

pect of the pro-Soviet Prince Charles assuming the throne at some point in the future.

More fundamental yet, LaRouche stressed, is that these appeasement arrangements were being mediated through "the radical, pro-Soviet changes in the doctrine of the Anglican Church, as introduced under the prominent sponsorship of Archbishop Runcie." These changes violated the Act of Settlement of 1701, which binds the Windsor monarchs, as Sovereigns of the Church of England, to uphold the articles of Anglican Christianity. As long as the Queen's man, Runcie, carries out such changes, the very legitimacy of the House of Windsor would have to be challenged.

Indeed, the "LaRouche factor" in Britain became more and more controversial. The British Broadcasting Corporation, in a July television feature, highlighted LaRouche as an American figure of controversy, particularly on AIDS. Between Nov. 4 and 10, LaRouche was the subject of significant features in the Fabian Society's *New Statesman*, the *Times* of London, and the *Daily Express*, the first two quasi-objective and the latter violently hysterical and hostile.

Royal AIDS

To paraphrase Dr. Leonard, it was the issue of AIDS that began, especially in the last quarter of the year, to "bring people to their senses." It has forced a re-thinking of the predominant cultural paradigms which have ruled Britain.

In a Dec. 11 statement, James Anderton, chief constable of Greater Manchester and president of the Association of British Police Chiefs, a former Methodist lay preacher who has been in the process of converting to Roman Catholicism, declared to an AIDS seminar for British police officers that the chief factor in the spread of AIDS was moral degeneracy among people "swirling around in a human cesspit of their own making," "obnoxious sexual practices," and "our increasingly degenerate conduct as a human race." Within 48 hours of his statement, Anderton's office in Manchester had received more than 1,000 calls, close to 100% of them expressing total agreement.

The causal connection between moral degradation and the AIDS calamity cannot help but draw attention to the strange occurrences around Buckingham Palace. The Oct. 4 death from AIDS of Prince Charles' valet, Stephen Barry, several months after the death from AIDS of palace aide Lord Avon, drew ironic comments from Fleet Street about the rampant homosexuality inside the palace.

This intersected another line of investigation: the circle of friends of Princess Margaret. In September, British tabloids began to reveal details of past cocaine parties at her Kensington Palace, which occurred while her sister, the Queen, was present. Other attention was drawn to Margaret's old flame, the Duke of Marlborough, whose son, the Marquis of Blandford, was tried during 1986 for his involvement in a cocaine-trafficking ring, and who was revealed, in the course of the court proceedings, to have spent vast sums on his own cocaine habit.

Southern Africa

Fight for economic independence begins

by Thierry Lalevée

The riots which began in northern Zambia on Dec. 11 received far less international coverage than those which have happened over the year in South Africa. However, both have the same roots—the collapsing economies of the region and the drive of the International Monetary Fund (IMF) to impose total dictatorship over a weakened continent.

Zambia, like Zaire, has been following the IMF prescriptions. When President Kaunda decided on Dec. 11 to increase the price of basic commodities by 200%, the core of Zambia's industrial center, the miners, went on a general revolt. After several days of rioting, the arrest of hundreds of miners, and the death of many, Kaunda was forced to back down and withdraw the measure. An editorial of the *Financial Times*, entitled "Warning Signals from Africa," admitted he had no choice: The African countries could not be expected to implement the full measures advocated by the IMF, "unless additional resources are being provided."

As Kaunda knows, the riots have put into question much more than his embarrassed relationship with the IMF. They are questioning the development strategy of the entire region, especially the front-line states. Most are accepting IMF demands as they believe that such behavior will reinforce their calls to Western nations to impose a full economic boycott on South Africa. Most have publicly announced such a break. Zambia's riots were the result. Are they ready to sacrifice their population for such chimeras?

The only display of seriousness and sanity which should serve as a model to these countries, has been advanced by Zaire's President Mobutu whose country was branded, only a few weeks ago, as the model of what an African country could become by implementing IMF measures. In a major speech in front of the central committee of the ruling party on Oct. 30, President Mobutu made no bones on what he thought this had done to the country: utter destruction. "A country cannot sacrifice everything just to pay its external debts," he warned. "We will not alienate our sovereignty and independence." Following the example of Peru, he then announced that Zaire from now on would restrict its debt repayment to 10% of the value of its exports.

Again, an embarrassed international silence followed

Mobutu's announcement. Given Zaire's crucial political role in central and southern Africa, it could not simply be boycotted; negotiations had to take place. Nonetheless, Zaire is now showing the way in Africa. Which other countries will follow?

It is a safe guess that such issues will come to the fore in South Africa itself by 1987. They have been already at the root of the policies advocated by the only sizable and reasonable movement of opposition to apartheid led by Kwazulu Chief Minister Buthelezi of the Inkatha movement. Doing away with the cheap and criminal demagoguery of those who are advocating the destruction of the country and of its population through full economic sanctions, Buthelezi recently toured the United States to campaign against them. "Sanctions are being imposed at a terrible cost to the victims of Apartheid themselves," he told an assembly at Boston University on Nov. 17.

In fact, the process of the whole year made clear that economic sanctions as advocated by the Soviet Union, its client states and gullible Western forces, has a double aim: to strengthen the apartheid system by throwing hundreds of thousands of primarily black workers into total misery, which will increase the potential for a radical blow-out in the entire region. Moscow has no other goals, and knows that as Mozambique, Zimbabwe, Zambia, and other countries are manipulated into cutting their own throats, the region will slide into its orbit.

In that regard, the Soviet Union did score a few successes in Europe and through the American Congress, and with a few radicals of the Jesse Jackson kind who are more concerned about the 1988 elections than Africa's actual plight. It succeeded, too, in creating a climate of legitimacy for the Soviet-run African National Congress. Thanks to the extreme right wing in South Africa which opposed President P.W. Botha's reform programs, Moscow scored a point there, too.

However, Buthelezi's trip to the United States in the fall, and his experimental attempt to impose a non-apartheid solution in the Kwazululand territory indicate the trend for the next year. The 1.3 million members of Inkatha are now fully mobilized for their rights as they see them. Unless Botha goes a step further in his proposed constitutional reform, he may just become a spectator as the main battles will be between Inkatha and the ANC. This will determine what Buthelezi termed the "plight of the responsible black leaders in South Africa. It is insufficiently realized that there is a life and death struggle taking place which is, bluntly put, a power struggle. . . . The ANC arrogates to itself the right to plan the struggle, to conduct the struggle, etc. It is hungry for power. For the ANC, the primary means of liberation must be violence . . . necklacing, butchering by mobs, hand grenades thrown into black houses. I have now told my people that enough is enough. I have now said that we are prepared to die for what we believe. . . . I reiterate again that it requires a very powerful force to moderate the kind of violence which is spiraling upward in South Africa. . . ."

The end of an era: the fall of Marcos

by Paul Goldstein

Of all the strategic developments in Asia in 1986, none are comparable to the transformation of the Philippines and none has such potentially disastrous consequences for the United States and its allies in the Pacific. As an eyewitness to the fall of Marcos, I can report that the "democratic rise" of Corazon Aquino, the U.S. news media's characterization, belies the actual story of who put Aquino into power, and how.

Since the February coup, the insurgency led by the New People's Army has consolidated its grip on 20% of the country and improved its position in the key urban areas. The economy is deteriorating rapidly. Unemployment is at a record 60-70%, while the "corruption rate," bad under Marcos, is now worse. In economic policy, Aquino and her controllers are leading the Philippines into the status of an International Monetary Fund "colony."

Marcos was overthrown because of economic policy and the Philippines' geostrategic position. The news media and the Congress, along with a variety of U.S. think tanks, perpetrated the myth that the "victory of Cory Aquino" was a victory for democracy. But "People's Power," the slogan of the "liberation theology" Catholic Church under Cardinal Jaime Sin, was mere political cover for a naked military coup directed by the U.S. State Department. While Defense Minister Juan Ponce Enrile and sometimes chief-of-staff Fidel Ramos had complex motives, they were mere participants in a U.S. operation.

Filipino nationalists could only recall how the brutal Spanish colonialists and their priesthood kept Filipinos in a state of subservience.

The basis for the February coup

Historically, the Philippines were the model of the U.S. commitment to development of backward peoples. U.S. rule over the Philippines sought to demonstrate to the world that it were not only possible to raise a backward people to sovereign status, but also a moral necessity. This had been General Douglas MacArthur's commitment and an outlook shared by President Franklin Roosevelt.

The postwar U.S. shift away from MacArthur's outlook toward support of neo-colonialism, especially during the period of the Vietnam War, placed the now-sovereign Philippines in a difficult position. The Philippines came to reflect the best and the worst of American political culture. On the