

The 'New Yalta' deal in action: America attacks its Asian allies

by Linda de Hoyos

On Dec. 16, India Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi was in Madras to dedicate "to the nation" India's fast breeder reactor, making India the fifth nation in the world, second in Asia, and the first in the underdeveloped world, to build its own fast breeder capability. The occasion was further marked by the presence of representatives of the Atomic Energy Commission of Pakistan, there at the invitation of the Indian prime minister. Their presence acted as a symbolic statement that the two nations are capable of overriding their long-standing hostilities and working for the mutual goal of economic development.

India's fast breeder inauguration in Madras is a reminder to the world of the great potential waiting to be unleashed within the nations of the vast Asian continent. For India, the fast breeder's dedication sent out a message that India has weathered the total crisis and danger of disintegration that threatened the country in the process leading to the Oct. 31, 1984 assassination of Prime Minister Indira Gandhi. On Oct. 31, 1985, on the anniversary of this great leader's death, *EIR* editors released the results of a year-long investigation of the forces responsible for Mrs. Gandhi's death. The book, *Derivative Assassination: Who Killed Indira Gandhi*, proved that the assassination was the result of a combined conspiracy between British and Soviet intelligence, with subsidiary aid from the Israeli Mossad. The strategic agreement among these forces is the goal of destroying the independent nation-states of the region, achieving their economic pulverization and political fragmentation as the condition required for a new rule by empire, in the case of Asia, with Moscow and Peking as the capitals. Although India stood firm in the face of the crisis created by Mrs. Gandhi's death, other countries in the region have been thrown into a spiral of economic and social dislocation. In 1985, the ASEAN countries—Thailand, Singapore, the Philippines, Brunei, Indonesia, and Malaysia—were thrown "into the barrel." In this case, the chief agencies doing the dirty work were the International Monetary Fund and the U.S. State Department.

The most lurid case in point for the United States' attack on its allies is the Philippines. From Manila, *EIR* correspondents traveling there discovered, it looks like the United States has declared war on its own allies. The crisis in U.S.-Filipino

relations, begun with the August 1983 assassination of opposition leader Benigno Aquino, reached a fever-pitch beginning in June 1985 when the House Foreign Relations Committee threatened to end all military aid to the Marcos government—aid which Filipinos consider due rent for the U.S. bases at Clark Field and Subic Bay. In July, *EIR* broke the story, corroborated by sources in both Manila and Washington, that U.S. Ambassador Stephen Bosworth, a protégé of Henry Kissinger, was directing the opposition to the Marcos government and was also preparing a coup option against President Marcos, with the hope of using acting Chief of Staff of the Armed Forces, Fidel Ramos, as the replacement for Marcos. The *EIR* exposure of the plot momentarily ruined Bosworth's plans, but did not succeed in breaking the across-the-board consensus in Washington that Marcos must go.

The justification for this consensus is based upon a lie: that if Marcos does not go, Manila will be overpowered by the insurgent New People's Army and the Philippines will become a Nicaragua in the Pacific. This evaluation is false on two counts. First, the Marcos presidency is the core institution of the Philippines at the present moment, and its toppling in the manner prescribed by the State Department will produce only social chaos and disintegration—exactly what the United States presumably wants to avoid. Second, the biggest recruiter for the NPA is the International Monetary Fund, whose program for the Philippines, implemented under a credit embargo instituted since August 1983, has brought the economy to the lowest point since the Japanese occupation. According to State Department desk officer John Maiso, the State Department "has a lot of input" into the Fund's dealings with the Marcos government.

However, State Department policy is worse than incompetent. Beginning in June, the liberal media led by the *New York Times*, which has cheered on the State Department's anti-Marcos policy, recommended that the United States start looking for alternative sites to the U.S. base on Luzon—pulling the U.S. air and naval forces back to Guam or Saipan. This option is known to be a chimera—the natural fortifications and deep water of Subic Bay and the skilled Filipino labor force are irreplaceable. Scrapping Subic Bay means pulling U.S. Trident submarines all the way to Bremerton,

Washington, and giving the U.S.S.R. strategic command of the South China Sea, the crucial link between the Indian and Pacific Oceans, breaking the supply lines to Japan.

The Philippines destabilization, led from Washington, is in fact a result of the New Yalta plan by which the United States is executing its strategic withdrawal from the Pacific. In the fall of 1983, the "arc of crisis" on the perimeter of the Soviet Union in the Middle East, was extended into Asia. At the end of 1985, the United States policy had produced one policy debacle after another in the Asian theater—and a deliberate game plan to hand hegemony in the region to Moscow and Peking. Negotiations for this imperial transfer of territory took place on two occasions. On June 18, U.S. Assistant Undersecretary of State Richard Murphy, a man who had earlier told the Russians, "Take Lebanon, we don't want it," met in Washington with Oleg Sokolov, the number-two man in the Soviet embassy, and Yuri Alekseyev, chief of the Mideast Department of the Soviet foreign affairs ministry, to "exchange views" on Afghanistan. In the first week of September, Assistant Undersecretary of State for Asian and Pacific Affairs' Paul Wolfowitz, met in Moscow with Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister Mikhail Kapitsa for an exchange of official positions. Although the views discussed were official, Wolfowitz told South Korean and Japanese leaders after the trip that his discussions with Kapitsa were "confidential."

On one level, such official discussions with Moscow are designed to avoid superpower miscalculation and confrontation, as both powers proceed to destabilize the countries of the region. On a deeper level, the United States is breaking up the economic stability and political integrity of its allies, in the process of handing them over to the U.S.S.R. Strategic withdrawal as a U.S. policy goal in Asia began with the escalation of the Vietnam War and was enunciated in the Nixon-Kissinger Guam Doctrine of 1969. But it is best put forward, in the words of former U.S. ambassador to Iran and the Philippines, William Sullivan, a protégé of Averell Harriman, whom *EIR* caught this year attempting to orchestrate a coup against President Marcos. Writing in his autobiography, Sullivan reveals the only policy which could possibly explain the grotesque posture with which the United States has confronted its Asian allies this year:

When an objective history of American international performance in the middle decades of this century is written . . . I believe that the pattern which will emerge will be more straightforward than the current record will suggest. It will be seen not as an effort to grasp for greater power, but rather as a sustained attempt to devolve unwanted responsibilities on others. . . . Our foreign policy . . . will ultimately be seen, not as a series of rear-guard actions by cohorts defending against assaults upon a jealously guarded

empire, but rather as a constant struggle to find and develop worthy heirs to handle *those elements of our hegemony we no longer wished to dominate* [emphasis added].

Sullivan's policy summary is the motivation for the U.S. declaration of war against its allies in Asia:

The political stability of Thailand was shattered on the morning of Sept. 9, when Young Turks, led by Col. Manoon Roopakhorn, and backed by leading military officers, attempted a coup against the government of Prime Minister Prem Tinsulanond. The coup failed, but before it was over that afternoon, civilians had been killed and many were wounded. In the aftermath of the coup bid, Colonel Manoon and his Young Turk brother were escorted out of the country, but within a week, the government had arrested former Prime Minister Gen. Kriangsak Chamonan and three other leading officers, including Deputy Supreme Commander ACM Arun Trontep, for their alleged involvement in the coup attempt.

Despite all the discussion of divisions in the Thai military, the underlying cause of the instability in Thailand is the 17% devaluation of the Thai currency, the baht, in November 1984. With that, the Prem government placed the Thai economy in the hands of the IMF and World Bank. The result: The Thai trade deficit has increased; farmers are going bankrupt because of the low price of their products, and industries are also failing. The World Bank has issued orders to halt all development projects. The newly issued Prem budget calls for cuts in all categories, with the exception of tourism. A government demand to raise the diesel fuel price by 30% is now expected to cause a strike in the Thai fishing and transport industries. Thailand is also a victim, along with the other ASEAN countries, of the Jenkins Textile Protection Act, which threatens to shut down 60% of Thailand's young textile industry.

Bangkok is now rife with rumors of another coup and possible counter-coups. The word from the U.S. embassy is that the United States is not concerned with the political crisis or who will govern, as long as the IMF austerity program goes through. Particularly, Henry Kissinger told Thai officials privately during a stopover in January, the Kra Canal development project—revived by the Fusion Energy Foundation and now under study by a parliamentary commission—must not go through. The economic and political instability has indeed put all such initiatives on the back burner.

From Bangkok, the view is that the United States has abandoned Thailand to the mercies of China and Russia—there is not even minimal intelligence cooperation from the United States in the areas of drugs and security. The relationship between Thailand and the United States is epitomized by the jailing of former Prime Minister General

Kriangsak. The orders for Kriangsak's full trial and prosecution reportedly came from Kissinger himself, since Kriangsak, who fought with Americans in World War II, the Korean War, and the Vietnamese War, is regarded in Washington as the one Thai leader that could rally a successful resistance to the IMF.

U.S. policy toward Japan has taken the same tone. On Jan. 2, 1985, Japanese Prime Minister Yasuhiro Nakasone met President Reagan in California. As a result of their talks, Nakasone declared his support for Reagan's Strategic Defense Initiative. The SDI is the only possible defense for Japan, which otherwise is extremely vulnerable to Soviet assaults upon its sea lanes and upon Japan's northern island of Hokkaido. At the end of November, Nakasone again affirmed his support for the SDI, indicating that there had been no progress in U.S.-Japanese cooperation on the projects since January. The SDI requires Japanese cooperation, especially in the area of the fifth-generation computer. But the response from the U.S. side has been dilatory, while Secretary of State George Shultz continues to complain that Japan is not meeting its "responsibility for global security."

The response from the Soviet Union to Japan's support of SDI has been violent. On Jan. 22, the Soviet Defense Ministry daily *Krasnaya Zvezda* called the Japanese endorsement of SDI part of a plan for a "greater Japan," and complained about a "Washington-Tokyo-Seoul axis." In September

is being militarily threatened by Japan. "Building up its military and economic potential, Japan has become . . . one of the main centers of world imperialism," wrote Marshal Vasilii Petrov on Sept. 1. In November, the Soviet forces on the four islands directly north of Japan staged maneuvers for the Soviet takeover of Hokkaido. Soviet seizure of Hokkaido would secure a breakout capability for the Soviet fleet from Vladivostok.

In the face of Soviet pressure on Japan, U.S. policy has been carried out with the unofficial objectives of bringing down the Nakasone government, precisely because the Japanese prime minister is pro-SDI. The process began in earnest in January when Henry Kissinger moved successfully to split the faction of ruling party leader Kakuei Tanaka, Nakasone's primary base of support. Even more threatening, the State and Commerce Departments launched a full-scale attack on Japan's dirigist economic system, forcing Japan to open up its financial markets and create an offshore center for fully deregulated banking. These and other protectionist pressures—including a long memorandum delivered in September telling the Japanese to change their lifestyle to conform to American credit-fueled consumerism—are aimed at discrediting the Nakasone alliance with the Reagan administration. Although Nakasone is extremely popular with the Japanese people, political forces in Japan have put his chances of winning the third term he is seeking at almost nil.

Thus Japan finds itself the target of a squeeze play from both Moscow and Washington. It remains to be seen how long Japan will hold onto its nearly non-functional alliance with the United States, before it is forced to come to terms with the U.S.S.R.

Within the perverted logic of William Sullivan, such an outcome of U.S. policy toward Japan would be welcomed as a great success. Likewise, in November, Henry Kissinger happily admitted that his attempts at a strategic alliance with China, the policy with which the State Department turned away from its Asian allies, has been a failure. "China will never become the card of anyone," chirped Kissinger in Peking. The United States, he said, welcomes the Sino-Soviet rapprochement that has steadily advanced over the last year. U.S. and Chinese interests, he said without explanation, remain identical.

The year 1985 has thus brought about a situation in which the Asian nations face an effective alliance among Moscow, Peking, and the Kissinger forces of the West. The question for 1986 is whether patriots in the United States—who oppose the Harriman-Sullivan goal of capitulation—wake up to the crisis in time, or whether one by one, the nations of Asia are compelled to turn their back on the United States and make their *kotow* to the dual power of Moscow and Peking.

Derivative Assassination: Who Killed Indira Gandhi?

by the Editors of
Executive
Intelligence
Review

Order from:
**Ben Franklin
Booksellers, Inc.**
27 South King St.
Leesburg, VA 22075

\$4.95 plus shipping (\$1.50 for first book, \$.50 for each additional book). Bulk rates available.

