

former Foreign Minister Ibrahim Yazdi. According to the *Voice*, these four have backgrounds as activists in the Muslim Student Association in the United States, "a body now viewed with interest and mistrust in Teheran since it received funding from the American Friends of the Middle East, identified in the 1960s with the CIA." "The planned release of the hostages," the *Voice* notes, "was part of a process designed to overthrow Bani-Sadr."

That the U.S. raid on Iran was aimed at toppling Bani-Sadr and bringing into power the lunatic faction around Ghotbzadeh on the one hand, and around the clergy on the other, is clear. From the start it was Ghotbzadeh, not Bani-Sadr, who was in on the preparations of the U.S. raid, meeting secretly in Paris to work out the details of the operation with First Secretary Murphy of the U.S. embassy there. It is interesting to note that it was while the raid and coup preparations were in the works that Bani-Sadr first began to sound the alarm publicly of the danger of his being toppled.

Despite the failure of the raid, and with it the failure of the coup, the operation achieved a partial "success" in that on the eve of the parliamentary elections, the hard-line faction associated with extremist Ayatollahs Behesh-ti and Khalkhali was strengthened considerably, undermining Bani-Sadr's efforts to shore himself up. Earlier, Bani-Sadr had been granted by Khomeini the power to appoint a prime minister and to oversee the armed forces and Iranian radio/TV. But with the upsurge of fundamentalist fanaticism following the raid, Bani-Sadr has been blocked by the Islamic Republican Party in his efforts to appoint Admiral Ahmed Madani, a moderate, as prime minister. The post still remains unfilled.

The fight between the Bani-Sadr moderates and the Khomeiniacs peaked with last week's confrontation between Bani-Sadr and Ayatollah Khalkhali, known in Iran as the "Blood Judge" for his having sent thousands of people associated with the Shah's regime to their death. Khalkhali, defying an order from Bani-Sadr to the contrary, told his followers to tear down the mausoleum of the founder of modern Iran, the Shah's father. In the boldest move since his accession to the presidency, Bani-Sadr stripped Khalkhali of all his titles, a move that is certain to ignite an intensified round of internecine warfare inside the country.

The precariousness of the situation inside Iran was underscored by a well-briefed Iranian source who revealed that "the reason the hostages were taken in the first place was because the Khomeini regime was crumbling," and that the hostages will continue to be held because if they are released, the Khomeini "revolution" will unravel. Last week, Habibollah Peyman, the head of the terrorists occupying the U.S. embassy in Teheran who is known to be tied into Israeli intelligence, stated that the hostages would be held "indefinitely, in order to ensure the continuation of the revolutionary process."

Asia

Soviets warn Ohira on 'China card'

by Richard Katz

Using the sternest tones heard in years, Soviet Ambassador to Japan Dimitry Polyanski warned Japan not to proceed with its planned de facto military alliance with China and the United States and its corollary military buildup. Polyanski reminded the Tokyo Foreign Press Club of the U.S.S.R.'s new naval presence in the Pacific—including deployments of nuclear submarines armed with nuclear missiles into the South China Sea—and its new military bases on the famous "four northern islands" claimed by Japan. A few days earlier, TASS had condemned Prime Minister Masayoshi Ohira's full support for "Carter's adventurism" in Iran as well as Japan's headlong move into a triangular military alliance with China and the United States.

The reasons listed by Polyanski for the Soviet military deployments reflect how seriously the Soviet Union regards the current strategic situation in Asia. Polyanski insisted his government would not tolerate Japan joining a U.S.-China military alliance, which would have a deleterious effect on the already growing instability in the Korean peninsula and the growing tensions in Indochina. The Soviet Union perceives a cooperative effort by the United States and China not only to undermine Soviet friends in Asia, such as Vietnam and India, but even to destabilize relatively peaceful situations such as Korea—all for the sake of producing a pan-Asia military coalition against the U.S.S.R. Polyanski's speech was aimed at preventing a full consolidation of recent Japanese moves to join the U.S.-China alliance.

Chinese threat

China's menacing posture in South Asia lies at the core of the new Soviet military deployment. Only days before Polyanski's warning, Pakistani dictator Zia ul Haq visited China and received full backing for his recent series of military skirmishes with India in the disputed Kashmir region. China itself has built up its troop strength in Sinkiang Province bordering on Kashmir (and the Soviet Union), according to the London *Daily Telegraph*. A European source reports that China is also adding more troops on its own border with India.

At the same time, China is attempting to destabilize Indira Gandhi's government by funding and inciting the

Assamese nationalist terrorists who are now depriving India's shaky economy of 30 percent of its oil. Indian opposition factions favored by the Carter administration now threaten to raise a national outcry should Gandhi militarily respond to the sedition in Assam.

In addition to the pressure on India, Chairman Hua Guofeng has repeatedly stressed in recent weeks that China reserves the "right" to "repunish" Vietnam.

Backing up its troops and destabilization activities, China has informed Japan and the United States that it will soon test a 3-megaton nuclear missile with the range ability to hit Moscow. Interestingly, the brains of the China missile program, Chien Hsueh-Chien, was a classmate of Defense Secretary Harold Brown at the California Institute of Technology during the 1930s. Chien then participated in the U.S. Army Air Corps during World War II and in postwar military intelligence missions to study Nazi rockets. In 1955 at the height of the Cold War, Chien was allowed to leave the United States and return to China. The technology used in developing the new missile comes from satellite launchings, whose further development will be aided by the cooperation agreement just signed between Washington and Peking.

A Japanese military buildup

China's activities pose a danger to Asian peace primarily because they have the backing of the Carter administration. Now Carter is putting immense pressure on Japan to join in a triangular de facto military alliance with the U.S. and China. This was the subject of the Ohira-Carter discussions in early May in Washington and is the premise for any military buildup by Japan itself. With some qualifications, Ohira essentially agreed to Carter's demands on this subject.

In Japan, the Carter administration policy is being pushed by Trilateral Commission-associated unofficial advisers to the Ohira administration. They are led primarily by Nomura Research Institute head Kiichi Saeki and former Foreign Minister Kichi Miyazawa. Saeki, a very close associate of Zbigniew Brzezinski and a longtime official of the London International Institute of Strategic Studies (IISS), is working closely with Japan Defense Agency (JDA) officials on military policy for Japan. According to Japanese sources, JDA officials are proposing a series of steps, all leading ultimately to a NATO-type alliance in Asia including China as well as countries of Southeast Asia and South Korea, presumably with a new government in the latter. Saeki is sponsoring a June meeting in Tokyo—the Security Conference on Asia and the Pacific (SCAP)—in collaboration with former U.S. Ambassador to South Korea Richard Sneider.

Already, military cooperation between Japan and China has begun in the form of Japanese military dele-

gations to China and Japanese economic support for China's military modernization. Two weeks ago, former Japan Defense Agency head Yasuhiro Nakasone, who aspires to be Prime Minister, visited Peking. He was told there by Chinese defense leaders that Japan should double its defense spending to 2 percent of GNP and build up exactly those air and naval deployments also being urged on Ohira by Washington. According to Chinese press reports, Nakasone replied that Japan and China had a role to play in preserving the security of Asia and that "*in that contest* it is appropriate that Japan aid China's four modernizations." The first of the four is military.

At the April Trilateral Commission meeting in London, George Ball made it clear that the first step in Japan's joining a NATO-type structure in Asia was for Japan to build up its air and naval deployments in order to free U.S. forces to deploy in the Indian Ocean. Former foreign minister Kichi Miyazawa, a longtime associate of Ohira's, supported Ball's proposals.

Ohira and his foreign minister Saburo Okita regard it as premature to publicly discuss the steps leading to a NATO structure in Asia—and reportedly are not yet ready to go as far as Saeki and Miyazawa. Nonetheless, Ohira agreed in Washington to the preliminary military buildup demanded by Carter. Ohira agreed that Japan would accelerate its defense buildup, with emphasis on air reconnaissance and antisubmarine deployments against the Soviet Union. Two months ago, Japan first participated in multilateral naval maneuvers with the United States, Australia and New Zealand. That participation is now expected to become routine.

A State Department-linked source noted, "This new military buildup is qualitatively different from the vague talk we have heard for 20 years of Japan taking on a growing military role. This means something." The source also noted the role that Ohira's Pacific Basin economic concept would play in aiding the military developments. Saeki happens to be a key advisor to Ohira on that policy as well.

Not everyone in Japan is pleased with Ohira's acquiescence to Carter. Japan's most powerful business leader, Toshio Doko of the Keidanren business federation, made a denunciation of military buildup proposals just prior to Ohira's departure for Washington. Such pressure led Ohira to deny that he had actually made some of the military commitments to Carter that he had made.

Ohira had already invested a great deal of political capital in supporting Carter's sanctions on Iran, at the cost of 12 percent of Japan's oil supply. When Carter pulled his "rescue" stunt in Iran two days later, Japanese newsmen said he had subjected Japan to potential "annihilation without representation." Nonetheless, Ohira went to Washington with a license to go along with

Carter on oil, military policy, Mexico.

Now, the consequences are raising a storm of criticism in Japan. This focuses particularly on the loss of Mexican oil and the military buildup policy. The opposition parties intend to place a vote of no-confidence against Ohira for his actions in Washington on the military question among others. There are rumors that members of the LDP factions of former prime ministers Miki and Fukuda—may vote with them.

At this point it is not clear if the Miki and Fukuda factions and their business backers intend to try another attempt to remove Ohira

Threat to South Korea

Perhaps the most immediate threat to peace posed by the U.S.-Japan-China alliance is the current destabilization by the Carter administration of one of the major Asian opponents of the China card, the government of South Korea. It is no accident that Polyanski included the Korean instability as a cause for the Soviet military buildup and warning to Japan.

The student demonstrators in Korea are now demanding the ouster of Korean Central Intelligence Agency head Gen. Chun Doo-Hwan and Prime Minister Shin Hyon-Hwack as well as an end to martial law. These were not the original demands of the student demonstrations that began one month ago and have now reached the unprecedented level of 2,000 off-campus demonstrators. The Opposition-supported elements among the students received a boost when Carter told Japan's Ohira that KCIA chief Chun had gathered too much power and then conveniently leaked the remark.

The student demonstrators' demands are backed by leading opposition politician Kim Kae Jung, who is believed to be favored by whole sections of the U.S. State Department. Kim had made it clear to the State Department that he regards the current regime as an obstacle to the China card strategy for Asia, adding that he himself will cooperate with the policy.

The "human rights" crowd involved in aiding the students from the U.S. are headed by former U.S. Ambassador to Japan Edwin Reischauer of Harvard and his assistant Edward Baker. The latter works for Amnesty International as head of the South Korea section.

While China's role is not certain, informed analysts believe China is urging North Korean restraint in this situation so as not to give the South Korean military a credible justification for a military crackdown.

Should the South Korean regime be replaced by a pro-China card government in a U.S.-Japan-China-Korea anti-Soviet lineup, the U.S.S.R. may decide it is necessary to go much farther than Polyanski did in warning of the folly of Brzezinski's confrontation politics.

EIR's Frankfurt conference

Planning for India to realize Nehru's dream

A small core of scientific professionals from India and West Europe outlined a detailed blueprint for avoiding mass depopulation and world war at a conference held in Frankfurt, West Germany May 6 and 7. The conference, entitled "The Industrial Development of India—Its Potential, Its Necessity," was sponsored by the Fusion Energy Foundation and the *Executive Intelligence Review*.

The themes of the conference were eloquently summed up by K.D. Malaviya, former Indian Union Minister for Petroleum and Chemicals, the father of the Indian oil industry and a close collaborator of India's first Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru. "Without peace there is no development," Malaviya told his audience, "and without development there is no peace."

The economic program presented as the basis for conference discussion—a comprehensive, step-by-step, 40-year plan for developing India from relative backwardness to an industrial superpower—was outlined by Uwe Parpart, director of research for the Fusion Energy Foundation, and Daniel Sneider, editor-in-chief of the *EIR* which published the program. The program itself has been the subject of detailed discussion in the *Far East Economic Review* as the possible path of economic planning to be chosen by the government of India's Prime Minister Indira Gandhi.

Despite the obvious importance of the issues to be discussed by a distinguished list of conference speakers, less than two dozen persons of those who accepted to attend were actually present. Those conference sponsors associated with internationally renowned economist Lyndon LaRouche, who designed the economic model used for the development of the India program, reported that the systematic campaign waged by Club of Rome circles and others to prevent West German representatives of government and industry from speaking and attending was unique to their extensive experience in its scope and intensity.

Malaviya and other conference speakers stressed the increased political courage required from West European governments, industry and labor organizations for