

LaRouche: Philippines Was Robbed of Development

On June 10, Lyndon LaRouche was interviewed by Butch Valdes, the head of the Philippines LaRouche Society and the Katipunan ng Demokratikong Pilipino (League of Filipino Democrats), on Manila radio station DZRL. Valdes asked LaRouche about the lack of Filipino leadership since the fall of President Ferdinand Marcos in 1986. This was LaRouche's reply:

Well, this was deliberate. It was a deliberate chopping down. You had people who came out of the wartime and the post-war period, shall we say, the MacArthur experience, where there was a certain promise implicitly by Gen. Douglas MacArthur, about freedom for the Philippines—an experience, which of course, reflected also his own father's role in the Philippines.

So, the idea that—here's a people, which had a certain potential, a certain historical development, which should be treated in a sense, as a protected nation—not ruled by the United States, but protected by it, so it could get on its own feet, and rule itself. And up through the early 1980s, of course, we had significant progress, which became more and more difficult during the 1970s.

And then you had the U.S.-dictated overthrow of the government [in 1986], and things of that sort. And chaos set in. And we had a situation, such as dealing with the so-called minorities question in the Philippines, where, as you may recall, Butch, we were—and you can explain to others there better than I could, exactly what kind of discussions we had with people in Mindanao and so forth, of trying to solve some of the conflicts which outsiders were trying to stir up, within the Philippines.

So, these things were absolutely done to destroy the Philippines.

And why? Well, first of all, what the Philippines represented was, in a sense, a European culture in Asia, which was European in most leading respects. It had its own character as well, from the people who had been there before the Spanish came in. So, this was considered a nuisance to those who had a *globalization* intention. For example, the Philippines, with the U.S. bases, which were not always the nicest thing for the Philippines to have—morally or otherwise—but the air base and the naval base, especially the naval base, represented a certain kind of *machine-tool capability*, a potentiality, in the Philippines, which was essential for building a modern nation. With large-scale infrastructure development of the type which Marcos was associated with, this could have happened. It would have been a longer process, maybe a generation or two, but there was a genuine prospect at that time, of an actual development of the Philippines, a continuing development, as a nation, which would play an important part in its relationship to the nations of Asia, and something which the United States would be proud to have as a friend.

That changed. And Marcos was dumped out, as we know; dumped out on orders from Washington, by certain interests. That, in a sense, broke the already fragile capability of progress in the Philippines at that time.

I think it's important that people know that in the Philippines, and emphasize that; younger people in particular, because it's important not to be ashamed of your country. You may be ashamed of some of the things that go on. But don't be ashamed of the country as such. The country is not a failure. *The country's chance of development was curtailed and taken away from it.*

And therefore, you have to look at the country, as one which *still has*, a people that *has* that potential. And that to me, is the main concern. The Philippines still does have a potential role in Asia, that being its special character, which is a different character than other countries in Asia, but it's a contribution to the cultural development of Asia as a whole. That's what I think we would want to concentrate on.

is another crucial target of the financial oligarchy in demanding a Constitutional Convention in the Philippines. The current Constitution imposes limitations on foreign ownership of certain Philippine industries. Although these restrictions have been watered down, and virtually ignored in some cases, they provide a basis for the defense of the national patrimony and sovereignty. The international spokesmen for “globalization,” the currently popular term for colonialism, insist that these Philippine Constitutional restrictions are old-fashioned relics of protectionism that have no place in the era of globalization. President Arroyo alluded to her agreement with this colonial demand in a July 7 address to the nation, when she

called for “modernizing the economic provisions of our Constitution.”

With the onrushing explosions of the global hedge fund and real estate bubbles, both developed and developing nations are being confronted with issues of survival, because of their dependence on the international financial institutions. But they are also presented with the opportunity to assert their voices in the effort to return sanity to the brotherhood of nations. Those in the Philippines who recognize that reality must lift the vision of the troubled citizenry from the parochial and localized problems to that broader goal. Solutions to the current crisis depend on that effort.