Well, what a surprise! It turns out that the recent “revolution” in the Kyrgyz Republic was just the latest in the series of manufactured Orange, Inky Finger, and Cedar Revolutions, of the same ilk as most of the other examples of “People Power” over which the neocons have waxed so eloquent these past 20 years. The following is from a December 30 report by Ambassador Stephen M. Young:

Taking into account the interests, of our presence in the region and development of democratic society in Kyrgyzstan, our primary goal — according to the earlier approved plans — is to increase pressure upon Akaev to make him resign ahead of schedule after the parliamentary elections. Realizing the plan is of key importance as, we think, the present opposition is not strong enough to challenge the present authorities, though Akaev has claimed he is not going to prolong his terms of office…

With a view to providing favorable conditions and helping democratic opposition leaders come to power, our primary goal for the pre-elections period is to arouse mistrust to the authorities in force and Akaev’s incapacitated corruption regime, his pro-Russian orientation and illegal use of “an administrative resource” to rig elections. In this regard, the embassy’s Democratic commission, Soros Foundations, Eurasia Foundation in Bishkek in cooperation with USAID have been organizing politically active groups of voters in order to inspire riots against pro-president candidates.

It mystifies me, by the way, that Bill O’Reilly insists on labelling George Soros as “far left.”

We have set up and opened financing for an independent printing office — the Media Support center — and AKIpress news agency to interpret impartially the course of the elections and minimize state mass media propaganda impact. We also render financial support to promising non-governmental tele- and radio companies.

According to public polls results, we can come to conclusion that only a minor part of the population— former USSR citizens — is satisfied with close cooperation with Russia. Young people are most likely oriented to the West. Therefore we consider it extremely important to popularize American way of life among them to diminish Russian influence. At least 45 national higher schools have their local Students in
Action organizations, which we are planning to use properly during parliamentary and presidential elections. In our opinion, those additional funds ($5 mm) transferred by the Department of State to hold seminars in all leading Universities of Kyrgyzstan and organize training in western countries turned out insufficient.

In the view of the pit-election situation and effort to provide fair and democratic elections in the KR and retain our positions in mass media and contacts with the opposition leaders, I advise focusing on discrediting the present political regime, thus making Akaev and his followers responsible for the economic crisis. We should also take steps to spread information on probable restriction of political freedoms during the election campaign.

It is worthwhile compromising Akaev personally by disseminating data in the opposition mass media on his wife’s involvement in financial frauds and bribery at designation of officials. We also recommend spreading rumors about her probable plans to run for the presidency, etc. All these measures will help us form an image of an absolutely incapacitated president.

Young’s repeated references to Russian political influence confirm that American involvement in former Soviet Central Asia is just a strategic effort by Oceania to mop up the remnants of Eurasia, and to secure control of the Caspian oil basin.

Thomas Carothers’ work is useful for properly evaluating what neoconservatives mean when they exult over “democracy” and “rule of law.” Writing in “The Reagan Years: The 1980s,” (in Abraham F. Lowenthal, ed., Exporting Democracy), he argued that American “pro-democratic” policy in the Third World has traditionally identified “democracy” with electoralism, and little else. The “underlying objective” of pro-democracy policies is “to maintain the basic order of what... are quite undemocratic societies.” Democracy is a means of “relieving pressure for more radical change,” but only through “limited, top-down forms of democratic change that [do] not risk upsetting the traditional structures of power with which the United States has been allied.” Democracy policy in El Salvador, for instance, promoted a form of “democracy” through the Duarte regime that did not touch the power of the military or the landed elite.

As I’ve written repeatedly here (some might call it an obsession), the main purpose of all these so-called “democratic” revolutions is to install a pliable leadership that’ll be easier for the World Bank and IMF to deal with.

**Update.** Sigh Jesse Walker tipped me off that all or part of the memo may be a fake. The U.S. embassy in Kyrgyzstan has denied its authenticity. Even Justin Raimondo is repudiating it. I’m not sure how much of it is a forgery (if any), but take it with a grain of salt.