

Africa, Asia are in the cross-hairs

by Gail Billington and Michael Billington

The Foreword to the 1994 English-language edition of *The Plot to Annihilate the Armed Forces and the Nations of Ibero-America*, states that the translation was necessary “as a warning and a call to action to the nations of the developing sector in Asia, Africa, and the Middle East. . . . Most of the individuals and institutions engaged in this economic, political, and military assault on the nations of Ibero-America are also directly involved in similar campaigns in other parts of the world—often bragging of the ‘experience’ they have gained in their destructive and often genocidal operations in Ibero-America.” Subsequent events have borne out this warning.

For two days in March 1995, the International Forum for Democratic Studies and the George C. Marshall European Center for Security Studies met to consider “Civil-Military Relations and the Consolidation of Democracy,” featuring top globalist strategist Prof. Samuel P. Huntington as keynote speaker, and U.S. Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Affairs Dr. Joseph Nye. Joining them was Carolina Hernandez of the Institute for Strategic and Development Studies in Quezon City, the Philippines, who, in May 1995, also participated in American University’s “Democracy Projects” conference, titled “Civil-Military Relations in Latin America: Lessons Learned.” As noted (see p. 50), American University is the central coordinating think-tank for the anti-military “Plot”-ers.

In her March speech, Hernandez accurately portrayed the historical role of the military in Asia, “as nationalist and anticolonial armies, a fact that to this day has given them considerable popular legitimacy. They also have helped to hold divided societies together and to promote social order and economic development. . . . Thus history and a comprehensive definition of security have enabled Asia’s militaries to play wide-ranging roles in society. In Indonesia, for example, the army remains the most organized and institutionalized political organization in the country. The notion of its having a ‘dual function,’ a doctrine deeply entrenched in the political culture, has not been seriously challenged.”

Hernandez and her American University cohorts make it clear that they are out to eliminate such a role for the military, as a step toward annihilating the nation-state as such. The “wide latitude in domestic affairs” played by the military, she argues, “may not be compatible with democratization,” nor is their “undesirable degree of financial independence,” ob-

tained through “sizable defense budgets” and “huge allocations of government and nongovernment resources.” She singles out the success of the “1992 pro-democracy movement” in Thailand for breaking “a tradition of direct or indirect military involvement in politics, government, and business.”

Hernandez’s reference to Thailand is revealing. As *EIR* documented in *The Plot*, the 1992 Thai events were choreographed from outside the country by a myriad of non-governmental organizations (NGOs), financed by the U.S. government, then led by George Bush, or by foundations, including the Ford and Rockefeller foundations, and by the Asian-American Free Labor Institute, the political arm of the AFL-CIO. The U.S. Agency for International Development alone disbursed over \$8.6 million in a three-year period to fund the NGOs, which “spontaneously” took to the streets against the military government.

Loss of economic sovereignty

Thailand today is paying the price of this operation, through the loss of its economic sovereignty. It is emerging as the model for the “Hongkongization” of all of Southeast Asia (see *EIR*, March 22, “Britain’s New Empire Strategy Invades Asia”). Starting with the set-up of the first offshore banking facility in the region, the sheer volume of illegal money flows into Thailand surpasses the annual budget, according to a Chulalongkorn University study; \$20 billion in proceeds from prostitution and \$4 billion from drug money laundering. The report warned that Thailand’s future is at risk as a result of the distortions in the flow of capital, labor, and resources to feed this “Thai miracle.”

The same process is being repeated today against Indonesia, where the military, since their victory over the Dutch in a bloody war of independence following World War II, have taken an official role in building and protecting the economy. Not surprisingly, Indonesia has been the primary nation in the Association of Southeast Asian Nations putting up significant resistance to the loss of national economic sovereignty, retaining both protective policies necessary for industrialization, and the military role in directing that process.

Also, the Indonesian government and military are playing a critical role in the development of a new constitutional government in Myanmar (Burma), where the northern opium-producing areas have always been under the control of foreign powers. Now that the military regime is abandoning its nearly 40 years of isolation, opening up to international contact and taking steps to dismantle the insurgency drug-armies, the NGO apparatus has targeted Myanmar for destabilization, through a movement financed by the primary controller of the drug-legalization mafia, speculator George Soros. In both Myanmar and Indonesia, daughters of the leaders of the independence movements (Aung San Suu Kyi and Megawati Sukarnoputri, respectively) are being sponsored by these international institutions and their NGO apparatus to demand the dismantling of the military role in government and in nation-building.