

Carter 'human rights' now Reagan foreign policy

by Kathy Klenetsky and Vin Berg

Unfolding events in the Philippines, portending the early loss of the Pacific to the Soviet Union, represent a clear triumph for the administration of Jimmy Carter. The Filipino destabilization signifies that, under different rhetoric, the Reagan administration, in foreign policy as in economic policy, is nothing but a continuation of Cyrus Vance and Paul Volcker's Carter administration.

Remember the hue and cry over the lack of "democracy" and "human rights abuses" in the Shah's Iran? Remember also the consequences?

Ronald Reagan, during his 1980 presidential campaign, rightly denounced the Carter "human rights" policy on the grounds that it ran contrary to U.S. and Western security interests, and could only benefit the Soviet Union's imperial ambitions.

What Reagan did not say is that this was not an inadvertent consequence, but the whole point of the "human rights" policy. The underlying policy has since become virtually public: a "New Yalta" agreement with Moscow, ceding Europe and the Pacific (as well as the Middle East, etc.) to the Soviet Union, using financial strangulation to complement reconstructed "opposition" forces to destabilize those recalcitrant nations which insist on remaining allied to the United States. In this, the United States has acted as merely the puppet of the International Monetary Fund. Teddy Roosevelt did for the British Empire what the U.S. State Department does today for the IMF.

The Philippines now heads the State Department "New Yalta" target list of nations which are to be driven into Soviet hands and/or drowned in the blood of civil war, social chaos, and ungovernability. That list has been in existence since the Carter administration and earlier. It is being acted on now, in the Philippines, and very soon, many other U.S. allies, not because the State Department doesn't like this or that head-of-state, but because of a determination to wipe out all vestiges of national sovereignty among nations which, com-

bined, might otherwise be able to use an impending collapse of the world financial system to overthrow the power of usury embodied in the IMF.

Haiti was very publicly placed on that list at the end of 1985, when the IMF cut off Haiti for "non-compliance" with loan conditionalities—even Baby Doc Duvalier apparently could not starve his population fast enough for them. On the pretext of the IMF action, the United States also acted to suspend aid. Elites in Haiti got the message, "opposition" hit the streets, and the United States supplied the plane for Duvalier's departure.

In the case of the Philippines, as is well known, the State Department demanded that Marcos *violate his constitution* by calling snap elections; he did, he won, and the State Department, the press, the Congress, and even the President therefore denounced the elections. Something similar is being prepared for the South Korean case. The State Department is demanding that the government in Seoul change its constitution to have direct presidential elections; they now have indirect elections for President—*just as in the United States!*

This policy is treason to the United States. Jimmy Carter must be proud.

Target Mexico

Mexico is very high on the list, with an economy about to collapse under IMF conditionalities and falling oil revenues. The State Department placed the government of the Mexican republic in the same category as the Philippines in early February, when its "Human Rights Report" called that government "corrupt" with elections marred by "fraud." In fact, Mexico features a small-minority PAN party, a clerical fascist party like Aquino's, which, it is already clear, the U.S. press will play up as "winning" future elections—and the State Department will thereupon refuse to recognize the actual victory of Mexico's ruling party.

The "Philippinization" of Mexico has been demanded in

public by Manuel J. Clouthier, expected PAN candidate for the Sinaloa governorship. He is quoted in the Feb. 19 *La Jornada*, pronouncing, "I don't know whether for better or worse, but this country is going to change. . . . Anyone who opposes it will be swept away. Two years ago, I went to the Philippines with Jorge Chapa. . . . I told him, 'Jorge, this guy [Marcos] won't last three years before going to hell. . . . Did you hear him speak, didja? He's a carbon copy demagogue of Echeverría. Personality cult, his photos all around, with MacArthur and his mother. . . .' And now Benigno Aquino's old lady is going to f--- him over. That is, things are going to happen, and it is inevitable that they will also happen in Mexico."

Banker Clouthier is one of the "hooded" oligarchical conspirators—like the Aquinos in the Philippines—dubbed by former Mexican President Luis Echeverría, "Christians who are not Christians."

Panama is on the list. It, too, was placed in the category of the Philippines by the State Department "Human Rights Report." Gen. Manuel Noriega, head of that nation's armed forces, acted to save his nation by deposing the former World Bank vice-president who was then President of Panama, Nicholas Ardito-Barletta. Barletta was destroying the nation with IMF conditionalities. The new Delvalle government backed by Noriega has allied itself with Peru's García government—also on the list—in resistance to the IMF. So, the State Department has cut off aid, its Elliot Abrams is denouncing Noriega for "human rights" abuses, and Sen. Jesse Helms, in matters of foreign policy, increasingly the manipulated plaything of Israel's gun- and drug-running "Irgun" group around Ariel Sharon, is holding well publicized hearings on "election fraud" and "human rights" abuses in Panama.

The Philippines

For a week after the Feb. 7 elections, President Reagan was still sounding much like the principled Reagan of 1980. The media was full of reports about how "angry" State's hierarchy was at the President. Reagan insisted during a nationally televised news conference Feb. 12 that, in light of the Soviet naval buildup and Pacific deployments, "one cannot minimize the importance of those [Filipino] bases, not only to us but to the Western world and certainly to the Philippines themselves." Reagan stated flatly: "I don't know of any that's more important than the base in the Philippines." The clear implication was that without Marcos, the bases would be lost—true.

By Feb. 15, however, Reagan had apparently succumbed. After a scolding from the *Washington Post*, the President issued a statement which said that the Philippine elections have been "called into credibility" because of "widespread vote fraud and violence, perpetrated largely by the ruling party."

After that, Shultz and his collaborators were able to open

up the anti-Marcos campaign full-throttle. On Feb. 19, Shultz testified before a Senate panel that securing "democracy" in the Philippines is more important than maintaining the American military bases on the island. Without those bases, the United States loses not only the Philippines, but the Pacific. The Philippines and every other nation of the region is forced to seek accommodation with Moscow. So, Shultz was effectively saying that democracy is more important than . . . democracy. Shultz continued: "We have a big stake there. We have a stake in freedom. *We have a stake in democracy. Let's put that first over and above the bases* [emphasis added]."

Treason on the Hill

Members of Congress are falling over each other in their eagerness to hand the Philippines to the Soviets.

Immediately after Shultz's testimony, the U.S. Senate overwhelmingly endorsed a resolution, 85-9, stating that the Philippines elections were marked "by such widespread fraud that they cannot be considered a fair reflection of the will of the people of the Philippines." Only nine members of the Senate voted against the resolution: Denton, East, Helms, Symms, Goldwater, Hecht, Melcher, Thurmond, and Wallop—all conservative Republicans, with the exception of Melcher.

The day after the resolution was passed, the House Foreign Affairs subcommittee on Asian and Pacific Affairs voted 9-0 in favor of a bill to withhold all U.S. military aid from the Philippines, until President Reagan certifies that a "legitimate government has been established . . . which commands the support of the Philippines." The bill was sponsored by subcommittee chairman, Rep. Steven Solarz (D-N.Y.), the congressman of the Soviet-controlled "Trust" financial network.

The bill also would deprive the Marcos government of \$125 million in current economic aid, which would be channeled instead through private groups, in particular, those Church networks which have been in the vanguard of the effort to topple Marcos.

But more important than the direct U.S. aid is planned credit strangulation of the Marcos regime. The International Monetary Fund has already indicated its intent by canceling the scheduled visit of its delegation to Manila in the wake of the elections.

President Marcos is correct when he denounces "a new imperialism" by circles in the United States as the cause of his country's troubles. What he has not yet understood, or said, is that, in this, the United States is merely acting as the IMF's puppet.

Only Secretary of Defense Weinberger still sounds like the principled Ronald Reagan of 1980. He cautioned Congress Feb. 19, "The only real beneficiary in the delayed or the diminished military aid program" to the Philippines "would be the New Peoples Army, the communist insurgency. And that is an outcome that we cannot support."