

**MOVEMENT
FOR A
FREE
PHILIPPINES**



MFP

FOUNDED 1973

NEWSLETTER

OCTOBER 1985

Number 17

C O N T E N T S

Network Show Draws Large Audience.....	2
U.S. Opinion Poll On Marcos.....	3
Why The AFP Needs Pentagon Help.....	5
Striking Back At Torturers.....	7
California's Congressional Muscle.....	9
Take Another Whack At The Aid.....	10
How The Body Count Mounts.....	11
A Grand Gathering In Washington.....	13
Thanking Our Friends.....	13

TAPPING THE FILIPINO CONNECTION

The Village Voice's documentation in this New York weekly's Oct. 15 issue of the real estate holdings of Mr. & Mrs. Ferdinand Marcos in New York and New Jersey, confirms much of the details published in July in the newspaper Mercury News of San Jose, California.

That the Malacanang couple and their cronies have been buying up American properties has been common knowledge for years among Filipinos here and at home. The question is asked: Why only now have these been told in the U.S. media?

It takes lots and lots of spadework to gather and check out these facts. Deals of this magnitude by the powerful are given to professionals adept at cover-up work and setting up fronts. Against them, the American journalists did a superlative job at peeling off the covers. And as we applaud them, due credit must also go resident Filipinos (and those in Manila) who helped provide the reporters with the clues to track, the documents and the valuable sources to talk to.

This brings us to point out once again the broad resources of the U.S.-based Filipino opposition groups. In a decade of protesting Manila's rule from these shores, we have nurtured a network of Filipino talent and expertise stretched from coast to coast. Much of it has been tapped to bear on Washington lobbying and media relations. But this resource is just as effective with other assignments. As the Village Voice and Mercury News reporters found out, you can call on it to uncover who's the crony buying what high-priced condo in Manhattan or in San Francisco.

EXPERIENCE A WEEK OF TURMOIL.

Watch
"The Philippines:
Islands of Discontent."

From the Executive Office of President Ferdinand Marcos to the guerrilla camps of those who hope to overthrow him, the MacNeil/Lehrer NewsHour's special five-part series takes an in-depth look at the complex political, social and economic issues plaguing the Philippine Islands.

Join us each night this week at 7:30, on WNET/THIRTEEN.

The MacNeil/Lehrer
NEWSHOUR



Most of you must have taped the five-part series on the Philippines that ran Sept. 16 to 20 on the MacNeil/Lehrer Newshour. We recommend you show it during meetings and chapter affairs. The series reached a very wide audience. "The Newhour is carried by 265 independent stations out of the 309 that make up the Public Broadcasting Service network", Christopher Ramsey, a spokesman at Channel 13 WNET (New York) told us. Each night beginning Sept. 16, a 12 to 15-minute segment of the Newhour was devoted to the Philippine report. Ramsey estimates that three million viewers each night tune in to the report, and that as many as 12 million saw all or part of the series. Local ads such as this one in the Sept. 16 and 17 issues of the New York Times helped draw viewers. The ads measured 3 columns by 10 inches long. Correspondent Charles Krause and producer Susan Mills spent six weeks in the Philippines to produce their report. The first two segments graphically portray the wrenching

poverty of Manila's poor and Negros Occidental's sugar workers as well as military brutality on civilians. The third segment examined U.S. policy and its shortcomings. The last two were full interviews with Marcos.

How to get more out of the program

It's seldom the Philippines gets such wide exposure on network TV on a sustained basis.

Bring a video tape of it with you whenever you are invited to a get-together at homes and stick it into their VCRs. For those who missed the program, it's their chance to see it. Pass around copies of our Newsletter after the showing.

Note: A shortened version of the program was shown Oct. 15 by the Newshour followed by studio interviews with Monsignor Antonio Fortich, Bishop of Negros Occidental (who was visiting New York) and Raul Manglapus. That evening, the Bishop was main guest at a fund-raising dinner held in the Long Island home of Willie Cornello, MFP regional council representative for New York.

As a rather small group of Washington decision-makers grapple with that great question -- How do we protect U.S. interests in these times of trouble in the Philippines? -- one organization took the question, placed it in a ballot and mailed it out to 67,121 people in the U.S.

The Foreign Policy Association, a 65-year old non-profit educational group, does this every year. It chooses eight foreign policy problems facing the U.S., and analyzes each one thoroughly in a 96-page "briefing book" called Great Decisions. The Philippines was one of the 1985 topics. An Opinion Ballot form is bound in the book, then sent to a nationwide sampling of participants. On May 31, 1985, the ballots were tallied. These were tabulated under the supervision of Esther Fleishman, vice president of Louis Harris & Associates, Inc.

This year's book devoted 10 pages to an excellent discussion of the Philippine situation. Here are excerpts from the four policy choices that was the basis of results returned by 3,919 respondents who returned the Philippine ballot.

WITH THE DEPTH of anti-Marcos sentiment in the Philippines publicly confirmed by the reaction to the Aquino assassination, the U.S. government has been reexamining its policy toward that country. U.S. diplomats reportedly are frustrated at their lack of leverage over the Marcos government as long as the U.S. wants to keep the bases. The U.S. is also unwilling to support an alternative leader for fear such intervention would backfire. Increasingly a distinction is being made between U.S. support for the Philippine people in general and the Marcos government in particular.

The value of the military bases is widely acknowledged, especially by the U.S. government. Many alternative sites have been suggested, but the conclusion is that there are no satisfactory substitutes for Clark Air Base and, especially, Subic Naval Base. The only good alternatives would be Hawaii or the U.S. West Coast, both of which are too far from the area for rapid response.

However, the counterargument is that the retention of the bases is no longer in the U.S. interest. Rear Admiral Gene R. La Rocque (Ret.) testified to this effect before Congress in June 1983, saying that the bases

were not essential to the defense of the U.S. or the Philippines. He held that the U.S. should move away from reliance on foreign military bases and from the old policy of containing communism through forward deployment of U.S. forces. He pointed out that the price the U.S. has to pay for such bases, which ultimately will have to be abandoned, is unacceptably high. Also, there is always the danger of terrorist attacks.

Policy choices are not clear-cut or easily made. Some possibilities, along with supporting arguments, are as follows:

■ **Option 1. Continue to support the Marcos government.** The paramount U.S. interest is strategic. Marcos has been a reliable U.S. ally for over two decades. He is a strong anti-Communist and has allowed U.S. use of bases. It would be folly to alienate Marcos or abandon him. He could punish the U.S. by denying access to the bases, although it is highly unlikely he would then turn to the Soviet Union. The U.S. cannot, in any case, realistically expect to change the government's internal policies. Marcos is not an absolute dictator; there is an opposition that is represented in government, although at present it is too fragmented to offer

an alternative to Marcos.

■ **Option 2. Keep "hands off."** The Philippines is a sovereign state and the U.S. must respect the right of Filipinos to choose their own form of government. If left alone, they will surely choose democracy. Any meddling by the U.S. in internal affairs, either on behalf of Marcos or the opposition, will only backfire and further discredit the U.S. Since sooner or later the American military will have to leave, the U.S. should scale back its military presence now, rather than be thrown out later.

■ **Option 3. Adopt a public policy of linkage.** The U.S. should take a stronger stand against Marcos. It should link military and economic aid to democratic reforms and respect for human rights. The U.S. should use the leverage it has to bring about internal changes. "Quiet diplomacy" is not heard by the Filipino people. If democracy is restored, the U.S. should offer large-scale aid. If positive change is not forthcoming, aid should be cut, not just reappportioned. If Marcos continues to rule by decree, the people will lose faith in democracy.

■ **Option 4. Exercise quiet diplomacy.** The U.S. should not hand Marcos any ultimatums; rather it should distance itself from him. Embarrassing him publicly would be counterproductive. Indirect pressure can be more effective in inducing the government to liberalize its policies. Since Marcos is dependent upon the U.S. for support, he will make changes if threatened with loss of this support. Quiet diplomacy is already working; Marcos' decision to hold the May elections showed that he is responsive to pressure.

**Topic 5: THE PHILIPPINES:
What Future for Democracy?**

Ballots Tabulated: 3,919

In its relations with the Philippines, the U.S. should:

	Agree Strongly	Agree Somewhat	Disagree Somewhat	Disagree Strongly
Link U.S. military and economic aid for the Philippines to democratic reforms there.	33%	43%	15%	9%
Maintain a "hands-off" policy toward both the government and the opposition.	20%	31%	29%	20%
Use quiet diplomacy rather than public pressure to persuade Marcos to adopt democratic reforms.	50%	32%	11%	7%
Continue to support the Marcos government and disregard internal politics in the Philippines.	3%	13%	26%	58%

Using quiet diplomacy rather than public pressure to persuade President Marcos to adopt democratic reforms received the strongest support. Only 16% think that the United States should continue to support the Marcos government and disregard internal politics in the Philippines.

For a copy of Great Decisions 1985, write the Foreign Policy Assoc. at 205 Lexington Ave., New York, NY 10016. FPA says that the book is used regularly by more than 200,000 Americans in school discussions. Opinion ballot results are presented to the White House, the Departments of State and Defense, and members of Congress.

WHY THE AFP NEEDS PENTAGON HELP

How much help does the Armed Forces of the Philippines need from the U.S.? Plenty, says a top Pentagon official. We can make do without it, says Acting AFP chief Gen. Fidel Ramos. In early August Ramos stated that U.S. assistance is welcome, but that the AFP can operate without it. Defense Minister Juan Ponce Enrile is proposing a 1986 military budget that will rise "substantially" higher than this year's 6 billion pesos. How and where the money will come from at a time of dire economic distress is unclear.

James Kelley, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Affairs takes a dim view of AFP's resources. "The budget of the AFP is spent almost entirely for personnel costs and fuel just to operate, and the only investment at all really comes from U.S. assistance," he told the House Subcommittee on East Asian & Pacific Affairs during hearings in Sept. 18, 1984. Elaborating, he said "the AFP have problems with equipment, mobility, logistics support, and with training...Some units are short on uniforms and boots, and others forage for food during field operations and resort to palm oil to lubricate weapons. Observers note deficiencies in training, both technical and in small or counterinsurgency tactics. Transportation is extremely limited. On one island, only two trucks are available for two battalions. Many units are without tactical communication equipment, forcing commanders to rely on runners to transmit operation orders."

Speaking before the same panel on March 12, 1985, Richard Armitage, the Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Affairs said "severe declines in defense spending and a devalued peso have left the AFP woefully short of the weapons and equipment that would enable it to move, shoot and communicate." He cites "as an example, during a recent visit to the Philippines, I learned that small businessmen in several areas have collected money to buy commercial radios for their local AFP units. Because of a shortage of military trucks, some AFP units rely on the ad hoc marshalling of commercial vehicles to support combat deployments."

U.S. defense officials pushed hard to obtain \$100 million in military aid for 1986 -- \$ 50 million in credits to allow AFP to purchase U.S. equipment; and \$50 million in grants. Congress approved only \$20 million in loans and \$50 million in grant aid. We lobbied hard to reduce the amounts just as hard as other aid critics who questioned whether larger shipments of armaments would really improve AFP's performance. In our view, internal reforms against corruption and abuses should be the focus of efforts to repair a badly tarnished AFP.

Here is a list of the defense articles and services the Pentagon wants to provide the AFP in their \$100 million aid request that Congress cut to \$70 million:

FY 86 DEFENSE ARTICLES AND SERVICES

Security Support for Subic Bay and Air Base	\$ 1.50M
Ground Force Supply Support	7.50
Engineer Spares	5.00
V150 Armored Vehicle Spares	1.20
V150 Rebuild	1.10
Helicopter Spares	5.00
Aircraft Spares	17.50
Shipyard and Service Craft Operation	2.80
Ship Overhaul/Life Extension	20.80
Ship Operating Cost	4.12
Navy Mobile Training Team/Subic Training40
Fixed Communications Spares	5.00
Aircraft Tech Assistance	1.00
Publications50
Dataphone Support	1.00
Calibration Support04
Military Training Teams	1.00
Communication-Electronics Equipment	9.50
Tactical Communications	1.00
Engineer Equipment	10.00
Cargo Truck 2 1/2 Ton (90 each)	4.00

What about the \$40 million in 1985 aid that the AFP received for the period Oct. 1, 1984 to Sept. 30, 1985?

Ten million have been "apportioned" at this time, says the Pentagon. The rest of the funds will become available to Manila through apportionment over the remainder of this fiscal year. There are \$81,600,000 of undisbursed funds for fiscal year 1984 and prior programs. Some \$50 million will be spent to obtain the items listed below.

	<u>FY84</u>	<u>FY85</u>
Ground Maintenance	\$ 0.5M	\$17.3M
Air Force Maintenance	4.5	13.0
Navy Maintenance	9.1	6.6
Tactical Communications	22.9	1.1
Field Medical Equipment	-	1.0
Field Dental	-	0.2
Military Training Teams	1.0	-
Microwave Communications	12.0	-
Other Requirements	-	0.8
	<u>\$50.0M</u>	<u>\$40.0M</u>

STRIKING BACK AT TORTURERS

Filipino victims of torture by Philippine security forces, now living in the U.S., may now be able to sue their torturers in American courts.

At its week-long convention in Washington last July, the American Bar Association resolved to support a federal law "that would authorize suits by both aliens and U.S. citizens who have been victims of torture, extrajudicial killings or prolonged arbitrary detention." Moreover, ABA proposes an amendment in immigration law that would deport persons who took part in the torture "under color of foreign law."

In proposing this legislation, the ABA seeks to resolve a conflict between two Federal cases. In 1983, a Federal court of appeals in New York ruled that a Paraguayan family was entitled to \$375,000 in damages from a former police chief for torturing a 17-year old youth to death in Paraguay seven years ago. The youth's father, Dr. Joel Filartiga and the youth's sister had sued for \$10 million but said they did not expect to collect anything from the defendant, Americo Norberto Pena-Irala. They sued after Mr. Pena, who was later deported, was picked up in Brooklyn in 1979 as an illegal alien. Dr. Filartiga has been an open foe of the Paraguayan government of Gen. Alfredo Stroessner. An appellate ruling said Federal courts had jurisdiction in a suit over a civil wrong committed outside the country "in violation of the law of nations."

However in a 1984 case involving Libya, the Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia dismissed a similar action. The 3-judge panel noted that the lack of congressional guidance does not provide a clear basis for authorizing federal suits against torturers residing or visiting the U.S. The ABA has prepared a 14-page explanation of how the proposed bill would be implemented. This backgrounder was compiled in consultation with congressional offices, legal scholars and human rights organizations. (If you wish a copy of the full text, drop us a note). Here are excerpts:

QUESTION: What type of suit would be brought under the statute?

ANSWER: A statute would authorize civil actions for compensatory and punitive damages. Such actions may include personal injury claims for compensation for physical injury or emotional distress suffered by the victim. They also may encompass requests for punitive damages to punish the violator for his deeds and to serve as a deterrent to other, potential perpetrators.

QUESTION: If a court renders a judgment awarding monetary relief to the victim of abuse, how would such a judgment be satisfied?

ANSWER: The victim, or his heirs or representatives, could execute a favorable judgment by seizing or attaching a lien on any of the assets of the defendant located in the United States. The rules concerning execution of judgments vary widely from state to state. In general, a judgment obtained in one jurisdiction will be recognized and may be

executed in another. In some cases, it may even be possible to execute an award of compensatory damages against assets of the defendant in a foreign country.

QUESTION: Could a government be sued under the proposed statute?

ANSWER: No. The proposed statute would establish personal liability for individual acts and would seek to avoid the political and legal problems that arise in applying sanctions against governments. It would protect internationally recognized human rights by holding individuals who violate these rights accountable for their actions. A government would be protected from suit by the Foreign Sovereign Immunities Act if the acts complained of could be shown to be official government policy.

QUESTION: If the defendant claims to have acted pursuant to official government policy, could the courts refuse to hear the suit on the basis of the Foreign Sovereign Immunity Act or the Act of State doctrine?

ANSWER: A defendant would have to convince the court that the abuse occurred pursuant to official government policy in order to raise successfully the defense of foreign sovereign immunity or Act of State. It is unlikely, however, that courts in the United States would conclude that a defendant accused of torture, extrajudicial killing or prolonged arbitrary detention acted pursuant to official government policy. States have a strong interest in denying that violators of human rights were acting as agents of their governments and therefore would be highly unlikely to make such admissions. If a state denied any prior knowledge or authorization of the alleged acts, a court probably would not find that the acts constituted an "Act of State." Thus, in cases where a state official is accused only of acting under "color" of state authority, the defenses of sovereign immunity and Act of State are not likely to succeed.

What you can do

The proposed law is a special project assigned by the ABA to the Lawyers Committee For International Human Rights (contact: Elizabeth Barnes, 202-546-5315). The Committee is working to have the bill introduced this year by Congressmen Jim Leach (Rep.-Iowa) and Gus Yatron (Dem.-Penn.) of the House Foreign Affairs Committee. Members of the House Judiciary Committee have also indicated an interest in co-sponsoring as have members of the Senate Foreign Relations and Judiciary committees. We have contacted Miss Barnes to offer our assistance in providing witnesses if public hearings are called by the committees. All MFP chapters are alerted to contact prospective witnesses. As you know some 97 Filipinos in the U.S. have been granted political asylum, a number of whom were tortured (see the July 1984 and August 1985 issues of our MFP Newsletter).

CALIFORNIA, KEEP SENDING THOSE LETTERS

As voting residents of the U.S., our voices have clout in Congress. The more voices, the more effective we are. And by most estimates, California is home to 400,000 Filipinos, by far the largest concentration anywhere in the mainland. And of course, the state is represented by the largest number of legislators in Congress.

The two MFP regional councils in this state together count with the most number of chapters and members than the other six councils representing other states. Our California chapters therefore generate a lot of the letters to Congress in our mailing campaigns. For your convenience and ready reference, here is a lineup of your representatives and the districts. Address forms:

The Honorable _____/United States Senate/Washington DC 20510/Dear Senator _____ The Honorable _____/House of Representatives/Washington DC 20515/ Dear Congressman/Congresswoman _____.

California

Senators

- Alan Cranston (D) San Francisco
- Pete Wilson (R) San Francisco

Representatives

- 1. Douglas H. Bosco (D) Santa Rosa
- 2. Gene Chappie (R) Chico
- 3. Robert T. Matsui (D) Sacramento
- 4. Vic Fazio (D) Sacramento
- 5. Sala Burton (D) San Francisco
- 6. Barbara Boxer (D) San Rafael
- 7. George Miller (D) Pleasant Hill
- 8. Ronald V. Dellums (D) Oakland
- 9. Fortney H. (Pete) Stark (D) Hayward
- 10. Don Edwards (D) San Jose
- 11. Tom Lantos (D) San Mateo
- 12. Ed Zschau (R) Sunnyvale
- 13. Norman Y. Mineta (D) San Jose
- 14. Norman D. Shumway (R) Stockton
- 15. Tony Coelho (D) Fresno
- 16. Leon E. Panetta (D) Monterey
- 17. Charles Pashayan, Jr. (R) Fresno
- 18. Richard Lehman (D) Fresno
- 19. Robert J. Lagomarsino (R) Ventura
- 20. William M. Thomas (R) Bakersfield

- 21. Bobbi Fiedler (R) Chatsworth
- 22. Carlos J. Moorhead (R) Glendale
- 23. Anthony C. Beilenson (D) Los Angeles
- 24. Henry A. Waxman (D) Los Angeles
- 25. Edward R. Roybal (D) Los Angeles
- 26. Howard L. Berman (D) Panorama City
- 27. Mel Levine (D) Los Angeles
- 28. Julian C. Dixon (D) Inglewood
- 29. Augustus F. Hawkins (D) Los Angeles
- 30. Matthew (Marty) G. Martinez (D) Montebello
- 31. Mervyn M. Dymally (D) Los Angeles
- 32. Glenn M. Anderson (D) Long Beach
- 33. David Dreier (R) Covina
- 34. Esteban E. Torres (D) Norwalk
- 35. Jerry Lewis (R) Redlands
- 36. George E. Brown, Jr. (D) Colton
- 37. Al McCandless (R) Riverside
- 38. Robert K. Dornan (R) Garden Grove
- 39. William E. Dannemeyer (R) Fullerton
- 40. Robert E. Badham (R) Newport Beach
- 41. Bill Lowery (R) San Diego
- 42. Dan Lungren (R) Long Beach
- 43. Ron Packard (R) Carlsbad
- 44. Jim Bates (D) San Diego
- 45. Duncan L. Hunter (R) El Cajon

TAKING ANOTHER SLICE OFF THE AID

It's not all over yet! Although a \$70 million military aid budget for the Philippines for fiscal year 1986 has already been authorized last August, not a penny of that can be spent until Congress has appropriated it. On August 1, the House Appropriations Committee cleared for action by the floor its Foreign Assistance Appropriations bill (HR 3228).

The bill has recommended to cut the funding: only \$25 million for military assistance program (MAP) and no money at all for Foreign Military Sales (FMS). Those were the spending limits passed earlier by the House Foreign Affairs committee in its authorization bill. Furthermore, the Appropriations committee said in its report:

HUMAN RIGHTS VIOLATIONS IN THE PHILIPPINES

The Committee was particularly concerned this year over testimony from outside witnesses related to human rights violations in the Philippines. These violations are particularly disturbing because the Committee believes that human rights violations by government forces directly assist the Communist insurgency in winning the acceptance of the Philippine people. Since last September there have been violent attacks on human rights workers in the Philippines. Two lawyers have been killed, 5 others have been arrested, and numerous others subjected to harassment.

It appears that the action taken concerning the human rights workers reflects a general worsening of the human rights situation in the Philippines. In the past year, there has been an increase in reported political killings of civilians and disappearance and unlawful abduction of civilians by government forces.

The Committee wants the State Department to look into the murders and harassment of human rights workers and other human rights violations in the Philippines. A report on the situation is to be provided to the Committee at the earliest feasible date, but not later than December 1, 1985.

What to do

If you will remember, the authorized funds for military aid came with non-binding conditions that called for Manila to accomplish a range of political and military reforms (see MFP Newsletter August 1985). Now is the time to push once again for binding conditions. The House appropriations bill has not yet been cleared by that chamber; neither has the Senate version. Contact your Congressmen now.

Philippine Army Kills 14 Communist Guerrillas

MANILA, Oct. 6 (Reuters) — An army anti-insurgency patrol killed at least 14 Communist guerrillas in a gun battle on the southern island of Mindanao, the official Philippine news agency said today.

The agency said the soldiers clashed with a force of guerrillas from the Communist New People's Army on Saturday at Polanco in Zamboanga Province, 450 miles southeast of Manila.

SLAIN: Eliseo Fernandez, 58, assistant prosecutor in Philippine President Ferdinand Marcos's home province of Ilocos Norte; in an ambush by unidentified gunmen; in Marcos's hometown of Batac, 396 km north of Manila, Sept. 5. Also killed was the official's son-in-law Fernando Ulit. Reports said Marcos ordered a national manhunt for the killers.

SLAIN: Mario Celestines, a top-ranking communist guerilla leader on the Philippines' Mindanao island; when shot by paramilitary troops who trapped him in a street in Davao; Sept. 3. The military had earlier placed a \$2,150 price on his head.

SLAIN: Father Nilo Valerio, one of four Roman Catholic priests known to have joined the Philippines' communist guerillas in 1979; in a clash with government soldiers north of Baguio last month; reported by the private news organization the Cordillera News Agency in early September. It said Valerio was killed in a gun-battle along with two New People's Army women fighters and that the three were beheaded by the troops before burial.

SLAIN: Westrimundo Tabayo-yong, mayor of the northern Philippine town of Laoac and member of President Ferdinand Marcos's ruling KBL party; after being shot by a lone assailant Sept. 6. He was the tenth mayor to be killed in the country this year.

THE KILLING FIELDS

In major U.S. newspapers here, they're tucked into the corners of inside pages. Editors call them "fillers" -- mostly an inch or two in length that fill up the bottom of columns.

From the comfortable distance of 12,000 miles, these deaths an ocean away seldom intrude into our consciousness unless such fillers catch our eye. If they do, they slide into our mental file. They sink fast, making slight ripples. Another shootout, another encounter, another killing. As we lounge in bed, far removed from the conflict, we turn the page. Days pass, maybe weeks. Then, one morning, another filler: a killing here, a killing there. And so it goes.

In the jargon of confrontation, these deaths are the products of "insurgency" and "counter-insurgency." As time goes by -- when did the killings start? 1969? 1970? -- we tend to lose sight of their proportions. Perhaps, some numbers will tell:

■ "Between 1981 and 1985, we have casualties, they number about 5,000. The casualties of the rebels are double that. The present rate (of rebel casualties

were killed during the same year.

■ In 1985 "seven NPAs are now killed everyday compared to only four NPAs killed daily in 1984," according to Brig. Gen. Eduardo Ermita, chief of the Armed Forces of the Philippines Civil Relations Service, during a press conference in Davao City in September.

■ In the last three years, the NPA claims that its guerrillas have killed 6,000 soldiers and government workers. During the same period, it says it suffered 800 casualties.

Even if these numbers are half of what they claim to be, nonetheless they should tell us that the killings have reached civil war proportions. And the saddest thing about it all is that the numbers are mounting. As someone noted, the Philippines has the only active guerrilla war going on in Southeast Asia.

Below are statistics submitted by Cong. Mervyn Dymally (Dem.-Calif.) during hearings March 12, 1985 before the House East Asian & Pacific Affairs Subcommittee on the 1986 Philippine aid budget.

Type of Violation	1983	1984 (Excludes Nov-Dec For Mindanao)
Arrests - - - - -	2,088	3,038
Torture Cases - - - - -	644	449
Extra-Judicial Killings (Salvaging) - - - - -	368	445
Disappearances - - - - -	145	137
Massacre Incidents - - - - -	30	36
Victims - - - - -	163	203
Strafing Incidents - - - - -	47	56
Victims - - - - -	102	130

Year	Arrests	Disappearances	Extra-Judicial Killings
1977	1,351	17	51
1978	1,620	10	86
1979	1,961	48	196
1980	962	19	218
1981	1,377	53	321
1982	1,911	42	210
1983	2,088	145	368
1984	3,038*	137*	445*

* Figures for 1984 exclude Nov-Dec for Mindanao

Source: Human Rights Situation & Militarization in the Philippines: Trends & Analysis, 1984. Report submitted to the UN Commission on Human Rights, Geneva, Switzerland, February 19, 1985, by the Task Force Detainees-Philippines in behalf of the Int'l Fact-Finding Mission.

A CONFERENCE-REUNION-COUNCIL MEETING IN WASHINGTON

It's a three-in-one get-together event. Originally scheduled in San Diego, California this month, the third MFP Executive Council meeting moves east to Washinton DC. The change of venue will take advantage of the attendance of several Congressmen and Senators to a conference that the Washington Regional Council is organizing to celebrate a reunion of chapter members from all over the country, including Canada.

The two-day event (October 25-26) includes workshops at the Holiday Inn Capitol and a roster of speakers on the theme of "Is Peaceful Transition Possible?" The Council will meet on Saturday.

A new home

The MFP Office For International Affairs (directed by Raul Manglapus) has been given office space at the David R. Hunter International Center, 731 8th St. NE, Washington DC 20003.

S END YOUR THANK-YOU'S

Last July, the House floor debated a move by Congressman Gerald Solomon (Rep.-New York) to reinstate \$25 million in 1986 Philippine military aid that the Subcommittee on Asian & Pacific Affairs chopped off from an Administration request of \$100 million. After a vigorous clash of words, the amendment was out to a vote. Results: 125 ayes to restore the cuts; 279 said no, a resounding rejection.

Congressman Stephen Solarz (Dem.-New York) and Howard Wolpe (Dem.-Michigan) led the fight to defeat the amendment. (We published excerpts of their remarks in our August issue). The record of how each legislator voted will be sent to you. Others who rose on the floor to speak against Solomon were: Gus Yatron (Dem.-Penn); Mervyn (Dem.-Calif); Mel Levine (Dem.-Calif); Bill Richardson (Dem.-New Mexico); Charles Schumer (Dem.-New York); James Jeffords (Rep.-Vermont). Kindly send each of them a note of appreciation.

New Video Is a Hit in Philippines

MANILA VIDEO STORES have a hot new item: a documentary on U.S. real estate that Imelda Marcos allegedly owns.

The video "Hidden Wealth" gives viewers a tour of Manhattan residences and luxurious country homes that Philippine opposition parties have linked to the Marcos family. The documentary raises sensitive questions. "Where did the money (to buy these properties) come from?" asks a critic of the Marcos government who lives in New York. Another question is whether and how the president's family circumvented strict Philippine central

bank restrictions on transferring funds abroad. Viewers of the tape are urged to "make your own judgment." The Marcos government has denied the allegations.

The documentary can't be shown on Philippine television "because Marcos's friends own all the stations, but no one can stop people from seeing it" on their VCRs, says Orlando Mercado, an opposition party member.

Wall St. Journal (Oct.18,1985)

Capital flight brochure

MFP is reprinting in brochure form the Mercury News and Village Voice (see page 1) features on the U.S. real estate holdings of Mr. & Mrs. Marcos

The MFP Newsletter is published four times a year.

**MOVEMENT
FOR A
FREE
PHILIPPINES** 

71 Shelbourne Lane, Manhasset, New York 11040

The Movement For Free Philippines functions as a U.S. base of protest against Ferdinand Marcos' rule in the Philippines. Because the U.S. government sustains that rule with its economic and military aid, the Movement's principal work centers on informing the American public and its Congress that such support actually endangers U.S. interests in the Philippines.

The Movement calls attention to Philippine violations of human rights, questionable development policies, and indiscriminate U.S. military aid. In this way, it serves as an overseas arm of the many forces in the Philippines that work for the return of true democracy there.

Founded on May 16, 1973 in New York city, the MFP has a network of chapters across America and Canada. These are clustered in eight regional councils located in Toronto, Chicago, Detroit, San Francisco, New York City, St. Louis, Los Angeles and Washington D.C.

Membership fees, donations and fund-raising activities help fund its work. Volunteers and members are welcome. Help is always needed to operate mailing campaigns, prepare information materials, organize speaking tours, raise funds. If you are interested in joining, contact us at the above address and we will provide the address of the chapter nearest you.

**MOVEMENT
FOR A
FREE**

PHILIPPINES

71 Shelbourne Lane, Manhasset, New York 11040 USA
