

## **EIR Feature**

# **Shultz torpedos American defense in the Philippines**

by Linda de Hoyos

The Philippines today, militarily, economically, and politically, is in the direst crisis that nation has faced since the Japanese invasion of the islands during World War II. Given the Philippines' strategic location as the "gateway to the Pacific" and the presence of the United States' most crucial Pacific bases on the island of Luzon, whether the Philippines survives the crisis or whether it goes the way of Iran, is an issue of vital national security for the United States and its allies.

Nevertheless, the deliberate policy of the U.S. State Department, even before the August 1983 assassination of opposition leader Benigno Aquino, has been to collapse the Philippines economically and politically. For the last year and a half, the State Department has deployed to destabilize the government of President Ferdinand Marcos, using economic blackmail from the International Monetary Fund and by building up an opposition to Marcos, which makes no bones about its animosity toward the United States or the U.S. bases. The policy, as one congressional visitor threatened Marcos in April of this year, has been to "apply the screws" on the Philippines government.

As of this writing, the overthrow of Marcos is the agreed-upon policy being carried out by the State Department under the leadership of Undersecretary of State and former ambassador to the Philippines Michael Armacost, the Pentagon under the direction of Assistant Defense Secretary Richard Armitage, the National Security Council under Robert McFarlane, and sections of the Central Intelligence Agency.

In the U.S. Congress, the State Department is coordinating this effort with New York Congressman Stephen Solarz, chairman of the House Foreign Relations Subcommittee on Asian and Pacific Affairs. In June, Solarz's committee provoked a full-scale crisis in the relations between the Philippines and the United States by unilaterally abrogating the 1981 U.S.-Filipino pact for the presence of U.S. bases at Clark Field and Subic Bay. Under Solarz's bidding, the House slashed \$110 million in U.S. military aid—that is, rent for the bases—to \$25 million. The reduction was designed to be a loud message of withdrawal of U.S. support from Marcos. For even pro-American Filipinos, the House move was considered, as



NSIPS

*Who's out to topple the Philippines government of President Ferdinand Marcos? The rogues' gallery includes (l. to r.) Henry Kissinger, George Shultz, and Rep. Stephen Solarz. (Do not be deceived by Shultz's typically inscrutable expression; his State Department is running the operation to deliver the Pacific to Soviet military domination.)*

one Manila columnist put it, "a near declaration of war."

The publicly stated motivation for the U.S. campaign against the Philippines is that Marcos, the alleged "repressive and corrupt dictator," is the obstacle to stabilizing the Philippines and dealing with the growing Soviet-backed New People's Army. Therefore, if Marcos goes, the Philippines can allegedly be saved for the United States.

This policy overlooks several crucial points. First, the single greatest factor destabilizing the Philippines is the International Monetary Fund, which, as we show below, has decimated the Filipino productive economy. The Philippines, once a newly industrialized country (NIC), is now a collapsed economy, with large sections of its population suffering unemployment and now, malnutrition and a 50% increase in disease.

In the Philippines, the name of the IMF is synonymous with the United States. The first step in the stabilization of the Philippines is to force the United States to break with the IMF, which functions as the economic battering ram for the Soviet Union throughout the underdeveloped sector.

Secondly, there is no viable alternative to the Marcos government. The opposition is composed of fragmented factions with no economic program for the country. Bringing down the 20-year Marcos government destroys the only institution at this time capable of holding the country together. As in Iran, any moderate regime—either civilian or military—installed after the demise of the Marcos government will be short-lived, swept away by the rising tide of anti-U.S. violent reaction fueled by the Soviet-backed New People's Army.

To be fair, most people in Washington policy-making circles are too stupid to comprehend this reality. But it should not be surprising to find that one of the people working the hardest to overthrow Marcos is William Sullivan, former ambassador to the Philippines and the ambassador to Teheran who did the same job to the Shah of Iran that Ambassador Stephen Bosworth is doing to Marcos in Manila right now.

### The 'New Yalta'

Behind the stupidity and the blinders, U.S. policy toward the Philippines is not designed in the interests of the United States, or its allies. The State Department is carrying out the policy formulated by Henry Kissinger, Zbigniew Brzezinski, Averell Harriman, and NATO Secretary General Lord Peter Carrington for a New Yalta deal with the Soviet Union. Under the New Yalta, the United States is to withdraw from Western Europe, Africa, and Asia, and recede to maintaining gunboat hegemony over the Western Hemisphere. For Asia, this policy has been in effect since the 1969 Guam Doctrine of Henry Kissinger, which signaled the strategic withdrawal of the United States from the Pacific. At the same time, since 1975, the Soviet Union in turn has systematically built up its own military presence in the region.

The downfall of the Marcos government and the consequent removal of the U.S. bases at Clark Field and Subic Bay will hand the Soviets full hegemony over the Pacific. The United States will be regarded everywhere, including in Japan, as not merely a worthless ally, but an enemy. These are the consequences of the State Department's policy toward the nation of the Philippines.