



When Marcos was elected President in 1965, the Philippines still had a colonial economy. He moved to establish food self-sufficiency, which brought him into conflict with the landed aristocracy left over from the Spanish imperial era. "Marcos was the first President of the Philippines who did not rise from this elite class, but was a 'commoner' trained as a lawyer." Here, a shantytown in Manila.

Philippines in August 1983 after three years in the United States. He was gunned down as he emerged from his plane in Manila.

Although the actual conspirators were never officially discovered, the assassination was immediately blamed on Marcos, and the economic hit men called in the "jackals" (as Perkins called those whose job was to depose or even kill world leaders who resisted the demands of the economic hit

men like himself). In the Philippines, Shultz and Wolfowitz doubled as economic hit men and jackals.

As to Aquino's view of the pending threat to his life, he had been asked by the U.S. magazine *Mother Jones* in January 1983, while contemplating his return to the Philippines: "What do you think Marcos will do?" Aquino replied: "He will keep me alive, because he knows the moment I die, I am a martyr, like Martin Luther King, and he wouldn't want that.

Why Marcos Was a Target Of the Economic Hit Men

President Ferdinand Marcos authored a book in 1983 entitled An Ideology for the Philippines. The following excerpt exemplifies why Marcos was a target of the Economic Hit Men:

The Western philosophical tradition locates man's uniqueness in his rationality: It defines man as a rational animal. The idea of man does not necessarily lead to the philosophy of humanism, for the concept of rationality could be construed mechanistically: as a movement of thought that follows a set of inflexible principles. The Cartesian conception of reason is mechanistic in this sense. For it regards thinking as something that can be pursued only in one way:

beginning with clear and distinct notions, the mind moves forward, step by step, following only the dictates of logic. What Cartesianism overlooks is that element of creativity so essential to the concept of human rationality. The recognition of man's creativity, or that impulse to create new forms and new modes of coping with the demands of reality, has tremendous implications—not only for a philosophy of man but also for social policy and thus for ideology.

In a sense, we can regard the history of civilization as the history of human creativity. The so-called scientific revolutions represent man's disengagement from traditional modes of thinking. . . .

The humanistic thrust of our ideology precisely takes into account the fact that apart from being rational, in the Cartesian sense of the term, man has a gift of creativity that expresses itself not only in his art but also in his science and social institutions. This creativity is what makes man truly human. In fact, it seems more appropriate to define man *not* as a rational animal but as a creative being.