

**UCLA**

**UCLA Electronic Theses and Dissertations**

**Title**

Atin ang Pinas: Anti-Imperialist Filipino Movement Interventions in a New Militarist Era

**Permalink**

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/8096d7mh>

**Author**

Morton, Ina

**Publication Date**

2024

Peer reviewed|Thesis/dissertation

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Los Angeles

*Atin ang Pinas: Anti-Imperialist Filipino Movement Interventions in a New Militarist Era*

A thesis submitted in partial satisfaction  
of the requirements for the degree  
Master of Urban and Regional Planning

by

Ina Morton

2024

© Copyright by

Ina Morton

2024

## ABSTRACT OF THE THESIS

*Atin ang Pinas:*

Anti-Imperialist Filipino Movement Interventions in a New Militarist Era

by

Ina Morton

Master of Urban and Regional Planning

University of California, Los Angeles, 2024

Professor Ananya Roy, Chair

This paper analyzes urban militarism, anti-imperialist movement organizing, and the contestation of space through a case study of the 2023 Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC) summit and protests in San Francisco, California. Building on existing literature on transnational continuities; urban militarisms; neoliberalism, imperialism, and militarization; and urban contestation and resistance; this paper studies the APEC protests and counter-summit as a site where anti-imperialist organizers in the Filipino diaspora contested American militarism transnationally in their interventions in militarized urban space. The qualitative research methods employed are primarily ethnographic, utilizing interviews and participant observation to capture the character, events, and discourses of the protests. This research intends to bridge the gap between Filipino, urban, and militarism studies, forming an analysis of the transnational continuities of militarism, neoliberalism, and counterinsurgency as synthesized by the organizers interviewed in this study.

The thesis of Ina Morton is approved.

Karen N. Umemoto

Marques Augusta Vestal

Ananya Roy, Committee Chair

University of California, Los Angeles

2024

*Dedication*

Para sa mga kasama ko.

## Table of Contents

<b>ABSTRACT OF THE THESIS.....</b>	<b>II</b>
<b>CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION.....</b>	<b>1</b>
<i>WAR IN THE ASIA PACIFIC</i> .....	1
<i>THE 2023 APEC SUMMIT</i> .....	4
<b>CHAPTER 2: BACKGROUND .....</b>	<b>7</b>
<i>AMERICAN MILITARISM AND COUNTERINSURGENCY IN THE PHILIPPINES</i> .....	7
<i>THE NATIONAL DEMOCRATIC MOVEMENT AND TRANSNATIONAL FILIPINO ORGANIZING</i> .....	20
<i>APEC AND FILIPINO ANTI-APEC PROTEST</i> .....	25
<b>CHAPTER 3: LITERATURE REVIEW .....</b>	<b>32</b>
<i>TRANSNATIONAL CONTINUITIES</i> .....	32
<i>URBAN MILITARISM</i> .....	35
<i>NEOLIBERALISM, IMPERIALISM, AND MILITARIZATION</i> .....	38
<i>URBAN CONTESTATION AND RESISTANCE</i> .....	40
<b>CHAPTER 4: RESEARCH METHODS AND HYPOTHESES .....</b>	<b>43</b>
<i>METHODOLOGY</i> .....	43
<i>HYPOTHESES</i> .....	46
<i>ON REFLEXIVITY</i> .....	47
<b>CHAPTER 5: FINDINGS &amp; ANALYSIS .....</b>	<b>50</b>
<i>MILITARISM AS COUNTERINSURGENCY</i> .....	50
<i>MILITARISM AS PLANNING DOCTRINE</i> .....	58
<i>'FILIPINO WOMEN ARE NOT FOR SALE'</i> .....	61
<i>NEOLIBERALISM AS A NECROPOLITIC</i> .....	66
<i>THE U.S. AS ALREADY AT WAR</i> .....	71
<i>BUILDING THE BROADEST FRONT FOR THE NARROWEST TARGET</i> .....	76
<i>PEOPLES' WAR FOR PEOPLE'S PEACE</i> .....	81
<b>CHAPTER 6: CONCLUSION.....</b>	<b>85</b>
<i>RECOMMENDATIONS</i> .....	87
<i>FUTURE RESEARCH</i> .....	88
<i>ATIN ANG PINAS</i> .....	89
<i>APPENDIX B: INTERVIEW QUESTIONS</i> .....	92
<b>BIBLIOGRAPHY .....</b>	<b>93</b>

## *Acknowledgements*

To my thesis committee, Ananya Roy, Marques Vestal, and Karen Umemoto, for their guidance and feedback—I am so grateful to have been supported by such deeply thoughtful and critical scholars for this work.

To all of my graduate professors here at the University of California, Los Angeles in the Urban Planning, Geography, and Asian American Studies departments, who have helped build the interdisciplinary, intellectual foundation for this thesis.

To all of my undergraduate professors from Occidental College in the Department of Urban and Environmental Policy, who so diligently prepared me for graduate studies in urban planning and anti-militarism and encouraged me to pursue this degree.

To my fellow UCLA classmates and friends who hold the contradictions of organizing and scholarship with deep thought, discipline, and humor—especially, those who have steadfastly supported the struggle at our occupation and in our union—I surely could not have finished this thesis without your support.

Lastly, I owe the deepest gratitude to all of the activists and organizers who participated in this research and reminded me that all genuine knowledge originates in direct experience. Concrete, people's struggles around the globe from Palestine to the Philippines are waging new paths forward, far beyond the limited scope of the academy.



## CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

### *War in the Asia Pacific*

National sovereignty and anti-base activists had already ringing been the alarm bells on escalating American military occupation and militarization when United States Defense Secretary Lloyd Austin in early February 2023 announced that U.S. military forces would be granted access to four new bases in the Philippines, expanding the official number of bases utilized wholly as training, equipment, and personnel reserves from five to nine.<sup>1</sup> “American commitment to the defense of the Philippines is ironclad. Our alliance makes both of our democracies more secure and helps uphold a free and open Indo-Pacific,” said Austin at the press conference announcing the increased base access, staged outside of the Department of National Defense at Camp Aguinaldo in Quezon City. A senior administration official with the Biden administration described the EDCA base expansion effort as “a priority for the Biden administration” that had “high level White House attention as part of our strategic effort across the region.”<sup>2</sup>

Philippine President Marcos Jr. likewise offered praise and emphasized the centrality of the U.S.’ expanded military operations to his administration, stating: “The United States has always been our longest partner and ally. I have always said, it seems to me that the future of the Philippines, and for that matter the Asia-Pacific region, will always involve the United States.”<sup>3</sup> The new military base locations were announced in April to be Naval Base Camilo Osias in Santa Ana, Cagayan; Camp Melchor Dela Cruz in Gamu, Isabela; Balabac Island in Palawan; and Lal-

---

<sup>1</sup> Ashley Westerman, “*The U.S. and the Philippines agree to a larger American military presence,*” *NPR*, February 2, 2023.

<sup>2</sup> Karen DeYoung and Rebecca Tan, “U.S. reaches military base access agreement in the Philippines,” *The Washington Post*, February 2, 2023.

<sup>3</sup> DeYoung and Tan, “U.S. reaches military base access agreement in the Philippines,” 2023.

lo Airport in Cagayan, with the State Department allocating an additional \$82 million USD in funding for infrastructure modernization.<sup>4</sup>

The geopolitics of the locations of these sites is significant, as Isabela and Cagayan both face Taiwan from the south, while the Palawan base sits to the east of the highly contested South China Sea, with the demonstrated rationale behind this expansion being heightening tensions between the U.S. and China that has resulted in military escalation in the region.<sup>5</sup> The sites not only demonstrate the value of strategic military proximity to Taiwan, but reveal their economic significance as well, as they lie along the trade route that Philippine economic officials describe as a space where over \$3 trillion USD in trade passes annually.<sup>6</sup> The original five military bases that will continue to be operated by US forces are Antonio Bautista Air Base in Palawan, Basa Air Base in Pampanga, Benito Ebuen Air Base in Cebu, Fort Magsaysay in Nueva Ecija, and Lumbia Airport in Cagayan de Oro.<sup>7</sup> Like the new bases, the locations of the sites overall span much of the Philippines geography but are overwhelmingly located in the northernmost Luzon region, many straddling largely remote regions along the Sulu and West Philippine Seas. The US' Archipelagic Defense Strategy for the Asia Pacific identifies the Philippines as part of the "First Island Chain defensive line," though organizers describe American military expansion and provocation of Chinese forces in the West Philippine Sea as offensive rather than defensive, preparing

---

<sup>4</sup> U.S. Department of Defense, "Philippines, U.S. Announce Locations of Four New EDCA Sites," press release, April 3, 2023.

<sup>5</sup> DeYoung and Tan, 2023.

<sup>6</sup> Karen Lema, "Philippines reveals locations of 4 new strategic sites for U.S. military pact," *Reuters*, April 3, 2023.

<sup>7</sup> U.S. Department of State, "Agreement Between the United States of America and the Philippines," in *Treaties and Other International Acts Series 14-625*, April 28, 2014.

amphibious, naval, and air forces for war with China on the islands.<sup>8</sup> The 2024 introduction of further military, economic, and political incursion into the region represent a new height of what scholars and strategists have described as the US’ “pivot to Asia” beginning November 2011.<sup>9</sup>

Filipino activists in the American diaspora and in the Philippines have since been mounting massive political and physical resistance to this expansion and their nation’s relegation to be merely a staging ground for an American war on China. Military agreements and interventions are of particular protest, though a broader range of practices and policies identified as central to American imperialism in the region such as military exercises, new diplomatic relations, and free trade agreements are also widely opposed. “We oppose U.S. military intervention in the Philippines and reject the puppetry of Bongbong Marcos to the U.S. There is no doubt this is a buildup to war in the Asia Pacific...to stoke the flames of world war. There is no doubt that we, the Filipino people will fight tooth and nail to defend our sovereignty,” spoke organizers with BAYAN.<sup>10 11</sup> At protest actions across the Filipino diaspora and nation, organizers chant “*Atin ang Pinas, U.S. at Tsina layas!*” translating to ‘the Philippines is ours, US and China leave!’ As tensions rise between the United States and China, with the Philippines situated firmly betwixt them, the 2023 Asia Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC) summit in San Francisco where Presidents Marcos and Biden, among others, had declared their intention to meet and further strengthen the alliance between their governments offered a critical site for Filipino organizers to

---

<sup>8</sup> Andrew F. Krepinevich Jr., *Archipelagic Defense 2.0*, Washington, D.C.: Hudson Institute, 2023.

<sup>9</sup> David Shambaugh, “Assessing the US ‘Pivot’ to Asia,” *Strategic Studies Quarterly* 7, no. 2 (2013).

<sup>10</sup> Sara Flounders, “Philippine-U.S. war games threaten China,” *Workers World*, April 19, 2023.

<sup>11</sup> BAYAN, short for *Bagong Alyansang Makabayan* or “New Patriotic Alliance” is a multisectoral alliance and campaign center made up of organizations in the National Democratic movement in the Philippines, with transnational chapters located around the world. The word *bayan*, means nation in Tagalog.

contest the militarist violence defining their physical and political environments—both in the diaspora and in the Philippines—and affect material change through protest and movement building.<sup>12</sup>

### *The 2023 APEC Summit*

In November 2022, at the Asia Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC) summit in Bangkok, Thailand, United States Vice President Kamala Harris announced that San Francisco would be the host city for the next year’s APEC meetings, marking the first time APEC had been held in the United States in the decade, and the third time the country has hosted overall since APEC’s initial establishment as a ministerial group and intergovernmental forum in 1989.<sup>13</sup> On July 11<sup>th</sup>, 2023, an international, anti-imperialist formation of organizations named the International League of People’s Struggle initiated the “No to APEC” coalition, a broad coalition of over a hundred left-wing, youth, labor, migrant, and anti-imperialist organizations who together launched the campaign, announcing their intention to mobilize thousands of activists to hold their own counter-summit and shut down the summit through protest, demonstrating their opposition to the “devastating impacts of APEC neoliberal policies on their communities.”<sup>14</sup> Filipino and Filipino solidarity organizations represented a significant makeup of the coalition’s attendees and

---

<sup>12</sup> This thesis defines “militarism” as both an ideology and practice reproducing violence in civilian life through military structures, institutions, and stratagems in response to a perceived existing or potential threat of danger or disobedience of the public, particularly those othered by the state. “Militarization” in the context of urban form and development is a therefore related, though not synonymous, term referring to the particular securitizing processes and infrastructures enacted by military forces that uniquely positions them as major actors in the urban.

<sup>13</sup> Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation, “History,” APEC, revised October 2023, <https://www.apec.org/about-us/about-apec/history>.

<sup>14</sup> The International League of People’s Struggle (ILPS) is an international organization, self-described as a “democratic formation,” made up of anti-imperialist and pro-democracy movements. The organization was founded in 2001, with Filipino movement leader and former Communist Party of the Philippines chairman José María Sison serving as founding chairman.

organizers, with a number of transnational organizations representing different sectors of the National Democratic movement in attendance among others. Of particular protest at the 2023 summit is the Indo-Pacific Economic Framework for Prosperity (IPEF), a trade framework negotiated at the APEC summit, with organizers decrying IPEF as a tool employed by the White House to promote “militarization of the [Asia Pacific] region in the US’ favor.”<sup>15 16</sup>

The APEC 2023 summit was designated as a National Special Security Event (NSSE) by the US Department of Homeland Security, a designation given to events of national or international significance deemed to be potential targets for terrorism or other major criminal incidents, resulting in an inflow of federal and state security resources and unprecedented security measures for the city of San Francisco. Security measures coordinated by the US Secret Service included the deployment of up to 5,000 San Francisco Police Department personnel, a 12-block “exclusion zone” enclosing areas surrounding marked APEC locations, Coast Guard and National Guard deployment, increased surveillance, and even the positioning of sharpshooters.<sup>17</sup> No to APEC organizers likewise lambasted these measures as “wasteful” and “anti-democratic” militarization, comparing these security tactics to ones utilized by previous APEC host cities, such as the deployment of snipers and tanks, water cannons, and rubber bullets and other “less-lethal” ammunitions against protestors.<sup>18</sup>

---

<sup>15</sup> U.S. Department of Commerce, “Indo-Pacific Economic Framework, <https://www.commerce.gov/ipef>, accessed January 4<sup>th</sup>, 2024.

<sup>16</sup> “Statement of the No to APEC Coalition,” 2023.

<sup>17</sup> Jonah Owen Lamb, “APEC Summit in San Francisco: Secret Service Will Lead Security Amid Fears of Attacks,” *SF Standard*, August 3, 2023.

<sup>18</sup> No to APEC, “No to APEC Coalition Rejects Militarized Conference Prep in SF,” public statement, September 2023.

This thesis seeks to examine the APEC protests as a site where anti-imperialist organizers in the Filipino diaspora contested American militarism internationally in their interventions in domestic urban militarized space; offering critical, analytical frameworks as to the relationship between neoliberalism, counterinsurgency, and militarization. Beginning first with asking how the No to APEC coalition synthesized the temporary militarization of San Francisco during the summit with the ongoing militarization occurring in the Philippines and in the broader Asia Pacific, this paper utilizes the lens of protest to raise activist analyses on imperialist militarism and the root causes of US militarization internationally; with activists advancing not only their analyses of the character of US militarism, but also their views of mass movement building and resistance as the solution, offering paths forward for demilitarization and socialist reconstruction.

Though I have come to this work with a primarily spatial interest in understanding militarized space—and protest, as both a means for disruption and an impetus for militarization—the spatial is wholly inextricable from the economic and social dimensions of militarism. Activist analyses of how US imperial militarism manifests itself in not just the cities of its global semi-colonies or neo-colonies, but even within the imperial core—particularly as counterinsurgency and a means to quell popular protest, are not narrowly spatial but more broadly concerned with militarism in all of its forms and impacts. Still, by employing the analyses of activists in third world diaspora to ask questions of the transnational geographies of American militarism, we can more critically challenge militarist apparatuses as they manifest in our local cities—having been tested and perfected abroad.

## CHAPTER 2: BACKGROUND

### *American Militarism and Counterinsurgency in the Philippines*

The United States has established military bases and outposts in the Philippines since as early as 1898, when it first seized control of the nation from Spain by purchasing it alongside Guam and Puerto Rico for a mere \$20 million as part of the Treaty of Paris; making the Philippines one of the US' first overseas colonies. The Philippines has long been a geopolitical foothold for the United States to project dominance across the Pacific from their bases and readily intervene in China, Korea, Japan, Vietnam, and other nations in the Asia Pacific, with significant arms and armies.<sup>19</sup> Of other significance was the natural resources, raw materials, and cheap labor desirous for extraction to a growing, early 19<sup>th</sup> century American empire. The revolutionary war for Philippine independence continued as it passed from Spanish to American colonial rule, with over a million Filipinos killed by genocide in this fight. The Philippine-American War served as a major flashpoint in American military strategy, as one of the US' first ever deployments of not only counterrevolutionary violence but counterinsurgency, staging mock battles and collaborating with wealthier interests within the Filipino revolutionary movement to subvert the limited victories of the Katipuneros.<sup>20</sup>

Though the state propaganda regarding the colonial conquest of the nation presented images of benevolent assimilation and the depiction of the American colonizer as a gentler, friendlier one than that of the Spanish, American military brass utilized extreme violence and genocide to not only suppress ongoing Filipino rebellion, but to prevent all future revolutionary

---

<sup>19</sup> Walden Bello, *Let the Good Times Roll: Prostitution and the U.S. Military in Asia*, edited by Sandra Pollock Sturdevant and Brenda Stolfus, New York: New Press, 1992.

<sup>20</sup> Luis Francia, *A history of the Philippines: from Indio Bravos to Filipinos*, New York: Overlook Press, 2010.

movement at its hilt. In an October 1901 massacre of Filipino children and civilians, American Brigadier General Jacob (“Hell Roaring Jake”) Smith infamously ordered his troops on Samar Island to “kill everyone over ten,” stating:

I want no prisoners. I wish you to kill and burn, the more you kill and burn the better it will please me. I want all persons killed who are capable of bearing arms in actual hostilities against the United States.<sup>21</sup>

Though Smith would be ordered into retirement from the Army over such actions after public outcry, he faced no further punishment nor investigation. His actions reflected not only the US’ sanctioned hate and terror against the Filipino, but the American’s view that able-bodied Filipinos, even in their childhoods, would revolt and are thusly dangerous.<sup>22</sup> Smith’s violence represents the historical and ideological foundation for American counterinsurgency in the Philippines, a strategy for state repression that would continue as assuredly as Filipino popular resistance.

After the terror and violence of WWII era Japanese occupation, which saw the American military apparatus seek to defend their strategic interests in the Philippines (opposed to the Filipino people themselves, who had their own armed resistance movement to the Japanese), the post-World War II remaking of the Philippines brought with it a transition from formal American territory to a legally independent, yet economically and politically dependent state retained with it the semi-colonial or neocolonial logics.<sup>23</sup> Filipino activists refer to this transition as “hindipendence,” with *hindi* being the Tagalog word for no, referencing the false nature of such

---

<sup>21</sup> Richard E. Welch, “American Atrocities in the Philippines: The Indictment and the Response,” *Pacific Historical Review*, 43, no. 2 (1974): 233–53.

<sup>22</sup> Paul A. Kramer, “Race-making and Colonial Violence in the US Empire: The Philippine-American War as Race War,” *Diplomatic History* 30, No. 2 (April 2006).

<sup>23</sup> Benedict J., Kerkvliet, *The Huk Rebellion: A Study of Peasant Revolt in the Philippines.* Lanham, Maryland: Rowan & Littlefield, 1977.



independences.<sup>24</sup> Two major military agreements were forged between the new Philippine government and the United States during this period: the 1947 Philippines-US Military Bases Agreement which allowed the US access to Clark Air Force Base and Subic Naval Base, along with nearly two dozen other sites, relatively unconditional access for a period of 99 years; and the 1951 Mutual Defense Treaty, established to provide indefinite mutual support in the case of an armed attack in the Pacific. Both measures defined the architecture of early-Cold War era American militarism in the Philippines, fortressing American military might and interest in the Asia Pacific as communist, national liberation movements flourished in the region.<sup>25 26</sup>

The most significant sites of 20<sup>th</sup> century militarism in the Philippines were two of the largest American military installations—domestic or overseas: Subic Bay Naval Base in Olongapo City and Clark Air Force Base in Angeles City, both located in Central Luzon.<sup>27</sup> Resulting material consequences of the bases were documented to have been, but not limited to: the appropriation or theft of residential land, widespread gendered sexual abuse and violence, the creation of subeconomies dependent on military personnel’s needs and wants—including a sex trade populated by local women—toxic runoff and contamination, the abandonment and mistreatment of Amerasian children with military fathers, and the creation of a two-class economic system that separates local

---

<sup>24</sup> Reynaldo C. Ileto, *The ‘Unfinished Revolution’ in Philippine Political Discourse*, Southeast Asian Studies, Vol 31, No.1, June 1993.

<sup>25</sup> United States Senate. *Agreement between the Republic of the Philippines and the United States of America Concerning Military Bases*. Washington, D.C., 1947.

<sup>26</sup> United States Senate. *Mutual Defense Treaty Between the United States and the Republic of the Philippines*. Washington, D.C., 1951.

<sup>27</sup> Gwyn Kirk and Carolyn Bowen Francis, *Redefining Security: Women Challenge U.S. Military Policy and Practice in East Asia*, Berkeley Women’s Law Journal, 2000.

populations and treats them as second class citizens.<sup>28</sup> The US has historically built as many as twenty-three confirmed bases in the Philippines, occupying nearly 200,000 hectares of territory, though many activists and scholars speculate many more have been established and maintained secretly and unacknowledged.<sup>29</sup> By design, there has historically been little internal data about the violence and oppression experienced by base-area populations at the hands of the US military, but the conditions as expressed and evidenced by local organizers speaks to the negative force American base-building has on living conditions in the Philippines.

The maintenance of major American military bases and the burgeoning collaboration between the US military, the Armed Forces of the Philippines (AFP), and the Philippine Constabulary—early military-police predecessor to the Philippine National Police (PNP)—served a two-fold purpose, providing launching pads for the United States into their military incursions into the region as well as providing the infrastructure for the sophisticated suppression of armed and unarmed social movements within the country that would threaten its influence.<sup>30</sup> While battalions from the AFP were deployed to Korea, Vietnam, and the Spratly Islands, American forces and counterintelligence units were deployed to the Philippine countryside to eliminate the *Partido Komunista ng Pilipinas* (PKP)-backed *Hukbalahap* guerrilla army who had sought to free the nation from Japanese occupation, continued to do so against American-backed rule in the

---

<sup>28</sup> Anne E. Lacsamana, *Works and Days (Special Issue: Invisible Battlegrounds: Feminist Resistance in the Global Age of War and Imperialism)* 57/58 (Volume 29, Nos. 1 & 2), 2010.

<sup>29</sup> Catherine Lutz, *The Bases of Empire: The Global Struggle Against U.S. Military Posts*, New York University Press, 2009.

<sup>30</sup> US. General Douglas MacArthur, whose name dots city monuments and parks throughout not only Los Angeles but the entire United States and the Philippines, supervised the training and establishment of the Armed Forces of the Philippines. MacArthur served as the “Field Marshal of the Philippines,” a role that would later be absorbed by that of the Philippine President following formal independence in 1946.

Philippines.<sup>3132</sup> The Hukbalahap forces were targeted by the United States as anti-communism boiled over inside the American government, with then Major General Edward Lansdale, early architect of psychological warfare and counterinsurgency, leading the Joint United Military Assistant Group, Philippines. As part of one operation, the CIA created a vampire in the Philippines to stoke anti-communist sentiment among locals.<sup>33</sup> Journalist Vincent Bevins writes:

CIA agents spread the rumor that an *aswang*, a bloodsucking ghoul of Filipino legend, was on the loose and destroying men with evil in their hearts. They then took a Huk rebel they had killed, poked two holes in his neck, drained him of his blood, and left him lying in the road.<sup>34</sup>

Though the Philippines was no longer the US' "little brown brother" in name, it was in practice, as the United States continued to seek to form the nation into their Western-friendly, democratic foothold in the East with the support of neoliberal Philippine government leaders. While he was guiding US intelligence services and Philippine forces to national rebellion, Lansdale worked to install Ramon Magsaysay (then Secretary of National Defense) to the Philippine presidency; demonstrating again American neocolonial governance, particularly in the fields of military, economy, and politics. Lansdale's approach would be lauded nationally for cutting America its

---

<sup>31</sup> Kerkvliet, *The Huk Rebellion: A Study of Peasant Revolt in the Philippines.* 1977.

<sup>32</sup> In 1942, the *Hukbalahap* (Hukbalahap being an acronym for *Hukbong Bayan Laban sa Hapon*, or "People's Army Against Japan,") was developed as a united front army to combat the Japanese occupation, in large part through the leadership of the *Partido Komunista ng Pilipinas*, or "Communist Party of the Philippines," which had itself been established in 1930.

<sup>33</sup> Moon-Ho Jung, *Menace to Empire: Anticolonial Solidarities and the Transpacific Origins of the US Security State* (Oakland: University of California Press, 2022).

<sup>34</sup> Vincent Bevins, *The Jakarta Method: Washington's Anticommunist Crusade and the Mass Murder Program that Shaped Our World*, New York: Public Affairs, 2020.

teeth in the field of counterinsurgency, going on to be instructed by CIA director Allen Dulles to “do what you did in the Philippines [in Vietnam].”<sup>35</sup>

The interrelation of counterinsurgency and militarism to the American, and American-backed Philippine state governance of the nation would reach a new peak under the dictatorship of Ferdinand Marcos, who infamously declared martial law in response to active popular and communist resistance. Though Marcos specifically cited the “threat” of communist and Moro liberation movements, the former of which had begun actively organizing in largely rural, peasant regions in the Philippines as the Communist Party of the Philippines (CPP) and its armed wing, *Bagong Hukbong Bayan* or New People’s Army (NPA)—the successors to the Hukbalahap and former Partido Komunista ng Pilipinas, in actuality, it was declared in response to the growing rallies, demonstrations, and larger mass movement forming around demands for national democracy in the Philippines.<sup>36 37</sup> After over a decade under martial law with nearly a hundred thousand activists, guerillas, and Filipino civilians kidnapped, tortured, or murdered, the rising popular and political resistance to the Marcos dictatorship forced his ousting in 1986—with the Marcos family granted asylum and transportation to the United States.<sup>38</sup> In one Memorandum of

---

<sup>35</sup> Jordan Camp, Jennifer Greenburg. “Counterinsurgency Reexamined: Racism, Capitalism, and US Military Doctrine,” *United Kingdom: Antipode* Vol. 52, Issue 2, 2020.

<sup>36</sup> The Communist Party of the Philippines (CPP) was established in 1968 after a rectification movement led by student activist Jose Maria Sison, which sought to unite the then dying iteration of the Partido Komunista ng Pilipinas (PKP) around the ideology and application of Marxist-Leninist-Maoism (MLM) to the context of the Philippines. The New People’s Army was established contemporaneously, and is currently established in 73 out of 81 Philippine provinces. Founded in 1969, the armed communist struggle in the Philippines is the longest ongoing communist insurgency in the world.

<sup>37</sup> Schirmer, Daniel B., and Steven Rosskamm Shalom, eds. *The Philippines Reader: A History of Colonialism, Neocolonialism, Dictatorship, and Resistance*. Boston: South End Press, 1987

<sup>38</sup> Schirmer and Rosskamm Shalom, *The Philippines Reader*, 1987.

Conversation between US Ambassador to the Philippines Henry Byroade and former President Richard Nixon, the relationship between a martial law era Marcos and Nixon is described as such:

The president declared that we would "absolutely" back Marcos up, and "to the hilt" so long as what he was doing was to preserve the system against those who would destroy it in the name of liberty. The President indicated that... we would not support anyone who was trying to set himself up as military dictator, but we would do everything we can to back a man who was trying to make the system work and to preserve order. Of course, we understood that Marcos would not be entirely motivated by national interests, but this was something which we had come to expect from Asian leaders.<sup>39</sup>

Despite Marcos' overthrowing by the EDSA or "People Power" uprisings, both the neocolonialism, national democratic movement, and state violence that proliferated under his regime would persist to the modern day Philippines, as new post-EDSA leadership pursued a reformed, rather than abolished, relationship with the United States.<sup>40</sup>

In 1991, after another decade of mass movement, anti-base protest during the administrations of new post-Marcos Philippine governance, the Philippine Senate finally voted to end the 1947 Philippines-US Military Bases Agreement and decommission American bases throughout the country. National democratic activists credited this organizing victory to four major factors: 1) their longstanding attempts to appeal to the "nationalist and anti-imperialist sentiments" among the Filipino masses; 2) the strength of anti-Marcos, anti-dictatorship organizing that had persisted even after Marcos' ousting; 3) the organization of broad relationships and coalitions with anti-base, anti-nuclear, and anti-treaty groups and organizations; and 4) an enduring, militant campaign which continuously held large-scale mass mobilizations and protests demonstrating growing public opposition to the bases.<sup>41</sup> The declaration of base closures occurred during the

---

<sup>39</sup> "Foreign Relations of the United States, 1969–1976," *Volume XX, Southeast Asia*, October 27, 2009.

<sup>40</sup> Ileteo, *The 'Unfinished Revolution' in Philippine Political Discourse*, 1993.

<sup>41</sup> Carol Pagaduan-Araullo, "Lessons from September 16," *Bulatlat*, September 22, 2011.

same year as the first staging of the joint US-Philippines *Balikatan* (“shoulder-to-shoulder”) military exercises, exercises conducted pursuant to the Mutual Defense Treaty to “maintain and develop their individual and collective capacity to resist armed attack.”<sup>42</sup>

Though activists celebrated their hard won victories in the struggle against US military bases as American troops began to withdraw, this victory would be essentially overturned a mere few years later, with the introduction and passing of the Visiting Forces Agreement (VFA) in 1998.<sup>43</sup> Activists vigorously opposed the agreement, with the analysis that with the passing of the VFA, the “entire territory of the Philippines can then be used as a military base for US activities.”<sup>44</sup> <sup>45</sup> Indeed, the language of the Visiting Forces Agreement allowed for the rotation and stationing of American troops throughout the Philippines for war drills and military exercises, now extending the scope beyond just American military bases to Philippine military bases and the nation at large.<sup>46</sup> In 2002, the Mutual Logistics Support Arrangement (MLSA) was signed between the Philippine Department of National Defense and the US Department of Defense, complimenting the legal framework of the VFA which provides for the stationing of troops in the nation, with further legal frameworks to materially support the logistical “needs” and warehousing of US weapons, supplies, and materials for stationed American troops.<sup>47</sup>

---

<sup>42</sup> George Baylon Radics, *Terrorism in Southeast Asia: Balikatan Exercises in the Philippines and the US 'War against Terrorism*, (Stanford Journal of East Asian Affairs: 2004).

<sup>43</sup> Radics, *Terrorism in Southeast Asia*, 2004.

<sup>44</sup> Scrap VFA! Movement, <https://scrapvfamovement.wordpress.com/about>.

<sup>45</sup> Daniel B. Schirmer, “VFA: Shape of things to come?” [www.boondocksnet.com/centennial/setexts](http://www.boondocksnet.com/centennial/setexts).

<sup>46</sup> U.S. Department of State, *Agreement Between the United States of America and the Philippines*, (Manila: Treaties and Other International Acts Series 12931, 1998.)

<sup>47</sup> U.S. Department of Defense, *Mutual Logistics Support Agreement*, (Manila, 2002).

Post 9/11 and the declaration of the Philippines as the “second front” in the US War on Terror, the regularly scheduled military stationing and training exercises in the country allowed under the VFA saw both US and Philippine troops utilize live-fire operations, execute unwarranted assassinations and extrajudicial killings, and openly intimidate not just insurgents but rural Filipino civilians in exercise-areas.<sup>48</sup> In 2005, 15 of the 23 scheduled US-Philippine military exercises were located in Mindanao, especially Muslim-dominated areas in the region.<sup>49</sup> On 9/11 era VFA exercises, Radics writes that these military incursions stood not just to posture against Muslim and communist insurgency in the region, but that “under the thinly veiled excuse of military exercises, Balikatan constitutes an actual war in the region.”<sup>50</sup> Under the VFA and new American war on terror, war and militarism took on a new shape in the form of escalating counterinsurgency throughout the region. Without a legally declared war in the Asia Pacific, the desired total elimination of anti-state insurgents became a prominent front as the US even employed Philippine bases as a launching pad for troops and supplies towards Iraq and Afghanistan.<sup>51</sup> The Philippines again became a home for, what the US 206 Quadrennial Defense Review described as “war in countries we are not at war with.”<sup>52</sup> Decades later, the military exercises first regularized under the VFA are now numerous and frequent in number, with Cope Thunder, Balikatan, Kamandag, and RIMPAC (The Rim of the Pacific Exercise) all bolstering strategic military foothold and

---

<sup>48</sup> Julie Chao, “Second Front: Waiting for the War to Begin,” *Manila Bulletin*, March 10, 2002.

<sup>49</sup> Roland G. Simbulan, “People’s Movement Responses to Evolving U.S. Military in the Philippines, in *The Bases of Empire: The Global Struggle Against U.S. Military Posts*, ed. Catherine Lutz, (New York University Press, 2009).

<sup>50</sup> Radics, 2004.

<sup>51</sup> Renato Cruz De Castro, “Abstract of Counter-Insurgency in the Philippines and the Global War on Terror. Examining the Dynamics of the Twenty-first Century Long Wars,” *European Journal of East Asian Studies* 9, 1 (2010): 135-160.

<sup>52</sup> Maria Ryan, *‘War in countries we are not at war with’: The ‘war on terror’ on the periphery from Bush to Obama*, (Int Polit, 48, 2011).

collaboration in the Philippines at the cost of the increasing militarization, human rights violations, and environmental destruction throughout the country.<sup>53</sup>

A final major military agreement defines American military presence in the Philippines to present day, the 2014 Enhanced Defense Cooperation Act (EDCA) a contemporary iteration of the long-standing Visiting Forces Agreement which former Philippine President Rodrigo Duterte had frequently grandstanded about eliminating.<sup>54</sup> EDCA defines its purpose as threefold, to 1) deepen defense cooperation between the parties and “develop their individual and collective capacity to resist armed attack,” by improving the capabilities of the Armed Forces of the Philippines (AFP) and authorizing access of all agreed bases and other locations in the Philippines to the United States forces, 2) to provide the principal provisions and necessary authorizations for the usage of those bases and facilities, and 3) enact security cooperation exercises, joint and combined training activities, disaster relief activities, and any other practices agreed upon jointly.<sup>55</sup> Despite his positioning as the first anti-American president of the Philippines, Duterte’s violent suppression of democratic movements—particularly communist or “red-tagged” movements, his state killings of thousands of activists, revolutionaries, and land defenders in the name of anti-communism and as many as 27,000 drug-war related killings, only furthered anti-resistance and anti-communist US

---

<sup>53</sup> Simbulan, “People’s Movement Responses to Evolving U.S. Military in the Philippines,” 2009.

<sup>54</sup> Sophie Jeong and Brad Lendon, “Philippines renews key military agreement with the United States,” *CNN*, July 30, 2021.

<sup>55</sup> U.S. Department of State, *Agreement Between the United States of America and the Philippines*, Treaties and Other International Acts Series 14-625, April 28, 2014.



interests in the region.<sup>56 57 58 59</sup> The 2018 establishment of the National Task Force to End Local Communist Armed Conflict (NTF-ELCAC) and the 2020 signing of the Philippine Anti-Terrorism Act, itself reflective of the US' PATRIOT Act of 2001, only further streamlined such killings in its systematization of terror-tagging, investing millions of pesos into the identification, warrantless arrest, and execution of activists arbitrarily designated as terrorists.<sup>60</sup> During Duterte's first term as president (2016-2020), the United States provided the Philippines \$729.2 million USD in aid, \$275.9 million of which was specifically carved out for military aid and law enforcement.<sup>61</sup>

Though some journalists and scholars identify Duterte's repression of human rights in the Philippines as exceptional, the historical arc of counterinsurgent, anti-communist violence in the nation preceded him and has likewise succeeded him, with the currently elected president Ferdinand "Bongbong" Marcos Jr., son of former dictator Ferdinand Marcos, carrying on the torch of open war on activism and the poor.<sup>62</sup> Despite presenting himself as a diplomatic, civil statesman to counter Duterte's brash, openly violent image internationally, activists and human rights defenders argue that extrajudicial killings of accused drug users, the urban poor, terror-tagged

---

<sup>56</sup> Al-Jazeera, " 'Appalled:' UN urges probe into killing of Philippine activists," March 10, 2021.

<sup>57</sup> Red-tagging, also known as terror-tagging, is a widely panned practice in the Philippines wherein individuals, groups, and organizations are labeled as communists or terrorists by the state. This tagging frequently results in the surveillance, targeting, harassment, kidnapping, and extrajudicial killing of human rights defenders, activists, and wholly unaffiliated civilians.

<sup>58</sup> Howard Johnson and Christopher Giles, "Philippines drug war: Do we know how many have died?" *BBC*, November 12, 2019.

<sup>59</sup> United Nations Human Rights Office of the High Commissioner, "Philippines: UN report details widespread human rights violations and persistent impunity," June 2020.

<sup>60</sup> Amnesty International, "Philippines: Dangerous anti-terror law yet another setback for human rights," July 3, 2020.

<sup>61</sup> Ibon Foundation, "US Aid Increasing Under Duterte," July 3, 2019.

<sup>62</sup> Regletto Aldrich Imbong, *Authoritarian Disaster: The Duterte Regime and the Prospects for a Marcos Presidency*. (New York: Nova Science Publishers, 2023), pgs. 43-64.

activists, trade unionists, journalists, and insurgents, have actually *increased* during Marcos Jr.'s term. Human rights alliance Karapatan documented 87 extrajudicial killings, 12 victims of kidnapping or “enforced disappearance,” and 3136 victims of arbitrary arrest as of November 2023, roughly over a year since the beginning of the Marcos Jr. presidency.<sup>63</sup> The Third World Studies Program’s Dahas Project reported 474 drug-war related killings over the same period.<sup>64</sup>

The ND movement and its activists have been major targets of counterinsurgency since the movement’s inception, with the US and Philippine state both red-tagging and targeting ND organizations wholly unaffiliated with the CPP-NDF-NPA. A number of members of Anakbayan, GABRIELA, KMU, BAYAN, and other ND activists and leaders have accordingly been tortured, kidnapped, & assassinated. The No to APEC Peoples’ Counter Summit’s keynote speaker was one such activist, Brandon Lee, an organizer with the International Coalition for Human Rights in the Philippines (ICHRP) and Bay Area native who survived an assassination attempt from the Armed Forces of the Philippines while organizing with indigenous peasants as part of the Cordillera Peasant Alliance. Even in the diaspora, ND activists have been forced to confront domestic counterinsurgency including, but not limited to, red-tagging, extradition, deportation, surveillance, and even assassination; such as when Silme Domingo and Gene Viernes, two union leaders in

---

<sup>63</sup> Karapatan, “Karapatan to Marcos Jr.: Stop the killings, justice for the victims,” December 8, 2023, [https://www.karapatan.org/media\\_release/karapatan-to-marcos-jr-stop-the-killings-justice-for-the-victims/](https://www.karapatan.org/media_release/karapatan-to-marcos-jr-stop-the-killings-justice-for-the-victims/).

<sup>64</sup> Karapatan, “Stop the killings, justice for the victims,” 2023.

Local 37 of the International Longshore and Warehouse Union (ILWU) were assassinated in Seattle at the order of Ferdinand Marcos Sr.<sup>65 66 67</sup>

Having smoothed over any outstanding tensions between the US and the Philippines during Duterte's posturing towards China, Marcos Jr. has entered the Philippines into what activists are describing as a new escalation in American corporate interest and military presence in the nation, greenlighting billions in U.S. investment, increased hundreds of millions in socioeconomic and military aid, and the aforementioned establishment of access to more military bases nationally. Peace talks between the Philippine Government and the National Democratic Front of the Philippines (NDF), a political organization associated with underground mass organizations in the Philippines and the CPP and NPA, resumed in 2023 as the US-backed Armed Forces of the Philippines seek more urgently than ever to end the civil war and free up their military capabilities from domestic conflict to "external or territorial defense" to continue to support US interests in their rising with China.<sup>68</sup>

Under Marcos Jr. and US President Biden, the Philippines remains the largest recipient of US aid in the Asia-Pacific, receiving \$261.3 million USD in 2023 alone. In April 2024, members of the US Senate Foreign Relations Committee introduced the Philippines Enhanced Resilience Act (PERA), a bill introduced to "strengthen and modernize the US Philippines alliance" through significantly increasing the amount of US security assistance to the Philippines to a total of \$2.5

---

<sup>65</sup> Joy Sales, "'Activism is not a Crime': Confronting Counterinsurgency in the Filipino Diaspora," *The Journal of American-East Asian Relations*, 2022.

<sup>66</sup> Alfred McCoy, *Policing America's Empire: The United States, the Philippines, and the Rise of the Surveillance State*, (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 2009).

<sup>67</sup> Kim Kelly, "The Radical Vision of Silme Domingo and Gene Viernes," *The Nation*, January 18, 2022.

<sup>68</sup> Nick Aspinwall, "Prospects shaky for Philippines' government and communist peace talks," *Al Jazeera*, February 6, 2024.

billion USD in the next five years.<sup>69</sup> In a statement issued on a day of action as organizers with BAYAN USA, Malaya Movement, and the Tuloy ang Laban coalition protested Marcos Jr.'s April 2024 visit to the United States for a Trilateral Summit with the US and Japan, activists wrote:

While Filipinos live in worsening poverty and deepening economic crisis back home and abroad, Marcos outdoes himself in his readiness to drag the Philippines into a war of aggression against China, and further worsen the economic crisis through unequal military and economic deals. Marcos Jr. must be held accountable for his reprehensible sell-out of Philippine sovereignty and his blatant disregard for the lives of the Filipino masses.<sup>70 71 72</sup>

With American military presence and economic aid reaching virtually unprecedented heights in the Philippines, with the reaffirmation of close collaboration between the US and Philippine state and armed forces, activists internationally are taking great risks, at great lengths, protesting American imperialist presence in their homeland.

### *The National Democratic Movement and Transnational Filipino Organizing*

The national-democratic (ND) struggle traces its political origins to the 1896 Philippine Revolution for national sovereignty and freedom from colonial rule, though its current iteration began in 1965 as a mass movement striving to utilize legal means to build a united front of peasants, workers, the petite bourgeoisie, and the national bourgeoisie in opposition to what the movement describes as the “three basic problems” of Philippine society: imperialism, feudalism, and bureaucratic capitalism.<sup>73</sup> The ND movement therefore sees the major crises of the Philippines’

---

<sup>69</sup> Faith Argosino, “Romualdez wants multilateral military exercises, more military financing,” *Inquirer*, April 17, 2024.

<sup>70</sup> BAYAN Southern California, “Marcos, you’re not welcome here!,” *Instagram*, April 11, 2024.

<sup>71</sup> Malaya Movement (*malaya* meaning “free” in Tagalog) is an anti-fascist, anti-dictatorship mass organization founded in the US in 2018.

<sup>72</sup> The Tuloy Ang Laban coalition, (*tuloy ang laban* meaning “the fight continues” in Tagalog), is a coalition convened by BAYAN USA and the Malaya Movement during the 2022 Philippine elections to support human rights and democracy in the Philippines.

<sup>73</sup> Amado Guerrero, *Philippine Society and Revolution* (Hong Kong: Ta Kung Pao, 1971).

“semi-colonial, semi-feudal” character (widespread poverty, corruption, militarization, etc.) as symptomatic of the fact that the nation is not truly sovereign and independent, with the longstanding influence of the US in the nation dictating the terms of politics and production in the country. The ND movement self-characterizes as one of a “new type,” for its focus on the working class as the class most central to waging revolutionary change, as opposed to the 1896 ND movement which is characterized as that of the “old type” for being predominantly led by Spanish and American educated intelligentsia.<sup>74</sup>

The movement gained momentum with the rise of student organizing in the mid-60s under the leadership of then Kabataang Makabayan (KM) founding chair Jose Maria Sison, in response to the larger economic and political crises heightening under Ferdinand Marcos’ regime.<sup>75</sup> <sup>76</sup> A major turning point for the movement came with the First Quarter Storm (FQS), a series of predominantly student-led demonstrations in January-March 1970 which began as Ferdinand Marcos was elected to a second term. The FQS saw tens of thousands of students, workers and trade unionists, members of the public, and activists in other growing mass organizations, pour into the streets in the National Capital Region to demonstrate their opposition to the current conditions and systems of Philippine society widely and militantly.<sup>77</sup> In the Philippine countryside, the nascent New People’s Army had been steadily waging *protracted people’s war* (PPW)

---

<sup>74</sup> Guerrero, *Philippine Society and Revolution*, 1971.

<sup>75</sup> Jose Maria Sison, *Struggle for National Democracy (3<sup>rd</sup> Edition)*, (Quezon City, Philippines: Lagda Publications, 1995).

<sup>76</sup> Though Jose Maria Sison would go on to reorient the CPP under the political line of Marxist-Leninist-Maoism towards “people’s democratic revolution” (PDR), his early leadership in the legal mass movement for national democracy did not necessarily mean that the movement was affiliated with the CPP-NDF-NPA. In fact, ND activists to this day firmly make the distinction that though they may be politically supportive of the CPP-NDF-NPA, they are not themselves members of, nor do they take directions from or work in concert with, the CPP-NDF-NPA.

<sup>77</sup> Sison, *Struggle for National Democracy*, 1995.

expanding their membership; geographic scope in the country; and “mass base,” civilian members of the public who in sentiment and/or material supported the guerillas.<sup>78 79</sup> With similar protest actions to the FQS being mounted in both cities and rural regions across the nation, by peasants, workers/unionists, and other non-youth assemblies, the both legal mass movement and armed struggle continued to grow in its militancy until Marcos declared martial law in 1972, forcing many previously aboveground organizations to go underground indefinitely.<sup>80 81</sup>

Despite many organizations being forced underground, the ND movement further developed amidst the martial law-era 1980s with the founding of what are many of its largest groups today: GABRIELA, a grassroots alliance of working class Filipina women; Anakbayan, a youth and students mass organization; Kilusang Mayo Uno (KMU), a labor center for “genuine, militant, and patriotic” trade unionists; and BAYAN, an ND campaign center; among many

---

<sup>78</sup> The strategy of “protracted people’s war” or PPW, refers the political/military strategy formulated by Mao Zedong which guides guerrillas to build mass bases throughout the agrarian countryside before ultimately encircling the cities, wherein their power and military might is most outmatched relative to their opposition. The guerillas are characterized as primarily political actors and secondarily military, as their primary tasks are to organize peasants and larger barangay units towards the revolution.

<sup>79</sup> Jose Maria Sison, *Specific Characteristics of our People’s War*, (Utrecht, Netherlands: Foreign Languages Press, 2017).

<sup>80</sup> Schirmer and Rosskamm Shalon, *The Philippines Reader*, 1987.

<sup>81</sup> Kabataang Makabayan (KM) or “Patriotic Youth” remains a clandestine organization to this day, operating no longer as a member of the aboveground ND mass movement, but as a part of the NDFP, the underground popular front of revolutionary mass organizations associated with the CPP and the NPA.

others.<sup>82</sup> <sup>83</sup> <sup>84</sup> BAYAN asserts that at its founding, it brought together over a thousand mass organizations with a total membership of more than one million; supporting peasants as they demanded real land reform in the countryside, organizing nationally-coordinated workers strikes, and calling for massive civil disobedience during the 1986 EDSA uprisings after boycotting the snap elections.<sup>85</sup> The ND movement also grew in organizing outside of their direct membership, with activists aligning themselves within broader anti-Marcos coalitions such as the Justice for Aquino Justice for All Movement (JAJA) and the Coalition of Organizations for the Realization of Democracy (CORD), the dissenting public, and even more historically conservative institutions such as the Catholic church and liberal trade unions.<sup>86</sup>

While the national democratic movement was growing in struggle in the homeland amidst state repression, more and more Filipinos began to leave the nation as migrant workers and immigrants; many fleeing political repression, state violence, and economic crisis. Outmigration from the country had exploded since Marcos instituted the 1974 Labor Code (Presidential Decree 442) which further liberalized (also known as the Labor Export Program, or LEP), setting into motion the systems of export which would render nearly 10% of the entire Filipino population overseas migrant workers (also known as OFW's, Overseas Filipino Workers), employed in almost

---

<sup>82</sup> GABRIELA is an acronym for 'General Assembly Binding Women for Reform, Integrity, Equality, Leadership, and Advocacy,' which gains its name from Gabriela Silang, a Filipina national hero and revolutionary who fought against the Spanish during 18<sup>th</sup> century uprisings against the colonial government. GABRIELA USA, <https://www.gabrielausa.org/>, (accessed February 2024).

<sup>83</sup> *Anakbayan* means "child of the nation" in Tagalog. Anakbayan USA, <https://www.anakbayanusa.com/>, (accessed February 2024).

<sup>84</sup> *Kilusang Mayo Uno* (KMU) means "May First Movement" in Tagalog, referencing May Day, the international day celebrating workers that is especially significant to Marxist/socialist states and organizations. Kilusang Mayo Uno, <https://kilusangmayouno.com/about/>, (accessed February 2024).

<sup>85</sup> BAYAN Philippines, "What is BAYAN?" <https://bayan.ph/site/about/> (accessed February 2024).

<sup>86</sup> Guerrero, *Philippine Society and Revolution*.

two hundred countries internationally at the turn of the century.<sup>87 88</sup> With more and more Filipinos migrating abroad, particularly to American cities like New York, Los Angeles, and the San Francisco Bay Area, the ND movement too began to develop its overseas presence among the diaspora.<sup>89</sup> The establishment of the Katipunan ng mga Demokratikong Pilipino (KDP) in 1972, the first major revolutionary ND mass organization of Filipinos in the United States, marked a birth of transnational, diaspora ND organizing in the West that articulated the ND Filipino diaspora as internal to the Philippine revolutionary movement in their homeland.<sup>90</sup> Throughout the martial law years, ND activists and broader Filipino and solidarity allies in coalitions like the Union of Democratic Filipinos mobilized to voice their staunch opposition to Marcos from within the nation whose support he critically depended on, considering their “involvement in long-distance nationalism” as a central part of the international struggle to topple the regime.<sup>91</sup> In 1994, the initial establishment of the first international chapter of BAYAN, BAYAN USA, marked another significant step forward in ND diaspora organizing, with activists launching campaigns and other political activities in lockstep with their Philippines-based counterpart.<sup>92</sup>

---

<sup>87</sup> E. San Juan, “Overseas Filipino Workers: The Making of an Asian-Pacific Diaspora,” *The Global South* 3, no. 2 (2009).

<sup>88</sup> Robyn M. Rodriguez, *Migrants for Export: How the Philippine State Brokers Labor to the World*, (University of Minnesota Press, 2010).

<sup>89</sup> Robyn M. Rodriguez (ed.), *Filipino American Transnational Activism: Diasporic Politics Among the Second Generation*, (Boston: Brill, 2019).

<sup>90</sup> Rodriguez (ed.), *Filipino American Transnational Activism*.

<sup>91</sup> Augusto Espiritu, “Journeys of Discovery and Difference: Transnational Politics and the Union of Democratic Filipinos,” in *The Transnational Politics of Asian Americans*, edited by Christian Collet and Pei-Te Lien, (Temple University Press, 2009).

<sup>92</sup> BAYAN USA, “BAYAN-USA History,” <https://www.bayanusa.org/about/>, accessed March 1<sup>st</sup>, 2024.



BAYAN USA members organized local summits such as the People’s Centennial of the Philippine Revolution in 1996 and the People’s Assembly Against Imperialist Globalization in 1998; mobilized to oppose a 1997 APEC Summit and the IMF/World Bank in 1999; demonstrated against the Joseph Estrada and Gloria Arroyo-Macapagal regimes of the early 2000s; and widely participated in anti-war and anti-imperialist mobilizations to oppose occupation in Afghanistan, Iraq, and the Philippines post-9/11.<sup>93</sup> Per the BAYAN USA by-laws, diaspora Filipinos “...as an integral part of the national-democratic movement of the Philippines, the mission and purpose of BAYAN USA is to gather the broadest possible political, moral, material, and sectoral support for BAYAN and the national democratic struggle of the Filipino people.” The clear outlining of the particular roles and responsibilities for diaspora Filipinos to further organize their migrant, as well as first and second-gen, compatriots towards genuine democracy across the Pacific, embed an intrinsically transnational orientation to not only Filipino activists themselves as diaspora subjects, but to their organizing. Now thirty years since the initial establishment of BAYAN USA, the ND movement and BAYAN have over thirty member organizations spanning sectors and regions of the United States, with more solidarity organizations and close alliances such as the International Coalition for Human Rights in the Philippines, the National Alliance for Filipino Concerns, and Friends of the Filipino People in Struggle, to name a few.<sup>94</sup>

#### *APEC and Filipino Anti-APEC Protest*

The Asia Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC) intergovernmental forum emerged in 1989 in Canberra, Australia as an informal ministerial-level dialogue group with twelve founding member nations: Australia, Brunei, Canada, Indonesia, Japan, Korea, Malaysia, New Zealand, the

---

<sup>93</sup> BAYAN USA, 2024.

<sup>94</sup> BAYAN USA.

Philippines, Singapore, Thailand, and the United States. Emerging during post-Cold War period of economic deregulation, capitalist production, and neoliberalism in the Asia Pacific, APEC's creation was predicated on the perceived successes of regional economic governance following a series of Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) post-ministerial conferences in the mid-1980s.<sup>95</sup> APEC's stated goals primarily revolve around expansion of free trade in the region, with a 1991 Seoul Declaration of APEC objectives identifying the "enhancement and promotion of the role of the private sector and the application of free market principles in maximizing the benefits of regional cooperation," and "reduction of barriers to trade in goods and services."<sup>96</sup> Nearly twenty-five years later, the forum has grown to twenty-one member economies representing approximately three billion people.

APEC Philippines 1996, held at the Subic Bay Freeport Zone—former American military base that had at the time been transformed into a "special economic zone"—resulted in unprecedented mass mobilizations against APEC, neoliberalism, and American intervention in the Philippines and the larger Asia Pacific.<sup>97 98</sup> In the lead up to the APEC summit, activists and human rights groups reported massive increases in: demolitions of urban poor communities near the site of the summit, arrests and detainment of unionists and other activists, and the deployment of

---

<sup>95</sup> Vinod K. Aggarwal and Kun-Chin Lin, "APEC as an institution," Richard E. Feinberg, Ye Zhao, (eds.) in *Assessing APEC's Progress: Trade, Ecotech, and Institutions*, 2000.

<sup>96</sup>Asia Pacific Economic Cooperation, "Seoul APEC Declaration," [https://www.apec.org/meeting-papers/annual-ministerial-meetings/1991/1991\\_amm/annex\\_b\\_seoul\\_apec](https://www.apec.org/meeting-papers/annual-ministerial-meetings/1991/1991_amm/annex_b_seoul_apec), accessed November 15, 2023.

<sup>97</sup> Aziz Choudry, *NGOs, social movements and anti-APEC activism : a study in power, knowledge and struggle*, PhD thesis, Concordia University, 2008.

<sup>98</sup> Special economic zones (SEZ) generally refer to areas subject to different business, trade, and labor regulations than the rest of the country, and have especially increased in size and frequency in the Asia Pacific with the rise of globalized import and export. In the Philippines, they are frequently sites of extreme labor abuses and environmental degradation.

paramilitary groups and military battalions to enforce checkpoints and curfews.<sup>99</sup> The security measures employed in protection of the APEC summit at its attendees caused outrage across the political spectrum, with peasants being prevented from freely moving to and from the farms they worked on, the establishment of a vast security perimeter around the summit site, and the reserving of two entire lanes in each direction in Manila for APEC delegates and officials.<sup>100</sup> The APEC summit occurred during a period in which global leaders and economists had begun to murmur about the Philippines role in a globalizing market, an aspiring rising “Asian tiger” of its own to one day catch up with that of China, Japan, South Korea, and Vietnam.<sup>101</sup>

The Medium Term Philippine Development Plan for 1993-1998, also described as “Philippines 2000” was also midway through, a World Bank and International Monetary Fund structural adjustment program aimed to further liberalize and promote “free trade” that was also subject to great protest and outcry nationally. At one protest rally, an anti-APEC Manileno held a sign reading “APEC means another Philippines 2000’s economic curse.”<sup>102</sup> Other activists carried black coffins marked with red crosses painted over the words “APEC” and “WTO,” exposing the perceived necropolitics of APEC and free trade policies to death in the third world.<sup>103</sup> In both rhetoric and action, Filipino and solidarity activists attending from nearby nations vehemently opposed the impact of the APEC summit itself and the implications of further neoliberalism and militarization throughout the country.

---

<sup>99</sup> In the context of the Philippines, the term “urban poor” typically refers to people who cannot meet basic living standards and are unhoused or residing in informal housing such as slums or squats.

<sup>100</sup> Aziz Choudry, “APEC’s Thriller in Manila,” (Queensland Australia: *Kasama* Vol. 11 No. 2, April-May-June 1997).

<sup>101</sup> Choudry, “APEC’s Thriller in Manila,” 1997.

<sup>102</sup> Choudry, “APEC’s Thriller in Manila.”

<sup>103</sup> “Anti-APEC activists rally in Manila,” *United Press International*, November 13, 1996.

Along with mass mobilizations and direct actions wherein anti-APEC demonstrators openly protested the summit, blocking roads and shouting down delegates outside, the first large-scale anti-APEC “Peoples’ Summit” was also convened in Manila to counter the main APEC summit.<sup>104</sup> Titled the “Anti-Imperialist World Peasant Summit,” this *peoples’ summit* would also go on to culminate in two major anti-imperialist and anti-militarist conferences, the Manila People’s Forum on APEC (MPFA) in Manila, and the People’s Conference Against Imperialist Globalization (PCAIG) in Subic, Philippines. The deliberate wording of *people* and *people’s*, phrasing long used by Marxist and left-leaning groups to denote the democratic character of their organizing as opposed to the minority interests of the “ruling class,” also highlighted what activists perceived to be the inherently undemocratic nature of the summit as made up of wealthy diplomats and delegates representing corporate interests. BAYAN and other National Democratic organizations helped organize the summit, and its conclusion with a protest caravan up from Manila to the Subic site where further protests were held. Over 4,000 attendees in labor, human rights, women, and other sector/issue/nation-based organizations from 40 different countries across Asia—and even Latin America and Africa—attended the summit, marking the 1996 anti-APEC protests in the Philippines to be the largest and most international anti-APEC movement since APEC’s 1989 inception.<sup>105</sup> The 1996 APEC Summit ultimately yielded one of the forum’s seminal agreements, The Manila Action Plan for APEC (MAPA), which identified six priorities for member economies—foremost of which was the “development of human capital”—and begun the actual practice of implementing APEC agendas therein.<sup>106</sup>

---

<sup>104</sup> Choudry, *NGOs, social movements and anti-APEC activism*, 2008.

<sup>105</sup> “Anti-APEC activists rally in Manila,” 1996.

<sup>106</sup> Francis Quimba and Mark Barral, *The Evolution of APEC and its role in the Philippine trade and investment*, (Quezon City, Philippines: Philippine Institute for Development Studies, 2019).

Nearly twenty years later, with anti-APEC protests now an inescapable aspect of APEC summits no matter the host nation, the APEC summit was held again in the Philippines in Manila in 2015. Like in 1996, several hundred members of urban poor communities were detained and displaced in the lead up to APEC summit as part of a “clearing operation,” a number that included at least 141 children.<sup>107</sup> While street vendors and urban poor families were being detained and dispossessed, the Philippine government was spending ₱9.8 billion Philippine pesos (\$208 million USD) to wall off slum areas to hide them from view near the summit, again creating designated traffic lanes for APEC attendees, and simulating “terror attack responses” with the tens of thousands of deployed police and military forces.<sup>108</sup> Activists in the tens of thousands, led again by BAYAN and including Lumad indigenous organizations, students, women, and other labor groups, staged protests, rallies, and blockades with the call to “Junk APEC.”<sup>109</sup>

Outside of the heavily guarded summit, protestors clashed with thousands of military personnel and riot police with batons, truncheons, and shields, resulting in mass arrests and the deployment of water cannons against the demonstrators.<sup>110</sup> “These demonstrations will not stop, even if it means we have to go head-to-head against the entire police force and we have to break through all the barriers,” spoke Charisse Bernadine Banez, protestor and activist with the League of Filipino Students, an ND organization.<sup>111</sup> The heavily militarized brutalization and dispersal of the gathered protestors occurred while just inside the summit, APEC delegates and leaders

---

<sup>107</sup> Human Rights Watch, “Philippines: Mass Arrests Before APEC Summit,” November 15, 2015.

<sup>108</sup> Ayee Macaraig, “APEC what? An explainer on Manila’s high-profile week,” *Rappler*, November 11, 2015.

<sup>109</sup> David Lozada, “Thousands hold protest in Manila as APEC leaders meet,” *Rappler*, November 19, 2015.

<sup>110</sup> Lozada, “Thousands hold protest in Manila as APEC leaders meet,” 2015.

<sup>111</sup> “Water cannon fired at anti-APEC protestors in Manila,” *Al Jazeera*, November 19, 2015.

emphasized the importance of counterterrorism and international free trade just days after deadly gun and bomb attacks took 129 lives in Paris.<sup>112</sup> As a result of the 2015 APEC summit, the Philippine government secured further financial commitments towards military aid and secured two massive naval vessels from the US military to “increase maritime security” in the West Philippine Sea.<sup>113</sup>

2024’s No to APEC (also stylized as No 2 APEC) protests and counter-summit marked another series of demonstrations in a long history of international anti-APEC protests. Organizations and members in the coalition ranged in locality: from the location of the summit (the San Francisco Bay Area) to Latin America and Southeast Asia; sector: from students to women to trade unionists; and issue: climate, militarism, and labor, among others.<sup>114</sup> Though protests have erupted in response to nearly every APEC summit since its initiation, only one series of anti-APEC demonstrations have thus far succeeded in actually “shutting down” APEC, protestors in Santiago, Chile in 2019 during a period of mass public outcry and uprising against economic crises in the country.<sup>115</sup> A small delegation of organizers from Peru were also in attendance of 2023’s No to APEC summit, already beginning to mount protest against the subsequent 2024 APEC Summit set to be hosted in the country, with Peruvian President Dina Boluarte of particular aim for her wielding of extrajudicial military violence, resulting in over 40 killings.<sup>116</sup>

---

<sup>112</sup> “Anti-APEC protests take place in Manila,” *BBC*, November 19, 2015.

<sup>113</sup> Rosette Adel, “Agreements. Vows made with Philippines on APEC sidelines,” *Philippine Star*, November 19, 2015.

<sup>114</sup> No to APEC Coalition, “Statement of the No to APEC Coalition,” public statement, July 11, 2023.

<sup>115</sup> Marion Giraldo and Natalia A. Ramos Miranda, “Chile cancels APEC trade summit and major climate gathering after riots,” *Reuters*, October 30, 2019.

<sup>116</sup> Agence France-Presse, “Genocide investigation opened against Peru president after protest deaths,” *The Guardian*. January 10, 2023.

Filipino National Democratic mass organizations played a significant role in the protest design, counter-summit programming, media, and logistical organization of the larger No to APEC coalition events, as demonstrated by their representation on the No to APEC steering committee, organizing alongside ILPS-US.<sup>117</sup> Their strong presence and agenda-setting of the protests on the steering committee further demonstrated how the US No to APEC protests were not singularly American and novel in nature, but iterative relative to prior APEC protests held internationally by BAYAN Philippines and allied organizations in Manila in 1996 and 2015, and on the North American continent at the 1997 APEC Summit in Vancouver, Canada, where protestors were arrested, beaten, and pepper sprayed in what was described as “the first in a chain of anti-globalization protests.”<sup>118</sup>

---

<sup>117</sup> Morton, Ina. *Observation of No to APEC coalition*. San Francisco, CA, November 2023.

<sup>118</sup> Maryse Zeidler, “‘We were at this tipping point’: APEC protests at UBC continue to shape politics 20 years later,” *CBC Canada*, November 25, 2017.

### CHAPTER 3: LITERATURE REVIEW

This literature review engages primarily with the fields of urban planning, critical military studies, geography, and Asian American studies to identify how previous scholars have conceptualized transnational continuities; urban militarisms; the relationship between neoliberalism, imperialism, and militarization; and urban contestation and resistance. Such literatures provide the early foundations for this research and contribute to understanding how these organizers form actions to unsettle all of the interrelated phenomena in their opposition to American militarism and empire. First, a review of the relevant scholarship as it relates to area studies literature on transnational continuities will establish the later basis for placing California's colonial, urban, and carceral histories in the same continuum of militarist violence that utilizes state weaponry, footmen, and powers to subjugate a perceivably violent populous abroad, linking the temporal militarization of San Francisco during APEC's 2023 summit to the militarism enacted in the Asia Pacific as brokered between the United States, the Philippines, and other APEC member economies. A subsequent discussion on urban militarism and the urban geopolitical turn precedes a framing that analyzes the relationship between neoliberalism, imperialism, and militarization which contextualizes why Filipino diaspora organizers and their solidarity allies have decried APEC not only for its economic outcomes but military ones, leading to increased funding for weapons manufacturing companies and further military intervention in the Global South. Lastly, an overview of the literature relative to public protest and power as negotiated through contesting space will frame the central research methods and questions for the thesis.

#### *Transnational Continuities*

In her American Studies Association presidential address, Shelly Fisher Fishkin asked: "What would the field of American studies look like if the transnational rather than the national were at its center?" (2004). In doing so, Fishkin described the emerging "transnational turn" in



the field more broadly, describing such scholarship as “interrogating and studying” borders within and outside of the nation, rather than “reifying and reinforcing” the perimeters of the nation-state. Perhaps no field has taken up this call more enthusiastically and rigorously than Asian American studies, which in its original formation as both an academic discipline and a social movement offered political and material support to Third World liberation movements globally, from the Black Panther Party to the People’s Army of Vietnam (Maeda 2016). Speaking to this, Asian American historian Sucheta Mazumdar (1991) stated that the “...very genesis of Asian American Studies was international.” Nearly a decade before Fishkin’s identification of a transnational turn, Wong (1995) noted her concern that the growing decentralization of the nation-state codified by trends in diaspora and transnational studies would actually understate the undisguisable violences of the American state, writing that the turn could “leave America’s racialized power structure intact.” Though views of the nation-state (implicated in conversations of the national, transnational, and international) in the field span a range of ideas—from identifying of the nation-state as a powerful framework around which anti-colonial nationalist struggles have organized (Chatterjee 1993), to viewing it as an inadequate and/or harmful colonial paradigm (Anderson 2006)—many critical scholars in the discipline have heeded Wong’s concern and firmly grounded their transnational analysis in strong critiques of US empire, whose expansion in the Asia Pacific has created transnational diasporas of Asian/Asian American political subjects displaced to the imperial core (Lee 2005).

Scholars have established multiple major lines of inquiry in studying transnational continuities under US empire, with three themes of particular relevance for this literature review: migration, political organizing, and militarism/policing. On migration, De Genova’s (2002) analysis of migration regimes as labor regimes calls into question the “legal production of illegality,” and the state’s weaponization of increasingly militarized borders and carceral detention

centers to further intimidate the undocumented migrant laborers they've extracted by design. Oishi (2005) and Wise's (2013) works on labor migration also write on the gendered nature of such migration regimes constructed by empire, extracting low-wage and informal women workers from migrant-sending nations—largely in Southeast Asia and Latin America—to serve as cheap, labor in migrant-receiving nations across the United States and Europe. These dual labor/migration regimes (Betts 2009; Bauder 2006) create transnational, multicultural (Sandercock 1998) subjects who occupy dual, single, or non-citizenship statuses between their countries of origin and host countries as they meet empire's every flowing, ever demanding need to reproduce labor and capital globally—serving as both a means and an end for American imperialist intervention.

On transnational organizing and political activity, scholars debate the character of the activity as legitimately transnational in action, or as inextricably American in nature. Collet and Lien (2009) write that Asian migrants and their Asian American descendants have forged two pathways, sometimes in contention with each other: engaging with politics diffused and movements externalized from their home countries, or forming pan-ethnic political alliances with other racialized peoples in the United States. Della Porta and Tarrow (2005) engage differently, with a broader scope less focused on trends and methods of Asian American political participation within the United States, but on zooming out on transnational protest in direct contestation with the neoliberal migration and labor streams tying themselves both to and from their homelands. Lastly, Guidry, Kennedy, and Zald (2000) emphasize the cultural aspects of globalizations' manifestations to assert the rise of not only transnational spheres of protest but wholly international ones, wherein transnational actors invoke “claims of a common global destiny in their struggles” to draw linkages between various diaspora struggles outside of the realm of the nation-state. Altogether, these intellectual lineages on transnational activism refute earlier concepts of a depolitical, highly assimilated, and “whitening” migrant and second-generation Asian/Asian

American populace (Warren and Twine 1997), speaking to the continued prevalence of political organizing, and particularly transnational movement organizing, within the diaspora.

Lastly, inquiry into militarism and militarization continue to rise to the fore of transnational Asian and Asian American scholarship. Shigematsu and Camacho (2010) examine how militarization “has constituted a structuring force that connects the histories of the Japanese and US empires across the regions of Asia and the Pacific Islands,” centering the expanse of the Pacific and its “currents” to analogize the transnational movement of militarism transforming the political geographies of the region, and defying “arbitrary” distinctions of Asia and the Pacific. Where Lutz (2009) described militarism as “an ideology that supports such policies by suggesting that the world is a naturally dangerous place which requires the control brought by armies,” Shigematsu and Camacho (2010) define militarization more broadly in both the micro and the macro, as a neocolonial, structuring force that connects the Asia Pacific, identifying with Sakai’s (2011) trans-Pacific analysis of *militarized organizing logics* as having embedded themselves into the way of life for the racialized, gendered, colonial subjects impacted. The transnational militarist continuities of the interconstituted American and Japanese militarization entwines a common history, space, and ideology of struggle to the Asia-Pacific that spans nations and seas; with questions of anti-militarism and demilitarization at the heart of such studies (Kirk and Okazawa-Rey 2000).

### *Urban Militarism*

This literature review’s analysis of urban militarism is grounded theoretically in what has been framed as the “urban geopolitical turn” of the 21<sup>st</sup> century, generated at the intersection of political geography, urban studies, and urban planning (Graham 2004; Fregonese 2009; Yacobi 2009). Rokem and Boano (2018) identify two major lines of research emerging from the spatio-political, urban geopolitical turn, the first being the militarization of urban space and asymmetrical

urban warfare (Weizman 2007), and the second being spatial contestation in urban ethno-national conflict. The national affiliation of urban geopolitical actors contesting the militarism, fortification, and surveillance of their surroundings—particularly, for refugees, migrants, and the urban poor—is also increasingly transnational and migratory, further pushing the norms of what has traditionally connoted the urban citizen in the nation-state and recognizing the increasing flexibility of territorial affiliations (Newman 2006). Though flexibilized, the border nonetheless remains highly militarized and regimented, with police officers and soldiers as spokespersons for state regimes (Fanon 1963), serving functionally identical purposes in border maintenance between the colonizer and the colonized, with borders between being represented by police stations and military barracks. On urban citizenship, Sassen (2010) writes that the “dual process of urbanization and militarization of urban life unsettles the meaning of the urban,” both in its degradation of free movement through public space, and in its inversion of the city not as a welfare provider, but as an antagonist and war profiteer.

Though much of the early literature approached cities through studying them during wartime as sites of targeted violence and damage (Shaw 2004), more contemporary literature examines cities as everyday spaces of war production and preparation even whilst at peace (Sidaway 2009), though processes of militarization continue to blur the war/peacetime dichotomy (Farish 2013). On the military-urban relationship as one that is co-constituted post-9/11, Graham (2009) posits the concept of the *new military urbanism* to analyze the linked processes of urbanization and militarization wherein the city becomes battlespace, and processes of “tracking and targeting...perpetually colonize the geographies of cities and the spaces of everyday life in both the homelands of the metropolises of the West and the various neo-colonial frontiers and peripheries around the world.” The militarization of civil society that is driven in parallel in both the capitalist metropole and the global periphery represents a transnational continuum of military

violence, engendering boundless violence in the American city against all that is perceived to be criminal or terrorizing as such violences are enacted abroad in the colony (Blackmore 2005). The city as a battlespace “sustains a conception of military matters that includes absolutely everything,” crafting porous, borderless, non-temporal, sites of permanent war across empire’s reach (Agre 2001). Spanu (2023) employs Lefebvre’s dialectical theory of spatial production to analyze militarism as therefore inextricable from urban dimensions of space in its reproduction and multidimensionality, with military geographies founded on particular institutions and infrastructures producing civilian places and cultures.

In the context of American militarism as it is experienced domestically, scholars across disciplines and activists alike have cast their focus to police militarization and the deputization of local law enforcement to carry out military scale tactics and operations (Balko 2013; Bove and Gavrilova 2017; Campbell and Campbell 2009). Kraska (2007) identifies slippages in the military/police dichotomy, demonstrating that 21<sup>st</sup> century policing has blurred the demarcation between the two, with four major dimensions to the military model of police militarization outlining this phenomena: material (martial weaponry, equipment, and advanced technology), cultural (martial language, appearance, beliefs, and values), organizational (martial arrangements such as ‘command and control’ centers), and operational (patterns of activity modeled after the military e.g. intelligence, supervision, war-making). In addition to the four dimensions of police militarization that engender military might, practices, and ideologies to local law enforcement, Delahanty et al. (2017) identify policies such as the US Department of Defense’s domestic arms transfer program 1033 as those facilitating the actual militarization of police departments, with weaponry having been used to sustain violence abroad being deployed locally against suspect bodies; largely Black, Brown, and poor urban communities. Researchers with the Stop LAPD Spying Coalition (2018) further articulate that contemporary police militarization stems is not

merely a 21<sup>st</sup> century phenomena, but a process centuries in the making, given the police force's foundational operations as rooted in colonialism, imperialism, and chattel slavery.

### *Neoliberalism, Imperialism, and Militarization*

Neoliberalism is a 'slippery concept,' and an inescapable one in the social sciences since the advent of the 21<sup>st</sup> century, and its early usage by the Zapatistas who described their 'encounters' with neoliberalism in Chiapas after the 1994 signing of the North American Free Trade Agreement (Springer et al 2016). In its most general sense, neoliberalism has been conceptualized as the post-70s re-orientation of the state, economy, politics, and civil society towards market exchange; resulting in further privatization, deregulation, and state withdrawal (Bourdieu 1998; Crouch 2011; Harvey 2005; Mirowski 2013). Since its meteoric rise as a polysemic descriptor of late-stage capitalism, globalization, and governmental deregulation, neoliberalism and associated terms (neoliberal, neoliberalization) have received a perhaps undue dressing down by scholars who identify its ubiquity as 'cursory,' 'insufficient,' or 'merely pejorative,' (Barnett 2005; Clarke 2008; Elyachar 2012; Kingfisher and Maskovsky 2008). Though much of this scholarship is oriented around questions of the analytical value of the framework of neoliberalism, a significant portion is likewise interested in lambasting the 'one-sided, morally laden' usage of the term by non-economists (Boas and Gans-Morse 2009; Venugopal 2015). This literature review makes the case that this dispute is overblown, and that regardless of its relative efficacy or inefficacy within the academy to precisely identify a particular state character or economic phenomenon, the very persistent use of the term outside of the academy by anti-neoliberal, anti-globalization activists demands that critical scholars index what it is that such activists are contesting (Ayres 2005).

Harvey (2006) asks, "in whose particular interests is it that the state takes a neoliberal stance and in what ways have these particular interests used neoliberalism to benefit themselves rather than, as is claimed, everyone, everywhere?" Assessing what neoliberalism is, and its

hegemonic expanse into not only financial and governmental institutions but into everyday ‘ways of life,’ ‘habits of the heart, and ‘ways of thought,’—likewise demands that the critical scholar or scholar-activist meaningfully confronts neoliberalism and the ‘class power’ upholding it (Harvey 2006; Nubudere 1978). To do so, many authors have engaged in contesting neoliberalism through uplifting the anti-neoliberal organizing and protest which has flourished throughout the United States, Canada, Latin America, South Africa, South Korea, the Philippines, and many other nations—well documenting expressions of mass political opposition to the lived contradictions of neoliberal globalization (Brand 2006). Of these common demands, the demand for the dissolution of international, US-led, Bretton Woods institutions such as the International Monetary Fund, the World Trade Organization, and the World Bank is prominent; especially in nations facing debt and loan crises after being subject to structural adjustment programs in the late 20<sup>th</sup> and early 21<sup>st</sup> century (Brand and Wissen 2005; Veltmeyer et al. 1997).

Harvey’s analysis of neoliberalism and accumulation by dispossession (2006) and others’ (Milić 2021; Petras and Veltmeyer 2007; Gürcan 2022) articulations within the field of political economy can be further interrelated with Marxist analyses of imperialism in pursuit of a framework that identifies neoliberalism as a contemporary stage of imperialism itself; specifically, Lenin’s (1916) conceptualization of imperialism as the highest stage of capitalism. Lenin’s (1916) analysis integrated and critiqued the writings of other classical Marxist thinkers on the subject (Bukharin 1915; Hilferding 1910; Lenin 1916; Luxemburg 1913), and described imperialism—also named as monopoly capitalism—as having five major features: the concentration of production and capital which creates monopolies which dominate economies; the merging of industrial and bank capital which is then translated into finance capital, facilitating the rule of finance oligarchy; the export of surplus capital to foreign markets, both driving and consolidating imperialist expansion; the formation of international cartels and alliances that divvy up the world among themselves; and

the final division of the world amongst the major imperialist powers. In applying Lenin's framework on imperialism to the current neoliberal stage of US economic hegemony (Bello 2006; Spector 2007; Tujan Jr. 2021), Marxist political economists have situated modern saber rattling against Russia and China and the rapid buildup of its military capacity in the US' own struggle to defend its unipolarity amidst economic crises. Militarization is therefore not solely a political, ideological, or territorial project, but a decidedly economic one for the United States, as billions in arms production and trade serve as increasingly large industries subsidizing American empire.

### *Urban Contestation and Resistance*

There has long existed a rich literature in geography and urban studies on urban contestation and the ways in which the urban public actively resist, shape, and construct space just as the state, and other governing classes and actors, attempt to dictate, destroy, and remake it (Gregory and Urry 1985; Harvey 2000; Lefebvre 1991; Soja 1996; Zukin 1995). Morrissey and Gaffikin (2006) identify two major forms of spatial contestation in the city: disputes related to pluralism centered on questions of power, welfare, and status; and disputes related to sovereignty centered on questions of not only equity and access, but ethno-nationalism, colonialism, and the legitimacy of the state. Morrissey and Gaffikin further identify eight central characteristics of conflict in contested space: it is intensive (coincidence of cultural/religious/national/ethnic diversity compounds and sharpens animosities), extensive (is not easily demarcated from civic society), persistent (is ancestral, durable, and stubborn in the face of resolution), harbors intimate enemies (crafts ill-informed stereotypes of the 'other'), generates mutual victimhood, 'normalizes revenge' (begets further violence), creates 'role of spoilers' (leaders disinterested in conflict resolution) and is fluid (volatile, dynamic, and constantly changing). Though Morrissey and Gaffikin's overarching analysis accurately pinpoints necessary elements defining spatial



contestation, it remains an ungenerous characterization of anti-colonial and anti-imperialist urban resistance, equivocating both sides in contest despite the realities of asymmetrical class and military warfare experienced in the urban sphere (Fanon 1963; Weizman 2007).

In the context of neoliberalism, imperialism, and militarization, contestation increasingly takes form in larger discursive arenas; with othered or colonized peoples revolting for land, life, self-determination, and national liberation (Appadurai 1997; Eade and Sallnow 1991; Pile and Keith 1997). These highly militarized, contemporary landscapes of urban conflict have required activists to regroup and forge new methods of resistance as imperialism continues to beget their resistance (Mayer 2007; Stolte 2016; Berberoglu 2015). Though neoliberalism has bred more hostile environments for activists to contest space in through protest, uprising, and organization resistance (Bond 2018; González-Sánchez and Maroto-Calatayud 2018; Atilés-Osoria 2013), the evidently worsening economic conditions in the neoliberal Global South have seemingly created the impetus and ripe conditions for revolt (Spector 2007)—conditions which more and more so are being contested in the urban sphere (Beissinger 2022; Cox and Nilsen 2007; Della Porta and Tarrow 2005; Miller 2016). American demonstrations against war in the Middle East (Della Porta et al. 2003), labor strikes across western Europe (Nowak and Gallas 2014), agrarian struggles heightening in South and Southeast Asia (Sethi 2021), and militant student activism in Latin America (Cummings 2015), represent just a handful of examples of the both emergence and escalation of increasingly anti-neoliberal, anti-imperialist, nodes of protest. Though the material outcomes of these struggles—reformist and revolutionary alike—remains in question (Spector 2007; Bevins 2023), there is little doubt as to the remarkable scope and scale of these contemporary global movements.

The aforementioned transnational and urban geopolitical turns in geography, Asian American studies, and urban studies/planning demonstrate an attention within the academy to the

constitution of urban militarized space that both predates and facilitates the US' 2010s pivot towards Asia and ramping up of military infrastructures, practices, and regimes across the Pacific. Still, this turn arrives relatively late after anti-militarist, anti-imperialist organizers had long criticized the academy for an overt attention to perceived weaknesses in anti-militarist organizing at the tail end of the anti-base movement of the 1990s that attributed slowness in demilitarization not to the highly militarized, offensive neoliberal regimes which enforced them, but to the activists themselves (Bello 1992). Though critical scholars in Filipinx, geography, and urban studies have established new canons of movement-aligned literature and participatory action research, this literature is often historical in method and has been slow to catch up to the 2020s acceleration of US military incursion into the Asia Pacific. The continued relevance of Marxist analyses on neoliberalism, imperialism, and militarization (Harvey 2006), offers this work a theoretical framework in which to challenge the notion that APEC is purely an economic forum, rather than one whose outcomes further define the military terrain for the US' heightening war on China as it is mediated on Philippine soil and in its waters.

## CHAPTER 4: RESEARCH METHODS AND HYPOTHESES

### *Methodology*

To address this studies' primary research question—How do anti-imperialist organizers in the Filipino diaspora contest American militarism transnationally in their interventions in militarized urban space?—I am employing an explanatory, qualitative case study research design that utilizes the particular context of the 2023 Asia Pacific Economic Cooperation Summit to explore Filipino organizers' protest rhetoric and demonstration during a period of heightened local and international militarization.<sup>119</sup> Such a design recognizes that though APEC 2023 is a site of unique significance relative to Filipino organizers' contestation of American militarism in the Philippines, particularly for presenting an opportunity for organizers to physically confront US President Biden and Philippine President Marcos Jr., it is not an incomparable one; but one that embodies many of the characteristics of events organizers and protestors regularly disrupt, such as state surveillance, large-scale police response, significant political figures, and the potential mediation of new international frameworks for militarism. In seeing APEC 2023 protests as a glimpse into the broader canons of anti-militarist and anti-imperialist protest in the Filipino diaspora, and APEC 2023 itself as a microcosm of both local militarization and a site in which international militarisms—and/or their pretexts—are mediated, we are able to make broader inferences about how militarism and empire are contested internationally.

Within this case study research design, I employed critical ethnographic methods to understand not only the narratives, rhetoric, and analyses of Filipino diaspora organizers but to interrogate the underlying, asymmetrical power relations governing structures of militarist and

---

<sup>119</sup> Robert K. Yin, *Case Study Research: Design and Methods*, (Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc. 2003).

imperialist oppression (Palmer and Caldas 2016). On the critical ethnographer, Soyini (2005) writes: “[they] take us beneath surface appearances, disrupt the status quo, and unsettle both neutrality and taken-for-granted assumptions by bringing to light underlying and obscure operations of power and control.” Thusly, I sought to center research methods which had historically lent themselves to critical understandings of movement-based protest and dialectics. Though in its activist/advocate orientation, critical ethnography explicitly challenges many traditional norms relative to researcher individualism and neutrality, it still requires clear academic rigor and a grounding in its principles to meet standards for validity in the method and in action research as a whole (Lather 1986). Herr and Anderson’s (2005) five criteria for action research and critical ethnography—dialogic, catalytic, process, democratic, and outcome validity—are the standards for validity met by this particular study, emphasizing the centrality of a co-constitutive relationship between the researcher, the subject community, and the thesis.<sup>120</sup>

My primary ethnographic research methods were 1) ten semi-structured qualitative interviews with organizers in the No to APEC Coalition and anti-imperialist Filipino mass organizations, and 2) participant observation during the week of protest (see *Figure 1*) against the APEC summit in San Francisco, to gather fuller analyses and reflections on the APEC protests. Field notes served as the main source of documentation/recordation for participant observation, which were initially a mix of vocally recorded memos, physical handwritten notes, and notes written digitally, were transcribed and aggregated before being coded and analyzed by notable findings. The interview subjects were selected for their extensive organizing experiences within each of their different mass organizations, with the represented organizations being: International League of People’s Struggle (ILPS), GABRIELA, Migrante, Anakbayan, Malaya Movement, BAYAN, LAKAS, and

---

<sup>120</sup> Kathryn Herr and Gary L. Anderson, *The Action Research Dissertation: A Guide for Students and Faculty*, Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc, 2005.

the International Women’s Alliance (IWA). Interviews were generally one hour in duration depending on subject interest and availability, and were likewise transcribed for clarity before being coded and analyzed by emergent themes. Interviewees could choose how they wished to be identified for the purposes of the study, with many opting to be anonymized, or only identifiable by their first name and organization.

*Figure 1: No to APEC Week of Action Timeline*

<b>Date</b>	<b>Event</b>	<b>Organizers</b>
Saturday, November 11 <sup>th</sup>	No to APEC Peoples’ Counter Summit at SFSU	No to APEC Coalition
Sunday, November 12 <sup>th</sup>	Mass mobilization in the Financial District	No to APEC Coalition
Tuesday, November 14 <sup>th</sup>	Marcos Confrontation in South San Francisco	BAYAN USA and Malaya Movement
Wednesday, November 15 <sup>th</sup>	Marcos Confrontation in San Francisco	BAYAN USA and Malaya Movement
Wednesday, November 15 <sup>th</sup>	Direct Action at the APEC CEO Summit	No to APEC Coalition and Last Chance Alliance

To further supplement the qualitative interviews and participant observations, I utilized foreign policy analysis to further study the military and trade agreements specifically named by activists as key mechanisms upholding American interests in the Asia Pacific, including those which emerged following the 2023 APEC Summit.<sup>121</sup> Though most of the policies named are those that have long been implemented, a few represent recently proposed measures which activists are mobilizing to “expose and oppose.” Of these, more recent both economic and security measures include: the Indo-Pacific Economic Framework (IPEF), the 123 Civil Nuclear Cooperation Agreement, the Philippines Enhanced Resilience Act of 2024, the 2023 US Security Sector

---

<sup>121</sup> Patrick A. Mello and Falk Ostermann, *Routledge Handbook of Foreign Policy Analysis Methods*, United Kingdom: Taylor & Francis, 2022.

Assistance Roadmap (SSAR), and the 2023 Bilateral Defense Guidelines. Outside of the aforementioned recent agreements, much of the analysis focused on what Filipino activists described as the five central unequal military agreements legitimating American militarism in the Philippines: the 1898 Treaty of Paris, 1947 Military Bases Agreement, 1951 Mutual Defense Treaty, 1998 Visiting Forces Agreement, 2002 Mutual Logistics Support Arrangement, and 2014 Enhanced Defense Cooperation Agreement. Discussion of these policies offers further insight into the objective realities of militarist phenomena experienced and noted by activists, and demonstrate their positions as grounded in such policy analyses as well.

Of primary limitation to this research are the necessary time constraints relative to drafting a master's thesis. While much of the critical ethnographic canon features studies spanning several years and even decades, this study was conceived of, carried out, analyzed, and summarized within the span of a single year. Likewise, the one week participant observation window, and the brief window for semi-structured interview limit the depth of inquiry that could serve to further strengthen research findings and conclusions. Future study with a longer time frame and a longitudinal research design may be necessary for the broader line of research inquiry relative to understanding larger dynamics of militarism and respondent anti-imperialist diaspora protest, though this study's case study design that seeks to understand such dynamics through the lens of the APEC 2023 summit draws rational parameters on the research scope in respect to time frame.

### *Hypotheses*

My overarching hypothesis is that organizers contest American militarism transnationally by employing their positions as Filipinos in the diaspora and geographic proximity to their target

to oppose war spatially and rhetorically within the “belly of the beast.”<sup>122</sup> As sub-hypotheses, I suggest that organizers: 1) challenge urban militarism through mass mobilizations that reclaim public space from police and opposing interests, 2) see American law enforcement and related security agencies as local agents of the same militarism that devastate their homeland, and 3) see successful protest interventions in militarized space *within* this country as striking blows to militarized space *outside* of this country. Lastly, I hypothesize that activist perceptions of militarist structures closely reflect objective realities of how those militarisms manifest on the ground level, with close relationships between Philippines-based and diaspora Filipino organizers facilitating pipelines of knowledge of how American militarism is experienced on the ground in the Asia Pacific and within the imperial core.

### *On Reflexivity*

The reflexivity or positionality statement, now a common place practice in social science research, offer a space for critical researchers to reflect and contend to their own positionality relative to the work and to the academy. Though such statements rightly reject positivist presumptions of the neutral, objective scientist dissociated from historic harms or subjective biases, they may also further reproduce power dynamics between researchers racialized as white as opposed to those racialized as people of color by centering whiteness through legitimacy (Gani and Khan 2024). Furthermore, they appear as attempts to mitigate power imbalances between researcher and research subject, though in many present iterations they actually obfuscate such power disparities and offer the researcher such legitimacy through their strategic distances and proximities to the othered research subject (Pillow 2010). Accordingly, this statement, appearing

---

<sup>122</sup> A common moniker for the American imperial core in anti-imperialist organizing spaces, drawn from a quote by Che Guevara, who in a 1960 speech stated: “I envy you. You North Americans are very lucky. You are fighting the most important fight of all—you live in the belly of the beast.”

in a thesis submitted for completion of a Master's degree in Urban and Regional Planning, reflects not solely on any particular racial, social, or gendered identity I may possess, but on my relative professional and class-based status as a graduate student in the field of urban planning. The urban planning graduate student occupies not just a privileged position as a graduate student within the academy, but as a budding or active practitioner in the field writ large.

Under capitalism, the urban planner's role is to facilitate social control, disperse classes perceived to be dangerous to society—namely racialized others and the working poor—to further flung corners of the city, and to “gild the ghetto,” (Harvey 1985). Within the context of the Philippines, the export of modern American city planning in the early 20<sup>th</sup> century served as a critical form of colonial authority, reordering the environment to construct new buildings and cities in the image of American society.<sup>123</sup> Following the 1945 American bombing of Manila which resulted in the complete levelling of the city and the killings of over 200,000 Filipino civilians—at a time when the guerilla Hukbalahap army and Allied forces in the region had already wiped out much of the area's Japanese forces—postwar reconstruction was dictated by the conditional provision of war damage reparations in exchange for the approval of US-controlled free trade in the region.<sup>124</sup> The jeepney, the ubiquitous method of public transportation in the Philippines recognized globally as a symbol of Philippine culture and art, is itself a leftover of World War II era American military presence. American base towns in the Philippines expropriate not only land, but bodies as well—creating local economies wholly dependent on not only the maintenance and function of the military base itself, but on meeting the personnel's demands of “rest and

---

<sup>123</sup> Ian Morley, *Cities and Nationhood: American Imperialism and Urban Design in the Philippines, 1898-1916*, Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2018.

<sup>124</sup> Jose Antonio Custodio, "A Study on the Battle for the Liberation of Manila," Quezon City: The Manila Studies Association, 2004.



recreation,” wherein forced prostitution and sexual violence against local women, without legal recourse, are part and parcel of their urban fabric.<sup>125</sup>

These handful of examples offer a brief glimpse into both the totality of American military urbanism in the Philippines, and the historic and contemporary damages of Western city planning in the third world. The role of planning in suppressing not only ordinary public movement and life, but insurgency and organized protest, is also of note. On the ideology of the planner, Harvey (1985) writes: “...the planner seeks to intervene to restore ‘balance,’ but the ‘balance’ implied is that which is necessary to reduce civil strife and to maintain the requisite conditions for the steady accumulation of capital.” This paper’s focus on the contestation and unsettlement of American militarism through anti-imperialist protest seeks to unravel such balances, turning the gaze towards the planner as a perpetrator of state violence. It is therefore necessary to ground this paper’s critical reproach of such colonial and military urbanisms in that of my own position in the academic and professional field of urban planning, rather than feign distance from such structures.

---

<sup>125</sup> Sandra Pollock Sturdevant and Brenda Stolfus, editors, *Let the Good Times Roll: Prostitution and the U.S. Military in Asia*, New York: New Press, 1992.

## CHAPTER 5: FINDINGS & ANALYSIS

### *Militarism as Counterinsurgency*

Interviewees were united in their perception that the transformation of San Francisco into a highly militarized urban zone was an act of counterinsurgency, with the express purpose of demobilizing any dissent or protest from occurring as has historically happened internationally for APEC, and locally for other similar mobilizations. Organizers attested to the both objective material and phenomenological experience of militarized urban space as the San Francisco area was transformed to host the APEC 2023 summit and accommodate its designation as a National Special Security Event (NSSE) by the US Department of Homeland Security.<sup>126</sup> Several of the organizers interviewed for this project brought up the NSSE designation unprompted, emphasizing not only the harms of the actual militarization enacted through the declaration, but the violence of the existing urban infrastructures of militarism which allowed for such a unilateral transformation of the city to be made overnight in the interest of “national security.” Nyusha, an organizer with the International League of People’s Struggle (ILPS), the anti-imperialist organizing formation that initiated the call for the No to APEC Coalition, posited their theory that the early designation of the APEC Summit as a NSSE served a three-fold purpose to the state: 1) it put the wheels in motion for the unbounded securitization and containment of the conference area, 2) it attempted to intimidate potential protestors, particularly with the outlining of “potential extremist activities and terrorist events,” and 3) it ‘got the jump’ on the narrative regarding the event, blaming activists and protestors for shutting down San Francisco for the summit.

When asked for specific moments protesting the APEC Summit that organizers experienced which resembled militarism, most interviewees described their experiences

---

<sup>126</sup> Lamb, “APEC Summit in San Francisco.”

participating in a mass mobilization organized by the No to APEC coalition on November 12<sup>th</sup>, which was attended by an estimated 10,000 protestors marching from the Embarcadero to the Moscone Center, the central venue of the APEC Summit programming. An anonymous Anakbayan Los Angeles organizer described encountering San Francisco as a militarized zone whilst performing volunteer security duties for the protest, saying:

There were hundreds of police cars following us along the route, a route we had to plan strategically because the city had tried to block people from even approaching their security perimeter. At the height of the rally closer to where meetings were taking place, we paused and could see paddy wagons lining the street, with police all in their riot gear. There were concerns about being kettled and we were trying to protect the crowd, and it felt like you were coming up against the enemy. You could feel that you needed to hold your ground, and this made the city feel foreign. It showed that when the people make decisive moves to challenge power, there's a huge apparatus and millions of dollars to be dropped on a dime to block people from voicing their opinions and accessing the city.

Jill, an organizer with ND women's organization GABRIELA USA, described a similar experience at the same mobilization:

It was a very peaceful mobilization in Downtown SF, attended by students, migrant communities, women, and families. At one point we didn't actually get to our destination because we were blocked off by police in riot gear. They blocked not just pathways to the center, but were coming at us from the sides too, closing in with riot gear.

The asymmetrical nature of the contestation, in which a non-violent formation of unionists, migrants, women, and other activists were met with police intimidation in a highly militarized urban zone, was a point of particular reflection for interviewees. Other activists described the range of security measures taken at the time of the conference—from the positioning of sharpshooters to city rooftops around the Moscone Center to the deployment of over 5,000 San Francisco Police Department officers, Secret Service agents, and other federal law enforcement personnel—as ‘intentionally excessive,’ ‘menacing,’ ‘extremely disturbing,’ and ‘jarring.’

Aside from the mass mobilization, interviewees described another major flashpoint as the November 15 direct action to “shut down” the APEC CEO Summit, with two contingents in

attendance organized by a climate justice organization named the Last Chance Alliance, and the No to APEC coalition. This action, which was more confrontational and militant in nature as protestors attempted to block access to the summit from Mission and 5<sup>th</sup> Street, resulted in not only contestation between protestors and law enforcement, but between protestors and APEC attendees. Katie, an organizer with the International Women's Alliance, reflected on the CEO Summit action, sharing:

We had expected the militarized presence, but we hadn't expected police and APEC delegates to be so actively confrontational to protestors. Our protestors were very clear that they weren't trying to get arrested or violent, but still...I witnessed several instances of police being directly violent, holding people down and assaulting them. I also saw some APEC attendees pushing protestors down and then grabbing them while they were down...Police were riot geared up while protestors were in t-shirts and Crocs. The only time we saw police help us rather than the APEC delegates was when one protestor was punched by an APEC delegate and had to go to the emergency room.

Jill (GABRIELA USA) also recounted the same action, stating:

The police did nothing to protect people until protestors started reading off their badge numbers, recording their faces, calling them out by name. It was traumatizing watching so much harm be inflicted...this really showed the state's interests in only protecting the people who were attending the summit.

Again, protest attendees rhetorically contrasted the relative civility of the actions of their activists to the repression experienced at the hands of the state and oppositional class interests (e.g. APEC delegates). Filipino movement organizers generally avoided convening protest actions that would result in arrests, opting to hold larger, broader, mobilizations rather than smaller, more militant, high-risk demonstrations. This de-escalation again stood in contrast to the highly militarized SFPD and Secret Service forces, who across several largely peaceful confrontations assaulted and harassed protestors. Such a contrast does not necessarily emphasize pacifism or nonviolence as the morally just tactic for protest, but instead demonstrates the state's asymmetric warfare and monopoly on violence against a politically dissident public.

Though the encounters with militarism recounted by interviewees largely took place within or around the 12-block “exclusion zone” around the Moscone Center established by the interlocking federal and local law enforcement forces overseeing security, others described how APEC programming and militarization permeated public space far beyond its radius. One anonymous ND organizer who studies at a Bay Area university described how space was contested between APEC delegates, security (public and private), and students on multiple local college campuses:

There was an event held by the [Berkeley] business school welcoming APEC leaders and delegates to the university and they really rolled out the red carpet...I had never seen so many police on campus in my life. What were they doing on a public university campus? [...] Campus police have so much authority on supposedly public universities with histories of political demonstration, but every day we see campus police being specifically stationed around campus to maintain control over its every aspect.

The same organizer recounted the pushback the No to APEC coalition had experienced from San Francisco State University—a historic site for the Black Power, Third World, and Asian American movements—in preparing the venue to host the coalition’s People’s Counter Summit.<sup>127</sup>

Just looking like an activist led to being immediately approached by campus and city police. The school kept pushing back on our attendance, on our activity, and asking questions that were not asked of other events being held in that space, a large event space on the land of a public university...despite months of preparation and discussion with the university. All of these institutions are culpable. Every day we are confronted by something that is in direct opposition to what they say their values are, it’s the business of these places.

In preparation for the NSSE and broader security/military situation at the summit, No to APEC organizers described the constantly evolving, extensive coordination and contingency building that led up to the major counter-summit, mass mobilization, and smaller direct actions which continued throughout the week. “It’s been a while since I saw so many military personnel concentrated in

---

<sup>127</sup> Persico, Connell Francis. *The Student Movement and Institutional Disruption: A Historical Case Study of San Francisco State College*. Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University ProQuest. 1974.

such a small city or space...we had to be tactical, secure, and ready to maneuver to continue our primary political task: to fight repression and continue our organizing,” said Nyusha (ILPS).

Interviewees were also quick to identify parallels between militarized counterinsurgency in San Francisco and in the Philippines. An organizer with Anakbayan closed their interview constructing a shared analysis of the US/Philippines continuum of counterinsurgency and policing, stating:

The U.S.’ military presence in the Philippines is part of the same imperialist presence as it is internally to the U.S. too. In the Philippines they have the collaboration of the US puppets there, it’s warfare on the people, it just looks slightly different there than it does here like at Stop Cop City and anti-police brutality protests because the people’s movement is stronger there. Hundreds of millions of dollars each year are going to tactical sharing, with U.S. police training their forces how to act like U.S. soldiers, and U.S. soldiers training Filipino forces how to act like U.S. soldiers [...] Both sides are learning from each other on how to better control the people. Their interest is in militarizing half off the globe while controlling people here at home, who are also trying to build up their people’s movements in different ways. It’s all part of the same fight just happening in different locations. It’s the same players who are fucking up people’s lives all over the world and we should be united against them, the way they’re united against us.

Other organizers named similarities between the US’ militarization of various local, state, and federal agencies in pursuit of quelling anti-APEC protest, and the Philippines’ ‘whole of nation’ or ‘one nation’ approach to targeting perceived ‘communists’ and ‘terrorists’ through every aspect of its governmental structure. “Schools, police, public parks, public space, infrastructure...all of it is part of the military structure,” said Katie (IWA), who went on to offer specific references to militarism as it is embedded into civic life:

Police forces get weapons tech and surveillance systems from the military. CPS separates families in highly militarized ways...in our biggest school districts JROTC is being instituted specifically in schools with high populations of students on free and reduced lunch. The US military has been drastically under recruiting for the last six years to find enough people for all the wars they’re preparing for, trying to get more kids in the pipeline to join the military after graduation. Weapons corporations fund stem programs all the way down to the elementary level to feed people into defense manufacturing. Every part of our day to day lives is so deeply ingrained in war.

Jill (GABRIELA), who's originally from San Diego, a national hub for military production with a large population of Filipino naval officers and Marines, reflected:

Growing up in SD, in a family with a military background, the military was always present in my life. It was common for my friends to join the military too. It wasn't until going through the impacts of US militarism and talking about it in [GABRIELA] that my political consciousness was raised, and I saw how predatory the US military is in recruiting from working class people of color. Our resources, our tax dollars, are being funneled into the military industrial complex. Our cities are part of that too. If it isn't the military it's the police, it's Homeland Security, it's local governments...militarism is so entrenched in how this country is run at every level.<sup>128</sup>

"No matter where you look, there's the military," summarized another anonymous ND organizer.

They continued on:

American police are a military force, especially in major cities with large Black communities, migrant communities, and communities of color. Of course there's cop cities, but there's also training programs for local police forces, who are trained by these international military regimes. Just like the military, the police have huge, ballooning budgets that go towards purchasing military equipment, vehicles, and technologies, with no clear community need. Why does the City of Oakland have helicopters? There has been such a normalization of this militarized approach to local policing and local government, that the use of deadly and unequal force is now business as usual.

At a teach-in titled 'The Fascist Offensive' at the counter-summit taught by organizers with BAYAN, Nodutdol, and the Palestinian Youth Movement; organizers with BAYAN USA invoked the parallel between the Philippines' whole of nation approach and militarism in America, describing how both governments and their civilian bureaucracies are militarized in their entirety to serve fascism.<sup>129</sup> <sup>130</sup> The same speaker noted that while the NTF-ELCAC is represented by

---

<sup>128</sup> Theresa Cenidoza Suarez, *The language of militarism: Engendering Filipino masculinity in the U.S. empire*, University of California, San Diego ProQuest, 2008.

<sup>129</sup> The title of the workshop is a reference to the work it's founded on theoretically, a report given by Georgi Dimitrov to the Seventh World Congress of the Communist International in 1935 titled *The Fascist Offensive and the Tasks of the Communist International in the Struggle of the Working Class against Fascism*.

<sup>130</sup> Nodutdol is a US and Canada-based organization of anti-imperialist, diasporic Koreans organizing for the reunification of Korea (<https://nodutdol.org/about/>, accessed April 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2024). The Palestinian Youth Movement is a transnational, grassroots movement of young Palestinians in exile organizing towards the end of the Zionist occupation of Palestine (<https://palestinianyouthmovement.com/about>, accessed April 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2024).

cabinets and agencies spanning the entire Philippine government, it's ultimately funded by US military aid, and grounded the NTF-ELCAC's historical roots in US counterinsurgency doctrine in the Philippines in the early 20<sup>th</sup> century.

The transnational parallel was further relevant relative to protestors' confrontations with Philippine President Ferdinand Marcos Jr., which occurred twice: once on November 14<sup>th</sup> outside of an event in South San Francisco for invited local politicians, business owners, and other notable figures; and a second time on November 15<sup>th</sup> outside of the Ritz Carlton where he had been staying. At the November 14<sup>th</sup> action, over a hundred protestors with BAYAN USA, Malaya Movement, and other solidarity organizations formed lines outside of every entrance into the conference center parking lot to demonstrate their mass opposition to the Marcos regime. '*Marcos you're not welcome here,*' '*Marcos tuta, diktador, pasista*' and other chants in both Tagalog and English punctuated speeches made by protest organizers that specifically took aim at Marcos' repression of Filipino activists, participation in forums like APEC, and further militarization of the Asia Pacific.<sup>131</sup> Protestors strategically positioned themselves on sidewalks bordering parking lot entrances to circumvent receiving a dispersal order from police whilst maintaining their presence outside of the event. Riot police were outnumbered but still vastly overrepresented, with a roughly 3:1 ratio of demonstrators to SSFPD and Secret Service officers. By the end of the action—after Marcos Jr.'s motorcade had driven through a gap in the crowd created by two, armed police lines—organizers had rallied for several hours and significantly delayed Marcos' entry to the event.

At a similar demonstration organized the next morning on the 15<sup>th</sup> outside of the Ritz Carlton in Chinatown, organizers again attempted to prevent or delay Marcos' departure from the hotel to APEC programming, but were foiled as he left through an unaccounted private exit.

---

<sup>131</sup> In English, '*Marcos tuta, diktador, pasista*' translates to 'Marcos dog, dictator, fascist.'



Activists decried his actions as cowardly, specifically contrasted the lavish cost of the hotel suite in comparison to rising costs of basic necessities in the Philippines for the working masses, and lambasted his disinterest in hearing the voices of dissenting Filipino nationals. On this anti-Marcos action, Katie (IWA) said:

The last day BBM was in SF we had planned to surveil him,<sup>132</sup> as he was the only head of state there who didn't release a public schedule—even Xi Jinping did! People had planned to go into the hotel he was staying in, but someone got recognized by security detail right away. As organized as we are, the state is also watching us as much as we're also in the public eye confronting him. Marcos didn't just have his own security, he also had San Francisco police who primarily recognized us. This really made me realize how organized they are, which was a big lesson learned.

Cathy, an organizer with Migrant Los Angeles also known as *Ate Cathy* to younger activists in the movement, described how the police/military presence at the APEC summit and protecting Ferdinand Marcos Jr. in South San Francisco reminded her of life under martial law in the Philippines, sharing:<sup>133</sup>

I noticed a lot of black tinted cars [outside of the Marcos Jr. protest], with the US Secret Service protecting the Philippine president. Even after the APEC program march, there was a huge military police presence there and a lot of unmarked cars in front of us. When we were in the Philippines during the height of the Marcos Sr. regime there were a lot of killings and kidnappings of people they suspected to be supporters of the NPA. They thought my mom was a supporter, so our security was at stake. Outside of our school, we saw black tinted cars park. One day we took a plane to Manila after being advised to, as one of her friends kids' was kidnapped in a black tinted car. Looking at them [unmarked vans] it was a flashback for me, how they do their surveillance...both the US and the Philippines.

Cathy went on to describe further collaboration between American and Philippine police forces, naming the example of Los Angeles Police Department coordination with the Philippine National

---

<sup>132</sup> BBM is shorthand for Bongbong Marcos.

<sup>133</sup> *'Ate'* means older sister in Tagalog, and is a signifier of both respect and endearment.

Police, who host a foreign attaché near the Philippine Consulate in Los Angeles.<sup>134</sup> Cathy's analogy of the unmarked, black tinted van as a harbinger of surveillance, state violence, and even killing is not merely an abstract memory of martial law traumas, but another marker that a new stage of militarized US/Philippines collaboration is not so dissimilar from the old one.

### *Militarism as Planning Doctrine*

Beyond protesting the particular character of the militarization of San Francisco, interviewees echoed their objection to the urban transformation as one that categorically denied every day, working, city residents their right to the city and public space. One anonymous ND organizer based in the Bay Area described the transformation as rendering their hometown as “unrecognizable” and “not representative of what the city is really like,” stating:

Our city was transformed in front of our eyes, and we had absolutely no impact or input on it...the blocking off of the Moscone Center, the closure of BART and MUNI stations, the changing of traffic patterns so that people can't even approach Civic Center without the correct badges...it completely cut us off from our public spaces overnight. Even outside of the protests and the Civic Center it felt like APEC was everywhere. How can we voice our opinions as citizens on public land if it's all been turned private at the drop of a hat?

Another Anakbayan Los Angeles member who grew up in San Francisco before their family was priced out into the suburbs, shared similar sentiments, further linking the experience of militarist transformation to that of ongoing gentrification in the city:

I have so many memories of being in the city and seeing how it's changed and feeling a deep frustration about the gentrification and displacement, seeing my hometown become more hostile in front of me. This [the militarized police response at the mass mobilization] felt the same.<sup>135</sup>

---

<sup>134</sup> Joy Sales, “‘Activism is not a Crime’: Confronting Counterinsurgency in the Filipino Diaspora,” *The Journal of American-East Asian Relations*, 2022.

<sup>135</sup> Karen Chapple and Miriam Zuk, *Case Studies on Gentrification and Displacement in the San Francisco Bay Area*, Center for Community Innovation, University of California, Berkeley, 2015.

The militarized removal of the encampment and occupation at People’s Park in Berkeley was also mentioned by two Bay Area-based organizers who described it as another example of how gentrification, displacement, and militarization are interlinked, with one stating:

People’s Park shows how not only real estate development, but militarization is also a money making strategy. The school and the city spent \$7 million to displace protestors, and have spent like \$1 million a month to police the one block parcel of land, using the funds of students tuition and the public institution to pay private security companies for their patrols. It’s completely unjustified, but so normalized that the neighbors don’t even think about how they live next to a totally militarized, police state, “public park.” The city and the university are literally treating it like a military conflict, acting in the defense of property.<sup>136</sup>

Several interviewees also mentioned how leading up to the APEC Summit, the City of San Francisco had executed widescale sweeps throughout Downtown SF, and vehemently criticized the displacements.<sup>137</sup> In an interview with the San Francisco Standard, an unhoused man living in an encampment on Van Ness Avenue reported that he had been told by the city to “clean up and leave” for APEC, likening San Francisco’s transformation to “getting dressed up for a party.”<sup>138</sup> Van Ness had been identified as one of six priority areas for the city to sweep ahead of the conference due to the siting of several fundraisers for APEC delegates and attendees on the street, including one hosted by SF Mayor London Breed.<sup>139</sup> The attention to the struggles of unhoused residents is not new to ND and allied Filipino organizations, as several of the organizations interviewed (GABRIELA, Anakbayan, Migrante, LAKAS, and Malaya Movement) work closely with unhoused Filipinos in Los Angeles as part of an organizing campaign called Housing for

---

<sup>136</sup> Don Mitchell, “People’s Park again: on the ends and ends of public space,” *Environment and Planning: Economy and Space*, Volume 49, Issue 3, 2016.

<sup>137</sup> A *sweep* is the forced removal of unhoused people and their belongings from public space, typically under the guise of city sanitation.

<sup>138</sup> David Sjostedt, “San Francisco ‘cleaned up’ streets ahead of APEC. But how and what, exactly, did it do?” *The San Francisco Standard*, November 14, 2023.

<sup>139</sup> Sjostedt, “San Francisco ‘cleaned up’ streets ahead of APEC.”

Juanita, fighting alongside residents of a former Filipinotown encampment which had been swept into one of Los Angeles Mayor Karen Bass' Inside Safe interim housing sites as they advocate for their needs to be met within a program residents have described as jail-like and unsanitary.<sup>140</sup>

When asked what motivated their protest to the APEC 2023 Summit, Lauren, an organizer with GABRIELA who's active on the Housing for Juanita campaign said:

I was motivated to join the protest of the APEC 2023 Summit after seeing the effects of neoliberalism, both here on the streets of Los Angeles and in the Philippines. In the fall of 2023, my organization got involved in organizing a community of unhoused Filipinos here in Historic Filipinotown. As GABRIELA, we understand that the roots of the homelessness and housing crisis in LA are neoliberalism, which turns housing into a for-profit business rather than a human right. Many of the unhoused community members are immigrants and were forced to migrate from the Philippines because of the neoliberal Labor Export Policy, and their low wages too are a result of neoliberalism there and in this country.

Organizers described APEC militarization and transformation of the urban landscape as an act of class war against unhoused people and the working class writ large, equivalating it to the larger, international violences wrought by neoliberalism. On this, Nyusha (ILPS) said:

What became clear is that the current state in its role, in our view, is to defend the interests of the ruling class. In most circumstances, it is a repressive entity that attacks the people to defend those interests. That's why they always send the cops on unhoused people...on activists...homeless people in San Francisco were displaced just for heads of state to meet and make the world more hostile for all of us.

Jill (GABRIELA) echoed similar sentiments:

The city conducted a bunch of sweeps and was very brutal to the unhoused population who lived there. They blocked off a lot of the streets, impacting workers' ability to get around, especially without a car. The city really turned into this menacing environment, for both unhoused people, workers, protestors, and everyone in the area.

The city is characterized as not only a landscape incidentally inequitable to working people, as is sometimes supposed in urban planning/design, but as an entity managed by a repressive state wielding military force, diametrically opposed to the interests of working people in defense of

---

<sup>140</sup> Elizabeth Chou, 'A good start, five months later:' Historic Filipinotown residents push for Inside Safe promises to be kept,' *Los Angeles Public Press*, March 26, 2024.

capital. No to APEC activists therefore view their contestation of space at protests, mass mobilizations, and direct actions as not only rhetorically antagonistic to the state, but spatially antagonistic, as the state wields urban space to impose its class interests. Katie (IWA), who is based in Portland, Oregon, described their view on urban wars on the poor as facilitated by the very design and planning of American cities:

We can see clearly how our cities are at war against the poor. War is built into the urban fabric of cities like Portland, where we have two monuments to Philippine American War. Why in a liberal, white, mecca are so many parks and infrastructures around the city memorializing war in the Asia Pacific? Our streets are set up to evacuate people during wartime, our bridges are designed to go up fast so a warship can go through. Our working class and our poor people have more in common with the peasantry in the Philippines who are being militarized as part of the same tactic, it's just different manifestations.

Activists' linking of the conditions of poor, working-class people living in cities in the United States and the peasantry in the Philippines further demonstrates how No to APEC organizers utilize militarism as a through line to overcome geographic and national differences, and construct transnational networks of class solidarity-based anti-militarism and anti-imperialism. We can synthesize these perceptions of the symbiotic relationship between militarism, the city, and the state as fitting into the larger canon of urban militarism/military urbanism (Graham 2009; Weizman 2007), with militarism operates as a planning doctrine or ideology in its urban expression, shaping both the governance of public space and its very form.

*'Filipino Women are Not for Sale'*

Organizers with GABRIELA, the largest ND organization advocating for the welfare of women, queer and trans people, and children, intentionally outlined the particular impacts of APEC, neoliberalism, and militarism on their sector in their interviews. Members hold the analysis that Filipina women are primarily subjugated by virtue of their class and national oppression under the three basic problems of Philippine society (US imperialism, bureaucrat capitalism, and

feudalism).<sup>141</sup> For GABRIELA members, liberation for women, queer and trans people, and children (whom they view as oppressed by the same authorities) is therefore achievable through the advancement of the mass movement for national democracy in the Philippines. Throughout the APEC counter-summit and mobilizations, GABRIELA members in coordination with the International Women’s Alliance (IWA) were: leading protest contingents—one such contingent of women’s organizations at the November 12 mass mobilization hosted nearly a thousand participants; leading chants in both English and Tagalog like “Filipino women are not for sale,” “*abante babae, palaban militante,*” and “*sulong Gabriela, lumaban makibaka*”;<sup>142</sup> and performing anti-war songs calling for women to take action against the system that charges them rent and drafts their children into war.

On neoliberalism at APEC, GABRIELA organizers took particular insult to one of the 2023 APEC Summit’s subthemes: women’s economic empowerment. APEC discussion on the theme both leading up to the summit and at the summit itself was largely couched in proposing programs seeking to advance the role of women in the technology and business processing sectors in the Global South. In one interview, a GABRIELA Los Angeles member stated:

The fact of the matter is that the situation for women in APEC member economies has only gotten worse and worse under neoliberalism. APEC frames its policies as good for women, as promoting jobs, but really it’s about ‘how do we squeeze every cent out of these workers and then teach them how to help us make their jobs obsolete.’

Another ND organizer responded similarly:

APEC is promising women in the Philippines all of these jobs to “uplift and upskill them,” framing it as providing amazing job opportunities when it reality it just intensifies their suffering and glamorizes these shitty outsourced, dirty jobs. Corporate investment and initiatives benefit foreign trade, not us. Actually, they don’t just not benefit us, they actively harm us.

---

<sup>141</sup> GABRIELA USA, <https://www.gabrielausa.org/>.

<sup>142</sup> In English, these chants roughly translate to “advance women, fight militantly” and “come forward Gabriela, fight back, struggle.” These are the two major GABRIELA chants both in the Philippines and in the diaspora.

At a “Women in Economy” forum held in Seattle as part of an APEC ministerial meeting prior to the summit, roughly 500 organizers with GABRIELA, the International Women’s Alliance, and other allied women’s organizations mobilized in protest to demonstrate their opposition to the neoliberal and militarist policies propagated by APEC member economies. In addition to organizing a mass mobilization, activists also hosted workshops led by migrant women who were victims of human trafficking in the Asia Pacific, women in the tech sector informing participants about the realities of the outsourcing of tech labor to the region, and organizations representing the interests of former comfort women in Japan, Korea, and the Philippines.<sup>143</sup>

Another frequent subject of criticism was the US’ launching of the “IPEF Upskilling Initiative,” a program aimed at training a reported seven million women and girls in data science, AI, robotics, and “the use of digital tools” in Brunei, Fiji, India, Indonesia, Malaysia, the Philippines, Thailand, and Vietnam in order to “achieve sustainable and inclusive economic growth while advancing greater competitiveness in the region.”<sup>144</sup> The initiative emerged as part of the US’ larger thrust to advance their Indo-Pacific Economic Framework for Prosperity (IPEF) at the APEC summit.<sup>145</sup> Fourteen US companies including Amazon, Apple, Google, and Microsoft were identified as private sector partners and facilitators of the initiative. GABRIELA members did not mince their words on their perception that this initiative was designed to further exploit women and girls rather than uplift them:

---

<sup>143</sup> Yuki Tanaka, *Japan’s Comfort Women: Sexual slavery and prostitution during World War II and the US occupation*, London, UK: Routledge, 2001.

<sup>144</sup> U.S. Department of Commerce, “Commerce Department Launches the Indo-Pacific Economic Framework for Prosperity (IPEF) Upskilling Initiative, <https://www.commerce.gov/news/press-releases/2022/09/commerce-department-launches-indo-pacific-economic-framework-prosperity>, accessed March 25, 2024.

<sup>145</sup> U.S. Department of Commerce, “Indo-Pacific Economic Framework.”

APEC describes women and girls as an “untapped resource” for economic growth within poor countries. The IPEF Upskilling Initiative is nothing more than a tool for tech companies to exploit greater profits from the Indo-Pacific region by specifically targeting women and girls. These programs only support a small number of women and girls to access training and education and their clear objective is to supply the US tech industry with a surplus army of low-paid workers. This means IPEF fails the women and girls it seeks to serve before even starting the upskilling initiative. STEM programs cannot meet women’s needs, only a militant women’s movement for national democracy can do so.

Another central tenant of GABRIELA’s analysis is that the US military is the number one perpetrator of violence against women, and that women and children are particularly frequent targets of militarist and imperialist violence. Though activists frequently centered their analysis about the impact of US militarization in the Philippines and other nations in the Asia Pacific with American military bases, they were firm in their assertion that women and children in the imperial core were likewise subject to such violences, pointing out several such examples that took place in San Francisco. After reading an article in the San Francisco Standard about how local strip clubs and adult venues were arranging service-oriented “specials” to cater to the interests of APEC delegates and attendees, GABRIELA Los Angeles members huddled together to release a brief statement denouncing the “sexploitation” of women during APEC.<sup>146</sup> <sup>147</sup> On the first slide of the statement posted to the organization’s Instagram, a photo of an A-frame sign outside of a strip in San Francisco club advertises: “APEC SF 2023: Welcome diplomats! Anonymity assured; your privacy is our priority.”<sup>148</sup> A segment of GABRIELA LA’s statement reads:

---

<sup>146</sup> Kevin Truong and Jonah Owen Lamb, “San Francisco strip clubs, pot shops roll out welcome mat for APEC,” *The San Francisco Standard*, November 11, 2023.

<sup>147</sup> Members of GABRIELA have long organized around the issue of prostitution, sex trafficking, and the larger sex trade, both in the Philippines and in the diaspora where women are frequently exported into the sex trade as prostitutes, mail order brides, and domestic workers. For more on this organizing and the sex trade in the Philippines, see: Sandra Pollock Sturdevant and Brenda Stolfus, *Let the Good Times Roll: Prostitution and the U.S. Military in Asia*.

<sup>148</sup> GABRIELA Los Angeles, “Women’s bodies are not a ‘welcoming mat’ for the APEC elite!” [https://www.instagram.com/p/CzrWnvUAAGx/?img\\_index=1](https://www.instagram.com/p/CzrWnvUAAGx/?img_index=1), accessed April 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2024.



Women's bodies are not a "welcoming mat" for the heteropatriarchal ruling elite of the Imperialist class! We denounce the commodification of women's bodies under a decaying capitalist society. Women are not for sale! [...] The presence of these officials in San Francisco is no different from the disruption of military forces occupying poverty-stricken countries in the global south. In fact, APEC will exacerbate harmful conditions for women and trans people with the state forces present in the city from the secret service to the FBI to riot police, and the fascist leaders' entourage of cronies. Sex positivity and liberation is not rooted in capitalism. Genuine liberation for all people will come from the end of U.S. imperialism.

By likening the proliferation of *sexploitation* in the US during international forums like APEC to that of the sex trade in the Philippines through the common link of the commodification of women's bodies, members of GABRIELA interrelate neoliberalism, militarization, and violence against women.

On the use of militarized force leveraged against women and children, organizers again described the police intimidation and repression at the November 12<sup>th</sup> mass mobilization, specifically naming how families who were in large attendance at the march were threatened:

Police formed riot lines mere feet away from us, holding rubber bullet guns and zip ties for mass arrests. It was extremely disturbing to see that there while at a peaceful march with all of these children and families around. A member of our organization had her baby daughter with her who wasn't even one year old. Women, migrants, babies...we were all seen as a threat that needed to be handled [with military force] because we were organized.

At the November 15<sup>th</sup> direct action at the APEC CEO Summit, a woman organizer with the Malaya Movement was sexually assaulted by a member of the San Francisco Police Department while she was acting as a safety marshal, positioning her body between officers of the SFPD and protestors. The assault was caught on video, in which SF Police Sergeant R. Jensen is clearly seen reaching out and intentionally groping the activist's breast. In a statement released by the Malaya Movement, the organizer who was assaulted is quoted as writing:

While I am horrified and shaken up from being assaulted by SFPD officers, I am unsurprised that they would assault peaceful protestors like myself. While Marcos Jr. had convoys of police protection, protestors like us were facing police repression. While the state was acting to protect the profit of CEOs and heads of state at APEC, they sought to

silence us for dissenting. What they don't understand is this: we will do whatever it takes to make our voices heard for an end to the exploitation of our people and our homeland.<sup>149</sup>

Another organizer with the Malaya Movement stated that this was not the only incident of state violence against women they witnessed at anti-APEC protests, noting that they saw several instances of police being directly violent against women and gender non-conforming people to “demoralize and deter protest.” In opposing neoliberal and militarist solutions to women’s struggles and actively propping about the violences of the imperialist state to women and children, GABRIELA, IWA, and other organizers in the women’s movement clearly demarcated themselves from those advancing APEC’s agenda on women’s economic empowerment. In the face of sexual assault, repression, and intimidation at the hands of a militarized security apparatus, organizers rooted themselves in the cry that “women are not for sale” and advanced their solution for working class women around the world: the dismantling of American imperialism through the advancement of national liberation struggles across the continent.

### *Neoliberalism as a Necropolitic*

Employing Lenin’s analysis of imperialism as the highest form of capitalism, Filipino organizers argued that neoliberal intergovernmental forums and trade agreements were merely pretexts for military expansion, violence, and out-and-out war, resulting in widespread death.<sup>150</sup> One organizer with BAYAN USA shared a ND movement mnemonic for explaining neoliberalism, describing it as “*lapida*” meaning tombstone in Tagalog. According to BAYAN, neoliberalism is characterized by three major tenets which are represented by the term: “la” for liberalization (explained as “so-called free trade” agreements), “pi” for privatization (explained as

---

<sup>149</sup> Malaya Movement, “Malaya Movement USA’s statement on sexual assault by SFPD at APEC,” <https://www.instagram.com/p/C0ViC1rpFB/?igsh=MzRIODBiNWFIZA==>, accessed April 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2024.

<sup>150</sup> Vladimir Ilyich Lenin, *Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism*, Petrograd, Russia, 1917.

policies of privatization with deep cuts to social spending), and “da” for deregulation (explained as the rolling back or elimination of protective legislation in the interest of corporations). “People need a living wage, not a *libing* wage,” continued the organizer, with *libing* meaning funeral in Tagalog. Altogether, the allegorizing of neoliberalism as a tombstone (*lapida*), and current poverty wages to a funeral (*libing*), identifies it as a necro-politic which organizers see as leading the masses to early graves.

The analysis of neoliberalism as an impetus for militarization was at the center of organizer’s framework of neoliberalism as a practice fundamentally about death making. Interviewees frequently referenced mining liberalization laws, nuclear power agreements, and even the development of free trade frameworks as examples of APEC summit agreements which subsequently resulted in formal military agreements, heightened counterinsurgency, and war profiteering through the increasing lucrateness of military industry. In an article for *The Nation* titled “The Forces That Nearly Murdered Me Are Meeting in San Francisco Today,” No to APEC counter-summit keynote speaker and survivor of an assassination attempt by the Armed Forces of the Philippines, Brandon Lee wrote:

I was almost killed by Philippine troops upholding the global economic order on display at this week’s APEC Summit [...] but it was not only those specific soldiers who were responsible for my near-murder. It wasn’t even only the Philippine government. The global neoliberal economic model that prioritizes endless profiteering and exploitation over peace, equality, and environmental stewardship helped load the gun.

In his keynote speech, Lee also discussed the deadly conditions for workers and labor organizers challenging major multinational corporations like Nestle who are beneficiaries of neoliberal APEC policies, who in the Philippines executed a targeted anti-union campaign to repress a nine-year strike, resulting in the deaths of 48 workers, the assassination of two union presidents, and the

leveraging of criminal charges against 250 striking workers.<sup>151</sup> “There’s blood in your coffee,” Lee reminded the crowd. To organizers, the extrajudicial killings of unionists, workers, and activists cannot be divorced or extricated from the neoliberal policies which created the worsening conditions that necessitated their protest in the first place.

During the workshop on ‘The Fascist Offensive’ at the counter-summit, organizers with BAYAN expanded on their understanding on the interplay of not just militarism, but fascism, with neoliberalism:

Within the imperialist homelands, the growth of working class militancy and socialist influence among the toiling masses and worsening quarrels between the ruling class result in the state enacting more restrictive laws to justify use of violence and denial of civil liberties; the imperialists continue to push for more territories, and adopt harsher measures to facilitate colonial plunder and to suppress the resistance of subjugated peoples; this intensifies inter-imperialist rivalries and growing militarism through the expanded role of modern standing armies, their elite officer corps, and the military-industrial complex.

Organizers quoted George Dimitrov, stating: “Fascism in power is the ‘open terrorist dictatorship of the most reactionary, most chauvinistic, and most imperialist elements of finance capital.”<sup>152</sup>

This is a time of economic decline, inter-imperialist conflict, military buildup, and straight up fascism—felt locally and exported internationally. We can see flashpoints of these attacks against the people everywhere: from militarization in San Francisco to genocide in Palestine.

This analysis of the interplay between peoples’ resistance and fascism and the US and the Philippine state is explicit in *Philippine Society and Revolution*, a foundational text in the legal and revolutionary ND movement. Former Chairperson of the Communist Party of the Philippines, Jose Maria Sison, wrote:

In the face of a revolutionary mass movement, the bureaucrat capitalists are even more vicious in using their armed power. They are in the first line of defense on behalf of their imperialist and feudal masters. The reactionary armed forces of the Philippines and the local police forces are ever at their disposal for counterrevolutionary purposes. If they themselves cannot subdue the revolutionary mass movement, U.S. aggressor troops are expected to come out of the U.S. military bases and press them further into the frontlines

---

<sup>151</sup> Marya Salamat, “The Blood in Your Coffee (and Milk) Thickens: Nestlé Replaces Union on Strike, Continues to Flout SC Decision,” *Bulatlat*, May 8, 2010.

<sup>152</sup> Georgi Dimitrov, *Georgi Dimitrov, Selected Work Volume 2*, Sofia, Bulgaria: Sofia Press, 1972.

against the people. The bureaucrat capitalists who turn into barefaced fascists take after their imperialist masters in brutality. For seven decades, U.S. imperialism has taught them how to launch counterrevolutionary violence and has improved their weapons and techniques. [...] There has not been a single decade in Philippine history that is not stained by the blood of the people spilled by imperialism and its running dogs.<sup>153</sup>

Activists often characterized the relationship between neoliberalism and militarization as both symbiotic and consequential; in pursuit of larger markets and cheaper labor, imperialist states impose neoliberal policies in their colonies and metropolises. Funding becomes increasingly siphoned away from necessary services and welfare, and working conditions become even more exploitative as living conditions worsen. With wages decreasing, and prices increasing, people begin to fight back and organize to voice their dissent. To protect the super profits extracted under these neoliberal regimes, imperialist states heavily militarize themselves, creating entire industries. These steps are not necessarily described as always occurring in this sequence, though the impacts always compound on the other and mutually reinforce the strength of each. An organizer with Anakbayan described this phenomena in brief:

When we see neoliberal policies increase, what needs to follow for the state is increased militarism. The more they squeeze the people for every last dime, the more people push back. So, the only way they can increase these policies is through militarism. You don't think people are going to be mad by stuff like Marcos opening up industries to 100% foreign ownership? No, they have to strong arm those changes to policy in some way. These policies sounds ridiculous to a lot of people unless you're part of the upper classes who benefit from these agreements.

Nyusha (ILPS) also raised the precarity of this system:

What's profitable under capitalism? War and weapons. The military is always wrapped up in these trade agreements, NAFTA for example. Instead of amending NAFTA after it devastated Mexico, the course of action was to militarize the border and bar what are essentially economic refugees. This dual profit model for the US is super unstable though, because after all, war is only profitable when you're at war.

---

<sup>153</sup> Guerrero, *Philippine Society and Revolution*, 1971.

Beyond describing war profiteering and industry as antagonistic towards the general warfare, activists also described the zero sum nature of such spending, describing the billions dedicated towards national military budgets as funding allocated away from increasingly privatized needs such as healthcare, education, and housing. This point was particularly brought up in the context of talking to both organized and unorganized workers and migrants to try and relate the anti-imperialist, anti-militarist struggle to their “bread and butter” issues. Min, an organizer with BAYAN Southern California, related local, economic struggles to neoliberalism and anti-militarism:

Imperialism and neoliberalism seem so nebulous, but they’re everywhere and affect every part of our life...It’s critical that we make this type of analysis accessible to the everyday working class person, and not even just Filipinos but all those who are exploited under this current system of capitalism, and more specifically imperialism as well [...] Here in SoCal, there’s housing, education, and economic crises and all of these different manifestations are the result of neoliberal policies like the ones passed at APEC. From dilapidated housing infrastructure, to flooding, to people being killed in hit and runs because there’s no streetlights—people see that it’s dangerous to live in places like these. Developers come in, gentrify our communities, and construct expensive buildings that people cannot even afford to live in. These are just some of the conditions put upon people, and it’s because all of our money is going to war.

The references to housing, education, and economic crises all represent different issues that BAYAN organizations are actively organizing around in Southern California, taking up what they describe as the “gut issues” of the people to further build trust in their communities and raise people’s understandings of economic crisis as ones manufactured and upheld by state neglect. An organizer with Anakbayan offered similar thoughts, sharing:

Imperialist conflict is at the heart of the issues of the people, it causes harm to workers in economic ways, environmental effects and destruction through war and technology (like pollution, waste, and material byproduct), attacks on the land and the open displacement of people (for bases and military production), and hyper-militarization which is directly dangerous to the people (increased violence against women, violence against indigenous communities). It’s not just an issue of war but an issue of the people as it affects every aspect of our lives down to people’s health. And all of the money is being redirected *from* the people to build infrastructure that’s not relevant outside of the military, leaving people without the capacity to address their own concerns.

Min (BAYAN) went on to describe how even in this aspect of neoliberalism characterized less by outright violence and more by neglect, the system culminates in death:

The ruling class is such a small number of people, and all that they do take away services from welfare and society that the people need [...] The ruling class extracts super profits from workers, takes away the compensation workers deserve for their hard labor, and puts it to war. It's not even just corporations, but the government who squeeze people so hard to pay for war that they're becoming homeless and hungry. Not only physically and materially is it hard to live here, but it is very taxing mentally and emotionally for people. Even beyond the material complications, people are impacted in that way too. People are not just fighting against imperialism/neoliberalism cerebrally anymore, but they feel now physically what it means [...] People are dying from the plunder of the imperialist state.

Organizers demonstrate their view that death within the neoliberal necropolitic is two-fold: the death executed through militarism as advanced by counterinsurgency, extrajudicial killings, and assassinations; and the death as advanced by state neglect, economic deprivation, and the siphoning of welfare/social services for war profiteering.

### *The U.S. as Already at War*

Interviewees argued that the U.S. has blurred the line between what is war and what is practice for war, suggesting that between operating hundreds of military exercises annually, selling arms and providing funding to repressive militaries, opening and maintaining foreign military bases, and forming unequal military agreements and alliances, the U.S. is already at war on several fronts. In one workshop on American imperialism at the counter-summit, activists described US-led war as fought on three major fronts: in Eastern Europe and the Ukraine, propping up the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) to oppose Russia; in West Asia, propping up Israel and Saudia Arabia to oppose Iran; and in the Asia-Pacific, using the Australia, United Kingdom, US trilateral pact (AUKUS) and Japan, Republic of Korea (ROK), US trilateral pact (JAROKUS) to

oppose China and the Democratic People's Republic of Korea (DPRK). The Asia-Pacific front is believed to be the US' primary front since its pivot to Asia in 2011.<sup>154</sup> Katie (IWA) spoke:

The US is not just preparing for war, they're already at war...just without a war target. The US is instigating war with China, so it becomes that target. The US' five hundred annual military exercises aren't just them building practices through war games, it's unreciprocated war. The US military isn't always going after a national enemy, but after the people themselves.

The US is thusly characterized as not only at war against China, Russia, and Iran, but against the Filipino people and working people internationally, an external expression of the system which produces local warfare on poor people and activists domestically.

When asked about APEC neoliberal policies that further advanced the US' war on China, activists identified the Indo-Pacific Economic Framework (IPEF) as the largest such attempt at the summit to further encircle and isolate China economically, geographically, and militarily.

Discussing IPEF and US/China relations, Nyusha (ILPS) said:

People usually know "all or nothing" trade agreements, but IPEF exists in the context of the US' hold on the world slipping and being challenged by China economically, politically, and militarily. China is putting out its own trade agreements and frameworks like RCEP to those in their sphere of influence.<sup>155</sup> To continue to assert itself, the US has tried to box out China through IPEF, a framework rather than an agreement, and is trying to make countries more exploitable by signing on to get further access to resource and labor power for war buildup. The framework is unique because a sign on can include agreeing to whichever part they want, which can consolidate them firmly within the US' camp geopolitically but also pulls in countries that are less firmly held and can be swayed.

Because IPEF is a trade *framework* rather than an agreement, its largest proponents are able to circumvent the typically required congressional approval process to instead pivot towards entertaining corporate backers to promote its adoption internationally. In the aftermath of APEC, organizers questioned the US' declared success in promoting IPEF at the summit, referencing the

---

<sup>154</sup> Shambaugh, "Assessing the US 'Pivot' to Asia."

<sup>155</sup> RCEP is short for the *Regional Comprehensive Economic Partnership*, a China-initiated free trade agreement formally lunched in 2012 at an Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) Summit in Cambodia.



fact that major players like India had either partially or wholly opted out of agreeing to the framework's major pillars.

The ND movement's analysis of the US/China war is that it is an inter-imperialist conflict for territorial and economic divisions in the area, and that China has evolved into a social imperialist state since its post-70s capitalist turn.<sup>156</sup> Though activists were highly critical of China's incursion into Philippine territorial waters, particularly in their attacks of Filipino fisherfolk whose livelihoods are dependent on local access to the West Philippine Sea, they vehemently opposed the idea that the US' interest in the region is in protecting Philippine sovereignty as it has posited its motivations to be. ND organizers described the US as "deliberately instigating" these smaller fights between China and the Philippines as part of a hot proxy war to invoke mutual defense treaties, provide cover for their own military incursion and establishment of land and sea-based military bases, and utilize Filipino people and land as "collateral" as much as possible instead of American service personnel. Min (BAYAN) echoed this view, saying:

The US has dragged us into a dangerous situation with China, who is increasing their military presence in the West Philippine Sea specifically to counter the U.S.' increasing offensive presence there. We do not want to be used by any side to promote their imperialist agenda in the region. *Atin ang Pinas, U.S. at Tsina layas!* [...] People still think the US is protecting us, but really they're preparing to get us killed. At any moment, these warships and floating military bases could all start firing.

Activists enumerated the impact of the U.S.' frequent military exercises and 'war games' as multitudinously harmful for increasing violence against women, children, and civilians more broadly; enacting environmental destruction; violating territorial and political sovereignty; posturing against enemy states (in this context, China) as a show of force; and in building up the military's capacity and preparedness for out and out warfare. These exercises were described as

---

<sup>156</sup> The terminology of "inter-imperialist" conflict is derived from Lenin's analysis of World War I as an inter-imperialist conflict in *Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism*.

“non-stop,” “terroristic,” “ecologically disastrous,” and “extremely violent against women” by a number of interviewees who named high-profile, joint military exercises like Balikatan, Cobra Gold, and RIMPAC. Seven interviewees spoke in length about RIMPAC especially, which activists are mobilizing to in San Diego in late June 2024 to protest as part of a campaign called *Cancel RIMPAC*.<sup>157</sup> Katie (IWA) expanded on these military exercises:

These war exercises happen all over the world, but in the last decade they’ve mostly been water based and in the Indo-Pacific since war on China would likely be primarily naval. At sea, the physical targets are typically older military technology like decommissioned ships, and they’re destroyed to test their new technologies like drone operated ships and aircraft carriers. Beyond that though, these exercises are largely about training soldiers to subdue local populations, so the people and their resistance aren’t an issue.

An organizer with Malaya Movement referenced the legacies of US colonialism in the Philippines in their charge against US military exercises in the Philippines, saying:

These exercises are reminders that the Philippines is not our own, that our homeland is a token that Marcos is more than happy to pawn off to pad his pockets. We’re told that the Philippines needs the US to protect us, its ‘little brown brother,’ but it traps us in a loop of subservience with a military base for a country. Military exercises like RIMPAC are expensive wastes of money that exacerbate war and conflict, destroy the environment, disrupt the livelihood of fisherfolk and peasants, and steal necessary public resources which should be used to meet the urgent needs of the Filipino people.

The expansion and maintenance of new US military bases in the Philippines through military agreements like the 1947 Military Bases Agreement, 1951 Military Defense Treaty, 1999 Visiting Forces Agreement, 2002 Mutual Logistics Support Arrangement, and 2014 Enhanced Defense Cooperation Agreement was at the forefront for many interviewees, with every single organizer interviewed calling for the end to the Enhanced Defense Cooperation Agreement (EDCA) and the immediate expulsion of US military personnel and stripping of access to Philippine bases. Organizers with BAYAN USA campaign for base closures and an end to US

---

<sup>157</sup> Cancel RIMPAC, [www.instagram.com/cancelrimpaccampaign](http://www.instagram.com/cancelrimpaccampaign).

military exercises in the Philippines as part of their “US out of the Philippines” campaign, calling on their activists to build the “anti-imperialist united front more broadly” and:

...build upon our work exposing the neoliberal economic priorities of the US-Marcos regime and link it to the military’s role in enforcing wide-scale economic plunder. Let us make concrete connections for the broad masses as to why their bread and butter interests are diametrically opposed to US militarism worldwide and especially in our homeland. Let us show the masses why the true solution to our country’s problems must involve national and social liberation from US imperialism and its local puppets!<sup>158</sup>

Cathy (Migrante), who organized against US military bases while she was a high school student in the Philippines in the 80s, shared her determination to rebuild the anti-base movement:

Thinking about the new bases is so painful for me because we had spent so much time, so much of our blood and tears protesting to kick them out and now they’re back again. We should not allow ourselves to be silenced, as these bases cause so much damage not only to the environment but to women specifically. We know more women will be victims of sexual violence, and being an island facing the US and facing China means that all of us in the Philippines are at stake right now. We need to fight, as much as possible, as hard as possible, so that these bases get out of the Philippines. I know everything seems like it’s coming back, but we will not stop here. We’ve kicked the bases out before, and we can do it again. As long as we have the power to fight, the conditions are ripe [for change].

Min (BAYAN) described the 2023 expansion of US bases in the Philippines as the single, clearest, example of the strength of US imperialism and the fraud of Philippine sovereignty, noting:

Because of the VFA and EDCA, even when the US bases were technically closed they never really left. When the US and the Philippine state first announced expanding to nine military bases, they were saying it would only require 32 projects in total to set up those bases, but now it looks like it’s actually going to be closer to 95. These are just what we know for sure too, as there are even more unreported and undisclosed bases, places where the US is storing weaponry and other forces. Our country, in its entirety, has become an overseas military base for the US.

In concert, neoliberal frameworks which provide impetuses for war, military aid and arms sales to highly repressive regimes, increasingly frequent war games and military exercises, and unequal military agreements like the VFA and EDCA, have turned the military “base” into a highly

---

<sup>158</sup> BAYAN USA, “US Out of the Philippines,” [https://www.instagram.com/bayan\\_usa/p/C6ZZon1vsRF/?img\\_index=1](https://www.instagram.com/bayan_usa/p/C6ZZon1vsRF/?img_index=1), accessed May 12<sup>th</sup>, 2024.

malleable, ambiguous site: legally and spatially. Legally, access to military bases is granted to the US, grounding their denial that these sites are not themselves US bases, though they are constructed and operated by/for the US. Spatially, the point where a base ends and begins becomes unclear as wartime/peacetime, military exercise/warfare, US/Philippine armed forces grow indistinguishable in the militarized Philippine landscape. If we are to agree with Filipino organizers that their nation has in essence been transformed into one large military base, demilitarization therefore requires much more than a decommissioning of any given number of military bases, but a full exodus of US influence, might, and empire from the country.

*Building the Broadest Front for the Narrowest Target*

The named strategy of “building the broadest front for the narrowest target” contextualizes the effort of Filipino organizers to work in solidarity in diverse coalitions like No to APEC, organizing people outside of the Filipino diaspora to oppose US imperialism and militarism in the Philippines, and supporting other anti-imperialist organizations and national liberation struggles. In their interview, an organizer with Anakbayan expanded on the importance of not just solidarity but interconnected struggle, saying:

From our perspective, we see its each country and each oppressed people’s responsibility to unite themselves and offer solidarity with other groups fighting the same fight. All people’s need to have this reckoning, and hopefully places like the Philippines can offer inspiration to people across the globe who are fighting the same fight. For diasporas, the issues affecting our families don’t go away just because we’re out here, it actually needs to be solved at home. It’s a global fight each nation needs to wage, and there’s so much coordination and solidarity and power that can be built when we realize that.

The ongoing Israeli genocide in Palestine and active Palestinian struggle both in Palestine and in the diaspora also frequently came up in interviews with activists, as both an example of the violences of US empire and its allies, and a model of resistance. Organizers opened remarks at the No to APEC counter-summit by offering their full throated support for the Palestinian people and

their resistance just a month out from the events of October 7, 2023.<sup>159</sup> Speakers led the crowd in chanting “From the river to the sea, Palestine will be free!” and “From Palestine to the Philippines, end the US war machine!”, and dedicated their efforts countering APEC and US imperialism to the “thousands of martyrs who have carried out not only their own struggle, but our struggles for freedom too.” Organizers with Students for Justice in Palestine and the Palestinian Youth Movement were well represented at the summit and mobilization as both attendees, organizers, and speakers, with one panelist with the Palestinian Youth Movement receiving a standing applause after speaking:

The struggle for Palestinian liberation is not just a struggle by or for Palestinians, but by and for people of conscience around the world. We want for everybody what we want for ourselves: an end to this genocide, the right of return, freedom for all political prisoners, and self-determination for our people and our land. We will not only survive this moment, but we will grow from it. We will win freedom for Palestine, and for all of our homelands in our lifetime.

The No to APEC summit and mobilizations were bookended by solidarity with Palestine, concluding with an action organized by the Palestinian Youth Movement outside of a Democratic National Committee Fundraiser attended by Joe Biden and Kamala Harris on the evening of November 15<sup>th</sup>. The deep solidarity bonds between Palestinian, Filipino, and other third world diaspora movements represent years of relationship building and close organization, and reflect that though these organizations are nationalist in character, they are fundamentally internationalist in their orientation; seeing their struggles as highly interrelated, and victories as mutually victorious.

Though many of the organizations in the No to APEC coalition were explicitly anti-imperialist, attendees represented a larger range of tendencies, ideologies, and orientations who were united in their opposition to APEC. “In a room of a thousand people from all over the world,

---

<sup>159</sup> Asma Barakat, “Brief: Operation Al-Aqsa Flood,” *Institute for Palestine Studies*, October 9, 2023.

what unites us all is our opposition to APEC and neoliberal policies. We have so much in common [...] a common struggle and a common enemy,” said Brandon Lee (ICRP) in his keynote speech at the counter-summit. Though there were a range of levels of involvement from No to APEC coalition member organizations, all member organizations agreed with four coalition points of unity: 1) opposing APEC as an “exclusive and elitist country club of the rich representing the interests of big business, 2) opposing APEC as a forum for corporations and institutions to “push so-called ‘free trade’ to exploit their workers and put the benefits of corporations over the rights of nations and peoples,” 3) opposing the “false solutions to peoples issues” that APEC promotes, and 4) supporting the right of nations and peoples to self-determination and sovereignty.<sup>160</sup> In a unity statement released ahead of the counter-summit, the coalition wrote:

To achieve the world [we’re fighting for] these many fights must be united as one. To wage this united fight against the profit-oriented system that APEC and IPEF are a part of, we must build a mass movement across all issues, generations and borders. The No To APEC Coalition has been an example of such a movement, and the months-long campaign, counter summit and the actions we will take against the APEC heads of state are proof of the power we can have when we fight together [...] Wherever APEC and IPEF go, the people fight back, and wherever people are struggling for a brighter world, we’ll be there to join the fight!<sup>161</sup>

The united front of explicitly anti-imperialist organizations, national liberation struggles, trade unions, and non-profits assembled by the No to APEC coalition to oppose their ‘anti-people program and economic alliance’ of the 2023 APEC Summit was central to the coalition’s ability to mobilize a thousand people from across the country to attend a people’s summit held in an airplane hangar on the San Francisco State University campus, and nearly 10,000 to a march through the heart of Downtown San Francisco. Nyusha (ILPS) stated:

From the perspective of ILPS as an anti-imperialist alliance, we can see how all of these different aspects and conditions people face...are all expressions of the imperialist system.

---

<sup>160</sup> International League of People’s Struggle United States, “No to APEC Coalition,” <https://ilpsusinfo.wordpress.com/no2apec/>, accessed May 12, 2024.

<sup>161</sup> International League of People’s Struggle United States, “No to APEC Coalition.”

The general task and course of action, then is to build a commensurate anti-militarist mass movement to oppose war. If people can be united in confronting the biggest enemy we're all facing, we will have the power to defeat it. We must also get at the root of what breeds war; in order to solve the problem of war and militarism, we have to end imperialism and capitalism. Around the world, various anti-imperialist struggles are on the rise amidst all this crisis [...] We also see the rise of workers organizing even in the imperialist countries. War comes as a result of imperialist conflict over dominance of the economy and world, so workers need to be engaged and at the forefront of this struggle as well.

Rather than having the impact of diluting or mellowing the anti-imperialist, anti-militarist discourses of the ND movement, the coalition appeared to bring those less explicitly radical organizations more leftwards, closer to the cause of building national democracy with a socialist perspective in the third world.

The unity building work of the No to APEC Coalition can also be viewed as a microcosm of the larger mass movement building perspective of the ND movement, and innumerable other revolutionary struggles around the world. When organizers were asked what they believed to be the necessary courses of action to deconstruct structures of militarism, locally and abroad, every single interviewee answered mass movement building. An organizer with an ND organization based in the Bay Area spoke about the importance of mass movement building not just as a tactic or strategy, but as a way to understand the scope of imperialism and anti-imperialist struggle internationally:

We have to think about how we can make strong ties to the larger Filipino movement, and strong connections across different movements histories, experiences, and stories. This is foundational to understanding the global system of exploitation as happening intentionally rather than by chance. Having this solidarity with other organizations [...] helps to give language to the experiences of what you're seeing in the world, why empire must end.

Other organizers posited the ND theory of change through contrasting American methods of reform and electoralism with the ND analysis of mass movement building and united front work.

Uplifting the importance of mass movement building, Min (BAYAN) said:

With US elections coming up again, it's important to know that no matter who you choose, it doesn't matter. It's never mattered. This is me speaking as someone fighting for the

liberation of the Philippines. Change is only possible through organizing and building up the capacity and the consciousness of the people to take back what's rightfully theirs. This is the solution that's the most sustainable, the most viable. [...] Biden and Trump are both people who want to maintain the current system just in different ways. Even though people here may feel trapped in a capitalist society, in that feedback loop, there are actually things changing right now too. With the worsening economic crisis here and another recession, people are fighting back at a different level right now, as the current manifestation of capitalism in the US is even worse than ever before. More and more people are fighting against this, they aren't taking it lying down.

Min's analysis depicts the character of the ND movement as one that is fundamentally disinterested in only parliamentary reform or electoral means, seeing the mass movement as a highly political force to advance revolutionary change, rather than an end in itself. An organizer with Anakbayan spoke similarly, saying:

We can only confront the ruling class if we build power through organizing a unified peoples movement. In the ND movement, we see that the Filipino people need to unite themselves with the majority's interest across sectors and have a vision of what the alternative is that we're seeking to build. It needs to be a brand new thing, not reform. We have to constantly ask ourselves, how are we building up the people's power so that in the near future it can smash the old dying system and create a new one in its place?

The No to APEC Coalition, and more largely, the Filipino mass movement for national democracy, painstakingly build the "broadest front for the narrowest target" by organizing multi-sectoral, multi-national alliances to specifically expose and oppose US imperialism in its many manifestations. Whether that be through expressing their closest solidarity with the Palestinian resistance struggling to end Israel's genocide in Gaza, identifying coalition points of unity, and building a mass movement oriented away from electoralism and reforms and towards revolution and transformative change, organizers are highly strategic in orienting the many 'masses' against the few members of the 'ruling class' in the Philippines, the diaspora, and beyond.



*Peoples' War for People's Peace*

Though organizers identified the geographies of their organizing with Filipino migrants and workers in the diaspora as strictly urban, they continued to uplift the significance of mass movement building across urban/rural contexts in the Philippines. Jill (GABRIELA) spoke:

We have to organize the majority of the population against this form of US imperialism and militarism that serves only the interests of a few. When you ask organizers who are severely impacted in countries like the Philippines it really boils down to that. We have to organize in the cities, inside of factories: condemning increased military production, and fighting for wage increases people need. There also has to be organizing in the countryside with peasants where the vast majority of the population resides...this is also where a lot of the AFP are stationed to quell that organization.

This urban/rural dialectic wherein the organizing in factories, workplaces, neighborhoods churches, and other urban sites of community is complemented by the organizing that is done in the countryside is further teased out as organizers describe the separate, though complementary, role of the armed struggle in the Philippines which they articulate as 'just' and carrying out of a 'peoples' war for peoples' peace.' On the role of armed struggle in the anti-war movement, Nyusha stated:

We need to address the needs of the people while confronting our enemy. We know that all of these are necessary striking blows: legal mass movement building, workers blocking weapons shipments, student movements against anti-imperialism, and people taking up arms for their national liberation struggle. All of these are fronts for the global anti-war movement. We have to think about how we can bring people together on the issues that matter to them and allow them to fight on the terms they're ready to fight on. Imperialism is war, and the solution is resistance in a very concrete sense.

Katie (IWA) offered a concurring opinion, with a focus on international women's' struggles:

How do we make poor and migrant women a voice that cannot be ignored? We build a militant women's movement! This is not so much the case in this country, but women around the world—in the Philippines, India, Myanmar, and other places—are leaving their families to head to take up arms and head to the countryside to confront fascist militaries. Our tactics are different in the belly of the beast, but those women are advancing our liberation too.

Though activists in the imperial core employ different tactics, they identify a continuity in how international advances in anti-imperialist armed struggles advance the local anti-imperialist legal struggle.

Organizers described the recent re-opening of peace talks between the Government of the Republic of the Philippines and the National Democratic Front of the Philippines as another example of the US' push for the Philippines to end the civil war to reorient their military focus externally to oppose China.<sup>162</sup> They were firm in their analysis that the peace talks would not succeed in disarming or dismantling the New People's Army, contending that until the 'root causes' of armed conflict were resolved, the struggle would continue. Jill (GABRIELA) spoke about how imperialist war begets peoples' war:

Ending that kind of violence [militarism] is difficult because, violence is the only language the military will speak. Our organizations understand that there is a civil war that's trying to end the control of the US military, particularly in the countryside. It's an armed struggle that ultimately aims to end imperialist wars. It's hard to say what will end the militarism without getting to the root cause, but fighting back through arms is the only language that the military understands and adheres to.

Interviewees described the US as 'pulling the strings behind the scenes' pushing peace talks between the GRP and NDFP, with US counterinsurgency therefore serving the dual purpose of oppressing the people's armed resistance and increasing US military capacity against China by repositioning the AFP. On this, Min (BAYAN) said:

The defense strategy of the US in their war with China is to start in and from the Philippines where they have the strongest hold, though the people's movement is holding them back. People are trying to protect themselves in the countryside, and who is protecting them? It's not the US. It's the revolutionary forces who are protecting their people from the US and Philippines state forces, people are trying to build a better society from an old, rotten one.

---

<sup>162</sup> Aspinwall, "Prospects shaky for Philippines' government and communist peace talks."

At the No to APEC counter-summit, one organizer with BAYAN described the New People's Army as carrying out the 'highest form of resistance against US imperialism,' emphasizing that though their movements were distinct, they were both forwarding the cause of Filipino liberation in the face of the state repression and inter-imperialist war.<sup>163</sup>

Interviewees emphasized that armed struggle itself is necessitated by virtue of 1) the state's monopoly on violence and enactment of asymmetrical warfare against both combatants and civilian non-combatants, and 2) the economic, social, and political crises that activists describe as the 'root causes' of armed conflict. Cathy (Migrante) synthesized the second point in Tagalog and English, saying '*pag wala na kain, kailangang lumaban ang mga tao para mabuhay,*' or 'when there is no food, people have to fight to survive.'

I think it's important to prioritize the basic needs of the people, jobs with living wages, national industrialization, local businesses rather than foreign investment; services like free healthcare, education, housing; agriculture since the Philippine population are mostly peasants, give them their own land to till; protect the environment, no to mining, land conversion, and military in the countryside. When you address the needs of the people and their empty stomachs, there will not be resistance or armed struggle. Otherwise, people will mobilize and organize themselves. Basic needs *talaga!*<sup>164</sup> Promote national industrialization *para sa mga tao.*<sup>165</sup> Even if they start to address the needs of the people, we will not stop to AOM [arouse, organize, and mobilize] the people and make them aware of what's going on.<sup>166</sup>

To the organizers interviewed, peoples' war and armed struggles for national liberation as both materialist and life affirming causes. Materialist, because organizers see forces like the New People's Army as not only actively resisting, but quantifiably and qualitatively weakening the

---

<sup>163</sup> ND activists resist red-tagging and make the distinction that they are not themselves members of, nor do they take directions from or work in concert with, the CPP-NDF-NPA. They maintain their political support for the CPP-NPA-NDF from the perspective of Filipinos in wholly distinct organizations.

<sup>164</sup> In English, *talaga* translates to "really" and is often used to punctuate or emphasize the statement in question.

<sup>165</sup> In English, *para sa mga tao* translates to "for the people."

<sup>166</sup> Arouse, organize, mobilize (AOM) is a term in the ND movement which refers to how activists conduct political work among the masses.

forces of the comprador state and occupying empire. Life affirming, because activists see armed struggle as an expression of their oppressed peoples' determination to free themselves from their poverty, landlessness, and militarization. One activist referenced Fanon's writing on anticolonial violence in their interview, quoting: "The need for this change exists in its crude state, impetuous and compelling, in the consciousness and in the lives of the men and women who are colonized."<sup>167</sup> While activists unsettle militarist geographies from within the American city, they simultaneously espouse their solidarity with those unsettling state military geographies in the Filipino countryside.

---

<sup>167</sup> Fanon, *The Wretched of the Earth*.

## CHAPTER 6: CONCLUSION

My overarching hypothesis and sub-hypotheses on the nature, character, and orientation of Filipino anti-militarist protest in urban space are largely proven, though further nuanced in great detail, in the seven major findings of this paper. Those hypotheses and sub-hypotheses are that organizers:

- 1) Contest American militarism transnationally by employing their positions as Filipinos in the diaspora and geographic proximity to their target to oppose war spatially and rhetorically within the “belly of the beast;”
- 2) Challenge urban militarism through mass mobilizations that reclaim public space from police and opposing interests;
- 3) See American law enforcement and related security agencies as local agents of the same militarism that devastate their homeland;
- 4) See successful protest interventions in militarized space *within* this country as striking blows to militarized space *outside* of this country; and
- 5) Hold perceptions of militarist structures that closely reflect objective realities of how those militarisms manifest on the ground level;

The findings are, in brief, that organizers:

- 1) View the transformation of San Francisco into a militarized urban zone as an act of counterinsurgency, linking it to militarized counterinsurgency in the Philippines;
- 2) Characterize the city as a space weaponized by the state to impose its class interests, therefore viewing their contestation of space at protests as definitionally antagonistic to the state;
- 3) Advance their solution for working class women around the world as the dismantling of American imperialism in the face of state repression;
- 4) View neoliberalism as a necro-politic fundamentally about death making as it provides an impetus for military expansion and violence;
- 5) View the US as having blurred the line between what is war and what is practice for war, with activists identifying the US as already at war
- 6) Build the broadest front for the narrowest target by organizing multi-sectoral, multinational alliances to expose and oppose US imperialism in all its manifestations;
- 7) View armed struggles for national liberation as a distinct, though necessary cause that both materially advances their cause and is life affirming.

In their socio-spatial and discursive interventions, Filipino activists offer a critical model for transnational movement organizing that adeptly confront the sharpest edges of empire as it flows both to, from, and across the United States/Asia-Pacific military geography.

Today's epoch of neoliberal globalization, austerity, and state repression has manifested such accelerated forms of exploitation in both the metropole and the periphery, that not for the first time, man is "compelled to face with sober senses his real conditions of life, and his relations with his kind," (Marx and Engels 1888). Even within advanced capitalist countries in the West, pro-Palestinian activism has mainstreamed not only the anti-war movement, but the anti-imperialist movement. At the moment of this paper's penning, American workers are withholding their labor in response to the anti-student repression on college campuses leveraged against pro-Palestine student protestors after two nights of terror, violence, and brutality; first from a pro-Israel mob, then from California Highway Patrol, Los Angeles Police Department, and University of California campus police on the University of California, Los Angeles campus.<sup>168 169</sup> Though the US' war on China and the Philippines' geography as a foreign military base have further heightened since this paper's research was gathered, the ND and larger anti-imperialist and Filipino liberation movement have only become more determined in their organizing, building commensurate resistance for the worsening conditions in the nation and in the diaspora.<sup>170 171</sup>

---

<sup>168</sup> Nora Caplan-Bricker, "Reviving the Language of Empire," *Jewish Currents*, May 9, 2024.

<sup>169</sup> Janie Har, "University of California academic workers strike to stand up for pro-Palestinian protesters," *AP News*, May 20, 2024.

<sup>170</sup> An April 2024 trilateral summit between US President Joe Biden, Philippine President Ferdinand Marcos Jr., and Japanese Prime Minister Fumio Kishida resulted in the introduction of the Philippines Enhanced Resilience Act, a Senate proposal for the US to increase security assistance to the Philippines to a total of \$2.5 billion in foreign military financing over the next five years. The three leaders agreed on a "shared vision of a free and open Indo-Pacific," and Biden proposed a \$128 million dollar congressional allocation to fund another 36 projects at EDCA sites. Activists in BAYAN and the Malaya Movement staged several actions in protest of the summit, decrying the leaders for selling out the Filipino people and further militarizing their homeland.

<sup>171</sup> In March 2024, Marcos Jr.'s charter change (also known as cha-cha) initiative to amend the 1987 Philippine Constitution that was reconstituted after the ousting of his father's dictatorship passed in the House. Activists have especially targeted cha-cha's introduction of 100% foreign ownership in the Philippines, relating the further liberalization of the Philippine economy to US military expansionism in the nation.

## *Recommendations*

This paper's recommendations for the professional urban designer or planner are highly limited in scope. Within the field of urban planning, the planner can scarcely be an actor of anti-imperialist or anti-militarist disruption, rather a tacit participant in the ever-heightening militarization of their city at best, and an architect of its violence at worst. Though militarized space exists within the planner's purview—whether that be in housing, on transportation, or in public space—the planner's position as either an agent of the state or a contractor of the state puts them in close collaboration with the police/military apparatus, disciplining space and subjugating the masses as they move through the city (Harvey 1985). For the planner to adopt an antagonistic role to the state and align themselves with the growing global, anti-imperialist, anti-militarist movement, they must emancipate themselves from the formalized discipline of planning and actively challenge not only *who* is the planner, but *what* is planning. If the planner is to extricate themselves from the field of planning and de-professionalize (Dozier 2018), accepting that reform under capitalism is implausible, *where* should the planner go? In carrying out this project, I have hoped to compel the planner to recognize the important geographical, socio-spatial work of the activist/organizer/revolutionary in militarized space—and take up that urgent task.

There are a clear number of necessary courses of action to demilitarize our cities and our nations, all of which have long been demanded by the organizations interviewed in this thesis. The US militarization and occupation of the Philippines, thusly turned inwards in San Francisco to punish public protest and the poor, are not irreversible facts of life and space but phenomena that veer closer and closer to their end every day that conditions worsen, and resistance grows. On a local level, it is demonstrably clear that the proliferation of urban military violence is rooted in the unhindered funding and militarization of local police departments. Though other steps are undoubtedly necessary to dismantle militarism as it is politically and culturally embedded into

every level of government bureaucracy (ex. the whole-of-nation approach to counterinsurgency), defunding and demilitarizing police departments are two actionable policy mechanisms that would have the single largest impact on reducing the scale of military violence in the American city.

On a national and international scale, the purview of the planner grows even slimmer, and I further call on the planner to reject their powerlessness, engender themselves to the role of activist/organizer/revolutionary, and engage with movement demands for an end to militarism and imperialism. Principal to these demands are an end to the US' proxy war on China, an end to unequal military and trade agreements, a stop to the hundreds of war games carried out by US and allied militaries in Philippine lands and waters, and a total withdrawal of US military from the Philippines. Though these demands seem unwieldy or large, they are both highly actionable and non-negotiable. Even smaller scale policy interventions like the introduction of the Philippine Human Rights Act, a House bill seeking to block assistance to GRP police and military forces amidst ongoing human rights violations, would represent a positive step towards demilitarization in the Philippines. Still, because the political will trends towards militarism, imperialism, and capital, organizers affirm the need for a multi-tactical and multi-fronted fight for liberation that includes labor action, mass movement building, and even armed struggle.

### *Future Research*

Outside of academic analyses, the renewed strength of Marxist, anti-imperialist popular movements through Latin America, Africa, and Southeast Asia in nations long ravaged by neoliberal policies demand that we reconsider propositions that Marxism is decaying, unpopular, and dying in the Global South (Della Porta and Tarrow 2005; Spector 2007). The socialist orientation to the ND movement, and other member organizations in the No to APEC coalition, speaks further to this phenomenon. The ground-truthing of the material realities of imperialist



phenomena through critical participatory study of anti-imperialist protest and contestation can be employed to rectify the academic/activist dichotomy that has distanced many activists in the transnational anti-militarist movement from the academy (Chatterton et al. 2010; Kemmis et al. 2014). This work demonstrates the importance of an interdisciplinary, mixed methodological approach to understanding the complex struggles of transnational spatial injustices and demonstrate the growing importance of the insertion of the anti-militarist, anti-imperialist rhetorical framework developed by organizers and critical researchers in the Global South in discussions of neoliberal governance, urban contestation, and military urbanism.

### *Atin ang Pinas*

The title of this paper, *atin ang Pinas*—the Philippines is ours—expresses a sundry of realities and sentiments about today’s era of militarism across the Asia Pacific; from the Philippines to California. *Atin ang Pinas* expresses certain legal truths about national sovereignty and the illegality of American military occupation in the Philippines, factually stating that as a legally independent nation the Philippines *is* ours. *Atin ang pinas* expresses a political and historical truth, warning occupying forces that their nation is ours, and as we have removed military bases from it before we will do it again, with permanence and swiftness. Lastly, *atin ang Pinas* expresses a deep longing that is transnational and sociospatial in nature, striking at the heart of the diaspora Filipino and the Filipino national.

To organizers in the national democratic movement, the Filipino diaspora and the Filipino nation are inextricable, tethered by circumstance, nation, life, and struggle. To the diaspora Filipino living in the United States, separated from their homeland and nation, the statement *atin ang Pinas* is no more true or untrue than it is to the Filipino national, who likewise must struggle fervently for their determination as the Philippines is materially overrun by those who seek to sell it for parts

or weaponize it for capital. Filipinos aspire for a land free of military violence, of war games, of US Marines who murder trans women and get pardoned for it.<sup>172</sup> They aspire for a San Francisco free of gentrification, a war on the poor, and of police who sexually assault female protestors on camera and threaten families with rubber bullets guns. Beyond longing, Filipinos and their allies are fighting for a nation that's theirs. In the home, the workplace, the church, the college campus, and the city street, activists carry out a struggle decades older than them for the chance to free their people and homeland.

---

<sup>172</sup> Gina K. Velasco, *Queer and Trans Necropolitics in the Afterlife of U.S. Empire*, Amerasia Journal Vol. 46, Issue 2, 2020.

## APPENDICES

### *Appendix A: List of Interviewees*

<b>Interview Date</b>	<b>Organization type</b>	<b>Interviewee</b>	<b>Affiliation(s)</b>
February 3 <sup>rd</sup> , 2024	International anti-imperialist coalition	Katie	International Women's Alliance (IWA)
February 3 <sup>rd</sup> , 2024	National Democratic mass organization	Anonymous	Anonymous ND organization based in the SF Bay Area
February 5 <sup>th</sup> , 2024	National Democratic mass organization	Anonymous	Anakbayan Los Angeles
February 6 <sup>th</sup> , 2024	National Democratic mass organization	Min	BAYAN USA, Anakbayan UCLA
February 8 <sup>th</sup> , 2024	International anti-imperialist coalition	Nyusha	International League of People's Struggle (ILPS)
February 8 <sup>th</sup> , 2024	National Democratic mass organization	Jill	GABRIELA USA
February 11 <sup>th</sup> , 2024	National Democratic mass organization	Cathy	Migrante Los Angeles
February 11 <sup>th</sup> , 2024	National Democratic mass organization	Lauren	GABRIELA Los Angeles
February 12 <sup>th</sup> , 2024	Filipino community organization	Megan	Los Angeles Kalusugan Collective
February 12 <sup>th</sup> , 2024	Filipino human rights organization	Anonymous	Malaya Movement

*Appendix B: Interview Questions*

1. Describe your involvement in anti-imperialist/anti-militarist organizing.
2. Describe your involvement with the No to APEC campaign.
3. What are the particular impacts and consequences of APEC that you and your organization opposed?
4. Describe your understanding of the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC) forum.
5. Did you have any experiences in San Francisco for the APEC summit that resembled militarism and/or militarization (encounters with the police, heightened security, etc.)?
6. Describe your understanding of/experience with militarism in the Philippines, or in the broader Asia Pacific.
7. How do you understand the relationship between neoliberal trade agreements and militarization?
8. Describe your understanding of/experience with militarism in the United States.
9. What do you believe are the necessary courses of action to deconstruct structures of militarism, locally and abroad?
10. Do you wish to share any final thoughts or comments related to any of the topics discussed?

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- “Anti-APEC Activists Rally in Manila.” *United Press International*, November 13, 1996.
- “Anti-APEC Protests Take Place in Manila.” *BBC*, November 19, 2015.
- "Foreign Relations of the United States, 1969–1976," Volume XX, Southeast Asia, October 27, 2009.
- “Water Cannon Fired at Anti-APEC Protestors in Manila.” *Al Jazeera*, November 19, 2015.
- Adel, Rosette. “Agreements. Vows Made with Philippines on APEC Sidelines.” *Philippine Star*, November 19, 2015.
- Agence France-Presse. “Genocide Investigation Opened Against Peru President After Protest Deaths.” *The Guardian*, January 10, 2023.
- Aggarwal, Vinod K., and Kun-Chin Lin. “APEC as an Institution.” In *Assessing APEC’s Progress: Trade, Ecotech, and Institutions*, edited by Richard E. Feinberg and Ye Zhao, 2000.
- Agre, Philip E. “Imagining the Next War: Infrastructural Warfare and the Conditions of Democracy.” *UCLA Department of Information Studies* (2001).
- Al-Jazeera. “‘Appalled’: UN Urges Probe into Killing of Philippine Activists.” March 10, 2021.
- Amnesty International. “Philippines: Dangerous Anti-Terror Law Yet Another Setback for Human Rights.” July 3, 2020.
- Anderson, Benedict. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*, rev. ed. London: Verso, 2016.
- Appadurai, Arjun. "Sovereignty without Territoriality: Notes for a Post National Geography." In *Geography of Identity*, edited by Patricia Yeager, 40-58. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press, 1996.
- Asia Pacific Economic Cooperation. “Seoul APEC Declaration.” Accessed November 15, 2023. [https://www.apec.org/meeting-papers/annual-ministerial-meetings/1991/1991\\_amm/annex\\_b\\_seoul\\_apec](https://www.apec.org/meeting-papers/annual-ministerial-meetings/1991/1991_amm/annex_b_seoul_apec).
- Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation. "History." APEC, revised October 2023. <https://www.apec.org/about-us/about-apec/history>.
- Atilas-Osoria, José M. "Neoliberalism, Law, and Strikes: Law as an Instrument of Repression at the University of Puerto Rico, 2010–2011." *Latin American Perspectives* 40, no. 5 (2013): 135-47.

- Ayres, Jeffrey. "Framing Collective Action Against Neoliberalism: The Case of the Anti-Globalization Movement." *Journal of World-Systems Research* 10, no. 1 (2004).
- Balko, Radley. *Rise of the warrior cop: The militarization of America's police forces*. New York: Public Affairs, 2013.
- Barakat, Asma. "Brief: Operation Al-Aqsa Flood." *Institute for Palestine Studies*, October 9, 2023.
- Barnett, Clive. "The Consolations of 'Neoliberalism.'" *Geoforum* 36, no. 1 (2005).
- Bauder, Harald. *Labor Movement: How Migration Regulates Labor Markets*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2006.
- BAYAN USA. "US Out of the Philippines." Instagram, [https://www.instagram.com/bayan\\_usa/p/C6ZZon1vsRF/?img\\_index=1](https://www.instagram.com/bayan_usa/p/C6ZZon1vsRF/?img_index=1). Accessed May 12, 2024.
- Beissinger, Mark R. *The Revolutionary City: Urbanization and the Global Transformation of Rebellion*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2022.
- Bello, Walden. "From American Lake to a People's Pacific." In *Let the Good Times Roll: Prostitution and the US Military in Asia*, edited by Sandra Pollock Sturdevant and Brenda Stolfus, New York: New Press, 1992.
- Bello, Walden. "The Capitalist Conjuncture: Over-accumulation, Financial Crises and the Threat from Globalization." *Third World Quarterly* 27, no. 8 (2006): 1345-1368.
- Berberoglu, Berch. "Social Movements and Transformation in the Age of Globalization: Origins, Dynamics, and Mobilization." *International Review of Modern Sociology* 41, no. 1 (2015): 1-18.
- Betts, Alexander. "Institutional Proliferation and the Global Refugee Regime." *Perspectives on Politics*, 2009.
- Bevins, Vincent. *If We Burn: The Mass Protest Decade and the Missing Revolution*. New York, NY: Public Affairs, 2023.
- Bevins, Vincent. *The Jakarta Method: Washington's Anticommunist Crusade and the Mass Murder Program that Shaped Our World*. New York: Public Affairs, 2020.
- Blackmore, Tim. *War X: Human Extensions in Battlespace*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2005.
- Boas, Taylor C., and Jordan Gans-Morse. "Neoliberalism: From New Liberal Philosophy to Anti-Liberal Slogan." *Studies in Comparative International Development* 44 (2009).

- Bond, Patrick. "Neoliberalism, State Repression and the Rise of Social Protest in Africa." In *The Palgrave Handbook of Social Movements, Revolution, and Social Transformation*, edited by Berch Berberoglu, 105-23. Cham, Switzerland: Palgrave Macmillan, 2018.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. "The Essence of Neoliberalism: What is Neoliberalism? A Program for Destroying Collective Structures which May Impede the Pure Market Logic: Utopia of Endless Exploitation." Paris, France: *Le Monde Diplomatique*, 1998.
- Bove, Vincenzo, and Evelina Gavrilova. "Police Officer on the Frontline or a Soldier? The Effect of Police Militarization on Crime." *American Economic Journal: Economic Policy* 9, no. 3 (2017).
- Brand, Ulrich, and Markus Wissen. "Neoliberal Globalization and the Internationalization of Protest: A European Perspective." *Antipode* 37, no. 1 (2005): 11-29.
- Brand, Ulrich. "The World Wide Web of Anti-Neoliberalism: Emerging Forms of Post-Fordist Protest and the Impossibility of Global Keynesianism." In *Neoliberal Hegemony: A Global Critique*, edited by Dieter Plehwe, Bernhard Walpen, and Gisela Neunhöffer. Oxfordshire: Taylor and Francis, 2006.
- Bukharin, Nikolai. *Imperialism and World Economy*. Moscow, Russia: 1915.
- Camp, Jordan, and Jennifer Greenburg. "Counterinsurgency Reexamined: Racism, Capitalism, and US Military Doctrine." *Antipode* 52, no. 2 (2020): 407-427.
- Campbell, D.J., and K.M. Campbell. "Soldiers as Police Officers/Police Officers as Soldiers: Role Evolution and Revolution in the United States." *Armed Forces and Society* 36, no. 2 (2009).
- Cancel RIMPAC. Instagram, <https://www.instagram.com/cancelrimpaccampaign>. Accessed May 28, 2024.
- Caplan-Bricker, Nora. "Reviving the Language of Empire." *Jewish Currents*, May 9, 2024.
- Chao, Julie. "Second Front: Waiting for the War to Begin." *Manila Bulletin*, March 10, 2002.
- Chapple, Karen, and Miriam Zuk. *Case Studies on Gentrification and Displacement in the San Francisco Bay Area*. Center for Community Innovation, University of California, Berkeley, 2015.
- Chatterjee, Partha. *The Nation and Its Fragments: Colonial and Postcolonial Histories*. New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1993.
- Chatterton, Paul, Stuart Hodkinson, and Jenny Pickerill. "Beyond Scholar Activism: Making Strategic Interventions Inside and Outside the Neoliberal University." *ACME: An International E-Journal for Critical Geographies* 9, no. 2 (2010).

- Chou, Elizabeth. "'A good start, five months later:' Historic Filipinotown residents push for Inside Safe promises to be kept." *Los Angeles Public Press*, March 26, 2024.
- Choudry, Aziz. "APEC's Thriller in Manila." Queensland Australia: *Kasama* Vol. 11, No. 2, April-May-June 1997.
- Choudry, Aziz. *NGOs, Social Movements and Anti-APEC Activism: A Study in Power, Knowledge and Struggle*. PhD thesis, Concordia University, 2008.
- Clarke, John. "Living with/in and without Neo-liberalism." *Focaal: Journal of Global and Historical Anthropology*, 2008.
- Collet, Christian, and Pei-Te Lien. *The Transnational Politics of Asian Americans*. Temple University Press, 2009.
- Crouch, Colin. *The Strange Non-Death of Neoliberalism*. Cambridge, UK: Polity, 2011.
- Cummings, Peter. "Democracy and Student Discontent: Chilean Student Protest in the Post-Pinochet Era." *Journal of Politics in Latin America* 7, no. 3 (2015): 123-38.
- Custodio, Jose Antonio. "A Study on the Battle for the Liberation of Manila." Quezon City: The Manila Studies Association, 2004.
- Dalton, Russell, Manfred Kuechler, and Wilhelm Burklin. "The Challenge of New Movements." In *Comparative Politics: Western Europe and the United States: Foundations of Comparative Politics*, edited by Howard J. Wiarda, 85-105. Oxfordshire: Taylor and Francis, 2005.
- De Castro, Renato Cruz. "Abstract of Counter-Insurgency in the Philippines and the Global War on Terror: Examining the Dynamics of the Twenty-first Century Long Wars." *European Journal of East Asian Studies* 9, no. 1 (2010): 135-160.
- De Genova, Nicholas. "Migrant 'Illegality' and Deportability in Everyday Life." *Annual Review of Anthropology* 31 (2002): 419-447.
- Delehanty, Casey, Jack Mewhirter, Ryan Welch, and Jason Wilks. " Militarization and Police Violence: The Case of the 1033 Program." *SAGE Publications Limited*, 2017.
- Delgado Wise, Raul. *The Migration and Labor Question Today: Imperialism, Unequal Development, and Forced Migration*. New York: Monthly Review, 2013.
- Della Porta, Donatella, and Sidney Tarrow. *Transnational Protest and Global Activism*. New York: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, Inc., 2005.
- Della Porta, Donatella, Mario Diani, and Lynn Mastellotto. "No to the War with No Ifs or Buts: Protests Against the War in Iraq." *Italian Politics* 19 (2003): 191-210.



- DeYoung, Karen, and Rebecca Tan. "U.S. Reaches Military Base Access Agreement in the Philippines." *The Washington Post*, February 2, 2023.
- Dimitrov, Georgi. *Selected Work Volume 2*. Sofia, Bulgaria: Sofia Press, 1972.
- Dozier, Deshonay. "A Response to Abolitionist Planning: There is No Room for 'Planners' in the Movement for Abolition." *Planners Network*, August 9, 2018.
- Eade, John, and Michael J. Sallnow. *Contesting the Sacred: The Anthropology of Christian Pilgrimage*. London, UK: Routledge, 2001.
- Elyachar, Julia. "Before (and After) Neoliberalism: Tacit Knowledge, Secrets of the Trade, and the Public Sector in Egypt." *Cultural Anthropology* 27 (2012): 76-96.
- Fanon, Frantz. *The Wretched of the Earth*. New York: Grove Press, 1963.
- Farish, Matthew. "Militarization." In *The Ashgate Research Companion to Critical Geopolitics*, edited by Klaus Dodds, Merje Kuus, and Joanne Sharp, London, UK: Routledge, 2016.
- Fishkin, Shelley Fisher. *Crossroads of Cultures: The Transnational Turn in American Studies: Presidential Address to the American Studies Association*. Johns Hopkins University Press, March 2005.
- Flounders, Sara. "Philippine-U.S. War Games Threaten China." *Workers World*, April 19, 2023.
- Francia, Luis. *A History of the Philippines: From Indio Bravos to Filipinos*. New York: Overlook Press, 2010.
- Fregonese, Sara. "The urbicide of Beirut? Geopolitics and the built environment in the Lebanese civil war (1975-1976)." *Political Geography* 28, no. 5 (2009).
- GABRIELA Los Angeles. "Women's bodies are not a 'welcoming mat' for the APEC elite!" Instagram, [https://www.instagram.com/p/CzrWnvUAAGx/?img\\_index=1](https://www.instagram.com/p/CzrWnvUAAGx/?img_index=1). Accessed April 3, 2024.
- Gani, Jasmine, and Rabea Khan. "Positionality Statements as a Function of Coloniality: Interrogating Reflexive Methodologies." *International Studies Quarterly* 68, no. 2 (June 2024).
- Giraldo, Marion, and Natalia A. Ramos Miranda. "Chile Cancels APEC Trade Summit and Major Climate Gathering After Riots." *Reuters*, October 30, 2019.
- González-Sánchez, Ignacio, and Manuel Maroto-Calatayud. "The Penalization of Protest under Neoliberalism: Managing Resistance through Punishment." *Crime, Law, and Social Change* 70, no. 3 (2018): 231-48.
- Graham, Stephen. "Cities as Battlespace: The New Military Urbanism." *City* 13:4 (2009).

- Graham, Stephen. "Postmortem City: Towards an Urban Geopolitics," *City* 8, no. 1 (2004).
- Gregory, Derek, and John Urry. *Social Relations and Spatial Structures*. New York, NY: St. Martin's Press, 1985.
- Guidry, John, Michael D. Kennedy, and Mayer Zald. *Globalizations and Social Movements: Culture, Power, and the Transnational Public Sphere*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press, 2000.
- Gürcan, Efe Can. *Imperialism after the Neoliberal Turn*. London: Routledge, 2022.
- Har, Janie. "University of California academic workers strike to stand up for pro-Palestinian protesters." *AP News*, May 20, 2024.
- Harvey, David. "Neoliberalism as Creative Destruction." *Geografiska Annaler: Series B, Human Geography* 88, no. 2 (2006): 145-58.
- Harvey, David. "The 'New' Imperialism: Accumulation by Dispossession." *Socialist Register* 40 (2004): 63-87.
- Harvey, David. *A Brief History of Neoliberalism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.
- Harvey, David. *Spaces of Capital: Towards a Critical Geography*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2001.
- Harvey, David. *The Urbanization of Capital: Studies in the History and Theory of Capitalist Urbanization*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1985.
- Herr, Kathryn, and Gary L. Anderson. *The Action Research Dissertation: A Guide for Students and Faculty*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc, 2005.
- Hilferding, Rudolf. *Finance Capital: A Study of the Latest Phase of Capitalist Development*. Vienna, Austria: 1910.
- Human Rights Watch. "Philippines: Mass Arrests Before APEC Summit." November 15, 2015.
- Ibon Foundation. "US Aid Increasing Under Duterte." July 3, 2019.
- Ileto, Reynaldo C. "The 'Unfinished Revolution' in Philippine Political Discourse." *Southeast Asian Studies* 31, no. 1 (June 1993): 21-59.
- Imbong, Regletto Aldrich. *Authoritarian Disaster: The Duterte Regime and the Prospects for a Marcos Presidency*. New York: Nova Science Publishers, 2023.
- Institute of Political Economy. *Lenin's Imperialism in the 21st Century*. Manila, Philippines: IBON Center, 2017.

- International League of People's Struggle United States. "No to APEC Coalition." Website, <https://ilpsusinfo.wordpress.com/no2apec/>. Accessed May 12, 2024.
- Jeong, Sophie, and Brad Lendon. "Philippines Renews Key Military Agreement with the United States." *CNN*, July 30, 2021.
- Johnson, Howard, and Christopher Giles. "Philippines Drug War: Do We Know How Many Have Died?" *BBC*, November 12, 2019.
- Jung, Moon-Ho. *Menace to Empire: Anticolonial Solidarities and the Transpacific Origins of the US Security State*. Oakland: University of California Press, 2022.
- Karapatan. "Karapatan to Marcos Jr.: Stop the Killings, Justice for the Victims." December 8, 2023. [https://www.karapatan.org/media\\_release/karapatan-to-marcos-jr-stop-the-killings-justice-for-the-victims/](https://www.karapatan.org/media_release/karapatan-to-marcos-jr-stop-the-killings-justice-for-the-victims/).
- Kemmis, Stephen, Robin McTaggart, and Rhonda Nixon. *The Action Research Planner: Doing Critical Participatory Action Research*. New York, NY: Springer, 2014.
- Kerkvliet, Benedict J. *The Huk Rebellion: A Study of Peasant Revolt in the Philippines*. Lanham, MD: Rowan & Littlefield, 1977.
- Kingfisher, Catherine, and Jeff Maskovsky. "Introduction: The Limits of Neoliberalism." *Critique of Anthropology* 28, no. 2 (2008).
- Kirk, Gwyn, and Carolyn Bowen Francis. "Redefining Security: Women Challenge U.S. Military Policy and Practice in East Asia." *Berkeley Women's Law Journal* 15 (2000): 229-270.
- Kirk, Gwyn, and Margo Okazawa-Rey. "Demilitarizing Security: Women Oppose U.S. Militarism in East Asia." In *Frontline Feminisms: Women, War, and Resistance*, edited by Marguerite R. Waller and Jennifer Rycenga, Philadelphia, PA: Routledge, 2000.
- Kramer, Paul A. "Race-Making and Colonial Violence in the US Empire: The Philippine-American War as Race War." *Diplomatic History* 30, no. 2 (April 2006): 169-210.
- Kraska, Peter. "Militarization and Policing—Its Relevance to 21st Century Police." *Policing: A Journal of Policy and Practice* 1, no. 4 (2007).
- Krepinevich, Andrew F., Jr. *Archipelagic Defense 2.0*. Washington, D.C.: Hudson Institute, 2023.
- Lacsamana, Anne E. "Invisible Battlegrounds: Feminist Resistance in the Global Age of War and Imperialism." *Works and Days* 57/58, 29, nos. 1 & 2 (2010): 209-217.
- Lamb, Jonah Owen. "APEC Summit in San Francisco: Secret Service Will Lead Security Amid Fears of Attacks." *SF Standard*, August 3, 2023.

- Lee, Christopher. "Diaspora, Transnationalism, and Asian American Studies: Positions and Debates" in *Displacements and Diasporas: Asians in the Americas*, edited by Wanni W. Anderson and Robert G. Lee. Ithaca, NY: Rutgers University Press, 2005.
- Lefebvre, Henri. *The Production of Space*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1991.
- Lema, Karen. "Philippines Reveals Locations of 4 New Strategic Sites for U.S. Military Pact." *Reuters*, April 3, 2023.
- Lenin, Vladimir Ilyich. *Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism*. Petrograd, Russia: 1917.
- Lozada, David. "Thousands Hold Protest in Manila as APEC Leaders Meet." *Rappler*, November 19, 2015.
- Lutz, Catherine, ed. *The Bases of Empire: The Global Struggle Against U.S. Military Posts*. New York: New York University Press, 2009.
- Luxemburg, Rosa. *The Accumulation of Capital: A Contribution to an Economic Explanation of Imperialism*. Berlin, Germany: 1913.
- Macaraig, Ayee. "APEC What? An Explainer on Manila's High-profile Week." *Rappler*, November 11, 2015.
- Maeda, Daryl Joji. *The Asian American Movement*. Oxford Research Encyclopedias, June 2016.
- Malaya Movement. "Malaya Movement USA's statement on sexual assault by SFPD at APEC." Instagram, <https://www.instagram.com/p/C0ViCi1rpFB/?igsh=MzRIODBiNWFIZA==>. Accessed April 3, 2024.
- Mayer, Margit. "Contesting the Neoliberalization of Urban Governance." In *Contesting Neoliberalism: Urban Frontiers*. New York, NY: Guilford Press, 2007.
- Mazumdar, Sucheta. *Asian American Studies and Asian Studies: Rethinking Roots*. Pullman, WA: Washington State University Press, 1991.
- Mello, Patrick A., and Falk Ostermann. *Routledge Handbook of Foreign Policy Analysis Methods*. United Kingdom: Taylor & Francis, 2022.
- Milić, Slobodan. "Neoliberalism as a New Imperialism." *Mianu-Science and Practice, Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities* 1, no. 1 (2021).
- Miller, Byron. *Spaces of Contention: Spatialities and Social Movements*. London, UK: Routledge, 2016.
- Mirowski, Philip. *Never Let a Serious Crisis Go to Waste: How Neoliberalism Survived the Financial Meltdown*. New York, NY: Verso, 2013.

- Mitchell, Don. "People's Park again: on the ends and ends of public space." *Environment and Planning: Economy and Space*, Volume 49, Issue 3, 2016.
- Morley, Ian. *Cities and Nationhood: American Imperialism and Urban Design in the Philippines, 1898-1916*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2018.
- Morrissey, Mike, and Frank Gaffikin. "Planning for Peace in Contested Space." *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 30, no. 4 (2006): 870-81.
- Newman, David. "Borders and Bordering: Towards an Interdisciplinary Dialogue." *European Journal of Social Theory* 9, no. 2 (2006).
- No to APEC Coalition. "Statement of the No to APEC Coalition." Public statement, July 11, 2023.
- No to APEC. "No to APEC Coalition Rejects Militarized Conference Prep in SF." Public statement, September 2023.
- Nowak, Jörg, and Alexander Gallas. "Mass Strikes Against Austerity in Western Europe: A Strategic Assessment." *Global Labour Journal* 5, no. 3 (2014): 239-63.
- Nubudere, Dan. *The Political Economy of Imperialism: Its Theoretical and Polemical Treatment from Mercantilist to Multilateral Imperialism*. London, UK: Zed Press, 1978.
- Oishi, Nana. *Women in Motion: Globalization, State Policies, and Labor Migration in Asia*. Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University Press, 2005.
- Pagaduan-Araullo, Carol. "Lessons from September 16." *Bulatlat*, September 22, 2011.
- Palmer, Deborah, and Blanca Caldas. "Critical Ethnography." In *Research Methods in Language and Education*, edited by Kendall King, Yi-Ju Lai, and Stephen May, Encyclopedia of Language and Education, New York City: Springer, 2015.
- Persico, Connell Francis. *The Student Movement and Institutional Disruption: A Historical Case Study of San Francisco State College*. Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University ProQuest, 1974.
- Petras, James, and Henry Veltmeyer. "Neoliberalism and Imperialism in Latin America: Dynamics and Responses." *International Review* (2007).
- Pile, Steven, and Michael Keith, eds. *Geographies of Resistance*. London, UK: Routledge, 1997.
- Pillow, Wanda. "Dangerous Reflexivity: Rigour, Responsibility and Reflexivity in Qualitative Research." In *The Routledge Doctoral Student's Companion*, edited by Thomson and Walker, London: Routledge, 2010.

- Quimba, Francis, and Mark Barral. *The Evolution of APEC and its Role in the Philippine Trade and Investment*. Quezon City, Philippines: Philippine Institute for Development Studies, 2019.
- Radics, George Baylon. "Terrorism in Southeast Asia: Balikatan Exercises in the Philippines and the US 'War Against Terrorism'." *Stanford Journal of East Asian Affairs* 4, no. 1 (2004): 122-135.
- Rokem, Jonathan and Boano, Camillo. *Urban Geopolitics: Rethinking Planning in Contested Cities*. Oxfordshire: Routledge, 2018.
- Ryan, Maria. "'War in countries we are not at war with': The 'War on Terror' on the Periphery from Bush to Obama." *International Politics* 48, no. 2/3 (2011): 364-389.
- Sakai, Naoki. "Imperial Nationalism and the Comparative Perspective." *Positions Asia Critique* 17, no. 1 (2009).
- Salamat, Marya. "The Blood in Your Coffee (and Milk) Thickens: Nestlé Replaces Union on Strike, Continues to Flout SC Decision." *Bulatlat*, May 8, 2010.
- Sales, Joy. "'Activism is not a Crime': Confronting Counterinsurgency in the Filipino Diaspora." *The Journal of American-East Asian Relations* 29, no. 3 (2022): 246-271.
- Sandercock, Leonie. *Towards Cosmopolis: Planning for Multicultural Cities*. London, UK: Wiley, 1998
- Sassen, Saskia. "When the City Itself Becomes a Technology of War." *Theory Culture and Society* 27 no. 6 (2010).
- Schirmer, Daniel B. "VFA: Shape of Things to Come?" <http://www.boondocksnet.com/centennial/sctexts>.
- Schirmer, Daniel B., and Steven Rosskamm Shalom, eds. *The Philippines Reader: A History of Colonialism, Neocolonialism, Dictatorship, and Resistance*. Boston: South End Press, 1987.
- Scrap VFA! Movement. "About." <https://scrapvfamovement.wordpress.com/about>.
- Sethi, Aarti. "One Year Later: Reflections on the Farmers' Protest in India." *Journal of Ethnographic Theory* 11, no. 2 (2021): 102-19.
- Shambaugh, David. "Assessing the US 'Pivot' to Asia." *Strategic Studies Quarterly* 7, no. 2 (2013): 10-19.
- Shaw, Martin. "New Wars of the City: 'Urbicide' and 'Genocide'." *Cities, War, and Terrorism: Towards an Urban Geopolitics*, 2004.

- Shigematsu, Setsu, and Keith L. Camacho, eds. *Militarized Currents: Toward a Decolonized Future in Asia and the Pacific*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press, 2010.
- Sidaway, James D. "Shadows on the path: Negotiating geopolitics on an urban section of Britain's Southwest West Coast path." *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 27 (2009).
- Simbulan, Roland G. "People's Movement Responses to Evolving U.S. Military in the Philippines." In *The Bases of Empire: The Global Struggle Against U.S. Military Posts*, edited by Catherine Lutz, 147-163. New York: New York University Press, 2009.
- Sjostedt, David. "San Francisco 'cleaned up' streets ahead of APEC. But how and what, exactly, did it do?" *The San Francisco Standard*, November 14, 2023.
- Soja, Edward. *Thirdspace: Journeys to Los Angeles and Other Real-and-Imagined Places*. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley-Blackwell, 1996.
- Soyini, Madison D. *Critical Ethnography: Method, Ethics, and Performance*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc., 2005.
- Spanu, Giacomo. "Urban military geographies: New directions in the (re)production of space, militarism, and the urban." *Geography Compass* Vol. 17, Issue 12 (2023).
- Spector, Alan J. "Globalization or Imperialism? Neoliberal Globalization in the Age of Capitalism Imperialism." *International Review of Modern Sociology* 33, Special Issue (2007).
- Springer, Simon, Kean Birch, and Julie MacLeavy, eds. *The Handbook of Neoliberalism*. United Kingdom: Routledge, 2016.
- Stolte, Carolien. "Social and Political Movements: Experiments in Anti-Imperialist Mobilization." In *Explorations in History and Globalization*, edited by Cátia Antunes and Karwan Fatah-Black, 120-40. London, UK: Routledge, 2016.
- Stop LAPD Spying Coalition. *Before The Bullet Hits The Body: Dismantling Predictive Policing in Los Angeles*, 2018.
- Sturdevant, Sandra Pollock, and Brenda Stolzhus, eds. *Let the Good Times Roll: Prostitution and the U.S. Military in Asia*. New York: New Press, 1992.
- Suarez, Theresa Cenidoza. *The Language of Militarism: Engendering Filipino Masculinity in the U.S. Empire*. University of California, San Diego ProQuest, 2008.
- Tanaka, Yuki. *Japan's Comfort Women: Sexual Slavery and Prostitution during World War II and the US Occupation*. London, UK: Routledge, 2001.

- Tarrow, Sidney. *Struggle, Politics, and Reform: Collective Action, Social Movements, and Cycles of Protest*. Ithaca, NY: Center for International Studies, Cornell University, 1989.
- Truong, Kevin, and Jonah Owen Lamb. "San Francisco strip clubs, pot shops roll out welcome mat for APEC." *The San Francisco Standard*, November 11, 2023.
- Tujan Jr., Antonio. "The Second Century of Imperialism: Neoliberal 'Globalization' and Permanent War Project of Monopoly Capital." In *Lenin's Imperialism in the 21st Century*, edited by Institute of Political Economy. Manila, Philippines: IBON Center, 2017.
- U.S. Department of Commerce. "Commerce Department Launches the Indo-Pacific Economic Framework for Prosperity (IPEF) Upskilling Initiative." Accessed March 25, 2024. <https://www.commerce.gov/news/press-releases/2022/09/commerce-department-launches-indo-pacific-economic-framework-prosperity>.
- U.S. Department of Commerce. "Indo-Pacific Economic Framework." <https://www.commerce.gov/ipef>. Accessed January 4, 2024.
- U.S. Department of Defense. "Philippines, U.S. Announce Locations of Four New EDCA Sites." Press release, April 3, 2023.
- U.S. Department of Defense. *Mutual Logistics Support Agreement*. Manila, 2002.
- U.S. Department of State. "Agreement Between the United States of America and the Philippines." In *Treaties and Other International Acts Series 14-625*, April 28, 2014.
- U.S. Department of State. *Agreement Between the United States of America and the Philippines*. Manila: Treaties and Other International Acts Series 12931, 1998.
- United Nations Human Rights Office of the High Commissioner. "Philippines: UN Report Details Widespread Human Rights Violations and Persistent Impunity." June 2020.
- United States Senate. *Agreement Between the Republic of the Philippines and the United States of America Concerning Military Bases*. Washington, D.C., 1947.
- United States Senate. *Mutual Defense Treaty Between the United States and the Republic of the Philippines*. Washington, D.C., 1951.
- Velasco, Gina K. "Queer and Trans Necropolitics in the Afterlife of U.S. Empire." *Amerasia Journal* Vol. 46, Issue 2, 2020.
- Veltmeyer, Henry, James Petras, and Steve Vieux. *Neoliberalism and Class Conflict in Latin America: A Comparative Perspective on the Political Economy of Structural Adjustment*. London, UK: MacMillan Press Ltd., 1997.
- Venugopal, Rajesh. "Neoliberalism as Concept." *Economy and Society* 44, no. 2 (2015): 165–87.



- Warren, Jonathan W., and France Winddance Twine. "White Americans, the New Minority?: Non-Blacks and the Ever-Expanding Boundaries of Whiteness." *Journal of Black Studies* 28, no. 2 (1997).
- Weizman, Eyal. *Hollow Land: Israel's Architecture of Occupation*. New York: Verso, 2017.
- Welch, Richard E. "American Atrocities in the Philippines: The Indictment and the Response." *Pacific Historical Review* 43, no. 2 (1974): 233–53.
- Westerman, Ashley. "The U.S. and the Philippines Agree to a Larger American Military Presence." *NPR*, February 2, 2023.
- Wong, Sau-Ling C. *Denationalization Reconsidered: Asian American Cultural Criticism at a Theoretical Crossroads*. Los Angeles, CA: Amerasia Journal, 1995.
- Yacobi, Haim. "Towards urban geopolitics." *Geopolitics* 14(3) (2009),
- Yin, Robert K. *Case Study Research: Design and Methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc., 2003.
- Zeidler, Maryse. "We Were at This Tipping Point': APEC Protests at UBC Continue to Shape Politics 20 Years Later." *CBC Canada*, November 25, 2017.