

# IDEOLOGIES IN THE PHILIPPINES: A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS

**Rizal G. Buendia**

Special Lecturer, College of Economics and Politics,  
Polytechnic University of the Philippines.

## Introduction

This paper, in brief, is an attempt to present the major ideologies espoused by different parties, groups, and aggrupations in the country today and analyze their concepts of an ideal political system for the Philippines. Given the multifarious and complex socio-cultural, economic, and political problems of the country, ideologies continue to compete in offering solutions and programs of government to respond to the national crisis.

Ideologies have sharpened their distinctions and differences from each other as they strive to gain peoples' support to their ideologies; while new ones emerged or re-emerged to suit the idiosyncracies of the country's political milieu. These developments are most welcome and encouraging because they signify the growth of political movements aspiring to answer the country's acute social illnesses.

An expanded and slightly revised paper delivered on the occasion of the First National Convention and Third Anniversary of the Kabataang Liberal ng Pilipinas, (Young Liberals of the Philippines) September 12-13, 1992, Hasmin Bldg., Polytechnic University of the Philippines, Manila.

All ideologies have their *raison d'etre* and proffer convincing arguments to justify their programs of government and strategies for a better political system, either by etching and grafting new or re-modelled structures within the existing socio-economic and political order or building new ones from the ashes of the old.

Ideologies in one historical point,

oftentimes depending on its position from the power spectrum at a given time, can be generally considered conservative, reformist, and revolutionary or radical. These can be classified under the following groups: as staunch defender of the status quo, when it is deemed dominant and in power (conservative or "rightist"); an advocate of change within the existing order when it is in the fringe of political power (moderate or "centrist"); and a rabid believer in the total destruction of an existing social order through "revolutionary violence" when it is out of power and does not seem to have a chance of seizing political power under the present socio-economic and political structure (radical or "leftist").

Apart from these major categories, there are other ideologies which stand "in-between" the aforesaid classifications. These ideologies are modifications of existing ones and contain certain shades of two or more fundamental elements of major ideologies. These "shady" are formulated and "concocted" by political scientists through time and are continued to be done as the political landscape of a given society changes. However, they remain to be classified in accordance with their ideological roots, how they perceive change, and in what mode it should be done. Ideologies, therefore, are not mere products of abstract reasoning but are interpretations of political events and phenomena—historical and contemporary—based on the concrete conditions of the time.

Apparently, the future and survival of ideologies rest on the peoples' support and their ability to dynamically respond to new challenges and demands of political development as well as ideals of a "good" society. Whether such ideal political system is anchored on solid and material bases and viable given the country's political culture is for the people to decide and history to judge.

The discussion in detail and in depth of various ideologies cannot be done in this

forum, given the limited time. It takes a semester or even two courses in politics for us to explore the topic in a comprehensive and profound way. Thus, the discussion on ideologies shall be confined to those major ones prevailing in the country today.

Ideology (idea-logic), generally refers to ideas, principles, values, or a set of comprehensive beliefs and attitudes which are logically related that lend legitimacy or illegitimacy to existing political, economic and social institutions and processes (Rodee et. al. 1983: 76-77; Lawson 1989: 56-57): It offers a critique of the existing system and a view of an ideal system. It can be used to justify the status quo and resist every attempt to alter it or serve the purpose of change. In both cases, the defense of or affront to the prevailing order can take the form of reform or violence as the primary means to a perceived end—an ideal socio-economic and political system.

Moreover, an ideology can be an instrument of oppression or liberation depending on the perspective it is being viewed. For instance, those who defend the status quo and reluctant to change it invoke the "divine right theory" (conservatism) which sees that power and authority vested upon rulers are something derived from God. Thus, all policies, decrees, and laws issued by rulers must not be questioned otherwise it would be tantamount to questioning the authority of God. On the other hand, rebellious subjects may justify their acts of violence against those in power by citing the principles of "natural rights" or the "consent of the government" (liberalism).

However, it was the same ideology which liberated the subjects from their "gods" that, thereafter, was used to oppress the "governed". In the same vein, the socialists incite the masses, specifically the working class, to "break the chains of capitalist exploitation" and establish a democratic socialist regime from the ashes of a bourgeois state. Subsequently, socialism was used to legitimize dictatorial control over the working masses.

Apparently, ideologies tend to shift and change its color, ideals, and interests before and after seizing political power. An ideology seems to embody the principles and ideals of a progressive society when it remains

out of power but regresses to passivity and becomes lackadaisical when it takes power and thus, protects it from progressive elements in a society advancing an ideology that threatens the authority of power holders. In such case, the ideology loses its dynamism and turns itself to be reactionary and resistant to change. Obviously, ideologies of that sort fail to respond to the vicissitudes of contemporary politics and do not reflect concrete situations obtaining in a polity over time.

An ideology which refuses to see the dynamics operating in a particular political landscape and social milieu loses its relevance, reduces its sustainability, and diminishes support from the masses. Contrary to the beliefs of others, ideology is an independent variable that has an independent causal impact on politics. It is pro-active rather than acted upon. It incorporates progressive ideas and principles in one coherent system of political belief in order to advance the attainment of a better society.

However, an ideology which tends to be regressive upon seizure of political power, in spite of its progressive posture prior to its assumption, is a deliberate attempt to reduce the role of ideas and the significance of ideologies itself in political life. It tries to conceal the true underlying motives of political actors under the mantle of an "ideology", though it may look progressive. Theories that seem to reduce ideologies to sporadic perceptions and symptoms of something more basic is known as "reductionism". These reductionist theories fall into three main categories: power reductionism; economic reductionism; and psychological reductionism (Hagopian u. d. : 395).

For instance, power reductionism sees ideology as the dependent variable (See Morgenthau 1960). In this case, power is seen as the primary means and ends of politics. Adversaries are thrown off guard and neutrals are lured to the side of the power seekers or made to stay where they are. Ideological disputes are manipulated and "national interest" is defined in terms of maintaining or defending and enhancing the state's power position.

On the other hand, economic reductionism believes that economic interest is the only foundation of ideologies; if we know the economic interest of a certain group, we can easily predict its ideological persuasions.

According to this theory, privileged classes are inexorably drawn to conservative ideologies and work for the defense of status quo. While the less privileged and poorer segments of the society easily uphold revolutionary ideas.

This simplistic approach, however, proved to be inaccurate. Experience among revolutionary movements attest that leaders of revolutions, oftentimes come from the wealthy class while the poor are the ones that resist change or even serve as spies against the revolutionary forces.

Finally, psychological reductionism sees ideologies as rooted in one's mental traits and dispositions. The theory sees that peoples' attitudes and actions are rationalized in terms of some general principle or doctrine. Pareto (1963) calls all rationalizations as "derivations" from underlying psychological "residues". Derivations, among others, include theological beliefs and political ideologies which are projections of individual character.

Apart from the forecited flaws in reading ideologies, there are a lot of "loose" definitions as there are people using the term ideology. Apparently, there is a conceived notion that a distinction between political culture and ideology is unnecessary, if not trite and unessential. However, it is preferred for purposes of precision and eschewing confusion over the use of the term ideology, that a "tight" definition be made.

This paper culls Robert Haber's definition of ideology. He states:

"Ideology as an intellectual production has several elements: (1) a set of moral values, taken as absolute; (2) an outline of the 'good society' in which those values would be realized; (3) a systematic criticism (or ... affirmation) of the present social arrangements and an analysis of their dynamics; and (4) a strategic plan of getting from the present to the future..." (1969 : 283).

Ideologies, therefore, are very explicit and highly systematic patterns of political belief. Hagopian (u. d.: 390) declares that it is "a programmatic and rhetorical application of some grandiose philosophical system, which arouses men to political action and may provide strategic guidance for that action".

On the other hand, political culture is far more complex and diffused sets of political beliefs—almost a mosaic—that includes not only several competing beliefs, but belief system (subcultures) that influence political life. It refers to all those aspects of a country's general culture that bear more or less directly on political processes and institutions.

An ideology has three (3) main structural aspects, namely: relationship to a grandiose philosophical system; program derived from a philosophical system; and strategy of realizing programmatic aims (Hagopian u.d.: 391). In other words, an ideology is not a philosophy but a translation of an abstract philosophical principle into a concrete political program intended to achieve a specific goal.

Moreover, an ideology performs the following functions: it tries to legitimize and provide moral justification for political power; helps interpret reality by organizing the complexity of the political world into more readily manageable categories of thought; and mobilize the masses either to support or overthrow an existing political order.

Given the aforesaid context, ideologies in the Philippines will be analyzed using the parameters set forth in the definition of an ideology.

### Liberal Democracy

Liberal democratic ideology is one of the various ideologies in the country espoused by parties, groups, and aggrupations which remained tied with the colonial-sponsored liberal democratic thought as propagated by the Americans. Perhaps, this is the longest existing ideology in the country prominently embodied by political electoral parties since the "granting" of Philippine independence in 1946.

Liberal democracy is neo-liberalism or modern liberalism as distinguished from classical liberalism of John Locke (natural rights liberalism), John Stuart Mill (utilitarian liberalism), Herbert Spencer (social Darwinist liberalism). Although classical liberalism and neo-liberalism share the same unit of social analysis—the individual—the former believes that liberalism is incompatible with democracy while the latter asserts that liberalism and democracy are inseparable.

Liberal democracy defines freedom in a positive sense. It contends that individual

freedom cannot be fully realized by mere absence of minimal government control and social pressure on one's thought and action. Freedom is deemed acquired only when one has achieved a certain "freedom-creating" state of mind which requires governmental action whose responsibility is to raise its citizens' level of consciousness to a point where an individual can exercise one's freedom in a mature and responsible manner. Beyond such point, the growth and expansion of one's freedom becomes a personal responsibility. The modern liberals do not advocate a "paternal government" which denies the individual the responsibility to nourish or destroy one's acquired freedom.

While it is apparent that the liberals call for the safeguard of individual's rights and liberties, classical and neo-liberalism differ in the means on how to secure one's individualism. For the former, the government should perform a minimum rule while the latter favour an expanded role in the affairs of its citizens especially in the areas of economics and education.

The transition from a "negative" or "positive" conception of freedom and the shift from anti-democratic liberalism to liberal democracy is a matter of logical necessity and not a product of historical development. The convergence of the ideas of liberalism and democracy resolves a pragmatic question in development rather than a doctrinaire. As Leonor Hobhouse states:

"The manner in which the state is to exercise its controlling power (over property and industry) is to be learnt by experience and even in large measure by cautious government" (in Sidorsky 1970:20).

A more interventionist role of government in the economy cannot be dispensed with and becomes fundamental as laissez faire economics could no longer ensure the ideals of liberalism (Lawson 1989:66). John Stuart Mill argued that laissez faire did not promote the survival of the fittest but ensured the exploitation of the many by the few. Neither did it guarantee the worker's just compensation for the amount of work rendered but the reward was inversely proportion to work (Rodee et. al. 1983:100). Thus, it becomes essential that social and political reforms be undertaken by the government. The State, therefore, has a social function.

Liberal democrats believe that the individual's liberty must be defined within a

social context rather than abstracting one's nature, motivations, and rights outside of an economically interdependent society. John Dewey maintains that individual development and progress necessitate social requisites and insulating an individual from society constitutes a debasement of one's individualism (in Hagopian u.d. : 470-71). He thinks that true individualism for the masses and elite requires collective (governmental) action against misery, poverty, and ignorance.

The neo-liberals perceive that true freedom of an individual can only manifest when one's thoughts and actions are governed by reason and morality, termed as the "higher" or "true" self, instead of the "lower" self (instincts and passions). True freedom, equated with the "higher" self or "self-realization", can be attained with the individual's association and participation with a group. As Dewey said:

"Liberty is that secure release and fulfillment of personal potentialities which take place only in wide and manifold association with others; the power to be an individualized self making a distinctive contribution and enjoying in its own way the fruits of association" (1954:150 in Hagopian u.d.: 471).

Evidently, liberal democracy is more pluralistic and democratic in addressing the question of individualism compared to classical liberalism. It recognizes the important role of a government, as a political institution, in promoting the citizens' freedom as long as it does not interfere into the realm of the individual's "freedom-creating" state of mind.

Neo-liberals, furthermore, accept the growing participation of government in civilian affairs as society becomes complex. For them, it is inevitable and consistent with the basic purpose of liberalism—to secure for all citizens an equal opportunity for self-development. The government is allowed to assume more welfare functions not only for the middle class but for those citizens who are prevented by circumstances beyond their control to effectively compete with those who are more privileged.

Liberal democracy, by virtue of its adherence to democracy, advocates for parliamentary government in the broad sense—an elected members of legislature which exercises a check on the powers of the executive. It believes in the idea that all rational

beings possess the inalienable right to rule themselves. It is to be noted that the liberal thought is the ideological root of democracy.

Liberal democracy works for an egalitarian society but does not intend to even off class differentiation nor eliminate classes as what the communists are advocating. Inasmuch as the neo-liberals posit that all human beings are capable of reason and rational action, the government is duty-bound to provide assistance only to those citizens who are willing to develop their potentials. However, it cannot force anyone to avail of the government's support if such is not being sought. Any attempt to help a citizen who does not ask for it is a transgression to individual's right, liberty, and freedom. The "social evolution". Liberal democrats contend that progress requires social action which must be achieved and earned by individuals which may well mean using the government. Since the modern liberals see the State as an instrument for one's attainment of freedom, they likewise perceive that progress and political change have to be instituted within the government and under the parameters of the State's laws.

They believe that political change has to be made through peaceful, parliamentary, and non-violent means. The liberal faith in reforms is linked with its belief in historical progress which can be achieved through positive social action.

Liberal democracy promotes specific reform programs, whose aggregate sum equals the modern welfare state. In fact, its advocacy for positive freedom, social function of the State and government, parliamentarism, equality of opportunity, and reformism constitute the idea of a welfare state within the framework of liberal ideology.

Finally, liberal democrats support the separation of Church and State and freedom of conscience. Its anti-clerical posture is an offshoot of its individualism which demands that religion is to be made a "personal" and private affair.

Apart from the various differences in philosophy and ideals between classical liberalism and modern liberalism, the latter was able to preserve many aspects of the former: individualism, parliamentarism, reformism, and separation of State and Church. However, one significant difference is that liberal democracy was able to make liberalism and democracy inseparable and

rendered the "tyranny of the majority", feared by the classical liberals, passe'.

In the Philippines, the first direct contact with the Anglo-Saxon liberal tradition of the 17th century was made no further back than the late 19th century. The few Filipino intellectuals sojourned in Europe before the Philippine Revolution of 1896 first came to know the great modern ideas in political thought—concepts of national self-determination, popular sovereignty, representative democracy, republicanism, constitutional government, political rights, and liberty.

Although these concepts and ideas were not exclusively European, the "ilustrados" happened to know them in their European flavor. In fact, the Malolos Constitution which very few Filipinos now have studied, is an "ilustrado" document and the first republican constitution in Southeast Asia. Evidently, the American colonization in 1900 largely cut off the link of the Filipino intellectual to European political thought.



As a result of the 45 years of direct American rule in the country, liberal political ideas were implanted to Filipinos' mind in American fashion. Through the establishment of an efficient mass-based school system where English became the only medium of instruction, Filipinos learned more of American history, culture, heroes, and system of government than its own. Moreover, the country's political and governmental institutions and structures until the present time were and are shaped from American political tradition. Thus, the meaning of liberty, freedom, and rights were understood by the Filipinos in the American context.

Inasmuch as the ideals and principles of liberal democracy remain unchanged, its application need not necessarily be identical either the Anglo-Saxon or American tradition. The complexion and dynamism as well as applicability of liberal democracy have to be defined and suited to the peculiarities and idiosyncracies of the society's historical development and political culture. As revolution cannot be imported, ideology cannot be imposed. It has to follow the contours of the peoples' political life. Otherwise, it will not survive and become an instrument of oppression rather than liberation.

The wheels of history cannot be turned back. Liberal democracy in the Philippines has been grafted than homegrown. However, recent political events and peoples' movements have indicated that the ideology of neo-liberalism seems to be a viable political thought. Nonetheless, its ultimate success shall be tested on how effective the advocates are in indigenizing and nourishing liberal democracy in Philippine soil.

### Socialism

Socialism is an ideology which evolved out of the perceived failure of liberalism and its attendant economic system—capitalism, to provide the "true" freedom, democracy, and rights to the individual. The ideology believes that the undue emphasis given by liberalism to the individual has induced one's selfishness, in total disregard of the welfare and interest of others. This unbridled selfishness exacerbated the inequalities among individuals who were never born equal by virtue of talent, wealth, and capacity.

This inequality is thus reflected in the entire society. The relations between classes tend to be oppressive and exploitative, with the few privileged classes possessed with extreme wealth, power, and opportunities while the vast working masses squalor in poverty, powerlessness, and ignorance.

Moreover, the basic feature of liberalism and capitalism which is the private ownership of the basic means of production (land, mines, machines, and techniques) and exchange (wholesale and retail outlets, transportation and communication facilities, financial institutions, etc.) has resulted in the overconcentration of wealth and prosperity to the "bourgeois class" and deprived the "proletariat" or working class of its just share in the fruits of labour.

In this regard, the socialists say that liberalism protected the freedom, liberty, and rights of the bourgeoisie and constricted that of the toiling masses. They contend that the capitalist economic system engendered the exploitation of man by man and resulted in dehumanization and alienation for society.

The system, therefore, which places an individual as its center and disregards the interest of the society in general becomes abhorable. Furthermore, a system which gives primordial value to private accumulation of capital and maximization of profit and completely remiss of its social responsibility to those who made them rich is detestable.

Socialism becomes attractive to the most underprivileged masses—the exploited and oppressed. It feeds on the poverty, misery, material deprivation, and ignorance of the people. It is an ideology based on emotion and feeling, nonetheless, intellectually defensible, which accounts for its ascension to and later fall from power. This also explains the passion with which socialists contend against each other as one tries to defend the brand of socialism one believes in. Apparently, similar passion is exhibited against the non-socialist world.

Socialism departs from the liberal democratic concept of human nature. It views that the most important characteristic of human beings is the individual's natural sociability. People can readily engage in cooperative social activity only if given a chance. However, structures of society—political, economic, and social institutions, were created to respond to the selfish needs and demands of individuals who are fortunate to possess political and economic power due to

birth, race, creed, or sex. These structures eventually became instruments of the privileged class to expand and consolidate their powers through exploitation and oppression causing untold sufferings to the greater number of people in the society.

The socialists believe that a better society can be established through the social ownership of the means of production where the State becomes the owner, economic planner, and distributor of socio-economic benefits. It is argued that this economic system (socialism) would prevent the overconcentration of wealth to individuals, promote social equity and fair distribution of public goods, and correct social and economic disparity between the rich and poor.

Likewise, socialists advocate the limitation or total abolition of private property. This is viewed as the source of selfishness and greed. The absence of private ownership is envisioned to accelerate the attainment of an egalitarian society. This is the stage of society where one becomes totally free.

Under a socialist State, the working class which is the most exploited but most productive under capitalism would be the ruling and governing class. This will ensure political power to the once powerless class and use it to strengthen its power base against possible attempts of the bourgeoisie to redeem the power it lost. Moreover, with the workers at the helm of the State, employment would be guaranteed and just share in the fruits of their productive labour will be assured.

Socialism as an ideology covers a wide range of beliefs. Given the fundamental agreements on the imperative of eschewing away the root cause of multitude's suffering by limiting or abolishing private property, sharp disagreements are noted on the manner or method that would be most effective in bringing about the ideal social system; the extent on the limitation of private property ownership; the roles, if any, the State and government should play in the construction and consolidation of socialism; and the character of the socialist state.

C.A.R. Crosland (1963:67) stipulates the following principles of socialism, regardless of its variety:

1. A protest against the material poverty and physical squalor which capitalism produced:
2. A wider concern for "social welfare" for

the interests of those in need, or oppressed, or unfortunate, from whatever cause;

3. A belief in equality and the "classless society", and especially a desire to give the worker his "just" rights and a reasonable status at work:
4. A rejection of competitive antagonism, and an ideal of fraternity and cooperation; and
5. A protest against the inefficiencies of capitalism as an economic system, and notably its tendency to mass unemployment.

In the Philippines, the socialist movement has two major tendencies: One, the social democrats or democratic socialists who opt for a peaceful and democratic transition from capitalism to socialism; and two, the revolutionary socialists who believe in armed struggle as the primary means in seizing political power for the establishment of socialism in the country.

There is the third group which emerged in mid-1980s and calls itself as the "independent socialists". This group, for some reasons or another, thinks that it embodies a different strand of socialism compared to the two socialist blocks mentioned. However, a study of their program and strategy seems to indicate that it is no different from the social democrats/democratic socialists. Their interest in disassociating from the latter, perhaps, is a reason other than political.

#### Social Democracy and Democratic Socialism

Social democracy or democratic socialism traces its roots to Karl Marx. Contemporary social democrats would even label themselves as the "true" Marxists. They are the Marx of 1872 speaking before the Dutch workers on peaceful transition of capitalism to socialism than the Marx of 1848 proclaiming the specter of communism is haunting Europe and calls upon the workers of the world to unite and revolt against their oppressors.

Social democracy, also known as "evolutionary socialism", is a late 19th century ideology which grew out of the conviction that socialism can be achieved through a democratic process rather than revolutionary violence. It asserts that capitalism can be voted out in the electoral and parliamentary

system of the capitalist state without resorting to an armed struggle.

The thesis on the peaceful transition to socialism is based on the following assumptions: (1) the working class would eventually constitute the majority of the voting population; and (2) raising of political consciousness of the workers through educational programs would ultimately draw them towards the establishment of socialist state.

Thus, the sheer number of politically conscious workers makes socialism an inevitable reality. The indispensability of democracy in the socialist struggle is the cornerstone of social democracy. This makes the ideology to be known as democratic socialism. Apparently, this distinguishes the ideology from statist socialism of the "revolutionary socialist" or communist.

Note that democratic socialism emerged in the late 19th century in Europe—at the time when the Filipinos came to have a direct contact with the 17th century ideology of neo-liberalism. And it was only in the late 1960s that the social democratic movement began to take form in the Philippines. The Filipino Social Democratic Movement, popularly known as the Soc-Dem (SD), tries to suit the ideology and strategy to the Filipinos' political culture. However, a review of their political documents indicates that no significant deviation nor enrichment has been made from the classical social democratic thought of the 19th century. The political thought has just been rephrased.

Soc-Dems trace the roots of the Philippine underdevelopment to the following interlocking structures: US imperialism, feudalism, and bureaucrat capitalism (CSPPA u.d.). US imperialism is said to be politically and economically responsible for the country's neo-colonial stature. It continually frustrates the people's struggle for sovereignty and independence. On the other hand, the feudal economic system prevailing in the countryside serves as the economic base of imperialism. This system is maintained to provide capitalist countries with cheap agricultural products and raw materials as well as a source of low-cost labour. Finally, domestic capitalism with its "internally disarticulated structure and heavy dependence on foreign capital" serves as the economic base of political elites (CSSPA; Karaos 1987:18).

Given the structural problems besetting the Philippine society spawned by the domi-

nation of the elite in the political and economic spheres, the Soc-Dems intend to resolve these issues by democratizing the informal and formal structures of economic and political power. Economic democracy, in concrete terms, shall be advanced through specific programs and measures like national industrialization, workers' participation in policy-making relative to their welfare, and agrarian reform to mention a few (Karaos 1987:19).

On a similar vein, political democracy shall be fought on two major fronts: One, within the formal structure and political system of the state—parliamentary process and participation in a democratic election. Two, outside of the formal structure of State power. This shall manifest through the creation of mass-based organizations and institutions among students, youth, women, farmers, workers, professionals, church workers, media, minority groups, and others.

The social democrats envision that peoples'— and institution-based organizations are "important venues for political education and practice of (democracy)" (Karaos 1987:19). Through this effort Soc-Dems believe that the ethic of democracy will be inculcated in the people's consciousness in turn protecting them against abuses that may be committed by the State's elites of statist socialists.

The Soc-Dems argue that the struggle for democracy is not merely a wrestle for the equalization of rights between the "haves" and "have nots" but the "equalization of power". It aims to reduce the inequalities in power enjoyed by the different classes in a society rather than simply the extension of citizenship rights. The equalization of power is to be realized when the formal structures of power in government have been transformed from elite-to mass-based institutions and alternative centers of power have been created outside the state structures. Thus, the form of representative democracy is dynamically linked with the organs of direct democracy in workplaces and communities (Tolosa Jr. 1988:5).

For the Filipino social democrats, socialism can be achieved through its two-pronged program: the minimum or what they call the "social democratic" stage, and maximum, the stage of "democratic socialism". The former is a transition stage to achieve the latter. In other words, social democracy is a necessary stage to attain the goal of demo-

cratic socialism. Soc-Dems contend that there is a qualitative difference between these programs.

The social democratic program (minimum) seeks to redistribute political power and economic wealth in the short run. It is in this stage where the roots of Philippine structural problems would be eradicated to establish the foundation of a democratic socialist order. Moreover, social democracy shall provide the venue for massive socialist education, thereby increasing the constituency for democratic socialism. The political and economic models for democratic socialism shall likewise be tested and strategic alliances among different political formations shall be strengthened in this stage (CSPPA u. d.).

On the other hand, democratic socialism (maximum program) is the stage where all social relationships and social institutions are democratized to their fullest. Social equality becomes a reality since the root cause of inequalities—the deprivation and alienation of labour from ownership and control of the means of production—would be completely extirpated (social inequality remains under the social democratic stage). Democracy, as conceived, is perfected and completed under this stage. Democratic socialism shall be characterized by: political pluralism; institutionalized people's participation; participatory and self-managed economy; socialized market economy; central economic planning; worker's control over key areas of the economy; and eradication of social conflicts as a result of continued socialist education (CSPPA u.d.).

Undoubtedly, doctrines espoused by the Filipino social democrats—democratic socialists (SD/DS) spring from the late 19th century social democratic ideology, otherwise known as "revisionism" or "evolutionary socialism". Social democracy became a distinct ideological system from "revolutionary socialism" which advocated for a violent overthrow of the capitalist bourgeois state as the necessary means to pave the way towards socialism. Conversely, social democracy opted for a peaceful route of political democracy to achieve the ends of socialism.

The ideology is notably identified with Eduard Bernstein and the British Fabian Society led by George Bernard Shaw, Sidney Webb, and Beatrice Webb. To date, Fabian Society continue to publish ideological tracts and is an affiliate of the British Labour Party.

The Filipino SDs/DSs assert that they do not "attempt to appropriate the Revisionist ideology" of Bernstein nor share the premise of "progressiveness of capitalism" for their "gradualism" (gradual approach to socialism). Their "ideology" is said to be based on the "different reading of the realities of capitalism in the Philippines (domestic capitalism) and of global monopoly capitalism today" and "commitment to the primacy of democracy as the means to socialism" (Karaos 1987: 18-19).

No matter how the SDs/DSs try to disassociate themselves from revisionism in their effort to project their "ideology" as a political thought based on the Philippine "class structure, political culture, and level of economic development" rather than something borrowed, their minimum and maximum programs glaringly indicate that they are the piety followers and staunch defenders of revisionism. Practically, nothing was added nor taken away from the basic principles of the 19th century classical social democratic doctrine. In fact, their aversion to welfare state even placed them among the left-wing social democrats of G.D.H. Cole and R. H. S. Crossman, thus drawing them nearer to the moderate communists in the Philippines. In other words, only affirmations and nothing new were said.

In the general sense, Filipino SDs/DSs share the view with Bernstein and Fabians on the peaceful transition to socialism. Bernstein rejected the "catastrophic theory", whereby it was contended that the "immiserization" of the working class would precipitate revolutionary action. On the contrary, he argued that the progress of socialism does not depend on the "deterioration of social conditions" or misery but on eliminating abuses (Bernstein 1961:213).

Bernstein believed that the elimination of abuses can be done through massive education of the workers on their rights and powers as well as their future under socialism; organization of the workers which will strengthen their ranks to work for political and economic reforms within the parameters of the existing state; and use of democratic and parliamentary processes where political and economic benefits would reach the workers in the immediate the tangible ways.

For Bernstein, improvement of the economic and political welfare of the workers presupposes a sophisticated, educated, well-organized, and confident working class. Piecemeal reforms will eventually raise the

material, moral, and mental level of the workers to a point where socialism shall become the logical conclusion and inevitable reality. Thus, revolution is rendered superfluous and "dictatorship" of any class becomes unnecessary.

Moreover, Bernstein contended that political and economic reforms are preconditions of both socialism and working class' emancipation and the struggle for reforms must be done in a democratic manner (Hagopian 1985:145). Political democracy as seen by Bernstein is the antechamber to socialism or economic democracy. Likewise, the Fabians express that the need for gradualism and the need for democracy are closely linked in its political approach. Sidney Webb recognized that:

"Important organic changes can only be (1) democratic, and thus acceptable to the majority of the people, and prepared for the minds of all; (2) gradual, and thus causing no dislocation, however rapid may be the rate of progress; (3) not regarded as immoral by the mass of the people, and thus not subjectively demoralizing to them, and (4) in this country at any rate, constitutional and peaceful" (in George Shaw ed. u.d.: 51; quoted in Hagopian 1985:147) (underscoring provided).

The Fabians' bias for gradualism stems from the British peculiar political culture which disdains untested innovations and abstract concepts and theories and the need to try it out in a certain transitional stage until confidence is built up for practical application.

The Fabians and Bernsteins think that the revisionist transition to socialism is most optimistic and democracy is not only valuable in itself but would hasten the victory of socialism. Classical social democracy posits the indispensability of democracy in the struggle for socialism. Democracy is considered both a means to an end (socialist economy) and an end in itself (just political order).

Clearly, the Filipino SDs/DSs are no different from the Bernsteins and the Fabians. In fact, their minimum program seems to be an exact replica of Bernstein's and fabians' thought expressed more than 100 years back. Their concept of "equalization of power" is nothing but a rephrasing of Bernstein's idea of the "rise of mass democracy" and the "creation of a stronger and

more sophisticated working class" capable of contesting the power of the bourgeoisie in electoral politics.

Similarly, the SDs/DSs call for the democratization of society by building "alternative centers of power" both in the formal and informal structures of the State is indeed a re-echo of Karl Kautsky's statement that: "modern socialism (is) not merely social organization of production, but democratic organization of society as well" (1964:6). The democratic organization of the society is perceived to be crucial in instilling into the minds of the masses that socialism's time has come thereby can be voted in democratically.

Likewise, the SDs/DSs' vision for the nationalization of industries and establishment of the State as the central economic planner, defined in its maximum program, (democratic socialism), are the same arguments of the classical social democrats. The latter believe that full social justice would be realized only in an economy where the government had "nationalized" at least the "commanding heights" of the economy. Basic industry would be owned by the public sector and the whole economy will be ran in accordance with a central plan of the State. The new economic institutions, further, would be supervised by the representatives of the people. The aforesaid statement obviously, do not run counter to what the Filipino SDs/DSs have pronounced in their maximum program.

The desistance of the Filipino SDs/DSs from advocating a welfare state for the Philippines is to avoid the danger of being perceived as approximating the ideological line of the neo-liberals. They are quite emphatic to state that they "do not aspire for the establishment of a welfare state" (Karaos 1987-18). However, this does not make them distinctive at all. By driving the wedge between neo-liberalism and "Filipino" social democracy, the latter linked itself to the social democratic "left" whose doctrines have been personified by G.D.H. Cole and R.H.S. Crossman—with a hairline difference separating the leftist social democrat and less radical communist.

Cole and Crossman advanced the idea that full realization of democracy and other values of socialism shall be ensured only in a largely socialized economic system. Cole pointed out that welfare state is not socialism:

"It is at most socialistic—if even that. For what we have been doing is not to put people on an equal footing, but only to lessen the extremes of inequality by redistributing grossly unequal incomes; and even this redistribution has quite largely taken the form of making the poor pay for one another's basic needs..." (1971:774).

Crossman, on the other hand, states:

"Whatever our intentions, wishes, or individual capabilities, the nations of the Western world will be unable to strengthen themselves by developing adequate public services until the public sector becomes the dominant sector in our economies. Only in this way shall we make it possible to work out a true national resources budget, which strikes the proper balance between production and consumption goods and ensures the community interests are given their priority over individual consumption" (1965:110) (underscoring provided).

Finally, the much avowed slogan of the Filipino SDs/DSs: "there is no socialism without democracy and there is no democracy without socialism" is an obvious rehash of Kautsky's maxim: "socialism without democracy is monstrosity" and a re-wording of revisionist axiom: "you cannot fully and truly have socialism without democracy".

So what else is new? What is "Filipino" in the Filipino Social Democratic Movement? Social Democracy and Democratic Socialism is one and the same. It is an ideology of the late 19th century. The Filipino social democrats/democratic socialists are nothing both revisionists and Fabians. They belong to the left-wing of the social democratic ideological line of Crossman and Cole.

#### Revolutionary Socialism or Communism

Revolutionary socialism is the second tendency of socialism in the Philippines. It espouses the ideology of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought (M-L-MZD-T). This is the ideological line of the re-established Communist Party of the Philippines (1968) in contrast with the *Partido Komunista ng Pilipinas* (PKP) established in 1930 by Crisanto Evangelista, which merged later with the Socialist Party of the Philippines (SPP) then headed by Pedro Abad Santos. The merger resulted in the adoption of a single revolutionary party—*Partido*

*Komunista ng Pilipinas*. (Communist Party of the Philippines).

The PKP follows the Soviet Communist ideological line—Marxism and Leninism. However, this ideology became less prominent in contemporary political struggle and marginalized beginning in mid-1950s until late 1960s when its key leaders and ideologues were either killed in battles or imprisoned, while some vacillated and co-opted with the government.

Moreover, the intense ideological struggle within the PKP between the "old guards" following the Soviet model and the "green horns" advocating the Chinese model led to the further weakening of the PKP as a revolutionary party. The inner-party struggle reflects the tussle between the Chinese and Soviet Communist Parties led by Mao and Khrushchev respectively in the 1950s.

The PKP was then polarized between the Maoist and Khrushchivites, with the former gaining the upperhand. The struggle for supremacy, power, and leadership was indeed a critical stage in the history of the communist movement, oftentimes characterized by violence and killings between comrades, for it will determine the future of communism in the country.

On December 26, 1968, the Maoist broke away from the PKP and established the Communist Party of the Philippines (CPP) with Amado Guerero (pseudonym of Jose Ma. Sison) as Chairman of its Central Committee. On March 29, 1969, the New Peoples' Army (NPA) was founded with *Kumander Dante* (pseudonym of Bernabe Buscayno) as its overall Field Commander. A number of young leaders of PKP and red fighters of its army, *Hukbong Mapagpalaya ng Bayan* (HMB) (People's Liberation Army), joined the CPP and NPA. This greatly decimated the ranks of the PKP and HMB ideologically and militarily.

To date, remnants of PKP and HMB remain but have opted either to join the government or pursue their struggle through parliamentary means. Their numbers became very insignificant and their ideology poses no threat to the present regime.

Evidently, the collapse of the Soviet Communist Party and other communist States under the influence of Soviet Union have practically rendered the PKP in near oblivion. This makes the discussion on PKP's ideology unnecessary. However, this does not

make the history of the PKP in the Philippine communist movement irrelevant.

The CPP with its armed group, the NPA, and unarmed alliance of political mass organizations, the National Democratic Front (NDF) collectively carries the ideology of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought (M-L-MZD-T). It tries to blend the fundamental contributions of three major political thoughts of communism in its struggle for power in the Philippines. The ideology virtually believes in the violent overthrow of the government through a protracted peoples' war, drawing support from the masses of peasants as its motive force and workers as its leading force, and the establishment of a socialist State under a single party system with the Communist Party as the ruling and governing party in the country.

Like the social democrats, the CPP believes in transitional stage towards socialism. As the former, identified the stage of social democracy as a necessary step before achieving democratic socialism, the latter contend that it should be the stage of "national democracy". The CPP argues that national democracy is not an economic system but a political system where the structures and institutions of socialism shall be shaped until such time that the economy and the people would be ready for the next higher stage of society—socialism.

Political documents and propaganda of CPP-NPA-NDF have given excessive emphasis on their national democratic political line and the national democratic programme of government. The label "nat-dem" has been attributed to anyone who espouses or are sympathetic with the aforesaid program. The socialist orientation and direction of the political program have been downplayed either deliberately or unwittingly.

Nonetheless, it seems that highlighting the national democratic line serves the organizational and political agenda of the CPP. The term "national democracy" is more acceptable to the Filipinos who have been exposed to the elite-based democracy in the country as well as the growing sentiments for national identity. Socialism, on the other hand, is perceived to be less acceptable in a populace whose revulsion against communism remains strong. Therefore, the call for national democracy becomes an effective propaganda and political tool to "arouse, organize, and mobilize" the masses against the government.

(Cont. from page 27)

There is nothing original about the national democratic line. National democracy or "New" democracy was the battlecry of Mao Zedong's Communist Party against the Kuomintang Army of Chiang-Kai-Shek in the 1920s. Amado Guerero's Philippine Society and Revolution which virtually became the "bible" of all nat-dem political activists in late 1960s, does not seem to differ from Mao's Chinese Society and Revolution. Although there is nothing wrong with parallel analysis given the same ideological framework, there can never be identical analysis of both the Philippine and Chinese societies. Differences and idiosyncracies definitely exist between these societies—in history, culture, and socio-economic and political systems.



The guiding ideology of the CPP-NPA-NDF is a transformed ideology. It draws from Marx's fundamental philosophy of dialectical historical materialism as applied in the development of societies and the theory of economic determinism; Lenin's concept of imperialism and ideas on democratic centralism as the guiding principle in Communist party's organization, and; Mao's national democracy and internationalism, voluntarism, and peasant-based but workers led protracted peoples' war.

The ideology adopts Marx's doctrine, variously known as "scientific socialism", "historical materialism", and "dialectical materialism". However, the doctrine itself is not a product of pure Marxist thought. It is a synthesis of the writings of the British political economy as analyzed by the bourgeois economists such as Adam Smith, David

Ricardo, James and John Stuart Mill, and others; the French utopian socialist tradition; and G.W.F. Hegel's philosophy on dialectics.

From the British political economy, Marx was able to study the elaborate operation of the capitalist economy. He deduced that economic life and economics itself can be studied "scientifically". Nonetheless, he departed from the conclusion of the classical economists that capitalism reflects the "eternal laws" of human nature. Marx viewed the capitalist economic "laws" as not absolute and subject to change.

The French socialists influenced Marx' thinking on private property ownership. The socialists contended that private ownership of the means of production was an "histori-

cally obsolete institution" and the imperative of abolishing private ownership is essential for the future of social organization (Hagopian 1985:119; Hagopian u.d.: 454). Although the socialists maintained that absolute equality, elimination of poverty, and abolition of property ownership cannot transpire under capitalism, they do not see the need for a revolution.

Marx branded the French socialists as "utopian" and naive for their failure to grasp the importance of a revolution in establishing a new political and economic order. Contrary to the utopians, Marx advocated a violent revolution that would lead to the abolition of private property ownership.

On the other hand, Hegelian dialectics inspired Marx's insight into the process of change. Hegel pointed out two things which

appealed to Marx: First, history is unity and progress moving in a single process and; progress is not evolutionary nor moves slowly but is characterized by conflicts and leaps forward (Hagopian 1985:120). Nevertheless, Marx criticized Hegel for being an idealist who believed that mind or spirit was the essence of reality and considered ideas and culture as independent forces of change. Marx argued that the world, made up of matter and idea is but a reflection of matter and the human mind is the highest form of matter.

As Marx said:

"My dialectic method is fundamentally not only different from the Hegelian, but is its direct opposite. To Hegel, the process of thinking, which, under the name of 'the Idea', he even transforms into an independent subject, is the demiurge (creator) of the real world, and the real world is only the external, phenomenal form of 'the Idea'. With me, on the contrary, is the ideal is nothing else than the material world reflected by the human mind, and translated into forms of thought" (in Stalin 1977: 5-6).

However, the materialism of Marx is a derivation from Ludwig Feuerbach sans its idealistic and religious-ethical contents. Marx extracted the "inner kernel" of Feuerbach's materialism and developed it into a scientific-philosophical theory of materialism (Stalin 1977:6).

The fusion of Hegelian dialectics and Feuerbach's materialism came to be known as Marx's dialectical materialism. Stalin (1977:5) views this as the world outlook of a Marxist communist party—the approach, study, and comprehension to the phenomena of nature is dialectical while the interpretation and conception of these phenomena is materialistic (For further discussion see Stalin 1977).

The application of dialectical materialism to the development of history and society led Marx to identify five stages: primitive communalism or communism; slave system; feudalism; capitalism; and communism with socialism as a brief transition stage towards a "classless", stateless" and "propertyless" society.

Moreover, the development of society would be characterized by revolution and class struggle. The contradictions in the

"mode of production" and "relations of production" would precipitate the destruction of the old order and the rise of new forces, which in turn will be destroyed by newer forces until communism is attained. At this level, the contradictions in the "mode of production" and "relations of production" would cease. There would then be contradictions between man and nature rather than man against man.

Marx's theory on society's development complements his doctrine on economic determinism. The doctrine states that a society is defined in accordance with its substructure (mode of production or economic base) and superstructure (State/political system, laws, morals, culture, and religion). The superstructure rests on its substructure and it is the latter which defines the character of the former. Any change which occurs in the economic system will definitely affect its political system. Thus, a move towards a better society necessitates an improvement in its economic base and mode of production.

Similarly, political and social ideas, theories, views, and political institutions in the different periods of society's development is a reflection of the different material life conditions of the people. In other words, the concrete conditions of the material life of society is the determining force of social development rather than abstract "principles of human reason". Marx concludes:

"It is not the consciousness of men that determines their being, but on the contrary, their social being that determines their consciousness".

Marxism as a political thought is a product of Karl Marx' synthesis of various philosophies, doctrines, and beliefs. His abstractions and deductions from these theories and his interpretations of social and political phenomena formed his beliefs which led to his concept of "good society". The Communist Party of the Philippines absorbed the Marxist doctrine as part of its ideology.

The CPP also adopted Leninism, which is Marxism after Marx and developed by Vladimir Illich Lenin during the stage of imperialism. He stated that imperialism was the highest stage of capitalism which delayed the downfall of a capitalist state by exporting its crisis to underdeveloped countries.

Rather than be baffled with the problem of excessive commodity production and capital which lead to price-cuts, less profits, low returns on investments, and reduction to

interest rates, capitalist states find it convenient to dump their surplus products and capital to less developed countries. These countries, in effect become ready markets and attractive sites for foreign investments. In other words, the rural and backward countries absorb the crisis of capitalism (See Lenin 1968).

This situation makes it improbable for capitalist countries to collapse and work for socialism, contrary to what Marx said. The imperatives of a socialist revolution lie among peasant-based, feudal, and backward countries where the link of imperialism is weakest. Furthermore, Lenin describes the oppressed and exploited people of these countries as revolutionary, compared to the workers in the capitalist countries.

Lenin's redefinition of the revolutionary role of the peasantry also refocusses the communist strategy in seizing political power. Given the feudal state of Russia, Lenin saw the significance of mobilizing the peasant masses against the Czarist regime. This revolutionary strategy enhanced the political role of the rural peasants in the struggle for power, contrary to Marx's claim that the urban industrial wage-earners of the advanced countries would be the leaders of world revolution. Nonetheless, it is still Mao who can be credited for exalting the peasant class as the "driving and motive force" of the revolution, with his classic strategy of "encircling the cities through the countryside". This strategy was likewise adopted by the CPP.

On the spontaneity of proletarian revolution espoused by Marx, Lenin argued that this cannot be done without a communist party composed of elite, full-time, capable, competent, and professional revolutionaries imbued with a strong commitment to spread the doctrine of revolution, mold the proletariat into a revolutionary striking force, and lead the masses of peasants and workers towards socialism. Lenin believes that the Communist Party must be the "vanguard of the proletariat", it must be a "conspiratorial" and "elite" party of the working class (See Lenin 1929).

The establishment of an elite communist party is in contrast to Marx's view of a mass party which is open to all workers and people who believe in the legitimacy of the communist struggle. From Lenin's perception, it would be very difficult for a mass party to win a proletarian revolution. Seizing political power requires a highly-disciplined party

composed of hard-line cadres who can withstand or are ready to accept the rigors of a revolution. Lenin argues that opening a party to undisciplined and non-ideologue masses cannot assure victory nor contribute to the success of revolution.

In the attempt to instill "iron discipline" in the Communist Party, Lenin formulated its organizational principle: "democratic centralism". This principle combines centralism and democracy in the formulation and implementation of Party rules, directives, and decisions. In essence, democratic centralism means democracy under a centralized leadership and centralism based on democracy.

The concept operates on two aspects: One, the lower organs of the Party elect the members of its higher organs and decisions of the latter must be binding and followed by the former; Second, open and free debate on major policies of the Party are allowed in Party congresses. However, once a decision has been made (after a "democratic" discussion on congresses), no one is allowed to question the "party line" nor its authority in implementing Party decisions. All Party organs must defend and fully execute policies and directives of the Party without reservation, otherwise dissidents will be subjected to disciplinary action and rule on insubordination.

Mao Zedong expounded on the principle of democratic centralism by emphasizing the role of the group (collective) and Central Committee of the communist party in decision making. He states that: "the individual's decision is subject to the collective decision; the lower organ's decision is subject to those of the higher organ; and all Party organs are subject to the decision of the Central Committee". Apparently, the importance of centralism rather than democracy has been emphasized in the principle of "democratic centralism".

V.I. Lenin's study on imperialism and the principle of democratic centralism have greatly influenced the CPP's understanding of the current problems of the Philippine neo-colonialism as well as its conduct on policy decisions. In fact Lenin's *Imperialism: The Highest Stage of Capitalism* written before the Bolshevik revolution of 1917 and *What is to be Done?* (1902) are fundamental readings of CPP's political activists and cadres. From the CPP's viewpoint, no substantial things have changed in the revolutionary movements from Lenin's time to the present

and his works written less than a century ago are still relevant.

Mao Zedong Thought (MZDT) is another strand of CPP's ideological framework. The CPP considers MZDT as Marxism-Leninism in the present era. Evidently, the Chinese Cultural Revolution of 1966-69 had a tremendous impact on the local communists. It was in the same period when student activism in the country reached an unprecedented height, with hundreds of thousands, predominantly youth and students, participating almost daily in school boycotts, barricades, rallies, demonstrations, and strikes with Mao's oversized portraits held conspicuously by the demonstrators as it was done in China.

Likewise, it was during this period when the *Kabataang Makabayan* (Nationalist Youth) was founded in 1964 with Jose Ma. Sison as its Chairman. Sison later became the founding chairman of the CPP's central committee in 1968. He was also instrumental in building the New Peoples' Army in 1969 and the National Democratic Front a few years after. In fact, the founding of the CPP was made on the birthday of Mao which falls on December 26. Undeniably, the Mao cult pervaded the CPP for quite some time.

While the CPP believes in Marx's theory of economic determinism, it also adopts Mao's doctrine on "voluntarism". Voluntarism, as the CPP conceives is not a rejection of Marx's "determinism" but an application of dialectics in the present-day struggle. Voluntarism signifies the preponderance of mind (ideas, theories, and concepts) in changing one's material being, as contrasted with "determinism" which suggests that physical or material forces govern one's human behavior.

Mao states, without attacking Marx's economic determinism:

"When the superstructure (politics, culture, and so on) obstructs the development of the economic base, political and cultural changes become principal and decisive. Are we going against materialism when we say this? No. The reason is that while we recognize that in the general development of history the material determines the mental and social being determines social consciousness, we also—and indeed must—recognize the reaction of mental on material things" (in Wakeman Jr. 1973-299).

Mao always felt that "thought reform"

could change a person's attitudes and behavior. The doctrine of voluntarism was so important for who Mao at that time was trying to build a broad coalition and mass-based alliances of Chinese nationalists and revolutionaries to repel the onslaughts of the Japanese Imperial Army which invaded China. The Kuomintang Army then under Chiang-Kai-shek tended to vacillate and align itself with the Japanese. Mao expects a formidable "enemy" to face if the Japanese and Chinese "counter-revolutionaries" joined forces against the Chinese Communist Party. Mao's voluntarism was an attempt to break the alliance between the Japanese and Chiang's forces and believed in the possibility of winning over the least of the "counter-revolutionaries" to the side of the communists. He said:

"To exercise dictatorship over the reactionary classes does not mean that we should totally eliminate all reactionary classes but rather we should eliminate the classes to which they belong. We should use appropriate methods (like persuasion and re-education) to remould them and transform them into new men" (in Schram 1974:169).

Similarly, voluntarism was used by Mao during China's socialist reconstruction by inviting "reformed class enemies" especially the intellectuals and bureaucrats to help China build its economy within the framework of socialism.

The CPP-NPA-NDF's strategy in waging its people's war by establishing "rural bases" where guerilla warfare is conducted and land reform is implemented is Mao's political strategy in building peasant-based centers of power prior to the seizure of State power in the cities. The encirclement of the cities through the countryside is the maxim of Mao's strategy of socialist revolution, which differed from the orthodox communists who clung to the idea of urban-centered proletarian-based revolution.

The peasant-based, proletarian-led revolution is the foundation of Mao's populism. He considered the peasants as the "driving force" of the revolution, the motive force in the struggle for liberation. The exaltation of the peasants tended to belittle the wisdom of the intellectuals. From Mao's perspective, a humble peasant could possess more genuine wisdom and contribute more to society compared to scholars basking in international renown (Hagopian 1985:137).

Another aspect of Mao's populism was his lament on the arrogance exhibited by revolutionary cadres towards the masses. This is apparent in his views on the role of revolutionary artists and writers:

"...no revolutionary artist or writer can produce any work of significance unless he has contact with the masses, gives expression to their thoughts and feelings, and becomes their loyal spokesman ...if he regards himself as the master of the masses or as an aristocrat .... then he will not be needed by the people and his work will have no future" (in Freemantle 1963:257).

Mao's adherence, to the imperatives of peasant support in a socialist revolution, nonetheless, does not mean a divergence to Marxist thought on the primacy of the urban-based industrial working class' leadership. Mao commits himself to the leadership of the proletariat in the Communist Party and even advised the peasantry to mold their consciousness in line with the proletarian thinking through "rectification" campaigns and "self-criticisms" that would transform themselves into "proletarianized peasants".

Another contribution of Mao to the communist movement, which the CPP adopted, was his view on nationalism and internationalism. While Mao admitted the universal truth of Marxism and Leninism, he pointed out that the specific character of the Chinese society and revolution must not be overlooked. Mao saw no conflict between the nationalist revolution of China and Marx's idea of proletarian internationalism. For Marx, nationalist struggles are irrelevant and unnecessary as the "workers of all nations unite" against capitalism and exploiters. Marx surmised the differences between nations would wither out and nationalities would melt as the socialist revolution of the working class spreads all over the world. However, Mao remarked that:

"This patriotism and internationalism are by no means in conflict, for only China's independence and liberation will make it possible to participate in the World Communist Movement" (in Wakeman Jr. 1977: 244).

Furthermore, Mao noted:

"... in applying Marxism in China, Chinese communists must fully and properly unite the universal truth of Marxism with the specific practice of the Chinese

Revolution... the truth of Marxism must be integrated with the characteristics of the nation and given definite national form" (1954:154).

E. H. Carr contended that Mao's thought on nationalism was the third phase of modern nationalism which involved the "socialization of the nation" and the "nationalization of socialism" (in Hagopian u.d.: 464).

Mao's integration of nationalism within Marx's internationalist political thought serves as an inspiration to the CPP's "national democratic" struggle. It adopts Mao's dictum: it is nationalist because it is anti-colonial; it is democratic because it involves the vast majority of the population—the peasants; it is socialist because it applies Marxism and Leninism, the guiding ideology of the Communist Party.

The CPP's national democratic political line is essentially lifted from Mao Zedong Thought on the assumption that the Philippine society, problems and aspirations are the same as the Chinese'. The local communists identify the three root causes of the country's problems as: imperialism; domestic feudalism; and bureaucrat capitalism. These problems are similar to those identified by Mao. Given the similarity, the CPP argues that the peoples' war strategy which proved successful in China in the 1940s would undoubtedly be most effective in seizing political power from the "puppet State".

The Chinese model for the Philippine revolution as seen by the CPP, is as good as its assumptions. However, if the assumptions are incorrect, the entire model collapses. If Marxism demands concrete analysis of concrete conditions, then the local communists must re-study Philippine realities rather than be blinded by the fascination of successful revolutions in other countries.

### Christian Democracy

Christian democracy as an ideology in the Philippines is at its budding stage. It has not created a dent in the country's political landscape nor has its presence been felt in political affairs. Except for its participation in the 1992 national election when it coalesced with the Administration's political party, the National Union of Christian Democrats (NUCD) is unheard of. Although a Christian Democratic Movement once

emerged in mid-1960s at the height of student activism, their activities as a political organization have been too imperceptible to warrant attention from political analysts.

However, after three decades of near oblivion, the Christian democrats suddenly rose to power as one of the political groupings under the coalition party of the present government. Time will say whether they would be a political force to contend with.

Political scientists are not in full agreement on whether Christian democracy can be properly called an ideology, inasmuch as its political successes as a party, especially in Europe, are attributed more to their "middle-of-the-road policies and the outstanding adroitness of their leaders" than it is to anything "Christian" about them (Hagopian 1985:167). Evidently, the same is true in the case of the Philippines whereby the NUCD gained power as a result more of its association and support from the incumbent administration rather than the strength of its ideology which was seldom explained in political rallies.

Nevertheless, the fact remains that some Christian democrats are now holding political power in government. Whether their political thoughts guide them in governance and policy decisions are something which cannot be ascertained as of the moment. But it would be noteworthy to understand Christian democracy as expressed by Christian Democratic parties whose "Christian" marks in some policy areas are strong and conspicuous.

Christian democratic doctrines spring from the notion of Natural Law and transitional character of the Roman Catholic Church. The former refers to God's prescribed law that governs the relationship among rational beings, known as the universal moral code. The latter, on the other hand, relates to the movement taken by the Church in making itself relevant by addressing social problems of the middle and lower classes of society as a result of modernization.

Christian democrats do not prescribe any particular type of political regime as long as the doctrine of the Catholic Church is maintained and its (Church) rights respected. As the Natural Law ordains, neither the State nor the numerical majority is considered as the dispenser of morality and justice. Obviously, Christian democracy rules out a regime purely based on classic liberalism and orthodox Marxism.

Ostensibly, its concept of democracy is a limited one. A type of democracy which protects Church moral principles and human personality from the possible "tyranny" of mass democracy. While Christian democracy favours social equality it is against extreme social levelling. For the Christian democrats, democracy requires a solid moral foundation which is the Catholic religion. Therefore, a political regime not based on Catholicism cannot be considered as democratic but still can be called pluralist.

Social pluralism for the Christian democrats involves two aspects: vertical and horizontal. The doctrine of vertical pluralism alludes to the recognition of Protestant and other secularists outlooks as essential requisites of modern culture. While horizontal pluralism maintains that social groups—family, local community, and Church—are the proper foci of political thinking or social policy rather than the whole society or the individual. In other words, policies of the State must be tuned towards the promotion of the interest of social groupings. This explains the historical aversion of the Christian democrats to the legalization of divorce, birth control, or abortion and favourable support to policies which encourage the teaching of religion in educational institutions.

The Christian democrats adhere to the principle of the separation of State and Church. They believe that the roles performed by each one in the society are completely distinct, i.e. the State is involved in temporal issues while the Church is more on the spiritual aspect, although there are some where cooperation and complementation becomes and feasible like in education and welfare.

However, the Christian democrats are convinced that they perform a superior and higher mission than that of the State. They argue that the Church's mission is measured against eternity saving and safeguarding souls, while the State's promotion of the common good is limited to the present world, i.e. the here and now. In this context, the Christian democrats posit that the State should provide assistance and institutional recognition to those religious communities—associations, religious or secular, educational, and scientific organizations—committed to social service and public welfare apart from their spiritual endeavors.

The Christian Democratic Movement in a predominantly Christian nation like the

Philippine has not been successful enough in spreading its ideology and political thoughts. To date, there seems to be a dearth of its political documents embodying their analysis of the Philippine society, vision for a better society, programme of government, and strategy in achieving its goals.

The Christian democrats' ability to clinch political power in government, however, does not mean the acceptance of their political agenda nor does their continued stay connote a presence of mass-following for their ideological line. The election of some Christian democrats was not a result of the popularity or approval of their ideology but of effective use of the flawed Philippine electoral system to their advantage.

Apart from the aforesaid ideologies, there are other political beliefs espoused by various political forces in the country but failed to qualify as an ideology due to inchoateness, e.g. popular democracy is one case. Some political views, in spite of their seeming acceptance to a relatively significant constituency, cannot be analyzed fully because of insubstantial political documents in circulation.

### Final Note

Ideologies perform a critical function in the country's political life. It can make and unmake regimes and governments. In the Philippines, ideologies remain to be sharpened and fashioned to the country's needs and demands for development. Many of the solutions proposed by various ideologies are shaped by the way the national problems are defined or seen. Oftentimes it suits the ideologues' interest—legitimizing its own theory. Rather than abstracting theory from realities, most ideologies try to shape realities in order to suit their political ideologies.

### References

- Bernstein, Eduard 1961- *Evolutionary Socialism*. New York: Schocken Books.
- CSPPA (Center for Social Policy and Public Affairs)  
u.d.- *Analysis of Philippine Situation*. (mimeographed).  
u.d.- *Conceptual Framework of the Minimum and Maximum Programs*.
- Cole, G.D.H. 1971- *Socialism and the Welfare State*. in I. Howe (ed.) *Essential Work of Socialism*. New York: Bantam Books.
- Crosland, C.A.R. 1963- *The Future of Socialism*. New York: Schocken Books.
- Crossman, R.H.S. 1965- *The Politics of Socialism*. New York: Atheneum.
- Dewey, John 1954- *The Public and Its Problems*. Denver: Allan Swallow.
- Freemantle, Anne (ed.) 1963- *Talks at the Yenan Forum on Art and Literature. Mao Tse-Tung: An Anthology of His Writings*. New York: Mentor Books.

- Haber, Robert 1969- *The End of Ideology as Ideology in Chaim I. Waxman (ed.) The End of Ideology Debate*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Hagopian, Mark u.d. *Regimes, Movements, and Ideologies: A Comparative Introduction to Political Science 1985- Ideals and Ideologies of Modern Politics*. Longman, New York and London.
- Hobhouse, Leonard T. 1964- *Liberalism*. New York: Oxford University Press
- Karas, Ana Marie A. 1987- *The Viability of Social Democracy as a Political Ideology in the Philippines*. *Kasarinlan* (2) (3).
- Kautsky, Karl 1964- *The Dictatorship of the Proletariat*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Lawson, Kay 1989- *The Human Polity: An Introduction to Political Science*. Houghton Mifflin Co.
- Lenin, Vladimir Illich 1968- *Imperialism: The Highest State of Capitalism*  
1929 *What is to be Done?* New York: International Publishers.
- Mao-Tse-Tung 1954- *On New Democracy*. In *Selected Works* (3). International Publishers.
- Morganthau, Heans 1960- *Politics Among Nations*. 3rd Ed. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.
- Pareto, Vilfredo 1963- *The Mind and Society*. Vol. 2. New York: Dover Publications.
- Rodeo, Carlton, Totton Anderson, Carl Christol, and Thomas Greene 1983- *Introduction to Political Science*. McGraw-Hill Book Co. New York, USA.
- Schram, S. 1974- *Chairman Mao Talks to the People*. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Shaw, George u.d. *Fabian Essays in Socialism*. Garden City, New York: Dolphin Books.
- Sidoraky, David 1970- *The Liberal Tradition in European Thought*. New York: Capricorn Books.
- Stalin, Josef 1977- *Dialectical and Historical Materialism*. International Publishers, New York.
- Tolosa Jr., Benjamin 1988- *The Underpinnings of Pandayan's Democratic Socialist Ideology and Political Line*. May 11. (mimeographed).
- Wakeman Jr., Frederick 1973- *History and Will*. Berkeley: University of California Press. 1977- *The Patriot*. in D. Wilson (ed.) *Mao Tse-Tung in the Scales of History*. New York: Cambridge University Press.