

EIRFeature

The Philippines: strategic conjuncture and future prospects

by Paul Goldstein

The Philippines today is undergoing its most important development since it declared independence from Spain in the late 19th century and earned independence from the United States in 1946. The Philippines reached this historic branching point when President Ferdinand Marcos declared a "snap" election slated for Feb. 7 of this year. After months of deliberation and enormous pressure from the United States, Marcos has set out to prove that his political mandate is intact and that, in his relations with the United States, he will assert his nation's sovereignty in a new way.

During a recent trip to the Philippines, which included meetings with the President and other top officials, this writer was told by one knowledgeable source that President Marcos, over the last 13 months, has learned more about the United States and its internal workings than the U.S. has learned about the Philippines. Whereas President Marcos has tended to be more patient toward the "dumb" Americans, the liberal-controlled U.S. Department of State has only displayed the worst attributes of arrogance and ignorance, with its leading representative in the Philippines, Ambassador Stephen Bosworth, exemplifying both.

Marcos's thinking about his relationship with the United States is best seen in his own words about World War II: "When I was in the battlefield and looked around me, I didn't see American GIs dying, but 200,000 Filipinos. That is not to say Americans did not die, but rather to make clear that it was the Filipinos who were in the front lines, taking the brunt of the attack." Similar remarks were made on U.S. national TV, reflecting the President's deep bitterness in the face of what he has come to see as "the American betrayal."

Marcos is not alone in thinking about the United States in this way. The U.S. State Department and the Eastern Liberal Establishment are hell-bent in bringing into existence a "New Yalta" arrangement with the Soviet Empire, which means selling out key U.S. allies from West Germany to Tunisia to the Philippines. A handful of U.S. military and intelligence officials are opposed to what the State Department is up to, but for pragmatic and narrow reasons. Even these individuals, located throughout various institutions in the government, are guided by no higher



An election rally of the Bayan, a coalition of left-liberals and communists which is supporting Cory Aquino's challenge to President Marcos.

commitment to the sovereignty of what a republican ally like the Philippines truly represents.

In contrast to this pragmatic approach of power-politics, and to assume the proper intelligence standpoint for judging the historic developments in the Philippines, it is useful to consider two quotes, from Lyndon H. LaRouche and President Franklin Delano Roosevelt. Both of the quotes reflect the anti-colonial outlook which was imbedded in the U.S. military and the World War II intelligence agencies. It is an outlook which needs to be revived in the United States, if we are to survive as a superpower. It is the basis for dismantling the policy of the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and World Bank.

LaRouche, candidate for the 1988 Democratic Party nomination, stated in a recent document: "In such a world order of sovereign republics, just as each individual must be equal before the law, so must each and all sovereign republics be equally sovereign before the law of nations. There must be no empires, no systems of satrapies. There can be only true partnership among sovereign states which share the same general principles for fostering of civilization. As each individual must contribute to civilization, according to his or her means, so each sovereign state and people must contribute according to its potentialities. As the only proper differences among individuals are those of merit, so the fact that a more powerful state has greater responsibilities does not lessen the political equality of other states."

LaRouche's concept of a "community of principle among nation-states" was nearly articulated by FDR in a meeting with British Prime Minister Winston Churchill, when the two

were discussing the future world order following the war. Roosevelt stated: "American foreign policy after the war must be along the lines of bringing about a realization on the part of the British, and the French, and the Dutch, that the way we have run the Philippines is the only way they can run their colonies. . . . I am firmly of the belief that if we are to arrive at a stable peace, it must involve the development of backward countries, of backward peoples. How can this be done by 18th-century methods?"

"Whichever of your ministers recommends a policy which takes wealth out of a colonial country, but which returns nothing to the people. . . . involve bringing industry to these colonies. Twentieth-century methods include increasing the wealth of a people by increasing their standard of living, by educating them . . . by making sure they get a return for the raw materials of their country. . . . [if not] the colonial system [will] mean war.

"The point is that we are going to be able to bring pressure on the British to fall in line with our thinking, in relation to the whole colonial question. It's all tied up in the one package: the Dutch East Indies, French Indo-China, India, British extraterritorial rights in China . . . we're going to be able to make this the 20th century afterall."

The post-war failure to realize this anti-colonialist policy design is the primary reason for the present crisis in the Philippines. It is not, as the U.S. press and the official policy line would have it, the result of the "corruption in the Marcos regime" or "Imelda Marcos's investments in the United States." Even the limited numbers of genuinely patriotic members of the Reagan administration continue to view Mar-

cos as a man who has stayed in power too long. "He needs to step aside even if he is re-elected," one former U.S. military official told *EIR*.

The State Department's opposition ticket

The forging of the Philippine opposition ticket to the Marcos-Tolentino one, was carried out by primarily two individuals, Cardinal Jaime Sin and U.S. Ambassador Stephen Bosworth. However, the architect of the policy of creating an opposition in the first place was the former ambassador to the Philippines and Iran, William Sullivan. Both Bosworth and Cardinal Sin are carrying out what Sullivan failed to do during his tenure as ambassador during the early 1970s. It was Sullivan's initial destabilization operation which prompted President Marcos's declaration of martial law in 1972.

The prerequisite for putting the opposition together to challenge Marcos was the Aug. 21, 1983 assassination of Ninoy Aquino, the husband of political neophyte Corazon

The Aquino-Laurel platform represents the precise outlook of the pro-New Yalta forces in the State Department. Despite an attempt at moderating her stance, Aquino continues to pledge the removal of U.S. military bases.

Aquino. According to one U.S. intelligence operative who served in the Philippines for 18 years, Aquino was killed in order to create a martyr, which was seen by Sullivan et al. as the essential ingredient for catalyzing an anti-government upsurge among especially middle-class Filipinos. This individual added that it is a known fact in the Philippines and inside U.S. intelligence agencies that Aquino was warned not to return to the Philippines, because there was a plot against him. Aquino was told by circles around Sen. Edward Kennedy that Marcos was dying from kidney failure and only Aquino could save the Philippines.

As the Philippines is a strongly Catholic country, the "martyrdom" syndrome of Philippine politics serves Cardinal Sin and his brand of "Liberation Theology" quite well. Sin, who has sanctioned the deployment of "revolutionary" priests to enter the ranks of the maoist terrorist force, the New People's Army (NPA), convinced Cory Aquino to run for President, on the wave of sympathy generated by her husband's tragic death. The political base that is deploying on behalf of Aquino is the Bayan, a coalition of left-liberals and a variety of communist front organizations led by the National Democratic Front. The NDF is backed in the United States by the leading left-wing think tank the Institute for Policy

Studies, and former Attorney-General Ramsey Clark.

The Aquino-Laurel platform represents the precise outlook of the pro-New Yalta forces in the State Department. Despite an attempt at moderating her stance, Aquino continues to pledge the removal of the U.S. military bases at Clark Air Field and Subic Bay. She and Laurel have promised to make Southeast Asia a zone of "neutrality, freedom, and peace," and to repudiate all agreements entered into by Marcos if these "oppose the national interest," including the agreement with the United States on the bases.

Aquino's economic policy is that of the World Bank: In a speech Jan. 6, she said she would dismantle the monopolies in coconuts and sugar, and stimulate investments in "labor-intensive, rural-based, and small- and medium-scale enterprises," preferably in food production. She said that she would emphasize the private sector, "the engine of the economy."

The key economic advisor to Cory Aquino is Jaime Ongpin, who comes from one of the leading oligarchical families of the Philippines. His brother is presently Marcos's industry minister, and has helped bring the IMF policy into the Marcos administration. Jaime Ongpin has been invited to the United States several times by the State Department, for briefing discussions with members of the National Security Council and the Congress. His political base is the Bandila, a coalition of left-liberals and social democrats. He is also the owner of the largest mining company in the Philippines, called Beuget.

Ongpin's outlook on the IMF economic policy is as follows: "The IMF and World Bank are nothing but big banks. Every nation in the world, except those better managed, deal with the IMF/World Bank and those who pay their debts on time, who do not default and do not divert funds which are meant for scarce resources, are treated quite well. But for countries like the Philippines, which are chronic misallocators of scarce resources, the IMF and World Bank levy stringent conditions, all on account of these countries' misbehavior. It is very convenient to say, it's the fault of the IMF/World Bank, but is it really? We in Bandila say, it's the fault of those who were responsible for mismanaging these scarce resources. And it's our own fault for letting them do it."

The opposition's economic program is precisely what the IMF and the State Department want for the Philippines. Despite all the problems of the Marcos government, and despite the economic difficulties it is facing, Marcos is committed to the economic development of his nation; he still represents the fundamental interest of the Philippines, in opposition to the very compromises he has made with the IMF. This was clearly defined when he defended Peruvian President Alan García's decision to face down the IMF (see *EIR*, Dec. 13, 1985, "Marcos Gives Backing to Peru; Declares War Against the IMF"). Marcos and the country's patriotic institutions and individuals, including some of the legitimate opposition, are still looking to fulfill what Franklin D. Roosevelt had promised for the Philippines and all former colonies: the right to sovereign economic development for the benefit of their populations.