

emergence of suicide bombings and Taliban raids against the occupiers.

10. Myanmar: President Bush, Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice, and UN Ambassador John Bolton have issued threats not only against Myanmar itself, but to the rest of the nations of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN), for refusing to join the United States in sanctions and political subversion activities against Myanmar. Meeting with several ASEAN members on the sidelines of the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC) meeting in November, Bush and Rice referred to Myanmar as “one of the worst regimes in the world.” ASEAN’s chairman countered that they would “continue the engagement with Myanmar.” In December, Bolton demanded that Myanmar be placed on the agenda of the UN Security Council, on the basis that Myanmar was a “threat to international peace and security.” The Security Council rejected this absurd claim, insisting that only ASEAN should determine whether Myanmar is a threat. Myanmar has begun the process of moving its national capital from Yangon to Pinyin in the interior, reportedly concerned about the vulnerability of Yangon to U.S. military threats.

11. Korea: After what appeared to be a substantial breakthrough in the Six-Party talks concerning North Korea in mid-September, the Cheney faction has effectively derailed further talks. U.S. Ambassador Christopher Hill, who had reached tentative agreements with Pyongyang, was replaced in late October by Ambassador Alexander Vershbow. When Vershbow, on Dec. 7, called North Korea a “criminal regime,” the chances of Pyongyang returning to the negotiating table went to near-zero, and saber-rattling is again the order of the day.

12. Philippines: Five thousand U.S. troops are landing in Mindanao in February, for joint military “exercises” in the live combat zones of the largely Islamic southern islands of the Philippines, despite explicit constitutional restrictions against foreign military operations on Philippine soil. These largest-yet “exercises” come as the neo-cons’ assets in Manila—former President Fidel Ramos and House Speaker Jose De Venecia—are trying to force the convening of a Constitutional Convention, aimed at: scrapping the Presidential system, allowing a virtual dictatorship free of checks and balances from the Congress; removing the few remaining restrictions on foreign control of the Philippine economy; and (although not admitted publicly) allowing the re-establishment of U.S. military bases, as required by Cheney’s perpetual war doctrine.

Hatred of Free Trade Sweeps Morales Into Bolivian Presidency

by Gretchen Small

Campaigning against the existing economic and political system, Evo Morales was elected President of Bolivia on Dec. 18 with the highest vote of any Presidential candidate in decades. With a majority of just under 54%, Morales was the first candidate to win in the first round of a Presidential election since 1982. He swept not only the poorer areas of Bolivia, but also won a significant middle class vote, including a surprising 30% in the wealthier region of Santa Cruz. His Movement Towards Socialism (MAS) party won only two of the country’s nine governor races, but it won a majority in the Chamber of Deputies, and is only two short of a majority in the 27-member Senate.

Morales has long claimed to speak for the coca growers, and campaigned internationally for the legalization of drugs. But Morales’s legalization campaign is of interest to a relatively small number of Bolivians (and a far more powerful group of foreign financiers). Instead, Morales’s vote reflected the overwhelming anger in the country at the free trade and privatization which have brought the country to the brink of disintegration. Bolivia is a land of great natural resources—e.g., it holds South America’s second largest natural gas deposits—but these resources, owned outright by foreign interests since the 1990s, have served only to pay the foreign debt and their foreign owners, while the living conditions of Bolivians, long among the poorest of Ibero-America, collapsed further.

Faced with a choice between candidates pushing more of the same, and the head of the coca-growers promising to re-nationalize and industrialize the nation’s hydrocarbons, the voters chose Evo Morales, the man promising national change.

It is an old story, that what a person champions as a candidate and then does as President, are not always the same. What Morales actually does, once sworn in as President on Jan. 22, will be shaped in great part

by the outcome of the historic political and social upheavals underway globally, centered in the battle to drive Dick Cheney and the Synarchists out of the U.S. government.

A ‘Soft’ Target

That change cannot come too soon for Bolivia, which has been deliberately driven to the brink of division and civil war by those financier interests who view the weakened country, located at the heart of South America, as a “soft” target, whose destruction can be used to advance their drive to crush nation-states throughout the region. In June 2004, the Cheney crowd based at Washington’s American Enterprise Institute (AEI), brazenly laid out a strategy to dismember Bolivia, by fomenting a separatist movement within the gas- and oil-rich eastern region led by the province of Santa Cruz, which would split it from the Andean highlands, whose economy these maniacs openly propose be based on the drug trade.

At the same time, the Cheney-Rumsfeld duo have been insisting since 2002 that the free trade-induced “ungovernability” of countries such as Bolivia requires South America’s nations to form a supranational intervention force to “secure” the region for foreign looting. The loyal Rumsfeld hack running the U.S. Southern Command, Gen. Bantz Craddock, targeted Bolivia—and Evo Morales directly—in an off-the-record discussion at a Washington, D.C. defense institution in October 2005. Craddock spoke of the danger which social conflict and “weak democracies” represent for regional security—illustrating his point with a map of Bolivia. As he labeled Bolivia a “high-risk” country, he put up a picture of Morales, only to then assert that when countries face problems of this magnitude, the classical concept of sovereignty is no longer valid, and must be replaced by the concept of “cooperative sovereignty.” His message was clear: The United States and/or other nations in the region will have to intervene to secure stability in Bolivia, because the Bolivians can’t.

The strength of Morales’s vote may stall the plans of these madmen for a time, but the danger remains live until they are removed from power, which would allow Bolivia to begin again to develop its country, and progress.

Soros’s ‘Narco-Nationalist’ Project

Morales is now faced with the choice of representing the interests of Bolivia, or those of the foreign financier sponsors who created him as a political figure, using him as a useful pawn in their drive to re-establish legal free trade in every narcotic on the face of the Earth: cocaine, heroin, you name it.

The irony is, that up until this point, the career of this supposed anti-imperialist firebrand representing the Indians and poor, owes his prominence to one of the world’s most

filthy-rich billionaires, mega-speculator George Soros, the destroyer of entire nations and king of drug legalization internationally. In July 2003, in Carnegie Endowment’s *Foreign Policy*, Soros’s top drug strategist, Ethan Nadelman, proclaimed that the time had come for Ibero-America to lead a campaign to legalize international trade in coca (the basic ingredient in cocaine)—exactly what Morales, and now Venezuela’s Hugo Chávez, too, present as some “indigenist” idea. Nadelman was explicit that Soros’s coca trade scheme is merely the cutting edge of the “organized revolt” against any war on drugs which the drug profiteers are fomenting.

The fight is now on as to which forces will gain control over Morales, and the ferment unleashed by his election, nationally and in the region. Thus far, Morales is sticking with the Soros program. His press spokesman and head of protocol for his inaugural ceremonies is none other than the “South American Bureau Chief of the internet publication, *Narco News*, and long-time advisor to the Soros-funded and -advised Andean Council of Coca Leaf Producers (CAPHC), Alex Contreras Baspiñeiro. And on Dec. 28, Evo whipped up a meeting of 20,000 coca-growers in Cochabamba with a speech on how “we are winning the green fight; coca is beating the U.S. dollar.”

Contreras’s job as head of protocol is to organize a continental “popular” ceremony in La Paz following the official inauguration, to which the Synarchist financiers’ leading Jacobin enraged movements of Ibero-America are invited: the *piqueteros* of Argentina, the Landless Movement (MST) of Brazil, Chavez’s Bolivarian Circles of Venezuela, Mexico’s Zapatista leader, Marcos, and the CONAIE and Pachakuti indigenous movements of Ecuador.

Meanwhile, Morales began his pre-inaugural international travels with a 24-hour visit to Cuba Dec. 30-31, where he was received with honors at the airport by Fidel Castro. Castro arranged his next visit, to Caracas, where he met Jan. 3 with Chávez. And by “extraordinary coincidence,” as the ever-subtle Chávez put it, Ollanta Humala was present also. The latter is currently tied for first place in the polls for Peru’s April 9 Presidential elections. Humala, also a supporter of drug legalization now portraying himself as a new Peruvian Chávez, represents an outright fascist threat to the continent. As *EIR* documented in its July 9, 2004 issue (see “The Friends of Blas Piñar Send the Andes Up in Flames”), Humala is a creation of a classic, 1930s-style Nazi-communist international Synarchist project, supported by the Spain-centered New Fascist International.

This is music to the ears of Cheney and Rumsfeld, and their drive for a supra-national military force to intervene in “unstable” Bolivia—for starters.