

Demanding Dictatorship?
US-Philippine Relations, 1946-1972.

A thesis submitted to The University of
Manchester for the degree of Doctor of
Philosophy in the Faculty of Humanities

2016

Ben Walker

School of Arts, Languages and Cultures

Contents

Abstract.	3
Declaration and Copyright Statement.	4
Acknowledgements.	5
Introduction. From Colony to Cold War Ally: The Philippines and American Foreign Policy, 1898-1972.	6
1. ‘What to do with the Philippines?’ Economic Forces and Political Strategy in the United States’ Colonial Foreign Policy.	28
2. A New World Cold War Order: ‘Philippine Independence’ and the Origins of a Neo-Colonial Partnership.	56
3. To Fill the Void: US-Philippine Relations after Magsaysay, 1957-1963.	87
4. The Philippines after Magsaysay: Domestic realities and Cold War Perceptions, 1957-1965.	111
5. The Fall of Democracy: the First Term of Ferdinand Marcos, the Cold War, and Anti-Americanism in the Philippines, 1966-1972.	139
Conclusion. ‘To sustain and defend our government’: the Declaration of Martial Law, and the Dissolution of the Third Republic of the Philippines.	168
Bibliography.	184

Word Count: 80, 938.

Abstract

In 1898 the Philippines became a colony of the United States, the result of American economic expansion throughout the nineteenth century. Having been granted independence in 1946, the nominally sovereign Republic of the Philippines remained inextricably linked to the US through restrictive legislation, military bases, and decades of political and socio-economic patronage. In America's closest developing world ally, and showcase of democratic values, Filipino President Ferdinand Marcos installed a brutal dictatorship in 1972, dramatically marking the end of democracy there.

US foreign policy, from the inception of the US-Philippine partnership, failed to substantially resolve endemic poverty and elite political domination. During the Cold War, the discourse through which State Department policy was conceived helped perpetuate these unequal conditions, whilst also at times explicitly encouraging authoritarian solutions to domestic problems. As the Cold War escalated through the 1960s, especially in Vietnam, US officials insisted the Philippines provide military and ideological solidarity with US Cold War objectives at the expense of effectively addressing the roots of domestic instability.

The Philippine example serves as the clearest case of the outcomes and impact of US foreign policy across the developing world, and thus must be considered an essential starting point when considering the United States' Cold War experience. Based on extensive primary research from across the United Kingdom and the United States, this thesis re-examines and re-connects the historiography of colonialism, neo-colonialism, Southeast Asia, and Cold War studies. Nowhere did the US have such a long and intimate history of influence and partnerships than in the Philippines, and yet Marcos's regime emerged there; this dissertation presents an analytical lens through which to measure the role of US foreign policy in creating a dictatorship.

Declaration

No portion of the work referred to in the thesis has been submitted in support of an application for another degree or qualification of this or any other university or other institute of learning.

Copyright Statement

- i. The author of this thesis (including any appendices and/or schedules to this thesis) owns certain copyright or related rights in it (the "Copyright") and s/he has given The University of Manchester certain rights to use such Copyright, including for administrative purposes.
- ii. Copies of this thesis, either in full or in extracts and whether in hard or electronic copy, may be made only in accordance with the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988 (as amended) and regulations issued under it or, where appropriate, in accordance with licensing agreements which the University has from time to time. This page must form part of any such copies made.
- iii. The ownership of certain Copyright, patents, designs, trade marks and other intellectual property (the "Intellectual Property") and any reproductions of copyright works in the thesis, for example graphs and tables ("Reproductions"), which may be described in this thesis, may not be owned by the author and may be owned by third parties. Such Intellectual Property and Reproductions cannot and must not be made available for use without the prior written permission of the owner(s) of the relevant Intellectual Property and/or Reproductions.
- iv. Further information on the conditions under which disclosure, publication and commercialisation of this thesis, the Copyright and any Intellectual Property and/or Reproductions described in it may take place is available in the University IP Policy (see <http://documents.manchester.ac.uk/DocuInfo.aspx?DocID=487>), in any relevant Thesis restriction declarations deposited in the University Library, The University Library's regulations (see <http://www.manchester.ac.uk/library/aboutus/regulations>) and in The University's policy on Presentation of Theses.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank my supervisors Dr. Aaron W. Moore and Dr. Thomas Tunstall Allcock for their academic guidance and unfaltering enthusiasm for this project. I am indebted to their steadfast commitment, encouragement, and patience they have shown, and for the time they have spent working with me. Thank you also to Dr. Pierre Fuller who read and commented on earlier drafts, as well as Professor Peter Gatrell for his advice throughout.

My research has been supported by the School of Arts, Languages and Cultures at the University of Manchester and the Zochonis Special Enterprise Fund, to whom I am grateful.

My appreciation also extends to Jenna de Graffenried at the Lyndon Baines Johnson Library & Museum, as well as Carol A. Leadenham at the Hoover Institution Archives, for their expertise and assistance, and for making my research trips so successful.

Besides all my friends and family who have been continually supportive, special thanks must go to Emily Cooksey, Henry Lee, Imogen Nevard, and Robert Taylor for their proofreading. Above all, however, I am eternally grateful to my parents, without whom none of this would have happened. Mum and Dad, this is for you.

Introduction.

From Colony to Cold War Ally: The Philippines and American Foreign Policy, 1898-1972.

'Okay, Johnny, go ahead. Make it look good.' The message was conveyed over the newly installed communication system, financed by US dollars, that connected all the key military officers to the Malacanang Presidential palace. Later that night the Philippine Secretary of Defense Juan Ponce Enrile's motorcade was ambushed and shot at with high powered automatic rifles. The government response was swift and forceful. On the same evening, in smoke filled room 1701 at the Hilton Hotel in downtown Manila, Ninoy Aquino, the popular political opponent of President Ferdinand Marcos, was seized by armed troops. There was no evidence linking Aquino to the attack, and Marcos had promised the American Ambassador Henry Alfred Byroade that he would take no immediate action, but on Friday 22 September 1972, he declared martial law in the Philippines. Marcos would remain in the presidency for another fourteen years, while Aquino was jailed for eight years before being assassinated in 1983. The ambush of Johnny Enrile's motorcade had been a set up.¹

This, after half a century as a colonial possession of the United States, and twenty six years of nominal independence, is what the country had succumbed to: the American project in the Philippines had resulted in dictatorship. The 1960s was the last decade in which the US State Department policy makers could have collaborated with democratically elected Filipino leaders to effect socio-economic reform policies. Against the militarising backdrop of Southeast Asian geopolitics, most notably the Vietnam War, domestic Philippine concerns were deprioritised in Washington, simultaneous to the inauguration of the new Filipino President, and the future dictator, Ferdinand Marcos. Marcos manipulated President Lyndon Johnson, and US Cold War insecurities more broadly; Marcos managed to accrue personal wealth and material assistance, and gain influence for very little military commitment to the Vietnam War. Despite having a historic relationship with the Philippines, and many close Filipino partners, as well as having designed the independent political system for the archipelago, twenty six years after independence Philippine democracy gave way to a nationalistic dictatorship.

¹ See William C. Rempel, *Delusions of a Dictator: The Mind of Marcos as Revealed in his Secret Diaries* (London, 1993), pp. 3-9.

Historians Gary Hess and Fredrik Logevall have called Philippine independence, inaugurated 4 July 1946, the result of the 'irresistible impetus' of the American post-war commitment to anti colonialism.² Indeed, independence was long in the making, and understanding the construction of the post-independence Philippine state is foundational to the development of US-Philippine relations throughout the Cold War, and this partnership will be explored by utilising the wealth of primary material in the Lyndon Johnson Presidential Library, the National Archive of Records and Administration, and the Hoover Archive. These materials from the intelligence community, including declassified CIA documents, personal papers, the presidential files of Johnson and his personal correspondence, as well as State and Defence Department material deal with the Philippines as well as the Vietnam War, Indonesia, and other key Cold War issues. By examining CIA reports, confidential ambassadorial, and State Department correspondence, as well as official diplomatic files and Presidential papers, this thesis will argue that the role of the Philippines in US foreign policy, including analysts and low level embassy staff, all the way to the White House, is an important yet understudied aspect of the Cold War. The primary documentation, when considered within the context of wider Cold War historiography, encourages us to place the Philippines, and the developing world in general, more centrally within twenty-first century Cold War debates. US foreign policy can only be truly understood when the Cold War is placed in a longer history, reaching back into the nineteenth century, as well as considering the post-Cold War period.³ In other words, the Philippines serves as the prime case study to demonstrate the continuities and patterns in late nineteenth and twentieth century US foreign policy. The continued relationships between US and Filipino elites, the continuation of the islands as strategic US military strongholds, and the image of the Philippines as the example of the application of US democracy overseas makes this transposal relationship an important aspect of twentieth century US foreign policy.

The anniversary of American independence, as well as the inauguration the Third Republic of the Philippines, on 4 July 1946, was not the end of this trans-Pacific partnership, but instead marked the reshaping of that relationship. The US-Philippines partnership, after independence, has been denounced most vocally by an ex-US soldier, William J. Pomeroy, as 'neo-colonial.' Neocolonialism as an interpretive framework, occurs in other literature too, and is useful to demonstrate how some fundamental relationships in the Philippines bridged independence.⁴

² Gary R. Hess, *The United States' Emergence as a Southeast Asian Power, 1940-1950* (New York, 1987), p. 218; Fredrik Logevall, *Embers of War: The Fall of an Empire and the Making of America's Vietnam* (New York, 2012), p. 48.

³ Michael H. Hunt, *Ideology and US Foreign Policy* (London, 1987).

⁴ Stephen R. Shalom, 'Philippine Acceptance of the Bell Trade Act of 1946: A Study of Manipulatory Democracy,' *Pacific Historical Review*, 49:3 (August, 1980), pp. 499-517; Julian Go, *American Empire and*

For example, Stephen Shalom argued that the United States restored pre-war society ‘with its wide disparities of wealth and power.’ Shalom continued that the ‘Americans could have reconstructed Philippine society along more egalitarian and democratic lines and independent of foreign domination,’ yet upon independence, ‘the pre-war elite, with only minor changes, retained control of the islands.’⁵ Indeed, ‘economic relations could even be strengthened after the colonies had gained political independence’—World War Two catalysed change in US dominance over the Philippines, rather than ending US interference in the islands.⁶ Though the Philippines was a former US colonial possession, colonialism was a means to achieve an end, which did not come to a conclusion after independence; indeed, only the formal political structure changed, the fundamental dynamic of the unequal relationship remained consistent. The global development of the influence of US politics and economic forces can be better explained using the term ‘imperialism,’ and though such a term has a Cold War revisionist tradition, Julian Go, Amy Kaplan, Robert McMahon and Walter Nugent have led the way in recent scholarship in revisiting the imperialist aspects of US foreign policy.⁷ (Neo)colonialism is a static force of territorial capture, whereas (neo)imperialism is more reflective of fluid geopolitical considerations, reflecting the complexity and scale of the United States’ position as the dominant economic force in the Cold War world, in which it used relationships, originally established during colonialism to help further foreign policy objectives. Furthermore, neocolonialism indicates high levels of US domination over government, while though US interests were extensive in the Philippines, the Cold War revisionist approach, typified by scholars of this school, such as William Appleman Williams and Gabriel Kolko,⁸ largely fails to account for Filipino agency. Imperialism describes a US foreign policy to which developing world actors could react; this thesis thus fuses revisionist critiques of US foreign policy with an appreciation for the agency of Philippine leaders, which reflects more recent Cold War historiographical approaches.⁹

the Politics of Meaning: Elite Political Cultures in the Philippines and Puerto Rico During U.S. Colonialism (London, 2008); William J. Pomeroy, ‘The Philippines: A Case Study of Neocolonialism’ in Mark Selden (Ed.), *Remaking Asia, Essays on the American uses of Power* (New York, 1974) pp. 157-199; James B. Goodno, *The Philippines: Land of Broken Promises* (London, 1991).

⁵ Shalom, ‘Philippine Acceptance of The Bell Trade Act of 1946,’ pp. 499-500.

⁶ Geir Lundestad, *East, West, North, South: Major Developments in International Politics, 1945-1996* (Oxford, 1997), pp. 289-290.

⁷ Julian Go, *Patterns of Empire: The British and American Empires, 1688 to the Present* (Cambridge, 2011); Amy Kaplan, *The Anarchy of Empire in the Making of U.S. Culture* (London, 2002); Robert J. McMahon, *The Limits of Power: the United States and Southeast Asia since World War II* (New York, 1999); Walter Nugent, *Habits of Empire: A History of American Expansionism* (New York).

⁸ William Appleman Williams, *Tragedy of American Diplomacy* (Cleveland, 1959); Gabriel Kolko, *Confronting the Third World: United States Foreign Policy, 1945-1980* (New York, 1988).

⁹ Nick Cullather, *Illusions of Influence: The Political Economy of United States-Philippines Relations, 1942-1960* (Stanford, 1994).

The United States government and businesses returned to their positions of influence in the Philippines after World War Two, and continued once independence was granted. The nationalist tendency in indigenous Philippine scholarship, as well as revisionist and New Left western historiography, has been critical of what has been perceived as the re-establishment of the unequal and exploitative partnership.¹⁰ According to Curt Cardwell's *NSC 68 and the Political Economy of the Early Cold War*, which emphasised the primacy of economic factors driving US foreign policy, argued that the continued relevance of economic factors helps 'validates the revisionist approach.' Cardwell continued to suggest that the post-revisionist and neo-orthodox school ultimately return to the conclusion that the Cold War originated as 'the result of Stalin's depravity and little else.'¹¹ Cardwell's willingness to highlight the prominence of US economic interests as a key policy driver in the Philippines, is echoed in a telegram from the American embassy in Saigon, explaining the mood amongst French officials in the city in 1947, which applauded the skilful resumption of extensive US influence in the Philippines within the formal setting of independence:

In mid-1947, the French minister in Siam, Pierre-Eugene Gilbert, told the American ambassador there that the goal of French policy in Laos and Cambodia was to "grant them the same measure of independence granted to the Philippines with orientation in economic and political matters toward France. Washington promptly cabled the U.S. ambassador to tell Gilbert that the Philippines was fully independent and that any special arrangements were based on the free decision of the Filipino people through plebiscite or their elected representative."¹²

As this shows, the notion of overseas colonies had always sat uncomfortably in the American discourse, whereas Europeans had a centuries old history that had normalised the idea.¹³ A reluctance within the US foreign policy making community to appreciate the dynamics of the long history of the US-Philippines partnership were foundational to the difficulties US-Philippine relations experienced after independence and throughout the Cold War; it was this that would define US-Philippines relations during the coming decades.

¹⁰ Patricio N. Abinales, 'Progressive-Machine Conflict In Early Twentieth-Century U.S. Politics and Colonial-State Building in the Philippines' in Julian Go, and Anne L. Foster, (eds.), *The American Colonial State in the Philippines: Global Perspectives* (North Carolina, 2003) pp. 148-181; Teodoro A. Agoncilla, *History of the Filipino People: Eighth Edition* (Quezon City, 1990); Renato Constantino, *A History of the Philippines* (London, 1975); Albert F. Celoz, *Ferdinand Marcos, and the Philippines: the Political Economy of Authoritarianism* (London, 1997), Goodno, *The Philippines*; Kolko, *Confronting The Third World*; Stanley Karnow, *In Our Image: America's Empire in the Philippines* (New York, 1989).

¹¹ Curt Cardwell, *NSC 68 and the Political Economy of the Early Cold War* (Cambridge, 2011), p. 6.

¹² Confidential Telegram, Ambassador Stanton (Saigon) to Secretary of State, 8 August 1947, *FRUS, The Far East*, p. 130.

¹³ E. Berkeley Tompkins, *Anti-Imperialism in the United States: The Great Debate, 1890-1920* (University of Pennsylvania Press, 1970); Susan K. Harris, *God's Arbiters: Americans and the Philippines, 1898-1902* (Oxford, 2011).

According to revisionist historian, Gabriel Kolko, the conditions imposed on the Philippines in 1946 were ‘the starkest case of total United States control over a nation,’ which extended ‘the essentially colonial “special relationship” with the Philippines after independence.’¹⁴ It was a continuation of US imperial ambition that characterised the US-Philippines relationship during the early Cold War. Kolko is correct in critiquing US policy, but what the revisionist school more broadly lacks is an appreciation of the agency of the receiving party of US foreign policy. The revisionist tradition of Cold War historiography, though often unabashed in its criticisms of Washington, established the study of the developing world, which is now a key aspect of the historiography.¹⁵ The contribution of more recent scholarship, such as that by Melvyn Leffler and Odd Arne Westad, and Nick Cullather in the case of the Philippines, has been to highlight the developing world, but to call into question the revisionist assertion of total American dominance.¹⁶ Considering that development in the scholarship, the relevance of the developing world that emerged in revisionism has been complicated by the likes of Westad, and with geographic specificity by Cullather, yet the US-Philippine Cold War scholarly field remains understudied, so placing the Philippines within the discourse of the contemporary scholarship will contribute an analysis of an important, yet somewhat overlooked, area of US Cold War foreign policy.

Despite the fact that many powerful and influential Americans shared an intimate relationship with Filipino elites, in the United States the colonial era primarily remains a period study, with little trans-epochal consideration.¹⁷ Michael Hunt and Steven Levine have addressed this gap in the scholarship to a degree, using each of America’s four East Asian wars to map the development of attempts to establish dominance in the region, though the Philippines chapter remains limited to the 1899-1902 period. Though the US wars with the Philippines, Japan, Korea, and Vietnam are all very connected, Hunt and Levine note that they are ‘conveniently’ treated as separate. This thesis looks to take a long view of US history in Asia with a sustained focus on the US-Philippines partnership.¹⁸ Though often characterised by their economic determinism, the most significant revisionist legacy, most notably developed by Walter LaFeber, was the consideration of US history in trans-epochal terms: nineteenth century—

¹⁴ Joyce Kolko and Gabriel Kolko, *The Limits of Power: The World and United States Foreign Policy, 1945-1954* (London, 1972), p. 80; Lundestad, *East, West, North, South* (Oxford, 1997).

¹⁵ Gabriel Kolko, *Confronting the Third World*; Michael E. Latham, ‘The Cold War in the Third World, 1963-1975,’ in Melvyn P. Leffler and Odd Arne Westad (eds) *The Cambridge History of the Cold War: Volume II Crises and Detente* (Cambridge, 2010), pp. 258-280.

¹⁶ Odd Arne Westad, *The Global Cold War* (London, 2005); Cullather, *Illusions of Influence*.

¹⁷ Julian Go, *American Empire and the Politics of Meaning*; Go and Foster (eds.) *The American Colonial State in the Philippines*; Paul A. Kramer, *The Blood of Government: Race, Empire, The United States & the Philippines* (North Carolina, 2006); Harris, *God’s Arbiters*.

¹⁸ Michael H. Hunt and Steven I. Levine, *Arc of Empire: America’s Wars in Asia from the Philippines to Vietnam* (North Carolina 2002), pp. 10-63, p. 1.

World War Two—Cold War.¹⁹ Alfred McCoy, who has studied the US-Philippine relationship across the twentieth century, through the guise of police and state surveillance,²⁰ delivered a harsh assessment of the US-Philippine field in the late 1980s: ‘I can find only three periods of American awareness of their Philippine presence—the initial conquest (1898-1902), World War II and the recent ‘yellow revolution’ of February 1986’—the field remains underdeveloped, with only a few exceptions, notably Cullather.²¹ Yet one of the most prevalent legacies in the Philippines, from both the Spanish and American occupations, was a system within which peasant farmers remained tied to debt within a system of exploitative landlords. Even though the so-called green revolution, the centrepiece of President John Kennedy’s developmental agricultural policies for the developing world failed in the Philippines, as it did elsewhere in other ‘green revolution epicentres—Pakistan, India, Sri Lanka, Bangladesh, Mexico, the Philippines, and Indonesia—are all among the most undernourished nations.’²² The failure was not just agricultural, but was also closely associated with the continued economic and political dominance of landed elites—the so-called *pensionados*. As Nick Cullather stated, underdevelopment was not just a ‘supply-side problem,’ but one of mismanagement and corruption.²³ In the Philippines, US developmental agencies failed to overcome the legacies and persistence of the *pensionado* class, and thus even after independence, the Philippine farmers, which made up roughly eighty percent of the population, remained locked in a system of cyclical socio-economic poverty.²⁴

This also suggests that the experience of failure in the Philippines had far-reaching consequences, especially for the prosecution of the Vietnam War: as Kathleen Weekley put it, ‘their [US] nation-building efforts there [Philippines] ought to feature in any consideration of the possibilities of nation-building again elsewhere in the world.’²⁵ First, the unstable domestic situation in the Philippines during the Cold War diminished American ability to draw upon one

¹⁹ Walter LaFeber, *The American Age: United States Foreign Policy at Home and Abroad* (Second Edition, London, 1994); Walter LaFeber, *The New Empire: An Interpretation of the American Expansion 1860-1898* (Cornell University Press, 1963).

²⁰ Alfred W. McCoy, *Policing America's Empire: The United States, The Philippines, and the Rise of the Surveillance State* (Madison, 2009).

²¹ Alfred W. McCoy, ‘Philippine-American Relations: A Problem of Perception,’ *Australasian Journal of American Studies*, 6:2 (December, 1987), pp. 17-27, p. 18; Cullather, *Illusions of Influence*.

²² Nick Cullather, *The Hungry World: America's Cold War Battle Against Poverty in Asia* (London, 2010), p. 266

²³ Cullather, *Hungry World*, p. 266; Harlan R. Crippen, ‘American Imperialism and Philippine Independence,’ *Science & Society*, 11:2 (Spring, 1947), pp. 97-126; Constantino, *History of the Philippines*.

²⁴ Cullather, *Hungry World*, p. 73.

²⁵ Kathleen Weekley, ‘The National or the Social? Problems of Nation-Building in Post-World War II Philippines,’ *Third World Quarterly*, *From Nation-Building to State-Building* 27:1 (2006), pp. 85-100, p. 85. These ideas are echoed in Gabriel Kolko, *Anatomy of War: Vietnam, the United States, and the Modern Historical Experience* (New York, 1985).

of its most valuable military and strategic strongholds, as increasing agitation in the Philippines toward American bases undermined US military installations throughout Asia.²⁶ Second, the social conflict created by economic inequality undermined the ideological claims of democracy and prosperity that American policy makers 'espoused.'²⁷ Third, the neoimperialist overtones of legislation passed by the US Congress which set post-independence Philippine trading policy, the Bell Trade Act (1946), military bases, and as well as the post-World War Two resuscitation of colonial era relationships, characterised by the perpetuation of socio-economic impoverishment and underdevelopment, was further exacerbated by Cold War anti-communist discourse. US policy makers would have better understood the problems and consequent unrest in the Philippines had they focused on locally articulated nationalism. The foreign policy line of strict anti-communism and containment, however, designed and pursued by high ranking US officials and advisors, such as George Kennan and Hans Morgenthau, often served as an intellectual compass for successive US administrations.²⁸ US policy makers in the State Department, and the CIA, demanded a strong and co-operative Philippine ally, often at the cost of addressing the fundamental socio-economic issues: as Leffler points out, 'geopolitical configurations were inextricably tied to economic relationships' and 'waging the Cold War their [US] principle aim was not so much to help others as to protect themselves.'²⁹ Consequently, this study deals primarily with the socio-economic conditions, which were in part a by-product of the US-Philippines relationship. US policy makers favoured the pursuance of short-term Cold War strategic aims, and indeed the absence of long term planning contributed to the Philippines' descent into military dictatorship in 1972.

In order to demonstrate the problems that Cold War relationships and policies created for developmental programmes and democratic practices in the Philippines, these chapters examine the attitudes within the US State Department and the US ambassadorial staff there, as well as their interactions with the presidential administrations of Ramon Magsaysay (1953-1957), Carlos Garcia (1957-1961), Diosdado Macapagal (1961-1965), and the first term of Ferdinand Marcos (1965-1969). This study will argue that long term US involvement in a developing country such as the Philippines had a high likelihood of resulting in authoritarian

²⁶ Melvyn Leffler, *The Specter of Communism: The United States and the Origins of the Cold War, 1917-1953* (New York, 1994), p. 104.

²⁷ Michael Cullinane, 'Playing the Game: The Rise of Sergio Osmeña, 1898-1907,' in Ruby Paredes (ed.) *Philippine Colonial Democracy* (Manila, 1989), pp. 70-113, H. W. Brands, *Bound the Empire: The United States and the Philippines* (Oxford, 1992), p. vii.

²⁸ Stanley Hoffman, 'An American Social Science: International Relations,' *Daedalus*, 106:3 *Discoveries and Interpretations: Studies in Contemporary Scholarship, Volume I* (Summer, 1977), pp. 41-60; For the realist school of US foreign policy, see: Hans J. Morgenthau, *Politics Among Nations: the Struggle for Power and Peace* (New York, 1949), Hans J. Morgenthau, *A New Foreign Policy for the United States* (London, 1969); George Kennan, *Realities of American Foreign Policy* (Oxford, 1954).

²⁹ Leffler, *Specter of Communism*, p. 129.

regimes. Michael Latham has concluded that an increasing willingness to support authoritarian governments in the developing world was a feature of US foreign policy in the 1960s, and that 'by the middle of the decade, US policymakers increasingly shifted from approaches stressing modernisation and accelerated development to a greater reliance on direct coercion and military force.'³⁰ After all, as Latham observed, 'modernisation theory alone was incapable of "causing" anything,' and 'gestures of US support' by the likes of the Peace Corps were peripheral to the central interests of foreign business which 'solidified the repressive institutions it was called to restructure.'³¹ As H. W. Brands wrote, there was 'little energy' in Washington to reform Philippine politics, indeed Brands noted the attitude in Washington towards the Filipinos was 'their government was their problem.'³² Certainly neither Johnson, nor the CIA, interfered with the 1965 Philippine election—despite Macapagal's commitment to send troops to Vietnam, his primary intention was to keep the Filipino role non-military, and in a civil capacity.³³ Furthermore, there were enough doubts and scepticism over economic issues, as discussed in memos sent to President Johnson from Secretary of State Dean Rusk and NSC advisor Robert Komer in early October that cast some negativity around the Philippine president in Washington.³⁴

Considering the colonial history and trans-epochal trans-Pacific relationships, US foreign policy in the Philippines, as this thesis will show, played a crucial role in the Cold War instability and perpetual socio-economic problems in the Philippines, which created conditions that led to dictatorship in 1972.³⁵ Above all else, US Cold War strategic concerns were prioritised, and in pursuance of these, the Philippines and other developing world regions were negatively impacted.³⁶ So powerful were issues of US security that the individual circumstances of different cases were often dealt with a uniform response as the US demanded near complete adherence to their policies and system.³⁷ Poor results in return led to incumbent Filipino

³⁰ Latham, 'The Cold War in the Third World, 1963-1975,' p. 260.

³¹ Michael E. Latham, *Modernization as Ideology: American Social Science and "Nation Building" in the Kennedy Era* (London, 2000), p. 10; Walter LaFeber, *Inevitable Revolutions: the United States in Central America* (New York, 1993); Simon G. Harman, *Dollar Diplomacy Modern Style* (Washington D. C. 1970).

³² Brands, *Bound the Empire*, p. 215.

³³ Robert M. Blackburn, *Mercenaries and Lyndon Johnson's "More Flags:" The Hiring of Koreans, Filipino and Thai Soldiers in the Vietnam War* (Jefferson, 1994).

³⁴ Memorandum from Secretary of State Rusk to President Johnson, 2 October 1964, *Indonesia; Malaysia-Singapore; Philippines, 1964-1968, Document 296, FRUS*; Memorandum from Robert W. Komer of the National Security Council Staff to President Johnson, 5 October, 1964, *1964-1968, Volume XXVI, Indonesia; Malaysia-Singapore; Philippines, Document 299, FRUS*.

³⁵ Brands, *Bound to Empire*, 215.

³⁶ Leffler, *Specter of Communism*, p. 129.

³⁷ Crippen, 'American Imperialism and Philippine Independence'; Naomi Klein, *The Shock Doctrine: The Rise of Disaster Capitalism* (London, 2007); Gilbert M. Joseph, and Daniela Spenser (eds.) *In From the Cold: Latin America's New Encounter with the Cold War* (North Carolina, 2008); Melvyn Leffler, *A Preponderance of Power: National Security, The Truman Administration, and the Cold War* (Stanford,

presidents losing US State Department backing for failing to secure American interests, and thus failing to win re-election—it was not until 1969, that a post-independence Filipino president won a second term.³⁸ The fact the US foreign policy making bodies could not instigate a successful relationship with the Philippines, either within a Cold War discourse, or concerning the colonial legacy, offers an important opportunity to reassess US policy elsewhere. If US policy was ineffective in the Philippines, a country in which the US was the only external nation with significant influence, this then suggests fundamental flaws in their approach to the developing world during the Cold War. Considering the unique position of the Philippines in US history, this case study offers an alternative analytical lens, using America's own colonial history in the Philippines to re-evaluate US foreign policy in the Cold War.

'I told him to put the Philippines on the map of the United States':³⁹ American Empire and the Colonial Philippines.

Sociologist Julian Go opened his book on American Empire by noting that in 1898 the US 'became an overseas colonial empire not unlike England, France, or Spain.'⁴⁰ As a result of the Spanish-American War, the US extended control and influence in Cuba, Puerto Rico, and Guam, and had made the Philippines a fully-fledged colony. The mid-Pacific island of Hawaii had succumbed to a coup led by private US citizens in 1893, which led later to US government annexation in 1898. This overseas expansionist move was catalysed by the Progressive movement, especially under Theodore Roosevelt's leadership.⁴¹ Even some of the anti-imperialist lobby were primarily interested in seeking economically exploitative policies, if not direct US military presence.⁴² Engrained cultural perceptions, part of the domestic American attitude toward unknown societies of the Pacific, help explain the inherently patronising and

1992) p. 508; Nick Cullather, *Secret History: The CIA's Classified Account of its Operations in Guatemala, 1952-1954* (Stanford, 1999), p. 7-8.

³⁸ Brands, *Bound to Empire*, p. vi; Cardwell, *NSC 68 and the Political Economy of the Early Cold War*, p. 2; Leffler, *Specter of Communism*, p. 130.

³⁹ General James Rusling, 'Interview with President William McKinley,' *The Christian Advocate* (New York, 22 January 1903), in Schirmer, Daniel B., and Stephan R. Shalom (eds.) *The Philippines Reader: A History of Colonialism, Neocolonialism, Dictatorship and Resistance* (Cambridge, MA, 1987), pp. 22-23, p. 22.

⁴⁰ Go, *American Empire and the Politics of Meaning*, p. 1; William J. Pomeroy, *The Philippines: Colonialism, Collaboration, and Resistance!* (New York, 1992), p. 1; Anne Foster, *Projections of Power: The United States and Europe in Colonial Southeast, 1919-1941* (London, 2010).

⁴¹ Karnow, *In Our Image*, p. 84; Walter LaFeber, 'The Empire of 1898—and Upheaval,' in Walter LaFeber (ed.), *The Cambridge History of American Foreign Relations, Volume II: The American Search for Opportunity, 1865-1913* (Cambridge, 1993), pp. 129-55; Anders Stephanson, *Manifest Destiny: American Expansionism and the Empire of Right* (New York, 1996).

⁴² Robert Beisner, *Twelve Against Empire: The Anti-Imperialists, 1898-1900* (New York, 1968); Constantino, *History of the Philippines*, pp. 287-290.

negative image of Filipinos in the United States, a mentality that had developed out of white America's domination of Native Americans and African slaves, as well as Southern Reconstruction.⁴³ By the turn of the century, the United States had become an imperialist power: the Philippines had been legally annexed as a colony. It is this juncture that much of the historiography has understandably focused on, as well as the subsequent colonial state in the Philippines.

As at the turn of the twentieth century, the installation of American rule over the Philippines required violent suppression of resistance movements: 'all opposition' was 'smashed,' 'often with great brutality.' The orders of General 'Howlin' Jake' Smith, commanding the US troops suppressing indigenous Filipino resistance, were 'the more you kill and the more you burn the more you please me.'⁴⁴ This remains the standard narrative in histories written by Filipinos, whose work traditionally is of a nationalist and leftist orientation, such as that of Renato Constantino.⁴⁵ The non-Filipino scholarship falls into two dominant categories, those in agreement with the critical assessment of US rule and the other more accepting, if not praiseworthy, of the style of colonialism practised by the United States. The former position was largely established by the Cold War revisionists, a part of the New Left movement, reassessing modern US foreign policy, yet these assessments rarely have formed substantive studies on the Philippines, and are generally briefly featured as part of works with other focuses. The exceptionalist position, that promulgates that American colonialism was altruistic and benevolent, a tutelary form of colonialism, has remained the dominant interpretation, according to Paul Kramer, for cultural histories, where the exceptional narrative 'continues to inform even the most interesting of the new cultural histories.'⁴⁶ What forms the majority of contemporary Philippines studies, however, are of a sociological and anthropological orientation, and thus are often exclusively focused on the Philippines. Whereas broader critiques of US foreign policy exclude, or have minimal, Philippine content, these studies seek

⁴³ Servando Halili Jr., *Iconography of the New Empire: Race and Gender Images and the American Colonization of the Philippines* (Quezon City, 2006); David Brody, *Visualising American Empire: Orientalism & Imperialism in the Philippines* (London, 2010); Walter Williams, 'United States Indian Policy and the Debate Over Philippine Annexation: Implications for the Origins of American Imperialism,' *Journal of American History*, 66:4 (March 1980), pp. 810-831; Kaplan, *Anarchy of Empire in the Making of U.S. Culture*.

⁴⁴ Benedict Anderson, 'Cacique Democracy in the Philippines: Origins and Dreams,' *The New Left Review* (May-June, 1988); Richard E. Welch, Jr. *Response to Imperialism: The United States and the Philippine-American War, 1899-1902* (North Carolina, 1987) pp. 41-42; Schirmer and Shalom, *Philippine Reader*, pp. 16-18.

⁴⁵ Agoncilla, *History of the Filipino People*; Constantino, *A History of the Philippines*; Renato and Letizia R. Constantino (eds.), *The Philippines: A Past Revisited* (Quezon City, 1978); Edgar E. Escultura, 'The Roots of Backwardness: An Analysis of the Philippine Condition,' *Science & Society*, 38:1 (Spring, 1974), pp. 49-76.

⁴⁶ Kramer, *The Blood of Government*, p. 16; Tony Day and Maya H. T. Liem (eds.), *Cultures at War: The Cold War and Cultural Expression in Southeast Asia* (New York, 2010).

to focus on the internal Philippine landscape, without drawing regional or international connections. A possible explanation for this, besides the author's field of speciality, was that these works emerged in the aftermath of the fall of the Ferdinand Marcos regime, and thus took on an exposé character, seeking to primarily criticise the dictatorship.⁴⁷ Benedict Kerkvliet has led the anthropological drive of Philippine study, with in-depth local studies of Filipino communities, through carrying out extensive field work in the islands in 1977 and 1986.⁴⁸ His work has provided insightful analysis, yet his studies on communities has not been sufficiently utilised by Cold War historians.

Prominent American historians have acknowledged the complexity of the internal situation in the Philippines in a Cold War context, but have rarely developed the theme.⁴⁹ According to McCoy the 'dismal state of [American] academic study simply reflects the attitudes of American society ... America has largely deleted its Philippine experience from the collective memory.'⁵⁰ McCoy and James Putzel have attempted to redress the balance, and have made strong contributions to the field.⁵¹ McCoy especially in *Policing America's Empire*, in a similar but more focused vein to his *The Politics of Heroin*, tells a counter history through the lens of the international drugs trade, to deliver a critique of US involvement in the Philippines and elsewhere.⁵² McCoy aside, the scholarship that deals specifically with the Philippines generally lacks in depth trans-epochal, trans-regional, and geographic contextualisation. Where the literature deals with these issues of space and time, the Philippines appears but very briefly, if at all. Robert McMahon has addressed the Southeast Asia regions specifically, with some Philippine focus, and though brief, his discussion of nationalism following President Ramon Magsaysay's death in 1957 highlights one of the more forgotten period of US-Philippine history.⁵³ Thus, both the Philippines and Cold War field requires a study that draws lines between the two, especially against the backdrop of the twenty-first century, post-revisionist

⁴⁷ Thomas Gibson, *Sacrificing and Sharing in the Philippines Highlands: Religion and Society Among the Buid of Mindoro* (London, 1986); Fenella Cannell, *Power and Intimacy in the Christian Philippines* (Cambridge, 1999), p. 5.

⁴⁸ James C. Scott and Benedict J. Tria Kerkvliet (eds.), *Everyday Forms of Peasant Resistance in South-East Asia* (London, 1986); Benedict Kerkvliet, *The Huk Rebellion: A Study of the Peasant Revolt in the Philippines* (Maryland, 1977).

⁴⁹ Leffler, *Preponderance of Power*, p. 394; Brands, *Wages of Globalism*; John Gaddis, *The United States and the Origins of the Cold War, 1941–1947* (New York, 1972); Mark Philip Bradley, 'Decolonisation, the Global South, and the Cold War, 1919-1962,' in Melvyn P. Leffler and Odd Arne Westad (eds.), *The Cambridge History of the Cold War. Volume II Crises and Detente* (Cambridge, 2010), pp. 464-485.

⁵⁰ McCoy, 'Philippine-American Relations: A Problem of Perception,' p. 18.

⁵¹ James Putzel, 'Social Capital and the Imagined Community: Democracy and Nationalism in the Philippines,' in Michael Leifer (ed.) *Asian Nationalism* (London, 2000), pp. 170-186; McCoy, *Policing America's Empire*.

⁵² Alfred W. McCoy, *The Politics of Heroin In Southeast Asia* (London, 1972); McCoy, *Policing America's Empire*.

⁵³ McMahon, *Limits of Empire*, pp. 90-95.

Cold War historiography, where developing world actors have been reinvigorated with increased agency in shaping the course of modern history.

Between this Philippines orientated historiography, and the Cold War literature, with which this dissertation primarily resides, is Nick Cullather's *Illusions of Influence*, which is a critical insight into the political economy of the Philippines between 1942 and 1960.⁵⁴ Cullather focuses especially on the Ramon Magsaysay era 1950-1957, and has argued that Magsaysay manipulated the CIA and acted, not as a US puppet, but as a self-aggrandiser while Secretary of Defence and later President. Within the clearly defined boundaries of his book Cullather does not reach back to the pre-World War Two period to draw on the colonial history, nor does the book reach into the 1960s, the decade where the Philippines really began to participate in the global Cold War. Building on Cullather, this current analysis contributes is a more internationalist and foreign policy focus on the 1960s, whilst looking back to the colonial period to fully appreciate the impact and development of State Department policy in the Philippines during the Johnson administration. Cullather has shown considerable appreciation for the agency possessed and exercised by the actors outside the US foreign policy community, specifically leaders in the Philippines. Filipino actors were not simply caught up in the bipolarised world of east-west geopolitics, but were part of an incredibly complex, internal, and domestic set of circumstances, which are essential to understanding the development, application, and outcome of US foreign policy.⁵⁵

Cullather's study of the Philippines was an important intervention in Cold War historiography. Published in 1994, *Illusions of Influence* reasserted the importance of the developing world, which helped highlight the significance of these regions, after the Cold War field became focused on the collapse of the Soviet Union. First, the Philippines did not have any Soviet interference during the Cold War,⁵⁶ and thus the problems experienced in the islands were largely rooted in the long history of American involvement, which challenged American post-Cold War triumphalism of their political system. Using the important but often neglected Philippine case study, Cullather revived themes of the Cold War revisionists, amidst the post-

⁵⁴ Cullather, *Illusions of Influence*; Nick Cullather, 'The Limits of Multilateralism: Making Policy for the Philippines, 1945-1950,' *The International History Review*, 13:1 (February, 1991), pp. 70-95; Frank Golay, 'Economic Consequences of the Philippine Trade Act,' *Pacific Affairs*, 28:1 (March, 1955), pp. 53-70; Shalom, 'Philippine Acceptance of the Bell Trade Act Of 1946.'

⁵⁵ Michael E. Latham. 'Redirecting the Revolution? The USA and the Failure of Nation-Building in South Vietnam,' *Third World Quarterly*, 27:1, *From Nation-Building to State-Building* (2006), pp. 27-41, p. 268; Scott and Kerkvliet (eds.), 'Everyday Forms of Peasant Resistance in South-East Asia.'

⁵⁶ Yano Tōru, 'Cold War in Southeast Asia' in Yōnosuke Nagai and Akira Iriye (eds.) *The Origins of the Cold War in Asia* (New York, 1977), pp. 321-337, p. 333; Tanigawa Yoshihiko, 'Cominform and Southeast Asia' in Yōnosuke Nagai and Akira Iriye (eds.) *The Origins of the Cold War in Asia* (New York, 1977) pp. 362-377, p. 371-374; Leffler, *Preponderance of Power*, p. 508.

revisionist period. Thus, with my study, the bridge between specialist Philippine studies and the global Cold War literature had been made. Cullather's study specifically dealt with the US-Philippines relationship, and utilised the historiography of Southeast Asia to both justify and contextualise *Illusions of Influence*. Yet seeking to place the Philippines in a trans-epochal Southeast Asian context is something that is lacking in the historiography. Adding to the important work Cullather has done on the US-Philippine partnership specifically on the 1950s, throughout this thesis, the US-Philippines partnership is contextualised within the broader study of the US nineteenth century territorial expansion across the North American continent, and elsewhere overseas, as well as the subsequent decolonisation, the Cold War, and the development of American interests in the global developing world. The relevance of this case study is only enhanced when considered within a regional and global context, and this is sustained throughout the following chapters.

In order to reduce unrest and allow for improving socio-economic conditions, which in turn would have satisfied poor farmers and 'modernising' economic nationalists alike, US agents and their Filipino partners needed to have implemented effective reform in the Philippines. Latham concluded that US foreign policy makers were 'slow to recognise the fundamental flaws embedded in an evolutionary model that reduced profound questions of history, culture and politics to matters of administration and technique.'⁵⁷ Kolko weighed in too, stating that hawkish elements, especially in the Defense Department and presidential advisors, drowned out the 'State Department reformers,' which as a result escalated the Cold War.⁵⁸ In fact when it came to aggressive policy makers, Fredrik Logevall suggested that, Johnson was in fact the 'biggest hawk of them all.'⁵⁹ Working with rural communities and economic nationalists would have been a better defence against subversive movements, but instead US planners opted for military escalation, which was also deemed a large part of the solution to the troubles in Vietnam. In many respects, the Philippines was seen as a low priority when compared to theatres like China, Korea, and Vietnam, and so warnings there went unheeded, while perceived influence held in the Philippines by US agents was celebrated Washington. The unfolding reality was that Filipino actors sought to achieve their own ends, according to Cullather, US policy makers became caught in an 'illusion of influence' in respect to their relationship with the Filipino leader, believing they had a level of control that they actually did not. The inaccurate interpretation of the relationship Magsaysay had with American agents by US policy makers, which Cullather has addressed skilfully, contributed to the foreign policy

⁵⁷ Latham, 'Redirecting the Revolution?' pp. 28-29.

⁵⁸ Kolko, *Limits of Power*, p. 80

⁵⁹ Fredrik Logevall, *Choosing War: The Lost Chance for Peace and the Escalation of War in Vietnam* (London, 1999), p. 335.

disaster in Vietnam. US leaders decided to deploy military force and a rigid Cold War rhetoric in Vietnam, even when similar tactics had failed to achieve results in the Philippines, a place where the US had historically an exclusive partnership with Filipino leaders. The price of ignoring the Philippines has been high indeed. Cullather has demonstrated the weakness in the US-Magsaysay partnership, and using this focused study, I have demonstrated how this relationship was rooted in a long, trans-epochal history, and how US-Philippine relations impacted other Cold War theatres.

'Unique ties and special relationships': The Philippines in the American Cold War.⁶⁰

Except for a brief period of expulsion during the Japanese occupation of the islands (1941-1944), the Philippines was a United States colonial possession from 1898 to 1946. The relatively uninterrupted nature of the US presence in the Philippines makes this relationship the most useful in demonstrating US foreign policy implementation over the twentieth century, superseding the chronological parameters, often established in Cold War historiography. The key issues of colonial legacies and US foreign policy goals were continual threads that ran through the twentieth century, not broken, but catalysed by World War Two. Considering the longevity of US-Philippines relations, the history of US policy in the Philippines is important to establishing a contextualisation for the focus of this study. Socio-economic conditions in the Philippines, as well as political practices and relationships between Filipinos and Americans had their origins outside of the usual chronological dates of the Cold War, and were rooted in a colonial past; it is important to understand the long history of US power and overseas intervention, not just for this thesis, but for broader study of US foreign policy.⁶¹

The United States, as far back as the nineteenth century, and through to the current day, has pursued a policy predicated on defending and developing the American economy, securing new markets for export, and raw material resources for import.⁶² Walter LaFeber's *America, Russia, and the Cold War, 1945-2002*, and William Appleman Williams' *The Frontier Thesis and American Foreign Policy* dated the origins of the Cold War as far back as 1898—that is to say the beginning of the United States' rise as an international power. LaFeber in *The New Empire*

⁶⁰ Paul Kattenburg to William Bundy, 'White House Interest in the Success of the Marcos State Visit,' 15 August 1966.

⁶¹ Carl H. Landé, 'The Philippines and the United States,' *Philippines Studies*, 49:4 (Fourth Quarter, 2001), pp. 518-539, p. 518.

⁶² Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri, *Empire* (London, 2000); Vladimir Lenin, 'Imperialism, The Highest State of Capitalism' in Robert Tucker (ed.), *The Lenin Anthology* (London, 1975), Brands, *Bound to Empire*, p. vi; Cardwell, *NSC 68 and the Political Economy of the Early Cold War*, p. 2; Leffler, *Specter of Communism*, p. 130.

suggested that the increasing industrialisation of the US, from around 1850, marked a simultaneous growing necessity of finding overseas markets to absorb increasing production, that culminated in the Spanish-American War, the acquisition of the Philippines, and the pursuit of the Open Door policy in Asia.⁶³ Indeed historians of East and Southeast Asia Yano Tōru, George Kahin, and Tanigawa Yoshihiko have placed colonial histories at the centre of the origins of the Cold War.⁶⁴ Beyond US investments in the Philippines, ‘valued at hundreds of millions of dollars’ by 1964, the islands served as an ideal stronghold from which to pursue economic interests in China—these interests bolstered diehard support for Chiang Kai Shek and the Chinese Nationalist Party by the US government.⁶⁵ The misperceived threat of substantive Soviet directed communism, in large part, contributed to the construction of a rigid Cold War discourse and policy that contributed to ‘some of the most humiliating and bloody pages in US history.’⁶⁶ The long, trans-World War Two patterns of US foreign policy shows the interconnectedness of the entire Asia region, and US misperceptions of the expansion of communism.⁶⁷

Much of US Cold War foreign policy was based upon consolidating and expanding US interests, a trend that existed long before the post-1945 geopolitical bipolarisation with the Soviet Union. This ‘struggle’ was rooted in a long history, indeed the United States’ oldest relationship with an Asian country was with the Philippines, since US acquisition in 1898. The relationship, like the rise of US global power, continued from the nineteenth, through the twentieth century. Michigan Republican Senator, and foreign policy internationalist Arthur H. Vandenberg noted that the Soviet Union had no troops stationed outside its territory or treaty zones, and the spread of US militarism in the Cold War were the actions of old empires exercising a presumed right over old colonial interests and developing nations.⁶⁸ US foreign policy documents, and correspondence within these bodies shows that a substantial part of the Cold War was a struggle of US foreign policy to extend their influence and control across

⁶³ Walter LaFeber, *In America, Russia, and the Cold War, 1945-2002* (New York, 2004); William Appleman Williams, ‘The Frontier Thesis and American Foreign Policy,’ *Pacific Historical Review*, 24:4 (November, 1955), pp. 379-395. LaFeber, *New Empire*; LaFeber, *American Age*.

⁶⁴ Tōru, ‘Cold War in Southeast Asia;’ George McT. Kahin, ‘The US and the Anticolonial Revolutions in SEA, 1945-1950,’ in Yōnosuke Nagai and Akira Iriye (eds.), *The Origins of the Cold War in Asia* (New York, 1977), pp. 338-361.; Tanigawa Yoshihiko, ‘Cominform and Southeast Asia,’ pp. 362-377, in Yōnosuke Nagai and Akira Iriye (eds.) *The Origins of the Cold War in Asia* (New York, 1977).

⁶⁵ Memorandum from Secretary of State Rusk to President Johnson, 2 October 1964, *Document 296, Indonesia; Malaysia-Singapore; Philippines, 1964-1968, FRUS*.

⁶⁶ LaFeber, *American Age*, pp. 502-503; David C. Engerman, ‘Ideology and the Origins of the Cold War, 1917-1962,’ in Melvyn P. Leffler and Odd Arne Westad (eds.), *The Cambridge History of the Cold War. Volume II Crises and Detente* (Cambridge, 2010), pp. 20-43; Bradley, ‘Decolonisation, the Global South, and the Cold War, 1919-1962.’

⁶⁷ Leffler, *Preponderance of Power*, p. 508.

⁶⁸ Arthur H. Vandenberg, Jr. (ed), *The Private Papers of Senator Vandenberg* (London, 1953).

the global south, whether the Soviet Union posed competition for the US system or not.⁶⁹ This is a challenge to the orthodox school and, reflective of post-revisionism, which has developed a critical middle way to both the Soviet Union and the United States' culpability in escalating Cold War tensions.⁷⁰ The longevity of the US relationship with the Philippines, and the continued attempts to exercise both overt and covert political influence to achieve foreign policy aims, presents an opportunity to highlight some of the relevant revisionist approaches, such as the focus on the developing world, whilst making sure ideas of localised agency of the post-revisionists is highlighted. The Philippines example helps preserve the important contribution of the revisionists, whilst embracing the nuanced approach of more recent scholarship.

To fully appreciate the importance of the Philippines as part of a larger US foreign policy study, this case study needs contextualising in the Cold War historiography. The revisionist approach developed contemporaneous to the Vietnam War, and primarily emerged from the University of Wisconsin-Madison.⁷¹ The anti-Vietnam War Arkansas Democrat Senator, J. William Fulbright, claimed 'if there is a single factor which more than any other explains the predicament in which we now find ourselves, it is our readiness to use the spectre of Soviet Communism as a cloak for the failure of our own leadership.'⁷² Certainly the widespread vociferous opposition to the Vietnam War elicited 'torrents of impassioned prose,' but with new research and archival opportunities towards the end of the twentieth century, 'the emergence of a genuine synthesis' helped temper the revisionist, and offered a balanced, post-revisionist Cold War analysis.⁷³ Since there was no Soviet ambition in the Philippines, there has been little study on this subject.⁷⁴ However, the Philippines serves as a good example of how successive US governments sought to create a system in the post-war world to fulfil their own economic and security interests, thus the focus of this study is a typically revisionist

⁶⁹ Charles S. Maier, 'The World Economy and the Cold War in the Middle of the Twentieth Century,' in Melvyn P. Leffler and Odd Arne Westad (eds.), *The Cambridge History of the Cold War. Volume I Origins* (Cambridge, 2010), pp. 44-66, p. 52; Bradley, 'Decolonisation, the Global South, and the Cold War, 1919-1962,' Leffler, *Preponderance of Power*; McCoy, *Politics of Heroin in Southeast Asia*.

⁷⁰ For orthodox, see: Thomas Bailey, *America Faces Russia: Russian-American Relations from Early Times to our Day* (Ithaca, 1950); Arthur Schlesinger Jr. 'Origins of the Cold War,' *Foreign Affairs*, 46:1 (October, 1967) pp. 22-52. For post-revisionism, see John L. Gaddis, *The United States and the Origins of the Cold War, 1941-1947*.

⁷¹ Williams, *Tragedy of American Diplomacy*.

⁷² Williams, *Tragedy of American Diplomacy*, p. 12.

⁷³ John Gaddis, 'The Emerging Post-Revisionist Synthesis on the Origins of the Cold War,' *Diplomatic History*, 7:3 (July, 1983) pp. 171-190, p. 171.

⁷⁴ Ronald Grigor Suny, *The Soviet Experiment: Russia, the USSR, and the Successor States* (Oxford, 2011), p. 365; Kevin McDermott and Jeremy Agnew, *The Comintern: A History of International Communism from Lenin to Stalin* (London, 1996), pp. 158-159.

topic—an ex-colonial, developing world country within a trans-epochal study, whilst constructed with appreciation and acknowledgment of post-revisionism.

The pre-Cold War history of US-Philippines relations has been central to the development of the partnership after independence in 1946. One of the cornerstone foreign policy doctrines of the Cold War, from Truman's presidency onwards, was the containment doctrine, born out of US Ambassador to Moscow, George Kennan's Long Telegram in 1946.⁷⁵ Its central tenet was that the US should rely upon strong military bases capable of projecting US power against what was perceived as communist expansionist policy.⁷⁶ The Philippines housed the two biggest overseas US bases in the world, established before World War Two, which were the centrepieces of US defence strategy in Southeast Asia throughout the ensuing decades. US President Lyndon Johnson and his closest advisers adhered to the containment doctrine, and in particular the 'domino theory' that posited if South Vietnam fell to the North Vietnamese communists, then similar communist-inspired revolutions would spread across Asia, undermining US interests and potentially leading to a broader and uncontrollable global conflict.⁷⁷ What the documents in this study show, is that there were analyses, and dissenting voices resisting this construction of geopolitics—some of which came from Filipinos. Had US foreign policy makers considered planning outside the restrictive Cold War discourse, and sought more local expertise, defeats suffered by the US could have been avoided. The Philippines serves as a key example of where this could have been achieved most successfully. Despite this, the US sought Philippine endorsement for the Vietnam War, to legitimise and share the burden of misguided policy. The fact that both presidencies of Diosdado Macapagal and Ferdinand Marcos acted with some intransigence, not to mention the anti-American Filipino Congress, suggested support from other countries, not as close to the US as the Philippines, would not be forthcoming.⁷⁸ Macapagal failed to pass the bill creating the Philippine Civic Action Group (PHILCAG) during his first term despite his support for it, and Marcos, elected in 1965, committed Philippine troops in 1966, and did not renew PHILCAG's commitment in 1967. This was far from wholehearted support for US policy in Vietnam, and by association for other parts of the developing world too; policy critics, as well as leaders in the developing world understood the neo-imperial overtones of such conflicts as the Vietnam War.

⁷⁵ John L. Gaddis, *George F. Kennan: An American Life* (New York, 2012).

⁷⁶ John L. Gaddis, 'Grand Strategies In The Cold War, Volume II: Crises and Détente' in Melvyn P. Leffler and Odd Arne Westad (eds.) *The Cambridge History Of The Cold War. Volume II Crises and Detente* (Cambridge, 2010), pp. 1-21; Ian Shapiro, *Containment: Rebuilding a Strategy against Global Terror* (Princeton, 2007).

⁷⁷ George Kennan, *American Diplomacy* (London, 1984), and John L. Gaddis, *Strategies of Containment: A Critical Appraisal of Postwar American National Security Policy* (Oxford, 1982).

⁷⁸ Mark A. Lawrence, *The Vietnam War: A Concise International History* (Oxford, 2008), p. 111; Logevall, *Choosing War*, p. 181.

The fact high level US policy makers could not come to terms with issues concerning colonial legacies, suggests the US-Philippine relationship needs further analysis.

The interconnectedness of the Philippines throughout the Southeast Asia theatre is highly revealing to the usefulness of considering this case. A key aspect of US foreign policy from France's return after Japan's expulsion, to the defeat at Dien Bien Phu and the creation of South Vietnam in 1954, and with the founding of SEATO in 1954, it was during the Kennedy and Johnson years that American involvement in Vietnam became dominated by a fighting war.⁷⁹ The first hot conflict of the Cold War, the Korean War (1950-1953), demonstrated to the US leadership of a potential Chinese southward advancement in Asia: the invasion of the Chinese volunteer army across the Yalu River was the first major external action of the new People's Republic of China, suggesting to Washington the Chinese communists' desire for influence and expansion beyond their borders. The US bases in the Philippines featured prominently during the war, which is a useful and stark example of the dual role that the islands played in the Cold War: whilst internally embroiled in the Hukbalahap Rebellion, which began in the 1940s, outwardly providing key strategic bases for American troops fighting a Cold War conflict somewhere else. Furthermore, Indonesian instability increased the importance of a Philippine strong hold of US interests.⁸⁰ By the early 1960s the Indonesian Communist Party had over three million members, second in Asia only to the Chinese Communist Party, and by 1965 Indonesian President Sukarno had received two billion dollars of aid from Moscow. He was playing the Cold War superpowers off against each other, whilst orienting the Indonesia National Party towards the Non Aligned Movement (NAM); the 1955 NAM conference was held in Bandung, West Java. Sukarno had even been the target of a CIA assassination attempt as a result of straying from his US partnership.⁸¹ Being the most populous and powerful country in Southeast Asia, losing Indonesia to the Non Aligned Movement, placed further significance on the Philippines, not just to remain a close US ally, but as the 1960s began, to become a more active participant in the regional Southeast Asian Cold War.

This research sets out the expectations of the US Cold War discourse against the colonial legacies in the Philippines. It was the Philippines and Latin America where the US could impose

⁷⁹ Lloyd C. Gardner, *Approaching Vietnam: From World War II Through Dienbienphu, 1941-1954* (New York, 1954).

⁸⁰ D. R. SarDesai, *South East Asia: Past and Present* (Boulder, 2012) pp. 268-271; Adrian Vickers, *A History of Modern Indonesia* (Cambridge, 2013), p. 140.

⁸¹ Audrey Kahin and George McTurnan Kahin, *Subversion as Foreign Policy: The Secret Eisenhower and Dulles Debacle in Indonesia* (London, 1997), p. 114.

'social, political, and economic forms it preferred,'⁸² so this study can serve as a base line for assessments of US policy elsewhere. If the US had an unmatched level of influence in the Philippines, then it can be used as an explanatory model for outcomes of US policy in the developing world. The Philippines should be the starting point when considering the United States in the colonial, post-colonial, neo-colonial, and Cold War world; there is little scholarship joining all these strands, and this is one of the key contributions of this dissertation.

Conclusion: From Nineteenth Century Colonialism to Cold War Anti-Communism: a Trans-Epochal Study.

The United States Government sought to expand and solidify their interests across the world through direct and indirect influence and interference, not just during the Cold War, but as early as the nineteenth century. The US-Philippine relationship is the longest and most intimate example of this, and yet, seventy four years after the capture of the islands from the Spanish, Filipino president Ferdinand Marcos suspended democracy, installed a brutal dictatorship, and pursued a form of pro-Asian nationalism. 1972 marked the end, in many respects, of America's Philippine experiment, and these chapters demonstrate how US foreign policy fundamentally contributed to this moment. The origins of 1972 are rooted in the long history of the development of US global power, as well as ill-conceived policy toward the developing world. To understand the extension and subsequent failures of US foreign policy, the Philippines must be a key part of the analysis.

The rise of US global power, that reached its zenith after World War Two, began in the nineteenth century. Chapter One addresses the period from the Philippines annexation to the United States in 1898 through the early twentieth century decades, concluding with the Japanese invasion of the Philippines, 9 December 1941. The purpose here is to provide background and contextualisation to the Cold War relationship between the Philippines and the United States with specific regard to social and political unrest during the late 1950s and 1960s. The Cold War era difficulties within the US-Philippine relation had their foundations in the very earliest formulations of the partnership.

Though the colonial administration was dismantled in 1946, the essential relationship dynamic remained, and the means by which this was achieved is very revealing of US Cold War

⁸² Kolko, *Confronting the Third World*, p. 19.

objectives, not just in the Philippines, but also elsewhere. Chapter Two begins on the steps of the Philippine Congress Building with the inauguration of the first president of the Third Republic of the Philippines: Manuel Roxas (1946-1948). The new president, the passing of new legislation, and the granting of independence by the United States marked the start of a renewed asymmetrical relationship between the Philippines and the United States. Using State Department and embassy correspondence, this chapter will argue that US policy makers consciously created an economy of dependence in the Philippines; the social and political consequences of which were interpreted through an emerging anti-communist Cold War rhetoric, and this illusion subsequently shaped US foreign policy. The US State Department chose the oligarchic elites from the pre-war era as allies in the coming Cold War; they rejected the opportunity to reconcile with the Central Luzon peasantry who had presented a well organised political front.

Ill-conceived policy led to incorrect analysis by US foreign policy making bodies, and the events of the late 1950s and early 1960s are demonstrative of a major defeat for the State Department and CIA in the Philippines. Chapter Three assesses the legacy of failure of the Magsaysay years for US policy, and how this impacted the Carlos Garcia administration. This analysis is driven by State Department documents, presidential papers, National Intelligence Council papers, and Filipino newspapers, which build upon the critique, set out by Nick Cullather's study of Magsaysay in the 1950s. First, this chapter contributes to this debate by focusing on two important documents that show how the legacy of Magsaysay impacted the US-Philippine relationship in the 1960s, after his death in 1957.⁸³ Second, a debate on the presidency of Carlos Garcia that succeeded Magsaysay, which was defined by an overtly nationalist tone, marked a sharp shift from the close US-Philippine relations of the previous years. The unpopularity of Garcia in Washington was demonstrative of the openness with which US policy makers refused to work with nationalist concerns—which alienated many political elites, and potential allies, the world over.

Emerging from the Magsaysay-Garcia era, and into a rapidly escalating global Cold War, the role of the Philippine president took on new international dimensions. Ultimately, this was a role the new Filipino leader, Diosdado Macapagal, who promised much, including troops to Vietnam, was not able to live up to. Chapter Four assesses Macapagal's presidency, and the required duality of addressing domestic instability, plus some moderately nationalist policies, whilst exuding external cohesion, solidarity, and alignment with US foreign policy in the 1960s.

⁸³ 'U.S. Overseas Internal Defense Policy', National Security Action Memorandum 182, 24 August 1962, *Digital National Security Archive DNSA*; National Intelligence Survey: Philippines, 6 January 1963, *DNSA*.

Using State Department, ambassadorial, and White House papers, as well as national security files, this chapter analyses the manifestation of the problems during the Macapagal presidency, 1961-1965, and the transition from him to Marcos, during the 1965 presidential election. Though Johnson hoped Macapagal would commit troops to Vietnam, his faith in the Filipino leader was not steadfast enough to support him in the 1965 election. The dynamic of the US-Philippines relationship during Macapagal's term had changed markedly from that of the US-Magsaysay partnership. Macapagal was expected to exercise a more independent foreign policy, ushering the Philippines out of the US paternalistic shadow and into the international arena, whilst still maintaining the closest ties to the United States, especially in light of the escalating Vietnam situation. Though commitment to Vietnam dominated discussions in Washington regards Macapagal's presidency, for which the Filipino leader was supportive, there were other political and economic issues that were of concern to the likes of Dean Rusk and President Johnson.

Chapter Five draws the post-war US-Philippine partnership to a conclusion at the re-election of Ferdinand Marcos in 1969, and the later 1972 suspension of democracy. Drawing on Presidential, State Department, CIA, and embassy files, this chapter will demonstrate that ultimately, the long history of US foreign policy in the Philippines contributed to dictatorship. The Philippines was the United States' showcase for democracy and development, their closest developing world Cold War ally, and the archipelago was the physical manifestation of the application of US foreign policy. The US project in the Philippines, however, after seventy four years, ended with the establishment of dictatorship, suspension of basic rights and the constitution, and establishment of a military state.

Luis Taruc in 1953 wrote of the US seizure of the Philippines in 1898 as 'when the Americans came they made boasts about having brought democracy to the Philippines, but the feudal agrarian system was preserved intact.'⁸⁴ Forty eight years later, when the US had granted the Philippines independence, William Pomeroy wrote that for 'the first 28 years of independence, the Philippines was to be tied to the old colonial trade pattern.'⁸⁵ Understanding the US-Philippines relationship throughout the colonial era is essential to demonstrating the impact of US foreign policy upon the Philippines during the Cold War, indeed, the underlying causes of developing world conflict were present well before the Cold War started, reaching back into the nineteenth century.⁸⁶ In understanding how US foreign policy contributed to the rise of

⁸⁴ Luis Taruc, *Born of the People* (New York, 1953), p. 26.

⁸⁵ Pomeroy, 'The Philippines: A Case History of Neocolonialism,' p. 1.

⁸⁶ Robert McNamara, *In Retrospect: The Tragedy and Lessons of Vietnam* (New York, 1995) p. 324.

authoritarian governments in the developing world, the Philippines is the essential case study to consider. US foreign policy of establishing strong military bases, economic partnerships and relations, as well as a politically friendly environment was applied to the islands in the nineteenth century, in the pre-World War Two twentieth century, and throughout the Cold War. In order to understand the limits of US influence in the developing world, we must begin with the Philippines.

'What to do with the Philippines?' Economic Forces and Political Strategy in the United States' Colonial Foreign Policy.¹

The eruption of the Spanish-American War in April 1898 resulted in the postponement of the Pan-American Exposition. The World's Fair was later rearranged for 1901, held in Buffalo New York, between May and November. On 5 September, the day before his assassination, President William McKinley spoke of the 'unexampled prosperity,' and immense growth of the US economy in the post-Civil War period, indeed, he said America's wealth was 'almost appalling.'² From conquering the North American continent, to augmenting international trade, to industrialising after the Civil War, the US economy had been building to a crescendo. This manifested in a display of international power at the end of the century—defeating the Spanish Empire, and acquiring overseas territories. Consolidated and further driven by the inauguration of a new President after McKinley's death, the arch-expansionist Theodore Roosevelt sought to stake American power in the world. The fact the Philippines was only granted independence after World War Two, and was subsequently a large part of Cold War geostrategic planning, makes this Pacific archipelago a central part of a vast sweep of United States history, a permanent element across a typically chronologically divided modern era. Understanding the very foundations and subsequent aspects of the US-Philippine relationship allows for themes and patterns of continuity in US foreign policy to be mapped over time.

Conquering the Philippines represented the culmination of politico-economic forces, which had gained irresistible momentum, concomitant with westward expansion across the North American continent. Yet the Spanish-American War only marked the beginning of a coming century, largely dominated by the political, military, and economic forces of the United States. Along with the collapse of their control in Cuba, Puerto Rico, and Guam, Spanish rule in the Philippines was brought to an end, after having captured the islands in 1521. Throughout the unfolding drama, played out over the end of the nineteenth century, through the pre-war colonial twentieth century, World War Two, and the global Cold War, the Philippines has retained a constant presence in the story of modern American history. This chapter deals with this colonial history of the Philippines, and the origins of the US-Philippines relationship, which

¹ Chicago Tribune, 11 May 1898. <http://archives.chicagotribune.com/1898/05/11/page/6/article/what-to-do-with-the-philippines/> [Accessed August 2015].

² The last speech of William McKinley, Buffalo, New York, 5 September, 1901. <http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/amex/1900/filmmore/reference/primary/lastspeech.html> [Accessed September 2015].

is essential to contextualising the later Cold War; the connection between these two historiographical paradigms is that the latter was wholly influenced and indeed based upon the legacies of the former. The inability of US officials to reconcile this inextricable connection of colonialism is fundamental to explaining foreign policy failures in the developing world during the Cold War.

The Philippines was defined by its rural communities, a very hierarchical and unequal socio-economic structure, and a political system that operated based on colonial exploitation. It is widely acknowledged amongst Filipino historians, American Cold War revisionists, and twenty first century scholarly work alike, that these societal features from the colonial era persisted, and at times were actively perpetuated, by ruling elites in the Philippines and from overseas. Within these fields, it is also broadly surmised that the development of US foreign policy after World War Two was heavily influenced and often directly informed by experiences of colonialism. However, the limitations of this literature are that it has not developed an in depth, cross-paradigm, study of US-Philippines relations. World War Two did not mark a break in this history, and the accumulative impact of US policy in the Philippines consistently built from its inception in 1898, until the collapse of Filipino democracy in 1972.³ Historiographically, this chapter presents a fusion of several connected, but rarely formulated strands of American and Philippine history, thus providing a fresh analysis and combination of scholarship, to serve as the foundation for the subsequent primary material focused chapters. The specialist studies of Julian Go, Anne Foster, and Paul Kramer focus in particular on the early colonial period of US-Philippine relations, whereas Nick Cullather has dealt with the Cold War relationship in the 1950s.⁴ Renato Constantino and Benedict Kerkvliet have been less restricted by paradigmatic confines, and their specifically Philippines studies provide important local perspectives.⁵ The broader studies of US history, including Walter LaFeber and the Cambridge Economic History of the United States do not discuss the Philippines in any depth, so connecting these foundational discussions of the US economy, to chronological and geographical specific works is important in order to frame the US-Philippines relationship in an

³ Landé, 'The Philippines and the United States,' p. 522.

⁴ Go, *American Empire and the Politics of Meaning*; Julian Go, Anne L. Foster (eds.), *The American Colonial State in the Philippines: Global Perspectives* (North Carolina, 2003); Shirley Jenkins, *American Economic Policy Towards the Philippines* (Stanford, 1954); Juan Giusti-Cordero, 'Compradors or Compadres? 'Sugar Barons' in Negros (The Philippines) and Puerto Rico under American Rule,' in Ulba Bosma, Juan Giusti-Cordero and G Roger Knight (eds.), *Sugarlandia Revisited: Sugar and Colonialism in Asia and the Americas, 1800 to 1940* (New York, 2007); Kramer, *The Blood of Government*; Annick Cizel, 'Nation-Building in the Philippines: Rooseveltian Statecraft for Imperial Modernization in an Emergent Transatlantic World Order,' *Diplomacy & Statecraft*, 19:4 (2008), pp. 690-711; Nick Culather, *Illusions of Influence*.

⁵ Constantino, *History of the Philippines*; Kerkvliet, *Huk Rebellion*.

original and fresh perspective. Only then can Cold War and post- World War Two US foreign policy studies be truly contextualised and fully appreciated.⁶

This chapter reframes this historiography, creates the necessary contextualisation for the primary research in Chapters Two to Five, and re-orientate the Philippines to a more central position in Cold War, foreign policy, American, and post-colonial history. Each part of this chapter recounts a formative aspect of Philippines and American history, which laid the bedrock for US Cold War foreign policy, and the foundations of an independent Philippine state. First, the Spanish colonial authority was largely unorganised and lacked the rigor and regimentation of the later US occupation, however, the societal model of sharecropping, tenant farming, and exploitative landlordism was the true economic legacy of the nineteenth century. Second, the growth of the American capitalist system in the nineteenth century was the primary cause for the Spanish American War in 1898, and this is demonstrated by charting the constant demand of the US economic system to seek new markets, which meant the eventual foray into overseas expansion, in the form of colonisation in the Philippines. Third, the US colonial state in the Pacific archipelago created an economic, social, and political mechanism that came to define the modern Philippine state. The fourth and fifth sections deal with specific aspects of the Philippine state—the peasantry and the sugar industry as representative of the exploitative, US dominated economic system. It is through this colonial history that the Cold War problems in the US-Philippine relationship are founded, and not within the perceived post-World War Two geostrategic discourses created in Washington. Though this position is shared amongst Philippine historians, as well as Cold War revisionists, placing the archipelago central to debates on US foreign policy after 1945 is yet to be widely considered in the field. Other hot Cold War conflicts have deprioritised the Philippines in the historiography, but the archipelago represents the best example of US policy in Asia.

Colonial Legacies: Rural Society in the Spanish-Philippines.

To understand the Philippines, a brief survey of the legacies left by the three century long Spanish era of domination is essential because it is in this period that the Philippine societal structure and socio-economic hierarchy was developed. These circumstances, as with colonial

⁶ Walter LaFeber, *American Century*; Eric Foner, *Reconstruction: America's Unfinished Revolution 1863-1877* (New York, 1988); Stanley L. Engerman and Robert E. Gallman (eds.) *The Cambridge Economic History of the United States Volume 2: The Long Nineteenth Century* (Cambridge, 2000); David M. Pletcher, *The Diplomacy of Involvement: American Economic Expansion Across The Pacific, 1784-1900* (London, 2001).

systems across the world, were led by a very small foreign elite, which in turn, through delegated roles, created an indigenous ruling class who presided over the peasantry. The fact that this dynamic remained intact throughout the twentieth century highlights the extent to which the Spanish influence was engrained within the Filipino people and their society, but also the unexceptional nature of American colonialism. The Philippine colonial setting is foundational to understanding not just the US-Philippine Cold War relationship, but the role of the United States throughout the post-colonial, developing world.

The Spanish land system was administered through the Catholic Church—beyond the ecclesiastical responsibilities of Friars was the role of implementing the Spanish colonial authority's policies. The successful conversion of much of the Philippines population to Catholicism allowed the Spanish Crown to exploit the cultural influence of the Friar by utilising their societal position as magistrate and chief tax collector. This dual role then suggests several key aspects in the development of socio-economic conditions in the Philippines. The diocese essentially became a hacienda—the spiritual leader developed into an economic exploiter—and it was the Friar who accumulated the crops and revenue as the local colonial administrator, or landlord. For the most part, there lacked any legal administration of land and much relied upon hereditary privileges and common law understandings—as long as the Friar collected the dues, the Spanish authorities were satisfied and content with having little direct involvement in Filipino communities. However, improved agricultural practices and economic pressures from Spain helped influence an increase in land cultivation and legal consolidation of control by landlords over farming families. By 1894, the Maura Law unfairly demanded that claims to land be proven with a legal title back dated by at least one year—failure to produce such a document would lead to land confiscation, and the forfeiture of any perceived historical or hereditary rights to the land. Filipino farmers lacked an ability to get credit, access money, or even know about or understand Royal Decrees from Madrid. The result of this new law was the loss of family lands for approximately four hundred thousand peasant families, and the opening of an opportunity for wealthy mestizos to buy up vast tracks of land from the Crown and Church.⁷ Educated mestizo Filipino elites, originating from the Spanish period, the *Ilustrado*, were protected by the Spanish colonial authority or had their own private security to enforce this new arbitrary system, such was the dominance of the ruling elites.⁸ This societal hierarchy would remain intact for generations to come; a class system not just left unhindered, but actively perpetuated by US officials in the twentieth century, even into the Cold War era.

⁷ Renato Constantino, *History of the Philippines*, p. 125.

⁸ Kerkvliet, *Huk Rebellion*, p. 22.

The light human footprint of Spanish officials in the Philippines meant a great deal of co-operation was required from a small, elite group of Filipinos to assist the implementation of colonial policy. Utilising Catholic fervour as well as the power endowed by the Spanish Crown, Friars engaged in delegation on a local level of managerial responsibilities to selected *Gobernadorcillos*, petty governors, who oversaw the collection of tax from a group of villages (*Barangays*) who in turn devolved responsibilities of tax collection to village level chieftains.⁹ Creating a Filipino socio-economic hierarchy meant any disquiet or discontent was directed amongst and between local Filipino communities, deliberately fragmenting society, and thus distracting attention away from the broader injustices that were endemic in plantation culture and the colonial system.¹⁰ According to Renato Constantino 'wealth accumulation became a priority' for the Spanish, and endemic in that process was the creation of an administered socio-economic system of elite domination over the majority of exploited farmers.¹¹ Abusive landlordism, unfair sharecropping, and general socio-economic inequality remained central to unrest and the cause of instability in the Philippines well into the Cold War. A key policy shortcoming of successive United States governments was the failure to fully appreciate, or implement effective policies to combat the inherent injustice and deep resentment this caused across rural Filipino communities.

Like in the American South, sharecropping was a part of rural life in the Philippines: both regions were administered by the Department of the Interior, and thus when devising Philippine policy, the Department should have drawn on their experience of the cotton belt. The males within the extended family worked the land to make a subsistence living, however, their usually small harvest was subject to a payment of fifty percent of the crop in lieu of the privilege of tilling the land.¹² Constantino noted that due to the inconsistent Spanish colonial authority and local delegation of the implementation of sharecropping laws, this meant that responsibility fell to the landlords, and thus the sharecropping ratio could be as high as seventy percent.¹³ To compound the misery of the tenant farmers, these inconsistent and unregulated agreements were agreed upon before the harvest. In a bad year if the yield was small, the tenant farmer would be unable to feed his family, thus seeking loans from the landlord would then further tie the farmer to indebtedness. For example borrowing one cavan (approximately 75 litres) of rice from a landlord, a repayment of as many as five cavan would be expected in

⁹ Constantino, *History of the Philippines*, p. 61.

¹⁰ Sara Berry, 'Hegemony on a Shoestring: Indirect Rule and Access to Agricultural Land,' *Africa: Journal of the International African Institute*, 62 (1992) pp. 327-355, p. 329.

¹¹ Constantino, *History of the Philippines*, p. 65.

¹² Kerkvliet, *Huk Rebellion*, p. 6.

¹³ Constantino, *History of the Philippines*, p. 68.

return.¹⁴ These extortionate interest rates created a downward spiral of extreme poverty, from which it was impossible to escape from, entrenching both greatly unequal and unjust socio-economic conditions, but also resentment for colonialism.

As difficult and impoverishing as the Spanish system was for the Philippine peasantry, the Spanish colonial authority pursued a comparatively less efficient form of capitalism than by their colonial successors. The Spanish colonial system did not maximise economic potential or implement a uniform and centralised system, until the end of the nineteenth century when mechanisation improved yields regimentally. This is well-documented by Benedict Kerkvliet's research on the small town of San Ricardo, Nueva Ecija Province, in Central Luzon. Kerkvliet suggested the socio-economic conditions got worse as the nineteenth century gave way to the twentieth and the Spanish gave way to the US colonial authority, primarily because of an increase in the efficiency of the American capitalist system. His study of the land owning Tinio Family demonstrated how the Father (Manuel) himself set the comparatively reasonable fifty five percent of the harvest, and operated a free food ration system for struggling tenant families; defending his estate against bandits was the price exacted in return—at least to a degree, a mutually beneficial deal. Manaolo Tinio took over the family estate when his father died in 1927. Having been raised under the American system, Manaolo increased the crop share in his favour and abolished subsistence handouts. Kerkvliet analysed local peasant testimony to show that Manaolo was inherently less generous than his father; however, beyond personality traits, there are bigger economic complexities at work in the Philippines that had been developing over the previous three decades, between the 1890s and the 1920s. Land was far less available in the 1920s than the late nineteenth century because of increased cultivation and more efficient agrarian practises promoted by US administrators—between 1902 and 1939 cultivated land in Nueva Ecija went up 720 percent. Furthermore, the population boom in the first four decades of the twentieth century suggests that Manaolo had a more difficult environment in which to run his father's estate—a significantly increased population meant arbitrary hand outs were not sustainable or an effective business model.¹⁵ Manaolo seized an opportunity presented to him: the Spanish had left the Philippines underdeveloped, and the opportunity for amassing fortunes lay in wait if one was willing to initiate more efficient methods of extraction. The emergence of a monoculture centred on sugar, increasingly dominated by US sugar trusts and monopolies, replaced the largely decentralised and inconsistency exploitative Spanish system: 'US technology provided through their trusteeship would create the infrastructural improvements to allow the exploitation of

¹⁴ Luis Taruc, 'Struggles of the 1930s,' in Schirmer and Shalom, (eds.), *Philippines Reader*, pp. 62-66.

¹⁵ Kerkvliet, *Huk Rebellion*, pp. 7-9.

resources.¹⁶ This was not exclusive to the Philippines, and was the case in the Pacific island of Hawaii, throughout the latter decades of the nineteenth century, when the island finally became a US territory, though was not admitted to the union until 1959. Hawaii, like the Philippines, as elsewhere, came under the expanding influence and power of US global power, driven by economic forces.

American Empire? Economic Growth, and Territorial Expansion in the Nineteenth Century.

Tuesday 30 May 1893, over 123,000 tickets were sold on the gate alone at the Columbian Exposition, held on a 690 acre plot in Chicago's Jackson Park.¹⁷ This grand celebration of the four hundred and first birthday of Christopher Columbus' arrival in the New World was housed in the White City, a vast neoclassical stucco building, designed by architect Daniel Burnham, towered over the tenement slums of the adjacent neighbourhoods.¹⁸ At this world fair 'Americans celebrated their triumphs in industry and technology while, ironically, enduring the nation's worst economic depression.'¹⁹ Yet to historian Frederick Jackson Turner, addressing the American Historical Association at the 1893 Exposition, the event marked something of greater importance: 'little by little he [the American] transforms the wilderness,' indeed the 'fact is, that here is a new product that is American,' but now 'at the end of a hundred years of life under the Constitution, the frontier has gone, and with its going has closed the first period of American history.'²⁰ Although Walter LaFeber amongst others have agreed Turner 'overemphasised the importance of the frontier,' the 'birth pains' of a 'different America' in the final years of the nineteenth century 'were terrifying as well as promising.'²¹ Before the close of the century, the United States would expand beyond the now closed frontier that Jackson mourned in his 1893 thesis, opening new ground to become 'American.' Centre of this new frontier was the Philippine capital Manila; under United States colonial rule the city underwent a neo-classical beautification redesign project, and the island's Governor-General

¹⁶ David Ekbladh, *The Great American Mission: Modernization and the Construction of an American World Order* (Oxford, 2010), p. 20.

¹⁷ Chicago Tribune, 31 May 1893.

<http://archives.chicagotribune.com/1893/05/31/page/1/article/worlds-columbian-exposition-news> [Accessed July 2015].

¹⁸ Chicago Tribune, 12 April 1979.

<http://archives.chicagotribune.com/1979/04/12/page/71/article/jackson-parks-wooded-island-japan-complex-to-be-restored> [Accessed July 2015].

¹⁹ LaFeber, *American Century*, p 2.

²⁰ Frederick Jackson Turner, 'The Significance of the Frontier in American History,' *Report of the American Historical Association* (1893) reprinted by the Project Gutenberg (October 2007), p. 38.

²¹ LaFeber, *American Century*, p 2.

William Howard Taft commissioned none other than the architect Daniel Burnham.²² Burnham's employment reflected a strikingly visual, as well as ideological extension of domestic policy into the United States Pacific colonisation of the Philippines.

In hindsight Turner's prediction of a seismic shift in the course of American history was indeed accurate, its occurrence, however, certainly was not instantaneous or miraculous. This section addresses United States' economic expansion throughout the nineteenth century, culminating in the events of its final decade: 1890. Having conquered the western frontier, deployed gunboat diplomacy in Asia to open Chinese markets, overthrown Hawaiian queen, Lili'uokalani, in an 1893 coup, and acquired colonial possessions in the wake of the Spanish-American War, the United States had begun to engage in aggressive overseas enterprises in Central America and Asia. It was this period at the turn of the nineteenth and twentieth century that Julian Go has labelled America's 'third wave' of 'aggression,' which following two previous regional and hemispheric phases now culminated in 'heightened imperial aggression' 'on a global stage.'²³

At home, since the Reconstruction era (1865-1877) American big business, centred in the North and Midwest had had great financial success: 'the profits of industry boomed ... [which] were presided over by a triumphant industrial bourgeoisie.'²⁴ Whilst looking westward, the thirty years after the Civil War saw more land come under cultivation than the previous two and a half centuries, and such a transformation demanded new markets.²⁵ What defined this period of geographic as well as economic expansion was the rapid enlargement of the railway network. Robert Gallman pointed out 'the general phenomenon of rapid growth of output during the long nineteenth century was chiefly a consequence of the expansion of the supplies of factors of production.'²⁶ Indeed the eighty billion ton miles of railway laid by 1890 across the North American continent,²⁷ an increase of the labour force by a factor of forty eight between 1774 and 1909, and capital stock increase over the same period of a factor of 338, all reflect how 'transportation, communications, and financial networks tied the expanding economy together' to make the US 'by far the largest producer of goods and services in the world' by

²² Charles Moore, *Daniel H. Burnham. Architect: Planner of Cities, Volume 2* (New York, 1921), pp. 161-162.

²³ Go, *Patterns of Empire*, pp. 218-220.

²⁴ Foner, *Reconstruction*, p. 18 and p. 460.

²⁵ Foner, *Reconstruction*, p. 463.

²⁶ Richard E. Gallman, 'Economic Growth and Structural Change in the Long Nineteenth Century,' in Stanley L. Engerman and Robert E. Gallman (eds.) *The Cambridge Economic History of the United States Volume 2: The Long Nineteenth Century* (Cambridge, 2000), pp. 1-56, p. 12.

²⁷ Albert Fishlow, 'Internal Transportation in the Nineteenth and Early Twentieth Centuries,' in Stanley L. Engerman and Robert E. Gallman (eds.) *The Cambridge Economic History of the United States Volume 2: The Long Nineteenth Century* (Cambridge, 2000) pp. 543-642, p. 583.

1914.²⁸ Robert Lipsey suggested that it was not until the 1850s that ‘American exporting became more aggressive,’ which was a direct result of the vast continental expanse the developing nation had to grow into: there was no pressure to import food stuffs, thus the economy enjoyed a dominant export market without being tied to the need to purchase, from overseas, enough food to sustain the expanding population,²⁹ which grew by a factor of forty between 1774 and 1909.³⁰ Much of this export was continentally contained in the early phases of the century, spreading through the new territories gained: it was not until the Mexican-American War 1846-1848 that the territory that would become California, New Mexico, Arizona, Nevada, Utah, and parts of Wyoming and Colorado became part of the United States as stated in the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo on 2 February 1848. It took until 4 June 1876 that the first Transcontinental Express crossed the country, coast to coast, achieved in 83 hours and 39 minutes, compared to the months’ long voyage only a decade previous. This continental expansion was a harbinger for trans-Pacific development of US economic interests, and thus the conquest of the American frontier forms the early part of the story of the growth of US power.

Beyond the conquest of the North American continent, US overseas exports continually featured prominently in the nation’s economic system throughout the latter half of the nineteenth century. According to Gallman ‘industrialisation began as early as the 1820s,’ and mechanisation began in the fifteen years before the Civil War.³¹ This development is reflected by statistics from the National Bureau of Economic Research: between 1800 and 1860, the US, as a percentage of world exports, more than trebled from 3.2 percent to 9.8 percent, and despite the Civil War, by 1900 the percentage stood at 15—‘in other words, the US was more export-oriented than the average country.’³² Lipsey goes further to put the export market central to the development of the American economy: ‘without the highly elastic demand of the foreign market, expansions of production would quickly face the effects of the low domestic demand elasticities, prices would fall quickly, and the expansion would be cut off.’³³ This foreign market increasingly was located in Asia, indeed ‘it would not be too much to say,’ concluded diplomatic historian David Pletcher, ‘that the vision of the Golden East was a major motivating force in nineteenth-century American history, as it was largely responsible for

²⁸ Gallman, ‘Economic Growth and Structural Change in the Long Nineteenth Century,’ p. 13 and p. 51.

²⁹ Robert E. Lipsey, ‘U.S. Foreign Trade and the Balance of Payments, 1800–1913,’ in Stanley L. Engerman and Robert E. Gallman (eds.) *The Cambridge Economic History of the United States Volume 2: The Long Nineteenth Century* (Cambridge, 2000), pp. 685-732, p. 962

³⁰ Gallman, ‘Economic Growth and Structural Change in the Long Nineteenth Century,’ p. 13.

³¹ Gallman, ‘Economic Growth and Structural Change in the Long Nineteenth Century,’ p. 49.

³² Robert E. Lipsey, *US Foreign Trade and the Balance of Payments, 1800-1913: NBER Working Paper Series* (Massachusetts, 1994), p. 5.

³³ Robert E. Lipsey, ‘US Foreign Trade and the Balance of Payments, 1800-1913,’ pp. 60-61.

exploration and trade in the Pacific Ocean, for American interest in an isthmian canal, and in part for the whole western movement.³⁴ The opportunities of new markets, however, were not just additional profit making opportunities; they were important and later essential to the existence of the American capitalist system. The 1830s marked the advent of involvement that would 'come to shape a substantial part of the history of the US in the twentieth century.'³⁵ During a domestic crisis of surplus production in this period, a US agriculturalist claimed that 'the greatest evil which we have to encounter is a surplus of production beyond the home demand.'³⁶ US capitalism relied upon ever expanding markets to consume the increasing productivity of the growing American economy. Thus the domestic development of the United States throughout the nineteenth century happened simultaneous to the pursuit of interests overseas. The firm belief in Manifest Destiny in elite socio-economic, political, and policy circles in this period, ensured that spheres beyond the geography of the North American continent remained firm in the sights of the country's vision, which materialised during the Spanish-American War.

The formative decade for US interests in Asia was the 1830s, defined by missions, explorative expeditions, and trade agreements. First, in 1832, appointed by President Andrew Jackson as the first Far Eastern envoy, the diplomat Edmund Roberts traded and concluded treaties in Siam, which was the first US contact with the area. Second, and following this early success, the Exploring Expedition (1839-42) led by Charles Wilkes made the US the most knowledgeable country in the world on Pacific geography. The proselytising tradition of American Protestantism first made contact with China in the 1830s with a medical and Christian mission in the city of Guangzhou. It was, however, the 1834 English Charter Act that ended the East India Trading Company's monopoly of trade in China, which offered the opportunity for US merchants to participate in the huge opium trade in China, as well as exporting American cotton. The further opening of China to foreign trade after the First Opium War and the Treaty of Nanking of 1842 began a long period of US interest in the Asian market. Two years later Massachusetts Congressman Caleb Cushing, appointed by President John Tyler negotiated the Treaty of Wangxia, which replicated many of the key terms of the Treaty of Nanking but extended trade access to five ports (Guangzhou, Xiamen, Fuzhou, Ningbo, and Shanghai).³⁷ By the 1850s, having taken possession of California from Mexico in the war of 1846-1848, and now with a substantial trans-Pacific trading route established with steamboats, the

³⁴ Pletcher, *Diplomacy of Involvement*, p. 314.

³⁵ Gallman, 'Economic Growth and Structural Change in the Long Nineteenth Century,' p. 55.

³⁶ LaFeber, *American Age*, pp. 101-102.

³⁷ The US Department of State: Office of the Historian: *The Opening to China Part I: the First Opium War, the United States, and the Treaty of Wangxia, 1839-1844.* <https://history.state.gov/milestones/1830-1860/china-1> [Accessed October 2015].

establishment of relations with Japan became a pertinent issue for the US economy. President Millard Fillmore authorised a naval expedition to Japan, led by Commodore Matthew Perry in 1853-4. Perry achieved concessions on the part of the Tokugawa Shogunate to allow for US steamboats to refuel in selected ports. The fruits of the 'American economy gave to the United States in its international dealings a power that had political and military dimensions, and that came to shape a substantial part of the history of the US in the twentieth century.'³⁸

If Perry's expedition to Japan revealed a willingness to flex military muscle, the 1898 Spanish-American War demonstrated the emerging pre-eminence of US international power. This war of regional and international trade spheres and strategic territorial locations was not a spontaneous foreign policy decision, but the result of decades of overseas trade enquiries, culminating in this assertion of the new global American confidence. The conflict has often been characterised by the public outcry and jingoistic 'yellow press' reaction to the explosion, and sinking of the *USS Maine* in Havana Bay on 15 February 1898, costing 260 American lives.³⁹ However, the war really marked seventy years of incremental market pressure; the more sophisticated US production became, the greater the need to expand beyond the North American continent. The revisionist approach of William Appleman Williams and Walter LaFeber, as well as more contemporary assessments broadly agree with the Marxist explanation of Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri: 'capital is an organism that cannot sustain itself without constantly looking beyond its boundaries, feeding off its external environment. Its outside is essential.'⁴⁰ The United States had to look to dominate regions of the underdeveloped and developing world to help sustain and support the continued growth of the domestic economy.

The nearly two decades from the Spanish-American War to the beginning of the First World War mark an unprecedented, rapid overseas expansion of investment and interest from the US economy into Asia. This expansion was built on the preceding decades' developments; the maturity of the US national economy in these interwar years reflected nearly a century of net growth and expansion. Between 1897 and 1914 direct investment by US business in Asia grew from 23 million dollars to 119.5 million dollars, figures stood at 1.5-17 million dollars for Oceania, and 49-281.3 million dollars for Cuba and West Indies: in total over this period US

³⁸ Gallman, 'Economic Growth and Structural Change in the Long Nineteenth Century,' p. 55.

³⁹ For a cultural exploration of these issues in domestic US life, see Kaplan, *The Anarchy of Empire in the Making of U.S. Culture*.

⁴⁰ Hardt and Negri, *Empire*, p. 224.

overseas investment grew from 634.5 million dollars to over 2.6 billion dollars.⁴¹ These investments, especially in Oceania and the Caribbean were protected now by the establishment of a US colonial sphere of control ‘not unlike England, France, or Spain.’⁴² Indeed in the tradition of the Burkean maxim that ‘all empires are cemented in blood,’⁴³ four hundred thousand Filipino’s lost their lives during the US conquest of the archipelago.⁴⁴ There is some debate, however, by Julian Go and Anne Foster that the US pursued, at least to a degree, a tutelary, exceptionalist colonialism in the wake of their acquirement of new territorial acquisitions;⁴⁵ nevertheless these cultural and social layers are secondary explanations next to the economic model. The American venture into the Philippines, and thus into the realms of a colonial power were not practiced along exceptional lines—the United States had developed into a colonial power because of the capitalists system the US economy was based upon. The establishment of colonial presence was the culmination of pressures and developments in the US economy over the nineteenth century—these are the roots of twentieth century US power.

The Colonial State of Mind.

The Spanish-American War was by far the most overt and public overseas venture of any US administration up to that point. It was a war against a European imperial nation over the control of colonial assets in the Caribbean and Pacific which cost the lives of 2,910 Americans in less than four months of combat.⁴⁶ The American claim of ‘exporting democracy’ was, however, met with a hostile Filipino population who had hoped Spain’s defeat paved the way for independence.⁴⁷ The assertion of an American colonial authority in fact led to one of the most bloody episodes in American history: the subsequent Philippine War, which cost 600 million dollars.⁴⁸ Central to Julian Go’s research has been the collaboration of indigenous political elites with US authorities, and indeed these socio-economic dominant groups sought to benefit by working with the United States: the American era of colonial rule in the

⁴¹ Lance E. Davis and Robert J. Cull, ‘International Capital Movements, Domestic Capital Markets, and American Economic Growth, 1820–1914,’ Stanley L. Engerman and Robert E. Gallman (eds.) *The Cambridge Economic History of the United States Volume 2: The Long Nineteenth Century* (Cambridge, 2000), pp. 733-812, p. 787.

⁴² Go, *American Empire and the Politics of Meaning*, p. 1.

⁴³ Edmond Burke, *A Vindication of Natural Society* (1756), p. 7.
<http://oll.libertyfund.org/titles/850> [Accessed October 2015].

⁴⁴ Go, *American Empire*, pp. 5-6.

⁴⁵ Go and Foster (eds.), *American Colonial State in the Philippines*.

⁴⁶ Donald H. Dyal, *Historical Dictionary of the Spanish American War* (Westport, 1996), p. 67.

⁴⁷ Go, *American Empire*, p. 2.

⁴⁸ Frank Ninkovich, *The United States and Imperialism* (Oxford, 2001) p. 51.

Philippines was marked by economic and strategic motivations, and within this system local elites proved indispensable. The US tutored Filipinos in order for them to in turn serve US interests, and so it is misleading to use this example of exceptionality to explain the US model of colonialism. Having defeated Spain, the United States government was faced not with a docile and malleable Filipino population, but a determined, nationalistic, independence movement. Though many of the sentiments lived on through generations, officially the revolutionary insurgency lasted from June 1899 until July 1902. To convey the scale of the conflict, some 400,000 Filipinos died, including women and children who were forcefully removed from their homes into camps.⁴⁹ It was against this backdrop that the United States began to conduct the affairs of its first colonial state.

Though the guerrilla insurgency was eventually suppressed, the anti-American sentiments lived long in the Philippine popular conscience—the predominant perception was that the Americans were another colonial master imposing their system, not liberators or civilisers. Having demonstrated a willingness to wage a major conflict against the Filipino peasantry, the US authorities had made it clear that the only system of governance was the one that they expounded. The need to ‘win over the propertied and respected Filipinos’ was required to help run the country and make conditions conducive to achieving US policy, but all other groups had to fall in line or face heavy handed state opposition.⁵⁰ In practice this manifested itself initially with Order Number 100, proclaimed by General Arthur MacArthur Jr. in 1900. The order stated there was no neutrality of Filipinos: one was either on the American side or an enemy guerrilla combatant. Later on, this manifested into the development of a relationship between US authorities and the Philippine political class, who had entered the elite social circles; many wealthy mestizo *illustrados* would send their children to the US for education, would interchange positions in corporate and political spheres, and enjoy influence and privilege within the US-Philippine relationship across generations. With the co-operation of the *illustardo* elites, the United States’ colonial authorities in the Philippines implemented a political and legal administration based upon the American system. The bicameral legislative system was overseen by an American Governor General appointed by the US President, and both these houses of representatives were exclusively populated by the mestizo *illustardo* elite. From the inauguration of the colonial state the US had both identified their key partners in the Philippines, and securely placed important US officials in positions of influence. It was not until 1935 that the Philippines elected their first president; the intimate and inextricable development between the US colonial administration and the development of a Philippine

⁴⁹ Go, *American Empire*, p. 6.

⁵⁰ Welch, *Response to Imperialism*, pp. 35-37.

political and legal system ensured US prominence, if not outright dominance, of the political scene until at least the mid-1950s.

The US Commission in the Philippines remained the legislative body between 1900 and 1907, the members were personally selected by the US President, and exercised executive powers over the islands—the first Governor and head of the Commission was president-to-be and close ally of President Theodore Roosevelt, Taft. The 1902 Organic Act mandated the creation of a bicameral system in which the US Commission became the Upper House, which in turn was replaced by an elected Senate, set out by the 1916 Jones Act.⁵¹ The Lower House of Representatives, as of 1907, was an assembly of elected nominees, however, the vote only extended to those who passed a strict set of landowning qualifications. All the while the Governor General as well as other key government roles, including the secretary of education, remained the domain exclusively of American officials, who retained the right to veto any bill from the Philippine legislature.⁵² General Arthur MacArthur insisted that ‘education is primarily and exclusively to aid the military pacification’; an insight into the importance and politicisation of learning.⁵³ The 1935 Tydings McDuffie Act abolished the bicameral system, implementing a unicameral National Assembly style of government which narrowed the already limited representative influence. It was upon this more restrictive platform that Manuel Quezon was elected the first president of the Philippines on 15 November 1935. Quezon dominated Philippine politics throughout the first half of the twentieth century, and it seems only his death in 1944, whilst leading his government in exile in Washington during the Japanese occupation, prevented him from becoming the first president of an independent Philippines. He was the floor leader of the House of Representatives, the resident commissioner to the US House of Representatives, and after 1916 was the Senate President until his presidential victory in 1935. Quezon owed his career to the blessings of the US Commission, both they and officials in Washington favoured him—he possessed a sense of national pride and fully adhered to the importance of the role the US had in the development of the Philippines. Charismatic and cooperative, and though Magsaysay was perceived as America’s boy in the 1950s, it was Quezon who was really the original.⁵⁴

⁵¹ Daniel B. Schirmer and Stephen Roskamm Shalom, ‘Editors Introduction,’ in Schirmer and Shalom, *Philippine Reader*, pp. 35-37, p. 35.

⁵² Vincent Rafael, ‘The War of Translation: Colonial Education, American English, and Tagalog Slang in The Philippines,’ *The Journal of Asian Studies*, 74:2 (May 2015), pp. 283-302.

⁵³ Renato Constantino, ‘The Miseducation of the Filipino,’ in Schirmer and Shalom, *Philippine Reader*, pp. 45-49, pp. 45-46.

⁵⁴ Nick Cullather, ‘America’s Boy? Ramon Magsaysay and the illusions of influence,’ *Pacific Historical Review*, 62:3 (August 1993), pp. 305-338.

During the Great Depression of the 1930s, US foreign policy became less expansive and governmental focus became more inward looking and domestic orientated. Coupled with the anxieties of the possibility in the early 1930s of an Asian war, as the Japanese Empire expanded into Manchuria, Manuel Quezon and the narrow and restrictive democratic system the US had designed in the Philippines, demonstrated a long term policy to retain a high level of influence in the Philippines with minimal US physical entanglement. Quezon was the ombudsman between the Filipino economic elite and the United States government, and he fulfilled the requirements of representing both groups' interests very well. Within this elite partnership between the Philippine government and elites, on the one hand, and the United States authorities and Department of the Interior (the agency responsible for Philippine affairs), on the other, the Philippine peasantry remained a very low priority. Though the legislative and policy sphere of the colonial Philippines remained the exclusive domain of elite actors, and so power was concentrated in a small minority, the peasantry were continually active in representing their own interests, especially in the form of unionisation. Their commitment to improving their socio-economic conditions and the increasing dissatisfaction with their US colonial overseers, shows just how unexceptional US colonial policy was: as across the developing world, the Filipinos were adamant, and increasingly active, in demonstrating their rejection of subjugation to colonial rule.

Subjects of Empire: Inequality and Resistance in Rural Filipino Communities.

The cycle of disquiet, unrest, and rebellion had been a common theme in Philippine colonial history. Challenges to the status quo during the Spanish period were not uncommon, it was not until the US period, however, when the peasantry and labour groups developed a sense of 'mass consciousness,' and a nuanced understanding of the connection between the colonial and global economies and their own socio-economic hardship. Indeed developments in Philippine peasant and labour activity during the early twentieth century were influenced by international events. World War One and the Great Depression impacted the opportunities and willingness of an increasingly conscious peasantry and labour force to organise. This momentum built quickly during the US colonial era until World War Two demanded a 'realignment of forces against a common [Japanese] enemy.'⁵⁵ However, in the years and decades preceding the Japanese invasion on 8 December 1941, the Philippine Government and their US allies were facing not just organised labour, but an opposition which had the popular

⁵⁵ Constantino, *History of the Philippines*, p. 383.

support and commitment to their cause to challenge the dominance of the Manuel Quezon government.

The social history of the Philippine peasantry was one of struggle for food, work, and security. A statement released on the merging of the Socialist and Communist Party's encapsulated the mood of the vast majority of those participating in the social unrest of the 1930s: 'we have no intention of importing the Russian brand of communism into this situation. Russian conditions are utterly different ... In fact, I feel free to severely criticize the Soviets. Indeed, we would welcome ... twentieth century capitalism in the Philippines if our workers could approximate the living conditions, status, and rights that ... American workers have obtained under modern capitalism, we would be satisfied.'⁵⁶ The tragedy of US-Philippine relations is that those who opposed US interference, and US backed Filipino governments, were generally not seeking revolution, just reform within the existing structure.

Renato Constantino noted that by 1800 a three tiered-rural social hierarchy had developed; colonial authorities would delegate to local elites who in turn would direct and control the peasantry.⁵⁷ The Spanish colonial authority most notably experienced the rejection of this societal dynamic during the Dagohoy Rebellion (1744-1829) which was only eventually defeated by a yearlong campaign of thousands of Spanish troops—five of the six thousand Filipino troops serving the Crown deserted. Towards the end of the rebellion it was estimated that nearly twenty thousand rebels had joined the cause. The immediate cause of the rebellion was the refusal by a Friar to give Morales Dagohoy a Christian burial, however, Constantino concluded that 'three thousand people would have not abandoned their homes so readily and chosen the uncertain and difficult life of rebels had they not felt themselves to be victims of grave injustices and tyrannies.'⁵⁸ In short, the Filipino peasantry had already established a willingness to engage in violent struggle over economic and social injustice. By the time the US had firmly established their colonial state, a new form of resistance had developed: organised unions in the sugar growing heartland of Central Luzon.⁵⁹ These Unions were based on collective anger at the continued practises of inequality that had defined the Spanish period; unfair sharecropping policy, very high interest rates on loaned food, and the continued implementation of antiquated work policy not dissimilar to serfdom. The unions' increasingly popularity threatened to challenge the established political order in the rural Philippines.

⁵⁶ Kerkvliet, *Huk Rebellion*, pp. 49-53.

⁵⁷ Constantino, *History of the Philippines*, p. 62.

⁵⁸ Constantino, *History of the Philippines*, pp. 100-101.

⁵⁹ Kerkvliet, *Huk Rebellion*, p. 36.

The increased organisation and regimentation of the Philippine economy during the US era created a greater sense of regional unity amongst workers, and in the opinion of labour leaders, a more coherent awareness of exploitation. The first major impetus for early unionising groups was provided by the rapid increase in demands for Philippine goods by the US market in response to World War One. The 'business expansion brought together larger groups of labourers, thus encouraging the formation of new unions:' in 1912 six labour disputes were recorded, involving 1880 employees, however in 1918, eighty four strikes were recorded, involving 16,289 workers. Though these early unions and organisations were 'marred by disunity and dissension,' 'personal ambition' and 'intrusion of politics,' and lacked effectiveness because of '*illustrados* infused into these organisations their own political outlook,' and saw unionism as a means of improving conditions in order to bring labour and capital closer together, ultimately, however, there emerged an irreversible mass awakening amongst the peasantry and labour forces.⁶⁰ This created a foundation that was developed to a great extent as a result of the 'turbulent thirties,' The US domestic agricultural lobby's reaction to the Great Depression was to erect protectionist policies that immediately impacted the Philippine economy. Loss of jobs, decrease in investment, and plummeting demand highlighted the dependence of the Philippine economy on that of the United States. Out of this emerged three major movements which had a combined total of hundreds of thousands of Filipino members, who had signed up to organisations that rejected the US interference, the colonial economy, and the perpetuation of socio-economic inequality. The Sakdalistas, the AMT—*Aguman ding Malding Talapagobra* (General Workers Union) and the KPMP—*Kalipunang Pambansa ng mga Magsasaka sa Pilipinas* (National Society of Peasants in the Philippines) all formed the mass ranks from within which would develop the Philippines Communist Party.

Organised challenges to the US colonial authorities, and the complicit Philippine government were not insubstantial; indeed, they represented a broad and genuine sense of dissatisfaction with the political system. Renato Constantino stated that 'the popular movement with the greatest immediate impact spawned by the turbulent thirties was the Sakdal led by Benigno Ramos.' Ramos's political activism began with publishing a weekly paper attacking Quezon as a 'lackey' of the Americans. His more incendiary position promoted a Leninist influenced push for freedom from the US: 'independence is not given but must be taken through the united action of the people,' and indeed this proactive Sakdalista stance 'soon became immensely popular with all sectors that disapproved of or had grievances against the status quo.' The damaging influence of the colonial education, American economic control, and military bases was the platform from which Ramos called for 'complete and absolute independence by

⁶⁰ Constantino, *History of the Philippines*, p. 356.

December 1935.’ However, with the growth of the party, and the elevation of Ramos from pamphleteer to the representative of the Sakdal movement, led to a development of Japanese influenced nationalism, that took a fascist direction. Spending more and more time in Japan, Ramos became dislocated from the movement, which erupted in armed rebellion on 2 May 1935 in which fifty seven Sakdalistas were killed by the Philippine Constabulary. This move, instigated from the bottom of the party, drove a wedge between them and the leadership, and as a consequence, the movement lost momentum and direction. In the end then ‘the Sakdalista movement, despite its opportunist and fascist inclined leadership, was a genuine expression of protest and a milestone in the politicization of the people:’ it drew a line between colonialism and poverty and instilled a ‘consciousness of the masses.’⁶¹

Coupled with the exploits of the Sakdal movement, the AMT and the KPMP had over 106,000 members by 1939.⁶² Unlike earlier unions, the AMT was free from *illustrado* influence; the leaders were not landlord puppets, but independently selected by the workers themselves. The breakaway AMT proved very popular, indeed peasant leader and later head of the Hukbalahap movement Luis Taruc said that the AMT ‘grew substantially’ through the 1930s as a result of a campaign and petition to reduce the sharecropping ratio down from a seventy-thirty division in favour of the landlord. This campaign was in reaction to the intensified hardship endured because of the new protectionist policies in the US during the Great Depression: the petition was rejected.

The rejection of the petition resulted in strikes and picket lines drawn up in the sugar cane fields. In retaliation, the landlords organised themselves to pressure their tenants to leave the breakaway AMT union because it was an encapsulation of the erosion of power of the property owners over their tenants. Those who refused to join the AMT were boycotted in their neighbourhood, which caused serious social divisions within the rural communities.⁶³ The escalatory nature of the strikes, workers deciding to cross the picket line, strike breakers, and aggravated landlords created for a tumultuous social environment. Within this setting, the formation, and the later unification in 1938 of the Philippine Socialist Party (1929) and the Communist Party of the Philippine (PKP, *Partido Kominista ng Philipinas*, 1930) was interpreted as clandestine Russian intervention. The scholarly conclusions, however, drawn by Benedict Kerkvliet was that the PKP had continually debated leadership issues, and thus did not play a pivotal part in the unrest in Central Luzon, actually spending most of the 1930s in hiding, in

⁶¹ Constantino, *History of the Philippines*, pp. 367-370.

⁶² Kerkvliet, *Huk Rebellion*, p. 45.

⁶³ Luis Taruc, ‘Struggles of the 1930s,’ in Schirmer and Shalom, *Philippine Reader*, pp. 63-65.

prison, or in exile. Furthermore, a key PKP figure in the 1930s, Guillermo Capadocia, felt the party was too detached from the rural areas—the PKP was mainly active in the urban centres, and thus the agricultural strikes were not imbued with sophisticated, imported communist ideals, but just a desire for higher living standards.⁶⁴

Any involvement on the part of the PKP, however, did not necessarily indicate Russian interference in the development of the Communist Party of the Philippines. Though the PKP operated mainly in urban areas, and was affiliated to the Chinese population and the small Philippine proletariat, they were quick to distinguish their aims from those of the Kremlin. Though the majority of the peasantry were not Communists, the mutual desires for better socio-economic standards resonated across both groups. A reality of minimal ideological motivation and scant communistic involvement remained the case into the Cold War; however, the conditions nonetheless offered an opportunity for communist infiltration into the movement. Adhering to strict anti-communist Cold War paradigms meant that instead of interpreting these movements as attempts to improve socio-economic conditions, they were unfortunately perceived simply as a threat to US interests and security, and at no point either during the colonial or Cold War era were granted any substantive platform within legal or political theatres. The essential grievances of the peasantry were consistent over both periods; ironically the failure to recognise these persistent problems was to the great detriment, eventually, to all three groups: the peasantry, the US government, and the Philippine government.

Both the AMT and KPMP unions pursued their cause through the courts as well as on the picket line. Joining forces, they formed a political front and backed nine successful candidates for mayor and in eight of these won the majority of council seats.⁶⁵ The official governmental response to this show of democracy was to establish the Knights of Peace, an organisation designed to recruit desperate workers as strike breakers, founded by landlords and Quezon's Secretary of Labor Sotero Baluyut.⁶⁶ Taking the government's lead, a landowner cabal in Cabiao Province in Nueva Ecija formed the Association of Landlords (*Samahan ng mga Propietario*), which had a mandate to unite landlords to protect their interests against legal challenges set forth by Union leaders. This was the response of the socio-political elites who were now feeling threatened by the peasant majority they had for so long mistreated and dominated. Throughout the transition of colonial power in the Philippines from Spanish to the

⁶⁴ Kerkvliet, *Huk Rebellion*, p. 50.

⁶⁵ Kerkvliet, *Huk Rebellion*, p. 46.

⁶⁶ Kerkvliet, *Huk Rebellion*, p. 56.

United States, the role of the elite and peasantry remained the same. The United States developed the Spanish system from near feudalism to developed capitalism, but essentially the elites remained in positions of politico-economic dominance in order to ensure that the agrarian peasantry of Luzon continued their role as the cheap available labour.

Strategies of (in)dependence: Economic and Foreign Policy Developments from the Great Depression to World War Two.

The Philippines had become a noticeable participant in the expansion of the US capitalist system. Legislation passed by the colonial authorities at the beginning of the twentieth century tied the Philippine economy to the United States. The dependence of the archipelago's economy can be best demonstrated through the sugar industry, though the copra and cordage industries also offer some insight to the workings of the Philippines economy, and how it was affected by US interests in response to the Great Depression. It was through sugar that landed elites received preferential financial concessions from the US, thus perpetuating the unequal socio-economic system. Ironically, in supporting these powerful classes, the US colonial authorities created short term allies, but contributed to long term instability and unrest in the Philippines.

Sugarcane was central to US economic interests and key to the consolidation of the landed interests. The increased cultivation of the crop towards the end of the Spanish period and in the early twentieth century helped develop a monoculture of sugarcane, a concentration of wealth, and monopolisation of the industry. The process of mechanisation and economic dynamism began before the US period, in the second half of the nineteenth century, but was also undeniably further developed once the US colonised the archipelago. The boom in the Philippine sugar industry can be traced to the intervention of Nicholas Ker of Ker & Co in the islands. Ker sold, on credit, 159 sugar mills in one year to plantations in the provinces of Iloilo and Negros which, according to Constantino, were directly responsible for the astronomical increase in production. In Negros in 1859, 14,000 piculs had been collected that year, by 1880 618,120 piculs were harvested, and as many as 1.8 million piculs in 1893.⁶⁷ This 'radical technical and social transformation' that took place resulted in 820 plantation based steam powered sugar mills in Negros being replaced by only seventeen central factories between 1914 and 1927. As a result of this technological development and centralisation, the total production of the eleven largest central factories in Negros between 1922 and 1934 increased

⁶⁷ Constantino, *History of the Philippines*, p. 119.

by six hundred percent.⁶⁸ This is a clear demonstration of how competition became concentrated into a small number of cartels, the benefactors of this centralisation was of course the US markets because of preferential tariffs—the 1902 Philippine Act reduced tariffs on Philippine exports entering US by 25 percent after an initial decrease on duty in 1901. The US Sugar Trust controlled 98 percent of the refining industry, which also bought 22,484 additional hectares from the Catholic Church—evidence of the exchange of land from one elite group to another.⁶⁹ US colonialism fundamentally contributed to the perpetuation of the socio-economic conditions of the Spanish era.

This seismic increase in production occurred because there were markets abroad to absorb it: during the decade between 1920 and 1930 sugar imports arriving in the US from the Pacific archipelago rose 450 percent, and indeed it is also worth mentioning the 223 percent increase in coconut oil and 500 percent increase in cordage imports too from the colony.⁷⁰ This translated into US monopolisation of this export market: the rapidity of the US share of total value imports and exports went from eleven percent in 1911 to 41 percent in 1920, and by 1935 it stood at 72 percent. The extent of the intimate relationship that quickly developed between US interest and the mestizo-elites was reflected in the fact that by 1935, 79 percent of sugar investment came from Filipinos.⁷¹ During the pre-war period, the US private sector had two hundred million dollars invested in the Philippines: 64 percent of Philippine imports were from the US, two thirds of Philippine import revenue was generated from sales of sugar into US markets.⁷² Utilising Filipino partners in exercising influence can be summed up by the example of the Ledesma Central. Head of a sugar plantation dynasty, Oscar Ledesma owned a Negros central (the owner of which is referred to as a Centralista—owning both land and the mill) and was simultaneously the ambassador to the United States. He was also a mayor and provincial governor. He had previously been a senator and the secretary of commerce and presided on the board of the National Federation of Sugar Planters.⁷³ Ledesma collaborated with both the US and Japanese during World War Two in order to secure his future regardless of who won the war. Later, when the Puerto Rico sugar industry collapsed in the 1950s Ledesma personally went to buy vast amounts of sugar machinery from the Caribbean island. Ledesma was emblematic of the close relationship of economics and politics and the links between the US Government and the Philippine elites.

⁶⁸ Giusti-Cordero, 'Compradors or Compadres?' p. 184.

⁶⁹ Constantino, *History of the Philippines*, p. 297.

⁷⁰ Jenkins, *American Economic Policy towards the Philippines*, p. 34.

⁷¹ Giusti-Cordero, 'Compradors or Compadres?' p. 186.

⁷² Berry, *Hegemony on a Shoestring*, p. 330.

⁷³ Giusti-Cordero, 'Compradors or Compadres?' p. 186.

This details an economic scene wholly dominated by the United States by the mid-1930s. Within the Philippines, ‘American colonial policy had successfully trained Filipino politicians to be colonial spokesmen,’ and ‘colonial education had effectively transformed the image of the coloniser from conqueror to benefactor.’⁷⁴ As early as 1901 US policy makers, especially Taft realised that control of the Philippines over a prolonged period relied upon instilling the economic values of American capitalism upon the indigenous Filipino elite. Using economics, and a select group Filipinos with vested interests, the exploitative agenda of US colonialism was somewhat masked, and thus deflected domestic criticism from within the Philippines and the United States (US domestic concerns primarily focused on loss of American life and the exorbitant costs of occupation).⁷⁵ The construction of very successful and loyal indigenous elites meant the US had a body of reliable allies from which to draw the future Philippine political leadership. This was very early recognition that the US had long term aims of granting independence to the Philippines, and the system of economic and political elites would ensure the US had means of enacting their will over the direction of Philippine policy, prior to, and after independence. Granting independence could allow the continued benefits, without the entangling systems of direct colonialism—with this in mind, the Philippine independence movement gained momentum in the United States in the early 1930s, significantly spurred on by the domestic pressures of the Great Depression, and the rise of a militant Japanese Empire abroad. Retention of US influence, against a backdrop of independence was ultimately achieved by the 1946 Bell Trade Act, discussed in the following chapter, however, the foundations were set by the 1934 Tydings-McDuffie Act, granting commonwealth status, and a timetable for the dismantling of the official US colonial apparatus.

Setting a timetable for independence satisfied both US economic and foreign policy interests. First, a powerful domestic US agricultural lobby which had felt squeezed for years by the vast quantities of tariff free Philippine imports, had vested interests in Philippine independence. This had been caused as a result of the shifting global landscape after the Spanish-American War—indeed the US success in achieving extensive influence and control in Cuba and the Philippines was directly to the detriment of domestic producers. Sugar supplied to the US market from Cuba and the new territories doubled within a decade, which translated to just over thirty percent in 1900, to over 70 percent in 1910.⁷⁶ This rapid encroachment by non-domestically produced sugar became a major issue of lobbyist groups during the Great

⁷⁴ Constantino, *History of the Philippines*, p. 341.

⁷⁵ Daniel Schirmer, ‘The Conception and Gestation of a Neocolony,’ in Schirmer and Shalom, *Philippine Reader*, pp. 38-44, pp. 40-41.

⁷⁶ Douglas A. Irwin, ‘Tariff Incidence: Evidence from U.S. Sugar Duties, 1890-1930,’ *National Bureau for Economic Research* (October, 2014), Figure 2: Sources of Supply of U.S. Sugar Consumption.

Depression era: domestic producers were being pushed out of the market during good times, so during the bad 1930s, the Tydings-McDuffie Act offered substantial relief to these groups. Section Six of the Act was of primary interest here: ‘after the date of the inauguration of the government of the Commonwealth of the Philippine Islands trade relations between the United States and the Philippine Islands’ normal duty ‘shall be levied, collected, and paid’ on ‘refined sugars in excess of fifty thousand long tons, and on unrefined sugars in excess of eight hundred thousand long tons.’⁷⁷ Restricting the free trade of Philippine sugar was a key defensive measure to domestic production, indeed the quotas were seemingly very small before full duty was imposed considering that throughout the 1920s the US sugar market accounted for approximately 25 percent of world production.⁷⁸ It appeared then that US exploitation of the Philippines had become too successful for the good of their own domestic producers, thus independence was a means of achieving a level of normalisation of relations with the Philippines, which provided protection for domestic agricultural producers.

Protecting US interests was the first and foremost purpose behind the Tydings-McDuffie Act, granting the Philippines independence was very much secondary. Co-sponsor of the bill Millard Tyding demonstrated the primacy of US interests in Sections Two and Eight, concerning military bases and immigration. Tydings had achieved rank of lieutenant-colonel in the Army of Occupation of Germany following World War One, and he later survived a party purge by Roosevelt to rid the Democrats of engrained conservatives.⁷⁹ His personal history and disposition was reflected in the final bill: the US was not willing to surrender their military bases and immigration was to be aggressively capped. The Philippine Islands must ‘recognise the right of the United States ‘to maintain military and other reservations and armed forces in the Philippines and, upon order of the President, to call into the service of such armed forces all military forces organized by the Philippine Government.’⁸⁰ This caveat, and intrusion upon Philippine sovereignty ensured continued US ability to exercise regional influence and demonstrate its military capacity. Whilst on the other hand, the principle of freedom of movement afforded by extraterritoriality was not reciprocated to Filipinos: indeed immigration to the US was restricted, allowing only ‘a quota of fifty’ ‘for each fiscal year.’⁸¹ This bill then, enacted by Congress 24 March 1934 was heavily influenced by the history of US-Philippine economic relations, and specifically sugar relations, however, pressures beyond economic and

⁷⁷ The Philippine Independence Act (Tydings-McDuffie Act), Section 6a, 6b, and 6c.

<http://www.chanrobles.com/tydingsmcduffieact.htm#.UYOdgDCyBWI>.

⁷⁸ Irwin, ‘Tariff Incidence,’ Figure 1: U.S. Consumption of Sugar as Share of World Production.

⁷⁹ Featured Biography: Millard Tydings.

https://www.senate.gov/artandhistory/history/common/generic/Featured_Bio_Tydings.htm

⁸⁰ The Philippine Independence Act (Tydings-McDuffie Act), Section, 2.a.12.

⁸¹ The Philippine Independence Act (Tydings-McDuffie Act), Section, 8.a.1.

trade interests, such as the home job market and military bases played a substantial part in the Philippine independence movement as well.

Second, foreign policy and global development was a major factor influencing the Philippine independence movement. The predominant and prevailing attitude in Congress, and public opinion alike, was that the United States much rather disengage with their Philippine colony than become entangled in an Asian war. This attitude was not just conjecture, the Philippines were potentially susceptible to a Japanese invasion. In fact, such concerns were not far-fetched: by 1934 the Japanese Empire had invaded Manchuria, established the puppet state of Manchukuo, left the League of Nations, and their military leaders had severely weakened the democratically-elected civilian government in Tokyo.⁸² The United States government was not immediately prepared, nor particularly willing, to fight a war for the Philippines because of Japanese territorial expansion in the Pacific.

Beyond an alliance of European colonial powers, Japan was the foremost military presence in East Asia, and thus placing the Philippines within considerations of Japanese Empire's regional ambitions was an important aspect of granting Philippine independence. The Japanese had negotiated themselves an advantageous military deal during the Washington Naval Conference of 1921-1922, a meeting convened by US President Warren G. Harding, held outside the auspices of the League of Nations. The Conference contributed to the maintenance of peace throughout the 1920s, it did, however, contribute to the rise of the Japanese Empire. This was because part of the conditions were that for every five US naval vessels the Japanese could only have three; this restriction, however, was far less limiting in practise because the US had both Atlantic and Pacific Fleets to arm, thus Japan actually had a numerical, as well as home territorial advantage in the Pacific, if a naval war were to ensue. In any case, in the short term the US favoured a de-escalation of the situation in the Pacific, and Philippine independence aided that by essentially removing the US and its interests, to a large extent, from the zone of conflict. Though this appeared a well advised move, however, the plans to grant independence to the Philippines was not demonstrative of isolationism and shrinking back within the confines of the North American continent, but rather displayed the development of a new system of global politics and strategy.

The origins of the Philippine independence in Washington were driven by pro-US interests: according to Daniel Schirmer and Richard Shalom, the independence the Philippines was being

⁸² Ken'ichi Goto, *Tensions of Empire: Japan and Southeast Asia in the Colonial and Postcolonial World* (Singapore, 2003), p. 18.

granted was one 'with strings.'⁸³ Maintaining US interest without a large physical or directly colonial presence would become the United States' new world order after World War Two, and the Tydings-McDuffie Act represented the Philippines as the primary example of the implementation of this policy. The United States' great asset and most powerful weapon was its economy, thus utilising this force to conduct an internationalist role in the world was, remained, and indeed gained considerable popularity in the 1930s as a result of the rise of fascism in Asia and Europe. To understand US Cold War interventionism and internationalism, it is crucial to note that such thinking was prevalent pre-war, and was a prominent oppositional concept to isolationism.

President Franklin D. Roosevelt (1933-1945) wanted more support from Congress to stop aggressions such as Italy's invasion of Ethiopia, Nazi Germany's expansion in Europe, and the Spanish Civil War. However, Roosevelt was willing to compromise his foreign policy in order to find some common ground with Congress to pursue his flagship policy: the New Deal. At heart Roosevelt was an internationalist in Asia, as he attempted once again to gain popular Congressional support to pressure Japan at the outbreak of the Second Sino-Japanese War in 1937. In attempting to achieve this, Roosevelt supported his Republican counterpart's policy of strong opposition to Japanese aggression. Herbert Hoover's Secretary of State, Henry Stimson, who later would be appointed by Roosevelt as Secretary of War, was a key advocate of using 'economic embargo as a weapon;' a 1932 doctrine, named after him stated that the US 'would not recognise any agreements between Japan and China that limited free commercial intercourse in the region.'⁸⁴ Though the Stimson Doctrine established the position to refuse to acknowledge Japan's territorial aggrandisement, the principle suggested a willingness of US policy makers to engage in active internationalist policies throughout the 1930s.⁸⁵ Congress was undeniably isolationist, and clashed over this issue with Roosevelt consistently. It took the attack on Pearl Harbor, 7 December 1941, to reorient all US political opinion towards interventionism, indeed up until that moment Congress had remained staunchly committed to a hands-off policy. The succession of Neutrality Acts in the US (1935, 1937, and 1939) highlighted a prominent isolationist position within the US Congress, but Roosevelt challenged these attempts to keep the US from intervening in world affairs. His 'cash and carry' policy in 1939, designed to allow the sale of US goods, was a ploy to aid Britain and France against all Axis powers—whether in Europe or Asia. 'Roosevelt suffered a humiliating defeat when

⁸³ Schirmer and Shalom, *Philippine Reader*, p. 84.

⁸⁴ Bear F. Braumoeller, 'The Myth of American Isolationism,' *Foreign Policy Analysis* 6.4 (2010), pp. 246-371, p. 367.

⁸⁵ Office of the Historian, *The Mukden Incident of 1931 and the Stimson Doctrine*.

<https://history.state.gov/milestones/1921-1936/mukden-incident> [Accessed October 2015].

Congress rebuffed his attempt to renew 'cash-and-carry' and expand it to include arms sales,' however, Lend-Lease (March 1941) was a major concession to the previously dominant isolationist sentiments of Congress. If the United States was 'the most powerful and vital nation in the world,' they would have to use such grandeur to assist their allies in defeating the common enemy of fascism.⁸⁶ Wider use of the economic force of the United States as a foreign policy weapon then can be seen as a significant element of Philippine independence. It was not a withdrawal from East Asia, but part of a realignment of strategy.

Roosevelt's internationalism was not a lone voice amongst America's influential figures. Tycoon Henry Luce, 'the most influential private citizen in the America of his day,' was an advocate of the US seizing the opportunity for international leadership.⁸⁷ The article 'American Century' by Luce published at the start of 1941 was not just in support of Roosevelt's internationalism, but set forth an agenda for the US in the world. The perception for many American citizens was that the Philippines was a rocky outcrop in the far reaches of the Pacific, however, Luce wrote intervention was not territorial but in defence of 'democratic principles throughout the world.'⁸⁸ What Luce really inferred by 'democratic principles' was a world order that functioned within, and assistant to, the American capitalist system, once again making the US economy central to policy considerations, not the outmoded territorial aspect of nineteenth century European Empires.

Undeniably East Asian disengagement was prevalent in the US Congress in the 1930s. However, as Bear Braumoeller pointed out, 'Isolationists did exist, but they never came close to constituting a majority;' in fact the internationalist agenda was prominent throughout popular public opinion.⁸⁹ More US citizens had emigrated from Germany than any other country and thus there was a substantial group who felt aggrieved at the damage to German culture and traditions caused by the Nazi Party. Furthermore, nearly all American political factions—socialists, communists, Republican, or Democrats, all stood against the idea of authoritarian dictatorship. Furthermore, a survey of 174 newspapers and 35 magazines in 1919 suggested a positive endorsement for US entrance into the League of Nations; it was the reservations of Henry Cabot Lodge that was the key factor in the US refusing to join the

⁸⁶ Office of the Historian, *The Neutrality Acts, 1930s*.

<https://history.state.gov/milestones/1921-1936/neutrality-acts> [Accessed October 2015].

⁸⁷ Robert Edwin Herzstein, *Henry R. Luce, Time, and the American Crusade in Asia* (Cambridge, 2005), p. 1.

⁸⁸ Henry Luce, 'American Century,' *Time Magazine*, 2 February 1941.

<http://www.informationclearinghouse.info/article6139.htm> [Accessed October 2015].

⁸⁹ Braumoeller, *Myth of American Isolationism*, p. 349.

League.⁹⁰ Such a survey dispels the claim of John Gaddis that 'isolationism thrived right up to this point [Pearl Harbor].'⁹¹ US foreign policy throughout the 1930s, under the stewardship of Roosevelt was internationalist, but it was also undergoing a transformation to be more effective in a changing and globalising world. Philippine independence then, being offered as part of a gradual process beginning in 1934 with the Tydings-McDuffie Act was the embodiment of Wilsonian internationalism. The sugar industry had achieved a Philippine economic system that was closely tied to the US both in exports and imports, and thus the ruling *illustrado* elite were tied to US investments and market demand. This liberal system of using the American economy to inextricably tie a foreign nation to US interests was somewhat of a pertinent example of what would come to define the Cold War in many parts of the developing world. The nervousness showed by Congress at the prospect of an Asian war did impact on Philippine policy, but ultimately the US remained committed to establishing influence and authority in the Philippines, just through a less obvious and nuanced way.

Conclusion: The Unexceptional Empire.

Acquiring a formal colony, such as the Philippines, was the logical conclusion of the economic expansion of the United States through the nineteenth century. Though in defeating Spain, one of the old European empires, the US did not initiate the practice of a new colonialism, and indeed the exceptionalist debate is one of the better covered areas of US-Philippine history.⁹² The historic agent of economic growth and expansion, as argued especially by Walter LaFeber, is at the root of the explanation for the overseas acquisitions made in 1898 by the United States government; notions of benevolence and tutelary colonialism were more political rhetoric than drivers of foreign policy.⁹³ Thus, in order to appreciate the fundamentals of US Cold War objectives, which are widely acknowledged as protecting and furthering US economic and geostrategic interests, this nineteenth and early twentieth century contextualisation must be set out. Besides demonstrating the origins of modern US international power, this chapter dismantles the often erected historical barriers, which divide history into unhelpful, compartmentalised sections. It has been elucidated in this chapter that essential US foreign policy objectives, as well as the socio-economic and domestic landscape of Filipino politics, in many fundamental aspects, remained constant and unchanged across the

⁹⁰ James Dill Startt 'America Editorial Opinion and the Main Problems of Peacemaking in 1919,' *PhD Dissertation* (Maryland, 1965), in Braumoeller, *Myth of American isolationism*, p. 360.

⁹¹ John L. Gaddis, *We Now Know* (Oxford, 1997), p. 36.

⁹² Paul A. Kramer, 'Empires, Exceptions, and Anglo-Saxons: Race and Rule between the British and United States Empires, 1880-1910,' *Journal of American History*, 88:4 (March, 2002), pp. 1315-1353.

⁹³ LaFeber, *In America, Russia, and the Cold War, 1945-2002*; Kramer, *Blood of Government*.

various paradigmatic divides in modern history. As the Philippines featured as an important part of US history through the nineteenth and twentieth century, through both America's colonial and Cold War eras, the archipelago serves to demonstrate essential continuities in US foreign policy objectives.

This US-Philippine case study serves as a fresh perspective on grand US strategy, that can serve as a comparison to other developing world regions in Asia, Latin American, and Africa.⁹⁴ The Philippines presents an opportunity for detailed analysis of how US embassy, State Department, intelligence, and policy making officials interpreted and sought to deal with the domestic and internal situations in the Philippines, such as the socio-economic conditions, as well as lofty foreign policy and presidential relationships. This means using extensive archival research from across the US policy making community, allows for an original contribution to Cold War historiography, whilst also addressing colonial studies as well. The following chapters demonstrate how the colonial legacies, shown here, manifested themselves after Philippine independence in 1946, a year after the defeat of the Japanese Empire in Asia. These were the roots of the failures of US foreign policy in the islands, and how this ultimately led to the Marcos dictatorship, as well as served to contribute to ramifications elsewhere in the global Cold War.

The only period where US influence in the Philippines was challenged, and temporarily replaced, was during World War Two. On 12 March 1942 General Douglas MacArthur was smuggled under the cloak of darkness from the Bataan Peninsula, to Mindanao, where he was flown to Australia, evacuating the islands in the face of the impending Japanese conquest of the archipelago. Fifty four days later, on 5 May, General Sam Howard burned the 4th Marine Regiment's and national colours to prevent them falling to the Japanese; the following day at 1.30pm two US officers left the garrison with white flags, carrying the letter of formal surrender. MacArthur famously returned to the Philippines on 20 October 1944, striding ashore at Palo, Leyte, in the Eastern Visayas region of the archipelago. Though the US government had notions of Philippine independence firmly in mind, to be inaugurated as soon as possible, the conditions of the granting of sovereignty perpetuated existing relationships, socio-economic inequalities, and power hierarchies that had existed during formal colonialism. Localised resistance and political groups, who had contributed extensively to Japan's defeat, were actively persecuted by US and Filipino authorities, during and after the war, and thus continued the tumultuous US-Philippines relationship.

⁹⁴ Joseph and Spenser (eds.), *In From the Cold*; Matthew Jones, *Conflict and Confrontation in South East Asia, 1961-1965: Britain, the United States, Indonesia and the Creation of Malaysia* (Cambridge, 2002).

2.

A New World Cold War Order: 'Philippine Independence' and the Origins of a Neo-Colonial Partnership.

-*Tuesday, 28 May 1946.* The old Philippine Congress Building in downtown Manila had been largely destroyed from Japanese bombing in World War Two. However, the central portion, where Manuel Quezon had stood to inaugurate the Commonwealth of the Philippines eleven years earlier, remained intact. Such a location was symbolic of the US era, the promise of independence, and heroic resistance to the Japanese Empire. During his inaugural address, Philippine President Manuel Roxas boldly stated:

America ... has ... an earnest and heartfelt desire to advance not the cause of greed but the cause of freedom. We are and shall be a living monument of this fact. Yet we have today in our own land a few among us who would have us believe that we are in danger of an imperialistic invasion from the very nation which is granting us our sovereignty.¹

Unfortunately, Roxas was wrong; indeed, one elderly tenant in San Ricardo, Nueva Ecija, Central Luzon, stated that Roxas' pro-American government 'promised things would get better,' but despite this optimism, 'things got worse, really.'² Upon independence, the US government had created a system of patronage and economic dependence, ensuring the Philippines remained inextricably tied to US foreign policy objectives throughout the early Cold War.³ The failure to reconcile colonial legacies with the problems facing the US and Filipino governments after World War Two, perpetuated tensions and conflicts that ensured socio-political strains would continually worsen, until domestic instability, as well as anti-American nationalism, created conditions in which a brutal dictatorship could be established.

After the defeat of Nazi Germany and the Japanese Empire in 1945, the old colonial powers returned to their overseas possessions. This placed international leaders between the perceived national and global security threats of instability, regime change, and the encroachment of Soviet communism in the colonies whilst maintaining the ideologically

¹ Manuel Roxas inaugural address, 28 May 1946.

<http://www.gov.ph/1946/05/28/inaugural-address-of-president-roxas-may-28-1946/>

² Benedict Kerkvliet, *Huk Rebellion*, p. 110.

³ Rafael, 'The War of Translation: Colonial Education, American English, and Tagalog Slang in the Philippines,' p. 286.

charged, liberal Rooseveltian edict of decolonisation and independence.⁴ The fate of the colonial empires, some centuries old, would come to define much of the Cold War. The imperative of defining the roles of these regions in US foreign policy planning is evident, and from the earliest phases of the post-World War Two era, policy makers' inability to reconcile colonial and Cold War discourses led to short sighted directives. This chapter deals with the key events that occurred in quick succession in the spring and summer of 1946: the presidential election of Manuel Roxas, the passage of the Bell Trade Act, and the granting of Independence. These events laid the foundation for the neo-colonial relationship in the Philippines, which would eventually and ultimately come to undermine US authority and influence in the Philippines, when Ferdinand Marcos installed dictatorship in 1972.

At the time of granting independence, there was some dissent in the State Department as to this sequence of events. Prior to the inauguration of independence, at the ceremony held on 4 July 1946, there had been some criticism of aspects of the US policy, including Undersecretary of State Dean Acheson,⁵ and Chief of the Division of Philippine Affairs Frank Lockhart. Lockhart suggested 'it is doubtful whether it would be advisable to appoint a High Commissioner, especially since it is believed that such appointment would lead to the Filipino people to feel that the old order had been restored.'⁶ The Philippines was, to an extent, caught up in the bad relationship between Harold Ickes and MacArthur—the general called the civilian official 'the curmudgeon of Roosevelt's cabinet,' and MacArthur had never recognised the Secretary of the Interior's 'authority in the Philippines,' despite Ickes's unprecedented thirteen years in the office.⁷ With these dissenting voices largely ignored, the 1946 election created a political mechanism that would help to force the acceptance of the Bell Trade Act, which in turn restricted the self-determination and autonomy of the Philippine legislature once independence was proclaimed. The election and subsequent Bell Trade Act made independence geostrategically acceptable, and the events of 4 July served as a propaganda tool to promote the United States' image as the leader of the free world, as an example to the colonial Empires of Western Europe, and as the ideological opponent of the Soviet Union.

Despite the importance of (ex)colonial territories in the Cold War, they only first gained significant academic attention during the New Left movement in the 1960s with the University of Wisconsin-Madison revisionist school. Though an underdeveloped thread in the

⁴ David Ryan, *US Foreign Policy in World History* (Oxon, 2004), p. 104.

⁵ Dean Acheson to Harry S. Truman, 26 June 1946, *FRUS, Far East, 1946*, p. 890.

⁶ Frank Lockhart to Joseph Grew, 26 February 1945, *FRUS, 1945, Diplomatic Papers. The British Commonwealth, the Far East Volume VI*, p. 1193.

⁷ William Manchester, *American Caesar: Douglas MacArthur, 1880-1964* (Boston, 1978), p. 378. Douglas MacArthur, *Reminiscences* (London, 1964) p. 235.

historiography, the relationship between colonies and their role in the newly perceived Cold War policy planning discourses, this thesis argues that this connection is fundamental to understanding the policies and outcomes of the United States' Cold War.⁸ Within this field, the Philippines is a particularly underdeveloped case study, despite being the first colony granted independence, assuming the role of showcase of the exported system of American democracy. Though Nick Cullather addresses this period, and the *Philippines Reader* is an important assemblage of documents,⁹ the decolonisation of the Philippines remains a scholarly footnote.¹⁰ The fact the archipelago was the possession of the United States, whose policies would come to most impact the entire developing world over the course of the following decades, understanding the Philippines is important, in order to fully appreciate the development of US policy elsewhere—especially in Vietnam. Using presidential memoranda, National Security Council documents, and first-hand testimonies, this chapter shows that the Philippines was central to US military policy as an offensive base for the Cold War; there was, in fact, no Soviet threat to US interests in the Philippines. As a consequence, the Philippines was essentially a US extra-territorial space; outwardly it was a beacon of US power and influence, to promote 'freedom' and 'democracy' in Asia, but inwardly it remained socio-economically unequal, exploitative, and unstable.

This chapter deals, in turn, with the chronological development of events in the aftermath of World War Two in the Philippines. First, the backing Roxas received from General MacArthur in the 1946 election, all but guaranteed that the US Pacific Command secured their preferred candidate. Second, having secured influence in the highest post in the land, the US government sought to achieve favourable legislation in the islands. Drafted by Missouri Congressman Jasper Bell, the Bell Trade Act was railroaded through the Philippine Congress, in order to construct a post-independence economic state in the islands, thoroughly conducive to US foreign policy aims. The act would negatively impact the burgeoning industrialists and the low class agricultural demographic, namely the Hukbalahap Rebellion, and whilst it was understood this may sow the seeds for resentment and unrest, the Bell Trade Act was pursued nonetheless. Considering these domestic issues, the third part deals with the role of the newly independent Philippines in the broader region of Southeast Asia—especially the Korean War, and in the global geopolitical landscape of the Cold War. From the immediate aftermath of

⁸ David Marr, *Vietnamese Tradition on Trial, 1920-1945* (London, 1981); Jones, *Conflict and Confrontation in South East Asia*; Hans Hägerdal (ed.) *Responding to the West Essays on Colonial Domination and Asian Agency* (Amsterdam, 2009); Lionel Babecz, 'Japan–Korea, France–Algeria: Colonialism and Post-Colonialism,' *Japanese Studies*, 33:2 (2013), pp. 201-211; Foster, *Projections of Power*.

⁹ Cullather, *Illusions of Influence*; Schirmer and Shalom, *Philippine Reader*.

¹⁰ Roger Buckley, *The United States in the Asia-Pacific since 1945* (Cambridge, 2002).

World War Two, and the granting of Philippine independence, the US failed to contextualise the colonial legacies of the Philippines within the newly developing international political landscape. This failure to reconcile the convergence of these discourses proved detrimental to the legitimacy and stability of the Philippines as an independent, democratic state. These implications place the Philippines central to discussion of the United States' policy failure in other, more devastating affairs, such as the Vietnam War.

Picking the President: Agents of US Interest.

The United States portrayed themselves as leaders of the free world, and ideological proponents of independence and decolonisation. Indeed Roosevelt sent a personal message to MacArthur upon the liberation of Manila, congratulating him on the 'reestablishment of freedom and decency in the Far East.' When asked his opinion of the US role in the post-war Philippines, MacArthur answered: 'utmost care should be taken that an imperialist policy not be introduced.'¹¹ In fulfilling this self-given title, it was then crucial that the US colony make the transition into independence under the most legitimate and credible circumstances. Beyond the ceremony and rhetoric, however, the conduct of the presidential election campaign to decide the first leader of the Third Republic of the Philippines was anything but the organic manifestation of the people's democratic will. The essential principle of US foreign policy demanded the Philippine leader to actively promote and support American policy directives. The US relationship with Philippine Commonwealth President Manuel Quezon has suggested Washington's willingness to manipulate circumstances for their own purposes, but the Roxas election campaign marked a particularly high level of violence and intervention. The presidential victory of Manuel Roxas, 23 April 1946, with fifty four percent of the popular vote, set the tone for the Cold War US-Philippine relationship. This first section details how US foreign policies agencies re-established its influence in the Philippines after World War Two by instigating the rise to the presidency of Manuel Roxas, and how this set a precedent in US foreign policy that contributed to the rise of Ferdinand Marcos, and other dictatorial leaders.

Like much in the post-war US-Philippine relationship, the end of World War Two had not been a clean break with the past; the shared colonial history absolutely informed and influenced developments after 1945. For example, it was Manuel Quezon who had been the first agent through which the US instigated political domination and favourable economic conditions in the pre-war Commonwealth. Quezon had led the Philippine government from Washington

¹¹ MacArthur, *Reminiscences*, pp. 249-251.

whilst it was in exile from its Manilan home during the Japanese occupation. During this period Quezon was granted permission to unconstitutionally extend his presidential term due to the extreme circumstances of the war. It was during this period that Quezon died, 1 August 1944, whilst still in office from his bed in Saranac Lake, New York. His Vice President Sergio Osmena took office briefly, however, upon the recapture of the islands by US forces, an election was called to coincide with independence. Besides Quezon, Osmena had had the most distinguished political career in the Philippines, holding the vice presidency since 1935, however, when faced by Roxas and his US backers, he lost the election by approximately 200,000 popular votes. Osmena was a principled Nationalista, whereas Roxas was a right-wing favourite of the most influential American in the Philippines: General Douglas MacArthur—such an ally was an unquantifiable advantage, and it was this association that marked the beginning of the Cold War US-Philippines relationship.

Roxas's role in World War Two has come under some scrutiny from historians of the Philippines, and is demonstrative of the type of relationship that was set to develop between US interests and Philippine presidents in the coming years. Historians of the Philippines, including Daniel Schirmer, Benedict Kerkvliet, Nick Cullather and William Pomeroy, have pointed out that Roxas was a Japanese collaborator, and all but Kerkvliet claimed that the US granted Roxas amnesty from persecution for his war time collaboration.¹² In fact, Cullather and Pomeroy showed that it was the reinstated High Commissioner of the Philippines Paul V. McNutt and MacArthur who personally granted Roxas' amnesty; indeed Consul General Paul Steintorf wrote to the State Department that on the issue of 'collaborating with Japan,' MacArthur was 'intervening in Philippine political affairs.'¹³ This was all the more controversial for the fact Roxas was among 'the guiltiest of the puppets,' but MacArthur explained that he knew Roxas, and could vouch for his loyalty.¹⁴ The personal friendship between the two men was strong: Roxas and his cousin-cum-business partner Andres Soriano, as well as the latter's associate Joaquin Elizalde, had made payment of a 500,000 dollar 'gift' into a private account of MacArthur's in February 1942. Andres Soriano had been Finance Minister under Quezon before World War Two, whilst also was part of the Filipino pro-Franco faction during the Spanish Civil War. He had also made an intimate alliance with the Elizalde family who owned the huge sugar plantation, Central la Carlota. Elizalde, politically allied to Manuel Roxas, formed the Anti-Chinese League. Roxas's success, however, was based upon more than just

¹² Schirmer and Shalom, *Philippine Reader*, p. 78; Kerkvliet, *Huk Rebellion*, p. 138; Cullather, *Illusions of Influence*, p. 47; Pomeroy 'The Philippines: A Case Study of Neocolonialism,' p. 172.

¹³ Paul Steintorf to James Byrnes, 13 August 1945, FRUS, 1945, *Diplomatic Papers, the British Commonwealth, the Far East Volume VI*, p. 1231.

¹⁴ Cullather, *Illusions of Influence*, p. 46.

personal connections, because he represented what the United States believed was ideal for filling the position of President of the Philippines in the post-war era. Roxas had been a Brigadier General in USAFFE (United States Army Forces in the Far East), but upon the successful Japanese invasion in 1942, he collaborated to serve in the Japanese puppet regime of Jose Laurel; Roxas worked with both the US and Japanese during World War Two. The anti-Japanese resistance movement, the Hukbalahap (Huks), fought completely independently from the USAFFE, and there was friction between the two resistance movements because the Huks were not willing to submit themselves to MacArthur's control and direction. Thus, during World War Two Roxas had had experience cooperating with US military personnel while working against the Huks at the same time. The US military disposition against the Huks had already been firmly impressed upon Roxas before the emergence of the post-war rebellion. Roxas was well acquainted with US military protocol—he has been Commonwealth liaison officer with MacArthur's United States Army Forces in the Far East (USAFFE) headquarters. Roxas had been deemed a capable agent to be responsive to US policy makers' agendas and not pursue an autonomous, truly independent direction.¹⁵

MacArthur clearly felt Roxas was the right man to help achieve US policy objectives in the Philippines. At the very least, Roxas could deal with any domestic fall out as a result of the unequal Bell Trade Act (1946) and Military Base Agreement (1947). Either way, the US sought to bolster his chances of electoral success. The United States Pacific Command contributed to Roxas's election campaign by augmenting the military strength of Roxas and his allies' enforcers. In the lead up to the April 1946 presidential election, the US command in the Philippines had instigated a sizeable increase in military police in areas known to be Hukbalahap strongholds. These areas had a tradition of leftist political activism and organisation, notably from the Union movement of the 1930s (see Chapter One). An increased military presence would serve to intimidate opponents of the US and their Philippine collaborators. The Military Police (MP) received an extra five thousand machine guns, and in Nueva Ecija province (a Huk stronghold) the number of MP companies was doubled to twelve by February 1946. The increased numbers and military hardware of the MP, allowed them to 'break up political rallies using armoured cars.' However, the MP, in support of the Roxas campaign, went beyond intimidation and actually directly attacked the opposition. Just before Election Day armed men 'ransacked and destroyed Democratic Alliance (DA) headquarters in San Fernando, Pampanga,' men were arrested and even killed in the office. The Democratic Alliance was the third party, organised from small local groups who had formed councils during the Japanese occupation, and according to Kerkvliet, 'several DA leaders were murdered

¹⁵ Cullather, *Illusions of Influence*, p. 46.

during the campaign.¹⁶ The US Army supplied weapons to the MP who in turn used them to illegally affect the outcome of the election. By using the MP as a proxy, the US agents created a little distance between themselves and the unlawful practices, but the connection was clear—or, at least, it was so for the men who would go on to participate in the Hukbalahap Rebellion—the rural sympathisers that made up the majority of the DA’s support. The US backed Roxas’s presidential election campaign because he would be effective in implementing unpopular programs that would soon face tough opposition; he ‘had a zeal for military force,’ was comfortable with using violence, and could be an agent to help create an economy of dependence. This aspect of Roxas’s collaboration with US foreign policy interests manifested itself first and foremost in the passage of the unpopular Bell Trade Act.¹⁷ The deployment of indirect and covert US interference to influence a Philippine election would from now on become the norm, manifest in the campaigns of Ramon Magsaysay, Diosdado Macapagal, and Ferdinand Marcos.

‘Intolerable Conditions:’ The Bell trade Act.¹⁸

A young Luis Taruc, who later became the leader of the Hukbalahap Rebellion, once witnessed the retribution sought by a Filipino labourer who had been ‘publically whipped’ by his abusive overseer. The worker, with his bolo knife ‘chopped to pieces’ the man who had unfairly humiliated him. This experience led Taruc to ask ‘is this what will happen in the future?’ Whether violence was the answer or not, the memoirs of Taruc, ghost written by deserted US G.I. William Pomeroy, concluded that ‘we cannot sit back and wait for God to feed the mouths of our hungry children.’¹⁹ As discussed in Chapter One, many rural Filipino families had remained without land, with little food, and were subject to exploitative working conditions. This increasingly untenable situation had not diminished under American colonialism, and upon the conclusion of World War Two, and the granting of Philippine independence, US policy continued to contribute to the causes of social instability through the guise of what has been termed neo-colonial policy by historians of the Philippines, revisionist Cold War scholars, and political commentator alike.²⁰ However, the use of the term neo-colonialism does not

¹⁶ Kerkvliet, *Huk Rebellion*, p. 147.

¹⁷ Kerkvliet, *Huk Rebellion*, p. 148.

¹⁸ Cullather, *Illusions of Influence*, p. 25.

¹⁹ Taruc, *Born of the People*, pp. 27-29.

²⁰ See Kerkvliet, *Huk Rebellion*; Pomeroy, ‘The Philippines: A Case Study of Neocolonialism’; William J. Pomeroy, *American Neocolonialism: Its Emergence in the Philippines and Asia* (New York, 1970); Constantino, *History of the Philippines*.

reflect the difficulties US officials experienced in the Philippines, as well as Filipino agency. Neo-imperialism more accurately explains the post-war US-Philippine relationship.

Central to the debate of US influence in the Philippines is the Bell Trade Act, which defined the US-Philippine relationship in the early Cold War. The Act essentially perpetuated much of the socio-economic inequality that had given rise to a substantial and widespread union movement in the 1930s, indeed the protests were based upon the same grievances in the late 1940s: the political situation in the Philippines was not affording sufficient opportunities for these poor, agrarian families to pull themselves out of poverty. The reality was based upon the inherent problems of colonialism, however, US officials and Washington policy makers perceived the tumultuous Philippine agrarian classes as subversive and potentially communistic—especially against the back drop of the polarising geopolitical landscape. This illusionary communist threat had developed out of the increasingly predominant Cold War discourse that would come to dominate US foreign policy, and even the considerations of Filipino leaders, and their role in the developing world in the coming decades: President Elpidio Quirino told President Truman that he ‘wished to clean up the Huk rebellion before the outbreak of war in Germany.’²¹ In the specific case of the Philippines, the Bell Trade Act was passed into legislation partly down to a misinterpretation and lack of appreciation for a report from 1942, which detailed the situation in the islands. This example is particularly revealing of US foreign policy regarding the decolonising world, as the episode involved Americans from the highest offices, including President Harry Truman. This section details the origins and fundamental aspects of the Bell Trade Act that were ultimately detrimental to the development of Philippine independence and democracy.

Having evacuated the archipelago in February 1942 in the face of Japanese invasion, High Commissioner Francis Sayre left his political advisers, Evett Hester and Richard Ely, to establish a wartime office in Manila. Under the authority of the US Department of the Interior, Hester and Ely were charged with compiling a report of postliberation economic problems that the US may face in the Philippines.²² The results of the inquiry highlighted two major potential challenges to US control of Philippine politics and economics: first, an increasingly substantial group of industrialist, nationalist Filipino businessmen. Second, the ‘intolerable’ living conditions of the rural, agrarian communities was creating an ever more volatile demographic.²³ The latter group were of the greatest, immediate threat to the fragile stability

²¹ Harry S. Truman to James Bryne, 14 July 1948, *FRUS, 1948, The Far East and Australasia Volume VI*, p. 627.

²² Cullather, *Illusions of Influence*, p. 24.

²³ Cullather, *Illusions of Influence*, p. 25.

of the Philippines once the US had won the Pacific War. These rural farmers were in the midst of fighting a fierce guerrilla war against the Japanese Empire, and their potential to then turn against the to-be independent state were concerns that materialised in late 1946 with the start of the Hukbalahap Rebellion. The growing indigenous business class would later seek to challenge the established US allied and landed *illustrado* elites for political domination, which in turn then would erode the influence the US had previously secured during the decades of formal colonial rule. Yet in the immediate post-war years, any sort of nationalism was impeded by the restoration of the 'Philippines to the position it occupied before the war.'²⁴

First, the Hester and Ely report noted an emergence of an industrialist sector and a nationalist bourgeoisie who were hoping to benefit from local Filipino resources and labour, and not simply be propped up by foreign investment. This politico-economic group of indigenous Filipinos had sought freedom from US domination since the pre-war period; they pursued a nationalistic line of economic sovereignty and a desire to industrialise the Philippines in order to benefit and grow the domestic economy. To the US government, however, allowing the development of Philippine industry would have several undesirable consequences. It would result in the termination of the long held relationship between the US and the agriculturalist landlords. These landed elites were the group that had been integrated into the US socio-economic ruling classes during the colonial period, which had been carried over from the Spanish era. Moreover, the sovereignty demanded by the industrialists ran contrary to the Department of Defence's military plans for the Philippines and across Southeast Asia: 'the US will be allowed to operate without restriction ... US forces will be allowed to enter and depart ... at will,' was deemed a policy priority, not just to defend US regional assets, but to advance US interests throughout the Asian continent.²⁵ Further opposition came from Washington in the guise of the US industrial lobby, wishing to ensure minimal competition for the export of 'the overflow' of US wartime production.²⁶ This demand was established as part of the legal framework for US military bases in the Philippines, as well for the 'right to import free of duty, materiel, equipment, and supplies.'²⁷ Establishing such favourable conditions for US interest alienated Filipino nationalists immediately upon independence.

²⁴ Paul V. McNutt to Richard Ely, 18 January 1946, *FRUS, 1946, The Far East Volume VIII*, p. 863.

²⁵ Point 3, Preliminary Statement of General Principles Pertaining to the United States Military and Naval Base System in the Philippines, *FRUS, 1945, Diplomatic Papers. The British Commonwealth, the Far East Volume VI*, p. 1208.

²⁶ Pomeroy, 'The Philippines: A Case Study of Neocolonialism,' p. 161.

²⁷ Point 4, Preliminary Statement of General Principles Pertaining to the United States Military and Naval Base System in the Philippines, *FRUS, 1945, Diplomatic Papers. The British Commonwealth, the Far East Volume VI*, p. 1208.

The second major concern raised by the report, and indeed more alarmingly, was the conclusion concerning socio-economic inequalities: namely, the 'intolerable conditions' in which much of the Philippine population lived. This report, that reached the highest policy making circles in Washington, is evidence that the Bell Trade Act was not developed in ignorance, without at least a good sketch of the situation in the Philippines, but that the potential consequences of the act were treated as irrelevant, or at least less important than other considerations. Upon reading the report, Truman had requested 'a prompt investigation of agrarian unrest in the Philippines,' which should 'recommend remedies or reforms which ought to be taken by the commonwealth government and by the United States government.'²⁸ However, the role of a President is not to micromanage, and though he wrote Paul McNutt, co-drafter of the Bell bill, of the unfairness of the 'division of the product of their labour,' how there had been no 'effective solution' to this issue, and that this group 'organised a guerrilla army,' and 'did good work against the enemy' during the Japanese occupation, the fate of the Philippines was more in the hands of the regional US leaders.²⁹ The Americans most closely associated with the Philippines were first, High Commissioner Paul McNutt, an Indiana Democrat, who then served as ambassador during the presidency of Roxas. McNutt was reappointed to the position in 1946, which raised serious objections from Chief of the Division of Philippine Affairs Frank Lockhart—to him this was establishing the 'old order.'³⁰ The irony of this colonial office in an independent Philippines was lost on the High Commissioner, who remained steadfast in the opinion that 'we have boasted long of our enlightened policy in the Philippines.'³¹ Second was Supreme Commander for the Allied Powers, General Douglas MacArthur—who was possibly up to that point the American most intimately associated with the islands. The new president [Truman] was vague on the subject of the Philippines; he had decided to let MacArthur handle everything there.³² Third was member of the Filipino Rehabilitation Commission, and old associate of Truman, Charles Jasper Bell, who had given his name to the bill he sponsored. Bell had sat in the US House of Representatives for Missouri's 4th district, an area that borders both Jackson and Kansas City, between 1935 and 1949. Truman, before accepting the vice presidency nomination in 1944, was the Senator of Missouri

²⁸ Harry S. Truman 'to the High Commissioner to the Philippines' (October 25, 1945), *Letters to the High Commissioner to the Philippines and to the Heads of Federal Agencies Recommending Measures for the Assistance of the Philippines* (The American Presidency Project).

²⁹ Harry S. Truman, 'To the High Commissioner to the Philippines' (October 25, 1945), *Letters to the High Commissioner to the Philippines and to the Heads of Federal Agencies Recommending Measures for the Assistance of the Philippines* (The American Presidency Project).

³⁰ Frank Lockhart to Joseph Grew, 26 February 1945, *FRUS, 1945, Diplomatic Papers, The British Commonwealth, the Far East Volume VI*, p. 1193.

³¹ Paul McNutt to Richard Ely, 18 January 1946, *FRUS, Far East, 1946*, p. 836.

³² Manchester, *American Caesar*, p. 420.

between 1935 and 1945: undoubtedly a close and old association between these men, Truman entrusted his old friend with the fate of post-war Philippine planning.

McNutt had an intricate knowledge of the bureaucratic workings of the US Commission and Commonwealth government, MacArthur had the celebrity status in the islands, as well as the military clout, and Bell offered the domestic legitimacy for the bill to pass through the US senate. With Roxas elected, the bill could be moved through the legal and legislative bodies in the Philippines, allowing the Bell bill to materialise into the Bell Trade Act. Passed 2 July 1946, two days before Philippine independence was granted, the bill defined the US-Philippine relationship, 'for the first 28 years of independence.'³³ Having the bill passed, whilst the US still retained colonial control over the Philippines, ensured that this pro-American piece of legislation was carried through. This is not surprising considering the Bell Trade Act was largely disadvantageous to most Filipinos, and was closely overseen by MacArthur. However there remained dissension in the State Department towards this flagrant manipulation of conditions: Under Secretary of State Dean Acheson wrote Truman that 'quite aside from any possible doubts as to the legal validity of such an agreement ... the Department strongly believes that this agreement ... should not be entered into until the Philippines are an independent nation.'³⁴ Acheson's reluctance was understandable: the four key aspects of the Bell Trade Act simultaneously resuscitated the landed elites—the sugar barons, whilst also restricting the opportunities for indigenous industries; the rural agrarian groups would remain a very low priority. To understand the unequal nature of the Bell Trade Act, there are four key aspects that require analysis: 1) trade, 2) resources, 3) parity rights, and 4) aid. The act's provisions clearly were beneficial to US interests, and certainly made sense to the drafters and its supporters, yet support was not unanimous across US policy making groups. Acheson protested to Truman that 'a considerable body of domestic and foreign criticism has already been directed at certain provisions of the Philippine Trade Act which call for privileged status for US business interests in the Philippines'—he concluded that if such a bill will pass in the Philippine congress, let it pass in an independent Philippines, not one still 'under our flag.' Acheson was of course ignored, and whilst gaining such beneficial conditions for the US in the Philippines, 'a most unfavourable world impression of United States intentions' was being simultaneously forged.³⁵

Considering the four aspects of the Bell Trade Act, first, and central to the Bell Trade Act: 'US exports to the Philippines and Philippines exports to the US shall be free of ordinary customs

³³ Pomeroy, 'The Philippines: A Case Study of Neocolonialism,' p. 163.

³⁴ Dean Acheson to Harry S. Truman, 18 January 1946, *FRUS, Far East, 1946*, p. 890.

³⁵ Dean Acheson to Harry S. Truman, 18 January 1946, *FRUS, Far East, 1946*, p. 890.

duty.’ Free trade rights of Filipino exports into the US market allowed the haciendas that had been devastated by World War Two to recuperate; the unrestricted export opportunities helped to consolidate the wealth of the great agricultural estates whilst essentially returning the Philippine economy back to the American and Spanish colonial period. This was extremely disadvantageous for the rural poor, as their opponents, the landlords, were enjoying open and free markets, thereby propagating the socio-economic inequalities of the pre-war period. It also presented multiple problems for the would-be native industrialists who were also competitors, politically and economically, of the agricultural barons.³⁶ The situation was perpetuated by the fact that Filipino sugar was sold into American markets at artificially high prices. Until a gradual schedule of tariffs, starting in 1955 as part of the original bill, Filipino sugar was making roughly an extra forty million dollars per year on top of the market price to ‘subsidize’ the sugar barons.³⁷ ‘The thwarting of genuine industrialisation had been one of the main features of American neo-colonial policy in the Philippines,’ as Pomeroy put it, and in the late 1940s manufacturing accounted for a meagre 7.3 percent of Philippine gross national product. By 1969 it had only risen to 17.3 percent, showing that the Bell Trade Act resuscitated the wealth of a small landed elite and ‘literally was a reversal to colonial practice.’³⁸ This reality was not lost on the prominent economist and Director of the Office of International Trade Policy at the State Department, Dr. Clair Wilcox, an opinion he shared with Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs William Clayton. Wilcox wrote that ‘the department opposed the Bell bill because of its provisions [for] tariff preferences [that] will encourage the revival of industries dependent on preferences’—namely the sugar industry, a key factor in the high levels of poverty, and by association, instability.³⁹

The second key part of the Bell Trade Act simultaneously increased US interests in the Philippines whilst directly stifling the Filipino industrialists. As the Act itself stated, the rich resources of the Philippines would be fair game for any American business:

The disposition, exploitation, development, and utilization of all agricultural, timber, and mineral lands of the public domain, waters, minerals, coal, petroleum, and other mineral oils, all forces and sources of potential energy, and other natural resources of the Philippines, and the operation of public utilities, shall if open to any person, be open to citizens of the United States and to all forms of business enterprise owned or controlled, directly or indirectly, by United States citizen.⁴⁰

³⁶ Pomeroy, ‘The Philippines: A Case Study of Neocolonialism,’ p. 171.

³⁷ Cullather, *Illusions of Influence*, p. 145.

³⁸ Pomeroy, ‘The Philippines: A Case Study of Neocolonialism,’ pp. 176-177.

³⁹ Clair Wilcox to William Clayton, *FRUS, 1945, Diplomatic Papers, The British Commonwealth, the Far East Volume VI*, p. 1218.

⁴⁰ Article VII, Commonwealth Act Number 733, 1946 (The Bell Trade Act).

<http://www.chanrobles.com/commonwealthactno733.htm#Vid0Lvn6Hlw> [Accessed October 2015].

The constant priority in US policy was the economy and how global strategy could defend it and help contribute to its development. The US had exclusive influence in the Philippines, thus ensuring American access to the abundant resources was an obvious policy objective. The irony of how this infringed on the newly independent country's sovereignty was largely ignored or considered not pertinent, yet Consul General Paul Steintorf did contact the US Secretary of State, 19 September 1945, to argue the point that 'the underlying reasons for the present nationalistic trend are: there is to some extent a real and spontaneous resentment against alien domination of Philippine resources.'⁴¹ It remained, however, that US interests took priority over Philippine rights and sovereignty.

Third, to oppose the nationalism that emerged from the nascent Philippine manufacturing sector, the Act introduced parity rights for US business in the Philippines. With native businesses unable to compete with large American corporations, foreign interests could take advantage of the islands' raw materials, which were worked by cheap Filipino labour, whilst developing indigenous industries were crowded out of the market. Furthermore, 'the value of Philippine currency in relation to the United States dollar shall not be changed;' the Bell Trade Act pinned the peso to the dollar at 2:1 so that the US dollar remained very strong.⁴² The peso exchange rate was fixed by the Act, and thereby US investors could buy up many profitable parts of the Philippine economy relatively cheaply.⁴³

Fourth, attached to the parity rights clause was a forced acceptance of US aid, which could only be distributed by the aid disbursement body—namely, the Special Technical and Economic Mission (STEM). This condition was questioned by Acheson in June 1946, he raised the issue of 'domestic and foreign criticism' over the 'withholding [aid] payments' if the Philippines do not enter into the Bell Trade agreement.'⁴⁴ Furthermore, Acheson supported the findings of a report compiled by land reform expert Robert Hardie. An advisor to the Mutual Security Administration (MSA), Hardie, who had been in Japan immediately after the war, arrived in the Philippines in 1952 and stated the current land system 'fosters the growth of communism,' and advised the government purchased land from the landlords and resell it in small plots. Hardie found some support in Secretary of State Dean Acheson, who called his

⁴¹ Steintorf to Grew, 19 September 1945, *FRUS, 1945, Diplomatic Papers, The British Commonwealth, the Far East Volume VI*, p. 1223.

⁴² Article V, Commonwealth Act Number 733, 1946 (The Bell Trade Act).

<http://www.chanrobles.com/commonwealthactno733.htm#Vid0Lvn6Hlw> [Accessed October 2015].

⁴³ Pomeroy, 'The Philippines: A Case Study of Neocolonialism,' p. 173.

⁴⁴ Dean Acheson to Harry S. Truman, 26 June 1946, *FRUS, Far East, 1946*, p. 890.

report ‘sound, feasible and adequate,’⁴⁵ however, Stephen Shalom noted that ‘the Bell Report was not antithetical to the interests of US investors—on the contrary, they favoured it as a means for stabilising their investment market.’ Furthermore, Shalom noted that the MSA was ‘at all times to be guided by the principles of ... private rather than state, individual rather than collective ownership of land.’⁴⁶ Ultimately US foreign policy was designed to achieving broader objectives—solidifying alliances and security measures, and especially with the invasion of North Korean troops in the South, initiating the first hot conflict of the Cold War. The US government instead of seeking change and reform in the Philippines, sought to support Quirino and attempt to achieve a level of stability to withstand what Acheson called ‘the spearhead of a drive made by the whole communist control group on the entire power position of the West.’ Instead of embracing Hardie’s progressive reform agenda, he was castigated by Jose Zuelta, the Speaker of the Philippine House of Representatives. Zuelta, a close ally of the late president Roxas, was a hard-line politician, who had given the Philippine Constabulary free reign to deal with Huk insurgency. Zuelta denounced Hardie and his proposals as communist,⁴⁷ and the land reform expert was soon recalled back to Washington, very possibly on the demand of Eisenhower’s aggressively anti-communist Secretary of State John Foster Dulles.⁴⁸ The US chose to double down on their existing relationship with the Philippines. The Bell Mission and MSA essentially helped create conditions in which ‘American money, military assistance, and supervision reinforced cacique rule.’⁴⁹ Demonstrative of this was the STEM disbursement of aid between 1951 and 1954. Of sixty eight million dollars of development aid, only 1.4 million dollars went to industry, in the following two decades less than ten percent of development aid was spent on industry.⁵⁰ Economics professor and member of STEM, Roland Renne noted that eighty percent of dollar earning exports came from agriculture and thus investment in this sector was justified. However, this percentage was so high because prices of sugar were artificially inflated, so eighty percent was not an accurate market reflection of agricultural dominance of the economy. In other words, the price of Filipino sugar was unsustainably and deliberately bloated.⁵¹

⁴⁵ Secretary of State to the Embassy of the Philippines, *Number 309*.

⁴⁶ Stephen R. Shalom, ‘Counter-insurgency in the Philippines,’ *Journal of Contemporary Asia*, 7:2 (1977), pp. 153-177, p. 165-166.

⁴⁷ Shalom, ‘Counter-insurgency in the Philippines,’ p. 166.

⁴⁸ Office of the Historian: Foreign Policy under President Eisenhower <https://history.state.gov/departmenthistory/short-history/eisenhower> [Accessed October 2015].

⁴⁹ Cullather, *Illusions of Influence*, p. 89.

⁵⁰ Pomeroy, ‘The Philippines: A Case Study of Neocolonialism,’ pp. 176-178.

⁵¹ Roland R. Renne, ‘Agrarian Problems and Foreign Aid in the Philippines,’ *Institute of Pacific Relations*, 22:13 (December 1953) pp. 179-183, p. 179.

The Bell Trade Act shows how interventionist foreign policy launched a new era wherein overt colonialism was antiquated, but a new means of exerting influence emerged. The Act was a move to implement economic control over the Philippine government and economy, and it was an early demonstration of how the US desired to expand their influence in the world without direct colonialism. The Act was therefore a manifestation of bilateral internationalism and an indirect form of colonialism, representing a key moment in the formulation and development of US Cold War policy. Though there were notable voices of resistance in the State Department, including the future Secretary State Dean Acheson; Truman, the Bell Commission, and MacArthur were committed to, and successfully achieved, a short term policy in the Philippines to ensure US dominance as part of establishing the foreign policy objectives of an emerging Cold War.

It was felt by these actors that the conditions of rural and urban workers were not a policy priority, and especially not worth detracting from trying to achieve what were the primary policy objectives. Ignoring the potential ramifications of neglecting these groups were born out of an inherent confusion that US policy makers had regarding the role of the Philippines in their regional and global strategic planning. Philippine independence had been set into motion in 1934, and especially with the US emerging as the dominant global power in 1945, Philippine independence offered the US an opportunity to showcase their supposed commitment to freedom and self-determination, in ideological contrast to their Soviet Union counterparts. However, whilst the Philippines was taking on this international role as a US propagandistic example to the old empires of Europe, the engrained and perpetuating legacies of centuries of colonialism in the Philippines persisted. So, the existence of these two realities: the ideological decolonisation, contemporaneous to the reality of a colonial society made for a ill-judged post-war policy in the Philippines, demonstrated by, and manifest in the Bell Trade Act.

Constant Resistance: The Hukbalahap from War to Rebellion.

In a clearing, deep in the forest where Pampanga, Nueva Ecija, and Tarlac provinces joined, the disparate leaders of various guerrilla bands met. A table had been fetched from a barrio and around it the leaders discussed the principles of which their men, sat crossed legged on the ground clutching their few rifles, would live by. After several weeks of meetings, the situation had been finalised by 29 March 1942. They gave themselves the name *Hukbo ng Bayan Laban sa Hapon*, Tagalog for the People's Anti-Japanese Army, and thus was born the insurgent movement, established to expel the Japanese occupiers, and which later fought the Philippine

government and their US associates during the Hukbalahap Rebellion.⁵² The rebels were not diehard communist cadres; they were labourers and farmers, seeking a future for their families in a Philippines without outside domination or interference. The root causes of the movement, as well as ineffective measures to combat it, and piecemeal reforms in the Philippines signified the failure of US Cold War foreign policy in the islands. Understanding the Hukbalahap Rebellion highlights US policy failures in the Philippines, and also is very suggestive of policy failures elsewhere in the decolonising, developing world too.

Interpreting events within a Cold War discourse, which the US embraced during the decolonisation of the Philippines, contributed significantly to policy that activity disadvantaged, and indeed persecuted, the Hukbalahap and their natural sympathising rural supporters. The guerrilla efforts of the Hukbalahap have been widely acknowledged, even by Truman in October 1945, as hugely significant to defeating the Japanese occupation; the United States Army Forces in the Far East (USAFFE), however, led by MacArthur, refused to deal with these self-organised Filipino fighters. Though faced with a common Japanese enemy, the US military further alienated the Central Luzon population during the war, which set the tone for the post-war period: the bad relationship turned to direct action by 1946. It is important to start at the beginning, and this section charts the origins of the antagonism between the Hukbalahap and the US authorities, and how this developed into open rebellion in the aftermath of the expulsion of the Japanese Empire and the return of direct American interference in Philippine politics. US actions, namely the Bell Trade Act and the manipulation of the system to manoeuvre Roxas into the presidency compounded the Hukbalahap and their supporters' alienation from the true sense of independence. This section first deals with the relationship between the US led and the indigenous Philippine anti-Japanese fighters, and second addresses the clash of the political wing of the Filipino resistance movement with US backed Philippine authorities. Third, these tensions are framed by the issue of US military bases, and how the US sought to make the Philippines part of their global Cold War strategy.

The Japanese had faced separate resistance movements—the indigenous Hukbalahap and the US led forces. For their part the Hukbalahap refused to take orders from MacArthur and the USAFFE; they believed in fighting the Japanese as free Filipinos, not as a branch of the US army. MacArthur saw this insubordination not just an affront to the United States, but to himself personally—he had after all been stationed in the Philippines since 1935, and had attained rank of Field Marshall whilst resident on the islands—he was used to being in charge. Both MacArthur and his 'ultraconservative' Philippine civil affairs administrator Major General

⁵² Taruc, *Born of the People*, pp. 64-65.

Courtney Whitney were ‘alarmed at the growth of the Huks and at the manner in which [they were] organised’—both concurred that Huks in the long run were a potential ‘threat to the status quo.’⁵³ In light of this, during the war, USAFFE were not just fighting the Japanese, but also working to limit the extent to which the Hukbalahaps had success in solidifying their role as a popular armed force. The Hukbalahap top leadership contained Socialist and Communist Party members; in December 1941 Pedro Abad Santo and Crisanto Evangelista wrote a pledge to Francis Sayre and Manuel Quezon stating their ‘loyalty to the governments of the Philippines and of the United States,’ this along with an appeal for armaments to be supplied by MacArthur was denied. Huk leader Luis Taruc later recalled a story in his memoirs that demonstrated the unshakable commitment of the US military forces, under MacArthur, to protect the financial interests of American and Filipino business partners. The American-owned Insular Lumber Company, on Negros Island, founded in 1900, was the largest lumber mill in the world, and thus later ‘indispensable to the Japanese’ occupation. Consequently, the Huks planned to sabotage the mill, but Whitney sent ‘express instructions not to attack private property.’⁵⁴ This shows a major contradiction within the priorities of these putative allies: a desire to protect the pre-war status quo, even to the detriment of furthering the cause to defeat the Japanese.

The mutual distrust between US authorities and the demographics that had made up the bulk of the 1930s union movement, clearly highlight that World War Two and independence was not a clean break in US-Philippine history. The basic social relationships had not altered, if anything the conflict catalysed tensions into all out armed conflict. The two groups could direct their efforts, even if separate, against the Japanese, however, once peace was achieved in 1945 it seemed somewhat inevitable, unless one side was willing to concede substantial ideological ground, they would violently clash. The United States, as the holders of military and financial power, bureaucratic institutions, and super-power status had the opportunity to compromise; the Central Luzon peasantry could barely survive in the aftermath of the destruction of World War Two, let alone allow their socio-economic and political position to regress or recede further. The war took what little the Hukbalahap had; they had nothing to lose so the continued struggle for socio-economic improvements was a reasonable choice. The US, however, the self-proclaimed leaders of the free world, could be hurt by a domestic rebellion; for America’s reputation, ‘the Hukbalahap could be embarrassing at best but potentially disastrous.’⁵⁵ Ultimately, the war did not radicalise the peasantry, but it gave them

⁵³ Taruc, *Born of the People*, p. 155.

⁵⁴ Taruc, *Born of the People*, p. 151.

⁵⁵ Schirmer and Shalom, *Philippine Reader*, p. 82.

the skills and self-confidence to resist. As Alfredo Buwan of Nueva Ecija put it, 'we little people had become stronger; we were more organised.'⁵⁶

Against this backdrop of wartime conflict between the American and independent Filipino insurgent forces and local political organisations and councils, and as the defeat of the Japanese occupation in the Philippines seemed imminent, a conference was convened between the Hukbalahap leaders and Philippine Communist Party. The mere presence of the Communist Party was opposed outright by US leaders, who feared an anti-imperialist revolution, as was developing, for example, in China; the reality was that the PKP simply wished to help build a 'broad based political movement for political and economic reforms,' which were long overdue.⁵⁷ Out of this meeting a new popular front political party, the Democratic Alliance (DA), was born in July 1945 with the following mandate:

The DA program was not revolutionary. It believed in the ballot and the peaceful petition as the instruments through which the people's will should be expressed and achieved. It did not propose even the mildest socialization or change in the system of society as we know it. The path it proposed would have led no further than the development of a healthy industrialized capitalist country out of the feudal agricultural colonial condition that we had.⁵⁸

The DA posed a legitimate and substantial challenge to Roxas. MacArthur had worked hard to ensure Roxas's election, and it was implicitly understood that Roxas would do what was necessary to shore up his presidential authority. This became most apparent with the passage of the Bell bill, which still had to pass through the bicameral Philippine Congress in order to become legislation. A two third majority was required, but Roxas understood that there was resistance from staunch Nacionalista and DA Party members within the Senate and House of Representatives. Of 24 Senate seats filled during the April election, Roxas held a slim majority with thirteen, but two were absent with illness, and five were detained over collaborationist charges. To overcome this problem, Roxas reinstated those detained and suspended three minority party senators over 'alleged irregularities in their election.'⁵⁹ To ensure he had enough support in the House of Representatives, Roxas removed seven DA members 'on trumped-up charges of vote fraud' so that the bill would be voted through. Upon returning to their homes in Central Luzon, the expelled members of the Philippines Congress recounted their story of unconstitutional usurpation. Word quickly spread throughout the barrios: 'The Huks dug up their World War II arms and Central Luzon once again became a battleground.'⁶⁰

⁵⁶ Kerkvliet, *Huk Rebellion*, p. 109.

⁵⁷ Kerkvliet, *Huk Rebellion*, p. 139.

⁵⁸ Taruc, *Born of the People*, pp. 214-215.

⁵⁹ Schirmer and Shalom, *Philippine Reader*, p. 92.

⁶⁰ Cullather, *Illusions of Influence*, p. 51.

The Independence of the Philippines was inaugurated 4 July 1946, but the anti-Japanese guerrilla resistance movement, the Hukbalahap, had already rearmed for a new purpose—to resist the reinstated US influence in the islands: ‘liberals, guerrillas, and anti-collaborationists are very bitter over this matter ... one former guerrilla told an officer of the Consulate that there will be no guerrillas in the next war’ fighting for the United States’ cause.⁶¹

The role of the US military in the Philippines served a global purpose, but to many Filipinos, these forces were simply encroaching on their newly established sovereignty. The Hukbalahap movement and rebellion was an insular affair to the participating Filipinos, and from their perspective, they perceived US policy and attitudes as unequal and unfair, and indeed they were. However, the US Pacific Command and officials in Washington considered the Philippines not in isolation, but within an international context. Globalisation had been catalysed by World War Two, which increased the pressure of the leading superpower to conceive its strategy with not just a regional, but global mind set. The Bell Trade Act allowed the US to continue a sufficient level of influence, if not domination in some areas of the Philippines to allow for the projection of broader foreign policy objectives across Asia. If the provisions of Bell Trade fell short, Roxas openly endorsed the establishment of a new, vast network of US bases in 1946, but because of Nacionalista Party resistance base legislation was delayed until 14 March 1947. US military planners grew aggravated by the delay; Secretary of War Henry Stimson had made it clear to Truman in May 1945, three days after victory in Europe was declared, that the US needed ‘staging and mounting bases ... ground garrison instalments ... air bases ... harbors.’⁶² McNutt offered the reassurance that Roxas could be relied upon and that if base legislation had been railroaded through the Philippine Congress simultaneously to the Bell bill, too much attention would have been drawn to the exercise of heavy-handed manoeuvrings by the US.⁶³ For the hawkish military planners, however, the wait was gratified by the provision of extensive extraterritorial access to the islands: indeed the US had complete jurisdiction within the bases, and in reality this extended to US personnel outside of the bases too.⁶⁴ The United States could install ‘any type of facilities, weapons, substance, device, vehicle or vehicle on or under the ground, in the air or on or under the

⁶¹ Steintorf to Bryne, 5 September 1945, *FRUS, 1945, Diplomatic Papers, The British Commonwealth, the Far East Volume VI*, p. 1232.

⁶² Stimson to Truman, 11 May 1945, *FRUS, 1945, Diplomatic Papers. The British Commonwealth, the Far East Volume VI*, p. 1206.

⁶³ Stephen R. Shalom, ‘Securing the US-Philippine Military Base Agreement of 1947,’ *Bulletin Of Concerned Asian Scholars*, 22:4 (October–December 1990), pp. 3-12.

⁶⁴ ‘Article XIII, US Military Bases & Assistance Agreements (1947),’ in Bert M. Drona, ‘Independence with Strings: From U.S. Colony to U.S. Neocolony,’ in *The Filipino Mind* (25 October, 2012), <http://www.thefilipinomind.com/2012/10/us-military-bases-assistance-agreements.html> [Accessed October 2015].

water.⁶⁵ The length of the base treaty is reminiscent of the Unequal Treaties of the nineteenth century regards China. The re-emergence of the typical 99 year period is suggestive of the deliberate reassertion of an imperialist discourse upon the Philippines. Having granted 'extensive military facilities for 99 years,' the Philippine government furthermore could not accept aid or advisors from any third party countries: immediately after independence it is evidently clear that US government agencies controlled Philippine defence and foreign policy in its entirety.⁶⁶

Having secured their future in the Philippines, by way of demanding far more than any of its NATO allies, United States foreign policy makers sought to project this power into Asia. Gabriel Kolko has suggested that 'there are always links as to how policy in one area impacts it in another theatre,' and indeed the United States planned to utilise their former colony to both embody, and help achieve Southeast Asian US orientated stability throughout the decolonising European empires.⁶⁷ Southeast Asian stability, that is support and solidarity towards the United States' world view, relied upon regional allies and 'the fullest and closest military co-operation.'⁶⁸ This meant that the European empires had to be buttressed by regional US military presence, and, especially in the case of British Malaya, the continuation of the export trade involving lucrative industries such as rubber and tin. Establishing major US military presence in the Philippines assisted the reinstatement of colonial authority in Malaya and Indochina, the rejuvenation of European post-war economies, and offered mutual protection to other regional bases, such as the major naval installation in Singapore.⁶⁹ US interest in the Philippines was not simply to serve that one country, but as part of a system throughout Asia, supporting the recovering economies of Western Europe and contributing to the East Asian military perimeter, which acted as both a defensive and offensive line of installations.⁷⁰ The US armed forces were not simply there to secure the defence of old colonies like French Vietnam, they served to expand US economic interests. For the Philippines part, Roxas cleared the way for the US: he told Truman that 'any needed bases would be available anywhere in the Philippines.'⁷¹ Cullather wrote, 'Pentagon officials' interest in naval and air bases required that the Philippines remain in the economic orbit of the United States ... American investors

⁶⁵ 'Article III US Military Bases & Assistance Agreements (1947),' Drona, 'Independence with Strings.'

⁶⁶ Article XXV, US Military Bases & Assistance Agreements (1947),' Drona, 'Independence with Strings.'

⁶⁷ Kolko, *Confronting the Third World*, p. 1.

⁶⁸ Point 1, Preliminary Statement of General Principles Pertaining to the United States Military and Naval Base System in the Philippines, 1945, *FRUS, 1945, Diplomatic Papers. The British Commonwealth, the Far East Volume VI*, p. 1208.

⁶⁹ Phillip Deery, 'Malaya, 1948: Britain's Asian Cold War?' *Journal of Cold War Studies*, 9.1 (2007), pp. 29-54, p. 37.

⁷⁰ Jonathon Spence, *Search for Modern China* (London, 1990), p. 527.

⁷¹ Truman to Marshall, 14 July 1948. *FRUS, 1948, The Far East and Australasia, VI*, p. 627.

benefited from this policy, but they did not instigate it.⁷² Nevertheless, the US was, in addition to its industrial products, an exporter of an expansionist system of capitalism based upon the preservation of US wealth and power. Thus, Pentagon officials had suggested that the Philippines should essentially be an extra-territorial space for the US economy to encompass, but whether the Pentagon or Wall Street, General or investors, US interests remained paramount—the ‘Philippines were dominated by United States military and economic interests.’⁷³

Beyond the bilateral Bell Trade Act and the exclusive access provided to their forces in the Military Base Agreement, the US sought to integrate the Philippines into the global system too. The original plans for a Central Bank of the Philippines was considered in 1933 but only materialised in 1948 during Roxas’ presidency. Having a centralised monetary authority, staffed at the request of president Roxas himself meant that whoever received credit could be influenced to serve state interests.⁷⁴ The United States had always monopolised the import-export market of the Philippines, but after the Bell Trade Act, which allowed parity rights for financial capital investment, US-controlled commodities and financial capital merged. Thus, as the political philosophers Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri indicated, the lines of exploitation after World War Two actually increased through the consolidation of control by a monopoliser. Even Frank Ninkovich, who takes a critical line of those who adhere to an American imperial foreign policy, does note that as a result of independence ‘the United States became more deeply involved than ever,’ and that Cold War pressures gave the islands a greater importance than during the colonial years.⁷⁵ Global banking centres such as New York had long relied upon a global periphery to serve the core metropole, indeed the analysis of Hardt and Negri has pointed out that these core-periphery relationships were founded in the nineteenth century colonial period. Thus, the military bases in such colonies as the Philippines were originally established to meet regional military threats, but the overriding ideological threat was always a challenge to the dominance of the metropole at home.⁷⁶ The expulsion of the Western powers from Asia during World War Two required contingency planning to protect the regions that formed the periphery and semi-periphery of the global capitalist system from future threats. In fact the new demands of the post-war American economy led to the ‘oppression

⁷² Cullather, *Illusions of Influence*, p. 41.

⁷³ McNutt to Marshall, quoting Pravda, *FRUS, Far East, 1946*, p. 923.

⁷⁴ Cullather, *Illusions of Influence*, p. 69.

⁷⁵ Ninkovich, *United States and Imperialism*, p. 79-80.

⁷⁶ Anthony Brewer, *Marxist Theories of Imperialism: A Critical Survey* (London, 1990), pp. 163-164; Immanuel Wallerstein, *The Modern World-System, Volume III: The Second Great Expansion of the Capitalist World-Economy, 1730-1840s* (San Diego, 1989); Andre Gunder Frank, *The Development of Underdevelopment* (New York, 1966).

and exploitation' of the periphery during the Cold War, as was evident with the design and implementation of the Bell Trade Act and Military Base Agreement.⁷⁷ So, in the immediate aftermath of World War Two, the US had not just designed a system to make the Philippines subservient to US policy requirements, but the Philippines was also viewed within a global framework in which policy considerations revolved around broad objectives. These often neglected the incendiary internal 'condition of lawlessness,' which had, whatever the reason, in the opinion of Secretary of Defense Louis Johnson, grown to 'serious proportions' by April 1949.⁷⁸

American Neo-Imperialism in the Philippines as Cold War History.

Behind the facade of independence, Philippine foreign policy remained dictated by the impositions of the US designed treaties and obligations throughout the early Cold War. Indeed much effort had been expended to secure such influence: the Bell Trade Act, the election of Roxas, and the Military Base Agreement were the central events of a rapid succession of activity that tied the Philippines to US foreign policy objectives. This was not all for nothing: Assistant Secretary of State for East Asian and Pacific Affairs, and later Secretary of State for both Kennedy and Johnson administrations, Dean Rusk said in 1951: 'it is vital that we hold the Philippines whatever the cost—unless we are prepared to write off Asia.'⁷⁹ It is at this juncture that foreign policy considerations regarding the Philippines moved from a colonial discourse to one rooted within Cold War considerations. The tragic irony being that whilst the Hukbalahap rebellion raged, ignited by a mass rejection of the reassertion of extensive US influence in the islands, the United States began to perceive the Philippines within the globalising, international Cold War. Lacking a real appreciation of the pertinent issues at hand, the US pursued a policy that would ensure the perpetuation of domestic Philippine unrest. Though for now it remained largely confined to the rural poor, by the time the US became embroiled in the Vietnam conflict, the rejection of US interference had manifested itself as a developed form of nationalism that eventually ran all the way to the Philippine presidency in the 1960s. This section deals with how this most intimate of relationships between the US and the Philippines developed during the early Cold War, especially during the Korean War, and how this helps to explain how US foreign policy in later conflicts, notably the Vietnam War, had failed to evolve a nuanced appreciation for the conditions in the Philippines, and thus the individualistic nature

⁷⁷ Hardt and Negri, *Empire*, p. 43.

⁷⁸ Louis Johnson to Acheson, 19 April 1949, *FRUS, 1949, The Far East and Australasia, Volume VII, Part 1*, p. 592.

⁷⁹ Dean Rusk, 'Foreign Relations of the United States, 1951,' in Kolko, *Confronting the Third World*, p. 63.

of each region, of what was instead considered a homogenous developing world.

The first hot conflict of the Cold War to a large extent provided evidence that the hawkish US policy of military bases and compliant Filipino leaders was paying dividends. President Elpidio Quirino passed a law on 7 September 1950 to send Philippine troops to Korea, and on the nineteenth of the same month, 7,420 men of the Philippine Expeditionary Forces to Korea (PEFTOK) were dispatched as the first Asian UN allied combatants.⁸⁰ Beyond the sacrifice of 112 men over their 398 day tour of duty, there are three important aspects connecting the Philippines and the Korean War in the early Cold War that help contribute to an understanding of the aggressive nature of US foreign policy. First, the defensive and conservative nature of Soviet foreign policy in Asia was misperceived by the US, and though Stalin was not a passive actor, his foreign policy was cautious. Second, because of the necessity to defend and expand their own economic and political interest in Southeast Asia, the US believed they had to militarise. Third, the countries that experienced US militarism had their internal socio-economic conditions largely ignored, due a strict adherence to Cold War discourses, which in perceiving a homogenous communistic enemy, neglected the reality of living conditions that were inextricably connected to winning local hearts and minds. So in analysing the Korean War, a very obvious and overt example of US foreign policy makers' willingness to engage in the violent pursuance of the containment doctrine, there are many parallels to earlier policies that were executed in the Philippines, which suggests that American belligerence in Asia was evident before the first 'hot war,' and well before the US entanglement in Vietnam.

First, the concern that any subversive behaviour towards the United States was susceptible to foreign communist penetration was unfounded because the Soviet Union's foreign policy was basically conservative; Soviet leaders acknowledged the power of the United States and the relative weakness of the USSR, and thus pursued comparatively unambitious goals in spreading Soviet ideology.⁸¹ Furthermore, the Communist International (Comintern) was marginalised throughout East and Southeast Asia, despite being the international arm of the world's largest and most powerful communist party.⁸² To think that a US (ex)colony in the South Pacific was a serious target of the Comintern is to overestimate its reach, influence, and ambition. Even before the Stalinist era began, the failure of the 1917 Revolution to spark global overthrow of capitalism caused an 'inward turn' in subsequent Soviet foreign affairs.⁸³ There had been attempts to support anti-colonial militants in Asia, but this created severe tensions with

⁸⁰ Art Villasanta, 'The Glory of our Father,' 12 December 2009. www.peftok.blogspot.co.uk

⁸¹ Suny, *Soviet Experiment*, p. 365.

⁸² McDermott and Agnew, *The Comintern*, pp. 158-159.

⁸³ Suny, *Soviet Experiment*, p. 185.

Western European empires, namely Britain and France, and thus throughout the 1920s the Soviet Union remained isolated from the world.⁸⁴ The extent to which the Soviet Union was occupied, waging total war against Germany in Eastern Europe, also contributed to a lack of attention given to far off Southeast Asia during the 1930s and 1940s. To accuse Soviet meddling in a region historically devoid of Russian influence is to neglect the essential defensive nature of the Soviet Union, whose geographic size meant that most of its foreign policy was dedicated to shoring up border regions and developing buffer states. The Soviet Union understood the limited influence it could have in Southeast Asia and focused efforts in the North Eastern region of Manchuria, where the establishment of rail links and ports with access to the Pacific could have real and material benefits. Though the propaganda organ of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union—*Pravda*, had come to Roxas's attention: 'depreciating our independence and charging that the Philippines are dominated by the United States,'⁸⁵ official Soviet policies were founded on realistic and limited national security aims. When US foreign policy failed in the Philippines, it was due to inherent flaws in planning and execution, and not because of the presence of a fifth column: US policy defeats were of their own making.

Though the victory of the Chinese Communist Party (C. C. P.) in 1949 spelled defeat for the US backed Nationalist forces, this did not create a unified communist bloc in Asia. Stalinism required all communist parties, the world over, to work towards the success and aims of the Soviet Union, so the victory of the CCP actually created a rival communist party.⁸⁶ Undoubtedly the P. R. C. was a buffer zone protecting the Soviet Union from any US backed assault from the East, but such an attack was extremely unlikely. The declaration of Mongolian independence in 1921, and their consequent close alliance with the Soviet Union (whilst never entering the Soviet Republic), suggested that the Soviet Union felt the need to have a buffer client state between themselves and China—such were the levels of mistrust between the rival, not allied, communist states.⁸⁷ The vast Peoples Republic of China, though communist, conversely, actually blocked the Soviet Union from East and Southeast Asia as any potential Soviet penetration in the region after 1949 would have entailed leaping over or crossing China, undermining the P. R. C.'s regional security. Sino-Soviet historian Shen Zhihua discussed the need for Stalin to affect a relationship with the rival communist P. R. C. in order to prevent a drifting of relations into an unresolvable limbo that would keep the Soviet Union out of East

⁸⁴ Suny, *Soviet Experiment*, p. 319.

⁸⁵ McNutt to Marshall, quoting *Pravda*, *FRUS, Far East, 1946*, p. 923.

⁸⁶ Francois Godement, *The New Asian Renaissance: From Colonialism to the Post Cold-War*, Translated by Elisabeth J. Parcell (London, 1997), pp. 114-115.

⁸⁷ Alexei D. Voskressenski, *Russia and China: A Theory of Inter-State Relations* (London, 2003), pp. 140-141.

Asia indefinitely, including the loss of the pre-1917 access agreements in Manchuria.⁸⁸ In other words, the communist powers in Asia had little interest in taking aggressive actions toward the Philippine Islands. The opening of Russian archives since the collapse of the Soviet Union has revealed, Ronald Suny concluded, that Stalin was interested in state affairs and not ideology.⁸⁹ If this is the case, there is no reason why Stalin would interfere in the Philippines, which was a geographic area historically in the US sphere of influence. Soviet interference in the Philippines would only escalate tensions with the US, and there would have been minimal gain from Soviet infiltration there; therefore there was no notable or credible external military threat to the Philippines in Southeast Asia.

Nevertheless, the Korea peninsular was important to all parties, and this would influence American policies in Southeast Asia, including the Philippines. Immediately following World War Two, the unfortunate geographic situation of Korea resulted in the interests of Washington, Beijing, and Moscow all converging on the peninsular, which meant that if there was to be a battle ground between the three principle powers they would more than likely clash there.⁹⁰ Shen Zhihua noted that the primary concern of Stalin was to 'avoid open conflict,' and he planned to achieve this by keeping Soviet advisors out of North Korea so the US State Department could not complain of a threatening Soviet presence there. Stalin also planned on allowing China to make the final decision whether to intervene (in which case Stalin backed Mao) or not once the war had broken out.⁹¹ Thus if China and the US entered an open conflict, the tactically cautious Soviet Union could claim an ideological victory as they had remained directly uninvolved, and the US had intervened in China's backyard. From the American side, National Security Council 73/2 paper: 'The position and actions of the US with respect to possible further Soviet moves in the light of the Korean situation,' predicted that a Soviet-influenced invasion by the North of the South may be part of limited, contained offensives planned by the Soviet Union; this was an attempt to spark further isolated conflicts that would challenge bastions of US influence in Asia, and this assessment of limited Soviet involvement in regional conflicts seems to have been largely correct. The US government's rapid response to these conclusions was 'to implement the massive rearmament plan ... to defend Taiwan and the French position in Indochina, to solidify NATO, and to rearm West Germany,' and to 'conclude a separate peace with Japan and maintain military forces in Okinawa and South Korea,' which all coincided with the affirmation and consolidation of the Military Base

⁸⁸ Shen Zhihua, 'Sino-Soviet Relations and the Origins of the Korean War: Stalin's Strategic Goals in the Far East,' *Journal of Cold War Studies* 2.2 (2000), pp. 44-68, p. 55.

⁸⁹ Suny, *Soviet Experiment*, p. 365.

⁹⁰ William Stueck, *Rethinking the Korean War: A New Diplomatic and Strategic History* (Oxford, 2002), p. 68.

⁹¹ Zhihua, 'Sino-Soviet Relations and the Origins of the Korean War,' p. 62.

Agreement with the Philippines in 1947.⁹² The fear of further Soviet-influenced aggression and direct Chinese intervention in Korea, both increased the levels of concern for the US government over communist-inspired attacks on US interests, and underlined the importance of the Philippines for the strategic defence of American economic and security interests abroad.

Second, though the Korean War broke out in June 1950, the US role in the establishment of Philippine independence shows how the US had prepared their former colony to substantially contribute, through hard line domestic leadership and military bases, to a war footing that would be called upon for the first time in the summer of 1950. The United States laid claim in Asia to a vast network of interests by supporting the French in Vietnam, the British in Malaya, rebuilding Japan, and the creation of South Korea, with which there was PRC, and some Soviet competition. In order to maintain these commitments in the region, US foreign policy had to both militarise and perceive opposition as a homogenous communistic challenge: if not allied with the US, you were opposed to the US, and thus an agent or supporter of communism. US foreign policy, in order to meet this challenge, whether real or illusory, and maintaining these commitments, sought base rights, economic domination, and political influence. This was chosen over attempting to win popular support by addressing issues of poverty, living conditions, and social security in the developing nations of Southeast Asia. These conclusions can all be deduced by the US relationship with the Philippines, and the events of 1946 and 1947 in particular highlight how this relationship served as a harbinger for US foreign policy affairs during the Cold War.

The largest contribution the Philippines made to US military policy in the Asian theatre was the Clark Air and Subic Naval bases, the two largest overseas American bases in the world. These installations were primarily designed to project US offensive power and interests, and not to guard against Soviet penetration into the Philippines. In fact, Southeast Asia was a region largely neglected in Soviet policy. Upon analysing the testimonies of leading members of Philippine anti-US movements, it appears that there was no Soviet or international communist penetration in the Philippines that attempted to redirect the Hukbalahap movement from domestic socio-economic unrest to international, political revolution. Nevertheless, within the ideological and geostrategic bipolar discourse of the Cold War, political figures frequently equated opposition to the United States government with being in league with, or at least associated with Soviet agents. These apprehensions were manifest in the words and actions of

⁹² Kathryn Weathersby, 'Soviet Aims In Korea and the Origins of the Korean War, 1945-1950: New Evidence from the Archive,' in Christian F. Ostermann, (Ed.), *Cold War International History Project Working Papers Series* (Washington, 1993), pp. 5-37, p. 5.

high ranking US officials, which in turn somewhat normalised 'red scare' hysteria. Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, J. Edgar Hoover told the House Un-American Activities Committee in 1947, of his 'real apprehension' of communist 'infiltration,' which bordered on paranoia.⁹³ Such fears promulgated attitudes that retaining and developing military installations were a national security necessity, which ironically increased anti-American sentiment and unrest in the localities of the bases.

Third, the primacy of viewing developments through a Cold War discourse directed attention from socio-economic conditions to broader, often misconceived threats of communist conspiracy. Undoubtedly the Korean War involved communist backing of the North invading the South, but military action alone could not defeat anti-American sentiments. Although Korea had many differences to the European colonial regions, and the conflict here was conventional, not an asymmetrical insurgency, the essential internal and socio-economic conditions had similarities with the likes of the Philippines. Thus it is important to understand the intricacies of the Korean War through the lens of other Asian countries. The policies and issues surrounding the Philippines in particular, when analysed alongside the Korean War, highlight some key flaws in US policy planning, and an inherent failure of US policy makers to appreciate the roots of the continued antagonism towards the United States across Asia, and the developing world. In February 1949, the conclusion of a CIA report could have been interpreted as, and in hindsight certainly suggested, an alternative lens with which to view the situation. In contrast to the prevailing Cold War pattern of attempting to overcome the realpolitik and ideological designs of Moscow and Beijing, an understanding that for political systems to work, whether it was capitalism or state socialism, Koreans as well all populations had to accept them. Indeed the CIA report pointed out that the farming population 'will support the party who offers land ownership, low taxes, and minimal police brutality.'⁹⁴ American policy makers, however, did not truly understand the importance of the socio-economic ambitions of agricultural workers, and though maybe the Korea case was far more complicated with the convergence of so many international powers vying for influence, there is very little legitimate excuse for US policy makers to have made these same mistakes in the Philippines. They were the only international power that exercised influence or had genuine interest in the archipelago. Yet even during World War Two with MacArthur's refusal to cooperate with the Hukbalahap, and certainly after the passing of the Bell Trade Act, the US lost the opportunity to reconcile with the Central Luzon peasantry through appeasement with

⁹³ J. Edgar Hoover, 'Testimony of before HUAC,' 26 March, 1947.

<http://cla.calpoly.edu/legacies/rsimon/rsimonsite/Hum410/HooverHUAC.htm>.

⁹⁴ CIA, 'Communist capabilities in South Korea,' 21 February, 1949. *Office of Reports and Estimates, Harry Truman Presidential Library*.

reform, which would not have necessarily been a form of socialism. Instead, the US supported Roxas, who pursued the 'Mailed Fist' policy; indiscriminate violence drove thousands to the Hukbalahap cause, and in the first five months the rebellion's numbers increased three fold—Taruc claimed 'the movement was thriving on suppression.'⁹⁵ US support of militarism then was failing in Asia, as seen in the Philippines, as early as 1947.

The Korean War broke out 25 June 1950, and by that point there had been considerable colonial conflicts in Indochina, Malaya, and Indonesia. Outside of Korea, unrest took the form of asymmetrical guerrilla insurgencies, whereas the Korean War itself was a conventional conflict. Instead of considering the centuries of outside, colonial interference into these societies, the perpetuation of exploitative economic and political relationships, and the suppression of oppositional movements was conceived as central to the predominate US foreign policy doctrine of containment, driven by President Truman and Ambassador George Kennan.⁹⁶ Though the Korean War did not erupt until June 1950, policies, especially in the Philippines, show the United States proactivity in seeking military solutions, conceived through a Cold War lens, which really originated out of colonial legacies. There is also a personal connection between the Philippines and Korea, one that helps demonstrate why the Philippines serves as an example of belligerent US policy as a precursor to other later incidents. The threat of the use of nuclear weapons, according to John Gaddis 'ultimately, confined the Korean War to the peninsula,' which set a precedent for the keeping future conflicts geographically restricted.⁹⁷ In the early phases of the war, however, the deployment of nuclear weapons had its strongest advocate at the forefront of the US Pacific forces: none other than Commander-in-Chief, and the former Field Marshal of the Philippines, General Douglas MacArthur. Military build-up in Korea threatened Japan, which in turn would have exposed the Philippines.⁹⁸ Though the US would have been quick to defend their record in the Philippines as an exceptionalist power and, during the Cold War, as the standard bearer for liberty, the socio-economic comparison of Korea and the Philippines present strong similarities as early as February 1949. This example demonstrates the importance of the Philippines in the early Cold War, especially considering the development of US foreign policy. The islands are the most useful example of the application and outcome of US Cold War objectives in the post-colonial world, and thus serve as the base of subsequent analysis elsewhere.

⁹⁵ Cullather, *Illusions of Influence*, p. 63.

⁹⁶ Walter Isaacson and Evan Thomas, *The Wise Men: Six Friends and the World they Made* (New York, 1997).

⁹⁷ Gaddis, *We Now Know*, p. 104.

⁹⁸ 'Consequences of US Troop Withdrawal from Korea in Spring 1949,' 28 February, 1949. *Office of Reports and Estimates, Harry Truman Presidential Library.*

Conclusion: A Return to the Past: Violence and Political Manipulation in the Sovereign Philippines.

The anti-Hukbalahap campaign seemingly portrayed the broad principles of the US position vis-à-vis their relationship with the Philippines. Through the 1950s Filipino authorities and US agents sought to defeat the Hukbalahp Rebellion. This suppression campaign has received much adulation, or at least is uncritically considered as successful, yet the methods deployed were morally and legally dubious.⁹⁹ A Department of the Army report from 1952 concluded that the Philippine Constabulary was often ‘used to protect properties such as mines and estates owned by politically influential persons,’ and that ‘in many areas of the Philippines, the population lived more in fear of the Constabulary than of the Huks.’ The return of US authorities in the Philippines, setting into motion the events of 1946, re-established an order that had existed for generations. The willingness to use violence against disenfranchised groups can be best summed up thus: Lansdale talking at a symposium in 1963 on counterinsurgency tactics against the Huks said, ‘Magsaysay very definitely desired to use napalm against concentrations. There were attempts to make our own napalm bombs but they didn't ignite—we did try dumping an inflammable mixture, mostly kerosene, out of a C-47, then firing into it with rifle tracer ammo.’¹⁰⁰

This example is demonstrative of what this chapter has set out: the establishment of a certain type of US-Philippine relationship, a continuation to support entrenched socio-economic elites in search of fulfilling perceived Cold War threats, at the neglect of confronting the domestic colonial legacies. The Filipino people elected a president, the winning candidate had been backed by MacArthur; the Congress controversially passed the Bell Trade Act, which established continued US dominance over the island's economy; the grant of independence from the United States was awarded to help establish the US at the forefront of self-determinism in the coming Cold War years; the 1947 Military Base Agreement guaranteed the facilities for the US to project its military power throughout Asia. It is evident that US policy makers struggled to reconcile colonial legacies in the early Cold War, failed to prioritise reform, and instead pursued relationships that appeared to contribute to broader foreign policy aims.

⁹⁹ Thomas Powers, *The Man Who Kept the Secrets: Richard Helms & the CIA* (New York, 1979), p. 135; David Wise and Thomas B. Ross, *The Invisible Government* (New York, 1964), p. 156; Joseph B. Smith, *Portrait of a Cold Warrior* (New York, 1976), p. 104.

¹⁰⁰ A. H. Peterson, G. C. Reinhardt, and E. E. Conger (eds.), ‘Symposium on the Role of Airpower in Counterinsurgency and Unconventional Warfare: the Philippine Huk Campaign,’ *14-18 January, 1963*, RAND Corporation, DNSA.

This, however, was a short sighted design, as the failure to fully embrace development, address the fundamental causes of unrest, and de-escalate militaristic thinking laid the foundations for continual instability in the islands, which eventually resulted in a dictatorship in 1972.

The US-Philippine relationship in 1946 was not cast anew, but in many ways continued into America's Cold War new world order. Cold War historiography has focused on the European theatre as the key Cold War battleground between the bipolar rivals, however, it became apparent to Soviet and US leaders that conflict on the European continent presented the most likely threat of military escalation to nuclear proportions. The importance of the developing world then became increasingly important to US policy far earlier than the Eisenhower Administration or even the 1960s—the period of primary focus for Cold War revisionists. Understanding the State Department's essential foreign policy aims, means of implementation, and attempts to achieve the outcomes can be demonstrated through their relationship with the Philippines. David Marr and Mark Lawrence have argued problems during the Cold War had their roots in colonialism, but this case study argues the Philippines offers more insight into the short comings and limitations of US foreign policy.¹⁰¹ The decision to deprioritise and delegitimise the issue of colonial legacies would not just result in turbulent relations with the Philippines, but would result in disaster later on in the Vietnam War.

The deliberate reinstallation of an economy of dependence led William Pomeroy to conclude the post-war years resulted in 'the Philippines being tied to the old colonial trade pattern.'¹⁰² For the part of Governor McNutt, 'the purpose of the Bell bill is the rehabilitation of Philippine export economy,' and the 'effect of the bill will be to help restore the Philippines to the position it occupied before war in world sugar market.'¹⁰³ McNutt seemingly validated Pomeroy's assessment without irony; the unfolding of the events of the 26 April Philippine presidential election, the passing of the Bell Trade Act by the Philippine Congress on 2 July, and the propagandistic inauguration of Philippine independence from the United States on 4 July represent a failure to understand and reconcile the historic colonial legacies, and the emerging Cold War. This set the tone for the coming escalating Asian Cold War.

As the Korean War armistice was signed 27 July 1953, Philippine Secretary of Defence Ramon Magsaysay was campaigning, ultimately successfully, for the Filipino Presidency. The CIA operative Edward Lansdale had, at the request of President Quirino in 1950, chosen Magsaysay

¹⁰¹ Marr, *Vietnamese Tradition on Trial, 1920-1945*; Mark A. Lawrence, *Assuming the Burden: Europe and the American Commitment to War in Vietnam* (Michigan, 2005).

¹⁰² Pomeroy, 'The Philippines: A Case Study of Neocolonialism,' p. 163.

¹⁰³ McNutt to Ely, 18 January 1946, *FRUS, Far East, 1946*, p. 863.

as a key element in his anti-Hukbalahap Rebellion strategy. Considering the volatility of the Asian Cold War, defined by the Chinese communist victory in 1949, the First Indochina War, and the Korean War, the importance to US security interests of a pro-American and stable Philippines, increased exponentially: the archipelago formed 'an essential part of the Asian off-shore island chain bases on which the strategic position of the US in the Far East depends.'¹⁰⁴ Attempting to achieve these aims, set out in this 1950 National Security Council report, however, came at the expense of the impoverished rural communities. The US-Philippine relationship was not just faced with colonial legacies, but with the legacies of failed Cold War policy, as a result of the Magsaysay era. It was against this backdrop, Presidents' Garcia and Macapagal had to face old troubles at home, and new challenges abroad.

¹⁰⁴ J.W. Davis to Harry S. Truman, 'National Security Council on the Position of the United States with Respect to the Philippines,' 9 November 1950, DNSA.

3.

To Fill the Void: US-Philippines Relations After Magsaysay, 1957-1963.

When President Ramon Magsaysay's plane was overdue into Manila airport on 17 March 1957 and its whereabouts still unknown, CIA agent Edward Lansdale received a call from Luz, the wife of the President. Later that day, Lansdale received confirmation from Colonel Borromeo of the Filipino leader's fatal crash, whose 'voice [was] so choked with tears that I barely understood his words,' the agent later recounted.¹ The following day at the swearing in of Vice President Carlos Garcia, he appealed for 'sobriety, calmness, and dedication' in seeking unity within the country, and regards external partners he asked that 'in the days that lie ahead, I will welcome honest and constructive criticism if it will redound to the public good.'² With the passing of Washington's favourite Filipino, a new, more stridently nationalist leader had replaced the deceased Magsaysay. US Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles was informed by a national security aide, on the same day as Garcia's inauguration speech, that the new resident in Malacanang was 'inept,' at least in fulfilling US objectives.³ In the years following the loss of Magsaysay, it was this approach that set the tone for the coming presidential term: quickly drawn conclusions, poor intelligence, and myopic Cold War rhetoric, which all contributed to a drift in US-Philippine relations in the late 1950s and early 1960s. The US resisted nationalist concessions every step of the way and, in doing so, entrenched nationalist resentment against them in high places. The US should have sought some workable relationship with nationalists because, in the form of Garcia and Senator Claro Recto, they were still moderate in comparison to Ferdinand Marcos, or other to-be dictators like Suharto in Indonesia. This episode demonstrates inflexibility in US foreign policy, due to rigid loyalty to ideological concepts of anti-communism, anti-nationalism, and pro-Americanism. This was much to the detriment of US interests, indeed, they made enemies out of potential allies.

The untimely death of Ramon Magsaysay in a plane crash in 1957 at only fifty years old took everyone by surprise; in fact, there was no CIA contingency plan in place. Magsaysay had

¹ Edward G. Lansdale, *In the Midst of War: An American's Mission to Southeast Asia* (London, 1972), p. 377.

² Carlos Garcia, 'Inaugural Address,' 18 March 1957.

<http://www.gov.ph/1957/03/18/inaugural-remarks-of-president-garcia-after-the-demise-of-president-magsaysay-march-18-1957/> [Accessed August 2015].

³ Parker Armstrong to John Foster Dulles, 18 March 1957, *FRUS, South East Asia 1955-1957*, p. 713.

worked and indeed lived alongside the CIA Philippines station, and was particularly close to Edward Lansdale in the early 1950s. In *Illusions of Influence*, Nick Cullather showed that Magsaysay was far more than a puppet, and in fact had designs for his aggrandisement of political power domestically, but the Philippines' foreign policy, and interaction with the global Cold War, had remained at the direction of US agents.⁴ Nevertheless, Garcia's sudden ascendance threatened this arrangement. It was widely understood the role of Filipino Vice President was as impotent, if not more so, as their US counterpart. Thus, when the Bohol islander ascended to the Presidency, 'no one from the [Philippines CIA] station knew [Carlos] Garcia when he took office.'⁵ There were no plans in place, and Garcia took the interim presidency in March, only eight months prior to the November 1957 presidential election. This point in Philippine history marked a moment of particularly poor judgement among US policy makers as they misplaced even more faith in the Magsaysay myth. This chapter examines the development of the legacy of the Magsaysay presidency, the subsequent Garcia government, and how this era represented the culmination of failed US policies that contributed and culminated in the eventual authoritarianism of Ferdinand Marcos.

During the eight years between the presidencies of Magsaysay and Marcos, from 1957 to 1965, two other presidents resided in the Malacanang Presidential Palace: Carlos Garcia and Diosdado Macapagal. This period then can be defined as a kind of post-Magsaysay despondency among US handlers, followed by the build up to the 1965 election, in which Ferdinand Marcos emerged triumphant as a more assertive and charismatic leader, who captured the American imagination. These years have been neglected by western Cold War historiography, possibly because they fall between the two headline-grabbing presidents—one who 'successfully' fought an anti-guerrilla war, and the latter who sent men to Vietnam and eventually became an infamous dictator. This thesis, and Chapter Three and Four in particular, argue that that these years are crucial to explaining how and why US foreign policy significantly contributed to creating circumstances in the Philippines that both allowed and encouraged increasingly authoritarian governments; this was a dynamic that emerged not just in the Philippines, but elsewhere in the developing world. Despite contemporary beliefs to the contrary, Magsaysay represented some significant failures in US policy in the Philippines.⁶ Following Magsaysay, Presidents Garcia presided over a drift in relations with their historic partners. The fact that the State and Defense Department, as well as the CIA, had designed legislation, supported chosen candidates, staffed huge overseas intelligence and diplomatic missions, as well as distributed large amounts of US dollars, they still failed to find a successful

⁴ Cullather, *Illusions of Influence*.

⁵ Smith, *Portrait of a Cold Warrior*, p. 254.

⁶ Cullather, *Illusions of Influence*.

formula for relations with the Philippines over two successive presidencies. This then largely contributed to the Johnson government's eventual acceptance of authoritarian regimes (in the Philippine case, under Ferdinand Marcos), even at the expense of 'democracy and freedom.'⁷

This chapter first expands upon Cullather's study of the Magsaysay era, which was an analysis of how the Magsaysay 'illusion' continued to inform important foreign policy up until 1962, and how his legacy remained a fond memory for US policy makers' planning strategy, leading up to the Vietnam War. Second, an analysis of the Garcia presidency, how it was defined by anti-American nationalism, and thereby furthered the consolidation of the Magsaysay myth; US policy planners constructed a fantasy of better relations with the Philippines through rose tinted glasses, which coloured their interactions with subsequent governments. Third in this chapter, a critical analysis of the US Overseas Internal Defense Policy from August 1962, that was released by a national security adviser McGeorge Bundy. The Policy paper was concerned about the difficulties facing the US in the developing world, and in turn celebrated the alleged successes of Magsaysay as a model to be applied elsewhere and in turn the success of US planners for their part in Magsaysay's career. His positive image in US foreign policy circles, however, was largely compromised in June 1963 by a National Survey, that showed the internal Philippine situation was still declining—suggesting that the actual impact of the Magsaysay era had been wholly unsuccessful and insubstantial. This reassessment makes up the fourth part of this chapter: in the wake of the release of the National Survey, in the first half of the 1960s, the United States State Department had to contend with the realisation that the Hukbalahap Rebellion and, by extension, the socio-economic problems in the Philippines had not been successfully dealt with. Even worse, the violent consequences of economic desperation among farmers were re-emerging as the Hukbalahap enjoyed a resurgence in popularity in the mid-1960s.⁸ These four sections thus reveal how US foreign policy decisions, when in combination with failed attempts to improve the conditions of the citizens of the Philippines, created opportunity and acceptance of increasingly authoritarian solutions to these problems, which reverberated across the developing world.

⁷ Michael E. Latham, 'The Cold War in the Third World, 1963-1975,' p. 260.

⁸ Intelligence memorandum prepared by the Central Intelligence Agency, 19 April 1967, 1964–1968 Volume XXVI, Indonesia; Malaysia-Singapore; Philippines, Document 348, *FRUS*.

'A genuine and growing nationalist sentiment': the 1957 Transition from Magsaysay to Garcia.

In seeking a solution to internal unrest in the Philippines, a certain CIA agent, who would later achieve great public fame in the United States, teamed up with the Filipino Defense Secretary, and later legendary President, Ramon Magsaysay, to defeat leftist subversion in the Philippines. Throughout the 1950s, Agent Edward Lansdale and Ramon Magsaysay worked in close partnership to defeat the Hukbalahap movement. Magsaysay provided the charisma and popular front to present to the Filipino population, whilst Lansdale offered psychological warfare and counter-guerrilla expertise. Together they devised a resettlement program for families who volunteered to sever their links and support for the movement in Luzon and be removed to small plots of land on the southernmost island of Mindanao, a largely Muslim, jungle covered region, to clear and cultivate for themselves. Lansdale and Magsaysay on one occasion travelled with a convoy of families who were being relocated from one island, Luzon, to another, Mindanao. On the journey Lansdale discovered that one eighteen year old passenger was in fact a committed Hukbalahap who had 'slipped through the screening process.' Living up to his populist persona, Magsaysay insisted on giving the teenager a chance to prove himself and win his freedom instead of being incarcerated as an enemy insurgent. Upon arrival in the jungle and discovering the 'bigger fruit and larger harvest,' the young man reportedly returned to his family in Luzon to persuade them of the benefits of the program and the futility of resisting the government.⁹ This relocation anecdote is largely representative of American leaders' experience with Magsaysay: he was a public relations figure who was marketable to the Filipino electorate, and whose legendary activities were sometimes difficult to believe. He furthermore carried out superficial policies that, in reality, failed to deal with the root of the chronic socio-economic problems that inspired subversive opposition to the United States. In the late 1950s, however, his association with the CIA was championed as a great collaborative success for joint US-Philippine ambitions.

Prior to becoming President of the Philippines, Magsaysay was made Secretary of Defense in 1950 by President Elpidio Quirino (1948-1953). Throughout he was a man of image and of little substance, yet the United States Pacific Command, the CIA, and the US State Department were captivated by his charm and personality. Romantic as the story above is about the reformed teenage Huk, the reality was that President Quirino had suspended the rights of habeas corpus

⁹ Peterson, Reinhardt, and Conger (eds.), 'Symposium on the Role of Airpower in Counterinsurgency and Unconventional Warfare: the Philippine Huk campaign,' *DNSA*.

on Luzon as part of the anti-Huk efforts. Between January and July 1951 alone, roughly 15,000 people were arrested, individuals were targeted by using an 'alphabetical list of Huk' suspects, and by 1951 over one thousand people were being held in detention.¹⁰ Indeed, the scholarly interpretation of the Magsaysay presidency, chiefly Nick Cullather's *Illusions of Influence*, suggests that Magsaysay had never been a die-hard agent of US foreign policy, and that in fact he had successfully manipulated US handlers in Southeast Asia, including the State Department, the CIA, and the United States Pacific Command, into securing his position as a popular and powerful public figure. He gained great wealth and influence without achieving the objectives for which he had been selected in the first place; the Hukbalahap rebellion, though severely weakened, had not been eradicated and the socio-economic situation of the Luzon peasantry had not been arrested. Indeed, throughout the Magsaysay period, the living standards of sixty percent of the Filipino work force,¹¹ those engaged in agricultural, continued to decline.¹²

The problem of declining living standards was a serious one, because the US State Department and foreign policy groups formulated future plans for the Philippines within the parameters of a perceived successful legacy from the Magsaysay era (1953-1957). Of course, Filipino presidents who had preceded Magsaysay had not successfully addressed issues that had negatively influenced US-Philippines relations; first and foremost, from 1898 onward, no government in the archipelago had addressed the lack of internal stability arising from domestic socio-economic problems. The United States, heavily reliant on the judgement of CIA operative Edward Lansdale, had firmly backed Magsaysay as the man who possessed the necessary traits to guide the new Philippine Republic through its infancy into a strong and stable US ally, able to contribute to an increasingly hot Cold War environment in Southeast Asia. An intelligence report filed to the State Department on 24 February 1954 described 'tremendous popular support' for Magsaysay, that his policies were 'constructive, but not drastically reformist;' it further reassured readers that 'significant change in foreign policy cannot be expected,' and that this should allow Magsaysay to 'whittle down the serious agrarian problem by reducing tenancy and raising per capita farm incomes.'¹³ Indeed, upon Magsaysay's death in 1957, Cullather noted that the Eisenhower administration knew of no other figure who could replace him, and thus, in the eyes of the administration, the death of Magsaysay was also the passing of their only ideal ally—an 'anti-chauvinist, pro-American,' and

¹⁰ Schirmer and Shalom, *Philippine Reader*, p. 117.

¹¹ Background Notes: The Philippines, 1964, White House Central Files (WHCF), CO 235, Philippines, Box 62, Lyndon B. Johnson Library (LBJL).

¹² Cullather, *Illusions of Influence*.

¹³ Fisher Howe to State Department, 'Intelligence Note: Prospects for the Magsaysay Administration.' 24.02.1954, *School of Oriental and Asian Studies Archive, Philippines Collection, Reel 3/37*.

high profile public leader.¹⁴ Magsaysay's death exposed a lack of alternative plans among US policy makers and the president's death launched a period of US-Philippines relations during which the Garcia and Macapagal presidencies were characterised by distant association. The fact the US felt so aggrieved by Magsaysay's death, according to Cullather, was a demonstration of how skilfully the former president had manipulated American handlers into believing that he was an essential hero, in spite of glaring facts to the contrary. In the end, the CIA and the State Department relied on Magsaysay as an individual, and they failed to develop significant relationships with other high profile figures who could take his place. With Magsaysay's sudden death, US agencies suddenly realised that they lacked a contingency plan, and this left them exposed to a rising tide of Filipino nationalism in the late 1950s.

At the end of the Magsaysay era, and throughout the late 1950s and 1960s, the US State Department and Pentagon had to contend with a high profile anti-American lobby in the Philippines. Though Filipino nationalism proliferated throughout the barrios of Luzon, the primary political challenge emerged from elite political and business circles in Manila. Roberto Paterno noted that Nacionalista Party Senator Claro M. Recto had been a long time challenger of outside involvement in the Philippines.¹⁵ According to his Philippine Senate biography, Recto confronted the US Attorney General in debate over American bases in 1935.¹⁶ Later, in 1946, he wrote that the Japanese 'Co-prosperity' plan in the Philippines had merely been a 'tokenistic' title: 'the sugar coating to disguise the bitter pill' of the 'pigheaded cocksureness of her [Japan's] colonial administrators,' and their 'iron heel' under which the so-called 'sphere' would reside.¹⁷ The Luzonian senator was a nationalist, who opposed the close relationship between the United States and the Philippines, who also advocated dealing openly with Communist China. Recto had publicly disassociated himself from the Magsaysay camp, as he insisted the Philippine president had become too conciliatory to US interests; thus from 1954 onwards, Recto took centre stage as the primary opponent of the United States' presence and continued interest in the Philippines. Recto was an ally of Magsaysay's Vice President, Carlos Garcia, and formed one of the dominant partnerships in Philippine politics in the late 1950s, which was an era defined by increasing nationalism and resentment of US demands. This period was born out of both poor and insufficient contingency planning, especially from the CIA. Upon Magsaysay's death on 17 March 1957, until 1965 when Marcos was elected to the Presidency,

¹⁴ Cullather, *Illusions of Influence*, p. 151.

¹⁵ Roberto Paterno, 'American Military Bases in the Philippines: the Brownell Opinion,' *Philippine Studies*, 12:3 (July 1964), pp. 391-423, p. 397.

¹⁶ Senate of the Philippines, Profiles: Claro Recto.

http://www.senate.gov.ph/senators/former_senators/claro_recto.htm [Accessed August 2015].

¹⁷ Claro M. Reto, *Three Years of Occupation. The Issue of Political Collaboration in the Philippines* (Manila, 1946) pp. 1-6.

US-Philippine relations suffered due to nationalism, military base disagreements, and a redefinition of US priorities and objectives away from their ex-colony.

Before rising Filipino nationalism came to dominate discussions in Washington, the State Department and the CIA were thoroughly satisfied with the Lansdale-Magsaysay partnership and the anti-Huk campaign. As this dissertation has already shown, much of the rebellion's motivation was rooted in seeking an improvement of living and working conditions for the rural poor, driven by a desire to disassociate themselves, and the islands, from the United States. The US intelligence community believed that Magsaysay had defeated the rebellion and pursued a successful reform program, but when analysing US government documentation from the early 1960s, these conclusions were revealed to be illusions. Yet in the eyes of US officials, Magsaysay's death 'created a leadership vacuum, a hiatus waiting to be filled.' For the Americans, this vacuum would not be satisfactorily filled until 1965 by Ferdinand Marcos; in the interim, as David Joel Steinberg put it, 'unlike Magsaysay, neither [Carlos] Garcia nor [Diosdado] Macapagal had the capacity to transcend the limitations of their class and time,'¹⁸ and so the US for the next two elected terms had to deal with presidents with whose reputation did not match Magsaysay's. Moreover, the new Filipino nationalism was damning: if Magsaysay had implemented all the reform programs successfully with US assistance, why then did anti-US nationalism sweep the press and presidency? The inability of Washington to reconcile this failure caused a drift in relations which only helped Marcos eventually establish an authoritarian regime.

The Philippines was faced with a so-called leadership vacuum, and into this space ascended Magsaysay's Vice President, and Nacionalista Party candidate, Carlos Garcia. Magsaysay was a member of the Philippine Liberal Party, but had placed Garcia in this largely ceremonial and impotent role, to placate his nationalist opponents. Even more forceful in his assertion of Filipino nationalism was Senator Claro M. Recto, who had broken away from his close association with Magsaysay just before the latter's death. Recto, with ally Lorenzo Tañada, split from Garcia and his less confrontational brand of nationalism to form the Nationalist Citizens' Party (NCP) in 1957. Further political division took place, and Magsaysay's Liberal Party also underwent fracture. Like the NCP, the Progressive Party was formed in 1957, having split from the Liberal Party. The newly formed Progressive Party, however, had significantly more success than Recto's challenge to the presidency, the former winning over 20 percent of the vote, whilst the NCP took only 8.55 percent in the November 1957 election, yet Recto

¹⁸ David Joel Steinberg, *The Philippines: A Singular and a Plural Place* (Oxford, 1994) p. 114.

remained very prominent on the Philippine political scene.¹⁹ The 1957 result was a disappointment to the Eisenhower government; a NSC report from 4 June 1958 stated that the Liberals were split, and that ‘many of Magsaysay’s closest associates’ sided with the smaller, less established progressive faction.²⁰ To further sour Washington’s attitude towards the Philippines at this time, US officials were disdainful of Garcia from the onset of his term. After twenty two years in the CIA, upon his retirement Joseph Burkholder Smith elucidated the Agency’s opinion of Garcia in 1976: ‘he was a Nacionalist, a Party hack ... his dark skin and, many said, his darker political past earned him the name “Black Charlie.”’²¹ A Special National Intelligence Estimate from 27 May 1958, only five months after his inaugural address, concluded that ‘Garcia has failed to demonstrate a capacity for principled and vigorous leadership,’ and that ‘Garcia has shown little willingness or ability to exercise the determined leadership necessary to carry out an effective program for the solution of the country’s economic problems.’²² As well as condemnation from the US intelligence community, notes from Ann Whitman, an Eisenhower White House assistant, which had been approved by the US President’s own initials, described ‘Garcia’s leadership as weak and hesitant.’²³ Ultimately however, Garcia had won the presidency for the next four years, and with that, according to the US National Intelligence Council, ‘there [was] a genuine and growing nationalist sentiment in the Philippines.’²⁴ It would appear that US officials found Garcia’s nationalism and his putative ‘incompetence’ to be inextricably linked in their dim view of his presidency.

Before a discussion of the implications and strains on the US-Philippines relationship during Garcia’s term in office, there are some important conclusions to be drawn about the performance of the CIA in the Philippines during the 1950s. Nick Cullather has already critiqued the mythologised Lansdale-Magsaysay partnership; consequently, understanding the effect of the CIA’s failings would have on Philippine politics after Magsaysay is significant in seeing how Agency policies impacted elsewhere in the world during, and after, regime change. The 1957 Filipino presidential race offers two broader implications for the CIA’s Cold War activities. First, Garcia from the outset was unpopular with Washington, and this was to a large degree attributable to his preoccupation with Filipino sovereignty issues. Though he himself was less

¹⁹ Project Gutenberg, The Philippines Presidential Election, 1957.

http://self.gutenberg.org/articles/Philippine_presidential_election,_1957 [Accessed August 2015].

²⁰ NSC Report, 4 June 1958, *FRUS, 1958-1960, South and Southeast Asia*, p. 860.

²¹ Smith, *Portrait of a Cold Warrior*, p. 254.

²² Special National Intelligence Estimate, 27 May 1958, Outlook for the Philippine Republic, *FRUS, 1958-1960, South and Southeast Asia*, p. 850.

²³ White House Staff Notes Number 324 (made by Ann Whitman, and seemingly approved by Eisenhower) 13 March 1958, *FRUS, 1958-1960, South and Southeast Asia*, p. 840.

²⁴ Special National Intelligence Estimate, 27 May 1958, Outlook for the Philippine Republic, *FRUS, 1958-1960, South and Southeast Asia*, p. 850.

assertive than Recto, his victory represented a further drift in the US-Philippine partnership since Magsaysay's fatal plane crash on 17 March, a chilling of relations that US officials could not arrest. Second, the CIA failed to find and back a presidential candidate they could help run a successful and staunchly pro-US campaign. Joseph Burkholder Smith and Nick Cullather agree on the ineptitude of the CIA in this area to pursue and achieve simultaneous objectives, and to have formulated an alternative vision for Filipino politics in the aftermath of Magsaysay's death: 'the station's election operation was, therefore, more an effort to make sure that Recto was soundly defeated.'²⁵ This suggests the Agency felt helpless to then watch Garcia go ahead and win the election, and that the CIA had not found anyone they felt could further carry out their objectives in the region. Cullather highlighted the CIA's ineffectiveness at this juncture: Lansdale had failed to create a group of 'Magsaysay orientated' politicians to dominate and defeat the nationalists—in fact, 'their [CIA] propaganda, election tampering, and social action' were 'long on ambition and short on results.'²⁶ As the years went on, the CIA, without a clear vision for the Philippines, would be in search of almost any leader who could replace Magsaysay, but refused to work with politicians who understood, or had evident sympathies with the roots of Filipino nationalism.

After Magsaysay, the CIA's lack of vision helped give a platform for vocal nationalism in the Philippines. Nationalism had always been the bedrock of the opinion of the Manilan free press, and these sentiments were now echoed loudly within the political ranks too. Recto was the 'leading advocate of an Asia-directed foreign diplomacy,' whilst close friend, politician, and legal practice partner, Leon Maria Guerrero III promoted the 'Asia for Asians' rhetoric. Although he made it clear this was in an Indian-Indonesian inspired, non-aligned approach, and very separate from war-time Japanese Empire propaganda, either way, this rhetoric must have been extremely inflammatory to US officials.²⁷ Whatever the Americans might have thought, however, the nationalist group remained staunchly anti-Japanese; as part of post-war reparations, Japan, as part of the Treaty of San Francisco, was directed to provide the Philippines with '\$550 million in goods and services over a 20-year period.'²⁸ To many Filipinos this was interpreted as a dangerous resuscitation of Japanese power. Indeed Recto responded with the allegation that this was 'an extension of the Japanese Greater East Asian Co-Prosperity sphere concept,' a stance that had been gaining substantial traction across the

²⁵ Smith, *Portrait of a Cold Warrior*, p. 255.

²⁶ Cullather, *Illusions of Influence*, p. 176.

²⁷ Sung Yong Kim, *United States-Philippine Relations, 1946-56* (Washington D.C., 1968) pp. 23-24.

²⁸ Memo of discussion at the 368th Meeting of the National Security Council, by S. Everett Gleason, DC, 3 June 1958, *FRUS, 1958-1960, South and Southeast Asia*, p. 856.

Philippine political board since the 1951 Treaty of San Francisco had been ratified.²⁹ The reparation issues caused a split within US ranks as well as between Philippine and American actors. President Quirino in 1951 valued Japanese damage to the islands at eighty billion dollars in reparations; furthermore he 'indicated that the Philippines people believed that their interests were being neglected at the expense of Japan.'³⁰ Yet in understanding 'the impossibility of extracting such a sum from Japan,' Quirino suggested the 'reparations bill be guaranteed by the United States!' much to the bewilderment of John Foster Dulles, amongst others. In support of his Filipino associates, MacArthur had told the US diplomats that if the US took compensation for damaged Allied property in Japan, but did not enforce other reparations, 'it would look as though the United States and England were feathering their own nest as the expense of these other countries,' and if the Philippines did not receive some compensation from Japan it 'would place the US in a morally indefensible position vis-à-vis the Philippines.'³¹

The reparation issues caused friction not just between Filipinos and US officials, but between American diplomats and the Supreme Commander for the Allied Powers. Ultimately, however, all sides realised the future of the Philippines was linked closely to the United States. Filipino nationalism did not completely exclude the US and its allies from their vision of the Philippines' future; they were fully aware some level of collaboration with these Cold War partners was essential, but the extent of CIA meddling in the islands, and across the entire region, especially throughout the Magsaysay years, had created a great resentment toward the US government. It is at this point that the US-Philippine relationship clashed over one of the biggest, and as the Cold War developed, increasingly central issue to policy making considerations: US military base facilities. Noted by historian John Price, the Korean War 'created new dynamics as the State Department aligned itself with Defense in the quest for maximum access and flexibility for military operations,' thus throughout the 1950s bases remained the key priority for US planners.³² In the Philippines, further to the mere existence of the bases, the nationalists nuanced their argument to include the purpose of, and motivation for, the military facilities. By the end of the Eisenhower presidency, and certainly throughout the 1960s, these facilities were the State Department and Pentagon's primary interest in the Philippines, and to the

²⁹ Sung, *United States-Philippine Relations, 1946-56*, p. 32.

³⁰ Memo of conversation, by the Deputy to the Consultant (Allison) at the Malacanang Palace, 12 February 1951, *FRUS, 1951, Asia and the Pacific, Part 1*, p. 881.

³¹ Memo by Mr Robert A. Fearey of the Office of Northeast Asian Affairs, 7 February 1951, *FRUS, 1951, Asia and the Pacific, Part 1*, p. 865.

³² John Price, 'A Just Peace? The 1951 San Francisco Peace Treaty in Historical Perspective,' *Japan Policy Research Institute, Working Paper, 78* (June 2001).
<http://www.jpri.org/publications/workingpapers/wp78.html> [Accessed October 2015].

nationalists they represented the biggest violation of their sovereignty.

To Recto, Guerrera, and Garcia, as well as others, it was felt that their race and colonial heritage determined an unequal treatment in international security agreements with the US, at least in comparison to arrangements within the NATO alliance. Garcia and Recto mistrusted what they saw as an ambiguous US pledge to defend the Philippines against outside aggression—contrasting this to the steadfast NATO agreement of guaranteed mutual defence and retaliation.³³ Undoubtedly it was appreciated that the US had greater and broader security concerns beyond just the Philippines, but if the US Pacific Command were to utilise their bases, especially Clarke and Subic to wage the Cold War against Asian communism, the nationalists understandably desired a reciprocal commitment to defending the Philippines. Historian Sung Yong Kim noted that by the end of 1941 the Japanese Empire had annexed Taiwan, had occupied Vietnam, and attacked Pearl Harbor—the invasion of the Philippines shortly followed.³⁴ By the late 1950s, the PRC had invaded the Korean Peninsula, seriously threatened the Republic of China in Taiwan, and were instrumental in providing aid and assistance to the Viet Minh in their defeat of the French in 1954 at Dien Bien Phu. If US military planners saw the bases as an offensive means of potentially launching bombing raids against the Asian mainland, the Philippine nationalists saw the bases as merely a provocation to invite hostility toward their nation of thirty million people, who resided outside of the safety of the bases' perimeters.³⁵

US government officials had attempted to limit the prominence of Filipino nationalists, but ultimately their prevalence in Philippine politics proved very challenging to the CIA, whom Cullather concluded 'failed to restructure Philippine politics.'³⁶ It is not surprising that Eisenhower's Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles, had Recto excluded from a conference at Baguio, 11 April 1954, which discussed possible Filipino assistance in Indochina to help the besieged French forces there. Recto had said in 1953 that much of the Philippine political elite were 'sycophants to General MacArthur, orderlies of Mr McNutt, apologists for [US Ambassador] Mr Cowen, minions of Mr Acheson.'³⁷ Whilst there may have been some truth here, such outspoken criticism served to restrict Filipino ambitions to develop as an emerging regional power. In 1951, Australia, New Zealand, and the United States signed a Security Treaty (ANZUS Treaty) which was an agreement to protect the security of the Pacific. Sung suggested here that the US wanted the Philippines for the bases, but not necessarily for their input into

³³ Cullather, *Illusions of Influence*, p. 143.

³⁴ Sung, *United States-Philippine Relations, 1946-56*, p. 45.

³⁵ National Security Council Report, 4 June 1958, *FRUS, 1958-1960, South and Southeast Asia*, p. 858.

³⁶ Cullather, *Illusions of Influence*, p. 176.

³⁷ Cullather, *Illusions of Influence*, p. 109.

regional defence and security planning.³⁸ However, for the time being Recto was an immovable presence in Philippine politics, leading the nationalist backlash in the late 1950s. The momentum was with the nationalists. Parts of the sugar lobby, which for decades had purely relied on this one agricultural product, began to diversify into manufacturing, and with less resistance to modernisation, began to sympathise with the nationalists and move away from their long-time US business partners. On 28 August 1958 Garcia announced his 'Filipino First' policy in National Economic Council Resolution 204, which 'committed government assistance to wholly or majority-owned Filipino commercial or industrial firms.'³⁹ In his Address on the State of the Nation, Garcia told the Philippine Congress on 25 January 1960 that 'economically we are still semi-colonial. This is especially true in our foreign trade. This policy is therefore designed to regain economic independence. It is a national effort to the end that Filipinos obtain major and dominant participation in their own national economy:' using the term 'semi-colonial' would have irked officials in Washington, especially because the American officials perceived their relationship with the Philippines as exceptionalist and benevolent. Considering the long history the two countries shared, Garcia was in full anti-American rhetorical flow.⁴⁰

Further to the damaging political rhetoric of Recto and Garcia, the US military only contributed to the unpopularity of the American presence. Deaths of Filipino citizens at the hands of US military personnel caused continual outbursts of anti-American nationalism. Sung recounts a fisherman being shot by a US sentry in 1955, yet the case was outside Philippine jurisdiction—Filipinos were dying but the perpetrators could not be held accountable in a Philippine court.⁴¹ The issue of civilian deaths at the hands of US personnel continued to be the source of tension and, consequently, front page news. Later in 1964, Ambassador Blair highlighted how the press reported such shootings in a way that fanned the flames: 'local civilians mowed down,' and that 'scores have been wantonly killed.'⁴² Such shootings were not rare. It was common for desperate Filipinos to break onto the bases and steal US provisions, and often these trespassers were shot. This was conveyed by I. P. Soliongco in the *Manila Chronicle*, 24 December 1964, as 'the killing of thirty Filipinos' and how these had been the 'compensation the US need[ed] for the loss of electrical materials'—in other words, Soliongco accused US authorities of believing it was reasonable to kill thieves as retribution, whilst the G.I. who shot

³⁸ Sung, *United States-Philippine Relations, 1946-56*, p. 46.

³⁹ Antoinette R. Raquiza, *State Structure, Policy Formation, and Economic Development in Southeast Asia: The Political Economy of Thailand and the Philippines* (Oxon, 2012), p. 335.

⁴⁰ State of the Nation Address, President Garcia, 1960.

<http://www.gov.ph/1960/01/25/carlos-p-garcia-third-state-of-the-nation-address-january-25-1960/> [Accessed August 2015].

⁴¹ Sung, *United States-Philippine Relations, 1946-56*, p. 130.

⁴² William Blair to Dean Rusk, 24 December 1964, NARA, RG 59, Philippines 1964-66, Box 1671, NARA.

the fisherman was not convicted. Soliongco connected the impoverishment experienced by Filipinos, who turned to theft, and were shot in 'cold blood,' to the gunmen who were largely responsible for the continued economic difficulties in the Philippines in the first place.⁴³ As in Korea, Vietnam, and elsewhere, the violence surrounding US bases and extraterritorial rights were far too reminiscent of formal colonialism for comfort.

Furthermore, there was a well-established and widely held opinion in the Manila press that the bases contributed very little to the socio-economic development of the Philippine nation. Filipinos believed that the bases were for US interests, not their own. Labor Attaché to the Embassy Anthony Luchek, reported to the State Department a leaflet produced by Manilan students who partook in a peace ride to Clark Field on 16 August 1964 that stated:

These military bases serve basically to protect the economic interests and power of the United States ... they guarantee the preservation of alien economic domination and serve to discourage any vigorous attempt at achieving economic independence through nationalisation ... in short, these foreign military bases are intended to preserve our colonial economy.⁴⁴

It was clear to the US embassy in Manila and the State Department in Washington that the bases were a key source of resentment and growing nationalism—the US government entered into negotiations with the Philippine Government. However, despite some base agreement amendments, ultimately the bases, and their essential purpose, remained largely undiluted and uncompromised. For example, the US had been creating and expanding military bases since the turn of the twentieth century, and many such facilities had become redundant. In 1965, as a tokenistic attempt to appease the nationalists, seventeen bases were handed over to the Philippine government, as well as 10,000 hectares of Clark, but even then US military capabilities remained unaffected.⁴⁵ Throughout the 1950s and 1960s Clark Airfield and Subic Naval base were the centrepieces of US Pacific military power, and to Eisenhower's State Department, as well to the incoming Democratic Kennedy Government—they were prioritised to the neglect of other Philippine issues.⁴⁶ So, while tensions increased in the US-Philippines relationship between 1957 and 1961, the centrality of militarisation to US overseas planning, at the neglect of economic development, persisted. A young Senator Ferdinand Marcos could not have failed to notice this orientation of priorities: US Cold War policy encouraged, if not

⁴³ I. P. Soliongco, 'Seriously Speaking, "The American Racists and the Bases Issue,"' *Manila Chronicle*, 24 December 1964, Files of Harry McPherson, Box 13, *LBJL*.

⁴⁴ Anthony Luchek to Department of State, 31 August 1964, NARA, RG59, Philippines, 1964-1966, Box 2588, *NARA*.

⁴⁵ Philippines Embassy to Secretary of State, 4 December 1965, RG 59, Philippines, 1964-1966, Box 1672, *NARA*.

⁴⁶ Cullather, *Illusions of Influence*, pp. 162-163.

implicitly accepted, the possibility of authoritarian governments if they were conducive to US military bases and strategy. Garcia, Recto, the free media, and protest movements all paled in comparison to the importance to US global Cold War strategic planning. Meanwhile, the bases continued to be a key issue of friction, and a very visible reminder of the United States' colonial legacy in the Philippines.

On top of accusations of nationalism, Garcia was accused of corruption, not an uncommon feature of post-war Philippine political life. Without the benefit of Magsaysay's public relations support—in particular Edward Lansdale—Garcia's reputation in Washington suffered immensely. Then again, it was doomed at the start by Garcia's nationalist views. The day after Magsaysay's death, the Secretary of State's Special Assistant for Intelligence W. Parker Armstrong wrote to Dulles that Garcia was 'inept,' and incapable of 'acting as the bulwark of a forthright pro-American foreign policy,' nor will he 'withstand the appeals of chauvinistic nationalism,' especially from the 'arch critic of the United States ... Senator Claro Recto.'⁴⁷ By 27 May of the following year, a Special National Intelligence Estimate claimed 'Garcia has failed to demonstrate a capacity for principled and vigorous leadership.'⁴⁸ Days later on 3 June, a memo of a NSC discussion read: 'Basically, said Mr Dulles, the Philippine management was rotten,' and 'has already given us many evidences that the next few years will be difficult.'⁴⁹ US-Garcia relations never got off the ground, US planners sought to lay the blame for the continued problems in the Philippines in these criticisms. The positive perceptions US policy makers had of their partnership with Magsaysay contributed to the subsequent disillusionment with Garcia—they were comparing the new president with the one Lansdale had so lauded and praised. The Garcia presidency is evidence of the impact of the legacy of the Magsaysay illusion, as well as US policy makers' hostility to any president who embraced Filipino nationalism. In the early 1960s a policy paper produced by an interagency group adopted a very positive tone to Magsaysay, but the following year a National Survey checked these claims. The following section of this chapter deals with these two documents, and how US perceptions of the Philippines, and especially the legacy of Magsaysay, were reinterpreted in the early 1960s. The disillusionment that followed was another step down the winding path to Marcos.

⁴⁷ Armstrong to Dulles, 18 March 1957, *FRUS, South East Asia 1955-1957*, p. 713.

⁴⁸ Special National Intelligence Estimate, 27 May 1958, *FRUS, South East Asia 1955-1957*, p. 850.

⁴⁹ Memo of discussion at the 368th Meeting of the National Security Council, 3 June 1958, *FRUS, South East Asia 1955-1957*, p. 851.

Breaking the Spell: The (Re)assessment of Policy after Magsaysay.

Garcia had represented a failure of, and defeat for, US policy in the Philippines. Yet it was still believed by the policy and intelligence community that Garcia was only a one term president following the successful Magsaysay years, and these errors were not to be repeated. In other words, despite the dissatisfaction and disappointment cast upon Garcia, there was still a substantive legacy, manufactured by the CIA, to fall back on. Despite the time, money, and man power expended during the Magsaysay era, the CIA and State Department had failed to create a winning formula. Though Garcia was castigated by these agencies for his more nationalistic, anti-American presidency, it is possible that his proposed policies to support Filipino industry and resist foreign domination of the domestic market was of more benefit to the Philippines than the pro-US Magsaysay policies had been. The adulation of Magsaysay was based on flawed views, represented by comments made in an interagency study entitled US Overseas Internal Defense Policy. This study came accompanied by Memorandum 182, a covering letter by McGeorge Bundy that stated the study had presidential approval was henceforth to be considered policy. An analysis of it will demonstrate how blinkered US policy makers were at this time, until the National Survey in 1963 presented the statistics and conclusions that shed light on the actual conditions in the Philippines and on the legacy of Magsaysay. Grasping the manufactured 'victories' of the 1950s is important because it would have been useful to discover how US foreign policy makers had failed in the Philippines—a country in which the US had such influence and dominance—and how this could spell disaster in other, more tumultuous Cold War arenas.

Against the backdrop of the Magsaysay illusion, the US Overseas Internal Defense Policy was released. Its main purpose was to identify the problem of agrarian poverty and the potentially destabilising effects it could have. Magsaysay, however, was lauded as an example of a great success in this area. In fact, the Policy document included comments celebrating Ramon Magsaysay's anti-communist campaigns and economic reforms, which were supported by the US government. It is a document that suggested that the highest level of policymaking bodies in the United States had realised the immediate and urgent importance of meeting the demands of the rural, agrarian population in countries vulnerable to internal subversion, and that overt force would only largely exacerbate the situation. The Policy paper referred to the success in the Philippines of overcoming the threat of internal instability, and thus was an example to current and future administrations of how to react to similar threats. The belief that the Magsaysay campaign against the Hukbalahap had been a success was based on poor analysis, but in 1962 the US State Department was full of praise of the Filipino leader:

The Philippines campaign against the Huks, led by Ramon Magsaysay, is a model of countering insurgency, and winning back the allegiance of the domestic popular base, thus destroying the foundations of guerrilla support. Magsaysay's strategy of combining the use of force with reform measures demonstrates what can be done. It is a pattern of action which may be applicable, with local modifications as necessary, to other vulnerable less developed countries facing the reality or threat of communist directed insurgency.⁵⁰

There were three main reasons why the US Overseas Internal Defense Policy promoted and lauded the Magsaysay campaign. First, it revealed the degree to which global Cold War views, with all of their concomitant flaws and presuppositions, had suffused even the analyses of allied countries. Second, it was linked to a policy of addressing unrest with economic solutions, and not necessarily brute force. Third, the Policy paper wished to head off criticism in the socialist world of US foreign policy by living up to its World War Two rhetoric of freedom and democracy, as well as overcoming its colonial past.

First, the US Overseas Internal Defense Policy was global in scope. The document contained 'policy guidance ... to defend the free world' in the aftermath of a succession of victories for leftist subversion in unstable societies—Algeria, Czechoslovakia, Cuba, North Vietnam, and China are used as evidence that the 'breakdown of internal security' result in the 'rebels of today' becoming 'the governments of tomorrow.'⁵¹ However, the document was nuanced in its understanding of the fundamental causes of subversion: they were not necessarily communist themselves, but internal unrest was susceptible to communist guidance. The document claimed the North Vietnam August Revolution (1945) was a 'nationalist revolution' and the Cuban Revolution (1953-1959) was a 'popular anti-dictatorial revolution,' neither inherently communist. The August Revolution began in 1945 when the Viet Minh instigated an uprising against French colonial rule; at this time, the Viet Minh's objective was primarily independence, not to install communism. Though Fidel Castro came to power in 1959, his party only became the Cuban Communist Party in 1965. The document revealed an understanding among policymakers that the causes underpinning subversion of foreign regimes friendly to the United States were diverse and had their own individual and varied characteristics. Also, this document demonstrated US political and military leaders had some appreciation of how to formulate policy, considering specific requirements of different threats around the world.

⁵⁰ U.S. Overseas Internal Defense Policy, *DNSA*.

⁵¹ U.S. Overseas Internal Defense Policy, *DNSA*.

Second, the US Overseas Internal Defense Policy reflected a broader fusion of militarism and political transformation in an era of intense civil conflicts. The United States, in backing Magsaysay, was trying to forge a new direction for Philippine politics: the paper made clear the importance of the 'US to remain in the background,' and to avoid 'charges of intervention and colonialism'—the Magsaysay-Lansdale partnership appeared to embody this policy, but the document had the proviso that 'the use of force to overthrow certain types of government is not always contrary to US interests. US bases in the islands would serve, if necessary, to enforce this notion if all other avenues failed, but Magsaysay's election and presidency represented the CIA's ability to covertly influence affairs in their favour. The Magsaysay presidency and the anti-Huk campaign were inextricably linked to an emerging perception of communism in the world. According to the Memo, the 'one generation' victory of the CCP had developed a doctrine which was being applied in Vietnam and Cuba, even an internal insurgency in Algeria had defeated the French, indeed the Policy further stated these sort of forces had succeeded against 'the established authority,' exposing the 'vulnerabilities of free societies.'⁵² It was symbolic of a new awareness by US policy makers that the type of threats to their interests by way of internal subversion throughout the world in Africa, Asia, and Latin America were socio-economic, which exposed these countries to the rise of politically subversive alternatives, but the movements themselves were not necessarily inherently communist. The global significance attached to the Philippines and the Magsaysay experiment is reflected in the fact that this strategy, based upon 'understanding the nature of the threat and combatting it with properly balanced action,' was a blueprint for success in defeating subversive political movements.⁵³ One of the positive aspects of Lansdale's counter-insurgency model was his recognition that the conflict in Vietnam was first and foremost a civil war, based primarily on internal conflicts in the country, which is acknowledged in the document. Nevertheless, the views espoused by Lansdale, and the 1962 Policy paper, were inherently militaristic in their proposed applications. Though James McAllister highlighted that Lansdale was stifled by enemies within the US military and diplomatic corps during his second spell, 1965-1968, in Vietnam, when he had control and influence in the Philippines many aspects of his policies revolved around increasingly militarised law enforcement agencies.⁵⁴

Third, the Philippines, a formal US colony for half a century, was important for international prestige to demonstrate that their political legacy in the Philippines was capable of defeating a rebellion, and reforming the areas that had caused the unrest. As the Policy document put it,

⁵² U.S. Overseas Internal Defense Policy, *DNSA*.

⁵³ U.S. Overseas Internal Defense Policy, *DNSA*; Kolko, *Confronting the Third World*, p. 131.

⁵⁴ James McAllister, 'The Lost Revolution: Edward Lansdale and the American Defeat in Vietnam 1964–1968,' *Small Wars & Insurgencies*, 14:2 (2003) pp. 1-26.

the US-Philippine relationship had 'sixty-five years of close association, and shared sacrifices of World War II and the Korean War.'⁵⁵ In the Cold War context, US officials insisted that the Philippines was a 'free world power,' standing politically independent, but strategically and ideologically allied with the United States.⁵⁶ If American policy failed in an independent Philippines, it could fail anywhere, and this would be a serious indictment of US Cold War policy and propaganda. Thus the image of the Philippines in world opinion became the litmus test of US policy in the newly independent and developing world. Ultimately US policy would fail, but in the early Marcos years a great effort was expended at every level of the US government, including that of President Johnson himself to build an image of the friendly, workable, and successful US-Philippines post-colonial relationship.

Finally, if Magsaysay's influence over the situation in the Philippines was itself an 'illusion,' then it was one that the 1962 Policy helped to create. US strategists had some understanding of the nature of the threat to internal security, but the execution and analysis of the outcome were deeply flawed. First, the Hukbalahap had not been 'destroyed,' though Magsaysay made strides in defeating the guerrilla insurgency and weakening their support base; the 'foundations' for future similar insurrections certainly had not been eradicated, nor had the hard-core base of the Hukbalahap movement. Second, the 'reform measures' only addressed the issues superficially—not offering substantive results. For example the relocation policy designed by the National Resettlement and Rehabilitation Administration (NARRA) was more like penal transportation, primarily to remove dissident groups out of the agriculturally fertile but politically volatile Central Luzon area into uncultivated jungle in the far south of the Philippines; areas predominantly of Islamic faith were essentially politically and culturally walled off from the northern, Catholic regions.⁵⁷ Policies such as this one were more an attempt to disperse troublesome groups from Central Luzon, using divide and rule tactics by relocating them to areas of little priority or interest to the Philippines government which were geographically distant from Manila. Thus, even if Filipino presidents like Magsaysay had managed to annihilate the Hukbalahap entirely, conditions arguably would have produced similar armed revolts in the future because the fundamental issues were still not addressed, but simply removed from sight. Six years after the death of Magsaysay, a document was released that went some way to exposing these oversights. The statistical evidence produced for the 1963 National Intelligence Survey suggested the program under Magsaysay had not been successful—thus future troubles in the Philippines had to be expected, and thus the US government had suffered a policy and propaganda defeat.

⁵⁵ National Policy Paper on the Republic of the Philippines, 1 December 1965, *DNSA*.

⁵⁶ William Blair to Department of State, 14 December 1965, *DNSA*.

⁵⁷ U.S. Overseas Internal Defense Policy, *DNSA*.

The biggest challenge of the Magsaysay presidency was the fight against the Hukbalahap Rebellion, and the re-emergence of this movement in the 1960s is demonstrative of a US-Philippine policy defeat. The alleged success Magsaysay had in defeating this agrarian-based revolt became the core of his legacy; this 'illusion' became central to America's Cold War foreign policies. Indeed, in 1967, then head of the Military Assistance Command in Vietnam, William Westmoreland, noted in respect to the Vietnam War, that 'the pacification program is still going slowly, because in many ways South Vietnam had not yet learned the lessons Filipinos learned under Magsaysay.' This cable does not elucidate what these lessons were, but either way, whatever Magsaysay did in the Philippines, it was significantly less destructive than the policies being pursued in Vietnam.⁵⁸ Yet the belief that Magsaysay had inaugurated a thoroughly successful formula for the Philippines was largely discredited in the 1963 Survey. Though it eschewed direct criticism, the Survey's statistics suggested that Magsaysay did not live up to expectations when he swept to the Presidency in 1953 with 68.9 percent of the vote.⁵⁹ The Huks had not been defeated because the basis of their power was based upon the continuing difficulties of Filipino farmers. Nevertheless, to the State Department's credit, they had identified in the Survey the issues that were most pertinent and threatening to stability, responding, in their view, with appropriate and effective measures. When the Survey disproved the claims in the US Overseas Internal Defense Policy, the Magsaysay campaign began to lose credence as a successful model for dealing with internal subversive threats in vulnerable Cold War base areas.

The 1963 Survey suggested that Magsaysay and his US government backers had not devised a sufficient reform-based policy to appease the hostile Central Luzon population. The socio-economic and political situation of the post-independence Philippines further declined after Magsaysay's death. It must be said that the US Overseas Internal Defense Policy had been a miscalculation: the 1962 policy directive had been successful in identifying what was the threat to stability, and it expressed an understanding that repression was not a long term or particularly effective strategy—'sheer repression of political unrest seldom does more than buy time. There must be healthy economic growth, human liberties, representative government.'⁶⁰ The document focused on reform for, and appeasement of, poor farmers, who were the potentially unstable demographic group, arguing that this would be a more

⁵⁸ William Blair to Department of State, 'Report of Conversation between Goldberg and Marcos,' 6 March 1967, *DNSA*.

⁵⁹ Project Gutenberg, The Philippines Presidential Election, 1953.

http://self.gutenberg.org/articles/Philippine_presidential_election,_1953 [Accessed August 2015]

⁶⁰ U.S. Overseas Internal Defense Policy, *DNSA*.

sustainable policy. Nevertheless, while it identified the most serious problems to Filipino security, it claimed achievements where there had been none. The 1963 Survey shows that the US failed to make any real impact on the socio-economic problems that were the foundations of the 1940s Hukbalahap Rebellion. Indeed, the continuation and major resurgence of the Huks, as well as agrarian discontent more broadly, remained the 'leading social and political problem' in the Philippines, even after Magsaysay.⁶¹ This was not just a matter of the consolidation of the committed Huk guerrillas, but also the mass base of Huk sympathisers had been continually harbouring deep resentment because of 'the failure of the government to do anything for the farmers.'⁶² That statement of 'failure,' from 1966, was not made by a Huk rebel or a communist agent, but by the US Secretary of Defense, Robert McNamara, who had come to the same disappointing conclusion as the authors of the 1963 Survey.

The Survey portrayed both a dangerous and disappointing picture for the US and Philippine governments, particularly in the countryside. To begin with, Filipino farm wages 'during the 1955 to 1960 period not only failed to keep pace with cost-of-living increases, but actually declined.' This was not a situation likely to placate the demographic that had consistently revolted throughout centuries of socio-economic inequality. The offerings of American consumer capitalism broadly appealed to Filipinos, but the inability of this group to afford the items that were so evidently abundant in elite residential areas 'revealed that the distribution of income ... was becoming worse rather than better.'⁶³ The divide in wealth was not the only damaging aspect of the Survey's statistics. Daily caloric intake per capita in 1955 was 1,820 calories with only a small increase to 1,950 calories by 1960. In 1960, a relatively comparable post-colonial Asian country like Ceylon had a caloric intake of 2,150, in the Latin American region the average was 2,393—the US was 3,120.⁶⁴ As the Survey itself noted, 'Philippine consumption levels [did] not come close to meeting Philippine nutritional standards.' The inability to attain a greater amount of calories is reflected by the poverty that riddled the countryside: the average rural family was 5.6 people, with an average income of 989 pesos. Had these Filipinos earned the average US income at the time, it would have been approximately 87,000 pesos. The agricultural economy was not developed enough to provide sufficient harvests for feeding the family or funding production improvements. The harvests of these families were primarily kept for subsistence—as much as seventy five percent. Too small an amount was left to earn sufficient pesos by selling the harvest for cash to invest in

⁶¹ National Intelligence Survey: Philippines, *DNSA*.

⁶² Robert McNamara to Dean Rusk, 'Proposal for US Funding for Engineering Construction Battalions for the Philippines,' 11 April 1966, *DNSA*.

⁶³ National Intelligence Survey: Philippines, *DNSA*.

⁶⁴ World Health Organisation, Global and Regional Food Consumption Patterns and Trends (http://www.who.int/nutrition/topics/3_foodconsumption/en/index.html) [Accessed August 2015].

equipment or fertiliser—perpetuating the same extreme poverty season after season.⁶⁵ An inability for farmers to earn enough money by selling their crop was compounded by an exceptionally high birth rate. This created a situation where even subsistence farming was inadequate to feed the family, much less go to market; consequently, there was not enough money to buy food or improve land productivity, and the socio-economic hardship of the countryside caused widespread migration to urban areas. This in turn resulted in a rapid overcrowding of cities and housing programs were inadequate to meet the demands; dwellings per one thousand people between 1948 and 1968 declined from 175 to 154, meaning in 1948 there was on average 5.7 people per dwelling, whereas in 1968 there were 6.4 people.⁶⁶ US intelligence services thus saw cascading problems among the poorest Filipinos, and this had occurred during the close collaboration between Magsaysay and his US associates.

Furthermore, the figures in the Philippines with whom US officials most closely consorted represented an upper class target for lower class resentment, which the Hukbalahap or indeed any left-wing or nationalist political movement could easily harness. Rural farmers were unable to sufficiently feed and house their families whilst the ‘luxurious, often ostentatious, mansions and apartments with facilities and amenities equal to those of the well-to-do in the United States/’ reflected an accelerated disparity between the rich and poor.⁶⁷ Secretary McNamara’s comment that the Philippine Government failed ‘to do anything for the farmer’ shows that even policy makers as high as Secretary of Defense acknowledged that the Huk movement might sustain a mass support base. In fact, in the period after the US and the Philippine Government had claimed that the Hukbalahap movement had been defeated, the Huks estimated the number of their supporters to be around 30,000 and growing by the middle of the 1960s.⁶⁸ Ultimately things since 1898 had not fundamentally improved for Filipinos, even though the Philippines ‘was a country that had been under direct American rule for nearly fifty years. In the same period the United States had advanced tremendously, and had attained the highest standard of living in history.’⁶⁹ Post-war ‘liberation’ had only succeeded in producing more inequality and social unrest and, in the eyes of many Filipinos, the Americans were closely associated with the domestic political leaders who enabled this situation.

⁶⁵ National Intelligence Survey: Philippines, *DNSA*.

⁶⁶ National Intelligence Survey: Philippines, *DNSA*.

⁶⁷ National Intelligence Survey: Philippines, *DNSA*.

⁶⁸ Robert McNamara to Dean Rusk, ‘Proposal for US Funding for Engineering Construction Battalions for the Philippines,’ 11 April 1966, *DNSA*.

⁶⁹ William J. Pomeroy, *The Forest: A Personal Record of the Huk Guerrilla Struggle in the Philippines* (Berlin, 1963) p. 25.

The Magsaysay illusion was unravelling and the internal Philippines situation was deteriorating—low class Filipinos still lived in poverty and were not receiving adequate assistance to help them develop out of this position. For them, this was the only concern—to feed and house the family—the Philippines struggle was isolated from international allies.⁷⁰ For the US government, the Philippines was only part of the global Cold War, but it remained essential that the country maintained its image as a pro-US, democratic, developing country while remaining stable enough to support rear base areas. The US could not afford to lose the Philippines to rebellion or revolt—especially not a subversive left wing movement; such an event might embolden similar movements elsewhere and threaten containment strategies in East and Southeast Asia. The situation in the Philippines was as dire as it was elsewhere: three years prior to the Survey, in Japan, massive riots erupted around the passage of the 1960 US-Japan Security Treaty, which enabled nuclear weapons to secretly pass through American bases in Okinawa.⁷¹ Two years after the Survey, in 1965, President Lyndon B. Johnson would deploy regular army troops into Vietnam following the Gulf of Tonkin Incident. Independence (also meaning close affiliation to the US) had to be maintained, possibly even at the cost of the Philippines' democracy.

Conclusion: Reflections and Nationalism: Broken Promises and Domestic Failures in the Philippines.

'I don't really hate the United States, you know,' Senator Claro Recto once felt compelled to say. Nevertheless, because of the tunnel vision often caused by Cold War discourse, Recto, along with his fellow nationalists was attacked and shunned by US authorities dealing with the Philippines.⁷² Sadly, there could have been substantial collaboration between the US and the Philippine nationalists; Garcia and Recto fully understood that the future of the Philippines was inextricably linked to the US, they just desired greater equality in the relationship. Further hampering Garcia's presidency was the long lasting, and ill-informed legacy of Magsaysay. Cullather has demonstrated that Magsaysay presented a very pro-American exterior and, regardless of any possible ulterior motives, served as an excellent propaganda tool to show the developing world the benefits of close association with the United States over other, possibly communist or non-aligned, partners. This chapter has presented the documentary evidence of how the Magsaysay legacy unravelled, to an extent, during the Macapagal presidency,

⁷⁰ William J. Pomeroy, *Guerrilla Warfare* (New York, 1968), p. 241.

⁷¹ Jean-Marie Bouissou, *Japan: The Burden of Success* (London, 2002), pp. 89-93; Thomas R. H. Havens, *Fire across the Sea: The Vietnam War and Japan, 1965-1975* (Princeton, 1987), pp. 7-13.

⁷² Smith, *Portrait of a Cold Warrior*, p. 281.

significantly contributing to this undeveloped field of reassessing the Magsaysay legacy, by focusing on the consequent impact on US-Philippine policy in the 1960s. Not until Garcia had left the presidency did US policy agencies come to realise the failings of the Magsaysay era. It was this that largely contributed to the drift in the partnership during the 1957-1961 period.

This chapter has chronologically moved through the Cold War history of the Philippines from the death of Magsaysay in 1957, to the reassessment of his legacy in 1963. First, Interjected is an analysis of the Garcia presidency, not just because it is integral to the post-war Philippine narrative, but because it was during this term that nationalism came to the fore in prominent political and business spheres, encouraged by a frequently anti-American print media. Second, the 1962 Policy paper is demonstrative of how perceiving conditions through a Cold War lens had the potential to be dangerously misleading.⁷³ Third, the Magsaysay legacy was checked by the 1963 National Intelligence Survey, but only to a degree.⁷⁴ Ultimately, Garcia fared far worse than his predecessor, and was roundly rejected by the US foreign policy community; the clearly nationalistic turn that defined his term ran contrary to CIA, Defence, and State policy objectives. Magsaysay had represented a high in US-Philippines relations, and Garcia a low. Garcia bore the brunt of unpopularity in US policy circles, possibly as obvious a target of frustration that the Magsaysay era had fallen short of expectations. What this episode demonstrates is that there was poor character judgement and slow analysis regards Magsaysay, as well as a realisation that nationalist groups had the capacity to attain high office. The fact that US officials' were again duped by Marcos, who after early adulation, emerged as a nationalist, is a clear example that the State Department and CIA, as well as President Johnson and his inner circle, had not learnt the lessons of the Magsaysay and Garcia period. The ramifications of this would become all too evident in the early 1970s as Marcos moved towards dictatorship.

Marcos's ascendancy was built not only on the failures precipitated by the ghost of Magsaysay that haunted the Garcia years, but also the impossible demands made on the subsequent Macapagal presidency during troubling developments in Indonesia and Vietnam. This made possible Marcos's first term as President, who would go on to be the first Filipino to be re-elected in that office. Hoping, but ultimately failing, to find a working system during the Macapagal presidency, the Philippines were forced onto the stage of international conflicts which demanded an operational foreign policy, especially with regards to Vietnam. This occurred while the Philippines had not, under the watchful eye of their American partners,

⁷³ U.S. Overseas Internal Defense Policy, *DNSA*.

⁷⁴ National Intelligence Survey: Philippines, *DNSA*.

found a successful leadership model that simultaneously satisfied US Cold War objectives and addressed the endemic socio-economic problems in the islands. The longer a solution eluded the archipelago, the more conducive the situation would become to extreme and authoritarian solutions. The fact that the US supported dictatorships throughout the 1960s and 1970s was ultimately an indictment of their alleged commitment to democracy and freedom across the developing world—and no more so than in their very own developmental project of the Philippines.⁷⁵ The US-Philippine partnership at the end of the 1950s essentially had to be reset, it had reached a nadir: an embassy telegram to the State Department stated ‘relations fell to post-war low in early 1959.’⁷⁶ So, on the eve of the 1960s, the Kennedy and Johnson decade, a period defined by an increased proactivity in US foreign policy, Diosdado Macapagal represented American hopes and expectations as the leader of their key Southeast Asian ally.

⁷⁵ Latham, ‘The Cold War in the Third World, 1963-1975.’

⁷⁶ Telegram from the Embassy in the Philippines to the Department of State, 24 December 1960, *FRUS Southeast Asia, 1958-1960*, p. 973.

4.

The Philippines after Magsaysay: Domestic Realities and Cold War Perceptions, 1957-1965.

20 January 1961, and the inauguration of President John Fitzgerald Kennedy ushered a new era for US foreign policy, defined by greater state led initiative to counter communism across the Cold War world. This change also inaugurated a new relationship between the White House and Malacanang; newly elected President Diosdado Macapagal was friendly towards Washington, unlike Carlos Garcia, who held office 1957-1961. Dwight Eisenhower, Kennedy's predecessor, had supported a clandestine operations driven foreign policy, and had highlighted Laos as the 'cork in the bottle' in Southeast Asia, and the key to the prevention of the collapse of states to communism: the 'domino theory.'¹ Kennedy quickly re-orientated US foreign policy to prioritise Vietnam as the epicentre of the Cold War in Southeast Asia, and as Logevall reminds us, over Kennedy's short presidency, he increased American feet on the ground in Vietnam from 1,000 to 16,000 troops; Kennedy expanded and boasted 'about American power.'² The expansion and development of US foreign policy was into the developing world, and in many ways defined Kennedy's presidency: 'he understood the yearnings of the underdeveloped world.'³ However, there was a lessening of rigidity towards the end of the Eisenhower era; it had been the 1956 Suez Crisis, according to Stephen Ambrose, which had 'made Eisenhower almost painfully aware of the importance of the Third World.' Yet Eisenhower for the remainder of his presidency 'could not convince the people ... Republican Party ... Secretary of the Treasury,' nor an intractable Congress.⁴ Eisenhower said at the 192nd meeting of the National Security Council, 6 April 1954, that 'even if we tried such a course [unilateral intervention in Vietnam], we would have to take it to Congress and fight for it like dogs, with very little hope of success,'⁵ and he would not intervene without Congressional approval.⁶ This all changed in 1961; 'Kennedy, unlike Eisenhower had packed his

¹ Notes of Conversation Between President-Elect Kennedy and President Eisenhower, 19 January 1961, 1961-1963, Volume XXIV, Laos Crisis, Document 7, *FRUS*.

² Fredrik Logevall, 'Vietnam and the Question of What Might Have Been,' in Mark J. White, *Kennedy: The New Frontier Revisited* (New York), pp. 19-62, p. 19.

³ Richard J. Walton, *Cold War and Counterrevolution: The Foreign Policy of John F. Kennedy* (New York, 1972), p. 4.

⁴ Stephen E. Ambrose, *Eisenhower: The President: Volume 2, 1952-1966* (London, 1984), pp. 376-377; Michael A. Guhin, *John Foster Dulles: A Statesman and his Times* (London, 1972), Stephen Kinzer, *The Brothers: John Foster Dulles, Allen Dulles, and their Secret World War* (New York, 2013).

⁵ Memorandum of Discussion at the 192nd Meeting of the National Security Council, 6 April 1954, 1952-1954 Volume XIII, Part 1, Indochina, Document 705, *FRUS*.

⁶ Richard Immerman, 'Between the Unattainable and the Unacceptable: Eisenhower and Dien Bien Phu,' in Richard A. Melanson and David Mayers (eds.) *Re-evaluating Eisenhower: American Foreign Policy in the 1950s* (Urbana, 1987), pp. 135-136.

administration with individuals who had special expertise concerning the developing countries.⁷ New Frontier programs such as the Alliance for Progress, the Peace Corps, and increasing military and technical advisors overseas exuded the confidence and charisma that Kennedy himself brought to the White House.⁸ In return for his 'New Frontier' mind set, Kennedy expected his Cold War allies to be equally personable, co-operative, and internationally minded. Despite the rise of detente after the Cuban Missile Crisis, Kennedy was upping the stakes in Southeast Asia, and the role of the Philippines, vis-a-vis the Vietnam Cold War hotspot, in many ways, came to define the one term Presidency of Diosdado Macapagal, 1961-1965. In many ways, Macapagal was expected to participate in the regional Cold War, and he in fact did pledge to send Filipino troops to Vietnam, even though he never delivered. Though the troops to Vietnam issue dominated Kennedy's, and his successor Lyndon B. Johnson's discussion on the Philippines, there were also other important issues that eroded Macapagal's reputation in Washington.

Macapagal inherited many problems that had remained unsolved in the Philippines, primarily socio-economic issues that had their origins in the colonial era, and Macapagal failed to adequately address them since independence. US-Philippines relations had been defined in the 1950s by Washington's partnership with Magsaysay, which had been an alliance perceived as pro-American and directed by US agents, most notably Edward Lansdale. However, Cullather has since made clear that the US only had an 'illusion of influence,' due to the manipulative nature of Magsaysay, and Magsaysay's own agency. So, persistent domestic Philippine problems that the Magsaysay-Lansdale partnership had not resolved were now compounded with expectations that Macapagal take on a new internationalist outlook in his presidency, which caused tensions within the Manila-Washington relationship. Whilst willing to commit Filipino troops to Vietnam, Macapagal also sought limited reform policies to address the domestic crises that had hampered the development of the Philippines: stagnating agricultural economy, lack of industrialisation, and widespread poverty. Whilst Macapagal was supportive of sending Philippine troops to Vietnam, which won him support in Washington, the Filipino president's position on domestic issues were the cause of disquiet amongst elite US policy circles.

⁷ James A. Bill, *George Ball: Behind the Scenes of US Foreign Policy* (London, 1997) p. 139.

⁸ Anthony Hartley, 'John Kennedy's Foreign Policy,' *Foreign Policy*, 4 (Autumn, 1971) pp. 77-87; Campbell Craig, 'Kennedy's Foreign International Legacy, Fifty Years On,' *International Affairs*, 89.6 (2013) pp. 1367-1378; Richard N. Cooper, 'Economic aspects of the Cold War, 1962-1975' in *Cambridge History of the Cold War, Volume II, Crises and Detente*, (eds.) Odd Arne Westad and Melvyn P. Leffler (Cambridge, 2010) pp. 44-64, Kimber Charles Pearce, *Rostow, Kennedy, and the Rhetoric of Foreign Policy* (Michigan, 2001) pp. 87-116.

The outlook of US foreign policy in regards to the Philippines lacked clarity during the Macapagal era. In order to understand why this was so, it is important to first acknowledge the 1960s marked the start of a new era of US Cold War strategy. However, the primary issue that caused difficulties between the US-Philippine relationship during the first half of the 1960s was the shifting role that the US government expected the Philippines to play as part of their global Cold War strategy. At this juncture, the role of the Philippines was changing, and in retrospect it seems clear the US State Department did not have a coherent vision for the Philippines within their foreign policy strategy. Ultimately, extraneous influence came to dictate the US-Philippine relationship, at least to a substantial degree, once the US involvement in the Vietnam conflict began to gain momentum. Successive US governments had failed to appreciate the need for socio-economic reform in the Philippines, and when the US committed to Vietnam, needing all staunchly pro-American assistance they could muster, any Philippine reform agenda in Washington was further downgraded. By the 1960s, the legacy of the US colonialism, as well the post-war partnership with the Philippines, had contributed towards an impoverished and underdeveloped archipelago. At the same time, and especially by the end of Macapagal's term and the inauguration of Lyndon Johnson, following Kennedy's assassination, the Philippines was forced to move from a ring-fenced post-colonial developing nation, to a global Cold War ideological, political, and military ally in the American war against communism. The confusion this caused, and inability to reconcile the emerging duality of the Philippines role in their partnership with the US contributed to the fall of Macapagal, the rise of Marcos, and the eventual declaration of dictatorship.

The shift of US foreign policy has been well documented in western Cold War historiography. Michael Latham identified the Johnson administration after his 1964 electoral victory, as the start of an increased willingness to support hard line governments in the developing world.⁹ Considering the challenges to Washington by Cuba, Vietnam, and Indonesia, desiring more hard-line leaders in friendly states such as the Philippines is an understandable, if short sighted, approach to policy formation in that context. These other geographic regions have been covered with ample scholarship, and yet the Philippines remain largely understudied. Such threats to US influence, 'Washington got the sense of having to hold the line,'¹⁰ an embattled White House and State Department subsequently created a space for the likes of Suharto in Indonesia, Mobutu in Congo, extensive interference in Latin America, and even a

⁹ Michael E. Latham, 'The Cold War in the Third World, 1963-1975,' p. 260.

¹⁰ Westad, *Global Cold War*, pp. 158-160.

military junta in Greece that came to power in the mid-1960s.¹¹ Cold War revisionists and twenty first century foreign policy scholars alike have delivered critical accounts of US overseas actions, without lending adequate attention to the Philippines. As part of this Philippine narrative, Macapagal occupied a pivotal era as he presided over a difficult period: on the one hand he was willing to work with Washington in Vietnam (without delivering any actual results), whilst on the other he simultaneously pursued some nationalist policies. These policies concerned US policy makers for going too far, whilst agitating the Manilan press for not being assertive enough. Thus, Macapagal had allies in Washington because of the promise of troops, which turned the Manilan nationalist press against him. Had Macapagal's American allies supported his reformist policies, he may have won re-election, and have been in a position to then gain Congressional approval for troop commitment and lead a long term pro-American era of Philippine foreign policy. Instead, US policy makers, including Secretary of State Rusk, wanted both troops and a reduction in nationalist policies. Unwilling to compromise, and see the potential benefits of reform and long term development in the Philippines possibly cost Macapagal re-election in 1965, and the potential long term ally Johnson needed in Asia.

Succeeding Macapagal, Ferdinand Marcos did not declare dictatorial rule until 1972, but his election in 1965, in such a crucial Cold War country, means the transitional period from Macapagal to Marcos requires investigation. Gerald Sussman stated that the presidency 'of President Diosdado Macapagal (1961-1965), [is] a period that has never been adequately explained or understood. Nor has there ever been published a coherent analysis of Philippine foreign policy decision-making in general.'¹² Macapagal has suffered the fate of serving as president between the era of the two most infamous post-war Filipino figures—Magsaysay and Marcos, and thus the literature is underdeveloped. There are, however, US government documents that elucidate the US-Macapagal relationship, from which emanate two key themes. First, that Macapagal was willing to commit troops to Vietnam, but was not willing to bypass the 'uncooperative [Philippine] Congress' that stood in opposition. Macapagal could have gained enough political capital had he achieved a second term, but his unpopularity in the press, as well as 'resistance from powerful vested interests and poor public support,' hampered his re-election campaign. The second feature of these documents, and what

¹¹ Angel Rabasa and John Haseman, *The Military and Democracy in Indonesia: Challenges, Politics, and Power* (Santa Monica, 2002); Edward Aspinall, *Opposing Suharto: Compromise, Resistance, and Regime Change in Indonesia* (Stanford, 2005); Barbara Sutton, Sandra Morgen, and Julie Novkov, *Security Disarmed: Critical Perspectives on Gender, Race, and Militarization* (London, 2008); James Edward Miller, *The United States and the Making of Modern Greece: History and Power, 1950-1974* (North Carolina, 2009); Stephen G. Rabe, *The Killing Zone: The United States Wages Cold War in Latin America* (Oxford, 2012).

¹² Gerald Sussman, 'Macapagal, The Sabah Claim and Maphilindo: The Politics of Penetration,' *Journal of Contemporary Asia*, 13:2 (1983) pp. 210-228, p. 210.

contributed to displeasing Washington, as well as angering the Filipino press, was his limited, but potentially troubling to US interests at least, nationalist policies. Though Vietnam took centre stage in President Johnson, Secretary of State Dean Rusk, and National Security Council member Robert W. Komer's discussion on the Philippines, conversation memoranda did clearly highlight 'his [Macapagal's] nationalism,'¹³ the 'threat to US investment from the new [Filipino] Retail Trade Nationalization Law,'¹⁴ and the 'continuing threat to long-established United States business operations in the Philippines' 'valued at hundreds of millions of dollars.'¹⁵ In addition, reports produced by Officer-in-Charge of Philippine Affairs Robert Ballantyne contributed to an unsettled atmosphere surrounding Macapagal and his relationship with Washington.¹⁶

Illusions of Failure? Macapagal and the Filipino Mass Media.

Diosdado Macapagal's role, not just as the Philippine president, but as the representative of the Philippines within the special relationship with the United States, meant that he had to both satisfy his international allies as well as his domestic critics. His predecessor, Ramon Magsaysay, had shown the importance and relevance of image consciousness, setting a precedent Macapagal failed to achieve. Macapagal's relationship with both the Philippine press and the US government suggests that he failed to meet this dual role; in other words, Macapagal's presidency was caught between leading an autonomous and independent Philippines, whilst also maintaining relations with Washington. This section addresses the latter years of Macapagal's presidency, and the difficulties he had in ultimately failing to achieve Filipino troop commitment to Vietnam. Though Macapagal remained supportive of Johnson's Many Flags campaign and was willing to send Filipinos, bankrolled by the US, into an American war, his domestic policies and nationalism remained cause for concern in Washington.¹⁷ Though the Philippine leader endured sustained criticism in the Manila media, it

¹³ Memorandum from Secretary of State Rusk to President Johnson, 2 October 1964, 1964–1968 Volume XXVI, Indonesia; Malaysia-Singapore; Philippines, Document 296, *FRUS*.

¹⁴ Memorandum from Robert W. Komer of the National Security Council Staff to President Johnson, 5 October 1964, 1964–1968, Volume XXVI, Indonesia; Malaysia-Singapore; Philippines, Document 299, *FRUS*.

¹⁵ Memo Rusk to Johnson, 2 October 1964, Document 296, *FRUS*.

¹⁶ Robert J. Ballantyne, 'Report of Philippines Visit,' 8 January 1965, RG 59, Philippines 1964-1966, Box 1, *NARA*; Robert J. Ballantyne, 'Report from UN 19th General Assembly,' December 1964, RG 59, Philippines 1964-1966, Box 1, *NARA*.

¹⁷ Memorandum from Robert W. Komer of the National Security Council Staff to President Johnson, 5 October 1964, 1964–1968, Volume XXVI, Indonesia; Malaysia-Singapore; Philippines, Document 299, *FRUS*; Memorandum from Secretary of State Rusk to President Johnson, 2 October, 1964, 1964–1968 Volume XXVI, Indonesia; Malaysia-Singapore; Philippines, Document 296, *FRUS*; Blackburn, *Mercenaries and Lyndon Johnson's "More Flags."*

was the nationalist tendencies in Macapagal's domestic policies that dissatisfied US policy makers, thus Macapagal was caught in the crossfire of an anti-American media, and demanding US foreign policy objectives. Because Macapagal faced criticism both from US officials and the Philippine press, it is important to assess the position of the Manila media to appreciate the domestic atmosphere surrounding the presidency, before analysing perceptions in Washington, and how the Filipino leader failed to balance a popular domestic agenda with meeting the expectations of his US allies. Detailing how Macapagal was trapped between these two powerful and influential groups is central to understanding his failure to win a second term, and map out the development of US policy towards, and with, the Philippines into the Marcos era. To achieve this, the following section focuses on the work of several key Filipino journalists, including I. P. Soliongco, Jose C. Balein, and Maximo V. Soliven, but first and most prominently, J. V. Cruz.

Most damaging to Macapagal was the polemic waged against him and the United States in late March 1965 by *Manila Times* journalist J. V. Cruz. Spread over three editorials encapsulating the growing anti-Americanism within the Filipino educated class, Cruz was known for 'demolishing any public figure that differed from him;' indeed Marcos when president, to avoid his 'devastating prose,' made Cruz the ambassador to Britain in order to 'deflect J. V.'s pen.'¹⁸ Cruz highlighted the fact that Macapagal's image was tarnished by accusations concerning his own behaviour as president, but also the involvement of the United States in Filipino domestic affairs. The US government was still committed to retaining a strong military and political presence in the Philippines, but any difficulties in that relationship had historically been resolved by seeking a change of incumbent in Malacanang; if the US-Macapagal relationship was widely criticised by the press, as history had shown, it would be the Filipino half of the partnership that would be recast.¹⁹ This can be partly explained by the fact that public life in the Philippines was reliant on the development of positive images through mass media. Ramon Magsaysay achieved this with good results during his presidency, aided by employing Cruz as his press secretary. Later Ferdinand Marcos, who sent Cruz to Britain on diplomatic duty, proved a skilful operator in his first two years in office, but Macapagal lacked the character or tact to satisfy the outspoken Philippine press.²⁰ Although other voices chimed in, as we shall see, Cruz was the *primus inter pares* of the anti-Macapagal press corps.

¹⁸ John H. Esterline and Mae H. Esterline, *Innocents Abroad: How we won the Cold War* (Oxford, 1997) p. 264.

¹⁹ J. V. Cruz Obituary, 18 May 2011. <http://jamilledesma.com/?p=287> [Accessed August 2015].

²⁰ James Hamilton-Paterson, *America's Boy: The Marcoses and the Philippines* (New York, 1998) p. 97.

An inevitable duty of an incumbent president was to deal with the media and the attacks upon the US-Philippines relationship, and this was simply beyond the skills of Macapagal. Indeed after a month long trip to the Philippines, Officer-in-Charge of Philippine Affairs from the Office of Southwest Pacific Affairs in the Department of State, Robert J. Ballantyne, reported 'Macapagal ... as ineffective [and] lacking character.'²¹ Whether Macapagal was 'lacking in character' or not, Filipino reporters certainly were successful in framing the conflict between the US and the Philippines as his personal failure. Reporters in the Philippines understood the role that the archipelago was supposed to play in support of US Cold War strategy in Asia, and they asserted that Macapagal was a 'helpless pawn' in this project.²² In the 1960s, as conflict in Vietnam was escalating, many Filipinos saw US policies as based in a kind of race hatred for Asian people. Addressing the issue of American military bases, radical *Chronicle* columnist and University of the Philippines lecturer I. P. Soliongco wrote that 'propaganda smoke emitted by the USIS ... has blinded the Filipinos to the tremendous reality that the Americans ... are fundamentally racist in thought and action.'²³ Other writers addressed the US-Philippines relationship with a greater attention to the colonial history that they shared. On 27 March 1965, J. V. Cruz wrote that 'the Philippines ... is a classic example of the total impotence to which puppet nations inevitably and pathetically reduce themselves,' and that they become 'helpless pawns in a power struggle whose development and outcome they cannot influence, but in whose flames they will surely burn and perish.'²⁴ Despite this partisan attack, Cruz critically developed his argument on the post-independence US-Philippine relationship and how, by early 1965, it had failed to transform the Philippines successfully from a colonial and dependent, to an autonomous and independent nation. Without explicitly referring to the 1946 Bell Trade Act and the 1947 Military Base Agreement, it was easy for Filipino readers to make a connection between what Cruz wrote and unequal legislation. The Philippine political situation, according to Cruz, had not developed since 1946 and can largely explain the rising tide of nationalism during the Garcia and Macapagal presidency. The United States had not helped the Philippines to achieve development to any substantive degree nor was Macapagal able to address this alleged exploitation of the Philippines. Furthermore, Cruz broadened his attack over all three editorials, emphasising the flippant and often abusive attitude of the US Cold War rhetoric toward Southeast Asian countries. On 21 March Cruz wrote that 'it is a favourite assumption of US policy that the rest of the world, including the Philippines, is simply

²¹ Robert J. Ballantyne, 'Report of Philippines Visit,' 8 January 1965, RG 59, Philippines 1964-1966, Box 1, NARA.

²² J. V. Cruz, *the Manila Times*, 27 March 1965, WHCF, CO 235, Philippines, Box 63, LBJL.

²³ Esterline and Esterline, *Innocents Abroad*, p. 265; I. P. Soliongco, 'Seriously Speaking, the American Racists and Base Issue,' *Manila Chronicle*, 24/12/1964, LBJL.

²⁴ J. V. Cruz, *the Manila Times*, 27/3/1965, WHCF, CO 235, Philippines, Box 63, LBJL.

a bunch of retarded nations which wouldn't know what to do next.' To underline his point, Cruz quoted the Hawaiian branch of the International Longshore and Warehouse Union:

... as a nation [the US] we find ourselves hated in Asia and Africa, feared and distrusted in Latin America ... our motives are suspected in Europe. We are trying to pick up the pieces of the fallen colonial empires in order to continue the exploitation of them through puppet dictators, masquerading them under the name of independence.²⁵

Specifically for the Philippines, Cruz envisioned the paternalistic arm of the colonial period developing into geostrategic requirements for the projection of US power in Asia, which was dressed up in 'semantic gobbledegook' that celebrated protecting and promoting freedom and democracy.²⁶ Macapagal was evidently not managing the US-Philippine relationship well: instead of the press reporting a strong bilateral partnership that was waging a concerted effort against poverty at home and communism across Asia, the media, nearly two decades after independence, were still levelling broadsides, such as the country's president being nothing more than a 'helpless pawn.'²⁷ US ambassadorial staff in the Philippines saw nationalist reporters like Cruz as a suspicious group that 'provided for Communist subversion an opportunity ... these media are already penetrated to some extent.'²⁸ US officials, including First Secretary of the Embassy Richard E. Usher, interpreted this journalism as a threat because, as in Vietnam, they regularly conflated anti-colonial nationalism and international communism.

Other Filipino reporters also connected disparaging US evaluations of their country with Macapagal's personal failures; in some cases, they were responding specifically to reports by US officials. Both the *Manila Chronicle* columnist Jose C. Balein, and the *Evening News* journalist Luis D. Beltran reported on Assistant Secretary of State for East Asian and Pacific Affairs William Bundy's statement to a congressional subcommittee, having returned from the Philippines in early summer 1965. Balein wrote that Bundy 'paints a dismal picture of the present administration' and that 'the Philippines has not lived up to earlier hopes and bears watching.' To further emphasise his point, Balein concluded that 'little progress has been made on the basic social problems the country faces ... Mr. Macapagal has neglected the presidency.'²⁹ Piling on the opprobrium, Maximo Soliven, in the *Manila Bulletin*, contributed a

²⁵ J. V. Cruz, *the Manila Times*, 21/3/1965, WHCF, CO 235, Philippines, Box 63, *LBJL*.

²⁶ J. V. Cruz, *the Manila Times*, 27/3/1965, WHCF, CO 235, Philippines, Box 63, *LBJL*.

²⁷ J. V. Cruz, *the Manila Times*, 27/3/1965, WHCF, CO 235, Philippines, Box 63, *LBJL*.

²⁸ Richard E. Usher to State Department, 8 June 1965, RG 59, Philippines 1964-1966, Box 2590, *NARA*.

²⁹ Jose C. Balein, *Manila Chronicle*, 25 June 1965, RG 59, Philippines 1964-1966, Box 2589, *NARA*.

comment that resonated with the wide-spread resignation concerning Macapagal's administration:

It did not need any keen perception on the part of the American official to notice that little progress has been made on the basic social problems the country faces, such as land tenure, unemployment, and even distribution of wealth ... it is very highly doubtful whether too many economists will quarrel with the American official about the economic state of the nation.³⁰

Bundy had been in the CIA, a foreign affairs advisor to Kennedy, and was a key strategist in the Vietnam War. His word undoubtedly carried weight, and this statement to a congressional subcommittee was a direct address to the US legislature—but it was also a message that Filipino opponents of Macapagal decided to embrace for their own purposes.³¹

Macapagal was thus under tremendous pressure from the Filipino mass media, but he also failed to get Filipino troops into Vietnam. On the one hand Ramon Magsaysay, for years, had enjoyed prolonged rapturous applause from Washington and embassy officials, as well as support from Filipinos. Whilst on the other, nationalist Filipinos saw Macapagal as unable to resolve domestic economic and social problems, but also as a servant of US interests. Regarding the latter, though Macapagal was largely subordinate to US aims, he did initiate some limited attacks on US influence in the Philippine economy, which garnered the attention of both Secretary of State Rusk and President Johnson. Though Vietnam was the primary concern of the US leadership, legislation during Macapagal's term, Komer noted to Johnson that 'we want to complain about [the] threat to US investment from the new'³² 'Retail Trade Nationalization Law,' posed a 'threat' to 'hundreds of millions of dollars' to 'American investment.' In addition to this risk to American investments, Rusk and Johnson were also concerned about financing Philippine commitment to Vietnam, noting that the 'Philippine budget will not cover increased costs' and how Macapagal 'will expect the United States to provide the necessary financing.'³³ Furthermore, Rusk expected that the Filipino leader use this discussion to 'request for significant increase in our [US] MAP aid.'³⁴ In a more general summary of his presidency, Macapagal lacked the proactivity the was increasingly demanded by the US; with the Vietnam

³⁰ Maximo V. Soliven, *Manila Bulletin*, 25 June 1965, RG 59, Philippines 1964-1966, Box 2589, NARA.

³¹ J. V. Cruz, *the Manila Times*, 27 March 1965, WHCF, CO 235, Philippines, Box 63, LBJL.

³² Memorandum from Robert Komer to President Johnson, 5 October, 1964, 1964-1968 Volume XXVI, Indonesia; Malaysia-Singapore; Philippines, Document 299, *FRUS*.

³³ Memorandum from Secretary of State Rusk to President Johnson, 2 October 1964, 1964-1968 Volume XXVI, Indonesia; Malaysia-Singapore; Philippines, Document 296, *FRUS*.

³⁴ Memorandum from Secretary of State Rusk to President Johnson, 3 October 1964, 1964-1968 Volume XXVI, Indonesia; Malaysia-Singapore; Philippines, Document 296, *FRUS*.

crisis escalating, Macapagal had to be seen as initiating regional leadership against communism, and not simply following the United States lead. To US policy makers, proactivity and independent initiative, within the discourse of US foreign policy strategy, was the cornerstone of autonomous but closely allied countries, possessing a shared Cold War vision. Macapagal ultimately lacked the grandiose of stature Magsaysay and Marcos had demonstrated in the early years of his coming presidency.

Despite the economic concerns Rusk and Johnson had with Macapagal, the Filipino president was too close to the US, or at least conciliatory, for the likes of the Philippine press. Trying to placate both powerful groups, Macapagal failed to wholly satisfy the demands of either the Manilan press and US policy makers, which ultimately contributed to his decline. On the one hand, the Retail Trade Nationalization Law represented an overt, yet cumbersome, combination of nationalism and anti-American sentiment that were both on the rise in the Philippines. On the other, the setting of some pro-Hukbalahap and Communist Party case law precedents in the Supreme Court highlighted that Macapagal was not in control of either Congress or the courts. Though the Philippine political system was democratic and the legal system removed from the political sphere, it was the Philippine president's role to make the country a pro-US, anti-communist stalwart and thus the weight of responsibility rested, ultimately, on his shoulders. Roxas proved his worth to the US by forcing through the Bell Trade Act, Magsaysay had waged a brutal campaign against the Hukbalahap, and Marcos would turn out to be the most powerful of all Philippines presidents, but Macapagal failed to deliver troops to Vietnam, despite support for the notion, and thus had failed to meet the criteria of what the US government desired in a Filipino president. First, the passing of legislation that was damaging to US interests evidently caused further erosion of Macapagal's standing in Washington. Second, and with far greater and broader implications, was his stance on communism. This is not to suggest that Macapagal was not anti-communist, but his handling of events, involving subversive factions was lenient, if not at times favourable to agents who had at some point actively fought US interests in the Philippines, and the Cold War at large.

Having begun in the late 1950s, by the 1960s, the Philippine Congress began responding to growing nationalist demands for greater domestic control over the country's economy. John Kennedy reacted multilaterally, pressuring the International Monetary Fund to present Macapagal with a set of precise conditions, in order the buttress US economic control over the islands through non-militarised means. As part of a three hundred million dollar 'stabilisation fund,' the Philippines in return would have their currency devalued, import controls and exchange licensing abolished, incentives to foreign capital extended, and domestic credit

restricted.³⁵ American observers continued to pay close attention to this trend under Macapagal, but it had really begun during the Garcia years. The 1954 Retail Trade Nationalisation Law, enforced by Garcia and reasserted by Macapagal, was the first step Congress took in this direction. According to US officials, the law ...

... obliged all firms to market their products at retail through wholly US or Philippine owned companies. Retail trade is defined so broadly as to include many transaction considered 'wholesale' in the commerce of this country [Philippines]. As no American firm which sells stock openly to the public can guarantee it is 100% US owned, the net effect of this legislation is that American firms in the Philippines engaged in trade will have to sell through intermediaries, probably Philippine-controlled, rather than distribute their own products.³⁶

Essentially the law was designed to restrict the freedom of US companies in the Philippines, which would have an enormous impact on roughly half a billion dollars of US-owned assets in the Philippines, held by major companies such as Esso, Caltex, Goodyear, Proctor & Gamble, and Del Monte.³⁷ The US industrial lobby opposed this move; on balance it represented a Philippines that was conducting its own policy in an attempt to establish conditions favourable to themselves and reversing a history of neo-colonialism such as the 1946 Bell Trade Act. This law, however, was delivered as part of double-punch that included increased sugar exports to the US market. By 1964, the sugar quota of Philippine exports to the US was fixed, guaranteeing the Philippines a market regardless of global economic forces. After the establishment of Fidel Castro's government in Cuba, and the cessation of Cuban-US trade, the Philippine sugar quota had been further increased, filling the Cuba void in US imports and making the Philippines by far the 'largest supplier of the US market.' Despite this favourable situation, Commercial Attaché Joseph Rands wrote to the State Department that the Philippine government requested an even 'larger quota.'³⁸ This issue, clearly of some importance, was raised by Rusk in a memo to Johnson, advising the US president to be 'noncommittal' when Macapagal asks 'for a larger sugar quota.'³⁹ Philippine businesses thus simultaneously moved to nationalise retail at home, and demand the US purchase more of Filipino products abroad. This request, on top of the Retail Trade Nationalisation Law, was considered a 'concern' and as 'politically difficult' by the State Department, and in the words of NSC staffer Robert Komer to Johnson, 'jeopardizes long-established US businesses in [the] Philippines.' The US government was already bank-rolling Philippine military efforts against domestic internal subversion, the

³⁵ Robin Broad, *Unequal Alliance: The World Bank, The International Monetary Fund, and the Philippines* (Oxford 1998) p. 33.

³⁶ Joseph Rands to State Department, 12 April 1964, RG 59, Philippines, 1964-1966, Box 2590, NARA.

³⁷ R. C. Porter III to Paul Kattenburg, 30 September 1965, RG 59, Philippines 1964-1966, Box 2589, NARA.

³⁸ Rands to State Department, 12 April 1964, NARA.

³⁹ Memorandum from Secretary of State Rusk to President Johnson, 2 October, 1964, 1964-1968 Volume XXVI, Indonesia; Malaysia-Singapore; Philippines, Document 296, FRUS.

Indonesia threat, and the proposed Philippine assistance in Vietnam; the discussion of Macapagal's economic policies between Komer, Rusk, and President Johnson demonstrates that war in Vietnam was not the only issue on the table.

Even though Macapagal did have some nationalist tendencies, he was caught between powerful, competing domestic interest groups that he struggled to deal with. On the one hand, the burgeoning industrial nationalists were working to force out US control of the Philippine economy while, on the other hand, the agricultural oligarchs were attempting to secure an even greater reliance on the American import market. Historically, the US had backed the plantation owners as these groups were dominant, and these traditional pre-war and early post-war socio-political and economic elites supported American power in the region, as well as supplying a US market demand for cheap sugar. The emergence, however, of a new conversation in the Philippine economic landscape led to the erosion of the sugar-barons' influence. The irreversible rise of industry as means of generating jobs and raising living standards was supported by successive Filipino presidents because it was the most realistic means of lifting the Philippines out of the poverty that was allegedly exposing the Philippines to communist infiltration. No doubt US government officials desired to reconcile the need to help the Philippines develop whilst protecting US economic interests, but the request for a sugar quota increase and the implementation of the Retail Law represented, for the Americans, a Filipino leadership finding its post-independence identity, amidst the pressing demands from Washington to participate in an escalating Asian war.

The second damaging incident that damaged Macapagal's standing occurred in July 1964. Though the political and legal spheres are separate in the Philippine system, to State Department officials, the Philippine president was responsible for making sure the country aligned with US policies and aims. As well as supporting legislation that was damaging to US interests, Macapagal presided over the Supreme Court's decision of Communist Party member and labour leader Amado V. Hernandez, which caused resentment among State Department officials. Hernandez had been charged with rebellion and conspiracy, but the Court reinterpreted the wording of the 1957 Anti-Subversion Law to 'narrow the basis for conviction where "only certain types of action may be considered criminal."' For example, propaganda was specifically excluded—it was not a criminal offence to act, work, or produce propaganda for the cause of subversion. To add insult to injury, the Court did not just reinterpret the Anti-Subversion Law but claimed it may be 'unconstitutional,' thus if there was to be another large scale insurgency, 'the Court's ruling might hamper any sweeping campaign against Communists and Communists sympathisers.' Additionally, the Court concluded that the 1957 law, which

outlawed the Philippine Communist Party, decided that 'the act of being in the Communist Party was not sufficient to render the member liable of rebellion or of conspiracy to commit rebellion.' The immediate impact of this decision was that the Communist Party leader, Jesus Lava, who was in custody, now could appeal his detention on the grounds that the Anti-Subversion Law was unconstitutional.⁴⁰ A soft approach to the most destabilising force in the history of the Republic of the Philippines had a damaging effect on the credibility of Macapagal abroad; the US was on the eve of a massive materiel and financial commitment to defeating communism in Vietnam, whilst their closest Southeast Asian ally and socio-political project was simultaneously softening its legal stance towards communism.

Though the Philippine Government still largely relied on the US for its national security, the bilateral relationship had developed significantly from America's paternalistic embrace of the colonial era. By the 1960s the Philippines had to present itself as an autonomous functionary of foreign policy that aligned with US Cold War ideology. Analysing the various crises in the first half of the 1960s, such as in Indonesia and Vietnam, demonstrates the difficulties Macapagal faced, and why the Philippines were so important to US foreign policy strategy. Mapping the position of the Philippines in these 1960s Cold War crises suggests the rise of a more authoritarian leaning leader such as Marcos could attain such prominence in such a limited period of time. In the first half of the decade the Philippines were not simply a reactionary member of a network of US allies part of an escalating Vietnamese conflict, but they were involved directly with a crisis that was poised to overshadow Vietnam in scale. With a population of approximately 100 million, and led by the increasingly erratic Sukarno, Indonesia threatened to embroil the Philippines, and consequently their ally the United States, into yet another Southeast Asian conflict.

Security and the Regional Cold War: the Philippines Emerge Out of America's Shadow.

US Ambassador William McCormick Blair alerted the US Pacific Command to what he perceived as Indonesia's 'limited capability to mount an overt attack on southern Phil[ipines].' Furthermore, and possibly of more concern was that Blair estimated that the 'US would have primary responsibility for repelling external attacks.'⁴¹ This potentially additional demand and pressure on US military resources, only weeks after Johnson had committed US ground troops in Vietnam, placed the emphasis on the Philippine government to take a hard line approach to

⁴⁰ Keith Guthrie to State Department, 29 July 1964, RG 59, Philippines 1964-1966, Box 2589, NARA.

⁴¹ William Blair to William Rusk, 20 May 1965, RG 59, Philippines 1964-1966, Box 1669, NARA.

such threats as this alleged Indonesian crisis. By mid-1965 the Filipino presidential election was well underway, and this presented Marcos with a stage to promote his position of a reinvigoration of the islands' assertive position in the Asian community, which increased the pressure on Macapagal to materialise his support for the Vietnam War.

The concerns over Indonesia were part of a developing regional situation, the 1963-1966 Indonesian-Malaysia Confrontation, which turned into a crisis of Philippine national defence against external agitators. What made this a key issue for US planners was that it involved the weakest spot of the archipelago's external defence system: the south. Militarily, politically, and economically, Luzon Island, the northern most part of the archipelago was the centre of both Philippine and American defence strategy; Clark and Subic military base, the nation's capital, and the location of the Hukbalahap rebellion, had essentially made the Luzon region almost the sole focus of joint Philippine-US efforts. The attention the Indonesian issue received in official communication, and indeed the strategic analysis of the situation, shows that Indonesia in the early 1960s posed a substantial threat to the Philippines—the reaction and implication of the Indonesian threat can substantially contribute to our understanding of US-Philippine relations. The erratic behaviour of the Sukarno government in Indonesia in the early to mid-1960s affected the Philippines and Macapagal's presidency in three key ways. First, Sukarno posed a threat to stability and balance of power in Southeast Asia; the Philippines, being not just a physical but ideological American stronghold had to react to the regional crisis that culminated in the Indonesian-Malaysian Confrontation. Thus a brief additional contextual note is necessary to sketch the details prior to the Indonesian-Philippine crisis. Second, the increase of regional tensions and perceived threat of Sukarno-instigated subversion to regional security alerted the Philippine press, the Macapagal government, and US Pacific Command. It was the soft underbelly of the southern Philippine islands, and its susceptibility to infiltration, which highlighted weakness in the US Pacific defence perimeter system. Third, the Indonesian threat resulted in the manifestation of some substantive policy considerations. Aid programs to fund new units and a readjustment of the focus of Philippine coastal and external defence systems both suggest the perceived seriousness of Indonesia, and a change in strategic thinking in US circles.⁴²

It is appropriate to begin by addressing the context of this episode in order to understand what it exposed in the US-Philippine Cold War relationship. Once again the post-colonial and Cold

⁴² Timothy P. Maga, 'The New Frontier vs. Guided Democracy: JFK, Sukarno, and Indonesia, 1961-1963,' *Presidential Studies Quarterly*, 20:1, *Leadership and Crisis Management* (Winter 1990), pp. 91-102; Baskara T. Wardaya, 'Diplomacy and Cultural Understanding: Learning from US Policy Toward Indonesia under Sukarno,' *International Journal*, 67:4, *Canada after 9/11* (Autumn 2012) pp. 1051-1061.

War discourses interlinked, and the Philippines was drawn into a regional crisis that evolved from Southeast Asia's colonial past. The creation of Malaysia (involving the unification of Malaya, Singapore, Sabah, and Sarawak) was opposed by Sukarno on the grounds that it was serving to strengthen and broaden British influence in the region. The Philippine government took issue with the claim over Sabah, citing the historic links to the Sulu islands in the extreme south of the country. The issue was one of national pride to Filipinos, and therefore was not of great concern to the United States, but the exploitation of the tensions between the US-backed Philippines, and British-backed Malay states by Sukarno was of great concern to CINCPAC and the State Department. The disputed territory of Dutch New Guinea, a colonial possession of the Netherlands in 1962 was already subject to covert paramilitary subterfuge directed by Sukarno. Though the move failed, the possibility of such activity being deployed in the Philippines to undermine the pro-US government, and by association, the American position in Southeast Asia altogether, was a serious concern. Furthermore, in the Philippines, the concern for security was not just an issue of defence against Indonesian infiltration, but an issue of such agitation potentially being an inspiration to the Hukbalahap, which also brought into the question the fundamental US-Philippine post-independence relationship. Thus, the concern of subversive Indonesian infiltration into the Philippines had implications far more serious for the US-Philippine relationship than the Indonesia-Malaysia Confrontation (1963-1966) alone. In terms of external forces entering the Philippines, Indonesia posed the greatest threat to Philippine security. Indonesian infiltration into the Philippines was envisaged to come through the southern island group of Mindanao and more specifically, the island of Sulu, on the south-western most tip of the archipelago; to withstand either covert or overt action, US officials insisted that the defence facilities in this region 'needed to be bolstered.'⁴³ The fall of Sukarno in 1965 and Suharto's conclusion of hostilities with Malaysia in 1966 essentially ended the Indonesian threat to the Philippines, but it nevertheless exposed three significant issues in the US-Philippine relationship; 1) the inadequacy of the Philippines security forces, 2) the inability of the economy to maintain an independent Philippine system of defence from internal and external threats, and 3) the growing strength of Philippine nationalism.

During the Cold War, United States planners and strategists took maintaining stability in the Pacific region very seriously, which can be seen in the correspondence of Ambassador William Blair with Secretary of State Dean Rusk in Washington. First, 'the limited funds of the Armed Forces of the Philippines' meant there was a requirement for US Military Aid Program money, and JUSMAG direction in leading a counter-insurgency initiative. A CINCPAC study (20 May 1965) suggested that an additional six 'civic action groups' in addition to the existing two in the

⁴³ William Blair to Dean Rusk, 31 October 1964, RG 59, Philippines 1964-1966, Box 1669, NARA.

field, would 'provide instruction on various community projects to barrio leaders in the immediate surrounding area of the two centres (Mindanao and Sulu).'⁴⁴ An increase of three hundred percent in these civic action groups highlights both the insufficiency of the existing system, but also the extent to which the Philippine government had limited control over the predominantly Islamic and detached far south of the Philippines. Further to the developmental civic groups, CINCPAC recommended 'equipping a special forces group of 1000 men ... such a force, highly trained and motivated, would be exceptionally effective in combating Indonesian infiltration in Mindanao.'⁴⁵ Not just the co-ordination of a 'counter-insurgency ... and civic action mission,' but the scale of the suggestions, when in the context of the formal Armed Forces of the Philippines, which numbered roughly 15,000, was a substantial commitment of resources. Furthermore, there had been press reports from as early as October 1964 of a Johnson-Macapagal discussion on the potential establishment of a joint US-Philippine military base in the south.⁴⁶ The US military presence, secured under the Military Base Agreement of 1947, was primarily clustered in the northeast of the archipelago, facing the Asian mainland. Had a base been established in the south, the only logical target for its projection of power was Indonesia, thus suggesting an explanation as to why a base never materialised after Sukarno's overthrow at the hands of anti-communist hardliner Suharto. These suggestions made by the US Pacific Command had been, through Blair, sent to the offices of both the Secretary of State and Defense, showing a willingness to consider a major reorientation of US resources in the Philippines in order to ensure its stability during the Sukarno years.

The second key fact exposed by this episode is that of the country's failing finances. Cynical US officials believed that the Philippine government simply expected large amounts of US aid, rather than genuinely requiring it for necessary projects, but there is no doubt the Philippine economy was insufficient to support its population, let alone fund the expansion of major defence projects. The CINCPAC report concluded that 'if serious effort is to be made to enhance Philippine southern defence, the US must be prepared to underwrite the operation,' and that 'the AFP are not maximising efficiency due to limited funds, and any further equipment of battalions will have to be funded through MAP.' This study was compiled in May 1965, and the Philippine Department of National Defense budget in that year was 300 million pesos—their forecast for 1966 was thirty million less at 270 million pesos. The Philippine government was cutting the budget amidst these proposed expansions and international crises, and thus the US had 'to be prepared to shoulder the major portion of additional peso

⁴⁴ Blair to Rusk, 20 May 1965, *NARA*.

⁴⁵ Blair to Rusk, 20 May 1965, *NARA*.

⁴⁶ William Blair to William Rusk, 30 October 1964, RG 59, Philippines 1964-1966, Box 1669, *NARA*.

costs as well as additional hardware.⁴⁷ The recommended cost for the one thousand man special force was only 670,000 US dollars for equipment, and a subsequent 1.4 million US dollars in annual maintenance costs. Such paltry costs, in comparison to the expenses incurred in Korea or Vietnam, seem a small price to pay considering the CINCPAC study analysed the situation as ‘a sharp turn to the left in Indonesia with its current alignment with Chicoms [Chinese Communists] and large number of illegal Indon[esian] residents in the Southern Philippines.’ Thus, the US Pacific Command identified the southern region of the Philippines as the physical portal for the infiltration of the United States’ enemies into their key Southeast Asian and developing world ally.⁴⁸ However, it would appear the Vietnam blinkers had descended, and instead of realising the potential threat and comparatively cheap solution, the Philippine government for now, had to utilise their existing resources. Considering the overall US investment in the Philippines, US planners were making a statement by withholding these funds, demonstrating there was a limits and expectations attached to their spending in the Philippines, especially in light of the escalation in Indochina.

The highlighted Indonesian threat to Philippine security was perceived in elite US policy circles as genuinely concerning. At this time the paranoia of the domino theory essentially made anywhere in Southeast Asia apparently susceptible to infiltration, subversion, and communist takeover. Thus, the refusal of the US to financially support this project can be interpreted in two conjunctive ways. Primarily, as a statement of loss of confidence in Macapagal’s ability to run his country’s finances or maintain a hard-line position against subversive threats in the Philippines. In October 1964 Rusk wrote Johnson that ‘his [Macapagal’s] nationalism has led him to follow less constructive line’ regarding Indonesia. Though in the same letter Rusk notes that the Filipino President had ‘shown considerably more responsibility’ in this area in 1964 compared to the first half of his term, the same memo criticised Macapagal over the Retail Trade Nationalisation Law, and heavily infers US expectation that the Philippines should increase their ‘budgetary support for its armed forces.’⁴⁹ More peripheral, but worth noting, head of CINCPAC, Admiral Ulysses Simpson Grant Sharp Jr., a proponent of massive and immediate military commitment in Southeast Asia, clashed with the Johnson administration, McNamara in particular, who took a more ‘careful escalatory’ approach to the war.⁵⁰ Thus rejecting the Filipino counter-insurgency task force could also be viewed through the lens of civil-military politics—that the Philippines could find an alternative solution to their southern

⁴⁷ Blair to Rusk, 20 May 1965, NARA.

⁴⁸ Blair to Rusk, 20 May 1965, NARA.

⁴⁹ Memo Rusk to Johnson, 2 October, 1964, Document 296, FRUS.

⁵⁰ Frank Costigliola, ‘US Foreign Policy from Kennedy to Johnson,’ in Odd Arne Westad and Melvyn P. Leffler (eds.) *Cambridge History of the Cold War. Volume II* (Cambridge, 2010) pp. 112-133, p. 116.

security at a time when the eyes of the Johnson administration were fixed on Vietnam.⁵¹

Third, the complexity of the US-Philippine relationship was evident here: Filipino leaders, at least on some level, were manipulating inherent Philippine security fears to serve the larger US Cold War strategy, and solve their domestic problems at the same time. There is no doubt that the US Pacific Command understood the Filipino 'deep seated and emotional fear of again being abandoned and left to fend for itself,' because it was in fact CINCPAC who 'abandoned' the Philippines to the Japanese in 1941. This fear was embedded in the fact that the Philippines, two decades after their independence, still looked to the US as 'primary responsible for repelling external attack under the mutual defence treaty.' The military predominance of the US over Philippine security, and the leverage from the fear of 'abandonment' converged to secure a 'permit to continue to use bases,' especially if there were rumours of a new base in the south. Also, according to Blair, the Indonesian issue 'can buy the US further assistance in Vietnam.'⁵² So, though the Indonesian issue had no doubt raised some serious concerns regards Philippine security, the implications and political manoeuvring tie this issue into the broader realm of the US-Philippines relationship.

Though this primarily was a regional Cold War issue, in the middle of these delicate negotiations and international crises, the Hukbalahap movement re-emerged in the Philippines. It is the Hukbalahap facet here that demonstrates the interconnectedness of the internal unrest from as early as 1946, on the one hand, and the external, regional Cold War threats, on the other. If Indonesian infiltration into the Philippines had succeeded, Sukarno's expected ally, at least as the situation was perceived by the Undersecretary of State for the Economy and Agriculture George Ball, would have been the Hukbalahap. After a shooting of Philippine civilians at the Clark military base, the *Manila Times* journalist Joe Guevara wrote 'now I know why the Americans can't win the war in Vietnam. They are too busy killing Filipinos here.'⁵³ Ball wrote to Blair that these 'deceased Filipinos seem natural candidates for martyrdom for leftist agitation ... the shootings raise the possibility of PKI (Communist Party of Indonesia, *Partai Komunis Indonesia*) efforts to exploit incidents.'⁵⁴ This observation by Ball followed his receipt of a summary telegram from Jackson (Third Secretary of the Embassy) of the Philippine-United States Mutual Defence Board Meeting from 13 February 1964. The

⁵¹ Christopher Marquis, 'Ulysses S. Grant Sharp Jr., Vietnam War Admiral, 95,' *New York Times*, 2001. <http://www.nytimes.com/2001/12/18/us/ulysses-s-grant-sharp-jr-vietnam-war-admiral-95.html>. [Accessed, October 2015].

⁵² Blair to Rusk, 20 May 1965, NARA.

⁵³ Blair to Rusk, 22 December 1964, RG 59, Philippines 1964-1966, Box 1671, NARA.

⁵⁴ George Ball to Philippine Embassy, 15 December 1964, RG 59, Philippines 1964-1966, Box 1671, NARA.

Meeting included a briefing by Captain Olano of the Philippine Constabulary, wherein he reported 2,500 Indonesians in the Philippines; Olano continued in this vein, stirring up American fears, stating that there were prevalent 'communist agents among Indonesian illegal entrants' and that there were 'reports of the dissemination of communist propaganda.'⁵⁵ At the end of 1964, then, it is reasonable to conclude that the biggest external threat to the Philippines' stability was Indonesian communist infiltration. 'It is doubtful that large-scale hostilities will break out,' but the clandestine, subversive spread of Indonesian agents in the Philippines would naturally be attracted to the Hukbalahap movement, acting as a spark to the fire of pre-existing social and economic conflicts inside America's chief ally in the Pacific.⁵⁶ Such security concerns reflected a failure of the president to secure the country's borders, and threatened to draw the US into yet another regional war—fifteen years after the communist victory in the Chinese Civil War, and just as a similar conflict was escalating in Vietnam.

Macapagal at home and abroad: US Cold War Idealism, and the Filipino Presidency.

Understanding the position of the press, Macapagal's legislative agenda, and the regional strategic outlook, the US State Department looked upon the incumbent Filipino president with some scepticism. The term of Macapagal was summarised in two reports by US State Department official Robert Ballantyne at the end of 1964, essentially highlighting the problems the US State Department had with Macapagal's presidency. Congressional and presidential discussions on the Philippines were few in number, so when such reports as Assistant Secretary of State for East Asian and Pacific Affairs William Bundy's and Ballantyne's came to light, they commanded attention. This section deals with two reports from the Officer-in-Charge of Philippine Affairs Robert Ballantyne, and like Bundy, he was part of the US Department of State. From 1964 to 1965, Ballantyne was the middleman between the embassy and the Secretary of State; working in the Bureau of Far Eastern Affairs in Washington. This section deals with State Department policy and the Philippines, and the individual actors who were of particular influence during the latter part of Macapagal's presidency in 1964 and 1965, when US support for the incumbent Philippine president began to erode. During the Kennedy and Johnson presidential years the CIA was substantially downgraded, and the State Department's profile was enhanced as a result. Henry William Brands noted that after Kennedy was 'burned by the agency's [CIA] bungling at the Bay of Pigs' he turned to country teams, where all US personnel reported to the ambassador. In addition to

⁵⁵ Jackson to State Department, 13 February 1964, RG 59, Philippines 1964-1966, Box 1670, NARA.

⁵⁶ Jackson to State Department, 13 February 1964, NARA.

Brands' Bay of Pigs example, in the US-Philippine documentation, a 1963 National Survey in particular, an intelligence source that McNamara admitted that was heavily relied upon, revealed that the CIA-ran Magsaysay presidency had indeed not lived up to Washington's expectations.⁵⁷ Once Johnson took office, he further downgraded the CIA to a role of 'speak when spoken to.'⁵⁸ Meanwhile, the Manila embassy, headed by Ambassador William McCormick Blair (1964-1967), was one of the largest US missions in the world. During this period it maintained a very brisk pace of reportage to the State Department—at no point during this period could the Department have claimed to be under-informed, and throughout the 1960s this relationship was the essential information and opinion source for Philippine affairs in Washington.

Within a matter of days at the end of 1964, Ballantyne wrote two extensive reports on the Philippines: a report for the nineteenth General Assembly of the UN in December 1964, and a report of his visit to the Philippines, which he sent to Bundy on 8 January 1965. Simultaneous to critiques in the Philippine and American press, Bundy and Ballantyne turned their backs on Macapagal, leaving him thoroughly exposed in the build-up the November 1965 presidential election. There are two common threads over the two reports: first, criticisms of the Philippines' progress in development, and concern of urbanisation's production of a potentially revolutionary social demographic. Second, they were thoroughly praiseworthy of their own, US efforts in the face of a difficult Philippine political class. The first should be interpreted as critical of Macapagal as president, although the issues raised were really endemic in the Philippines and far larger than the president's first three years in office. The latter thread highlighted the US commitment to the Philippines, which was framed almost philanthropically, and served to deflect any blame for the state of the country away from US foreign policy. In sum, US officials like Bundy and Ballantyne interpreted problems in Filipino development as a Macapagal failure, and this laid the blame primarily at his feet.

The first thread of Ballantyne's view was that 'economic progress' had been 'limited,' that 'rural life appears stagnant, and there is seen some debate as to whether real income in the barrios has not actually fallen since pre-war days.'⁵⁹ Speaking of the trauma of the Hukbalahap movement, Ballantyne wrote that it was no secret that slow development was the source of 'unrest among agricultural workers.' Indeed, throughout the history of twentieth century rural unrest in the Philippines, radical ideology was not primarily responsible for protest; farmers demanded an improvement in material living conditions and not necessarily a turn to

⁵⁷ National Intelligence Survey: Philippines, *DNSA*.

⁵⁸ Brands, *Wages of Globalism*, p. 14.

⁵⁹ Ballantyne, 'Report of Philippines Visit,' *NARA*.

communism, but the continual failure to address these issues would, sooner or later, potentially result in the successful spread of subversive ideas. Recognising this, Ballantyne asserted that any form of capitalism that created a 'wealth distribution' inequality, cannot but succumb to widespread dissatisfaction if not unrest and rebellion.⁶⁰ The chronic underdevelopment of the countryside was an issue that preceded Macapagal—the problem was deeply engrained in a society built on a system of landlords and oligarchs. The report from January 1965, however, failed to explain that these issues were larger than the president; instead, Ballantyne continued to insist that Macapagal, specifically, was 'ineffective' and alleged that 'corruption' was as bad 'as any in recent history.'⁶¹ Ballantyne's conclusion here is a contradictory view of US foreign policy's influence over and support of the landlords who perpetuated economic inequality in the Philippines. Ballantyne implied that Macapagal was failing to wrestle control of the countryside from the 'thin layer of powerful landowners.' Indeed, Ballantyne suggested that these landlords could 'influence heavily the political structure,' and that they maintained their dominance through 'low productivity ... tenant farming ... and underemployment.'⁶² The guaranteed price floor for Filipino sugar exports to the American market directly benefited these landlords, meaning that there was a set export quota to the United States—in other words, the US was actually complicit in limiting political and economic progress in the Philippines. Sixty percent of the population was engaged in agricultural employment, yet only produced thirty percent of the country's GNP. So despite the 'low productivity,' the landlords were still maintaining a substantial income because of the concentration of wealth, and the lack of any trickle-down 'distribution.'⁶³ Fifty eight percent of Philippine exports went to the United States, and thus the status quo was, financially at least, beneficial to the powerful landlords as well as the US import market.

US officials like Ballantyne, however, were fearful of the sort of Filipino 'modernisation' that the Nationalistas had advocated since the pre-war period, because the social forces it unleashed were potentially harmful to US interests in vulnerable urban areas like Manila. Ballantyne also highlighted fledgling industries within the Philippine economy that held promise for a more equitable form of development. After his month-long trip to the Philippines, he reported the 'economic progress' had been 'limited to those areas which has seen some industrialisation,' which was a slight nod of acknowledgment to the Garcia presidency. Nevertheless, his enthusiasm for these sectors was tempered by a Cold War fear of

⁶⁰ Robert J. Ballantyne, 'Report from UN 19th General Assembly,' December 1964, RG 59, Philippines 1964-1966, Box 1, *NARA*.

⁶¹ Ballantyne, 'Report of Philippines Visit,' *NARA*.

⁶² Ballantyne, 'Report from UN 19th General Assembly,' *NARA*.

⁶³ Ballantyne, 'Report from UN 19th General Assembly,' *NARA*.

their creation of a revolutionary class of Filipinos. It appears that Ballantyne believed that the 'rapidly expanding Manila proletariat' were 'a greater immediate threat and the one which bears more watching.' The 'unrest among agricultural workers' had been problematic ever since the inception of the US-Philippines relationship, and this was a reality with which the United States and the Philippine governments' had to continually contend, but the emergence of urban discontent, where a large amount of the population was centred, as well as the intellectuals and youth within the education system, posed a new challenge. The Communist Party of the Philippines was above all an urban organisation, primarily based in Manila. It was the growing nationalism within the intellectual and industrial centres (predominantly an urban development) that was of immediate concern to Ballantyne. Whereas piecemeal land reform and armed suppression had prevented a mass uprising on the scale of the Hukbalahap in the 1940s and 1950s, an urban-based movement would have been founded on firm ideological grounds and by those who wielded political, financial, and social influence. For Ballantyne, there were several nightmarish scenarios in an industrialised, but inadequately managed Manila, for example: a dissatisfied university professor expounding anti-Americanism and possibly a communist doctrine to his students, or a wealthy factory owner who had been refused entry into the US market due to protectionist interests, alongside the 300,000 urban-based immigrant Chinese population. In the mind of US officials like Ballantyne, these posed a far more real threat to the stability of the Philippines than the rural poor farming communities.

The second theme of Ballantyne's reports concerned issues pertaining to military and strategic concerns, both the stationing of extensive US presence in the islands, as well as Philippine commitment to the regional Cold War epicentre: Vietnam. Concerning the US role, Manila was the only important political hub in the archipelago, and much of the Philippines' international relevance rested on Manila.⁶⁴ Clark Air Force Base and the Subic Naval Base were close by, Manila housed almost all Philippine business centres, as well as one of the largest US overseas diplomatic corps in the world was based in the city.⁶⁵ It was crucial to the relationship, as well as Philippine regional and international standing, that Manila was under the firm control of a pro-US government. Ballantyne ultimately felt that Macapagal did not have the 'traits of character' to guide Filipino modernisation along pro-US lines, while he mentioned Senator Ferdinand Marcos was, despite his detractors, a 'brilliant man.' Known as 'ruthless' and for having a 'tendency to use any means, including thinly veiled threats of force, to achieve his ends.'⁶⁶ These two reports, then, did not just impugn Macapagal's ability to lead the Philippines into a stable, pro-US future, Ballantyne also implicitly supported a Marcos-

⁶⁴ Jackson to State Department, 13 February 1964, *NARA*.

⁶⁵ Embassy to State Department, 26 May 1964, RG 59, Philippines 1964-1966, Box 2589, *NARA*.

⁶⁶ Ballantyne, 'Report of Philippines Visit,' *NARA*.

dominated regime. The second thread was less Filipino-focused, centred upon establishing a positive analysis of the United States' role in the Philippines; this was analysed from both the civil (the Agency for International Development, United States Information Service, and the Peace Corps)— and the military wing of US overseas interests (the Joint US Military Assistance Group and American bases). Ballantyne's report shows the American dedication to their continued interest in the Philippines, especially as major commitments to the Vietnam issue grew exponentially in the following months. Thus, it is important for scholars of Cold War studies to understand that US officials did not overlook the Philippines at this time, but rather saw the islands as more valuable than ever. To secure a pro-US and anti-communist Vietnam meant that the US had to achieve these aims throughout the entire region. Taking steps to solidify Philippine support was an incomparable necessity.

US presence in the Philippines was extensive, and thus it required an atmosphere conducive to a continued and increasingly active American presence. At the end of 1964, Clark Airbase estimated that 'over 425,000 passengers per year will transit the field,' which pre-dated the escalation of hostilities in Vietnam. Furthermore, the permanent personnel on US bases in the Philippines stood at 25,700, a physical military presence that required twenty five million US dollars in military aid to the Philippine government in the fiscal year of 1964 alone. Indeed, it had been no secret that the Philippines formed a key part of an offensive military installation network in the Pacific, but in order to deflect criticism from the outspoken Philippine press, and also to meet ideological obligations as a pro-development ally, a strong civic presence was essential to counterbalance this very visible militarism. Thus, in addition to military personnel, seventy AID [Agency for International Development] officials worked in Manila, along with a ninety seven Joint United States Military Assistance Group team, as well as 500 Peace Corps volunteers.⁶⁷ During this period, the Peace Corps presence increased in the Philippines to 601 volunteers by 1967, and over the period 1961 to 1967 the presence in the Philippines was greater than in Thailand, Malaysia, Korea, Indonesia, or Micronesia.⁶⁸

Besides the military presence, the active US assistance in the Philippines from civil organisations was both a sign of goodwill and to attempt some genuine improvements in the domestic socio-economic situation. Although the dual purpose of personnel and financial assistance could be interpreted as a means of purchasing favour, it was also part of US geopolitical ambitions in Asia. By the mid-1960s the expectations of the Philippines to the

⁶⁷ Ballantyne, 'Report from UN 19th General Assembly,' *NARA*.

⁶⁸ Peace Corps, 'Sixth Annual Report to Congress' Files of Harry McPherson, Box 13, *LBJL*.

Johnson White House were first and foremost orientated to participation in the Cold War as an internally minded ally. A key US objective was:

To energise the Filipinos to accelerate their economic and social progress, thus developing a stable partner who would reflect the advantage of the democratic system in an Asian context, contribute to the defense of the non-Communist world, continue close relationship with the US, support the principal lines of US foreign policy and provide a friendly climate for our military and economic interests in the country.⁶⁹

These platitudes were not simply conjecture: Ballantyne had no problem overtly elucidating what was meant by ‘contribute to the defense of the non-Communist world:’ he reported that ‘we are confident that proposals for Philippines material aid to the [Vietnam] effort can be implemented to the satisfaction of all concerned,’ and this had been a well-established line emanating from Malacanang. Meanwhile, Macapagal had unequivocally stated that he would not be out done by his regional partners, Australia or New Zealand, in contributing to the Vietnam War.⁷⁰ However, two issues arise here: first, Ballantyne, as well as Rusk, insisted that it was ‘questionable that the Philippines would be willing to furnish much financial support for its contribution’ to Vietnam.⁷¹ Second, although the Filipino president was supportive of Vietnam commitment, Macapagal lacked the ability to either convince Congress to back increased military spending or to use his presidential powers to force through a bill for further spending. In a post-1965 Philippine presidential election analysis telegram from the Embassy to the State Department, Blair noted that Macapagal whilst president ‘appeared inept in its [power] use and unsure what he wished to do with it.’⁷² Either way, an inability to discipline Congress was a problem that ultimately fell at the feet of Macapagal, and for Ballantyne he was ultimately responsible for greasing the Philippine political system to be conducive to an essential US foreign policy interest—containment. This meant a contribution to this policy doctrine would manifest itself as the Philippines aiming to achieve domestic stability and a willingness to assist the US elsewhere in Southeast Asia, namely Vietnam.

First, the politics of who would furnish the finances for an Asian Cold War posed a considerable issue for the Philippine commitment to ‘hot’ conflicts such as Vietnam. During his state visit to the United States, Macapagal met with Robert McNamara at Blair House, during which time the Secretary of Defense addressed this issue directly: McNamara was ‘seriously concerned by

⁶⁹ Ballantyne, ‘Report from UN 19th General Assembly,’ *NARA*.

⁷⁰ James Wilson to Dean Rusk, 22 September 1966, RG 59, Philippines, 1964-1966, Box 1669, *NARA*.

⁷¹ Ballantyne, ‘Report from UN 19th General Assembly,’ *NARA*; Memo Rusk to Johnson, 3 October, 1964, 1964–1968, *FRUS*.

⁷² Telegram from the Embassy in the Philippines to the Department of State, 26 November, 1965, 1964–1968, Volume XXVI, Indonesia; Malaysia-Singapore; Philippines, Document 218, *FRUS*.

the level of the Filipino defense budget,' and he continued by saying that he realised 'you have internal political problems, but the dangers ahead are too great for you to keep your defense efforts at such a low level.'⁷³ Macapagal nevertheless did not simply try to satisfy McNamara's requests; the Philippine president wanted the US to directly finance Philippine assistance.⁷⁴ Such a request had two motivations: first, the Philippine government had limited funds to finance their own internal military forces, let alone contribute to overseas ventures; second, and most importantly, American dollars signified their desperate need for Filipino support, which indirectly bought domestic goodwill over military base issues. Furthermore, financing this project would not have been done in isolation—indeed the US Military Aid Program had furnished the Philippines with 448.3 million dollars between 1946 and 1964, in all, US aid between 1946 and 1962 totalled 1,750,800,000 dollars.⁷⁵ It was important to Macapagal, and the US, that support for Vietnam be seen as voluntary, though despite appearances, requiring appropriate compensation from the United States.

Second, the politics of Philippine assistance to Vietnam also caused considerable friction in late 1964 and early 1965. Macapagal wished for a substantial presence in Vietnam from other Southeast Asian nations. The Speaker of the Philippines House of Representatives Cornelio T. Villareal told Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs William Averell Harriman that the Philippines should be represented in Vietnam through a multilateral SEATO team. This proposal, however, had far too many detractors to be considered plausible. Many SEATO members had already formed bilateral agreements with the US to offer assistance, and thus were unavailable to offer further aid—Macapagal had expressed a desire to work with the Thai government in Vietnam, believing more Asian involvement would help 'convey a sense of common purpose.'⁷⁶ However, as the US State Department put it: 'the Government of Vietnam has never requested collective SEATO military or non-military aid' and 'we have no indication so far the GVN [Government of Vietnam] actually desires such SEATO assistance.'⁷⁷ Despite the dedication shown by Macapagal to commit to Vietnam, he wrote Rusk 24 July 1965 that there were 'factors underlying his decision to postpone further action on the bill before the Philippine Congress,' and that he 'pledged to seek legislative authority.'⁷⁸ This, out of context, may appear perfectly reasonable, but Philippine presidents, with overt US backing, had set a

⁷³ Diosdado Macapagal and Robert McNamara at Blair House, 6 October 1964, RG 59, Philippines 1964-1966, Box 2589, *NARA*.

⁷⁴ Circular Telegram, State Department, 21 October 1964, National Security File (NSF), Agency File, Box 42, *LBJL*.

⁷⁵ Military Assistance Reappraisal, FY 1967-1971, June 1965, NSF, Agency File, Box 20 [2 of 2], *LBJL*.

⁷⁶ Memorandum from Secretary of State Rusk to President Johnson, 3 October, 1964, 1964-1968 Volume XXVI, Indonesia; Malaysia-Singapore; Philippines, Document 298, *FRUS*.

⁷⁷ Circular Telegram, State Department, 21 October 1964, *LBJL*.

⁷⁸ William Rusk to President Johnson, 9 September 1965, RG 59, Philippines 1964-1966, Box 1669, *NARA*.

precedent of flaunting the ‘very considerable power resting in the hands of the President.’⁷⁹ President Manuel Roxas expelled democratically elected representatives from congress in 1946; Macapagal, if he had been firmly committed to pushing through Congress the Philippine assistance team, in US eyes, he needed to be more assertive in pressuring Congress instead of ‘postponing’ and meekly seeking ‘legislative authority.’⁸⁰ By the time this memo had been passed to Johnson, US troops were already in Vietnam, and the stalling of Macapagal did nothing but diminish his reputation at the highest echelons of US government. Indeed, though Macapagal was supportive of sending Filipino troops to Vietnam, and this position was acknowledged by Washington, ultimately, the Philippine Civic Action Group never made it to Vietnam during his presidency. Meanwhile, US sugar imports were dominated by Philippine cane, American investments were valued at ‘hundreds of millions of dollars’ by Rusk, so although the principal and primary role of the archipelago for the US was as a military and ideological ally in Southeast Asia, economic factors cannot be totally discounted.⁸¹ Examining the documentation here, and the absence of open US support in the 1965 election, strongly suggest that Macapagal’s vocal support for the Vietnam War was not the only issue under consideration in Washington. As the documentation has shown, economic factors and the intransigence of the Philippine Congress were also very pressing concerns—indeed they remained in Rusk’s and Johnson’s communique throughout 1964.

Robert Ballantyne’s reports, as well as Rusk-Johnson memoranda covered a significant range of the most pertinent issues for the Philippines in the Cold War during the mid-1960s. The predominant position was of disappointment in Macapagal, whilst consistently endorsing US government policies. The consequences were damaging, as the US continued to strive for Filipino support in Vietnam, and when Marcos took the presidency, this objective took precedent above all issues. Marcos was able to then manipulate the US into consolidating his power and position as a regional Cold War figure, largely ignoring the socio-economic issues that remained the real problem at hand. Essentially Ballantyne accused the individual in the system, and either could not or would not point to the failing system that had helped create a cacophony of social, political, and economic complaints in America’s ex-colony. On the back of these misguided conclusions, Macapagal received no official endorsement or support from Washington during the 1965 election.

⁷⁹ Military Assistance Reappraisal, FY 1967-1971, *LBJL*.

⁸⁰ Rusk to Johnson, 9 September 1965, *NARA*.

⁸¹ Memo Rusk to Johnson, 2 October 1964, Document 296, *FRUS*.

Conclusion: What's the Solution? The Militarisation of the Asian Cold War.

During Diosdado Macapagal's incumbency in the Malacanang presidential palace, the United States experienced a tumultuous period of the Cold War. There had been the erection of the Berlin Wall, the Cuban Missile Crisis, the assassination of Kennedy, and the escalation of US commitment to Vietnam. Considering these Cold War crises, Macapagal's one term presidency is of particular importance because it marked a crucial juncture in the US-Philippine relationship. With the Magsaysay legacy compromised and Garcia having been an abject failure in US policy makers' eyes, Macapagal had offered marginal improvement, willing to commit to Vietnam, but domestically presided over some anti-American decisions. Ultimately, 1961-1965 had represented another presidential term in which US Cold War foreign policy objectives had not been fulfilled by the Filipino leader, even though at times Macapagal did endorse US policy, and was supportive of sending Filipinos to Vietnam.

The Philippines for their part had been involved in an international incident with Indonesia over land claims, as well as the alleged movement of foreign seditious forces into southern islands. Though widespread violence in Indonesia, this episode was concluded without an international war; the threat of the Philippines being embroiled in a Cold War conflict, for the US State Department, helped indicate that Macapagal needed to be more assertive as a regional and domestic leader. Coupled with his softened stance against domestic subversive elements, as well as his adherence to the Retail Trade Nationalisation Law, it was seemingly evident that despite support for the foreign policy of sending troops to Vietnam, his domestic and economic policies were not up to the demands of US Cold War objectives. Criticisms of Macapagal, as revealed in the Embassy and State Department papers, was driven by Robert Ballantyne, who was influenced by the very vocal Manila press—which itself was directly informed by Rusk and Johnson's conversations. Despite the importance of the build up to the Marcos era, contemporary historiography on the Philippines has revolved around Marcos, and not the environment in which Marcos emerged. This chapter, as with this study as a whole, seeks to redress this balance: the Philippines cannot be understood with just a post-World War Two perspective, nor can it be appreciated just considering history since Marcos.⁸²

⁸² Linda Luz Guerrero and Rollin F. Tusalem, 'Mass Public Perceptions of Democractization in the Philippines: Consolidation in Progress?' In Yun-han Chu, Larry Diamond, Andrew J. Nathan, and Doh Chull Shin (eds.) *How East Asians View Democracy* (New York, 2010), pp. 61-82; Jose V. Fuentecilla, *Fighting from a Distance: How Filipino Exiles Helped Topple a Dictator* (Chicago, 2013); Mark R. Thomson, *The Anti-Marcos Struggle: Personalistic Rule and Democratic Transition in the Philippines* (Yale, 1995); Angel Rabasa, John Gordon, Peter Chalk, Audra K. Grant, K. Scott McMahon, Stephanie Pezard, Caroline Reilly, David Ucko, and S. Rebecca Zimmerman, *From Insurgency to Stability: Volume II: Insights from Selected Case Studies* (RAND Corporation, 2011), pp. 9-40.

When Marcos won the 1965 election, the Philippine islands would be dominated by an increasingly authoritarian regime that lasted until 1986, which occurred through considerable indirect assistance from poorly planned and failed US policy. This chapter has demonstrated the alternative to the likes of Marcos—Macapagal—and how he conducted his presidency. Macapagal had his detractors, indeed some quite extensive, but in summary he did attempt to placate the three main pressure groups: the US, nationalist media and business interests, and Hukbalahap sympathisers broadly defined. He tried to offer something to each interest group over his presidency, but ultimately in trying to satisfy so many competing sectors, he failed to wholeheartedly win any of them over. His moderate policies did not offer either the stringent anti-Americanism of the nationalists, the deep and wide-ranging reforms demanded by the Huk supporters, nor the steadfast and immediate commitment to defeating Asian communism in the likes of Vietnam. Marcos in turn, during his presidential campaign, espoused a determined pro-Americanism whilst recasting the Philippines as a new, reinvigorated Asian power.

US Ambassador to the Philippines William Blair wrote to Secretary of State Dean Rusk on 3 July 1965 that Macapagal was stalling on Vietnam commitment because of concerns over support and votes in the coming election. Blair reassured Rusk that 'I certainly left him in no doubt we consider [the PHILCAG] bill has taken on international and bilateral importance transcending domestic politics.'⁸³ The incumbent president's election rival was seemingly far more astute to the demands from Washington. Marcos deployed rhetoric incredibly skilfully, and in turning away from the likes of Macapagal, the agencies of the US government would spend much of 1966 and 1967 assisting Marcos in every way possible to achieve his alleged agenda. By 1972 this agenda evidently was dictatorial in nature, and thus understanding the moment when the US turned towards the likes of Marcos helps chart the moment in US foreign policy when it started to openly back violent administrations in the developing world.

⁸³ William Blair to Dean Rusk, 3 July 1965, RG 59, Philippines 1964-1966, Box 1673, NARA.

The Fall of Democracy: the First Term of Ferdinand Marcos, the Cold War, and Anti-Americanism in the Philippines, 1966-1972.

In a memo he sent the US President on 7 September 1966, National Security Advisor Walt Rostow wrote Lyndon Johnson that US objectives in the Philippines were: ‘keep Marcos on our side ... help him silence his critics ... keep him and the Philippines cooperative regarding use of bases ... especially regards logistical support to Vietnam ... continue and possibly expand Philippine engagement in Vietnam ... protect American acquired rights.’¹ From the mid-1960s, the requirements of US Cold War objectives in Vietnam demanded a certain relationship with the Philippines—one that was orientated towards US interests at the neglect of Philippine concerns. In the pursuance of these objectives, US foreign policy in the Philippines unintentionally created socio-economic and political conditions, and at times overtly encouraged, ‘authoritarian solutions.’ Washington believed that Philippine support was essential, and thus they backed Marcos, raised his international standing, and greatly boosted his sense of personal importance before he had actually committed personnel to Vietnam. Marcos had been gifted the position to make demands of the US government; in other words, by the close of the decade, they had given him exactly what he wanted, and indeed the ‘tail was wagging the dog.’²

Lyndon Johnson was desperate for foreign allies to willingly align themselves with him and the United States in their mission to defeat communism in Indochina, and ensure that the region developed as a pro-American sphere—if Marcos could help achieve this, then in a Cold War discourse, he was fulfilling his role as an US ally. This project only had credibility if the US could demonstrate that previous efforts to export their systems and values had successfully taken root, and resulted in strong, prosperous, and stable states. Ferdinand Marcos’s Philippines was to be the showcase of US influence in Southeast Asia, and thus understanding how a lack of socio-economic development led to the collapse of democracy in the Philippines, offers a needed analytical perspective for the application of US foreign policy in the developing world during the Cold War.

¹ Walt Rostow to Lyndon Johnson, 16 September 1966, WHCF, Confidential File (CF), ‘Philippines,’ Box 11, 1/2, LBJL.

² John L. Gaddis, *The Cold War* (London, 2005), p. 167.

The establishment of a dictatorship in 1972 marked the conclusion of the United States' democratic project in the Philippines.³ According to Michael Latham, 'superpower supported violence' was part of a marked shift in US policy during the Johnson administration, in many areas of the 'Third World,' though he does not accredit the significance of the Philippines. Latham further noted that the Johnson administration was willing to encourage 'direct coercion and military force,' and this was reflected in the US-Marcos relationship in 1966 and 1967.⁴ However, once the 'military force' and 'violence' that characterised the Marcos presidency began to not necessarily meet US foreign policy demands, but his own agenda, Marcos represented more of a roguish leader, unlatching himself from Washington's paternalism. Although this conclusion has many parallels with the work of Gabriel Kolko, and the Wisconsin-Madison school of Cold War revisionism more broadly, these scholars have never focused on the Philippines at any length.⁵ The country is almost totally neglected in the study of US relations with postcolonial or developing nations, Cullather and McCoy as exceptions, even the Pulitzer prize winning Stanley Karnow's *In Our Image* was criticised by David Joel Steinberg as offering 'no systematic treatment' of 1957-1972.⁶ It is strange, indeed, that America's modern colony does not feature in studies of American neo-colonialism in the Cold War.

Placing the Philippines exclusively in a Cold War paradigm, however, is problematic, because the fundamental issues plaguing the country from 1945 were rooted in a colonial legacy, removed from the ideological bipolarisation that characterised the post-World War Two geopolitical stage. Through a Cold War lens, US State Department officials, CIA operatives, and political leaders saw the Philippines as a homogenous bloc and, ideally, a bastion of pro-Americanism. Opposition groups to US interests were, however, more focused on the problems inherited from the colonial period: not Cold War geopolitical tensions. In reality, left wing and rural groups had a long history of anti-Americanism, and throughout the Cold War these groups were deliberately and forcefully excluded from positions of officially recognised power. Filipino nationalism had also emerged as a new threat to the hegemony of US interests; in contrast to leftist movements, this new threat operated from seats of considerable power, such as newly industrialised Filipino big business interests and the country's senate. The appearance of overtly nationalist rhetoric most noticeably occurred in the re-election campaign of President Marcos in 1968. Marcos was a self-serving nationalist, and thus his

³ Latham, 'The Cold War in the Third World, 1963-1975,' pp. 258-281, p. 260.

⁴ Latham, 'The Cold War in the Third World, 1963-1975,' p. 260.

⁵ Kolko, *Confronting the Third World*.

⁶ David Joel Steinberg, 'In our Image: America's Empire in the Philippines' (Book Review), *Journal of Asian Studies* 49.1 (1 February, 1990), pp. 211-212, p. 211.

immediate disposition was to aggrandise not just the Philippines, but his own standing as a personal friend of Johnson and leader of Asia. In the first two years of his presidency Marcos was an ally for US interests who was 'steeped in the American way of life,'⁷ and was keen and capable in dealing with Washington. All seemed well with US-Philippines relations in 1966 and 1967, indeed the year marked a high point in the Manila-Washington partnership in the Cold War.

In his first term, Marcos was allowed to develop his political standing quickly, and consequently 1965-1969 was characterised by a fast shifting landscape within the Philippine presidency. Considering this, Chapter Five unfolds chronologically throughout the latter 1960s. First, 1966 was the pinnacle year of the Washington-Manila relationship, marked by the personal relationship of Ferdinand Marcos, Lyndon Johnson, and other key Washington officials. Marcos visited the US, and Johnson stayed at the Marcos presidential residence during the 24-26 October 1966 Summit Conference; out of these events Marcos emerged at the forefront of pro-American Asian leaders, securing for himself the favour of the White House. This relationship is inextricably connected to the Vietnam War, and throughout 1966, Cold War strategy remained the priority. Consequently, Marcos was for the time being willing to placate Johnson in pursuance of these aims. Second, in response to his cooperation on the Vietnam issue in 1966 and early 1967, Marcos began to consolidate his power in 1967 and 1968, by seeking increasingly authoritarian solutions to pervasive and chronically poor socio-economic conditions. The problem of not just the resurgence of the Hukbalahap movement, but the struggle for US policy makers to gauge the true extent of this threat, offered Marcos an opportunity to manipulate the situation to his personal advantage, this middle period then is characterised by the militarisation of the Philippines by Marcos, and escalation of the Vietnam War. The militarised mind-set of US policy at this time may help explain Washington's contentedness to oversee, or willingness to participate in, Marcos consolidating his position with force. Third, during Marcos's re-election campaign, and the final days of the Johnson administration in 1969, overt nationalism in Marcos's public persona and policies emerged, simultaneous to a new cohesion in Filipino rejection of US influence and interference in the archipelago during the late 1960s. A true opportunist, Marcos seized the chance to placate nationalist groups at the expense of fulfilling or pursuing Cold War objectives during his re-election campaign in 1969. It is at this point where Marcos faltered in the eyes of US officials, and the engrained conflicts, contradictions, and colonial legacies in the US-Philippines relationship exposed a country increasingly unstable due to desperate socio-economic

⁷ Owen to Usher and Tatu, 24 August 1965, *DNSA*.

conditions. It was Marcos's failure to rectify these problems, and US officials' initial extensive support, then subsequent attempt to abandon him, which resulted in his dictatorship.

President Ferdinand Marcos: the Early Years, 1965-1967.

In 1979, at the height of the dictatorship, Marcos's Secretary of Foreign Affairs Carlos Romulo published a book titled 'the Democratic Revolution in the Philippines.' The foreword was dedicated to detailing the traits of Marcos's character, and it was these that had been so attractive to US strategists, especially when considered against the myriad of crises facing the Johnson administration in 1965. The Filipino President's story was feted with alleged success: he became the most decorated soldier in Philippine history, and was a guerrilla leader during the Japanese occupation (Marcos would have had extended contact with General Douglas MacArthur as Marcos was a Special Technical Adviser to President Roxas). After World War Two, he became a very successful legal practitioner, winning 'lawyer of the year' at the age of 23 and achieving the highest ever bar examination results. Though he dreamt of studying at Harvard, he joined public service and the staff of President Manuel Roxas in 1946 instead. He served as a technical assistant in mapping out economic development plans, which gave him extensive experience of the 'small man' in the Philippines. This helped Marcos cultivate an image of himself as a 'popular hero,' which was a sentiment he also earned as a teenage national rifle champion and later as military leader against the Japanese:⁸ though a championed Filipino, the State Department believed him to be 'steeped in the American way of life,' seemingly the ideal balance.⁹

Marcos appeared in many ways to be a Magsaysay-like figure: he was a popular and charismatic war hero, with an awareness of the internal situation, and he was believed to be impressionable regarding foreign policy decisions. If he could stabilise the Philippines domestically, and readily co-operate with the US regarding foreign policy, Marcos was, superficially, exactly what the US wanted in a Philippine president. Indeed, during the first two years of his term the US had made progress in achieving their Cold War objectives. Marcos's image and promise emerged at a crucial point in the development of the Cold War and American politics. The assassination of JFK, the Cuban Revolution, the Bay of Pigs fiasco, Cuban Missile Crisis, China's successful test of a nuclear bomb, and Johnson's escalation of the Vietnam War had all contributed to the Philippines' increasing importance as 'a priceless asset

⁸ Carlos P. Romulo, 'Foreword' in Ferdinand Marcos, *The Democratic Revolution in the Philippines* (New Jersey, 1979) pp. 12-25, p. 20-21.

⁹ Owen to Usher and Tatu, 24 August 1965, *DNSA*.

in Asia, the preservation of which is worth our maximum effort.¹⁰ Amidst these Cold War crises, Ferdinand Marcos offered a firm and pro-American hand on the Philippines' rudder; he presented himself as a scholar, a soldier, and a charismatic leader.

US officials missed an opportunity to identify Marcos's intransigency regards co-operating with Cold War strategy, and reluctance to committing troops to Vietnam in 1964. As President of the Senate, Marcos had been the principle opposition to Philippine involvement in Vietnam; Marcos had led legal and moral opposition to Philippine assistance, but US officials believed they could overcome this hurdle with Marcos, after he had defeated Macapagal at the polls in 1965. Marcos resisted early commitment to Vietnam as either a political ploy to win popular domestic support, or he was genuinely against Filipino involvement; considering his later political moves, it would appear that there are elements of both explanations. Marcos did send troops in 1967, and withdrew shortly after—he sought self-aggrandisement, and was willing to manipulate the US-Philippine relationship to achieve this. Yet in 1965 and 1966, the Americans who crafted the US-Philippines bilateral relationship viewed Marcos as the ideal Cold War ally, after all, he was staunchly anti-communist and aspired to regional leadership in Asia.

Though the primary objective of the Philippines government was to arrest the continuing deterioration of society and economy, and the US-backed Marcos was perceived to be the best man to shoulder this responsibility, Vietnam and the US-Philippines bilateral relationship was a pertinent issue. Two of the most influential figures in the relationship highlighted the continuity of the Magsaysay era ideas into the Marcos presidency; the presence of these agents embodied how US intelligence and policy agencies had not fully comprehended their earlier policy failings. It was revealed in a secret, confidential letter from Assistant Secretary of State for East Asian and Pacific Affairs William Bundy to US Ambassador William Blair, that CIA operative Edward Lansdale and Colonel Napoleon Valeriano were still manipulating Filipino politics covertly to serve American interests elsewhere:

Now that Marcos is elected, you will no doubt wish [to] use [the] forthcoming six weeks period [to] further fortify yours and your top Embassy staffs' close personal relations with him and his key people'... 'One aspect you may wish to consider is whether or when time might be appropriate for [a] visit to him by his old friend Valeriano who, as you know, [is] now with Lansdale in Saigon and who might well be effective in persuading Marcos [to] do maximum in [the] Viet-Nam aid field ... begin to fill him in on arrangements we have worked out with Macapagal directly ... on such matters as following: use of Mactan, bomber overflights, nuclear warships, training, US support for Philippine Viet-Nam Task Force, base land relinquishments.¹¹

¹⁰ National Policy Paper on the Republic of the Philippines, *DNSA*.

¹¹ William Bundy to William Blair, 17 November 1965, *DNSA*.

Officials like Bundy were confident in achieving their desired direction of Philippines foreign policy through exerting pressure on the recently elected Marcos. Marcos in turn supported the US in Vietnam in press conferences; while privately may have had doubts, as long as these remained quieted, the US-Philippine partnership appeared to have achieved a unified and cohesive strategy.¹² It would have been, in reality, very difficult for Marcos to resist the commitment of a Task Force to Vietnam due to the pressure of Lansdale and Valeriano, the economic pressure the US could exert upon the Philippines, and the fact that the plans to send Engineering Battalions to Vietnam had been very well formulated under Macapagal's presidency. Marcos, in terms of the US-Philippines relationship, praised the American Vietnam War effort and objectives, but was aware of the domestic volatility the issue of Philippine troops supporting their ex-colonial ruler's war in Asia could cause.

Sensing the possible sensitivity of the situation, Johnson did not immediately validate Marcos's presidential victory with his personal attendance at his inauguration in December 1965. The Texan did, however, send his Vice President Hubert Humphrey and close advisor Jack Valenti, who had played golf with Marcos on the morning of his swearing into office. Humphrey and Valenti, as special guests, at Marcos's presidential inauguration in Manila, both became strong advocates of the Filipino president, seemingly strengthening and solidifying the US-Marcos partnership from the outset of his presidency. Marcos's support within the highest levels of the Johnson administration is most strikingly seen in his relationship to Vice President Humphrey and insider Jack Valenti. Humphrey was appointed Vice President on 20 January 1965, after the office had been vacant for the fourteen months since John Kennedy's assassination. Initially he was against the escalating US involvement in Vietnam; he argued it was unwinnable and too costly, however, this resulted in him being frozen out of Johnson's inner circle of advisors, and in the following year Humphrey had committed to fully supporting the war.¹³ Ostensibly, his pro-Marcos stance was merely a reflection of his commitment to Cold War objectives; whether he was conscious of it or not, however, it also represented an endorsement of authoritarianism as a means of fulfilling those objectives. For example, Valenti wrote Johnson 6 January that 'Marcos could be different' from the 'usual ineptness' of Macapagal, and that the new Filipino leader.¹⁴ Humphrey wrote, only ten days into Marcos's first term on 10 January, 'I happen to believe that Marcos is going to be a fine ally and we

¹² William Blair to US State Department, 3 December 1965, *DNSA*.

¹³ Townsend Hoopes, *Limits of Intervention* (New York, 1973), p. 31.

¹⁴ Memorandum from the President's Special Assistant (Valenti) to President Johnson, 4 January, 1966, 1964–1968 Volume XXVI, Indonesia; Malaysia-Singapore; Philippines, Document 322, *FRUS*.

ought to cultivate him on every occasion.¹⁵ Furthermore, the following year, whilst visiting the Philippines, and only days prior to Marcos's arrival at the White House, the Vice President told US Manila embassy counsellor for political affairs Richard Usher that 'I don't believe that democracy in the Philippines will under the present leadership give way to military rule. Mr Marcos is so far doing an excellent job.' In fact Humphrey's sentiments were summed up by the Secretary of State himself, Dean Rusk, who in July 1966 said 'the Philippines have a vigorous and experienced leader in President Marcos, who is bringing fresh energy and new ideas to Philippines economic development.'¹⁶

Marcos received an even greater endorsement from Jack Valenti who, at his height of influence, like Rusk, had the ear of the President. After World War Two, Valenti succeeded in both Texan oil and advertising, and met Johnson through representing Albert Thomas, a Democratic Congressman and personal friend of Johnson. Valenti's ad agency worked on the Kennedy-Johnson ticket in 1960, and he subsequently served as a media relations officer for Kennedy. After having met Marcos for the first time in late 1965, Valenti became increasingly involved with Ferdinand and Imelda Marcos's interest in promoting Philippine film, utilising Valenti's position as president of the Motion Picture Association of America.¹⁷ As an oil and media tycoon and, after 1966, as the president of the Motion Picture Association of America, Valenti possessed both political capital and celebrity, which was a combination that Marcos most desired. The Valenti-Marcos relationship was well understood in Washington. Johnson's cabinet secretary Robert Kinter wrote to presidential aid Douglas Carter in September 1966 that 'Jack Valenti is a close friend of the Filipino President.'¹⁸ This was reflected during an episode involving a golf tournament in Manila, some US players struggled to get clearance to land at Clark Air Base. Valenti, to ensure the golfing enthusiast Marcos was not disappointed, went 'straight to [Secretary of Defense Robert] McNamara' to sort out the issue.¹⁹ The message that emanated out of these relationships Marcos had with Humphrey and Valenti was a confidence that the Philippine president was exactly what the Johnson administration wanted. In Valenti's words from February 1966, Marcos was 'the ideal Asian leader we need,' in fact he continued to note 'why wouldn't it be smart to back Marcos?'²⁰ It was this assessment that defined the US-Philippine relationship in 1966, which marked a historic high in the partnership.

¹⁵ Hubert Humphrey to Jack Valenti, 10 January 1966, WHCF, CO 235, Philippines, Box 62, *LBJL*.

¹⁶ R. B. Peters to US State Department 15 July 1966, RG 59, Philippine 1966-1964, Box 2580, *NARA*.

¹⁷ Michael Gary Hawkins, *Co-producing the Postcolonial: U.S. Philippine Cinematic Relations, 1946—1986* (New York, 2011), p. 133.

¹⁸ Robert E. Kinter to Douglass Cater, 12 September 1966, WHCF, CO 235, Philippines, Box 62, *LBJL*.

¹⁹ Jack Valenti to Lyndon Johnson, 25 February 1966, WHCF, CO 235, Philippines, Box 62, *LBJL*.

²⁰ Jack Valenti to Lyndon Johnson, 25 February 1966, WHCF, CO 235, Philippines, Box 62, *LBJL*.

Marcos, Johnson, and US Foreign Policy Considerations in 1966.

With the election of Ferdinand Marcos, the US State Department sought to further solidify the new atmosphere in US-Philippines relations. A National Policy Paper for the Philippines, signed off by Dean Rusk, 3 March 1966 stated 'by almost every criterion for policy development, the Philippines constitutes an area of key interest to the US in Asia.' This document was 'a comprehensive, authoritative statement of United States policy towards the Republic of the Philippines' and that 'all other agency planning and programming documents and directives to the field will proceed from and be consistent with the strategy and course of action stated in this paper.' The National Policy Paper set out several key objectives in order to 'preserve for the longer range the best possible environment in which to protect and uphold those US interests which really count.' United States' interests were in seeking a 'dynamic Filipino leadership,' 'economic growth,' 'bilateral trade and investment relationship,' 'internal defense,' 'maximum US freedom' regards military bases, and assistance in the 'affairs of Asia.'²¹ In other words, this Policy Paper required a strong Philippines, willing to adhere to US plans, and become involved in the Asian Cold War. With Marcos power, US policy planners believed that they could pursue these starkly escalatory Cold War objectives: the Filipino president suggested he had the willing, political currency, and commitment to ensure the Philippines remained a steadfast pro-US ally. In short, at the height of the Cold War, this National Policy Paper was the US State Department's reassertion of both the relevance and necessity of a strong US-Philippine relationship, of a single, coherent policy for their Southeast Asian ally, and the State Department's faith in Ferdinand Marcos.

The election poll opened 19 November 1965, and Senate President Ferdinand Marcos was President before the year was out. This policy paper was released in the aftermath of the election of Marcos, and together, symbolised the beginning of a new era for the US-Philippines relationship, for the US in Southeast Asia, and for the entire international Cold War. The Philippines were a 'priceless asset' in the US Cold War strategy, and also 'the sole example in Asia of America's efforts in granting freedom to a former dependency.'²² In 1965 the US had committed ground troops to Vietnam, an escalation in the fight to win South Vietnamese freedom, in the name of a democracy friendly to the United States. The Philippines was 'the chief monument to our [US] presence in the Far East,' the relevance of the US project in the

²¹ National Policy Paper on the Republic of the Philippines, *DNSA*.

²² National Policy Paper on the Republic of the Philippines, *DNSA*.

Philippines, according to National Policy Paper became one of the most relevant and important countries in the Cold War.

The National Policy Paper had identified the key issues the US was facing in the Philippines—problems that were not necessarily new, which was all the more problematic because this suggested that the previous policies had repeatedly failed. The pressure upon the 1965 policy, to achieve results, was seemingly significant because the Philippines was no longer a concern just because of internal instability, but were also becoming an actor in an international context. Previously the US had largely ring-fenced the Philippines from Southeast Asia—allowing the Government of the Philippines to focus exclusively on the internal issues that were present. These issues were still present in 1965 but, with the new burden upon US policy makers of the escalation of the Vietnam War, the Philippine government was encouraged to conduct a functional and participating foreign policy of their own. From the US perspective, the Philippines were stepping out of the American shadow, now less tied by their colonial history, with more autonomy and independence. It was of great necessity the Philippines remained a close US ally, and as long as the Philippines remained reliant on US aid and business investment, and the US held the military bases, a strong relationship could be secured. The view from Malacanang, where Marcos now presided, was reassuring. The reaffirmed US strategy for the Philippines was a list of requirements, and Marcos believed he could either deliver these, or at least offer tokenistic gestures suggesting compliance to these objectives. The eventual Marcos dictatorship was a personal one, ran by himself and his close entourage; this National Policy Paper was the beginning of Marcos's aggrandisement, constructing his soon unassailable personal and political position.

After the establishment of strong ties with both Humphrey and Valenti, and now with the National Policy paper in place, the Malacanang Palace received an invitation from the White House during the summer of 1966, asking Marcos and his wife Imelda, to be official state guests of Lyndon and Claudia 'Lady Bird' Johnson. Marcos had gained the confidence of the White House through these close relationships with Johnson's close associates, which then gave Johnson reason to believe he could further develop this relationship into steadfast Cold War partnership to face communism in Southeast Asia. Upon analysis, embassy reports to the State Department show a rapid succession of events in summer 1966 that reveal the opportunistic nature and public relation-mindedness of Marcos, and the willingness on the part of Washington to indulge Marcos on this front. For the time being, however, Johnson welcomed Marcos into the centre of his Cold War strategy of pro-American Asian leaders.

The state invitation reflected the good reports the State Department had received of Marcos's early months in power, and Marcos's artful reinvention of himself as an essential, 'Americanised' ally for US policies in Southeast Asia and the Pacific. In April 1966, the US embassy submitted a report to the State Department, titled 'the first three months of the Marcos Administration from the domestic political viewpoint.' The report's author, First Secretary of the Embassy, William M. Owen wrote that Marcos was a 'staunch anti-Communist,' who was 'pressing the Congress [for commitment to Vietnam],' and that he was contending with 'some dubious characters,' but that he knew where 'his country's security interests lie'—namely in close solidarity with the US.²³ However, Owen's report primarily revealed rhetoric myopically focused on US interests and Cold War issues. Fulfilling the embassy mandate, it produced factual reports, generally bereft of critical analysis or opinion. This particular report did convey information that, to the State Department's interpretation, strongly suggested that Marcos was the man to fulfil their needs. Marcos understood the lexicon of Washington, and as demonstrated here, knew the right discourses to pursue. Furthermore, he was in touch with recent history and popular American political views, and skilfully crafted his and his family's public image to appeal to US leaders. Early in his first term, Marcos seemed to not just align with Washington, but sought to Americanise his politics; Owen wrote 'he is trying his own Great Society,' noting the self-given title 'President of all the people.' Owen continued, describing how Marcos's wife Imelda, and young children, had settled into the presidential palace in an informal style 'influenced by the Kennedys.'²⁴

Beyond such political aesthetics, however, Marcos reapplied strong anti-communist policies and aimed to make the country more investment friendly for US business, unlike his predecessor Diosdado Macapagal. Marcos defined himself against Macapagal's 'anti-American' activities, including the use of the Retail Trade Nationalisation Law, the reinterpretation of the Anti-Subversive Act (which was seen as soft on communism), and his refusal to pressure Congress over committing the Philippine Civic Action Group (PHILCAG) to Vietnam. Ultimately, within the first three months Marcos had convinced the State Department that he, as the new Philippine president, placed US Cold War objectives—anti-communism and PHILCAG—as the 'highest priority.'²⁵ Owen's analysis served as a strong platform from which Marcos could appeal to the US for aid, which Marcos would later use to secure his personal power. At first, both sides appeared to be gaining what they desired. For the United States, they saw some very definite proactive steps to commitment in Vietnam from their Filipino partners. For Marcos, he saw militarisation as central to the consolidation of his position with threats of

²³ William Owen to Embassy, 19 April 1966, RG 59, Philippines 1964-1966, Box 2587, NARA.

²⁴ Owen to Embassy, 19 April 1966, NARA.

²⁵ Owen to Embassy, 19 April 1966, NARA.

what he called 'another Vietnam' in the Philippines, manipulating the anxieties of American policy makers.

Marcos assumed the responsibilities of the presidency on 30 December 1965. By mid-1966, the US military bases in the Philippines were supplying his government with extensive military aid and materiel, because in an unstable region beset by conflict, an armed US ally was perceived to be able to contribute to the war and suppress any internal dissidents. A succession of correspondence from the embassy to the State Department and United States Pacific Command (CINCPAC) throughout June and July 1966 offers insight to the militarisation of the Philippines internal law and order agency, the Philippine Constabulary (PC), using US materiel. On 24 June, seventeen US aircraft, 'ideal for anti-dissident operations,' arrived as part of 'US military assistance program.'²⁶ On 8 July, one thousand high powered rifles were sent to the PC in Pampanga province as part of a 'new special force,' dedicated to anti-guerrilla operations.²⁷ By the time Marcos wrote to Johnson accepting his state visit invitation on 10 August, he had already made substantial strides both in consolidating the power of his presidency and in gaining Washington's backing.

Marcos also styled himself as a regional leader in the US Cold War. In a press conference held one month later in September, and just four days before he was to be welcomed at the White House, Marcos sought to reaffirm not just his outwardly pro-American stance, but how the Vietnam War was important to Filipinos. In his comments to the press, Marcos promised that he 'personally must carry the burden' of the Philippines' problems, and that it was his 'responsibility' to ensure 'American power should be helped within the limits of our capability.' Marcos defined this 'responsibility' as a kind of personal duty, to be executed through his joint position as President and Secretary of Defense.²⁸ Washington had sought for decades a strong and confident Filipino leader, and Marcos's insistence on 'personally' handling his 'number one priority: security,' amidst the volatility of the Vietnam War, must have convinced them that he represented US interests. Reflecting Marcos's assumed position as a regional leader, Manila hosted a summit for the Vietnam War allies, 24-26 October 1966, including Australia, New Zealand, Thailand, Korea, and South Vietnam, making the Philippines a stage to display all of the supporters of Johnson's Many Flags campaign.

²⁶ R. B. Peters to US State Department 4 June 1966, RG 59, Philippine 1966-1964, Box 2580, NARA.

²⁷ R. B. Peters to US State Department 8 July 1966, RG 59, Philippine 1966-1964, Box 2580, NARA.

²⁸ R. E. Usher to US State Department, 16 September 1966, RG 59, Philippines 1964-1966, Box 2578, NARA.

Indeed, beyond the US-Philippine relationship, the archipelago featured prominently as part of the international effort in the Vietnam War, hosting a conference for the multilateral actors in Indochina. Lyndon Johnson's Many Flags campaign was designed to achieve international support for the Vietnam War, not just to lessen the burden on US troops, but also to address criticisms from anti-war and communist groups that the conflict was solely a US neo-colonial project. Kolko suggested the US post-war order was to create 'political destinies of distant places to evolve in a manner beneficial to American goals and interests.'²⁹ Fredrik Logevall noted that Kolko, in his assessment, was 'perfectly true, but not very helpful' in explaining the direct reason for military escalation in Vietnam. Logevall asserted that committing to military escalation was born out of an attempt to defend the personal credibility of Johnson and his highest ranking officials: McGeorge Bundy, Robert McNamara, and Dean Rusk.³⁰ It seems plausible that the Manila Summit was an extension of this 'credibility' exercise; standing side by side with Asian and Pacific leaders, to Johnson, seemed to lend a credible endorsement for the escalation in Vietnam. In reality, troop commitments from America's allies in Vietnam were limited; 6,300 troops from Australia, 2,720 from Thailand, 2,100 from the Philippines, and 360 from New Zealand.³¹ However, the act of gathering the heads of state of these nations at a summit offered the opportunity for a public relations coup, despite possible parallels to the not dissimilar Japanese exercises in the 1930s.³² On 25 October a White House press secretary statement noted that in Vietnam the 'peace and security ... of the entire world' was in the balance, arguing that support for the conflict had global ramifications.³³ Contemporaneous to this statement, at the Manila Summit Conference, Lyndon Johnson stood side by side with Prime Minister Nguyen Cao Ky of South Vietnam, Prime Minister Harold Holt of Australia, President Park Chung Hee of Korea, Prime Minister Keith Holyoake of New Zealand, President Nguyen Van Thieu of South Vietnam, and Prime Minister Thanom Kittikachorn of Thailand. The host of the event, and leader of America's military and ideological stronghold in Asia, was none other than Ferdinand Marcos of the Philippines. Johnson had achieved seven flags alongside his own, and the Summit was described in the *Washington Post* by long-time Asia observer, and critic of the development of the Philippines under US influence, Stanley Karnow thus: 'a large part of the US effort focused on the event itself as a vehicle to dramatize the growing relationship between the United States and Asia,' and the centre of this pro-American Asia was the Ferdinand Marcos regime.³⁴

²⁹ Kolko, *Anatomy of War*, pp. 72-73.

³⁰ Logevall, *Choosing War*, pp. 386-388.

³¹ Background Paper, 18 April 1967, NSF, Agency File, Box 42, *LBJL*.

³² Eri Hotta, *Pan-Asianism and Japan's War 1931-1945* (Basingstoke, 2007).

³³ White House Press Secretary, 25 October 1966, Files of Ceil Bellinger, Box 19, *LBJL*.

³⁴ Stanley Karnow, 'Manila Conference Reflects Growing US links to Asia,' *Washington Post*, 28 October 1966, Files of Ceil Bellinger, Box 19, *LBJL*.

Responding to the opportunities presented him by Johnson; Marcos demonstrated his domestic and international leadership abilities. First, his astuteness in balancing both the anti-American faction in the Nationalista Party and the US desire to use the Philippines in their war plans gained him much credibility with the US State and Defense Department. Late in 1965, wounded Korean troops were being evacuated out of Vietnam to Clark military hospital (situated on Luzon, north of Manila), which was a process done ‘within hours after being wounded and under [such] circumstances passports and visa formalities [were] obviously not feasible.’ Marcos ‘had no objections to this,’ thereby satisfying the United States Defense Department, but Ambassador Blair wrote that Marcos had ‘said firmly that he preferred we should not talk about the presence of the Koreans at Clark—that we should avoid any publicity on this.’³⁵ This allowed Marcos to placate the nationalists who felt the military bases were an infringement on their sovereignty—not to mention the uproar that the presence of unprocessed combatants would have caused. Second, and more importantly, Marcos delivered the engineering battalions that the US desired for Vietnam, prompting American contacts to note that ‘Marcos has laid his prestige on the line ... at some political cost’ to fast track two thousand Filipino troops to Vietnam. This commitment, more so than anything else, helped contribute to the image that the US had helped foster independence and autonomy in new Southeast Asian democracies, and that ‘beyond the unique ties and special relationships,’ the Philippines was ‘an Asian power in their own right.’ Marcos and PHILCAG ‘projected an image about [the war effort in] Vietnam’ based on the ‘vitality of the new Asia.’³⁶ As the situation in Vietnam deteriorated and Marcos proved himself more and more indispensable, it seemed that this close relationship between the United States and the Philippines was fast becoming the solid alliance the US needed to face a tumultuous Asian theatre.

The Summit was arguably not intended to resolve the war in Vietnam, but simply to develop US-Philippines relations, with the unintended consequence of also developing Marcos’s dictatorship. The conference, Karnow noted, ‘produced neither new military strategies nor really fresh proposals for a settlement of the Vietnam War. Indeed, its final Declaration on Peace and Progress was as banal in its piety as a Sunday-school sermon.’³⁷ The Manila Summit Conference nevertheless afforded Marcos centre stage at an event of such ‘enormous publicity,’ attended by Lyndon Johnson himself; the conference validated Marcos, who had

³⁵ William Blair to US State Department, 14 December 1965, *DNSA*.

³⁶ Paul Kattenburg to William Bundy, 15 August 1966, *DNSA*.

³⁷ Stanley Karnow, ‘Manila Conference Reflects Growing US links to Asia,’ *Washington Post*, 28 October 1966, Files of Ceil Bellinger, Box 19, *LBJL*.

been described by the Embassy as a president who keeps control with ‘an iron fist,’³⁸ and abetted his future dictatorship in service of American Cold War strategy.³⁹

The embrace of the ‘iron fist in a velvet glove’ for the Philippines is reflected in the preparatory information and memos supplied to Johnson during the run up to Marcos’s visit to Washington and to the Manila Summit.⁴⁰ The infrequency with which the Philippines was discussed by Johnson meant he was more reliant on his advisors and their opinions than he may have been regards other regions. Central to the development of US Southeast Asian policy over Johnson’s term was Special Assistant for National Security Affairs Walt Whitman Rostow—a notable hawk amongst Johnson’s inner circle. Rostow had been instrumental during the Eisenhower years in increasing US spending in the developing world to ensure the expansion of US economic growth, ensured by military force. Rostow’s personal memos to Johnson must be considered important to the development of US-Philippine relations in the late 1960s because the contents reflect so closely subsequent developments. The ‘bond of trust’ that existed between Johnson and Rostow made his Vietnam plans ‘the most influential blueprint’ of US policies in Indochina—to this extent, Rostow’s opinion would have influenced Johnson’s considerations for the entire region.⁴¹ On 7 September Rostow wrote Johnson a memo entitled ‘Marcos visit,’ in which he stated that US objectives were to ‘keep Marcos on our side and help him silence his critics.’ Rostow noted that it was imperative Marcos remain ‘cooperative regarding use of bases ... especially logistical support for Vietnam,’ and continue or even possibly expand Philippine ‘engagement’ in the war.⁴² The essence of Rostow’s remarks infer a willingness to prioritise Cold War objectives, including the conflict in Vietnam, over domestic crises in the Philippines—although the latter issue was not mentioned in the memo, unrest due to unresolved socio-economic problems was rising. Following Rostow’s lead, three days after the memo was sent on the eve of Marcos landing in Washington, the Filipino president in a press conference stated it was ‘impractical and imprudent to talk of economic development’ as long as security in Asia was under threat.⁴³ On Johnson’s final day of his visit to the Philippines, he delivered a speech at Corregidor on 26 October, similarly consolidatory of the orientation of Philippine government priorities by defining their role in the Cold War. Addressing a Filipino crowd, the US President proclaimed: ‘you, above all, need no advice on

³⁸ Owen to Embassy, 19 April 1966.

³⁹ Stanley Karnow, ‘Manila Conference Reflects Growing US links to Asia,’ Washington Post, 28 October 1966, Files of Ceil Bellinger, Box 19, *LBJL*.

⁴⁰ William Owen to Embassy, 19 April 1966.

⁴¹ David Milne, *America’s Rasputin. Walt Rostow and the Vietnam War* (New York, 2008), p. 11.

⁴² Walt Rostow to Lyndon Johnson, 7 September 1966, WHCF, Confidential Files, (Oversized Attachments), Box 172, 2 of 2, *LBJL*.

⁴³ Usher to US State Department, 16 September 1966, *NARA*.

how insurgency should be mastered,' because they had 'retained an Asian identity without rejecting Western values.'⁴⁴ The speech was made against the background of a Hukbalahap resurgence in Central Luzon, rising anti-American nationalism in urban centres, and continued widespread socio-economic impoverishment across the archipelago. It was a ringing endorsement of Marcos's willingness to focus on the Cold War at the cost of the domestic situation.

The Johnson administration was blinkered by the illusions of Cold War discourse in a country with little agency to oppose US foreign policy. In the fall of 1966, Johnson, his Special Assistant for National Security Affairs, Rostow, and Marcos privately and publicly advertised the proposed focus of Philippines foreign policy: meeting the US's regional Cold War objectives. In attempting to achieve these goals, Marcos had gained a new prestige as a world leader, weapons, and money; apparently, he had also been accepted by the US government hierarchy as a key player. The reality in the Philippines, however, bore little resemblance to what Johnson had called 'mastery over insurgency.' The country was spiralling out of control, and it appeared that soon the only feasible response to the domestic crises in the Philippines would be a militarised, hard line response. In short, the opportunity for genuine reform of the archipelago's chronic socio-economic problems had been passed over for regional 'security.'

Getting Priorities Straight? The Philippines' Domestic and Foreign Agendas.

The US-Philippine relationship was undoubtedly dominated by the Cold War, especially amidst the escalation of the Vietnam conflict. This region-wide military escalation certainly impacted the Philippines, allowing Marcos an opportunity to manipulate US Cold War anxieties for the enlargement and improvement of the Armed Forces of the Philippines. In 1966 and 1967 Marcos was still committed to Vietnam, evident by the deployment of PHILCAG, however the withdrawal of this battalion in 1969, after having accrued extensive US military aid, shows how Marcos had essentially used the regional Cold War crisis for his own ends. The lack of appreciation of the unfolding events in the Philippines, occurring between his inauguration and the eventual downturn in opinions of Marcos, is what is detailed in this section. During 1967 and 1968 an increase of violence and erosion of law and order developed contemporaneously with nationalism in Philippine cities, and the entrenchment of Cold War perspectives from within the US Defense Department. It would, however, be inaccurate to suggest the internal circumstances were not reported to Washington from the embassy.

⁴⁴ Lyndon Johnson, Remarks at Corregidor, 26 October 1966, Files of Ceil Bellinger, Box 19, *LBJL*.

Indeed memos from the US diplomatic mission in Manila continued to be thorough in passing on details of violence, demonstrations, and increasing dissent amongst the populace towards Marcos, the US, and the status quo, yet at times analysis was overlooked: 'a number of respected Asian specialists pointed out that they had sent McNamara a number of sceptical reports based on genuine expertise—and that the defense secretary ignored all of them.'⁴⁵ What was neglected, however, on all sides, were the real roots of these problems. Instead the chosen solution, as in Vietnam, was to escalate force to meet the problems in the Philippines that really needed comprehensive reform and rethinking of policy and political directives; Marcos was ideally suited to this task.

Intelligence and diplomatic officials recognised that there were serious problems in the Philippines. Domestic dissent in the latter 1960s, as in all decades of US involvement in the Philippines, was fuelled by the socio-economic problems. During Marcos's first term nationalism had emerged as a major aspect of Philippine politics; disappointing development in the economy, and the continued presence of US investment interests and military bases, led many to a rejection of American influence in the economic and political sphere. The manifestation of the disillusionment of the growing intellectual movement in Philippine universities was the base of an emerging leftist political scene, which was not dissimilar to those developing in the US or Europe. There had been labour and workers' groups throughout the twentieth century in the Philippines, but the contribution of intellectuals from within the education sector represented an attempt to unify these disparate groups into more cohesive movements. In early 1967, Deputy Chief of Mission in Manila, James Wilson wrote the State Department about the founding congress of the new 'Nationalist' Group—The Movement for the Advancement of Nationalism—which was attended by Jose Maria Sison of the Nationalist Youth and Ignacio Lacsina of the Workers Party.⁴⁶ Wilson noted that a *Manila Times* editorial was supportive, in that the newspaper proclaimed members of the new group were tagged as 'subversives' by 'congressional investigators and professional anti-communists,' meaning they will be 'misunderstood or deliberately misinterpreted.'⁴⁷ The CIA identified that the strength of the movement was the academic branch, which gave the coalition of the labour party, socialist party, youth groups, peasants, and farmers a unity and cohesion by 'portraying the US as the exploiter of the Philippines.'⁴⁸ The very range of these groups—spanning the political, economic, intellectual, and working class demographics, represented the most concerted

⁴⁵ Milne, *America's Rasputin*, p. 251.

⁴⁶ James Wilson to US State Department, 10 February 1967, RG 59, Philippines 1967-1969, Box 2426, NARA.

⁴⁷ Wilson to US State Department, 10 February 1967, NARA.

⁴⁸ Director of the CIA, National Intelligence Estimate, 'Prospects for the Philippines,' 20 June 1968, NSF, National Intelligence Estimates, Box 7, LBJL.

rejection of the US-backed oligarchy and subservience of Filipino presidents that had dominated the country for generations. Despite American officials' awareness of the problems at hand, the growing cohesion of America's opponents in the Philippines was not mirrored in Washington by any useful consensus on the Philippine issue. Relative neglect of the Philippines by Washington elites, at least compared to Vietnam, had created a narrative lacking cohesion: was the country perceived as an ex-colonial possession in need of deep reforms, or a crucial Cold War ally?

In other words, Marcos ably situated himself on one side of an ongoing debate among US officials, particularly conflicts between hawks in Washington DC, and Manila embassy officials who saw things in a more nuanced way. When Johnson decided to escalate military force in Vietnam, this established a precedent for Marcos to increase his central government's military presence throughout the Philippines. On 3 March 1967 Blair reported to the State Department that senator and founder of the Philippine Progressive Party had accused Marcos of overplaying the Huk threat in order to resist pressure from the League of Provincial Governors and City Mayors for greater decentralisation. The following month on 14 April, Blair reported Marcos had vetoed the proposed decentralisation bill.⁴⁹ On 21 July 1966, the embassy reported that Marcos directed Undersecretary of Defense Alfonso Arellano to 'freeze the earlier order calling for reduction of armed forces ... and placed additional forces at disposal of Central Luzon military authorities.' Some State Department officials pushed back: the following day an embassy report read, '... is there a Huk resurgence, or do recent events reflect a Huk reaction to gradually stepped up measures which Marcos has instituted?' US observers could not disaggregate these phenomena: 'the reality is generally unclear,' but among the 'farmers' there is a 'resigned attitude' from a 'string of past governments [that] has failed to improve their conditions.' This claim, accurate though not too remarkable, was followed by a statement that reveals the ambassadorial staff's scepticism regarding Marcos's Cold War posturing:

... present day Huks are largely local manifestation of defective peace and order situation which prevails throughout [the] country as a whole, and which provides a climate congenial to forces of lawlessness and banditry, whether they be called Octopus Gang from Cotabato or Huks in Luzon. The semi-feudal conditions still prevailing to deprive the masses of any real prospects for the future.⁵⁰

This is an accurate representation of the Philippines that the United States government and indeed Marcos wished to avoid facing. Marcos, however, skilfully worked his policies to fit into

⁴⁹ William Blair to US State Department, 3 March and 14 April 1967, RG 59, Philippines, 1967-1969, Box 2426, NARA.

⁵⁰ Richard Service to State Department, CINCPAC, and POLAD, 22 July 1966, RG 59, 1964-1966, Box 2588, NARA.

the Cold War framework consistent with that of hawks in Washington, thus creating the impression of solidarity with their position. Three days following this report, the embassy quoted Marcos as saying that ‘renewed communist activity was a sharp and violent reaction to the Philippine decision to send troops to South Vietnam.’⁵¹ This was reinforced when Marcos wrote Johnson to accept his state visit invitation: ‘there has been a noticeable resurgence of subversive activities in the Philippines since the Philippine Government decided to send to Vietnam a PHILCAG with security troops.’⁵² Embassy officials and the official Malacanang position both assessed the Philippine domestic situation as unstable, but pointed to different reasons. Marcos in any case used the situation to gain more aid whilst the embassy was trying to convey the seriousness of the domestic circumstances to the US president. National Security Adviser Rostow would not have given credence to suggestions that US policy had perpetuated ‘feudal’ and colonial practices in the post-war Republic of the Philippines; as this would have totally undermined the entire US Cold War project in Southeast Asia, it seems unlikely that Rostow ever passed such views on to Johnson.

It is useful to attempt to unpack the prevailing reality surrounding the deterioration of law and order in the Philippine countryside, to ascertain both the degree and type of violence that was increasing across the rural regions of the northern island of Luzon. Marcos used the Huk issue as an excuse to escalate the militarisation of the areas that had historically caused tumult for the centralised government; this was not primarily to defeat Hukbalahaps, or address any existing socio-economic issues, but to assert his authority over historically troublesome areas. A CIA Weekly Summary of regional events from 24 February 1967 inferred the willingness of the US agency’s implicitness to encourage Marcos’s authoritarianism: ‘with a year of experience behind him, Marcos may well become more forceful in asserting his leadership.’ The report suggested that for Marcos the solution is to be more ‘forceful,’ and that ‘failure could produce the same rising disillusionment that has swept out every previous administration.’⁵³

Embassy reports filed to the State Department detailed Huk attacks, almost all of which were exclusively directed against the Philippine Constabulary. Though the Hukbalahap movement had lost much of its original cohort after the Magsaysay campaigns of the 1950s, by no means had they been eradicated, and their support base of sympathisers remained intact—

⁵¹ Richard Service to State Department, CINCPAC, and POLAD, 25 July 1966, RG 59, 1964-1966, Box 2588, NARA.

⁵² Malacanang Palace to Lyndon Johnson, 9 August 1966, WHCF, CO 235, Philippines, Box 62, *LBJL*.

⁵³ CIA Special Report, ‘The Philippines under President Marcos,’ 24 February 1967, *CIA Records Search Tool (CREST)*.

numbering 29,000 according to the CIA in early 1967.⁵⁴ As long as the socio-economic inequalities in Philippine rural society existed, the Hukbalahap, or a similar anti-establishment organisation would inevitably exist. When elected, Marcos was in a position to use Macapagal as a scapegoat for the problems he was facing, offering convenient justification to escalate military presence in the countryside—solidifying his centralising and militarising agenda. The asymmetry of what the Huks could actually affect and the governmental response suggests that Marcos exploited the Huk issue for achieving his own personal plans. Over the latter half of 1967 Wilson dedicatedly reported PC incidents with Huk bands. On four separate occasions PC deaths were reported as six, eleven, eight, and two—these undoubtedly were cause for concern, but did not reflect Marcos's response. According to Wilson, on 16 June 1967 Defense Secretary Mata 'publicly announced that the Philippines Army and navy will undergo a build-up during the next fiscal year,' and the PC would be increased from 16,000 to 20,000.' Government anti-Huk agencies later that year conducted a manhunt for six men, with 'two hundred PC and army troops with air and armour support.'⁵⁵ Policy makers in Washington felt solidarity with Marcos, who was combatting a guerrilla movement that was developing contemporaneously with the one the US was facing in Vietnam: the Vietcong. The reality was that Marcos was pursuing his own agenda of securing an unassailable political position through the use of the military.

The developments in the Philippine countryside were occurring within the protective shield of the United States Pacific defence perimeter—it was events outside of this rim that dominated discussions in Washington, and indeed how the Philippines could contribute to the war in Vietnam, and to US regional strategy more broadly. The 30,000 US troops station in the Philippines, the nuclear submarine docking station, and the launching points for 'airstrikes against Vietnam' placed the Philippines firmly at the centre of the Asian Cold War.⁵⁶ Furthermore, the bases were used as holding, or for the transfer of wounded soldiers, such as Korean troops in 1965—making the bases a multilateral point of interconnectivity for US allies across Asia.⁵⁷ Thus the Philippines were of considerable strategic value to the Department of Defense, whose mandate was very focused on Vietnam, which further contributed to the neglect of the prevailing domestic circumstances in the Philippines.

Though the Philippines primarily fell within the remit of the State Department; with the US Philippine bases being used extensively during the Vietnam War, Defense had a substantial

⁵⁴ CIA Special Report, 'The Philippines under President Marcos,' 24 February 1967, (*CREST*).

⁵⁵ Wilson to the State Department, June-December 1967.

⁵⁶ Sherman Kent to Richard Helms, 13 December 1965, *CREST*.

⁵⁷ William Blair to US State Department, 14 December 1965, *DNSA*.

voice in Philippine affairs in the late 1960s. The United States Senate Committee on Foreign Relations compiled a report on US presence in the Philippines, titled 'US Security Agreements and Commitments Abroad: The Republic of the Philippines.'⁵⁸ This report expressed the centrality of Cold War objectives and the primacy of US interests for the Philippines, much to the neglect of the economic issues that actually produced instability. Some American politicians were not fooled by its rhetoric. At a hearing, Arkansas Senator William J. Fulbright stated on the issue of US presence in the Philippines:

This rigmarole about protecting the Philippines is window dressing ... [it is] to serve our own purposes ... we run into it time and again where we are always aligned with the old crowd, in many cases the feudal crowd, which resists any change in the basic political and social structure of those countries, which are highly unsatisfactory to 90 percent of the people.⁵⁹

Senator Stuart Symington of Missouri asked 'the truth of the matter is that the principal threat to the Government of the Philippines comes from the Filipinos who do not agree with the Government in the Philippines: is that not a fair statement?' Fulbright and Symington, well known as being in the left wing of the Democratic Party, critically examined hawkish opinions from military figures such as Rear Admiral Draper Kauffman, commander of US naval forces in the Philippines, and Lieutenant General Francis Gideon, commander of the 13th Air Force at Clark Air Base. To Symington's question Kauffman responded 'I am loathed to give a positive yes ... it implies that I am seriously worried about the internal threat, and I am not.' For Kauffman, Philippine domestic issues are not important or relevant, but the military capacity of the bases to achieve US aims in Asia was the priority; this was the view that was so crucial to Marcos's success in the Philippines.⁶⁰ The State and Defense Departments, as well as the Johnson administration, had supported Marcos as they believed him capable of dealing with fleeting resistance at home as they pursued loftier goals in Vietnam.

As mentioned above, on 26 July 1966, Marcos had already made it clear that he felt charged with the 'personal' responsibility to prevent 'another Vietnam in the Philippines,' and had mobilised a substantial escalation of government force in the countryside.⁶¹ Although there was no direct connection between the escalation in Vietnam and the rise of anti-government activities in the Philippines, the contemporaneous nature of the increase of Philippine

⁵⁸ 'US Senate, Committee on Foreign Relations, Subcommittee on United States Security Agreements and Commitments Abroad,' in Schirmer and Shalom, *Philippine Reader*, pp. 144-148.

⁵⁹ 'US Senate, Committee on Foreign Relations, Subcommittee on United States Security Agreements and Commitments Abroad,' in Schirmer and Shalom, *Philippine Reader*, pp. 144-148.

⁶⁰ Schirmer and Shalom, *Philippine Reader*, pp. 144-146.

⁶¹ Richard Service to State Department, CINCPAC, and POLAD, 26 July 1966, RG 59, 1964-1966, Box 2588, NARA.

domestic agitation, and the growing conflict in Vietnam meant that Marcos, hawks in Washington, and the Defense Department could easily conflate them. This was how Cold War paradigms caused a misinterpretation and misunderstanding of what the real priorities in the Philippines should have been, and how Marcos utilised Cold War anxieties to enhance and solidify his position in the Philippines. At the end of 1967, both Johnson in Vietnam, and Marcos in the Philippines were pursuing damaging and misguided escalating military tactics, that would both result in disastrous consequences for the peoples of Southeast Asia, and for the international reputation of the United States.

Arming the Janus-Faced Executive: Pro-Americanism, Filipino Nationalism, and Strategies for Political Survival in Marcos's First Term.

The cornerstone of Marcos' foreign policy is the US-Philippine alliance ... the problem is the interpretation of existing agreements and the frequently frustrated desire to enjoy simultaneously all the rights and dignities of an equal partnership and the assurance that the US will exercise paternalistic generosity in helping the Philippines out of trouble, all too often self-imposed.⁶²

This CIA conclusion, however, came in June 1968, by which time Marcos had solidified his position as Philippine leader; politically, militarily, financially, and internationally. 1966 and 1967 were the height of US-Philippine relations, and so keen was Washington to secure Marcos in their camp, they furnished him with both ego and power enough, that within four years, he could install a dictatorship.

Marcos greatly relied on US money and materiel throughout much of his first term as president, whilst simultaneously expressing a high level of inherently anti-American Filipino nationalism. Marcos had to continue to satisfy the old conservative elites who had ties to the United States, in order to secure aid and support from Washington: the materiel foundation of his eventual dictatorial regime. The difficulty for Marcos was how to keep these supply lines open, whilst solidifying his own nationalist, pro-Asian views, which manifested themselves most noticeably in the withdrawal of troop support in Vietnam upon his re-election in November 1969. Essentially, towards the end of his first term, and during the beginning of his second, 1968-1969, Marcos had to skilfully plan how he would sustain US aid whilst not adhering to Washington's directives. Ultimately, by the time Marcos's reputation began to subside within US policy and intelligence communities, he had already achieved a near

⁶² 'Prospects for the Philippines,' *LBJL*.

unassailable position of political and military strength in the Philippines, as discussed in the previous section.

The roots of Philippine nationalism had been fermenting long before the Cold War, primarily because of American control of large sectors of the economy, domination over the import-export market, and use of military bases. Nationalist attitudes were, however, further entrenched during the Cold War, namely by the Bell Trade Act of 1946 and the Laurel Langley Act of 1955, which tied the US economy to the Philippines, exacerbating not just rural and urban poverty, but disgruntling emerging domestic business interests. Emerging out of this political context, Marcos understood the situation clearly enough: whilst he relied upon what the CIA tagged as 'paternalistic generosity' of the United States,⁶³ he had interpreted the Southeast Asian Cold War crises accurately: 'the crux of the problem for America is to bring American power to bear in Asia on terms acceptable to Asian nationalism.'⁶⁴ This quote was part of an address made to the Joint Session of US Congress, 15 September 1966, and to such an important audience Marcos did not pass the chance to assert his personal authority and sense of responsibility on dealing with the matter, declaring to the US government that 'it is a difficult but not an impossible task.'⁶⁵ Once again, Marcos took the initiative to manoeuvre himself into a position where he was apparently forced to personally handle the roots of antagonism between the Philippines and United States; similar to the debates surrounding PHILCAG and domestic unrest, Marcos was appointing himself the job of assisting US Cold War objectives in the region, and used the situation to proactively consolidate his power. Upon analysing CIA and Defense Department documents, however, it is clear that Marcos's policies and actions were ultimately at odds with Washington's agenda, and indeed this realisation among US officials marked a downturn in the United States' faith in Marcos to remain a pro-American ally.

With help from allies in Washington, and the ability to dominate Philippine politics, Marcos moved to control the Filipino government. In fact, when he launched this project, American businessmen were already anxious about Filipino economic nationalism. Deputy Assistant to the Secretary for Commercial Affairs and Business Activities Eugene M. Braderman told the World Affairs Council in March 1967 that 'nationalism had been one of the dominant factors since 1946' in the Philippines, continuing, 'the accelerating growth of Filipino consciousness in

⁶³ Director of the CIA, National Intelligence Estimate, 'Prospects for the Philippines,' 20 June 1968, NSF, National Intelligence Estimates, Box 7, *LBJL*.

⁶⁴ Ferdinand Marcos, 'An Asian Message to America—Trustee of Civilisation,' address to Joint Session of US Congress, 15 September 1966, President's Appointment File, Diary Backup, Box 45, *LBJL*.

⁶⁵ Marcos, 'An Asian Message to America—Trustee of Civilisation,' *LBJL*.

the last twenty years' made the early Marcos years an era of the most out-spoken anti-American nationalist rhetoric, emanating from media, political, and underground factions.⁶⁶ Philippine Senate President Lorenzo Sumulong, who held the post throughout Marcos's first term, articulated a distinctly anti-American view of the country's dilemma; at a speech in Quezon City, Sumulong claimed that 'many of the social and economic problems which we have been trying hard to meet and solve are traceable to the foreign economic policy pursued by United States in developing our country only as a source of raw materials and as a market for her manufactured goods.'⁶⁷ Sumulong was a thoroughly credible figure: a Harvard law graduate, he served twenty one years as Senator and twenty four years in Congress. Holding such prestigious office, which had been implemented by US authorities during the colonial era to replicate their own political system, superficially, suggested that if the US government was to consider any grievances of this kind, those of the Senate President had to be taken seriously. Nevertheless, since Marcos, as President and self-appointed Secretary of Defense, managed the US-Philippine relationship personally, attitudes such as Sumulong's were kept away from Washington-Manila discussions. Consequently, while Sumulong had a platform for airing such grievances in the Philippines, he was out of the geopolitical, Cold War policy circles, allowing Marcos to isolate him. Sumulong was manageable, but the manifestation of nationalism proliferated elsewhere too, in areas less easily controlled, such as underground and anti-establishment associations. The reaction to rising anti-Americanism, which flourished during the late 1960s, put Marcos in a position to justify eventual dictatorial rule.

Midway through his first term, increasing doubts about his pro-American qualities, abilities to pursue Cold War objectives, and means of achieving stability were highlighted across US intelligence bodies. Ferdinand Marcos had successfully made allies in Washington by meeting their demands, and was capable of isolating dissenting voices at home, as shown with the Sumulong example. The very existence of these dissenting voices and overseas pressures, however, suggest that by the end of 1967, he was not in complete command of the situation or direction of the Philippines, despite the confidence he publically exuded. For example, a feature of the post-war US-Philippines partnership was an inability to find consistency and stability in relations. This trend continued with the latter part of Marcos's first term, and his campaign for re-election was riddled with US Defense Department and CIA doubts over his commitment to their aims. A top secret Defense Department military assistance reappraisal of the Philippines for the fiscal years 1967 to 1971 set out a clear agenda that strongly suggested that Marcos's role was to suppress nationalism, and certainly any anti-Americanism.

⁶⁶ Statement of Eugene M. Braderman to World Affairs Council, 8 March 1967, Files of Ceil Bellinger, Box 19, *LBJL*.

⁶⁷ R. B. Peters to State Department, 17 June 1966, RG 59 Box 2580, Philippines 1964-1966, *NARA*.

Objectives: develop and maintain a force that can defeat Communist insurgencies without direct intervention by US ... The Plan is designed to help create and maintain a political climate favourable to the continued US use of important bases in the Philippines. The Plan assumes that the [Philippine Government] will remain friendly to the United States.⁶⁸

As far as the Defense Department was considered, the 'Joint Intelligence Estimate for Planning in the Pacific and Asian Area' laid down the gauntlet for Marcos in the area of Cold War strategy. The expectations of Marcos had then been clearly defined, and within these it was down to his initiative to ensure the orientation of the Philippines. In order to create such a 'favourable climate,' Marcos was offered an opportunity to operate significant personal discretion in achieving US objectives. During the early years of his first term, Marcos indeed achieved his 'favourable climate,' which included the PHILCAG commitment, continued US military base use, increased armed police in unsettled areas, and his embrace of the Philippines as an autonomous regional participant in the Cold War. However, by late 1967, only two years into what would become a twenty one year rule, his reputation began to suffer in the eyes of President Johnson and the US State Department. Nationalist rhetoric in Marcos's presidency became stronger, and his pursuance of personal power superseded US Cold War objectives. US foreign policy in 1966 and 1967 had built up Marcos's wealth and military power and had made him a politically influential agent, but now Marcos began to detour from the pro-American policy line; US agencies were increasingly unable or unwilling to deal with the authoritarian and dictatorial nature of the Philippine President. The Johnson administration had invested a great deal of political capital in Ferdinand Marcos, but the target of this effort was achieving the Cold War objectives of support in Vietnam and a pro-American, anti-communist bulwark, and that in reality did not alleviate any of the most serious problems plaguing the Philippines. In describing the Marcos regime, Country Director for Philippine Affairs Richard M. Service reported a conversation he had with Carlton M. Stewart, Vice President of Asia for the First National City Bank of New York (largest bank holding company in the United States): 'he emphasized that he was entirely serious when he said that this regime is the worst so far.'⁶⁹

In 1967, the voices of Marcos's critics began to gain credence in the US foreign policy making community. Consequently Marcos pursued self-aggrandisement by concentrating power among his closest allies and syphoning state wealth for personal use. The key to this was

⁶⁸ 'Marcos Optimistic on Solving Social Ills Plaguing Philippines,' The New York Times, 14 March 1967 Files of Ceil Bellinger, Box 19, *LBJL*.

⁶⁹ Memo of conversation, Vice President of Asia, First National City Bank of New York and Richard M. Service, 15 June 1967, RG59, Philippines 1967-1969, Box 2426, *NARA*.

suggested by some Philippine newspapers in September 1966: they ventured the idea that the Marcos state visit to the US was a prize for sending the Philippine Civic Action Group (PHILCAG) unit to Vietnam.⁷⁰ Though Marcos responded by claiming the PHILCAG was for the 'national interest,' there are some important events to keep in mind when considering the legitimacy of Marcos's presidency—his political and diplomatic moves were motivated by self-serving ambitions.

Vice President Ferdinand Lopez commented that sending Filipinos to Vietnam was playing politics with Filipino lives.⁷¹ Indeed, Marcos was willing to play this game; he made a very conscious effort to move closer to Johnson and the United States, and he was willing to make himself vulnerable to nationalist criticism at home for the opportunity to open himself up to the benefits of being a close ally of the US. For example, the *Manila Times* reported that Marcos was planning on visiting Harry Truman, Dwight Eisenhower, the MacArthur family, J.D. Tydings (son of Millard, the sponsor of the Tydings-McDuffie Act of 1935), and the Jones Family (William Jones had sponsored the 1902 Organic Act in the Philippines).⁷² Evoking sentimentality within the social groups of these men who had been so intimately associated with the United States history in the Philippines, these visits suggest Marcos saw an opportunity to honour these men, making him more popular in the US, but certainly creating great dissatisfaction at home among nationalist Filipinos. It seemed Marcos moved closer to America, literally, upon these visits, for the elevation of his reputation and prestige, above the needs of his country.

Marcos had been furnished with prestige, money, and military aid in return for the small, and ultimately, short lived, commitment to Vietnam of Filipino troops. By 1967, however, the seemingly strong tapestry of the Johnson-Marcos partnership began to unravel. Ambassador Blair flew to Washington to report back directly to the Vice President Hubert Humphrey, his assistant, and his military aide, Colonel Herbert Beckinton. Such an audience conveyed the seriousness of the issue at hand. Marcos had duped the United States, and he was far from being the saviour of the Philippines. Marcos had made no substantial attempt to raise the socio-economic situation from rebellion-inducing conditions, which precluded any significant advance of the Philippines as an international Cold War partner to the US—Marcos had aimed to consolidate and aggrandise his personal wealth, power, and influence at the behest of his nation's wellbeing and reputation.

⁷⁰ Embassy to US Department of State, 9 October 1966, *DNSA*.

⁷¹ Embassy to US Department of State, 19 May 1965, *DNSA*.

⁷² Embassy to US Department of State, 30 August 1966, *DNSA*.

Upon his meeting with Johnson's Vice President, Blair noted four aspects of Marcos and his Presidency that were threats to the future stability and security of the Philippines, and which necessarily also endangered US interests; in fact, all four also inferred dangerous territory regards the state of Philippine democracy too. First, Blair confirmed Marcos's Foreign Minister Narciso Ramos 'had created a lot of noise' regarding the threat of nationalism 'to have some bargaining power ... a typical Philippine tactic.' Blair was thus suggesting Marcos had been attempting to extort US aid by deceptively enlarging the problem of nationalism, and other domestic threats. Second, 'and more disillusioning ... is the current involvement of Marcos in corruption ... to an astounding degree.' Marcos was not just falsifying claims for aid, but he was also mishandling these funds, so any further economic aid should be channelled to 'certain Governors who are honest ... not through the central Government.' Third, the 'seriousness of the Huk problem in Luzon' was increasing, as was the trend in the Philippines toward further inequality; the poor were continuing to get poorer, whilst the wealthy were becoming wealthier. Fourth, and finally, Marcos was 'acting like a traditional Philippine politician looking out for himself and his family,' which meant that he was either unwilling or unable to 'delegate authority,' and was concentrating power within a very small cabal of supporters. In 1967 Blair had highlighted not just that Marcos was actively failing to address the internal problems that the US had originally wanted him to resolve, but there were also clear signs that Marcos and the Philippines were moving towards a more extreme system. Even a CIA report in 1968 stated the situation in the Philippines was 'worsening,' and that long term prospects 'do not appear promising' and successes thus far 'can be attributed to the President's skill in public relations rather than to actual results;' indeed in response to Marcos's cornerstone campaign, 'Rice and Roads,' the report concluded Philippine 'rice yield is still amongst the lowest in the world and road paving has not increased noticeably.' Furthermore, not just had this campaign fallen short of expectations, land tenancy was highlighted as critical; fifty percent of peasants were still share-croppers, creating a 'stagnant system.'⁷³ Nothing had changed. Thus, when martial law was declared by Marcos in 1972, it could hardly have surprised already disillusioned observers like Blair.

These concerns, disturbing as they may appear to have manifested in the Philippines, had been the reality throughout the Cold War and even before World War Two. Marcos secured electoral votes and Washington's backing largely because he was skilled in public relations and offered, to American handlers, a vision of a regional leader and Cold Warrior. As discussed above, Marcos did live up to expectations in his early years in Malacanang, but throughout the late 1960s the law and order conditions throughout the archipelago were rapidly

⁷³ 'Prospects for the Philippines,' *LBJL*.

deteriorating. To a large extent, this was the uncomfortable and somewhat an embarrassing issue on the table in Washington regarding the Philippines, because to really address this issue was to look to effect the unacceptable and impossible: dismantle the entrenched landed elites and remove much of the established socio-political upper classes. This was improbable in the context of American paternalism because it required removing the very groups who historically enjoyed ‘close associations with the US;’⁷⁴ to foreign policy experts such as Rusk, Rostow, or Bill Bundy, this was untenable, especially considering the volatility of the entire region, including the stormy shores of Vietnam. The more a Cold War discourse was applied to the Philippines, and the further the real socio-economic issue was neglected, the only palatable outcome appeared to be accepting authoritarian rule by someone perceived to be an ally. It had been suggested by Robert Ballantyne in 1964 and 1965 that Marcos had these qualities, and reinforced by Helms in the CIA report in 1968 suggested that Marcos had facets to his character that were less than conducive to achieving US strategic goals. As seen at the beginning of this section, Helms had accused Marcos of assuming a Filipino entitlement to US aid, but then he darkly noted that ‘the role of Philippine leaders with strong ties to the US can be expected to decline.’ The role of nationalism and popular criticism of the “special” relationship with the US may well lead to a unification of leftist groups and “main stream” nationalist groups.⁷⁵ Thus, it appeared that the prevailing attitude of the CIA in June 1968 was that Marcos was insolent, but dangerously so amidst an increasingly hostile national atmosphere toward American policy and the assigned role of the Philippines in Cold War Asia. In other words, the CIA had apparently acknowledged the very Achilles heel of US Cold War foreign policy: by supporting potential dictators, they risked uniting nationalist opposition and driving it into the arms of socialism.

Conclusion: Setting the Stage for Dictatorship.

The presidential visits of 1966, when Marcos was still fresh to the presidency, marked the high point in US-Philippine relations. The following year Marcos acted, and in turn was treated, as the closest of allies to Washington. The 1968-1969 period marked a downturn in relations; Marcos had not remained steadfast over Vietnam commitment, nor had he arrested the still deteriorating socio-economic conditions at home. The 1969 presidential election campaign provided evidence that the June 1968 CIA report was accurate regarding growing Filipino nationalism—not just in the public consciousness, but now emanating directly from Marcos

⁷⁴ ‘Prospects for the Philippines,’ *LBJL*.

⁷⁵ ‘Prospects for the Philippines,’ *LBJL*.

himself. US Ambassador to the Philippines Henry Byroade wrote the State Department 6 November 1969, five days before the Filipino presidential election, that ...

... in the last few campaigning days Ferdinand Marcos has taken a nationalistic stance by announcing he will seek to repeal the anti-subversion law, release political prisoners, and allow the organisations of communist groups in the Philippines as long as they do not attempt to subvert the government ... he has said he wants to renegotiate all agreements with the US.⁷⁶

Having publicly articulated this nationalistic outburst at the eleventh hour, in the middle of a high-profile campaign, he had prevented any subtle or private intervention by US officials, reflecting Marcos's astute political awareness. To be clear, a reinterpretation of the anti-subversion law in 1964 by the courts under Macapagal's presidency had negatively impacted his standing in Washington policy circles and eventual downfall. Coupled with this now very public anti-American nationalism, Marcos had continued with other traits questionable to Washington. The previous month Byroade had told the State Department that Marcos enjoyed 'free of charge' public services to aid his campaign, such as 'transport, propaganda, and security.'⁷⁷ Byroade quoted the figure of 22.5 million pesos spent on vote buying, noted that the Liberal Party had charged the Marcos administration with deliberate armed coercion in a number of areas,' and cited Election Commissioner Miraflor as accusing both Philippine political parties of 'employing armed coercion.'⁷⁸ Regardless of what the Liberal Party had been doing at that time, Marcos was already flush with international financial support from his first term as a 'pro-American' president, and the armed forces under his command had been directly supplied by the United States as well.

What these two reports from Byroade show is that Marcos had retained what Ballantyne had earlier called a 'ruthless tendency to use any means, including thinly veiled threats of force, to achieve his ends,'⁷⁹ whilst now espousing an anti-American nationalism to appease potential rivals at home. What US officials saw as invaluable traits during the Macapagal years were quickly becoming disastrous under Marcos's own administration. While Marcos had expressed nationalist sentiment throughout his presidential career, he was arguably becoming more dedicated to self-aggrandisement: he openly opposed Philippine commitment to America's war in Vietnam, but later committed after gaining financial and military support that buttressed his

⁷⁶ Henry Byroade to US State Department, 6 November 1969, RG 59, Philippines, 1967-1969, Box 2426, NARA.

⁷⁷ Henry Byroade to US State Department, 11 October 1969, RG 59, Philippines, 1967-1969, Box 2427, NARA.

⁷⁸ Byroade to US State Department, 11 October 1969, NARA.

⁷⁹ Ballantyne, 'Report of Philippines Visit,' NARA.

position vis-à-vis domestic rivals. When adjoining both the domestic policies of Marcos, and the ramifications of his leadership for US foreign policy in the Cold War, there is a distinct lack of literature in this area. Once Marcos was elected, and began aggrandising his position, studies on this post-1965 period have sought to deal with the subsequent Marcos dictatorship, or the legacy of Marcos, post his presidency.⁸⁰ Whereas in this chapter, and the preceding ones, a clear and continuous narrative has been constructed, setting out how conditions in the Philippines and US foreign policy helped create his authoritarian regime. This important contribution to broader Cold War studies has been overdue, and presents an alternative and worthwhile lens through which to critique US Cold War policy and strategy.

Throughout much of his first term, Marcos was seemingly a pro-American ally, his potentially authoritarian tendencies were perceived as acceptably anti-communistic; when the discourse turned more nationalistic, however, Johnson turned against his erstwhile house guest. By the time Johnson left the White House in 1969, Marcos had withdrawn PHILCAG, and US-Philippines relations once again had begun to deteriorate. Marcos was unwilling to participate in the usual procession of pro-American rhetoric after 1968, and earlier US support had given him the tools he needed to survive. At no point has it appeared that US intelligence agencies doubted their objectives and policies toward the Philippines, but instead sort to victimise the Philippine president as the problem in US-Philippines relations. The fact that Marcos, like every incumbent of Malacanang before him, had fallen short of US policies and expectations, suggests very strongly that it was US Cold War policy and objectives that were at fault. The 1969 election, however, did not see a new president ushered in, but an unprecedented second-term victory for Marcos. He was now politically unique in Philippine history, and had amassed a fortune, a close entourage of domestic and international allies, and had reoriented the army as a domestic force. By the close of the 1960s, the Philippines had entered the death throes of democracy.

⁸⁰ Guerrero and Tusalem, 'Mass Public Perceptions of Democractization in the Philippines: Consolidation in Progress?'; Fuentecilla, *Fighting from a Distance*; Thomson, *The Anti-Marcos*; Rabasa, et al, *From Insurgency to Stability*.

Conclusion.

'To sustain and defend our government': the Declaration of Martial Law, and the Dissolution of the Third Republic of the Philippines.¹

When Ferdinand Marcos won re-election in 1969 he made history because he was the first Philippine president to gain a second term. In his first term, he had gained wealth, power, and prestige, much of which had been provided by President Lyndon Johnson, who had been seeking to purchase support for the Vietnam War. The fact that the US government had to use offers of wealth and power to persuade Marcos to commit troops, or in other words align with US Cold War objectives in Asia, shows the extent to which Marcos's nationalism played a role in the US-Philippines relationship. Also, the intransigency of Marcos is demonstrative of the agency of Filipino leaders more broadly, and how US foreign policy had, by the late 1960s failed to address the socio-economic problems in the islands. Also US policy makers had not been successful in creating a fully co-operative and malleable Philippine leadership—State Department, CIA, and Presidential efforts had failed on both counts. Marcos seized upon these shortcomings; considering global Cold War volatility, in the eyes of policy makers in Washington a dictatorship was preferable to, for example, the spread of the Chinese Cultural Revolution to the Philippines.² After decades of close partnership, and extensive interference in the development of Philippine politics, the impact of US foreign policy had created conditions in which the likes of Marcos could manoeuvre to install a dictatorship. Thus, this dissertation has demonstrated why the year 1965, and Marcos's first election success, was a pivotal year in US-Philippine history, as well as highly significant for understanding global US foreign policy altogether.

Marcos installed Martial Law in 1972, but the documents analysed here have shown the US State Department knew the Filipino leader had potentially dictatorial characteristics as early as

¹ Proclamation of Martial Law, 21 September 1972, <http://www.gov.ph/1972/09/21/proclamation-no-1081/>

² Zachary A. Scarlett, 'China's Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution and the Imagination of the Third World,' in *The Third World in the Global 1960s*, (eds.) Samantha Christiansen and Zachary A. Scarlett (London, 2013), pp. 39-56, p. 39; Rana Mitter, *A Bitter Revolution: China's Struggle with the Modern World* (Oxford, 2005), p. 194.

January 1965.³ Nevertheless, once elected, and throughout the early years of first term, Johnson treated the Filipino leader as well as any international partner. US foreign policy contributed to conditions in the Philippines that could allow someone like Marcos to come to power, on top of which once he had attained the presidency, the US government aided and supported his increasingly authoritarian rule.⁴ The events that occurred in 1972 can be seen to be the logical conclusion of the long US-Philippine relationship. Each chapter in this dissertation has added an important dimension into detailing the development of conditions, the impact and results of foreign policy, which combined, led to the rise of dictatorship. This concluding chapter first draws the narrative in this thesis to a close, by discussing the 1969-1972 period. These three years were a waiting period; Marcos's dictatorship had already taken shape through his first term in the presidency, dealt with in depth in Chapter Five. Second, a discussion of the dissertations contribution, and position, in the historiography precedes the final section. Third, concluding and summarising this study of US-Philippines relations since 1898, which draws to a close in the 1970s. 1972 is simply the bookend of a story that began the nineteenth century, accelerated in 1965, with the dictatorship all but guaranteed by 1969; the three years from Marcos' second election victory and installation of dictatorship, was a waiting game.⁵

Epilogue: Countdown to Dictatorship.

16 September 1982: the Philippine President and the First Lady, Ferdinand and Imelda Marcos, visited the Reagan White House, affording Ronald and Nancy Reagan the chance to reciprocate the warm welcome extended when the Reagans toured the archipelago in 1969.⁶ On the Rose Garden lawn at 10.15 pm the two presidents shared toasts in each other's honour. Reminiscing about the 1969 trip, when he had been governor of California for only two years, President Reagan said ...

... many things have changed in both countries since that time, but one thing remains constant—the basic nature of the Filipino-United States friendship. It remains solid. Both countries have worked hard over the years to maintain excellent cooperation in defence, foreign policy, refugee matters, economic assistance, and many other areas.

³ Report of Robert J. Ballantyne, 1/8/1965 (NARA, RG59, CFPF 1964-1966, Box 1, The Philippines, 1964-1966).

⁴ Michael E. Latham, 'The Cold War in the Third World, 1963-1975.'

⁵ Ballantyne, 'Report of Philippines Visit,' NARA; 'Prospects for the Philippines,' *LBJL*.

⁶ Stanley Karnow, 'Reagan and the Philippines,' *New York Times*, 19 March, 1989
<http://www.nytimes.com/1989/03/19/magazine/reagan-and-the-philippines-setting-marcos-adrift.html?pagewanted=all> [Accessed October 2015].

In his speech, the word democracy was not mentioned once in a two way toast running to over fifteen hundred words.⁷ At a time when President Reagan was emphasising the importance of democracy internationally, and in particular in contrast to the socialist world, this was a striking omission in a country where the leader, Marcos, had openly suppressed the nation's elected government.

It was in 1972, ten years prior to the Reagan visit, when Marcos suspended democracy in the Philippines, and it seems implausible that this caught US officials by surprise. Still, callous disregard for elections was not a constant in Filipino politics; in 1946, former president Manuel Roxas had said to Harry Truman on a visit to the White House that 'the millions of people of the Far East will look to us [and to you] as their models.'⁸ Despite this positive start, coupled with the ill-conceived US foreign policy, socio-economic and political conditions in the Philippines, over a long period, suggested that the country was in danger of developing a dictatorship. Even before the Marcos government finally declared martial law on 22 September 1972, President Nixon, Assistant for National Security Affairs, Henry Kissinger, and Ambassador Henry Byroade had received many signs that Philippine democracy, the 'replica in miniature of the United States,' had been under real threat. Byroade had asked Marcos on Thursday 14 September if he was 'about to surprise us with a declaration of martial law.' The reply the ambassador received was no, but implications to the contrary were strong: 'he [Marcos] said that if a part of Manila were burned, a top official of his Government, or foreign ambassador, assassinated or kidnapped, then he would act very promptly.'⁹ The day after Marcos responded to Byroade's questions regarding martial law, democracy in the Philippines was dealt a further blow. At an event in Manila, Secretary of Foreign Affairs, Carlos Romulo, had put his hand on the ambassador's shoulder and told him 'your brand of democracy clearly cannot get the Philippines out of its dilemmas and start her on the road to real progress.' In this 15 September telegram to the US State Department, Byroade concluded that the 'imposition of martial law, or an abandonment of the democratic constitution, would present us in America with a problem ... with regard to the Philippines, where we introduced our own brand of democracy.'¹⁰ The following week, on 22 September, Marcos fabricated an assassination attempt on his Secretary of Defense, manufacturing conditions under which he

⁷ Ronald Reagan, 'Remarks at the Welcoming Ceremony for President Ferdinand E. Marcos of the Philippines,' 16 September 1982 <http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/?pid=42990> [Accessed October 2015].

⁸ Manuel Roxas, 'Newsreel,' *Washington DC, 1946* <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=4oOE3iYn1RU>

⁹ Telegram from the Embassy in the Philippines to the Department of State, 15 September 1972, *FRUS 1969-1976*.

¹⁰ Telegram from the Embassy in the Philippines to the Department of State, 15 September 1972, *FRUS 1969-1976*.

had stated he would declare martial law: 'Okay, Johnny, go ahead. Make it look good...'¹¹ US officials seemed aware that Marcos was a dangerous figure to representative government, which begs the question: why did the American government, which held influence in the Philippines, allow this to happen?

By the time Lyndon B. Johnson had handed the presidency of the United States over to Richard M. Nixon in January 1969, Marcos had manoeuvred himself into an exceptionally strong position, both domestically and internationally. Johnson's administration had furnished him with money and materiel, as well as international prestige in return for what was, in the end, a limp military assistance package in the Vietnam War, which was recalled after only one year. The Philippines First Lady, Imelda Marcos, for her part, dazzled high profile dignitaries with her charm and elaborate parties, none more so than the Governor of California, and his wife, Ronald and Nancy Reagan during their visit to Manila in 1969. During the three years between Nixon's swearing in and the eventual passing of martial law (1969-1972), the notion of dictatorial power had featured throughout official Ambassadorial and State Department correspondence, as well as an acknowledgement that Marcos was trying to extract as much as possible from the US-Philippine 'friendship,' in order to consolidate his position.¹² This period was marked by increasing student protest movements, influenced by the Cultural Revolution in China, while the Hukbalahap also re-emerged as a major threat in the countryside. Considering both these developments, Kissinger told Nixon that Byroade 'observes that Marcos is really afraid of a revolution.' In the same memo Kissinger noted how Marcos 'complained about the hostility of the Manila press,' and asked for more military aid and materiel.¹³ Whether Marcos may have been genuinely concerned, but he also was seeking to manipulate the US once again; with US assistance, he was in a position to openly deal with his critics.

During the three years in which Nixon's presidency coincided with the final stages of Philippine democracy, US foreign policy only buttressed Marcos's confidence that, if he implemented martial law, American officials would stand idly by. The possibility of martial law had been discussed openly between Marcos and Byroade, Kissinger had written Nixon in February 1970 about it, and Byroade's only reaction had been to ensure the United States was not 'drawn into this situation.'¹⁴ Considering the domestic and international instability created by the

¹¹ See Rempel, *Delusions of a Dictator*.

¹² Memorandum from the President's Assistant for National Security Affairs (Kissinger) to President Nixon, 17 July 1969, *FRUS, 1969-1976*.

¹³ Memorandum from the President's Assistant for National Security Affairs (Kissinger) to President Nixon, 7 February, 1972, *FRUS, 1969-1976*.

¹⁴ Memorandum from the President's Assistant for National Security Affairs (Kissinger) to President Nixon, 7 February, 1972, *FRUS, 1969-1976*.

widespread political activism across the US, as well as the violence of the Chinese Cultural Revolution, Nixon's foreign policy doctrine was suggestive of support for the likes of Marcos. Marcos had already set a precedent of dictatorial behaviour, without official censure from the Nixon administration: the 1969 election experienced 'extremely high levels of fraud, violence and vote buying.'¹⁵ On 22 September 1972, after decades of poorly conceived foreign policy, and US policy makers' compliance in supporting increasingly authoritarian solutions to problems in the Philippines, the situation arrived at its logical conclusion: dictatorship in the United States' own democratic project.

The Nixon Doctrine, that defined the president's foreign policy outlook, further played into Marcos' hands. Cold War historian Greg Brazinsky has noted that Nixon's foreign policy 'would not undertake the defence of all free nations of the world,' but instead, sought to focus on troublesome hotspots, whilst also emphasising the need for regional allies, democratic ones or otherwise.¹⁶ Marcos would have realised the Philippines had to appear stable under his watch, or it would undermine the near three quarters of a century of US influence in the islands, as well as his own position. Furthermore, the protest against the Vietnam War in the US continued, if not heightened, following the Kent State shootings on 4 May 1970. Two months before in March, the US National Security Decision Memorandum 48, led to a massive withdrawal of 20,000 US troops from the Republic of Korea by the end of 1971. Marcos could not have failed to conclude all these factors represented a subtle nod to potential dictators: preserve US base interests, and maintain a level of domestic order, by any means other than American intervention. The stage was set for what Marcos stated in his Proclamation of Martial Law: to 'enforce obedience to all the laws and decrees, orders and regulations promulgated by me personally or upon my direction.'¹⁷ While US foreign policy had contributed to the conditions that enabled Marcos's dictatorship, it also at times implicitly encouraged such political moves, including the suspension of democracy in 1972.

1969 to 1972 was in many ways merely a waiting period when Marcos was preparing to take full control of the government. These last three years marked the end of a process that had been developing since 1898 when 'the American hand had [first] lain heavy on the Philippines,'

¹⁵ Jennifer Conroy Franco, *Elections and Democratization in the Philippines* (Washington, 2001) p. 87; Kolko, *Confronting the Third World*, p. 268.

¹⁶ Gregg A. Brazinsky, *Nation Building in South Korea: Koreans, Americans, and the Making of a Democracy* (North Carolina, 2009) p. 149; Fredrik Logevall and Andrew Preston (eds.), *Nixon in the World: American Foreign Relations, 1969-1977* (Oxford, 2008).

¹⁷ Ferdinand E. Marcos, 'Proclamation of Martial Law,' 21 September 1972, <http://www.gov.ph/1972/09/21/proclamation-no-1081/> [Accessed October 2015].

and especially since independence in 1946.¹⁸ It is the long history of US-Philippines relations that this dissertation has developed throughout its chapters: addressing how and why US foreign policies, such as the Bell Trade Act and the Military Base Agreement, significantly contributed to unravelling a system that American values were designed to spread, promote, and defend. The great irony for US foreign policy and Cold War objectives is that the restrictive legislation attached to Philippine independence in 1946 had not created a system that would ensure continued US control and dominance in the Philippines, but instead caused growing resentment, anti-American nationalism, and dictatorship supposedly in the name of supporting sovereignty. Marcos was a product of this US-designed system, and it is a great indictment indeed of US policy makers' short-termism, and adherence to Cold War discourses, that it was Marcos who sought to distance the Philippines from their historic partners.

Start with the Philippines: Analysing US Cold War Foreign Policy.

In 2011, at the request of the Office of the Secretary of Defense, the RAND Corporation was asked to investigate how violence transitions into stability, through the process of intensive counterinsurgency. Part of the RAND report was a Philippine case study, in which the pre-Marcos coverage was minimal, with no reference to key academic works such as those done by Nick Cullather.¹⁹ Such under-informed, publicly-funded studies are representative of a collective amnesia toward large parts of the US-Philippines historic relationship.²⁰ From the beginning of Cold War scholarship to contemporary studies, the Philippines has not received the detailed coverage its history and long association with the United States deserves. This dissertation contributes to the small body of work on the Philippines, yet it is not a niche study, as it sits within a broader historiography of the Cold War and US foreign policy.

Utilising the wealth of primary material gathered from the Lyndon Baines Johnson Presidential Library, the National Archive of Records and Administration, and the Hoover Archive, this study has contributed an elucidation of the importance of the history of US policy in the Philippines. These documents span the US foreign policy and intelligence community, including declassified CIA documents, personal papers, the presidential files of Johnson and his personal correspondence and dealings with the islands, as well as embassy, State and Defence Department material. These sources provide a useful view of the inner workings of US foreign policy, from localised reports from low level embassy staff, through the ranks all the way to

¹⁸ Stanley Karnow, *New York Times*, 19 March 1989.

¹⁹ Cullather, *Illusions of Influence*.

²⁰ Rabasa, et al, *From Insurgency to Stability*, pp. 9-40.

the White House. The embassy, State Department, Presidential, and CIA documents analysed should encourage further focus on the developing world, and ultimately place the Philippines more central in the twenty-first century Cold War debate. US foreign policy can only be truly understood when the Cold War is placed in a longer history, reaching back into the nineteenth century, and the country's first modern colony should be central to any future studies.

The developing world only really emerged in Cold War historiography during the 1960s, and was a central feature of the University of Wisconsin-Madison revisionist school. It developed in direct reaction to contemporaneous US involvement in conflicts and crises in Latin American and Southeast Asia, which explains somewhat the lack of attention the Philippines has received. Incorporating these vast, usually post-colonial regions, challenged Cold War orthodoxy successfully, dismantling firstly the bi-polar east-west dichotomy, and more closely considering the impact of the Cold War beyond Europe. This crucial addition of the developing world into Cold War discourse by the likes of William Appleman Williams, Gabriel Kolko, and Walter LaFeber, has been echoed in the twenty-first century by the attention given these regions by, for example, Odd Arne Westad in the *Global Cold War*.²¹ Westad, amongst others, has helped resuscitate important elements of the revisionist thesis, whilst promoting regional agency and contributing a truly global and multi-perspective approach, as this study has done. This angle of analysis remains relevant and useful because of the continued, post-Cold War involvement of the US in the developing world. The end of the Cold War did not mark the end of US involvement in world affairs, thus the focus on the developing world as central to understanding modern US foreign policy should be relevant beyond the chronological and thematic confines of the Cold War.

Following the rise of the New Right in the United States, with post-Cold War triumphalism, popular work such as Francis Fukuyama's *End of History*, the social impact of the Vietnam Syndrome, as well as newly opened Soviet archives; the developing world has not received its deserved attention since the revisionist school.²² The Philippines, even during the revisionist period, received insufficient focus, possibly because of the attention scholars paid to US involvement in the Korea and Vietnam War, as well as the Cuban Missile Crisis; the Philippines has remained a side study, a footnote, or an add on, for the most part, throughout the

²¹ See Williams, *Tragedy of American Diplomacy*; William Appleman Williams, *Empire as a Way of Life: An Essay on the Causes and Character of America's Present Predicament along with a few thoughts about an Alternative* (Oxford, 1980). For an alternative approach, see Geir Lundestad, 'Empire by Invitation? The United States and Western Europe, 1945-1952,' *Journal of Peace Research* (1986); LaFeber, *New Empire*; Gabriel Kolko, *Main Currents in Modern American History* (London, 1976); Westad, *Global Cold War*, Latham, 'The Cold War in the Third World, 1963-1975.'

²² Francis Fukuyama, 'The End of History?' *The National Interest* (Summer, 1989).

development of Cold War historiography since the 1960s.²³ There are of course exceptions, which have been extensively called upon in this dissertation, most notably Nick Cullather's *Illusions of Influence*, yet the Philippines has largely been understudied, which I have argued, has been to the detriment of scholars and policy makers, in assessing the impact and conclusions of US foreign policy in the developing world.²⁴

This study has therefore contributed to an established historiography in several ways. First, the US-Philippine relationship supersedes historical boundaries and markers; key aspects of colonial history persisted into the Cold War, including the fact that US policy makers' inability to reconcile colonial legacies produced consistently disappointing results from successive policies and US-backed governments in Manila. The Cold War scholarship, though not necessarily Philippine-specific, presented a powerful body of work that critically challenged the role of the United States in the developing world. Thus, second, this dissertation aligns specifically with twenty-first century Cold War historiography, primarily because it represents a considered analysis, taking into consideration the evolution of Cold War scholarship.²⁵ Third, and beyond the academy, discussions of the developing world have been central to public debates by the likes of Naomi Klein, Noam Chomsky, and William Blum. These popular engagements are suggestive of broader interest in the United States erstwhile colony, especially considering ongoing US involvement in developing world regions.²⁶

'Your brand of democracy:' Marcos, Dictatorship, and the Rejection of the American System.²⁷

'The confident postwar prospect of U.S. supremacy in the whole region was fading.' Planned as the 'southern anchor' of US power in Asia, US-Philippines relations have been tumultuous and complex ever since the inception of the partnership in 1898.²⁸ This dissertation had unfolded

²³ Kolko, *Confronting The Cold War*.

²⁴ Cullather, *Illusions of Influence*.

²⁵ Post-Revisionists: Gaddis, *The United States and the Origins of the Cold War, 1941–1947*; Thomas G. Paterson, *Soviet-American Confrontation: Postwar Reconstruction and the Origins of the Cold War* (London, 1973); John Lewis Gaddis, *Russia, the Soviet Union and the United States: An Interpretive History* (New York, 1978); Michael J. Hogan and Thomas G. Paterson, *The History of American Foreign Relations* (Cambridge, 1991).

²⁶ Klein, *The Shock Doctrine: The Rise of Disaster Capitalism*; Noam Chomsky, *Deterring Democracy* (London, 1992); Blum, *America's Deadliest Export*; Niall Ferguson, *Colossus: The Rise and Fall of the American Empire* (London, 2005).

²⁷ Telegram from the Embassy in the Philippines to the Department of State, 15 September 1972, *FRUS 1969-1976*.

²⁸ Pomeroy, *The Philippines: Colonialism, Collaboration, and Resistance!* p. 189.

chronologically from 1898 to 1972, whilst thematically addressing the domestic landscape, the regional and global Cold War scene, and how these have impacted the partnership between successive US and Philippine governments. The effect of this has been the setting out of how foreign policy, socio-economic situations, and Cold War pressures contributed to the creation of conditions in the Philippines that allowed for the rise of Marcos, and his installation of a dictatorship.

This dissertation's narrative began, in Chapter One, in the nineteenth century with the expansion of American export driven capitalism, seeking new markets to absorb the cyclical crises of over production. Westward advancement across the North American continent, into their hemispheric backyard, as well as into what Bruce Cummings called 'a vacuous Pacific,' was the inevitable unfolding of a system that relied upon growth.²⁹ The early and mid-nineteenth century forays in the Pacific marked intentions from Washington that the United States desired to expand overseas, and the US Civil War only served to accelerate the Northern States' industrialisation and manufacturing output. The Spanish-American War of 1898 marked the end of a century of explosive development in the United States: by the dawning of the twentieth century, the Philippines, Cuba, Guam, Puerto Rico, and Hawaii, were in some form, under direct US influence. From its inception, the US-Philippines relationship was perceived in the minds of US policy makers as far more than an isolated colonial outpost, though anti-colonial views were by no means absent in America. Nevertheless, driven by the likes of Admiral George Dewey and Assistant Secretary of the Navy Theodore Roosevelt, the conquest of the Philippines was portrayed by these men as the victory of their superior society, culture, race, and values—a symbol of Americanism in Asia—reflecting the emergence of a colonial discourse that, while not altogether new in America, was now looking increasingly beyond its continental borders. Now in possession of a major port in the Pacific region, the primary economic focus, China, was more easily in reach. Beyond trade, in 1907, the former Rough Rider, and now President, Teddy Roosevelt sent his Great White Fleet on a global circumnavigation to firmly assert the arrival of international US power, militarily, and economically.³⁰ The essential dynamic of the US-Philippines relationship was established from the very beginning, when President McKinley 'sent for the chief engineer of the War Department and...told him to put the Philippines on the map of the United States.' This assertive and domineering foreign policy continued from the formal colonial years, remained

²⁹ Bruce Cummings, *Dominion from Sea to Sea: Pacific Ascendancy and American Power* (Yale, 2009), p. 3.

³⁰ Stephen G. Walker and Mark Schafer, 'Theodore Roosevelt and Woodrow Wilson as Cultural Icons of U.S. Foreign Policy,' *Political Psychology*, 28:6 (December 2007), pp. 747–776.

largely consistent through World War Two, and the post-independence Cold War era.³¹ US foreign policy making bodies and intelligence communities sought to use the Philippines for three primary purposes: as the example to the developing world of the merits of accepting American values and systems; as a stepping stone into the vast markets of mainland Asia and; of increasing centrality as the Cold War unfolded, for housing vast military base installations and projecting aggressive US might in the tumultuous Asian theatre.

Many Cold War studies begin after World War Two but, as explained above, this was not a break in history: World War Two catalysed the process of US influence and intervention in the world. US influence in the Philippines after the war transformed in nature, but the essential partnership remained. In fact after independence, expectations of the Philippines within the State Department policy making circles increased. In principle, the archipelago was now a sovereign, autonomous Cold War ally, free of the paternalistic benevolence of US colonial authorities. In truth, 4 July 1946 inaugurated independence in name, whilst US influence and interests continued unabated.³² The Hukbalahap Rebellion in the 1940s and 1950s, and the rise of elite economic and political nationalism in the late 1950s was an exposure of, and a thoroughly visible demonstration against, the domineering US interference in the islands—namely the Bell Trade Act (1946) and the Military Base Agreement (1947). The re-establishment, and the continuity, of essential conditions within the US-Philippines relationship from the colonial to the post-colonial, and how US foreign policy interests sought to achieve similar objectives, contributed to the eventual and logical conclusion of dictatorship. Chapters Two through Five have analysed US foreign policy during the Cold War, stage by stage, and how it maintained and created circumstances, as well as endorsed and ham-fistedly encouraged authoritarian solutions to socio-economic and political problems in the Philippines, which had persisted since the inception of the US-Philippines relationship in 1898.

Chapter Two surveyed the establishment of a new framework of US influence in the Philippines, after World War Two, which perpetuated a system of economic dependence, still controlled by the exploitative landed elites of the colonial era. Though the fundamentals remained much unchanged, a transformation did occur in 1946. In order to fulfil late US President Franklin Roosevelt's commitment to decolonisation, in line with the 1941 Atlantic Charter, to meet the demand in the developing world for sovereign government, the US Government had to create a system through which they could still retain influence, without a

³¹ Schirmer and Shalom, *Philippines Reader* (Boston, 1987), pp. 22–23.

³² William J. Pomeroy, 'The Philippines: A Case Study of Neocolonialism,' pp. 159-191.

direct colonial authority. The new model for the Philippines, and somewhat representative of much of the decolonising world, was the maintenance of US, or European, influence and dominance by other means. It is Chapter Two that is concerned with this specifically, and the impact this would have throughout the Cold War, leading to 1972, is played out in the subsequent chapters.

This influence was achieved, and sustained, by two means: first by a pro-US orientation in legislation, and second, and more fundamentally, national leadership by a prominent political class who were steeped in loyalty and history with the United States. The great irony is that none of the CIA's or State Department's favoured presidential candidates in the Philippines had lasting success, and most lacked a clean record of operational credibility and legitimacy. First, the Bell Trade Act was a restrictive piece of economic legislation that tied the Philippines to the United States; the Military Base Agreement ensured continued US military presence across a vast complex of installations, principally used to project American power throughout Asia. Second, these could only be implemented, if the elected Filipino president was conducive to US policy objectives. Due to his unrivalled intimacy with the culture, a network of allies, and domineering personality, General Douglas MacArthur, Supreme Allied Commander in the Pacific, took the lead in late 1946, backing, and essentially helping Manuel Roxas win the April presidential election.

The immediate reaction to this, and what has been labelled 'neo-colonialism' by historians of the Cold War and of the Philippines, was the Hukbalahap Rebellion, which was a major challenge to the Philippine government, questioning the democratic and sovereign integrity of successive governments.³³ The rebellion would persist, in varying levels of seriousness and size throughout the Cold War. The more fundamental issue here, however, and that can offer parallels across the developing world, was that the US authorities had, after the devastation of World War Two, created a system that was unequal, and orientated away from addressing socio-economic issues. Confronting poverty, left wing and nationalistic political thought, and underdevelopment would have been a more considered plan to create a long term, stable, pro-American ally. Instead 'iron fist' leaders, military bases, and suppression of opposition was pursued as a means of securing US interests.³⁴ In light of this conclusion in Chapter Two, the

³³ Benedict Kerkvliet, *Huk Rebellion*; Renato Constantino, *Neocolonial Identity and Counter-Consciousness: Essays on Cultural Decolonization* (New York, 1979); Pomeroy, 'The Philippines: A Case Study of Neocolonialism.'

³⁴ Owen to Embassy, 19 April 1966, 'First 3 months of Marcos Administration from Domestic Political Viewpoint' (NARA, Box 2578-2591, RG 59, Box 2587, CFPF 64-6, Pol 15-1, 2.1.66).

path to dictatorship was clearly marked, and social inequality was actually catalysed by the increase of US global power, afforded them by World War Two.

Chapters Three and Four consider the years between the formation of the US-Philippines Cold War relationship, and the early, pre-martial law Marcos years. Within this period the partnership moved from the near euphoric celebrations in the State Department and CIA over the Ramon Magsaysay years, 1953-1957, to the collapse of relations during the nationalistic Garcia presidency, 1957-1961, to the more moderate, yet uninspiring, Diosdado Macapagal term, 1961-1965. The latter experienced some reconciliation, but was removed from office by the electorally triumphant Marcos. Chapter Three dealt with the legacy of Magsaysay, the term of President Garcia, and how these presidencies impacted on the US-Philippines relation in the 1960s. Of these presidents, Magsaysay has received by far the most attention in the historiography, as well as widespread public recognition, because of his charisma, anti-Hukbalahap Rebellion campaign, and intimate relationship with CIA agent Edward Lansdale.³⁵ The story of his presidency has been amply covered by Nick Cullather, and this chapter adds to the analysis of Magsaysay with an assessment of his legacy in the early 1960s when the role of the Philippines was rapidly moving from an inward looking, newly independent state, to a key regional Cold War ally to the United States. This analysis lay primarily in two important documents, a 1962 policy paper and a 1963 National Survey.³⁶ The latter, to a large extent, highlighted the failed promises of the Magsaysay era, and this is set against the second theme in Chapter Three, the Garcia presidency, marked by nationalism, and elite-political rejection of American influence in the Philippines.

Whereas Magsaysay defined himself as the anti-Hukbalahap campaigner in the countryside, Garcia, and the Manilan political landscape of the late 1950s was defined by a challenge to the status quo of US interests, from within the political and social elite. Though Garcia was a more moderate nationalist than his ally Senator Carlos Recto, his presidency gave a legitimised and high profile platform for anti-Americanism. The US-Philippines relationship had always attracted criticism and resistance from the lower classes of agricultural workers and unionised labourers, but by 1960, US interests in the Philippines had been openly challenged by the rural, peasant Hukbalahap, and now the elite political and economic factions too. The United States' credibility was under serious scrutiny, just at a time when the Cold War was heating up across a multitude of theatres. By this point, US policy makers needed their principle Southeast Asian

³⁵ Cullather, *Illusion of Influence*.

³⁶ U.S. Overseas Internal Defense Policy, *DNSA* ; National Intelligence Survey: Philippines, 01/06/1963, *DNSA*.

ally to present a unified, staunchly pro-American stance, but instead were faced with opposition, attempting to reduce US influence in the islands.

In a two candidate presidential race in 1961, Macapagal won with 55 percent of the vote; despite some popular stances taken by Garcia, his credibility was hampered by accusations of corruption. As a liberal, Macapagal immediately presented a more moderate, and pro-American stance than his nationalist predecessor; he was faced with both domestic crises and rapidly developing international pressures. Coupled with some pro-Philippines legislation during his term, the weight of responsibility of being a leading US Cold War ally led once again in 1965 for US policy making bodies to seek another new president. Domestically, the socio-economic conditions, allegedly dealt with by Magsaysay continued to deteriorate, and this was brought to the attention of the US intelligence community in the 1963 National Survey, an important, if not overdue assessment that largely discredited the apparent success of Magsaysay.³⁷ In addition, Macapagal presided over a softened stance in the Philippine Supreme Court towards subversive and leftist activists, who were part of the re-emergence of the Hukbalahap movement. Furthermore, the regional heating up of the Cold War, in Washington's eyes, required an increase in firm reaction, most notably, military assistance to the US forces in Vietnam. Considering the drift of Sukarno away from his one-time US partners, and the implications of possible encroachment by subversive Indonesians into the southern Philippine islands, as well as the territorial disputes within the Maphilindo region, Macapagal did not fit the demanding criteria set by US strategists. To be clear, he was far more popular than Garcia in Washington, and had resuscitated US-Philippines relations to an extent. Considering these multifaceted Cold War concerns, it was agreed across US agencies, Ferdinand Marcos, the so-called legendary wartime guerrilla, astute legal practitioner, and charismatic senator would meet expectations of a demanding US foreign policy making community more effectively.

1965 was a very eventful and pivotal Cold War year for some well-known reasons, and is where Chapter Five begins. It is at this point where domestic Philippine issues, the impact of US foreign policy elsewhere, as well as pressures of the global Cold War culminate into one of the key post-war moments in US and developing world history. President Johnson put US ground troops into Vietnam, Suharto's anti-communist purge and rise to power began in Indonesia, as well as the US occupation of the Dominican Republic after the 35 years of Trujillo and Bosch military rule was revolted against. In addition to this, and though maybe lower key at first, but what it represented had immense importance, was the election of Ferdinand

³⁷ National Intelligence Survey: Philippines, 01/06/1963, DNSA.

Marcos as the Philippine president, in November 1965. This was met with elation in the US foreign policy making community. In his first two years in Malacanang, Marcos visited the Johnson White House, and hosted Johnson, as well as the 1966 Manila Conference: the new president espoused a very pro-US stance, and committed to sending Filipino troops to Vietnam. Marcos met the demands of the Cold War, which is exactly what his US partners wanted. Domestically, Marcos sought to deal with problems with increasingly authoritarian and military solutions, which flew in the face of the vaunted American ideological principles, but was consistent with the prevailing circumstances across the developing world in which the US was involved. Marcos was built up by US leaders, Johnson included—finances, materiel, prestige, and regional leadership were offered to Marcos, a man understood in the US intelligence community to possess such characteristics of a ‘ruthless’ and ‘brilliant man.’³⁸ Marcos seemingly had answers to the problems that had dogged the US-Philippines relationship, and the domestic Filipino landscape. These problems had been deepened and perpetuated by consistently poor and unequal US policy towards the Philippines, which, by the late 1960s, could seemingly only be answered with authoritarian solutions, which logically moved into dictatorship by 1972.³⁹

Conclusion: US-Philippines Relations, 1898-1972.

This story has principally unfolded through the documents of the US State Department, CIA, and presidential papers of Lyndon Johnson, but driving this analytical narrative more than anything else has been US Embassy in Manila and State Department correspondence and reports. The US diplomatic corps in Manila was one of the largest in the world, and maintained a high rate of reportage to the State Department. The Philippines holds a unique position in US history, and with the colonial heritage, and close post-independence partnership, as well as close personal relationships Douglas MacArthur and Edward Lansdale had there. The Philippines was always appreciated as an important strategic and ideological ally, but US foreign policy makers, it would seem, never really fully comprehended the pertinent issues. This dissertation has dealt with several of the complex and multifaceted explanations as to why the Philippines has remained a problem area for success of US foreign policy planning, which have been addressed in the preceding chapters—all of which centre around the framing in which US policy makers have failed to appreciate the conditions, and position, of the Philippines. First, a symptom of Cold War discourse, as well as the perception of

³⁸ Report of Robert J. Ballantyne, *NARA*.

³⁹ Latham, ‘The Cold War in the Third World, 1963-1975.’

exceptionalism, has led to an inability within US foreign policy making circles to reconcile their colonial history and its legacy during the Cold War. The situation in the Philippines had more to do with the American colonial authority than the Soviet Union, European battle lines, or even the People's Republic of China. However, in the bipolarised atmosphere in Washington, disassociating the Soviet Union with troublesome Cold War regions was easier said than done. This feeds into the second: lack of discussion of events within certain frameworks—for example using explanatory models pertaining to neo-colonialism to describe the US-Philippines relationship would not have been entertained in Washington, but would have possibly helped to come to terms with problems the partnership had during the Cold War. This also then precluded insightful, but critical, assessments of US policies being considered as useful sources of analysis, including the writings of political persona non grata like US-Philippines expert William Pomeroy or scholars in the Philippines working within the Marxist tradition.⁴⁰ The third issue considers the realpolitik against the ideological drivers of the Cold War. The Marcos era, that spanned over two decades is a prime example of the complicity, and even willingness, of US policy makers to concede democratic values in order to maintain a certain form of government that was orientated towards the US, or at least away from their perceived enemies. At its most basic, US-Philippines history is demonstrative of the downgrading of the essential principles of American values in order to attain Cold War objectives; these would have consequences that persisted beyond elections and specific administrations' historical legacies.

These conclusions cast criticism over US foreign policy, and certainly are not unique to the Philippines. In a similar vein to the conclusions of the liberal establishment in Cold War studies, and with a firm focus on the developing world, incorporating the more recent work of Michael Latham and Odd Arne Westad,⁴¹ the development of the twenty first century Cold War narrative is convincing, and with less attention on the Soviet Union: 'it is US policy, when it is in the US interest,' regardless of a Soviet presence.⁴² However, the importance of the Philippines here is that since 1898, the official US policy toward the islands has been of benevolence, exceptionalism, development, and a close and unwavering alliance. There had been little or no external interference: a genuine absence of Soviet, Chinese, and European influence in Philippines domestic affairs. There were leftist movements, to be sure, but never a threatening communist force comparable to elsewhere in Asia or Latin America. Yet, such comparably favourable circumstances in which for the American system to be implanted, developed, and then set free in 1946 to flourish into an independent, sovereign, and autonomous nation, as

⁴⁰ Pomeroy, 'The Philippines: A Case Study of Neocolonialism.'

⁴¹ Latham, 'The Cold War in the Third World, 1963-1975'; Westad, *Global Cold War*.

⁴² Kolko, *Confronting the Third World*, p. 133.

these chapters have demonstrated, led instead to the collapse of the very system the United States aimed to create. If cyclical problems of socio-economic inequality and poverty, internal unrest and instability, a tumultuous political scene, and the rise of the Marcos dictatorship occurred in such an atmosphere as the United States' exclusive nation-building project, it was almost surely to fail in more challenging situations throughout the developing world. The Philippines was a favourable climate for US policy, especially in comparison to almost anywhere else, and still a dictatorship emerged out of seventy four years of colonialism and unfair US policies. The Philippines is a clear demonstration, and an essential example, of how US foreign policy could create dictatorship, and the broader implication is that if it happened there, it could very feasibly happen anywhere in the developing world.

Bibliography.

Primary Sources.

London School of Economics and Political Science

Digital National Security Archive

DNSA collection: the Philippines:

U.S. Overseas Internal Defense Policy [Sets forth National Counter-Insurgency Doctrine, as Mandated by National Security Action Memorandum No. 182], 24/8/1962.

National Policy Paper on the Republic of the Philippines, Part I/II, 1/12/1965.

Secret, confidential correspondence, Blair to Department of State, 14/12/1965.

Secret Cable, Blair to Department of State, 'Report of Conversation between Goldberg and Marcos,' 6/3/1967.

Correspondence—Robert McNamara to Dean Rusk, 'Proposal for US Funding for Engineering Construction Battalions for the Philippines,' 11/4/1966.

National Intelligence Survey: Philippines, 01/06/1963.

Correspondence, Owen to Usher and Tatu, 24/08/1965.

Confidential Airmail from Owen to Usher 06/10/1965.

Secret correspondence from William Bundy to William Blair, 17/11/1965.

Confidential cable from William Blair to the US State Department, 03/12/1965.

Confidential cable, Embassy to Department of State, 'State Visit is Not a Prize for PHILCAG,' 10/9/1966.

Confidential correspondence, Embassy to Department of State, 'Philippine Election Campaign,' 19/5/1965.

Confidential cable, Embassy to Department of State, 'Presidential Visit,' 30/8/1966.

Foreign relations of the United States (FRUS)

United States Department of State Foreign relations of the United States, 1861-1958/1960

1945, Diplomatic Papers. The British Commonwealth, the Far East Volume VI.

1946. The Far East, Volume VIII.

1947. The Far East, Volume VI.

1948. The Far East and Australasia, Volume VI.

1951. Asia and the Pacific (in two parts), Volume VI, Part 1.

1955-1957. Southeast Asia, Volume XXII.

1958-1960. South and Southeast Asia, Volume XV.

1961–1963. Laos Crisis. Volume XXIV.

1969–1976, Southeast Asia, Volume XX.

1964-1968 Indonesia; Malaysia-Singapore; Philippines, Volume XXVI.

Lyndon B. Johnson Library

Lyndon B. Johnson Papers

Office Files of Harry McPherson.

Office Files of Ceil Bellinger.

Appointment File, Diary Back Up.

National Security Files (NSF).

Agency Files, Defense Department.

National Intelligence Estimates.

White House Central Files.

Confidential Files (Oversized Attachments).

Philippines (CO 235).

Herbert Hoover Institute

Edward Lansdale Papers

Box 15.

National Archive of Records and Administration

RG 59, CFPF 1964-1966, General Records of the Department of State

Box 1669-1673.

Box 2578-2591.

RG 59, CFPF 1967-1969, General Records of the Department of State

Box 2426-2431.

School of Oriental and Asian Studies Archive

Philippines Collection

Reel 3/37.

Websites:

Chicago Tribune Online Archive

Chicago Tribune, 11 May, 1898.

<http://archives.chicagotribune.com/1898/05/11/page/6/article/what-to-do-with-the-philippines/>

[Accessed August 2015].

Chicago Tribune, 31 May, 1893.

<http://archives.chicagotribune.com/1893/05/31/page/1/article/worlds-columbian-exposition-news>

[Accessed July 2015].

Chicago Tribune, 12 April, 1979.

<http://archives.chicagotribune.com/1979/04/12/page/71/article/jackson-parks-wooded-island-japan-complex-to-be-restored>

[Accessed July 2015].

Harry S. Truman Library, Online Documents

Harry S. Truman Library, Public Papers of the Presidents, 1945-1953

Letters to the High Commissioner to the Philippines and to the Heads of Federal Agencies Recommending Measures for the Assistance of the Philippines.

<http://trumanlibrary.org/publicpapers/index.php?pid=185&st=&st1=>

[Accessed October, 2015].

"Communist Capabilities in South Korea," Office of Reports and Estimates 32-48, February 21, 1949. President's Secretary's Files, Truman Papers.
http://www.trumanlibrary.org/whistlestop/study_collections/koreanwar/documents/index.php?pagenumber=1&documentdate=1949-02-21&documentid=kr-8-6
 [Accessed October, 2015].

Online Sources

Commonwealth Act No. 733, 1946 (The Bell Trade Act).
<http://www.chanrobles.com/commonwealthactno733.htm#Vid0Lvn6Hlw>
 [Accessed October 2015].

State of the nation Address, President Garcia, 1960.
<http://www.gov.ph/1960/01/25/carlos-p-garcia-third-state-of-the-nation-address-january-25-1960/>
 [Accessed August 2015].

Manuel Roxas inaugural address, 28 May 1946.
<http://www.gov.ph/1946/05/28/inaugural-address-of-president-roxas-may-28-1946/>
 [Accessed August 2015].

Inaugural address of President Garcia, 18 March 1957.
<http://www.gov.ph/1957/03/18/inaugural-remarks-of-president-garcia-after-the-demise-of-president-magsaysay-march-18-1957/>
 [Accessed July 2015].

Senate of the Philippines, Profiles: Claro Recto.
http://www.senate.gov.ph/senators/former_senators/claro_recto.htm
 [Accessed August 2015].

JV Cruz obituary, 18 May 2011.
<http://jamiledesma.com/?p=287> [Accessed August 2015]
 [Accessed July 2015].

The Philippine Independence Act (Tydings-McDuffie Act), Section 6a, 6b, and 6c.
<http://www.chanrobles.com/tydingsmcduffieact.htm#UYOdgDCyBWI>.
 [Accessed July 2015].

William McKinley, Buffalo, New York, September 5, 1901.
<http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/amex/1900/filmmore/reference/primary/lastspeech.html>
 [Accessed September 2015].

Testimony of J. Edgar Hoover before HUAC, 26 March, 1947.
<http://cla.calpoly.edu/legacies/rsimon/rsimonsite/Hum410/HooverHUAC.htm>
 [Accessed July 2015].

Project Gutenberg, The Philippines Presidential Election, 1957.

http://self.gutenberg.org/articles/Philippine_presidential_election,_1957

[Accessed August 2015].

Project Gutenberg, The Philippines Presidential Election, 1953.

http://self.gutenberg.org/articles/Philippine_presidential_election,_1953

[Accessed August 2015].

World Health Organisation, Global and regional food consumption patterns and trends.

(http://www.who.int/nutrition/topics/3_foodconsumption/en/index.html)

[Accessed August 2015].

Ferdinand E. Marcos, 'Proclamation of Martial Law,' 21 September 1972.

<http://www.gov.ph/1972/09/21/proclamation-no-1081/>

[Accessed, September 2015].

Stanley Karnow, 'Reagan and the Philippines,' *New York Times*, 19 March, 1989.

<http://www.nytimes.com/1989/03/19/magazine/reagan-and-the-philippines-setting-marcos-adrift.html?pagewanted=all>

[Accessed, August 2015].

Ronald Reagan, 'Remarks at the Welcoming Ceremony for President Ferdinand E. Marcos of the Philippines,' 16 September 1982.

<http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/?pid=42990>

[Accessed, September 2015].

Manuel Roxas, 'Newsreel,' Washington DC, 1946.

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=4oOE3iYn1RU>

[Accessed, September 2015].

Henry Luce, 'American Century,' *Time Magazine*, 2 February 1941.

<http://www.informationclearinghouse.info/article6139.htm>

[Accessed October 2015].

Christopher Marquis, 'Ulysses S. Grant Sharp Jr., Vietnam War Admiral, 95,' *New York Times*, 2001.

<http://www.nytimes.com/2001/12/18/us/ulysses-s-grant-sharp-jr-vietnam-war-admiral-95.html>.

[Accessed, October 2015].

Memoirs

Hoopes, Townsend. *Limits of Intervention* (New York, 1973).

MacArthur, Douglas. *Reminiscences* (London, 1964).

McNamara, Robert. *In Retrospect: The Tragedy and Lessons of Vietnam* (New York, 1995).

Pomeroy, William, J. *The Forest: A Personal Record of the Huk Guerrilla Struggle in the Philippines* (Berlin, 1963).

Taruc, Luis. *Born of the People* (New York, 1953).

Vandenberg Jr. Arthur H. (ed.) *The Private Papers of Senator Vandenberg* (London, 1953).

Marcos, Ferdinand. *The Democratic Revolution in the Philippines* (New Jersey, 1979)

Smith, Joseph B. *Portrait of a Cold Warrior* (New York, 1976).

Secondary Sources.

Agoncilla, Teodoro A. *History of the Filipino People*, (Eighth Edition, Quezon City, 1990).

Ambrose, Stephen E. *Eisenhower: The President: Volume 2, 1952-1966* (London, 1984).

Aspinall, Edward. *Opposing Suharto: Compromise, Resistance, and Regime Change in Indonesia* (Stanford, 2005).

Bailey, Thomas. *America faces Russia: Russian-American Relations from Early Times to our Day* (Ithaca, 1950).

Beisner, Robert. *Twelve against Empire: The Anti-Imperialists, 1898-1900* (New York, 1968).

Bill, James A. *George Ball: Behind the Scenes of US Foreign Policy* (London, 1997).

Blackburn, Robert M. *Mercenaries and Lyndon Johnson's "More Flags:" The Hiring of Koreans, Filipino and Thai Soldiers in the Vietnam War* (Jefferson, 1994).

Blum, William. *America's Deadliest Export: Democracy: The Truth about US Foreign Policy and Everything Else* (London, 2014).

Bouissou, Jean-Marie. *Japan: The Burden of Success* (London, 2002).

Brands, Henry W. *Bound to Empire: United States and the Philippines, 1890-1990* (Oxford, 1992)

Brands, Henry W. *Wages of Globalism: Lyndon Johnson and the Limits of American Power* (Oxford, 1997).

- Brazinsky, Gregg A. *Nation Building in South Korea: Koreans, Americans, and the Making of a Democracy* (North Carolina, 2009).
- Brewer, Anthony. *Marxist Theories of Imperialism: A Critical Study* (London, 1990).
- Broad, Robin. *Unequal Alliance: The World Bank, the International Monetary Fund, and the Philippines* (Oxford 1998).
- Brody, David. *Visualising American Empire: Orientalism & Imperialism in the Philippines* (London, 2010).
- Buckley, Roger. *The United States in the Asia-Pacific since 1945* (Cambridge, 2002).
- Burke, Edmond. *A Vindication of Natural Society* (1756),
- Cannell, Fenella. *Power and Intimacy in the Christian Philippines* (Cambridge, 1999).
- Cardwell, Curt. *NSC 68 and the Political Economy of the Early Cold War* (Cambridge, 2011).
- Celoza, Albert F. *Ferdinand Marcos, and the Philippines. The Political Economy of Authoritarianism* (London, 1997).
- Chomsky, Noam. *Deterring Democracy* (London, 1992).
- Constantino, Renato. *A History of the Philippines: From the Spanish Colonization to the Second World War* (New York, 2010).
- Constantino, Renato. *Neocolonial Identity and Counter-Consciousness: Essays on Cultural Decolonization* (New York, 1979).
- Constantino, Renato and Constantino, Letizia R. *The Philippines: A Past Revisited* (Quezon City, 1978).
- Nick Cullather, *Secret History: The CIA's Classified Account of its Operations in Guatemala, 1952-1954* (Stanford, 1999).
- Cullather, Nick. *The Hungry World: America's Cold War Battle against Poverty in Asia* (London, 2010).
- Cullather, Nick. *Illusions of Influence: The Political Economy of United States-Philippines Relations, 1942-1960* (Stanford, 1994).
- Cummings, Bruce. *Dominion from Sea to Sea: Pacific Ascendancy and American Power* (Yale, 2009).
- Day, Tony and Liem Maya H. T. (eds.), *Cultures at War: The Cold War and Cultural Expression in Southeast Asia* (New York, 2010).
- Dyal, Donald H. *Historical Dictionary of the Spanish American War* (Westport, 1996).
- Ekbladh, David. *The Great American Mission: Modernization and the Construction of an American World Order* (Oxford, 2010).

Engerman Stanley L. and Gallman Robert E. (eds.) *The Cambridge Economic History of the United States Volume 2: The Long Nineteenth Century* (Cambridge, 2000).

Esterline, John H., and Esterline, Mae H. *Innocents Abroad: How we won the Cold War* (Oxford, 1997).

Ferguson, Niall. *Colossus: The Rise and fall of the American Empire* (London, 2005).

Foner, Eric. *Reconstruction, America's Unfinished Revolution 1863-1877* (New York, 1988).

Foster, Anne. *Projections of Power: The United States and Europe in Colonial Southeast, 1919-1941* (London, 2010).

Franco, Jennifer C. *Elections and Democratization in the Philippines* (Washington, 2001).

Frank. Andre G. *The Development of Underdevelopment* (New York, 1966).

Fuentecilla, J. V. *Fighting from a Distance: How Filipino Exiles Helped Topple a Dictator* (Chicago, 2013).

Gaddis, John L. *George F. Kennan: An American Life* (New York, 2012).

Gaddis, John L. *The United States and the Origins of the Cold War, 1941–1947* (New York, 1972).

Gaddis, John L. *Russia, the Soviet Union and the United States: An Interpretive History* (New York, 1978).

Gaddis, John L. *Strategies of Containment: A Critical Appraisal of Postwar American National Security Policy* (Oxford, 1982).

Gaddis, John L. *We Now Know: Rethinking Cold War History* (Oxford, 1997).

Gaddis, John L. *The Cold War* (London, 2005).

Gardner, Lloyd C. *Approaching Vietnam: From World War II Through Dienbienphu, 1941-1954* (New York, 1954).

Gibson, Thomas. *Sacrificing and Sharing in the Philippines Highlands: Religion and Society among the Buid of Mindoro* (London, 1986).

Go, Julian and Foster, Anne L. (eds.), *The American Colonial State in the Philippines: Global Perspectives* (North Carolina, 2003).

Go, Julian. *American Empire and the Politics of Meaning: Elite Political Cultures in the Philippines and Puerto Rico during U.S. Colonialism* (London, 2008).

Go, Julian. *Patterns of Empire: The British and American Empires, 1688 to the Present* (Cambridge, 2011).

Godement, Francois. *The New Asian Renaissance: From Colonialism to the Post Cold-War*, Translated by Elisabeth J. Parcell (London, 1997).

Goodno, James B. *The Philippines: Land of Broken Promises* (London, 1991).

- Goto, Ken'ichi. *Tensions of Empire: Japan and Southeast Asia in the Colonial and Postcolonial World* (Singapore, 2003).
- Guhin, Michael A. *John Foster Dulles: A Statesman and His Times* (London, 1972).
- Hägerdal, Hans (ed.) *Responding to the West Essays on Colonial Domination and Asian Agency* (Amsterdam, 2009).
- Halili, Servando, *Iconography of the New Empire: Race and Gender Images and the American Colonization of the Philippines* (Manila, 2003).
- Hamilton-Paterson, James. *America's Boy: The Marcoses and the Philippines* (New York, 1998).
- Hardt, Michael and Negri, Antonio. *Empire* (London, 2000).
- Harman, Simon G. *Dollar Diplomacy Modern Style* (Washington D. C. 1970).
- Harris, Susan K. *God's Arbiters, Americans and the Philippines, 1898-1902* (Oxford, 2011).
- Havens, Thomas R. H. *Fire Across the Sea. The Vietnam War and Japan, 1965-1975* (Princeton, 1987).
- Hawkins, Michael G. *Co-producing the Postcolonial: U.S. Philippine Cinematic Relations, 1946-1986* (New York, 2011).
- Herzstein, Robert E. *Henry R. Luce, Time, and the American Crusade in Asia* (Cambridge, 2005).
- Hess, Gary R. *The United States' Emergence as a Southeast Asian Power, 1940-1950* (New York, 1987).
- Hogan, Michael J., and Paterson, Thomas G. *Explaining the History of American Foreign Relations* (Cambridge, 1991).
- Hotta, Eri. *Pan-Asianism and Japan's War 1931-1945* (Basingstoke, 2007).
- Hunt, Michael H. *Ideology and US Foreign Policy* (London, 1987).
- Hunt Michael H. and Levine, Steven I. *Arc of Empire: America's Wars in Asia from the Philippines to Vietnam* (North Carolina 2002).
- Isaacson, Walter and Thomas, Evan. *The Wise Men: Six Friends and the World They Made* (New York, 1997).
- Jenkins, Shirley. *American Economic Policy towards the Philippines* (Stanford, 1954).
- Jones, Matthew. *Conflict and Confrontation in South East Asia, 1961-1965: Britain, the United States, Indonesia and the Creation of Malaysia* (Cambridge, 2002).
- Joseph, Gilbert M., and Spenser, Daniela (eds.) *In from the Cold: Latin America's New Encounter with the Cold War* (Durham, North Carolina, 2008).
- Kahin, Audrey and Kahin George, McTurnan. *Subversion as Foreign Policy: The Secret Eisenhower and Dulles Debacle in Indonesia* (London, 1997).

- Kaplan, Amy. *The Anarchy of Empire in the Making of U.S. Culture* (London, 2002).
- Karnow, Stanley. *In Our Image: America's Empire in the Philippines* (New York, 1989).
- Kennan, George. *Realities of American Foreign Policy* (Oxford, 1954).
- Kennan, George. *American Diplomacy* (London, 1984).
- Kerkvliet, Benedict. *The Huk Rebellion: A Study of the Peasant Revolt in the Philippines* (Maryland, 1977).
- Kim, Sung Yong. *United States-Philippine Relations, 1946-56* (Washington D.C., 1968).
- Kinzer, Stephen. *The Brothers: John Foster Dulles, Allen Dulles, and Their Secret World War* (New York, 2013).
- Klein, Naomi. *The Shock Doctrine: The Rise of Disaster Capitalism* (London, 2007).
- Kolko, Joyce and Kolko, Gabriel. *The Limits of Power: The World and United States Foreign Policy, 1945-1954* (London, 1972).
- Kolko, Gabriel. *Main Currents in Modern American History* (London, 1976).
- Kolko, Gabriel. *Anatomy of War: Vietnam, the United States, and the Modern Historical Experience* (New York, 1985).
- Kolko, Gabriel. *Confronting the Third World. United States Foreign Policy, 1945-1980* (New York, 1988).
- Kramer, Paul A. *The Blood of Government, Race, Empire, the United States & the Philippines* (Chapel Hill, 2006).
- LaFeber, Walter. *The New Empire. An Interpretation of the American Expansion 1860-1898* (Cornell, 1963).
- LaFeber, Walter. *The American Age: US Foreign Policy At Home and Abroad* (Second Edition, London, 1994).
- LaFeber, Walter. *In America, Russia, and the Cold War, 1945-2002* (New York, 2004).
- LaFeber, Walter. *Inevitable Revolutions: The United States in Central America* (New York, 1993).
- LaFeber, Walter. *The American Century, a History of the United States since the 1890s* (London, 1992).
- Lansdale, Edward G. *In the Midst of Wars: An American's Mission to Southeast Asia* (London, 1972).
- Latham, Michael E. *Modernization as Ideology: American Social Science and "Nation Building" in the Kennedy Era* (London, 2000).
- Lawrence, Mark A. *Assuming the Burden: Europe and the American Commitment to War in Vietnam* (Michigan, 2005).

- Lawrence, Mark A. *The Vietnam War. A Concise International History* (Oxford, 2008).
- Leffler, Melvyn. *A Preponderance of Power: National Security, the Truman Administration, and the Cold War* (Stanford, 1992).
- Leffler, Melvyn. *The Specter of Communism: The United States and the Origins of the Cold War, 1917-1953* (New York, 1994).
- Logevall, Fredrik. *Choosing War: The Lost Chance for Peace and the Escalation of War in Vietnam* (London, 1999).
- Logevall, Fredrik. *Ember of War: The Fall of an Empire and the Making of America's Vietnam* (New York, 2012).
- Logevall, Fredrik and Preston, Andrew (eds.) *Nixon in the World: American Foreign Relations, 1969-1977* (Oxford, 2008).
- Lundestad, Geir. *East, West, North, South: Major Developments in International Politics 1945-1996* (Oxford, 1997).
- Manchester, William. *American Caesar: Douglas MacArthur, 1880-1964* (Boston, 1978).
- Marr, David. *Vietnamese Tradition on Trial, 1920-1945* (London, 1981).
- McCoy, Alfred, W. *Policing America's Empire: The United States, the Philippines, and the Rise of the Surveillance State* (Madison, 2009).
- McCoy, Alfred W. *The Politics of Heroin in Southeast Asia* (London, 1972).
- McDermott, Kevin and Agnew, Jeremy. *The Comintern: A History of International Communism from Lenin to Stalin* (London, 1996).
- McMahon, Robert J. *The Limits of Power: The United States and Southeast Asia since World War II* (New York, 1999).
- Miller, James E. *The United States and the Making of Modern Greece: History and Power, 1950-1974* (North Carolina, 2009).
- Milne, David. *America's Rasputin: Walt Rostow and the Vietnam War* (New York, 2008).
- Mitter, Rana. *A Bitter Revolution: China's Struggle with the Modern World* (Oxford, 2005).
- Moore, Charles. *Daniel H. Burnham: Architect, Planner of Cities* (Boston, 1921).
- Morgenthau, Hans J. *Politics among Nations: The Struggle for Power and Peace* (New York, 1949).
- Morgenthau, Hans J. *A New Foreign Policy for the United States* (London, 1969).
- Ninkovich Frank. *The United States and Imperialism* (Oxford, 2001).
- Nkrumah, Kwame. *Neo-Colonialism: The Last Stage of imperialism* (New York, 1966).

- Nugent, Walter. *Habits of Empire: A History of American Expansionism* (New York).
- Paterson, Thomas G., *Soviet-American Confrontation: Postwar Reconstruction and the Origins of the Cold War* (London, 1973).
- Pearce, Kimber C. *Rostow, Kennedy, and the Rhetoric of Foreign Policy* (Michigan, 2001).
- Pletcher, David M. *The Diplomacy of Involvement: American Economic Expansion across the Pacific, 1784-1900* (London, 2001).
- Pomeroy, William J. *The Philippines: Colonialism, Collaboration, and Resistance!* (New York, 1992).
- Pomeroy, William J. *Guerrilla Warfare* (New York, 1968).
- Pomeroy, William J. *American Neo-Colonialism: Its Emergence in the Philippines and Asia* (New York, 1970).
- Powers, Thomas. *The Man Who Kept the Secrets: Richard Helms & the CIA* (New York, 1979).
- Rabasa, A. and Haseman, J. *The Military and Democracy in Indonesia: Challenges, Politics, and Power* (Santa Monica, 2002).
- Rabasa, Angel; Gordon, John; Chalk, Peter; Grant, Audra K.; K. McMahon, Scott; Pezard, Stephanie; Reilly, Caroline; Ucko, David; and Zimmerman, S. Rebecca. *From Insurgency to Stability: Volume II: Insights from Selected Case Studies* (RAND Corporation, 2011).
- Rabe, S. G. *The Killing Zone: The United States Wages Cold War in Latin America* (Oxford, 2012).
- Raquiza, Antoinette R. *State Structure, Policy Formation, and Economic Development in Southeast Asia. The Political Economy of Thailand and the Philippines* (Oxon, 2012).
- Recto, Claro M. *Three Years of Occupation. The Issue of Political Collaboration in the Philippines* (Manila, 1946).
- Rempel, William C. *Delusions of a Dictator: The Mind of Marcos as Revealed in his Secret Diaries* (London, 1993).
- Ryan, David. *US Foreign Policy in World History* (Oxon, 2004).
- Sardesai, D. R. *Southeast Asia: Past and Present* (Boulder, 2012).
- Schirmer, Daniel B., and Stephan R Shalom (eds.) *The Philippines Reader: A History of Colonialism, Neocolonialism, Dictatorship and Resistance* (Cambridge, MA, 1987).
- Scott, James C., and Kerkvliet, Benedict J. T. (eds.) *Everyday Forms of Peasant Resistance in South-East Asia* (London, 1986).
- Shapiro, Ian. *Containment: Rebuilding a Strategy against Global Terror* (Princeton, 2007).
- Spence, Jonathon. *Search for Modern China* (London, 1990).
- Steinberg, David J. *The Philippines: A Singular and a Plural Place* (Oxford, 1994).

Stephanson, Anders. *Manifest Destiny: American Expansionism and the Empire of Right* (New York, 1996).

Stueck, William. *Rethinking the Korean War: A New Diplomatic and Strategic History* (Oxford, 2002).

Suny, Ronald G. *The Soviet Experiment: Russia, the USSR, and the Successor States* (Oxford, 2011).

Sutton, Barbara, Morgen, Sandra, and Novkov, Julie. *Security Disarmed: Critical Perspectives on Gender, Race, and Militarization* (London, 2008).

Thomson, Mark R. *The Anti-Marcos Struggle: Personalistic Rule and Democratic Transition in the Philippines* (Yale, 1995).

Tompkins, E. Berkeley. *Anti-Imperialism in the United States: The Great Debate, 1890–1920* (University of Pennsylvania Press, 1970).

Tucker, Robert (eds.) *The Lenin Anthology* (London, 1975).

Vickers, Adrian. *A History of Modern Indonesia* (Cambridge, 2013).

Voskressenski, Alexei D. *Russia and China: A Theory of Inter-State Relations* (London, 2003).

Wallerstein, Immanuel. *The Modern World-System, Volume III: The Second Great Expansion of the Capitalist World-Economy, 1730-1840s* (San Diego, 1989).

Welch Jr., Richard E. *Response to Imperialism: The United States and the Philippine-American War, 1899-1902* (Chapel Hill, 1987).

Westad, Odd A. *The Global Cold War* (London, 2005).

Williams, William Appleman. *Tragedy of American Diplomacy* (Cleveland, 1959).

Williams, William Appleman. *Empire as a Way of Life: An Essay on the Causes and Character of America's Present Predicament along with a Few Thoughts about an Alternative* (Oxford, 1980).

Wise, D and Ross, T. B. *The Invisible Government* (New York, 1964).

Articles

Anderson, Benedict. 'Cacique Democracy in The Philippines: Origins and Dreams,' *The New Left Review*, May-June (1988), pp. 3-33.

Babecz, Lionel. 'Japan–Korea, France–Algeria: Colonialism and Post-Colonialism,' *Japanese Studies*, 33:2 (2013), pp. 201-211.

Berry, Sara. 'Hegemony on a Shoestring: Indirect Rule and Access to Agricultural Land,' *Africa: Journal of the International African Institute*, 62 (1992), pp. 327-355.

Braumoeller, Bear F. 'The Myth of American Isolationism,' *Foreign Policy Analysis* 6.4 (2010), pp. 246-371.

Craig, Campbell. 'Kennedy's Foreign International legacy, Fifty Years On,' *International Affairs*, 89.6 (2013) pp. 1367-1378.

Cizel, Annick. 'Nation-Building in the Philippines: Rooseveltian Statecraft for Imperial Modernization in an Emergent Transatlantic World Order,' *Diplomacy & Statecraft*, 19:4 (2008) pp. 690-711.

Crippen, Harlan R. 'American Imperialism and Philippine Independence,' *Science & Society*, 11:2 (Spring, 1947) pp. 97-126.

Cullather, Nick. 'America's Boy? Ramon Magsaysay and the illusions of influence,' *Pacific Historical Review* (August, 1993), pp. 305-338.

Cullather, Nick. 'The Limits of Multilateralism: Making Policy for the Philippines, 1945-1950,' *The International History Review*, 13:1 (February, 1991), pp. 70-95.

Deery, Phillip. 'Malaya, 1948: Britain's Asian Cold War?' *Journal of Cold War Studies*, 9.1 (2007), pp. 29-54.

Drona, Bert M. 'Independence with Strings: From U.S. Colony to U.S. Neocolony,' *The Filipino Mind* (25 October, 2012).

Escultura, Edgar E. 'The Roots of Backwardness: An Analysis of the Philippine Condition' *Science & Society*, 38:1 (Spring, 1974), pp. 49-76.

Fukuyama, Francis. 'The End of History?' *The National Interest* (Summer, 1989).

Gaddis, John. 'The Emerging Post-Revisionist Synthesis on the Origins of the Cold War,' *Diplomatic History*, 7:3 (July, 1983) pp. 171–190.

Golay, Frank. 'Economic Consequences of the Philippine Trade Act.' *Pacific Affairs*, 28:1 (March, 1955), pp. 53-70.

Hartley, Anthony. 'John Kennedy's Foreign Policy,' *Foreign Policy*, 4 (Autumn, 1971), pp. 77-87.

Hoffman, Stanley. 'An American Social Science: International Relations,' *Daedalus*, 106:3, *Discoveries and Interpretations: Studies in Contemporary Scholarship*, 1 (1977), pp. 41-60.

Irwin, Douglas A. 'Tariff Incidence: Evidence from U.S. Sugar Duties, 1890-1930,' *National Bureau for Economic Research* (October, 2014).

Kramer, P. A. 'Empires, Exceptions, and Anglo-Saxons: Race and Rule between the British and United States Empires, 1880-1910,' *Journal of American History*, 88:4 (March, 2002), pp. 1315-1353.

Landé, Carl H. 'The Philippines and the United States,' *Philippines Studies*, 49:4 (Fourth Quarter, 2001), pp. 518-539.

Latham, Michael E. 'Redirecting the Revolution? The USA and the Failure of Nation-Building in South Vietnam,' *Third World Quarterly*, 27:1, *From Nation-Building to State-Building* (2006), pp. 27-41.

Lipsey, Robert E. *US Foreign Trade and the Balance of Payments, 1800-1913: NBER Working Paper Series* (Massachusetts, 1994).

Lundestad, Geir. 'Empire by Invitation? The United States and Western Europe, 1945-1952,' *Journal of Peace Research*, 23:3 (1986), pp. 263-277.

Maga, Timothy P. 'The New Frontier vs. Guided Democracy: JFK, Sukarno, and Indonesia, 1961-1963,' *Presidential Studies Quarterly*, 20:1, *Leadership and Crisis Management* (Winter, 1990), pp. 91-102.

McAllister, James. 'The Lost Revolution: Edward Lansdale and the American Defeat in Vietnam 1964-1968,' *Small Wars and Insurgencies* (2003), pp. 1-26.

McCoy, Alfred W. 'Philippine-American Relations: A Problem of Perception,' *Australasian Journal of American Studies*, 6:2 (December, 1987), pp. 17-27.

Paterno, Roberto. 'American Military Bases in the Philippines: The Brownell Opinion,' *Philippine Studies*, 12:3 (July, 1964), pp. 391-423.

Price, John. 'A Just Peace? The 1951 San Francisco Peace Treaty in Historical Perspective,' *JPRI Working Paper*, 78 (June, 2001).

Rafael, Vincent. 'The War of Translation: Colonial Education, American English, and Tagalog Slang in the Philippines,' *The Journal of Asian Studies*, 74:02 (May, 2015), pp. 283-302.

Renne, Roland R. 'Agrarian Problems and Foreign Aid in the Philippines,' *Institute of Pacific Relations*, 22:13 (December, 1953), pp. 179-183.

Schlesinger Jr., Arthur. 'Origins of the Cold War' *Foreign Affairs*, 46:1 (October, 1967), pp. 22-52.

Shalom, Stephen R. 'Securing the US-Philippine Military Base Agreement of 1947,' *Bulletin of Concerned Asian Scholars*, 22:4 (October-December 1990), pp. 3-12.

Shalom, Stephen R. 'Counter-insurgency in the Philippines,' *Journal of Contemporary Asia*, 7:2 (1977), pp. 153-177.

Shalom, Stephen R. 'Philippine Acceptance of the Bell Trade Act of 1946: A Study of Manipulatory Democracy,' *Pacific Historical Review*, 49:3 (August, 1980), pp. 499-517.

Steinberg, D. J. 'In Our Image: America's Empire in the Philippines' (Book Review), *Journal of Asian Studies* 49.1 (1 February, 1990), pp. 211-212.

Sussman, G. 'Macapagal, the Sabah Claim and Maphilindo: The Politics of Penetration,' *Journal of Contemporary Asia*, 13:2 (1983), pp. 210-228.

Walker G. Stephen and Schafer, M. 'Theodore Roosevelt and Woodrow Wilson as Cultural Icons of U.S. Foreign Policy,' *Political Psychology*, 28:6 (December, 2007), pp. 747-776.

Wardaya, Baskara T. 'Diplomacy and Cultural Understanding: Learning from US Policy toward Indonesia under Sukarno,' *International Journal*, 67: 4, *Canada after 9/11* (Autumn, 2012), pp. 1051-1061.

Weekley, Kathleen. 'The National or the Social? Problems of Nation-Building in Post-World War II Philippines,' *Third World Quarterly*, 27:1, *From Nation-Building to State-Building* (2006), pp. 85-100.

Williams, Walter. 'United States Indian Policy and the Debate over Philippine Annexation: Implications for the Origins of American Imperialism,' *Journal of American History*, 66:4 (March, 1980), pp. 810-831.

Williams, William A. 'The Frontier Thesis and American Foreign Policy,' *Pacific Historical Review*, 24:4 (November, 1955), pp. 379-395.

Zhihua, Shen. 'Sino-Soviet Relations and the Origins of the Korean War: Stalin's Strategic Goals in the Far East,' *Journal of Cold War Studies*, 2.2 (2000), pp. 44-68.

Essays in Books

Abinales, Patricio N. 'Progressive-Machine Conflict in Early -Twentieth-Century U.S. Politics and Colonial-State Building in the Philippines' in Julian Go, and Anne L. Foster, (eds.), *The American Colonial State in the Philippines: Global Perspectives* (North Carolina, 2003), pp. 148-181.

Bradley, Mark Philip. 'Decolonisation, the Global South, and the Cold War, 1919-1962,' in *The Cambridge History Of The Cold War. Volume II Crises and Detente* (eds.), Melvyn P. Leffler and Odd Arne Westad (Cambridge, 2010), pp. 464-485.

Cooper, Richard N. 'Economic aspects of the Cold War, 1962-1975' in *Cambridge History of the Cold War Volume II, Crises and Detente*, (eds.) Odd Arne Westad and Melvyn P. Leffler (Cambridge, 2010) pp. 44-64.

Costigliola, Frank. 'US Foreign Policy from Kennedy to Johnson,' in *Cambridge History of the Cold War. Volume II, Crises and Detente*, (eds.) Odd Arne Westad and Melvyn P. Leffler (Cambridge, 2010) pp. 112-133.

Cullinane, Michael. 'The Rise of Sergio Osmena,' in Ruby Paredes (ed.), *Philippine Colonial Democracy*, (Ateneo University and Yale University, 1989), pp. 70-113.

Davis, Lance E. and Cull, Robert J. 'International Capital Movements, Domestic Capital Markets, and American Economic Growth, 1820-1914,' in *The Cambridge Economic History of the United States Volume 2: The Long Nineteenth Century* (Cambridge, 2000), pp. 733-812.

- Engerman, David C. 'Ideology and the Origins of the Cold War, 1917-1962,' in *The Cambridge History of the Cold War: Volume II Crises and Detente* (eds.), Melvyn P. Leffler and Odd Arne Westad (Cambridge, 2010), pp. 20-43.
- Gaddis, John Lewis. 'Grand Strategies in the Cold War Volume 2: Crises and Détente,' in *The Cambridge History of The Cold War: Volume II Crises and Detente* (eds.), Melvyn P. Leffler and Odd Arne Westad (Cambridge, 2010), pp. 1-21.
- Gallman, Richard E. 'Economic Growth and Structural Change in the Long Nineteenth Century,' in *The Cambridge Economic History of the United States Volume 2: The Long Nineteenth Century* (Cambridge, 2000), pp. 1-56.
- Giusti-Cordero, Juan. 'Compradors or Compadres? 'Sugar Barons' In Negros (The Philippines) and Puerto Rico under American Rule' in Ulba Bosma, Juan Giusti-Cordero and G. Roger Knight (eds.), *Sugarlandia Revisited: Sugar and Colonialism in Asia and the Americas, 1800 to 1940* (New York, 2007) pp. 177-202.
- Guerrero Linda L. and Tusalem, Rollin F. 'Mass Public Perceptions of Democractization in the Philippines: Consolidation in Progress?' in Yun-han Chu, Larry Diamond, Andrew J. Nathan, Doh Chull Shin (eds.) *How East Asians View Democracy* (New York, 2010), pp. 61-82.
- Fishlow, Albert. 'Internal Transportation in the Nineteenth and Early Twentieth Centuries,' in *The Cambridge Economic History of the United States Volume 2: The Long Nineteenth Century* (Cambridge, 2000) pp. 543-642.
- Immerman, Richard. 'Between the Unattainable And The Unacceptable: Eisenhower and Dien Bien Phu,' in Richard A. Melanson and David Mayers (eds.) *Re-evaluating Eisenhower: American Foreign Policy in the 1950s* (Urbana, 1987), pp. 135-136.
- Kahin, George McT. 'The US and the Anticolonial Revolutions in SEA, 1945-1950,' *The Origins of the Cold War In Asia*, (ed.), Yōnosuke Nagai and Akira Iriye (New York, 1977), pp. 338-361.
- LaFeber, Walter. 'The Empire of 1898—and Upheaval,' in Walter LaFeber (ed.), *The Cambridge History of American Foreign Relations, Volume II: The American Search for Opportunity, 1865-1913* (Cambridge, 1993), pp. 129-55.
- Latham, Michael E. 'The Cold War in the Third World, 1963-1975,' in *The Cambridge History of the Cold War: Volume II Crises and Detente* (eds.), Melvyn P. Leffler and Odd Arne Westad (Cambridge, 2010), pp. 258-281.
- Lipsey, Robert E. 'U.S. Foreign Trade and the Balance of Payments, 1800–1913,' in *The Cambridge Economic History Of The United States Volume II: The Long Nineteenth Century* (Cambridge, 2000), pp. 685-732.
- Maier, Charles S. 'The World Economy and the Cold War in the Middle of the Twentieth Century,' in Melvyn P. Leffler and Odd Arne Westad (eds.), *The Cambridge History of the Cold War: Volume I Origins* (Cambridge, 2010), pp. 44-66.
- Pomeroy, William J. 'The Philippines: A Case Study of Neocolonialism,' in Mark Selden (ed.), *Remaking Asia: Essays on the American Uses of Power* (New York, 1974), pp. 157-199.

Putzel, James. 'Social Capital and the Imagined Community: Democracy and Nationalism in the Philippines,' Leifer, Michael (ed.) *Asian Nationalism* (London, 2000) pp. 170-186.

Scarlett, Zachary A. 'China's Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution and the Imagination of the Third World,' in *The Third World in the Global 1960s*, (eds.) Samantha Christiansen and Zachary A. Scarlett (London, 2013), pp. 39-56.

Tōru, Yano. 'Cold War in Southeast Asia,' *The Origins of the Cold War in Asia*, (ed.), Yōnosuke Nagai and Akira Iriye (New York, 1977), pp. 321-337.

Weathersby, Kathryn. 'Soviet Aims in Korea and the Origins of the Korean War, 1945-1950: New Evidence from the Archive' in Christian F. Ostermann, (Ed.), *Cold War International History Project Working Papers Series* (Washington, 1993), pp. 5-37.

Yoshihiko, Tanigawa. 'Cominform and Southeast Asia,' *The Origins of the Cold War in Asia*, (ed.), Yōnosuke Nagai and Akira Iriye (New York, 1977) pp. 362-377.