

EIRSpecialReport

The Philippines: Henry Kissinger's next Iran

by Fernando Quijano

The assassination of opposition leader Benigno Aquino in August 1983 gave the signal for the "Iranization" of the Philippines. As the Shah of Iran was toppled by a coalition of international operatives sharing the goal of ousting the United States from the Middle East, so the government of President Ferdinand Marcos is being destabilized by the very same forces, and the stage is set for the destruction of the Philippines, Khomeini-style. The outcome, if this process is allowed to continue, will be the demise of U. S. influence in Asia.

Some might find it incredible that this could be happening. How could the United States abandon a country that it has been intimately tied to since the beginning of the 20th century? A country that many Americans have given their lives for. A country whose people deeply admire the United States and who have also given their lives to help the war efforts of the United States. A country that has binding military commitments with the United States, including Subic Bay Naval Base and Clark Air Force Base, which are kingpins of the U. S. strategic posture in the Pacific.

Yet *EIR* presents to you in the following pages some of the incontrovertible proof we have in our possession that Henry Kissinger and company are intent on "Iranizing" the Philippines. They intend for the Marcos government to be brought down, for violence and chaos to ensue, for the U. S. military bases to be removed, for separatist movements to break out, and in general for the United States to withdraw from the whole Pacific region. We are not predicting that this will ineluctably occur; rather we are warning that this process is rapidly developing and will continue to unfold until Kissinger and his cronies are ousted from all possible influence on U. S. foreign policy, and until a completely new economic policy perspective is implemented by the United States, in cooperation with Japan. Such a perspective must be based on the repudiation of the austerity policies of the International Monetary Fund (IMF), and their replacement with great projects for the development of the region—ranging from the building of the Kra and second Panama canals to the creation of huge waterworks on the Indian subcontinent throughout Indochina and China.



The people who put Khomeini in power are now "Iranizing" the Philippines. Former U.S. Attorney General Ramsey Clark, who helped engineer the fall of the Shah of Iran, is now leading demonstrations against President Ferdinand Marcos.

Our warnings should not be taken lightly. *EIR* was the only journal that identified the culprits who were responsible for putting butcher Khomeini in power in Iran, and accurately predicted the outcome of the Carter administration's promotion of "Islamic fundamentalism." Tragically, responsible Americans did not act to stop the destruction of Iran; today we still have time to stop the Iranization of the Philippines by the very same cast of criminals who brought you Ruhollah Khomeini.

Kissinger's game plan

Kissinger, Zbigniew Brzezinski, Ramsey Clark, Richard Falk, et al. have made clear their *intent* to destroy the Marcos regime and have revolution sweep the country. Here we will quote Kissinger and Brzezinski. The remaining articles in this Special Report will cover the others.

In a speech in Hong Kong Oct. 28, 1983, Kissinger stated in reference to the Philippines: "Political transformations are going to be a likely feature of the next decade. Not in the sense of changes of the system, but in the sense that the leaders who have achieved the extraordinary progress that we all see, are reaching an age where it is logical to think that within this decade, adjustments *will be forced* by nature, if not by deliberate decision [emphasis added]." Then Brzezinski, during a stopover in Manila on Feb. 27 of this year, announced: "One agrees that long-range prospects for the Philippines remain good." Brzezinski's clear implication was that the short-term prospects are anything but good!

Many fail to recognize these pronouncements as statements of *intent*, because they fail to grasp the motives under-

lying them. *EIR* has amply documented Kissinger's role as a Soviet agent of influence in the past, so we concentrate here on his "Pacific Region" geopolitical viewpoint.

Kissinger maintains that the United States can no longer hope to be a dominant world power as it was in the aftermath of World War II. Instead the United States must now adopt British 19th century-style balance-of-power politics, which recognizes no friends or allies, only "interests." The goal is to maintain a semi-feudal neocolonialist world ruled by different empires which compete but also share in the looting of the colonies. Kissinger developed in 1978 the following "cover story" to justify colonial backwardness in the developing world: "Many false notions are maintained in the United States. . . . One of them, the pet of the social scientists, is that the more rapidly a society industrializes, the more rapidly it achieves political stability. What happened recently in Iran demonstrates the falsity of this concept." This from the man who overthrew the Shah of Iran in order to stop the rapid modernization of Iran and the whole Gulf area!

Kissinger's "China Card" was aimed at imposing precisely this de-industrialization policy on Asia. While much has been made of Kissinger's and Brzezinski's claim that their policy was intended to box in the Soviet Union, the fact remains that the single most important aspect of the China Card was that it was targeted at Japan, the ASEAN countries, and India.

Japan was targeted because Kissinger and his oligarchic masters are vehemently opposed to the "mercantilist" policies of the Japanese, their drive for economic growth and technological progress. As for ASEAN, the nations of Thai-

land, Malaysia, Indonesia, and the Philippines in particular represent great potential markets for Japanese and U.S. exports of capital goods and technology. ASEAN also represents one of the greatest resources for the rapid development of Asia, because of its potentially highly skilled labor force. India is already one of the scientific and industrial superpowers and could become the most rapidly growing power in the world if the neocolonial pressures of the IMF were removed.

In short, the China Card of Kissinger and Brzezinski was designed to make China a regional imperial power that, along with and in competition with the Soviet Union and its proxies in the area (Vietnam), would militarily keep a check on any attempt by others to break out of the neocolonial fold. It goes without saying that this policy was also designed to keep China itself in backwardness and military dependence on outside technology. The Vietnam War debacle and Pol Pot's genocide in Kampuchea were to be merely the beginning of maintaining the region in war and backwardness. The only ones who have gained from this are the Soviets.

When the Reagan administration came to power in Washington, the Kissinger version of the China Card was dropped, for President Reagan wants a strong Japan and South Korea plus a strong U.S. military presence in the area. Yet Kissinger and company are still carrying out the geopolitical design underlying the China Card by other means: the Iranization of the Philippines, to be followed by the same process in Indonesia and the dismemberment of India and the subcontinent by Nazi-communist networks.

Reagan's policy: benign neglect

The Iranization of the Philippines started when the IMF and World Bank shut down all of Marcos's economic development projects by the end of 1982. Marcos had attempted to overcome the colonial profile of the Philippines as an exporter of raw materials and agricultural goods, with a series of projects that would have gone a long way toward industrializing the country.

Then came the assassination of Aquino, and the destabilization of Marcos went into full gear. Contrary to those liberal critics of Marcos who charge him with the murder of the opposition leader, Aquino himself had stated before he was gunned down that Marcos could not possibly benefit from his death, and that if he were killed it would be the terrorists who would do it (see below). But an internationally orchestrated press campaign went into gear against Marcos, along with a cut-off of credit by the New York, London, and Swiss banks, and finally a slap in the face when President Reagan refused to visit Manila. If it had been merely a matter of presidential security, as claimed, surely another message of support for the Philippines could have been sent. Instead, the President took the advice of Kissinger-linked White House staffers James Baker III and Michael Deaver, and snubbed the rest of ASEAN too by declining to visit Jakarta and Bangkok.

Since then the administration has done nothing to counter the efforts of either Congress, Kissinger, or the other groups involved in the destabilization of the Philippines. The policy has been what Sen. John Melcher (D-Mont.) aptly called "benign neglect." It amok in the Pacific.

Aquino: 'Marcos would not kill me'

Shortly before Philippine opposition leader Benigno Aquino was assassinated in August 1983, he was interviewed by Mother Jones correspondent Spencer A. Sherman in San Francisco. We publish excerpts from that interview in the January 1984 issue of Mother Jones.

Q: What do you think Marcos will do? . . .

Aquino: . . . He will keep me alive because he knows the moment I

he wouldn't want that. . . . Another possibility: he lets me out, and the communists knock me off. They blame Marcos. They have a martyr and they have eliminated a stumbling block. That is why Washington tells me, "You can't go home, You will give the communists what they wanted all along." You see, the Commies hate me more than they do Marcos. . . .

Q: . . . Let me play devil's advocate for a moment. Maybe a communist regime is right for the Philippines. . . .

Aquino: . . . I've been to Russia. I've been to the communist countries. I've still ahead. In he's still an angel compared to the communists. . . . You see, my biggest danger is not Marcos, it's the communists, because *they* know I'm

Q: Is get Aquino? . . .

Aquino: . . . If today, my friend, in six months I would be smelling like horseshit. Because there's nothing I employment. I criminality spawned by economic difficulties. . . .

Q: What would you do about the [U.S.] president?

Aquino: "Out with the bases," say the radicals. I agree. But we cannot remove the bases tomorrow and destabilize that region, particularly while the Russians are building in Cam Ranh Bay. Otherwise we will surely be changing masters. But I'm going to tell America I don't want these bases permanently. The sooner you remove them, the better.