

Eye on Washington by Nicholas F. Benton

Philippines: confessions of the Reagan administration

A Reagan administration adviser confided to this reporter while in Santa Barbara with the President the first week in November that concerted State Department efforts to remove Ferdinand Marcos from the Philippines presidency has not deterred the rise of communist insurgency in the country.

In a masterpiece of convoluted logic, he said that while the State Department (with Asian Affairs head Wolfowitz running the show) considered the removal of Marcos very important, nonetheless, his replacement by Aquino hasn't changed anything as far as political stability in the country is concerned.

So why did they get rid of Marcos? The adviser admitted that Marcos wasn't responsible for what had happened to the economy in that country. "It is world sugar and coconut oil prices which determine the destiny of the Philippines," he conceded, "as hard as it is for people to understand that."

He also admitted that these economic factors, and not political factors, determine the ferocity of the communist insurgency in the country. He noted a one-to-one correlation between where the pockets of economic hardship are located, and where the communists are the strongest.

Whether or not he realized it, the administration adviser was saying that a communist takeover of the islands is inevitable, as long as the Reagan administration insists on perpetuating its "free trade" economic insanity.

Such "free trade" policies (which Marcos resisted) enable the Soviets and

their "Trust" allies running the food and precious metals cartels to manipulate world prices to incite political revolt virtually wherever they please, especially with the International Monetary Fund (IMF) breathing down the necks of these countries, demanding impossible conditions on debt repayment.

Thus, the Philippines is a prime example that the Reagan administration has not only lost control of the Senate because of its acceptance of Don Regan's economic policies, but is rapidly losing the world as well.

Nothing is more pathetic than the sight of a leading policymaker shrugging his shoulders with an impotent grin on his face, as if he is helpless in the face of the "magic of the marketplace."

Kissinger's shadow cast over White House

From his office at the Center for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS) a few blocks from the White House, the former Secretary of State Henry Kissinger is casting a long pear-shaped shadow.

Recent developments, such as the release of the hostage Jacobsen and revelations about the activities of former National Security Adviser Robert McFarlane, are but harbingers.

Conniving with Kissinger are fellow CSIS employees Zbigniew Brzezinski and McFarlane. Recall that Brzezinski, while in the Carter administration, also implemented the "Bernard Lewis Plan" for fomenting religious fundamentalist movements demanding regional or tribal autonomies in the so-called "arc of crisis" extending from Turkey to Bangladesh. He used Ramsey Clark to advance his overthrow of the Shah and bring Khomeini to power in Iran, as part of this scenario.

Jitters over LaRouche emergence in 1986

Pay no attention to Democratic Party leaders' post-election drivings about the "defeat" of LaRouche candidates nationwide.

Their pronouncements about having "stopped LaRouche" are not taken seriously by themselves or anyone else in Washington.

In reality, official Washington is shaken to its boots over the emergence of LaRouche as a major, and permanent, force on the American political landscape in 1986. Three events contributed to this in their view: 1) the upset victories by LaRouche candidates Janice Hart and Mark Fairchild in the Illinois Democratic primary last March; 2) the LaRouche-sponsored AIDS initiative in California which drew the fire of every major "institutional" force at a time when the public's growing contempt for "institutions" is, in the view of one leading strategic analyst, the greatest threat the nation faces; and 3) the great Leesberg party-raid, when 400 feds and state police turned LaRouche into an instant folk hero, pitted against the excesses of politically motivated police actions in a way that hasn't been seen since the days of Martin Luther King.

These three events have turned LaRouche into a household word in 1986, and all the media slanders and legal excesses have only served to feed this. In California, because of the way the enemy played it, a vote for the AIDS initiative became a vote for LaRouche, and 2 million people voted for it. In Illinois, Janice Hart got more votes in November (469,000) than she got when she won in March (359,000).

No one in Washington thinks LaRouche has been stopped. On the contrary, they fear he's just getting rolling.