

TITLE: Ferdinand Marcos & Nicolae Ceausescu

Subtopic: Mass Movements in the Cold war Era

Author: Author: Doug Kotlarczyk, History Teacher, Lake Forest High School, Lake Forest, IL

Course: World History

Additional Resources Used: *Ferdinand Marcos* handout; *Ferdinand Marcos Dilemma Discussion Teacher Guide*

Lesson Objective: Students will be able to compare & contrast communist vs. capitalist dictators in the Cold War era

Method/Activities: A brief introductory talk on the Ceausescu regime in Romania will be followed by a student-led discussion on whether the U.S. should have continued to support the Marcos regime at the outbreak of the EDSA protests.

Assessment: On the basis of student contributions to the discussion

Procedures:

Before the Lesson:	
What the teacher will be doing:	What the students will be doing:
Arrange room for discussion	Read <i>Ferdinand Marcos</i> handout

During the Lesson:	
What the teacher will be doing:	What the students will be doing:
<p>Set Induction: Discuss Nicolae Ceaușescu, Communist dictator of Romania. He restricted civil liberties, including freedom of speech and the press (every typewriter in the country had to be registered with the secret police, so the author of anything subversive could be tracked down), imprisoned and executed political opponents, and a rumored 1 in 8 Romanians either was employed by or was a paid informant for the secret police.</p> <p>He was exactly the sort of leader that the US fought the Cold War to limit the powers of.</p> <p>In December of 1989, massive street protests broke out against Ceaușescu’s repressive regime.</p>	<p>Set Induction: Listen.</p>

Body of the lesson:	Body of the lesson:
<p>Phase 1: Point out that much of what Ceaușescu did was similar to what Marcos did, based on students' reading from the previous night.</p> <p>Ask students to respond to the question from the previous night's reading—should the US have continued to support the Marcos regime in the face of the EDSA Avenue protests?</p> <p>This should spark a student-led discussion on US support for Marcos. Feel free to intervene, using the <i>Teacher's Guide</i> to spur students to higher levels of Kohlbergian moral reasoning (if conversation is flagging, respond to the last student comment with a question from that Guide for the opposite side, but on a higher level).</p> <p>Normally, in a full period dilemma discussion, the discussion will corkscrew its way up the ladder several times.</p> <p>Evaluate student participation in discussions based on a discussion rubric (previously distributed to students. Suggested criteria include participation, use of evidence, and response to other students' comments).</p>	<p>Phase 1: Discuss.</p>
<p>Conclusion: Point out that in the end, the US did not support the Marcos regime, and the troops that the military was massing to attack the protesters ended up defecting and joining the protesters. Marcos himself fled to Hawaii, where he died peacefully 3 years later.</p> <p>Ceaușescu on the other hand—the Communist dictator from the set induction—also ordered his troops to attack. Some did, others defected—there was pitched fighting in the streets of Bucharest. Eventually, Ceaușescu eventually tried to flee, too, but was captured and executed by a military tribunal on Christmas Eve, 1989.</p>	<p>Conclusion: Listen.</p>

Standards:

Common Core State Standards

<http://www.corestandards.org/ELA-Literacy/RH/introduction>

Standard: CCSS.ELA-Literacy.SL.9-10.1.c: Propel conversations by posing and responding to questions that relate the current discussion to broader themes or larger ideas; actively incorporate others into the discussion; and clarify, verify, or challenge ideas and conclusions.

How This Lesson Meets the Standard: This lesson is a student-led discussion.

Ferdinand Marcos

The Philippines has been a US colony and/or ally since 1901. Filipino soldiers fought with American troops in all of the US's East Asian conflicts since the middle of the 20th century—World War 2, the Korean War, and the Vietnam War. The Philippines remained in the US bloc during the Cold War.

In 1966, Ferdinand Marcos was elected president of the Philippines. He was re-elected in 1969—the first Philippine president ever to be elected to a 2nd term. According to the Philippine Constitution, no one was permitted to serve more than 2 terms as president. Because of a Communist rebellion in the Philippines, however, President Marcos declared martial law in 1972, allowing him to continue to serve as president beyond the Constitutional limit. Ruling by decree, he curtailed press freedom and other civil liberties, closed down Congress and media establishments, and ordered the arrest of opposition leaders.

Between 1972 and 1976, Marcos increased the size of the Philippine military from 65,000 to 270,000 personnel. Military officers were placed on the boards of a variety of media corporations, public utilities, development projects, and other private corporations.

During his martial law regime, Marcos confiscated and appropriated many businesses and institutions, both private and public, and redistributed them to his own family members and close personal friends. Marcos also silenced the free press.

After putting in force amendments to the constitution, President Marcos lifted martial law on January 17, 1981, but Marcos retained many of his emergency powers. The opposition dubbed the lifting of martial law as a mere "face lifting" as a precondition to the visit of Pope John Paul II, and refused to participate in the election Marcos held six months later. Marcos was overwhelmingly re-elected.

In August of 1983, opposition leader Benigno Aquino, Jr. returned to the Philippines after a long exile in the United States. He was shot and killed at the airport as he was exiting from the plane. The Marcos regime denied responsibility.

By 1985, Marcos had made little progress against the Communist insurgency (it was in fact growing due to the heavy-handed measures of the martial law era), and was facing increasing pressure from the American government, so he called for a "snap election" (an election with little notice) to legitimize his authority. Although the government Commission on Elections declared Marcos the winner by over 1 million votes, an opposition poll-watching group said the opposition had won by almost 800,000 votes.

The election was widely viewed as fraudulent in the Philippines, and massive street protests broke out on EDSA Avenue in Manila (the capital). The military is massing soldiers just outside of Manila.

Both during the Martial Law period and after, the Philippines under Marcos has remained a staunch U.S. ally and a strong force for anti-communism in the region. From the declaration of martial law in 1972 until 1983 the U.S. government provided \$2.5 billion in military and economic aid to the Marcos regime, and about \$5.5 billion through institutions such as the World Bank.

Should the US continue to support the Marcos regime in the face of the EDSA protests? Write your answer in the space below—you must answer yes or no—and at least one reason why.

Ferdinand Marcos Dilemma Discussion: Teacher’s Guide

Dilemma Question: *Should the United States continue to support the Marcos regime?*

	Yes	No
Stage 2: Self-Interest	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Marcos is anti-communist - Marcos has been a loyal ally to the US, and the US needs to return the favor. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Support of democratic principles will look good internationally. - The Filipino people have been allies to the US for a long time and the US owes them a democratic government.
Stage 3: Good Boy/Good Girl	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The protestors are breaking the law anyway. Why should the US encourage people to break the law? - The protestors may be communists like the rebels Marcos is fighting. A communist regime would not be any better than the Marcos regime—look at Ceaușescu in Romania. He was even worse. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - As a dictator who does not respect civil liberties, Marcos is not behaving as a leader should. What is the Cold War even being fought for if the “good guys” are people like this? - Marcos is massing his troops to attack his own citizens. This is also not a good act.
Stage 4: Maintain social order	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - What happens to Cold War alliance system if US does not stay loyal to its allies? - Many people are protesting, but do they represent a majority of the population? How big does a protest have to be before it’s sufficient to overthrow a government? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The US-led bloc is supposed to represent democratic values. Supporting the Marcos regime in the face of popular opposition undermines the entire Western position in the Cold War. - If Marcos’s rule is increasing participation in the Communist rebellion, removing him from power would actually <i>improve</i> the social order.
Stage 5: Social Contract/ Individual Rights	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Marcos won the election. If his opponents have proof that he cheated, they need to produce it. Otherwise, isn’t this just sour grapes? - Isn’t anti-communism & respect for private property one of the 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Even if the Marcos regime is stable, it is a bad regime. Is this society worth maintaining at this cost to human rights? - Benjamin Franklin: “Rebellion to

fundamental rights that ought to be respected?

tyrants is obedience to God.” No?