

Guardian promotes reactionary view of Philippines struggle



HEROIC STRUGGLE led by Communist Party of the Philippines is distorted by the Guardian opportunists.

Dear Comrades at *The Call*:

On behalf of the progressive and democratic forces fighting the U.S.-Marcos dictatorship in the Philippines, we would like to thank you for the article on the Philippine struggle in your Nov. 1 issue.

We attach a letter we sent to the *Guardian* recently from which we have hitherto received no reply. It concerns questions of principle that might be useful in the broader context of support work undertaken by progressive forces here for the national liberation struggle of oppressed third world countries.

In Solidarity,
Felix Razon
Editorial Collective
Philippines Research Center

To the *Guardian*,

Your reprinting of Wideman's article on NPA "heroine" Barros, though qualified with an editorial note, is a mistake and raises serious questions about your editorial practice as a communist newspaper. By indiscriminately reproducing in toto that widely circulated article, you have committed two errors you could have avoided.

First, you have helped publicize the imperialist view that the Marxist-Leninist forces in the Philippines represented by the Commu-

nist Party of the Philippines, are sectarian, dogmatically applying Mao's "formula," completely uncreative and even unrealistic in ignoring the "country's geographical context." Second, you have helped publicize the reactionary view that the CPP follows "a strict Marxist view that religion is the opiate of the people."

Now, with your access to the revolutionary movement, you know very well both ideas are *wrong in fact* and are utterly counter-revolutionary in ideological intent. Comrades, you are only helping the enemy propaganda.

Those distortions are vigorously disseminated by the U.S. bourgeois media and the propaganda apparatus of the Marcos dictatorship. We were expecting a Marxist-Leninist paper to apply anti-imperialist and proletarian politics in command in concrete practice.

Apart from the above serious errors, you are also helping publicize a species of "romantic heroism" and "self-cultivation" in reprinting Wideman's article without even a slight modification.

By publicizing these ideas and lending credence to them, whatever "valuable insights" the piece might have acquires dialectically a strong counter-revolutionary effect.