order to raise the level of revolutionary work to a new and higher level. Being daily satisfied with the status quo and doing the same chores day in and day out run counter to the constant need for arousing, organizing and mobilizing more people for strengthening and advance of the revolutionary movement.

8. To regard oneself as having rendered great service to the revolution, to pride oneself on being a veteran, to disdain minor assignments while being quite unequal to major tasks, to be slipshod in work and slack in study. This is liberalism. How do we ensure that comrades don't fall to this kind of liberalism?

JMS: This is a case of liberalism in which someone thinks so highly of himself that he would disdain to do anything below his imagined self-importance even as he is actually short of what he can accomplish or does slipshod work and is wanting in further education. Such comrades who overrate themselves and underperform should come under the supervision and direction of the appropriate organs and collectives as well as of the masses.

9. Mao named eleven principal manifestations of liberalism in his pamphlet, and mentions there are more. We recommend that listeners read the whole text. Ka Joma, can you explain where liberalism stems from.

JMS: Mao declares, "Liberalism stems from petty-bourgeois selfishness, it places personal interests first and the interests of the revolution second, and this gives rise to ideological, political and organizational liberalism... Liberalism is a manifestation of opportunism and conflicts fundamentally with Marxism. It is negative and objectively has the effect of helping the enemy; that is why the enemy welcomes its preservation in our midst. Such being its nature, there should be no place for it in the ranks of the revolution."

10. To conclude, can you elaborate why liberalism is extremely harmful to the revolutionary collective and how can we battle and overcome it?

JMS: Mao teaches us: "Liberalism is extremely harmful in a revolutionary collective. It is a corrosive which eats away unity,

undermines cohesion, causes apathy and creates dissension. It robs the revolutionary ranks of organization and strict discipline, prevents policies from being carried through and alienates the Party organizations from the masses it leads. It is an extremely bad tendency...”

“We must use Marxism, which is positive in spirit, to overcome liberalism, which is negative... All loyal, honest, active and upright Communists must unite to oppose the liberal tendencies shown by certain people among us and set them on the right path. This is one of the tasks on our ideological front.”

We can combat and overcome liberalism by studying Mao’s Combat Liberalism, raising our level of consciousness about it and being vigilantly and militantly critical of it every time it is manifested. Mao prescribes the following: “We stand for active ideological struggle because it is the weapon for ensuring unity within the Party... But liberalism rejects ideological struggle and stands for unprincipled peace, thus giving rise to a decadent attitude and bringing about political degeneration in certain Party individuals and revolutionary organizations.”

On the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution

Fourth Episode of Mao Series

Anakbayan-Europe NDLIne Online School

Questions by Host Crisanto Kempendorff

January 3, 2021

1. What is the historical significance of the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution (GPCR) to China and to the world?

JMS: Mao launched the GPCR in 1966 in line with his theory of continuing revolution under the dictatorship of the proletariat through cultural revolution in order to combat modern revisionism, prevent the restoration of capitalism and consolidate socialism.

This theory was the result of his study of the class contradictions in Soviet socialist society and his critique of the Soviet political economy and the rise of the Soviet modern revisionism under Khrushchov as well as the circumstances of China from 1949 to 1966, especially from 1957 to 1966.

Mao had also observed that there were already revisionists or capitalist roaders within the Chinese Communist Party and the socialist state since the planning and preparation of the Second Five Year Plan in 1957; and that the Soviet revisionists headed by Khrushchov had influence on the Chinese revisionists since the rise of Khrushchov.

Liu Shaoqi and Deng Xiaoping sent study teams to the Soviet Union to learn from the revisionist reforms instituted by Khrushchov for application in China. They came into sharp conflict with the planning and preparation for the Second Five-Year Plan or the Great Leap Forward of China.

2. How did Mao take notice of the capitalist roaders in the Chinese Communist Party? And why did he launch the GPCR only in 1966 if he noticed them 10 years earlier?

JMS: Mao and the Central Committee had to observe first the pronouncements and behavior of the capitalist roaders, let them

unfold themselves first and do only what was warranted at a given time. Peng Dehuai who was defense minister and was well-known as close to the Soviet Union was the most brazen in opposing The Great Leap Forward at the Lushan conference in 1959 and was promptly made to account for his position.

In criticizing certain points or features of the Great Leap Forward, Liu Shaoqi, Deng Xiaoping, Chen Yun and Zhou Enlai were more prudent than Peng Dehuai. But Liu and Deng were systematic in taking advantage of contradictions and difficulties to undermine the entire Second Five Year Plan and not to solve them for the purpose of advancing socialist revolution and socialist construction.

They were for prolonging and enlarging concessions to the bourgeoisie in state-private corporations and to the rich peasants and private merchants. They were for the development of a “national democratic economy” instead of socialist construction. They exaggerated the need for private accumulation to run counter to the socialist drive for collective accumulation. In the name of using material incentives, they were for bigger wage differentials and for the piece-rate wage system.

Before and after the formation of the communes in the Great Leap Forward, Liu and Deng pushed the “Three Freedoms and One Contract” scheme to sabotage the advanced coops and the communes. The three freedoms were the freedoms: 1) to enlarge private lots, 2) to promote free-markets, and 3) for each individual household to be responsible for its own profit or loss. The one contract was to have each individual household sign a contract with the State for the production of a preset amount of crops. After the preset amount was met, the peasant would be free to sell everything on the free market.

3. What was the Great Leap Forward all about? According to the anticommunists as well as the Dengist capitalist-roaders, it was entirely or mostly a catastrophe like the GPCR.

JMS: After the basic socialist transformation of the Chinese economy in the First Five Year Plan from 1952 to 1957, the Great Leap Forward was planned and implemented to develop rapidly heavy and basic socialist industries as the lead factor in building socialism, agricultural collectivization through the communes as the

base of the socialist economy and light industry as bridge factor to provide for the immediate consumer and producer needs of households, especially among the peasants. This was supposed to learn from the overinvestment in heavy industry at the expense of agriculture in the Soviet experience under Stalin.

The Soviet revisionists and their Chinese followers were most vociferous in saying that agricultural collectivization was a certain failure if the agricultural machines were not yet provided everywhere. But the Great Leap Forward was successful in rapidly the economy self-reliantly through the wise and planned utilization of the available productive forces, through collective efforts, despite the continuing imperialist embargo, the Soviet abandonment of ongoing projects and the natural calamities which hit hardest in 1960 to 1961. The bumper crop came in 1962.

From then on, even the Chinese revisionists could not deny that the Great Leap Forward was greatly successful and that the Chinese people were enjoying stability and initial prosperity from year to year. Without the Great Leap Forward, China would not have developed its socialist economy self-reliantly on the two legs of industry and agriculture and would have succumbed to the imperialist embargo, the Soviet revisionist abandonment and the natural calamities.

Because of the Great Leap Forward, China scored major victories in developing socialist industry and the communes. Mao and the proletarian revolutionaries could not allow the Chinese capitalist roaders to get away with all the vitriolic attacks on his leadership when difficulties were misrepresented as insurmountable failures. Thus, he launched the Socialist Education Movement in 1963. But this was misdirected and sabotaged by Liu and Deng by promoting revisionism and they unwittingly laid the ground for the GPCR.

4. How did the GPCR begin and develop until the Ninth Congress of the CPC in 1969?

JMS: Liu and Deng themselves took part in the decision in January 1966 to explore the launching of the cultural revolution and to let Beijing Mayor Peng Zhen investigate how so much revisionist propaganda had run under the very noses of the responsible organs Chinese Communist Party, especially the Propaganda Department.

Peng Zhen came out with the “February Outline” to dismiss as merely academic the issue over what his vice mayor Wu Han had written against the decision of the Party to dismiss Peng Dehuai from his position because of his opposition to the Great Leap Forward. He tried to suppress Yao Wen-yuan’s criticism of Wu’s satirical piece which compared Mao to a tyrannical emperor for dismissing Peng from office.

When faculty members and students in Beijing rose up against the “February Outline”, Liu and Deng dispatched “work teams” to quell them. The intervention from above merely outraged the university population. The chain of events led to the formation of the Central Cultural Revolution Group of the CPC, the drawing up of the August 18, 1966 16-point Decision of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China Concerning the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution, the spread of the Red Guards Movement among the youth and the workers and Mao praising the youth as the successors of the revolution and calling on the Red Guards to bombard the bourgeois headquarters within the CPC and on the People’s Liberation Army to support the Left.

The exemplary theatrical works began to roll out and be performed in theaters, on the streets, on various forms of transport, in offices, factories and farms. They celebrated as heroes of the Chinese revolution the workers, peasants and soldiers. They promoted the line of the proletarian-socialist revolution and socialist construction. They condemned the Chinese capitalist roaders and upheld the line of proletarian cultural revolution against the old ideas, old culture, old habits, and old customs.

The Red Guards Movement was described as the most extensive and intensive manifestation of democracy in the history of mankind, arousing, organizing and mobilizing hundreds of millions of people all over China and utilizing huge assemblies, big character posters, slogans on walls and other forms of propaganda that the people could easily make against officials taking the capitalist road. In accordance with the Constitution of the Anshan Iron and Steel Company, the right of the workers to strike was spelled out and exercised to assert the leading role of their class.

The January Storm broke out in Shanghai in 1967. The workers overthrew the Municipal Party Committee and took power in the name of the Shanghai Commune. This was renamed the Revolutionary Committee the following month and became the model for forming revolutionary committees to take power all over China. They consisted of representatives of the Party, the people's army and masses. They became the base for delegates to the Ninth Party Congress in 1969.

5. How did the Chinese revisionist or capitalist roaders fight back against the forces of the GPCR?

JMS: Of course, the highest of the revisionists or capitalist roaders within the CPC resisted the GPCR. I have already mentioned the work teams deployed by Liu and Deng and maneuvers of Peng Zhen. There were those who used their high positions at various levels to maneuver and spread intrigues in order to counter the mass movement before they lost their positions. There were also those who pretended to be remorseful and pretended to be for the GPCR.

The worst enemies of the GPCR were those who created their own factions of Red Guards and worker rebels and took an ultra-Left line and carried out actions to discredit the GPCR. They were then denounced as those who raised the Red flag to attack it. They engaged in fighting the real Red Guards and carrying out physical actions and acts of vandalism against China's cultural legacy.

The objective of the Rightists in whipping up ultra-Left slogans and actions was to discredit the GPCR and conjure the demand for stopping the mass movement and stabilizing the situation by the authorities. The Rightists spread the intrigue that even Mao had been repelled by the unruliness of the Red Guards and they also sought to split the Left.

6. After the Ninth Congress in 1969, what happened to the Left and to Lin Biao after being hailed as "closest comrade in arms" of Mao and "universally accepted successor"?

JMS: Soon after the Ninth Congress, reports circulated that there was a falling out between Lin Biao and Chen Boda on one side and the Shanghai Group of Four (Jiang Qing, Zhang Chunqiao Yao Wenyan and Wang Hongwen), that Lin Biao was in a hurry to

become President and that he and his 24-year old son were plotting to overthrow Mao or to assassinate him.

Many outsiders express disbelief that Lin Biao could be rumored as plotting a coup for a long period of time before he was supposed to have botched his plot and taken a plane to fly to his Soviet foes with his top brass followers and with no sufficient fuel to reach the Soviet Union. After Lin Biao and his key followers were killed, the Group of Four would undertake a campaign to condemn Lin Biao and Confucius (a reference to Zhou Enlai).

It became apparent that the Left for which Mao called on Lin Biao and the PLA to support at the beginning of the GPCR was breaking up. It was reminiscent of how the top followers of Stalin (like Molotov, Malenkov and so on) had also split in the years before Krushchov took full power in 1956 in comparison to the re-ascent of Deng Xiaoping to power as Vice Premier and PLA Chief of Staff with the open support of Zhou Enlai.

7. But it looked like the Group of Four was still on the rise up to the Tenth Congress of 1973 and even thereafter. How much was the weight of this Left group in relation to the entire Left, Middle and Right section of the Chinese Communist Party?

JMS: Indeed, the Group was apparently on the rise as propagandists and icons of the cultural revolution up to the Tenth Party Congress in 1973 and even thereafter. Wang Hongwen became the Vice Chairman of the Central Committee, the third highest official after Mao and Zhou Enlai. He and other group members were raised to the Politburo.

Most of the time they enjoyed the support of Mao. Their strength was pushing the pen and doing propaganda pertaining to issues in culture, academia, education and similar matters. But by themselves they carried little or no weight within the Party, state and PLA. Without Mao to support them, they were ineffectual.

At any rate, they were able to launch the campaign to criticize Lin Biao and "Confucius" in late 1973 under the direction of Jiang Qing. The name of Confucius was used to refer to Zhou Enlai who was also pointedly alluded to as Zhou in the criticism of the novel, *Water Margin*.

The Group of Four were known to be on the same Left side with the Politburo member Kang Sheng in opposing the reascendancy of Deng and in targeting Zhou for criticism as the Centrist figure responsible for rehabilitating and promoting Deng Xiaoping. But subsequently, there would be falling out between the Group of Four and Kang Sheng who died of illness in 1975.

8. What were the accomplishments of the GPCR before it dwindled in effect and was finally defeated?

JMS: The GPCR put into practice Mao's theory of continuing revolution under the dictatorship of the proletariat through cultural revolution in order to combat modern revisionism, prevent the restoration of capitalism and consolidate socialism. This theory is supposed to be Mao's greatest contribution to the development of Marxism-Leninism, thus making Mao Zedong Thought or Maoism the third stage of development in the revolutionary theory and practice of the proletariat.

Mao had the opportunity to study the continued existence of classes and class struggle and the emergence of modern revisionism in the Soviet Union and China. He confronted revisionism as a growing threat already embedded in the Chinese Communist Party and the Chinese state. He hoped to succeed in preventing capitalist restoration and consolidating socialism through cultural revolution and in revolutionizing the political and cultural superstructure to promote the socialist mode of production against the one-sided revisionist and mechanical theory of "productive forces".

He succeeded in leading and generating the GPCR as the most extensive and intensive manifestation of democracy not only in the entire history of China but also of the entire mankind. The GPCR created the Red Guards movement among the youth, the three-in-one revolutionary committees as organs of political power, the three-in-one leading organs in factories, farms and institutions and the principle of mutual supervision between the cadres and masses.

The GPCR educated the cadres and masses in Marxism-Leninism-Maoism, the creation, created the exemplary literary and theatrical works and other artistic works, brought up the requirement for the youth to do mass work as part of their education and for the

masses to evaluate their fitness for further education, systematically deployed teams of educated youth, scientists and technologists to raise the level of production in factories and farms, generated rural clinics and barefoot health workers, scientific experiment and technological innovations flourished archaeological works expanded, and so on.

Contrary to the claims of the Dengist capitalist roaders that the GPCR was an economic catastrophe, the Chinese economy had an annual growth rate of 10 per cent despite the attempts to bring down the figures for certain years. Socialist industry and the communes advanced at an accelerated rate, inspired by the examples Daqing and Dachai. The high growth rate was accomplished self-reliantly in the direction of socialism and communism and not with the influx of foreign direct investments and loans for the purpose of capitalist restoration and integration of China with the world capitalist system.

9. How did Deng Xiaoping and the like undermine and defeat the GPCR? How did they use the three worlds theory and call for modernization, reforms and opening up for the purpose?

JMS: Since the Xunyi Conference in the Long March, Zhou had always or in the main supported the leadership of Mao. And he was known to consult Mao on every major issue in his line of work. Especially because of his deteriorating health, Mao relied on Zhou to keep the ship of state stable amidst the twists and turns of the cultural revolution and agreed with him when he recommended the rehabilitation of Deng to stabilize the situation after the fall of Lin Biao.

It is an interesting subject for study whether and how Zhou became a Centrist collaborator of Deng Xiaoping in the ultimate defeat of the GPCR. Did Zhou have his own reasons and initiative in collaborating with Deng or the Group of Four pushed him to collaborate with Deng to prevent the Group of Four from running him down.

Ultimately, the Group of Four was impotent in the face of the Centrist-Rightist combination against the GPCR no less within the CPC, the state and the PLA. Within the month after the death of Mao on September 9, 1976, the Group of Four was easily arrested under

orders by officials close to the late Zhou and Deng, like Hua Guofeng, Yeh Jianying, Li Xiannian and Wang Dongxing.

At the highest levels of policy-making by the Party and the state, the capitalist-roaders harped without cease on the line that GPCR had been chaotic and catastrophic and that therefore there was a need for stability and peace. Long before the arrest of Jiang Qing, Deng Xiaoping was also spreading the intriguing misogynistic joke that it would be a big tragedy if the Central Committee had come under the skirt of a woman.

But of course, in the most serious deliberations of the Central Committee, the Political Bureau or its standing committee, the Centrists and Rightist made use of the threats of Soviet social imperialism, the Zhenbao island incident in the Wusuli River and deployment of one million Soviet troops along the Sino-Soviet border as the pretext for drawing closer to the US, make a rapprochement with it as early as during the Nixon visit in 1972 and justify friendly relations with the US as the way to “modernization”.

The struggle between the two superpowers, US imperialism and Soviet social imperialism, was utilized by the capitalist roaders to favor US imperialism instead of playing off one imperialist enemy against the other. The friendly relations of China with the US became ultimately the highway for capitalist-oriented reforms and China’s reintegration in the world capitalist system. The US welcomed such relations with China in order to support the advancement of capitalism in China and abandonment of socialism and proletarian internationalism by China.

10. In the decisive year of 1976 how did Deng get overthrown and bounce back?

JMS: Zhou Enlai was the main patron and protector of Deng in his rehabilitation and reascendancy to power after the death of Lin Biao. When Zhou died of cancer in January 1976, the Left in general and the Group of Four in particular, had Deng removed from power for proposing “modernization” as a big comprador scheme for integrating China into the world capitalist system.

But when Mao died in September 1976, the Rightists and Centrists combined to bring Deng back to power and once more and arrest the Group of Four and thousands of cadres who adhered to

the GPCR. And they expelled Party members by the millions and replaced them with those opposed to the GPCR.

There was a total reorganization of the Chinese Communist Party, the Chinese state and the PLA in favor of the capitalist roaders. The proletariat was definitively overthrown. And the Dengist counterrevolutionaries succeeded in carrying out capitalist-oriented reforms and the integration of China in the world capitalist system.

11. What did the GPCR prove and what are the lasting lessons from it? Are you not dismayed that China has become capitalist and imperialist power contending for the No. 1 position?

JMS: The GPCR proved that there were capitalist roaders within the Chinese Communist Party, the state and the people's army. They were in control of major portions of state power and grew in strength to overthrow the socialist state of the proletariat. After the 1976 coup, it became obvious that China was taking the capitalist road after the GPCR was condemned as a complete catastrophe, the commune system was dismantled, the bourgeoisie was given access to the state banks to finance capitalist enterprises, the privatization of rural industries and departments of the Party, state agencies and people's army were financed to go into business and make acceptable to Party cadres "going into business".

The GPCR successfully exposed the existence and growth of the bourgeoisie in China and combated modern revisionism at least for some three to five years but it failed ultimately to prevent the restoration of capitalism and consolidate socialism. After 1976, China proceeded to become an unabashed oppressor and exploiter of the Chinese proletariat and other working people. Still further, it became the main partner of the US imperialism in propagating neoliberal globalization, especially after the Dengists crushed the mass movement against corruption and inflation in 1989 and the US steered China towards its entry into the WTO in 2001. Now, they have become the biggest contending imperialist powers.

Of course, it is dismaying that the two biggest socialist countries of the 20th century have become capitalist. But by becoming capitalist, after building a socialist industrial base, they have made the world capitalist system far more fraught than ever with the crisis of overproduction and the dangers of fascism, wars of aggression

and destruction of the environment by monopoly capitalism. All basic contradictions in the world are sharpening, between capital and labour in the industrial capitalist countries, between the imperialist countries and oppressed peoples and nations and among the imperialist powers themselves.

The current intensification of inter-imperialist contradictions, especially those between the US and China, are escalating the conditions of oppression and exploitation and driving the proletariat and the people to wage anti-imperialist and democratic struggles and aim for the resurgence of world proletarian-socialist revolution. The epochal struggle between capitalism and socialism, between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat, continues. Great revolutionary struggles are developing fast and great revolutionary victories of the proletariat and people are in the horizon.

On Proletarian Stand and Outlook

Second Episode: Introduction to

Marxism-Leninism-Maoism

Anakbayan-Europe NDLine Online School

Questions by Anghelo Godino

Answers by Jose Maria Sison

January 17, 2021

1. Why is studying Marxism-Leninism-Maoism (MLMZT) a basic task of a Communist?

JMS: At the outset, let me state that the Communist Party of the Philippines originally used the phrase Mao Zedong Thought like the Chinese Communist Party to signify all the major contributions of the great Mao to the development of Marxist-Leninist philosophy, political economy and social science and his own signal contributions, such as the rectification movement in Party building, protracted people's war and the theory and practice of the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution. For the purpose of symmetry, the CPP has used the word Maoism to align it with Marxism and Leninism.

It is the basic task of a communist as proletarian revolutionary to study Marxism-Leninism-Maoism as the universal theory of the revolutionary proletariat. Marxism is the stage when Marx and Engels laid the fundamental principles of the theory in the era of free competition capitalism. Leninism is the stage when Lenin developed Marxism in the era of modern imperialism and the world proletarian revolution. Mao Zedong Thought or Maoism is the stage when Mao put forward the theory and practice of continuing revolution under proletarian dictatorship through cultural revolution in order to combat modern revisionism, prevent capitalist restoration and consolidate socialism.

Every communist must understand the three stages of development of the universal theory of proletarian revolution: Marxism, Leninism and Maoism; and learn the basic principles of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism in materialist philosophy, political economy, social science, party building, strategy and tactics and opposing revisionism in socialist society. Such basic principles ought to be learned soonest by Party members after comprehending the Constitution and Program of the Party. For the purpose, I wrote the Basic Principles of Marxism-Leninism in 1981 in which I describe Mao Zedong Thought as the third stage of development as I had done since 1966.

2. Why is MLMZT only truly upheld by applying this universal theory to the concrete practice of Philippine revolution?

JMS: This universal theory has been developed on the basis of previous studies of nature and society, various forms of societies and the transformations of one form of society to another. It shows the similarities and differences of the international and Philippine history and situation and the impact of such world phenomena as colonialism, imperialism and neocolonialism on Philippine history and situation. It has therefore significance and relevance to the semicolonial and semifeudal Philippine society and can be applied in the concrete study and analysis of concrete conditions of Philippine society and also upon the concrete practice of the Philippine revolution.

Such basic problems of the Filipino people as imperialism, feudalism and bureaucrat capitalism are interrelated and interconnected with the history and development of capitalism on a world scale. Spanish colonialism came to the Philippines to impose colonial and feudal rule in connection with mercantile capitalism. US imperialism came on the crest of monopoly capitalism. It is necessary to relate world history with Philippine history and concrete conditions with the guidance of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism as the universal theory of proletarian revolution.

3. How do Communists develop the correct stand and outlook in studying MLMZT?

JMS: Communists must consciously take the proletarian stand and outlook in studying Marxism-Leninism-Maoism. They must

accept that the industrial proletariat is now the most progressive productive and political force that can lead the Filipino people to victory in the new democratic revolution and to advance further in socialist revolution.

They develop the correct proletarian and stand by studying MLM because this provides the most comprehensive and most profound integration of the most advanced scientific knowledge and practice in the service of the proletariat and the proletarian revolution. MLM integrates philosophy, political economy, social science, party building, the strategy and tactics and the cultural revolution in the service of the proletariat against the bourgeoisie.

4. What is revisionism and opportunism? Why do we have to oppose them resolutely?

JMS: Revisionism involves the systematic departure from and violation of the fundamental principles of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism. It misrepresents bourgeois ideas as proletarian and socialist ideas. It is the adoption of the bourgeois class stand against the proletarian class stand. The classical revisionism of the social democrats in the Second International involved socialist phrase-mongering to dress up petty bourgeois liberalism. Modern revisionism, which started in the Soviet Union, involved the abandonment of the proletarian class stand in favor of the bourgeois stand by Party and state bureaucrats and intelligentsia.

Opportunism has essentially the same meaning as revisionism but has the nuance of being of a less systematic and less blatant kind of violating the fundamental principles of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism.

A Right opportunist professes to be a communist but he adopts a line of capitulating to the bourgeoisie. A "Left" opportunist thinks that he is more communist than others and adopts the language of ultra-Leftism and the line of acting in the extreme, isolating the communist party and bringing about disaster to the revolutionary process.

5. Why does the duty of Communists to uphold Marxism and combat revisionism not cease for as long as there are classes and class struggle?

JMS: It is the duty of communists to uphold Marxism and combat revisionism so long as classes and class struggle do not cease. In

the Second International, revisionism arose when Bernstein systematically promoted the line that capitalism could peacefully evolve into socialism and thereafter when Kautsky made the socialist parties support the war budgets and aggressive actions of bourgeois states in the name of social chauvinism and social pacifism.

In socialist society, the ground for revisionism was laid when Stalin made the mistake of prematurely declaring the end of classes and class struggle in 1935. This tended to obfuscate the persistent old ideas, culture customs and habits of the vestigial members and representatives of the exploiting classes as well as unhealthy petty bourgeois and bourgeois currents among the bureaucrats and intelligentsia who wish to enlarge their privileges against the socialist line and class interests of the proletariat and other working people.

6. What is the meaning of total and complete service to the people?

JMS: Total and complete service of communists to the people means being ready to sacrifice one's life, being tortured and imprisoned and killed in the course of the revolutionary struggle. Under conditions of armed revolutionary struggle or otherwise, communists do not expect and are not promised by the Party any compensation other than what is reasonably set and honestly earned. To wage and advance the struggle, every cent is well-spent and accounted for.

Chasing after high positions, fame or fortune is frowned upon among communists. Recognition, honors and promotions are decided on the basis of merit and bestowed by collective organs and assemblies in order to inspire comrades and the people. The highest honors are accorded to the revolutionary martyrs and heroes. Outstanding thinkers and leaders are recognized on the basis of their works.

7. What is the meaning of boundlessly valuing one's task?

JMS: Whatever your task is, whether small or big at a given time, you must perform it seriously because it is interrelated and interconnected with the tasks of other communist party members. If you fail to do your assigned task, you can prejudice or foul up the collective effort of all party members.

You can prejudice even the life of your entire collective, if you sleep while on guard duty and you fail to sound off the alarm when the enemy is approaching or creeping on the position of your camp. You must be vigilant and diligent for the love of your comrades and the people.

8. What is the correct outlook of a Communist towards hardship, sacrifice, difficulty and death?

JMS: The correct outlook of a Communist towards hardship, sacrifice, difficulty and death is to understand that they arise as the price for making advances and achieving victories against an enemy that can still cause or inflict these and to adopt all measures of being vigilant, being more effective and avoiding unnecessary sacrifices.

Even when communists win victories, there can be certain costs in the course of fighting or as a result of certain errors. In any case, communists must honor and be inspired by the revolutionary martyrs and heroes. They must be encouraged to fight even harder and more effectively when sacrifices occur. Errors must be corrected promptly through criticism and self-criticism and adoption of the correct measures..

9. What is the mass line, and the correct basic attitude towards the masses?

JMS: The mass line is to learn from the masses their conditions, needs, demands and aspirations through social investigation and class analysis. Thus, we know how to arouse, organize and mobilize the masses more effectively than ever before in accordance with the general line and program of the party.

What we can learn from the masses can improve our work and style of work and further enrich and substantiate the existing program and the party's stock of knowledge in order to advance revolutionary practice. Revolution is a mass undertaking. It is impossible without the masses rising up and overthrowing the enemy state.

10. Why must a Communist become better in uniting with the broad majority of cadres and members of the Party?

JMS: A Communist become better in uniting with the broad majority of cadres and members of the Party because it is the democratic thing to do and because it is the way to strengthen the

entire Party and the entire revolutionary movement. If a party member of whatever rank acts in a selfish or arrogant way, timely comradely advice and criticism must be made in order to preserve and strengthen unity. Criticisms and proposals must be motivated by a desire for unity and must result in a higher level of unity and strength.

11. Why is it only on the basis of MLMZT that it is possible to forge a genuine and steady unity of proletarian revolutionaries?

JMS: MLM is the only basis existent to forge a genuine and steady unity of proletarian revolutionaries because it is the most comprehensive and profound source of knowledge and guidance for carrying out the people's democratic revolution with a socialist perspective. By availing of this theory, it is possible to make new contributions to enrich it and further develop it. There is a wave-like advance in the dialectical relationship of theory and practice, as Mao demonstrated in his theory of knowledge and practice.

12. What is the correct attitude towards comrades who have an outlook different from ours, those who are relatively backward, or if not, those who have erred?

JMS: The correct attitude is to cure the patient who is sick and help him become a healthy and stronger part of the party and the revolutionary movement. It is a matter of comradely sharing of knowledge and persuasive reasoning to overcome any backward attitude and to correct wrong ideas and actions or any shortcoming. It is the task of more advanced members to educate further those who are relatively backward. Errors and shortcomings can be criticized in a timely manner on the spot and these can also be taken up in timely and periodic sessions of criticism and self-criticism.

13. Why is active ideological struggle most important? What is liberalism and what harm does it bring the Party and the revolution? How do we combat it?

JMS: Active ideological struggle is important because it is the way to raise the level of revolutionary consciousness and militancy of party members and the entire party. It must always be characterized by comradely discussion, persuasive reasoning and avoidance of the bureaucratic and bullying style. A stern attitude and stern measures

may be adopted only in relation to serious errors that have resulted in serious damage.

In a previous episode, we discussed Comrade Mao's "Combat Liberalism". He pointed out as many as eleven examples of liberalism. These are generally characterized by individualism, selfishness and sometimes safe playing. We avoid criticizing comrades just because we do not wish to offend them. A criticism is well-done when it is fact-based and the constructive proposal is made to correct it. Someone properly criticized can appreciate the criticism if correctly done. In the first place, a good communist must criticize himself upon recognition of his own error for the purpose of instructing or educating others.

14. What is subjectivism? What harm does it bring the Party and the revolution? How do we combat this?

JMS: Subjectivism means depending only on one's fixed ideas or narrow personal experience. It is dogmatism when one depends on one's fixed ideas and denies or obfuscates objective reality and social practice. It is empiricism when one depends on one's own sense-data and personal experience and denies or fails to take into account the social practice and knowledge of collectives and other people.

15, Why is the Communist an internationalist?

JMS: The Communist is an internationalist because he is for the unity of the workers of all countries in order to ultimately defeat the bourgeoisie completely on a world scale and realize communism as a classless society. Communism is impossible so long as imperialism continues to exist and has the strength to oppose socialism. The Communist is for the people's democratic revolutions and socialist countries to arise, develop and win victories in various countries until imperialism is finally defeated, the proletarian class dictatorship can wither away and communism is realized as a classless society.

16. What is the outlook of a Communist towards nationalism?

JMS: The Communist outlook and view on nationalism is that it is a bourgeois political ideology reflective of the phenomenon of nation-states that have arisen as a result of bourgeois-democratic revolutions. At the same time, Communists and socialist states

recognize the principles of people's national sovereignty and independence of nation-states against colonialism, imperialism and neocolonialism.

Bourgeois nationalism goes astray when it is used to oppose and attack communist parties and proletarian internationalism and to generate chauvinism, xenophobia and fascism. Socialist states cannot wither away so long as imperialism, revisionism and reaction persist. It is their duty to strengthen the proletarian class dictatorship until all the anti-democratic, anti-socialist and anticommunist forces are defeated and the classless communist society becomes realizable.

Dialectical and Historical Materialism: A Review

Third Episode of Marxism-Leninism: An Introduction

Anakbayan-Europe ND Line Online School

Questions by Seyra Rico

Answers by Jose Maria Sison

January 24, 2021

1. What is the objective of studying Dialectical and Historical Materialism? How will it help to shape the political and personal life of activists and revolutionaries?

JMS: The objective of studying dialectical and historical materialism is to provide the proletariat and the people with the materialist-scientific outlook in comprehending nature and society and with the materialist dialectical method in cognition or acquiring knowledge from such social practice as production, class struggle and scientific experiment.

The study of dialectical and historical materialism is necessary for activists and revolutionaries in order to shape further their political and personal life and remold themselves as proletarian revolutionaries, whatever is their class origin. Even workers are not born Marxist-Leninists or proletarian revolutionaries. They have to study dialectical and historical materialism and other components of Marxism-Leninism in order to strengthen themselves as proletarian revolutionaries or communists.

2. What are the two world outlooks?

JMS: The two fundamentally different and opposite world outlooks are the idealist and the materialist world outlooks.

The idealist world outlook starts from consciousness rather than from the objective material reality itself in understanding and explaining material phenomena. It ascribes to the supernatural or to

the Platonic Absolute Idea or the Hegelian self-development of thought as responsible for the origin and development of nature and society. It can also be as subjectivist as narrowing reality to a mere complex of sense data or to personal experience rather than social practice as the source of knowledge.

The materialist world outlook starts from the objective material reality as the basis and source for acquiring a consciousness of it in terms of perceptual knowledge and rational knowledge. Consciousness reflects first natural and social phenomena through perceptual knowledge and then developed further by rational knowledge which comprehends the laws of motion that operate in said phenomena.

3. Where does the existence of two diametrically opposed world outlooks come from? Can you expound on: a) Condition of production; b) Class struggle; c) Creation of dialectical materialism

JMS: a) In most of primitive communal society, the stone tools and other rudimentary tools of production and the level of production were so low that the people in production interpreted the forces of nature and their beneficial and destructive consequences as the manifestations or workings of the supernatural, ranging from the animistic to the pantheistic and polytheistic.

At the same time, the people in production were not merely superstitious but were practical materialists who had to use their own wits, muscles and rudimentary tools in order to produce their means of subsistence, from the stage of food gathering and hunting in the stone stages to the tillage and animal breeding at the onset of the late barbaric stage of primitive communal society with the use of bronze metal tools.

b) Upon the use of iron metal tools and the rise of the surplus product beyond the level of tribal self-subsistence, private ownership of the means of production and patriarchy and subsequently patriarchalism emerged and consequently classes and class struggle developed in a series of exploitative class societies: slave, feudal and capitalist.

In the course of the slave and feudal societies, the slave masters and then the feudal lords favored the idealist philosophers and philosophies that ranged from the Platonic idealism to Christian

theology. Even then there were rudimentary materialist philosophers who sought to explain natural phenomena as such, like Democritus and Heraclitus did.

The slave system outgrew itself after the slaves expanded the land for cultivation and engaged in class struggle against the slave owners who ultimately resorted to converting them into serfs. Subsequently, the serfs engaged in class struggle against the feudal lords. Eventually, the bourgeoisie emerged with more efficient means of production, rising from the stage of handicrafts to the stages of manufacturing and industrial production.

With the rise of the bourgeoisie, the dominance of ancient idealism and Christianity was steadily breached by humanism against divinism, scientific discoveries and secular philosophies, especially the French Enlightenment and liberal democracy. The French Revolution was the first successful revolution to overthrow the idealist philosophical and political dominance of the feudal aristocracy and became a platform for secular but petty bourgeois ideas.

c) By the 19th century, German philosophy, British political economy and French social science became available for Marx and Engels as the best of received knowledge and as the object of their critique. They critiqued these, rejecting the dross and adopting the truthful and rational kernels, in order to lay down the fundamental principles of Marxism from the viewpoint of the revolutionary proletariat. They were able to define dialectical materialism by critiquing Hegel's idealism and Feuerbach's materialism.

Marx thoroughly applied dialectical materialism in the critique of the industrial capitalist mode of production and Engels ranged over the scientific advances of his time to put forward the basic laws of contradiction. Marx demonstrated the validity of dialectical materialism by applying it in the *Communist Manifesto* and in the proletarian class struggles up to the Paris Commune of 1871, summed up in the *Civil War in France*.

4. What is the great importance of dialectical materialism to the proletariat and the Marxist-Leninist Party?

JMS: The great importance of dialectical materialism to the proletariat and the Marxist-Leninist Party is that it is the philosophical

outlook and method of cognition and practice that recognizes and advance the revolutionary role of the proletariat as the most advanced productive and political force against the bourgeoisie and the capitalist system.

From the sphere of philosophy to that of political economy and social science, dialectical materialism upholds and promotes the revolutionary role of the proletariat in overthrowing the class dictatorship of the bourgeoisie, establishing socialism and developing the conditions for the emergence of the classless communist society.

5. Where do correct ideas come from?

JMS: As the great Mao has explained, correct ideas come from social practice. This consists of production, class struggle and scientific experiment. These terms, as formulated, are so well sequenced.

First of all, for any kind of society to exist from primitive communal times to civilization, there must be production to ensure the basic subsistence of the community and in the long run to create the surplus product that enabled civilization. Man is the only animal that makes tools for production and does not depend merely on picking the fruits of nature.

Civilization became characterized by the use of metallurgy, class struggle and literacy. The class struggles between the slaves and the slave masters, between the serfs and the landlords and between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie have resulted in economic, political and social advances as well as advances in scientific experiment and technology.

6. How is the process of development of knowledge? Can you explain more on a) The stage of perceptual knowledge; b) The stage of rational knowledge; c) Stage of applying theory in practice; d) The whole process of development of knowledge.

JMS: a) The stage of perceptual knowledge involves the initial gathering of facts through the sense data and personal experience of individuals as social investigators and through conversations with other persons who are presumed to know their own locality and circumstances.

b) The stage of rational knowledge begins when the reports based on perceptual knowledge are subjected to class analysis by the responsible collective unit or organ of the Party, conclusions and judgments are made and the tasks for further investigation and mass work are defined.

c) Application of theory is already at work when the individuals carrying out social investigation are mass activists and cadres with knowledge and training in the theory and the task of social investigation. But the application of theory and class analysis become more pronounced at the stage of rational knowledge because the facts gathered are subjected to further analysis by a collective with cadres who have a wider resource base of information and knowledge.

d) The whole process of developing knowledge, as illustrated by the great Mao, looks like advancing wave upon wave. Perceptual knowledge leads to rational knowledge, theory applied to practice leads to a higher level of knowledge and practice benefited by a higher level of knowledge leads to a higher level of practice.

7. What about historical materialism? What is the fundamental difference between historical materialism and the idealist outlook on history?

JMS: The fundamental difference between historical materialism and the idealist outlook on history is that the former analyses the mode of production, the class struggle and the scientific and technological level of development to account for the relative unity and equilibrium of a certain kind of society as well as for the revolutionary change that occurs from one kind of society to a higher kind. Insofar as class struggle is the motive force of history, the masses are the makers of history and main determinant of revolutionary change.

The idealist outlook on history ascribes to supernatural beings, divine providence or fate the persistence or development of a certain kind of society. It also makes outstanding individuals like kings, generals, philosophers, religious leaders and geniuses the main determinants of history and exaggerates their roles against the revolutionary classes and masses that are truly the ones responsible for the revolutionary change of social system.

8. Can you explain the a) *The issue of the ultimate basis of the existing social structure and the ultimate cause of change in society and the forward motion of history;* b) *The issue of the possibility of fundamental changes in society;* c) *The issue of class struggle;* d) *The issue of the role of exceptional individuals—kings, generals, leaders or geniuses.*

JMS: a) The mode of production is the material base of a society. When the forces of production grow and render the relations of production outmoded, then the class struggle between the exploiting and exploited classes intensify. In the capitalist mode of production, the social character of the forces of production are in constant contradiction with the private mode of appropriation by the bourgeoisie.

While the class struggle in the mode of production is of basic importance, it extends to the superstructure. The capitalist uses the state and the instruments of class coercion to subdue the proletariat as well as the bourgeois cultural institutions and instruments of propaganda to distract or mislead the proletariat and the rest of the people.

While the capitalist class is still dominant in the superstructure of capitalist society, the proletariat develops its own political and cultural instruments which can gain strength from the crisis of the ruling system that disables the capitalist class from ruling in the old bourgeois-democratic way and at the same time from the intensification of the all-round revolutionary struggle of the proletariat, its revolutionary party and the organized and spontaneous toiling masses.

b) In capitalist society, some basic pre-socialist reforms are possible. These improve the wage and living conditions of the proletariat and appease the proletariat for a certain period. But the capitalist class will never agree voluntarily to make fundamental reforms or changes that transform capitalist society to socialist society.

Basic reforms to improve wage and living conditions are always welcome. But it would be reformism to rely indefinitely on such reforms. It is even more outright reformism to hope for the capitalist class to voluntarily give up its economic wealth and state power.

Just as it is ready to use reformist social democracy to mislead the proletariat, it is also ready to use fascism to suppress the proletariat and prevent it from establishing socialism,

c) The class struggle is fought between the capitalist class and the proletariat in the economic, political and cultural fields. It is at its highest point when it becomes a struggle between armed revolution and the armed counterrevolution in the political field. It is settled by the overthrow of the capitalist class and the establishment of socialism.

d) The capitalist class can have exceptional individuals—kings, generals, leaders or geniuses. But the proletariat and its revolutionary party rely mainly on the masses of the proletariat and other working people to win victory in the revolution even as they have their own outstanding political and cultural leaders and revolutionary heroes.

9. What are the forces of production, and the relations of production?

JMS: The forces of production are the people in production and the means of production. And the relations of production in an exploitative economy and society are determined by the private ownership of the means of production and private appropriation of the surplus product above what is paid to the toilers for their bare subsistence.

10. What is the basis in the economy for the division of society into classes? Can you give a differentiation on a) Primitive communal system; b) The slave system; c) The feudal system; d) The capitalist system.

JMS: a) In primitive communal society, the stone tools were freely available and could not be monopolized by any part of the community, food gathering and animal hunting were a collective effort of the small community in the form of clan or tribe. There was no class yet owning the means of production and depriving another class of these.

b) In slave society, the slave masters owned the slaves, the metal tools, the land and livestock and deprived the slaves of these so that they were bound to give all that they produced to their masters who merely gave them rations for their subsistence. Private ownership of

the means of production was instituted by the force and law of the state and by patriarchal tradition.

c) In feudal society, the feudal lords owned the large landed estates and made the serfs to work on them. The serfs were required to pay most of the crop to the lords as land rent and retain a small part for their subsistence. Previously, the landed estates were opened and expanded by slaves or acquired through colonial conquests. As a result of slave revolts and runaways, the slave masters decided to adopt the feudal system, with them as the lords and the slaves as serfs.

d) In the capitalist system, the capitalist class owns the equipment, the raw materials and the factory site. The proletariat sells its labor power to the capitalist class and receives wages for its subsistence. The wages amount to a small part of the total value created by the workers and the rest, which is called the surplus value, is divided as profit for the capitalists, rent for the land owner and interest payment to the bank.

11. What is the state? And when did the state emerge in the history of society?

JMS: The state is the organization of violence by the exploiting class to subjugate the exploited class. It consists of the army, police, the courts and the prisons. It emerged upon the advent of the private ownership of the means of production in slave society and the class differentiation of the class of slave owners and the slaves who were treated as work animals and could be bought and sold and could be killed at will by the slave owners.

12. What is the role of the working and exploited classes in the development of production and of society?

JMS: No means of production drop from the sky and they cannot produce anything without the working and exploited classes using them. In fact, the working and exploited classes have in the course of history created and developed the means of production and have used them to create the surplus product for the benefit of society. But the exploiting classes assert and maintain with the use of the state power their private ownership of the means of production and private appropriation of the product of labor.

13. *What is meant by the absoluteness, or universality and particularity of contradiction? How can you apply this principle to the people's war? What is the relation of the universality and the particularity of contradiction?*

JMS: The laws of contradiction or materialist dialectics are absolute and universal in the sense that they operate in all forms of material reality and they have a particularity in different forms of things. Engels was the first to define the three laws of contradiction in his *Dialectics of Nature*: the law of the transformation of quantity into quality, and vice versa; the law of the interpenetration of opposites; and the law of the negation of the negation.

In his *Materialism and Empirio-Criticism*, Lenin would subsequently point to the unity of opposites as the most fundamental law of contradiction in natural and social phenomena and in the various fields of study thereof. In his own contribution to materialist dialectics, Mao in his "On Contradiction" elaborates on the unity of opposites as the fundamental law, as may be observed in various social contradictions and transformations. At any rate, the laws of contradiction operate in various kinds of motions and measures in the different forms of natural and social phenomena as well as in the human cognition that reflects these objective phenomena.

The law of contradiction or materialist dialectics applies on the people's war wherever that there are social conditions that require it. The people's war and the armed counterrevolution are extensions of the class struggle in the economic, political and cultural field. The people's war is the highest form of political struggle because it decides whether the communist party and the worker-peasant alliance are able to overthrow the state power of the exploiting classes. The term "people" denotes and connotes mainly the alliance of the proletariat and the peasantry, as in the October Revolution of 1917 and in the Chinese revolution.

Nowadays, however, there are infantile Maoists, who wrongly assert that people's war or even protracted people's war is universally valid or applicable even in the most advanced industrial capitalist countries where the farmers (mostly rich ones) are only 5 per cent or less of the national population. In such countries, the big agri-corporations and rich farmers are dominant over the farm

workers; and the poor peasants of the third-world type are non-existent. However, in most countries of the world, especially in the underdeveloped countries, the peasant population exceeds 50 per cent of the national population and the worker-peasant alliance is still a major and decisive factor in the conduct of armed revolution.

Significance of the Paris Commune of 1871

and its Relevance to the World Proletarian Revolution

**Address to the International League of Peoples' Struggle
as ILPS Chairperson Emeritus
March 18, 2021**

Dear Comrades and Friends.

I thank the International League of Peoples' Struggle for inviting me to give the keynote speech at this webinar for the purpose of celebrating the Paris Commune of 1871 on the occasion of its 150th anniversary.

I am honored and delighted to discuss the significance of this great and glorious revolutionary event and its relevance to the world proletarian revolution up to the ongoing anti-imperialist and democratic struggles of the proletariat and the entire people of the world. I am proud that since its founding in 2001 the ILPS has been inspired by the Paris Commune and has contributed greatly to the worldwide anti-imperialist and democratic mass movement.

Again in the revolutionary spirit of the Paris Commune of 1871, I daresay that these current mass struggles are in transition to the great resurgence of the world proletarian revolution from the major setbacks caused by revisionist betrayal of the socialist cause. The proletariat and people can never accept the escalation of their exploitation and oppression.

Imperialism has inflicted neoliberalism, state terrorism, wars of aggression, the threat of nuclear annihilation, global warming and pandemics on the proletariat and the people of the world and has incited them to fight back and advance the revolutionary cause for national liberation, democracy and socialism.

I. Significance of the Paris Commune of 1871

As Chairman of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Philippines, I discussed the significance of the Paris Commune of 1871 on the occasion of its 100th anniversary in 1971. I relied on the best possible summing up and analysis of the great event, *The Civil War in France* by Karl Marx who monitored the event through various public sources of information and best of all through members of the International Workingmen's Association (the First International) who were in the Central Committee leading the Paris Commune.

The Paris Commune proved for the first time in the history of mankind that the working class was capable of destroying the bourgeois state machinery as well as replacing it with the state of the working class, a dictatorship over the exploiting classes and a democracy for the erstwhile exploited classes. From March 18 to May 28, 1871, the workers of Paris (who numbered in the hundreds of thousands and who constituted the National Guards) rebelled, dismantled the reactionary army and demonstrated that they could seize political power and govern a new society.

They resisted the attempts of the French bourgeois reactionaries headed by Thiers to disarm them in compliance with the terms of surrender to the Prussians led by Bismarck who won in the Franco-Prussian War. Upholding the dictatorship of the proletariat, the Communards issued as their first decree the suppression of the standing army of the bourgeoisie and its replacement by the armed people.

The Paris Commune was eventually defeated because it failed to launch promptly an offensive against the reactionary bourgeois government put up by Thiers in Versailles at a time that its army was still weak and disorganized and the Prussians had not yet released the many French army men that they had held as prisoners of war to favor the French bourgeois government.

To gain time on the Communards and make a deal with Bismarck, Thiers dispatched armed detachments against Paris and at the same time pretended to sue for peace negotiations upon the failure of every armed expedition. Thus, Thiers and Bismarck were eventually able to launch attacks that overpowered the Paris

Commune and resulted in the mass murder of 20,000 to 30,000 worker-martyrs.

Marx honored the Paris Commune in the following terms: “Workingmen’s Paris with its Commune will be forever celebrated as the glorious harbinger of a new society. Its exterminators’ history has been already nailed to that eternal pillory from which all the prayers of their priests will not avail to redeem them.” The Paris Commune raised to a new and higher level the glorious struggle of the working class that burst all out all over Europe in 1848.

Consequent to the Paris Commune, Marx and Engels inscribed in the 1872 preface to the *Communist Manifesto* the following fundamental lesson of decisive importance: “One thing especially 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’...” They saw fit to restate the words that are in single quotation marks from *The Civil War in France*.

To lead the October Revolution of 1917 to victory, Lenin learned well from the Paris Commune and repudiated the bourgeois parliamentarists, social chauvinists and social pacifists of the Second International. In his *State and Revolution*, he was emphatic on the lesson from the Paris Commune that the proletariat must smash the bureaucratic-military machinery of the bourgeoisie. Thus, the October Revolution of the Bolsheviks was essentially the destruction of the bourgeois state machine, the establishment of the proletarian dictatorship and eventually its consolidation under Stalin.

In consonance with the Paris Commune, Chairman Mao taught us, “Political power grows out of the barrel of a gun.” This is the essence not only of the people’s democratic revolution under the leadership of the proletariat in China but also of all revolutionary struggles waged by the proletariat in the 150 years after the Paris Commune. It is impossible for the proletariat to seize political power without following and realizing the principle of armed revolution.

One more fundamental lesson that the Paris Commune has taught us is that the proletariat must have its revolutionary party to lead the revolution and overthrow the bourgeoisie and for such party to build its strength ideologically, politically and organizationally for the purpose. The revolutionary practice of the Paris Commune

showed the need for a central body of leadership to guide the vigorous movement of the revolutionary masses.

The National Guards, the body of armed workers, that seized power in Paris from the bourgeoisie looked up to a Central Committee for leadership. On March 26, the Paris Commune was elected by the workers as a representative body to lead them. Though the International Workingmen's Association was denounced by the bourgeoisie as responsible for leading the revolt of the workers, it did not carry the preponderant influence among the workers.

Despite the fact that Marx was the leading organizer and spirit of the First International, Marxism had not yet been grasped by the majority of the workers. Blanquism and Proudhonism were acknowledged by the leaders of the Paris Commune as their guide. In practice, however, the Paris Commune debunked the Blanquist school of anarchy and the Proudhonist school of petty-bourgeois socialism and proved the correctness of Marxism.

Contrary to the anarchist tenets of Blanqui, the workers of Paris did not only destroy the bourgeois state machine but established the dictatorship of the proletariat and it was not a mere bunch of intellectuals that made revolutionary triumph possible but the great mass of workers in the course of class struggle. The economic decrees of the Paris Commune found no use for Proudhon's economic teachings about small cooperatives and had to deal with the facts of large-scale industry.

Learning from the experience of the Paris Commune, Lenin wrote *What Is To Be Done?* in answer to the need for building the revolutionary party of the proletariat. Tirelessly he built the Bolshevik Party as the advanced detachment of the working class, with Marxism as the guide to action. This party served as the political leader and general staff of the proletariat in the revolution for establishing the dictatorship of the proletariat and building socialism.

In the Chinese revolution, Comrade Mao Zedong built a well-disciplined party armed with the theory of Marxism-Leninism, using the method of criticism and self-criticism and closely linked with the broad masses of the people. This was the core of leadership of the entire Chinese proletariat and the people. It was the leader of the

people's army and of the united front of all revolutionary classes and organizations.

Still one more fundamental lesson that can be learned from the Paris Commune is that the creators of history are the masses. Leaders can sum up and analyze experience and can formulate new tasks only on the basis of the revolutionary mass movement. Genuine leadership can arise, make decisions and act correctly only by relying on the masses and learning from them. "From the masses to the masses" is the correct line that must be followed by the revolutionary party of the proletariat and by its cadres.

At first, Marx warned the Paris workers that any attempt to overthrow the government would be the folly of despair. But when in March 1871, the revolutionary workers of Paris revolted against the bourgeoisie and created the Commune, Marx set the example of a true revolutionary thinker and leader by welcoming the Paris Commune and considering himself a participant. He paid tribute to the revolutionary enthusiasm and initiative of the workers and closely studied their movement for its great worth.

The Paris Commune showed the boundless capacity of the revolutionary masses for creating new things after destroying the bourgeois state machine with their own armed power. They created a new government based on a truly democratic exercise of universal suffrage among the workers. They put up a leadership from their own ranks, working conscientiously and receiving pay equal to that of the worker, with no representation allowances and discretionary funds.

Such a leadership shunned the separation of executive and legislative functions. It was the complete opposite of the parliament, a talking shop of the bourgeoisie and the landlord class and a complete obstacle to social revolution. Any leader was subject to recall by the people. The Paris Commune had the attributes of a true democracy for the proletariat and the people while being at the same time a class dictatorship over the exploiting classes.

The workers of Paris were capable of achieving so much despite the hardship and difficulties of political and economic life in a country defeated in war and in a city besieged not only by the ruffians of Thiers but also by the troops of Bismarck. How much more would the

workers have accomplished had they had their own class-conscious party thoroughly instructed on Marxism!

How much more would they have been capable of had they not been prevented from a revolutionary coordination with the workers in other cities and with the peasant masses in the provinces of France. The Paris Commune envisioned a nationwide system of people's communes with a national delegation seated in Paris.

II. Relevance to the World Proletarian Revolution

Subsequent to the defeat of the Paris Commune of 1871, especially because of the mass murders inflicted on the workers during the bloody week of March 21 to 28, the international bourgeoisie and its articulators prognosticated that the working class would not dare to rebel again against the bourgeois state. But the heroism and martyrdom of the workers of Paris inspired the workers of so many countries to build socialist and labor parties and movements. The *Internationale* became their common anthem.

In its better years within the period from 1898 to 1916, the Second International contributed to the building of Marxist parties of workers and making Marxism the main trend in the working class movement in Europe in the last decade of the 19th century despite the revisionism of Bernstein and then Kautsky. In the meantime, as a consequence of repeated crises of overproduction and the relentless accumulation and concentration of private capital, several capitalist countries became monopoly capitalist and ushered in the world era of modern imperialism and the world proletarian revolution towards the end of the 19th century.

In this new era, the world capitalist system became more afflicted by the contradiction between the social character of the forces of production (the proletariat and the means of modern industry) and the private mode of appropriation by the capitalist class and became even more prone to the crisis of overproduction, intensified class struggle and inter-imperialist wars, such as those of World War I and World II in the first half of the 20th century.

World War I provided the conditions for the working class to seize political power in Russia and build Soviet socialism in one-sixth of the earth where Tsarism once reigned. World War II provided the conditions for communist parties to defeat the forces of fascism and

take power and build socialism in China and other countries as well as to lead the national liberation movements in Asia, Africa and Latin America.

By the early 1950s one-third of humankind was governed by communist and workers' parties. But the US emerged as the strongest imperialist power also as a result of World War II. It launched the Cold War since 1947 and unleashed propaganda campaigns of anticommunism, touting "free enterprise" as the guarantee to democracy. It violently opposed the people's movements for national liberation, democracy and socialism. It waged wars of aggression in Korea from 1950 to 1953 and in Vietnam and the rest of Indochina from 1955 onward.

The Korean people and the Democratic People's Republic of Korea (DPRK) fought and stalemated US imperialism. And the Vietnamese and the rest of the Indochinese people inflicted on the US its first categorical defeat in 1975. All the while, China was engaged in socialist revolution and construction and stood as a bulwark against US imperialism. From its relative peak of economic and military strength from 1945 to 1975, the US started its strategic decline due to stagflation, military overspending and the economic recovery of capitalist countries devastated during World War II.

But in the Soviet Union, where Stalin had directed the postwar reconstruction of the socialist economy and had broken the US nuclear monopoly, modern revisionism had risen to power and totally negated Stalin in 1956 in order to overthrow the state of the working class and allow the bourgeoisie and the factors of capitalism to grow within socialist society. It pushed bourgeois reformism and pacifism under Khrushchov and then social-imperialism under Brezhnev.

The Communist Party of China (CPC) opposed the modern revisionist line of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (CPSU) in the international communist and workers' movement. It also opposed within China the blatant Rightists as well as the home-grown and Soviet-influenced revisionists. It prevailed over a number of anti-socialist elements before, during and after the Great Leap Forward but some persisted in power.

Recognizing the crucial importance of upholding Marxist-Leninist theory and practice, Mao carried out the socialist education

movement from 1962 to 1966 to cleanse the Party and the socialist state of Rightism and revisionism ideologically, politically, economically and organizationally. But this did not suffice. And thus the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution (GPCR) was carried out from 1966 to 1976 on the theory and practice of continuing revolution under proletarian dictatorship through cultural revolution in order to combat revisionism, prevent capitalist restoration and consolidate socialism.

At the 100th anniversary of the Paris Commune on 1971, the GPCR shone brilliantly as the peak of the world proletarian revolution. But it would go through twists and turns and ups and down. The Rightists or revisionists increasingly succeeded to combine with the Centrists against the Left behind the apparent victory of the GPCR while Mao was alive. But soon after his death in 1976, the capitalist roaders led by Deng Xiaoping successfully carried out a counterrevolutionary coup against the proletarian revolutionaries and the socialist state of the working class.

The Dengist counterrevolution declared the GPCR as a complete catastrophe and carried out the restoration of capitalism in China through capitalist reforms and opening up to the US and world capitalist system. After suppressing the mass protests against inflation and corruption at Tien An Men in Beijing and in scores of other cities in China in 1989, Deng and his political stooges pleaded for more economic concessions from the US and became even more determined to strengthen capitalism in China as an integral part of the world capitalist system.

By 1991 the Soviet Union collapsed and its satellite revisionist-ruled states in Eastern Europe disintegrated. The bourgeoisie took full control of all the countries in the Soviet bloc. The communist parties influenced by Soviet modern revisionism all disintegrated. So did those communist parties which became confused by the anti-GPCR position of the Chinese party and state. US imperialism emerged as winner of the Cold War and became the sole superpower. And its ideologues and publicists proclaimed the death of socialism and the end of history with the supposed permanence of capitalism and liberal democracy.

US imperialism gloated over the full restoration of capitalism in China, Russia and the entire former Soviet bloc. It was unmindful of the fact that China and Russia were two large capitalist countries that could exacerbate inter-imperialist contradictions and worsen the crisis of the world capitalist system. It became preoccupied with the objective of subordinating China to US economic expansion under the neoliberal policy of imperialist globalization and subjecting Russia to the neoconservative policy of using the full spectrum of US power to expand NATO and undo the vestiges of Soviet power and influence in Eastern Europe, Central Asia and the Middle East.

Thus, the US itself aggravated the conditions for accelerating its own strategic decline through its economic, trade and technological concessions that enabled China to grow economically and militarily and undermine US economic hegemony and through the “endless wars” to counter Russia that cost USD 6 trillion in so short a period of time. The US has conspicuously lost its sole superpower status since the financial meltdown of 2008 and the ceaseless worsening of the economic and political crisis of the world capitalist system until now.

US imperialism adopted neoliberalism to overcome the problem of stagflation. But it never solved the crisis of overproduction which had been the root cause of stagflation. The increased production by the military-industrial complex was profitable within the US economy and from sales of war materiel to the oil-producing countries. But it was counterproductive and unprofitable as the US wars of aggression failed to expand a stable economic territory for US imperialism abroad.

We see today the growing turbulence in the world capitalist system. All major contradictions in the world capitalist system are intensifying, such as those between labor and capital; those between the imperialist powers and the oppressed peoples and nations; those between the imperialist powers and states that assert national independence and the socialist cause; and those among the imperialist powers themselves.

The intensification of contradictions between labor and capital within the traditional and relatively new imperialist countries is due to the worsening crisis of overproduction relative to the drastically

reduced income of the working people in the entire world capitalist system. The workers have become restless and rebellious due to unemployment, low income, rising prices of basic commodities, austerity measures, the curtailment of their democratic rights and the rise of chauvinism, racism and fascism.

Among the imperialist powers, the US and China have emerged as the two main contenders in the struggle for a redivision of the world. Each tries to have its own alliance with other imperialist powers. The traditional alliance of the US, Europe and Japan is still operative in such multilateral agencies as the IMF, World Bank and WTO and in NATO and other military alliances. Ranged against the traditional imperialist powers are China and Russia which have broadened their alliance in BRICS, Shanghai Cooperation Organization (SCO), BRICS Development Bank, the Belt and Road Initiative and the Asian Infrastructure Investment Fund.

The imperialist powers engage in a struggle for a redivision of the world but so far they have not directly warred on each other to acquire or expand their sources of cheap labor and raw materials, markets, fields of investment and spheres of influence. They have developed the neocolonial ways and means of shifting the burden of crisis to the underdeveloped countries. They are afraid of any direct war between imperialist powers because they are afraid of mutual destruction with their own nuclear weapons of mass destruction. They give vent to their aggressiveness by waging wars against underdeveloped countries in Asia, Africa and Latin America.

They make the oppressed peoples and nations of the underdeveloped countries the main source of superprofits through a higher rate of exploitation. They make them suffer the main brunt of the recurrent and worsening economic and financial crisis of the world capitalist system. Even as they are now increasingly protectionist, they continue the policy of neoliberal globalization at the expense of others. To suppress the people's resistance to oppression and exploitation, they provide their client-states with the means of state terrorism and fascist rule by the bureaucratic comprador bourgeoisie. They also use their respective client-states for proxy wars and counterrevolutionary wars for maintaining their economic territory or for redividing the world.

Despite their attempts to shift the burden of crisis to the oppressed peoples and nations, the imperialist powers are driven to extract higher profits from their own working class under the neoliberal policy regime. To suppress the resistance of the proletariat and people to oppression and exploitation in both the developed and underdeveloped countries, they have enacted so-called anti-terrorist laws and are increasingly prone to the use of state terrorism and to sponsor fascist organizations and movements for countering the growing revolutionary movement of the proletariat.

There are anti-imperialist governments like the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Cuba, Vietnam, Venezuela and Syria that effectively assert national independence and the socialist cause. They enjoy the support of the people, stand up against US imperialism and take advantage of the contradictions among the imperialist powers in order to counter sanctions, military blockade and aggression. The people and revolutionary forces led by the proletariat can strengthen themselves in the course of their just struggles.

III. Transition to the Resurgence of World Proletarian Revolution

Since 2019, we have seen the unprecedented rise and spread of gigantic anti-imperialist and democratic mass protests, joined by millions of people and occurring in all the six continents and in both the developed and underdeveloped countries. These are the resistance of the broad masses of the people to the extreme exploitativeness and bankruptcy of the neoliberal policy of imperialist globalization and to the escalation of state terrorism and wars of aggression.

I am deeply gratified that the International League of Peoples' Struggle has contributed greatly to the development of the anti-imperialist and democratic mass movement since 2001. The mass protests of 2019 flowed from earlier ones as a result of the persistent stagnation and depression of the world capitalist economy and outrageous failure of the leaders and experts of the imperialist powers and the taskmasters of the client states to solve the economic crisis and avert political crisis.

The Covid-19 pandemic and the lockdowns and other efforts of the authorities to discourage the mass protests failed to diminish and dampen these in 2020. Instead the pandemic has served to expose the extreme anti-social character and consequences of neoliberalism and rouse the broad masses of the people to rise up against their loss of jobs and incomes, deprivation of social services, the bailouts and stimulus packages for the big bourgeoisie, the escalation of repressive measures and the promotion of fascism in the name of anti-terrorism. It is expected that the mass protests will intensify and spread further in 2021 and thereafter.

Clearly, the world capitalist system and the domestic ruling systems are in a grave and deepgoing crisis. The imperialist powers and their puppet states fail more than ever in the old way. The worldwide anti-imperialist and democratic mass struggles signify the transition to the resurgence of the world proletarian revolution. The revolutionary spirit of the Paris Commune of 1871 is once more calling for the further rise of the oppressed and exploited masses and the revolutionary parties of the proletariat against imperialism and all reactionary classes

The massive and sustained mass protests in various countries of Europe, North America, Oceania, Latin America, Asia and Africa bring to the surface the deep-seated detestation of the people for the extreme oppression and exploitation that they are suffering. The proletariat and people of the world are fighting back.

The starting points or inciting moments for the mass protests have been concrete issues of wide variability but they always rise up to the level of condemning imperialism and all reaction and demanding revolutionary change of system. The upsurge of anti-imperialist and democratic mass struggles shows that we are definitely in transition to the resurgence of the world proletarian revolution.

The broad masses of the people are rising up against the worst forms of imperialist oppression and exploitation, such as neoliberalism, austerity measures, gender discrimination, racism, oppression of indigenous peoples, fascism, wars of aggression and environmental destruction. The wanton plunder of the natural resources by monopoly capitalism threatens the very life of

humankind with global warming and pandemics even as the danger of nuclear annihilation persists, especially because the imperialist powers are whipping up fascism.

In the last 50 years, we have seen how imperialism, neocolonialism, modern revisionism, neoliberalism, fascism and neoconservatism attack and put down the proletariat and people of the world. Now, the people are resisting as never before and generating new revolutionary forces, including parties of the proletariat and mass organizations that are guided by Marxism-Leninism-Maoism. These will ultimately result in the spread of armed revolutionary movements and the rise of socialist states and people's democracies with a socialist perspective.

While the imperialist powers and their reactionary stooges all over the world are using all kinds of counterrevolutionary violence to suppress the mass protests, there are the reformists and opportunists who claim that these are leaderless and spontaneous and would soon subside upon the peaceful democratization of the rotten ruling systems of the exploiting classes. But already there are Marxist-Leninist-Maoist parties and groups striving to develop themselves as revolutionary parties of the proletariat and to build the armed revolutionary organization for seizing political power under the inspiration of the Paris Commune of 1871 and succeeding armed revolutions.

The Filipino people and their revolutionary forces have persevered in the new democratic revolution through protracted people's war and with a socialist perspective in the last more than 50 years. Thus, they are now in the front line of the ongoing anti-imperialist and democratic mass mass struggles and they are making major contributions in the transition to the resurgence of the world proletarian revolution.

Ever loyal to the just revolutionary cause of the proletariat and people, they have waged revolutionary struggle resolutely and militantly and have fought fiercely against the counterrevolutionary campaigns of suppression by the enemy. They have been inspired by the revolutionary spirit of the Paris Commune of 1871 and by all succeeding struggles for national liberation and socialism in the

world and are more than ever determined to contribute to the resurgence of the world proletarian revolution.

They take pride in being referred to as one of the torch bearers of the anti-imperialist struggles of the peoples of the world and the world proletarian revolution. Their revolutionary will and fighting spirit are more than ever higher as their revolutionary struggles are now in concert with the resurgent mass struggles of the proletariat and people on a global scale. We foresee that in the next fifty years the crisis-stricken world capitalist system will continue to break down and give way to the rise of anti-imperialist, democratic and socialist states and societies.

Stand for Socialism against Modern Revisionism

Questions from Edna Becher of Anakbayan-Europa NDLine
Online School
May 2, 2021

Revisionism is the systematic revision of and deviation from Marxism, the basic revolutionary principles of the proletariat laid down by Marx and Engels and further developed by the series of thinkers and leaders in socialist revolution and construction. The revisionists call themselves Marxists, even claim to make an updated and creative application of it but they do so essentially to sugarcoat the bourgeois antiproletarian and anti-Marxist ideas that they propagate.

The classical revisionists who dominated the Second International in 1912 were in social-democratic parties that acted as tails to bourgeois regimes and supported the war budgets of the capitalist countries in Europe. They denied the revolutionary essence of Marxism and the necessity of proletarian dictatorship, engaged in bourgeois reformism and social pacifism and supported colonialism and modern imperialism. Lenin stood firmly against the classical revisionists, defended Marxism and led the Bolsheviks in establishing the first socialist state in 1917.

The modern revisionists were in the ruling communist parties in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe. They systematically revised the basic principles of Marxism-Leninism by denying the continuing existence of exploiting classes and class struggle and the proletarian character of the party and the state in socialist society. And they proceeded to destroy the proletarian party and the socialist state from within. They masqueraded as communists even as they gave up Marxist-Leninist principles. They attacked Stalin in order to replace the principles of Lenin with the discredited fallacies of his

social democratic opponents and claimed to make a “creative application” of Marxism-Leninism.

The total collapse of the revisionist ruling parties and regimes in Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union, has made it so much easier than before for Marxist-Leninists to sum up the emergence and development of socialism and the peaceful evolution of socialism into capitalism through modern revisionism. It is necessary to trace the entire historical trajectory and draw the correct lessons in the face of the ceaseless efforts of the detractors of Marxism-Leninism to sow ideological and political confusion within the ranks of the revolutionary movement.

In the Philippines, the political group that is most embarrassed, discredited and orphaned by the collapse of the revisionist ruling parties and regimes is that of the Lavas and their successors. It is certainly not the Communist Party of the Philippines, reestablished in 1968. But the imperialists, the bourgeois mass media and certain other quarters wish to confuse the situation and try to mock at and shame the Party for the disintegration of the revisionist ruling parties and regimes. They are barking up the wrong tree.

1a. A lot will argue that Marxism or any theory for that matter must be progressive – open to changes and interpretation otherwise it is passé. Thus, can you discuss to what extent the interpretation and practice of Marxism borders revisionism? What is modern revisionism and how is it different from the classical revisionism?

JMS: An individual, group or entire party ceases to be communist and becomes revisionist the moment it starts to deviate from and violate the fundamental principles of the universal revolutionary theory of the proletariat and systematically passes off bourgeois ideas as proletarian.

Bernstein of the Second International violated Marxism and became revisionist by claiming that socialism is achieved through peaceful evolution. And Kautsky and others became revisionist by espousing social chauvinism, social pacifism and social imperialism, supporting the war budgets the ruling bourgeoisie and tailing after it in going to war and engaging in colonialism and imperialism.

The difference between the classical revisionists of the Second International from the modern revisionists is that the latter were in

power in socialist society and in the leadership of the communist party, like Khrushchov who espoused bourgeois populism (party and state of the “whole people”); and bourgeois pacifism (peaceful road, peaceful economic competition and peaceful coexistence as strategic line of the international communist movement).

1b. Do we then restrict the flow of different theories and ideas for the people to explore? How can we then distinguish then theories and ideas that are genuinely for the people from the one's that can be damaging?

JMS: Communists do not restrict the flow of ideas but know how to distinguish bourgeois ideology from the proletarian. They are the constant target of bourgeois ideological attacks. They cannot ignore these, especially because there may be unremolded petty bourgeois elements within the Party who are prone to being influenced by bourgeois ideas.

Communists critique the ideology of the enemy and they are for the development of the proletarian revolutionary theory in accordance with the situation and concrete revolutionary practice. They always welcome new ideas that advance the revolutionary theory and practice of the proletariat. And they criticize and rectify their own errors and shortcomings within the framework of Marxism-Leninism and the proletarian revolution.

Revisionists are not welcome in a genuine communist party just as communists are not welcome as members among the ranks of the bourgeoisie and atheists are not welcome as members in a religious organization. It is not progressive but retrogressive for a communist party to welcome as members those who take the bourgeois stand, viewpoint and method; and oppose its fundamental principles as a proletarian revolutionary party.

2. How did modern revisionism arise in the Soviet Union and how has it been used to undermine and cause the collapse of the Soviet Union?

JMS: Khrushchov and his ruling clique took advantage of the false notion that classes and class struggle had ceased to exist in the Soviet Union since the promulgation of the 1936 Soviet Constitution and that the point was to build the material and cultural foundation of communism, with his “creative” capitalist-oriented

economic reforms and his bourgeois populism and bourgeois pacifism.

In fact in Soviet socialist society, there were still the vestiges of the bourgeoisie, the emergence of a new bourgeoisie in the party and state bureaucracy and the influence and active intrusions of the international bourgeoisie, especially imperialism.

Khrushchov's complete negation of Stalin, the propagation of modern revisionism, the abandonment of the proletarian line, the further spread of bourgeois ideas and imperialist influence, the recentralization and wastage of resources in the arms race and in the practice of social-imperialism by Brezhnev and the swing back to Khrushchovite policies under Gorbachov undermined and caused the collapse of the Soviet Union.

3a. Did revisionism from Soviet and Eastern Europe affect the line of the Old Communist Party in the Philippines? In what way? Where did it go wrong?

JMS: The Lavaite revisionists in the old Communist Party established relations with the revisionist Communist Party of the Soviet Union (CPSU) in the 1960s and followed the Soviet revisionist line by espousing the line of indefinite legal struggle and endless avoidance of armed revolution in the Philippines. This was in contradiction with the Marxist-Leninist line of the reestablished CPP that it was possible and necessary to start people's war along the line of the national democratic revolution because of the chronic crisis of the semifeudal and semicolonial Philippine society.

3b. Why is it so important to uphold the Marxist-Leninist line? How can we distinguish the systematic changes in line from revisionism? How can we even uphold the Marxist-Leninist line?

JMS: It is important to follow the Marxist-Leninist line because it spells the advance of the proletarian revolution. We must always study and apply dialectical materialism in order to find out whether subjectivism and opportunism are being used to promote revisionism.

Look at how the CPP advanced since its reestablishment by upholding and being guided by Marxism-Leninism-Maoism and contending with the revisionism of the Lavaites in the old CP. And look at how the old CPP has degenerated and has become

inconsequential in the Philippines as a result of adhering to revisionism and capitulating to the Marcos fascist regime.

4. What was the basis of the old Communist Party to release and popularize the policy paper, "The Present World Situation and the CPP's General International line and Policies"? What was the effect of this error on the international work of the CPP? Are these errors still visible or felt up to today?

I presume that you are referring to the active role of the old CP in blocking the attempt of some of the leaders of the CPP to establish relations with the CPSU and the Soviet-bloc parties supposedly to seek military assistance from them in the 1980s. Indeed, the old CP stood guard against the effort of the aforesaid CPP leaders to establish relations with the CPSU in the 1980s.

Before and during the Second Great Rectification Movement (SGRM), which was launched in 1992, the CPP vigorously criticized the error and failed attempt to establish relations with the CPSU, reconsider its revisionist character and seek Soviet military assistance. The error did not cause grave damage to the CPP international work. The international relations of the CPP have flourished.

The error could not go far because the old CP actively prevented CPP relations with the CPSU. But even then, both the CPSU as ruling party in power and the Soviet Union was willing to support the CPP. They also started to disintegrate in the late 1980s and they collapsed in 1991. The CPP Central Committee and its SGRM promptly criticized and repudiated the error.

5. The NDF as the political arm of the CPP can seek relations with other anti-imperialist and national liberation formations. Why is it then wrong for the CPP itself to establish fraternal relations with these formations? Why not also with the CPSU? Is there a difference?

JMS: One should not speak of the NDFP as the political arm of the CPP as if the CPP is not itself a political party. The CPP can have fraternal or comradely relations with genuine communist and workers' parties as well as friendly relations with anti-imperialist and national liberation movements.

At the time that some CPP leaders in the early 1980s wished to have relations with the CPSU, the latter wanted the CPP to change its previous position that the CPSU was revisionist and that the Soviet Union was social imperialist. Friendly or comradely relations were impossible. The CPSU also wanted the CPP to collaborate with the revisionist old CP and its line of supporting the Marcos fascist regime. It was futile to expect military assistance for revolution from the Soviet Union which was deeply into collaboration with the Marcos regime.

6a. Why do we say that building proletarian dictatorship is a prerequisite to building socialism?

JMS: Proletarian class dictatorship simply means the socialist state, like the class dictatorship of the bourgeoisie means the capitalist or bourgeois state. The socialist state of the proletariat is a prerequisite to building socialism. Socialism is impossible without the socialist state being established first.

6b. Stalin is perhaps one of the most vilified historical personality, in some cases he even exceeds Mao's vilification. In Europe, he is known as a great commander who defeated the fascism of Hitler. But he is also known to be a 'dictator' whose evil is equal to Hitler. Before we jump to the next question, can you quickly introduce Stalin to our viewers and listeners.

JMS: Any proletarian revolutionary thinker and leader with great achievements, like Stalin or Mao, is treated as personification of socialism by anti-communist powers and propagandists and is vilified as a shortcut to vilify the entire socialist system.

The achievements of Stalin in socialist revolution and socialist construction and defeating fascism are undeniable and should be put forward. The lies of the anti-communists against Stalin and Mao try to deny the great advance of democracy through the liberation and empowerment of the toiling masses and the great advances in economic construction.

7. Upon the death of Vladimir Lenin, Stalin took the leadership and managed to continue policies and the line that Lenin started. However, in the new constitution he declared in 1936, he states that there were no more class struggle and exploiting classes in the

Soviet Union. Why is this claim wrong in the first place and how significant was his error?

JMS: Stalin and the CPSU were so happy with the victories of the socialist revolution and construction in 1936 that they thought that classes and struggle had disappeared in the Soviet Union. As I have earlier pointed out, the wrong presumption that there were no longer classes and class struggle in the Soviet Union would open the way for the revisionists to further cover up the persistence and influence of the bourgeoisie and misrepresent bourgeois ideas and policies as socialist. Proletarian revolutionary education would be undermined and derailed.

8. It took Stalin 20 years to build a Socialist country but it took longer for the revisionists to restore the capitalist society. What does it say about socialism?

The socialism that Stalin built was durable despite the Nazi invasion and occupation of the Soviet Union and the devastation wrought on the Soviet economy during World War II. Stalin practically industrialized the Soviet Union twice, from 1927 onward; and again from 1945 onward. Indeed the revisionists took a long time to undermine and destroy the Soviet Union.

9. How did then this modern revisionism overthrow the proletarian dictatorship and convert it to monopoly bureaucrat capitalism? For the benefit of our audience can you also please give context to what monopoly bureaucrat capitalism is?

JMS: As early as 1956, the revisionist ruling clique of Khrushchov overthrew the proletariat by completely negating Stalin and implementing anti-socialist policies. At every level of the Soviet state and economy, the bureaucrats became bourgeois and corrupt, seeking not only perks and privileges within the confines of their offices but stretching their hands to take cuts from private enterprises and transactions. The highest of these bureaucrats became the monopoly bureaucrat capitalists.

10a. In what way did Khrushchov undo the works of Lenin and Stalin in building socialism?

Khrushchov put forward and spread his ideas of bourgeois populism and bourgeois pacifism and dismantled the socialist economy by decentralizing and autonomizing state enterprises and

collectives and making them responsible for their cost and profit accounting. Managers were given hire and fire power over the workers. Kulaks reemerged in the collectives and the bureaucrat capitalists enriched themselves at every level of the Soviet state and economy.

You can review the article “Stand for Socialism against Modern Revisionism” to know more about how Khrushchov dismantled socialism in the Soviet Union.

10b. Can we then assume that bureaucratism and intelligentsia in the Party can lead to revisionism as seen by the likes of Krushchov?

JMS: Of course, bureaucratism and the intelligentsia within the Party can lead to bourgeoisification if not checked by Marxist-Leninist education and practice. Bureaucrats and the intelligentsia can become divorced from the masses and revolution, preoccupy themselves with perks and privileges and resurrect the bourgeoisie among themselves.

11a. How did Khrushchov ‘s successor Brezhnev, maximise revisionism in restoring capitalism? How did they entice the people to join the capitalist restoration?

JMS: By decentralizing the Soviet economy, Khrushchov put it into shambles. He was subsequently ousted by Brezhnev in 1964. Brezhnev recentralized the economy in order to have more funds for the center of the empire to engage in the arms race with the US, to carry out social-imperialist adventures from Czechoslovakia to Afghanistan and to feed the corruption of the central bureaucrats and their collaboration with a Mafia-type criminal bourgeoisie which was expert at stealing from the Soviet factories, collectives and state banks.

11b. Can you talk more about Brezhnev?

During the time of Brezhnev from 1964 onward, the Soviet Union wasted tremendous amounts of public resources in bureaucratic corruption and military overspending in the arms race and in a war of aggression as in Afghanistan. His revisionist clique made the Soviet economy bleed and decline. This set the ground for Gorbachov to put forward his brazen anti-socialist bourgeois “new thinking” and perestroika from 1985 onward.

12a. Gorbachev completed the fall of Soviet Union and his regime has been more influenced by the Western ideas. In what way did his regime push the full restoration of the capitalist society in now Russia?

JMS: Gorbachov made use of Brezhnev's bungling of the Soviet economy and the costliness of social-imperialism to swing back to the Khrushchov line. He was able to make the Soviet Union deteriorate further and formally go into a collapse by tolerating the corrupt bureaucrats and the criminal syndicates that had grown large during the Brezhnev regime, and secretly promoted separatist currents among the Soviet republics in collaboration with Yeltsin showing the way how Russia no less could break away from the Soviet Union.

12b. Did the restorations to capitalism start the Russian oligarchs?

JMS: Of course, modern revisionism and capitalist restoration brought about the rise of the Russian oligarchs who are monopoly bureaucrat capitalists and the mafia lords of private business who stole their assets from the state. From Khrushchov through Brezhnev to Gorbachov, the state and private monopoly capitalists as well as the criminal syndicates grew. The growth of private enterprises provided cover for criminal appropriation of the social wealth created by the working people and for systematic theft of the flow of products from the factories and farms.

13. What lessons does the CPP get from this historical event of the rise and fall of the Soviet? By the looks of it, lack of ideological struggle and consolidation gave rise to modern revisionism, what can you say about this?

JMS: There is a wide range of lessons for the CPP to learn from the rise, degeneration and collapse of the Soviet Union. The most important lesson is to adhere to Marxism-Leninism-Maoism, to always promote the proletarian revolutionary education and to apply the proletarian revolutionary stand, viewpoint and method in the class struggle against the bourgeoisie.

14. How can the revolutionaries deliver the people from the evil that is revisionism?

JMS: We have observed how modern revisionism went on in the Soviet Union until its collapse and how it was confronted by Mao and the Communist Party of China through ideological debate with the CPSU from 1956 onward and through the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution (GPCR) from 1966 onward.

We have learned a lot of principles and methods in combating revisionism in the GPCR but because this was defeated eventually in 1976, we have to study further and learn further in dealing with this problem. We deal with this problem in connection with new conditions.

15. How can the socialist construction and wealth distribution assure that it will not give rise to modern revisionism, should another socialist state be establish again?

JMS: The problem of modern revisionism will always have the potential of reemerging to counter socialism. There is no alternative but to fight and defeat it. Otherwise capitalism cannot be defeated. It is a problem that arises within socialism and it must be solved so as to consolidate and advance socialism toward communism.