

# The blueprint for dismembering India

## Roots of the Northeast Crisis

*The following article is reprinted courtesy of the influential Indian newsweekly New Wave. This is the first part of a series written by New Wave investigators examining the roots of the trouble in India's northeast region. New Wave has played a prominent role in exposing the years-long efforts to destabilize India.*

From time to time, India, a former British colony, is treated to predictions about its future viability as a nation-state by Anglo-American soothsayers. Sometimes, as was the case this June, Indian politicians and intellectuals are invited to London to serve as sounding boards for imperial patrons.

The most explicit prediction on India came last year in a portion of General Sir John Hackett's book on a scenario for World War III. Hackett unabashedly states that by 1984, the Indian nation as we know it today will have totally disintegrated. Secessionism, tribalism, ethnic chauvinism will overtake the region. "Rival factions and states in the Indian Union may start appealing to the Soviet Union and China. There might be *civil war* again in this whole area of India-Pakistan-Bangladesh."

Hackett's view is not mere futurology. It is based on policy options worked out by financial-political interests behind the NATO alliance, of which Hackett was up to recently a commanding member, for a long-term political strategic shift toward a "post-industrial society." For the developing countries, the NATO plan has meant blocking in-depth industrial development and a gradual destruction of the concept of the sovereign nation-state.

It has been accomplished already on a large scale in the starving continent of Africa through outright genocide policies that were set into motion through the manipulation of tribal conflicts and economic policies prescribed by the World Bank. In Asia, two versions—the Pol Pot Peking-sponsored extermination policies and the Islamic fundamentalism variety—have been activated to

destroy countries. The main targets now are any countries which for particular historical reasons have a strong identity as nation-states. India is close to the top of this hit list.

Today the northeastern part of the country has been picked as the most vulnerable flank of India. To the extent inroads are made here, the precedent will be set for secessionism, large-scale upheaval and communal strife on the subcontinent.

There are several layers to the destabilization in motion in the northeast. Here we present the ideological underpinnings to the northeast operation—that is, who thought it up and why.

The decision to totally paralyze and ultimately destabilize the central government was taken at the highest levels of government in London-Washington and Peking. The data-base on which this article concentrates was provided by the army of sociologists and anthropologists who have profiled India with the idea of using weak links to exacerbate social tension. As an added wing of the intellectual bank are the church organizations, primarily the Baptist Church, the Jesuit liberation theologians and the World Council of Churches.

For historical reasons, the church in the Northeast provides an ideal institution to launder funds as well as side with what it calls the oppressed sections of society, on the pretext that it is "protecting their identity" against the overwhelming strength and power of the "foreign" (Indian) nation.

In India, where the church is active, other communal organizations are not far behind. In the Northeast, the work on the ground to ripen the region for secessionist movements is being largely done by RSS [Hindu extremist—ed.] storm troopers and, from the Bangladesh haven, the Muslim League-linked operations in the guise of "protecting the Muslim minority."

India's northeast troubles are part and parcel of a

reinforced U.S.-China alliance. Last December, following the visit of top Peking leaders to Washington, high-level sources confirmed that a decision had been made by London and Washington to surrender "hegemony" of South and Southeast Asia to China. India was put into China's sphere of influence. Subsequent moves by Peking to activate its Bangladesh operations as a surrogate tension point vis-à-vis India follow this general policy line.

The design to destabilize the Indira Gandhi government is the implementation of revenge reiterated in China Card policy architect Henry Kissinger's famous post-1972 statement: "The inevitable emergence of Bangladesh ... presented India with fierce long-term problems. Whether it turned nationalist or radical, Bangladesh would over time accentuate India's centrifugal tendencies ... Bangladesh might set a precedent for the creation of smaller states, this time carved out of India."

### The old British plan

The current scenario for this project is not new. It is a plan taken out of deep freeze from the old British India Office and delivered for implementation at this time to Britain's most faithful stooge, the U.S.A. Two years ago, following the Afghan revolution in April 1978, the plan for southern Asia of Olaf Caroe, the former British governor of India's northwest frontier province, was dusted off the shelves and put in motion. It involved activating through the British intelligence operation called the Muslim Brotherhood a chain of Islamic fundamentalist fanatical movements across the southern border of the Soviet Union.

An updated version of Caroe's strategy now involves a pincer movement on India to incorporate this area into the anti-Soviet front.

Mrs. Gandhi's independent policy of safeguarding India's national interest and making friends and enemies solely on that basis is considered by the old and new imperial powers an unwanted obstruction.

To break the Indira Gandhi government, Anglo-American policymaking circles have revived another Colonial Office plan, the Coupland Plan, focusing it first on the fragile fabric of the northeastern states, then spreading it inward into the rest of the country. In the Coupland strategy, northeastern India would never have joined the Indian Union. It would have remained under British stewardship, a weak but pliable independent member of the Commonwealth.

Like General Sir John Hackett, today a professor of classics at King's College, England, and Caroe yesterday, Coupland was a member of the prized British school of anthropologists and historians who profiled the natives, sought out their weaknesses, made recommendations and then distanced themselves from the "dirty work" done by others. In the waning days of the

British Empire, Sir Reginald Coupland was drawn on to sort out the problems linked with a potential transfer of power. In 1942, he left his job as fellow at the All Souls College, to undertake the in-depth survey of Indian conditions that would be the basis for future imperial action.

Coupland had more to do with how partition was undertaken than the cartographer who drew the lines without full knowledge of the country, as reported in Viceroy Mountbatten's account of the partition. For three years he traveled extensively in British India, surveying different areas and talking to the population at large. He gave special attention to three areas—Punjab, Sind, and Assam. But his primary interest was to see if James Mill's tested thesis that Indian history and culture could be divided communally was valid; and two, what would be the form of government in the subcontinent that would not eclipse the British masters totally.

In 1944, Coupland put his research into the form of a three-volume study of British Indian history, where, after presenting two volumes of primary materials, he provides certain fundamental recommendations. It is well worth our while to study his prescription.

"The scheme of partition contemplates two Moslem states in the Moslem majority areas—'Pakistan' and 'Northeast India.' The first difficulty in realizing Pakistan is the problem of the Sikhs. The second and greater difficulty is the cost of defending the northwest frontier," he stated, echoing Caroe on the last point. "In other respects Pakistan could finance itself from its existing or potential resources but it could not maintain defense at its present level nor even at the necessary minimum without cutting down expenditure on social advancement." In these words were the clear pointers that should an entity like Pakistan come into being, some outside force would have to be its midwife for stability. "The financial viability of Northeast India would be no more than a weak appendage of Pakistan. But all such material considerations are likely to be overridden and partition adopted at all cost."

Coupland also gave the reasons why India had to be partitioned so as to prevent it from becoming a world power: "India is a geographical unity: it is not divided by such physical barriers as have fostered the growth of separate nations in Europe. Its unification under British rule has not only made all Indians feel themselves to be Indians; it has saved India from the fate which political and economic nationalism has brought on Europe. The Partitionists threaten to throw India back to the condition it was in after the breakup of the Moghul Empire, to make it another Balkans. This would negate the development of democracy in India. *Partition would also prevent a free India from taking her due place in the world as a great Asiatic power; for it would probably*



Viceroy Mountbatten (center) heads an informal staff meeting.

mean disruption into several States ranking with Egypt or Siam. [emphasis added]"

This "impact study" revealed the depth of British and later American and even Chinese understanding that India had within its hands the crucial ingredients to become a trend-setter in post-World War II modernization and industrialization of the newly independent states. Just as "political and economic nationalism in Europe" forced continental industrialization against British colonial wishes, so India could break with its past. To control this potential, Coupland was the first to prescribe certain post-partition measures to the British imperialists so that the latter could use their best agents to make them come true. He told them that the "Hindu-Muslim problem is the center of why democracy Western style will not work in the Indian subcontinent."

### Regionalization blueprint

Most damning of Coupland's India-loving advice was his proposal for provincial autonomy. He held out two formulas—a weak center and no partition versus partition and a "wide measure of autonomy for provinces." The powers of the central government would be curtailed in such a way that independent provincial identities would be safeguarded and central power to intervene reduced.

Nowhere in Coupland's mammoth treatise on "protection" of India's minorities is the issue raised of real economic development policy in independent India, much less the dominant role a central government would have to play in such a process. Though he does reference the riches of particular states—Assam for its legacy of British tea plantations and forests for instance—Coupland's plot was to create provincial structures that would safeguard British investment, and by

knowing the weakness of each region and tribe inside out, a controlled environment of policies could be evolved. As a further insurance measure, he proposed rather coyly that everything be done to ensure that the Indian Union remain within the Commonwealth, a cornerstone to postwar British foreign policy.

It was not until 1971, and then, too under conditions of tremendous stress and external manipulation, that the subcontinent saw its maps redrawn. The political geometry changed not just with the birth of Bangladesh, but with the realization of a long sought Anglo-American dream: the U.S.-China alliance, choreographed from the British Foreign Office and executed by its most faithful proponent, Henry Kissinger. Speaking before U.S. AID hearings in 1971, Kissinger blocked food aid to the Bengali refugee camps in India, because, he argued, the refugees would "suck India dry." From the refugee influx, the demise of the Indira Gandhi government was foreseen.

### Operation Assam

Even this disaster India managed, although not without enormous costs. But Bangladesh, the new nation struggled for survival. For five years, Mujibur Rahman fought to make Bangladesh a viable nation-state. When he was shot in 1975 with bullets provided by a conspiracy hatched in the Ford Foundation-linked Comilla Rural Reconstruction agency, a process Mrs. Gandhi then identified as a destabilization of the entire subcontinent was set into motion.

Operation Assam is a result of Coupland's "Balkanization of India" model. It is no coincidence that one of the Coupland plan's best fieldmen, Reverend Michael Scott, took up the Bangladesh refugee cause in 1970 from London and became one of the chief British operators befriending Bengali exiles.

In 1970-71, ostensibly to rectify the "Pakistan tilt" policy, the so-called "friends of India" got to work on the same area. What they produced was the "spillover effect" of Bangladesh into India's Northeast.

Chosen to do the Coupland-style primary study was a well known, American India-watcher, Myron Weiner, Ford international professor of political science, Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT). The study was commissioned about the same time that MIT produced through its professors Meadows and Forrester the Club of Rome's "Limits to Growth" propaganda and launched full scale the zero growth, environmentalist movement.

Weiner, who is part of the engineering-social demographics crowd that supplemented the Limits to Growth groups, got to work on the following topic: "Sons of the Soil: Migration and Ethnic Conflict in India." In the words of the author himself, the survey was designed to "study the socio-political consequences of interethnic

migrations in India and governmental policies toward ethnic migrations within the country.”

Weiner coined the “sons of the soil” title to study the viability and basis for establishing an “independent” identity of a variety of people—historically, culturally, and ethnically. The Assam-Bengali cultural and ethnic relationship was put under the microscope for future use as the primary and first case study.

Lest any naive soul believing that Weiner, a good researcher, carried out just a scholarly academic survey, one must take some time to describe his financial backers, and operations connections. “Sons of the Soil” was a project that received financial support from the Behavioral Sciences Research Branch of the U.S. National Institute of Mental Health (NIMH). NIMH is part of the post-World War II dispersal of British psychological warfare experts into civilian institutions. It was set up as an adjunct of the World Federation of Mental Health and has been run since the war by psychiatrists trained at Britain’s Tavistock Institute of Human Relations.

Tavistock is, in turn, funded by major British corporations, such as Unilever, to conduct psychological profile studies globally.

Sons of the Soil also received funding from the Rockefeller-Ford Program for Population Research and the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development. The Ford Foundation and Rockefeller Foundation’s interest in population control in the Indian subcontinent is well known. The notable aspect here is the evolution in their research. By and large, according to their own spokesmen, emphasis on India is more “research-oriented,” while their primary base of operations is located in Bangladesh. One of their associated institutions, the Population Council, is pumping money into Bangladesh.

### **Weiner’s Assam profile**

Weiner’s Sons of the Soil study divides Assam’s population into four main groups and proceeds to examine their psychological and current economic makeup: plantation migrants, primarily tribes brought in from Chota Nagpur and southern Bihar by the British as indentured laborers last century; Bengali migrants (Hindu), entrenched in the imperial bureaucratic structure and later in governmental white collar jobs; Bengali Muslims, the spinoff effect on Assam of the “demographic explosion” in East Pakistan and later Bangladesh; an last but not least, the Marwari migrants, controllers of commerce, banking, credit and trade.

The assessment in 1976, after four years of in-depth interviews with all parts of the society, was, not surprisingly, that Assam was ripe for revolt. Weiner did a special study of the 1972 language riots in Gauhati when the All Assam Students Union (AASU) shot to

fame spearheading the movement to get Bengali struck off as an optional second language in university examinations. He predicted that universities, students, and professors would become the backbone of a movement to articulate Assamese cultural chauvinism.

“Bengali cultural imperialism can only be met with linguistic nationalism,” he postulates, noting that once this occurs, there would be no reason why Assam and the entire northeast would not flare up in tribal demands.

In parting shots, Weiner produces the following scenario for civil war. “An unspoken coalition between Assamese and Bengali Muslims against Bengali Hindus will be the core of the problem in the future. It is not a wholly stable coalition, however, since it could be shattered if there were to be a major influx of Bengali Muslims into Assam or if Bengali Hindus and Muslims coalesce.”

### **The Gandhi Peace Foundation**

One of the most evil institutions active in India today is the Gandhi Peace Foundation, which has nothing to do with Gandhi. Under such a misnamed title, it has become the think tank for foreign agents and missionaries, involving itself in every sensitive social situation, under the guise of mediation work. As is well known, it is a mold of the Cold War days, having been created out of Ford Foundation’s India budget in addition to contributions by some Indians of the same type.

Later it Indianized, but kept on its core planning staff, figures linked to the Jesuit church, the Anglican church, the World Council of Churches, Amnesty International, and others.

Is it mere coincidence that the Bharatiya Janata Party leader A. B. Vajpayee has become one of the big promoters of the Gandhi Peace Foundation work?

Is it merely another coincidence that three of the agencies operating in tribal areas on the West Bengal-Assam border are linked to the World Council of Churches under the Indian pseudo-leftist names “Socio-economic Development Agency and Liberation Association of the Movement of the People”?

Both Amnesty International and the WCC have been longtime Anglo-American intelligence tools deployed carefully when a government overthrow is prepared. Sources indicate that GPF has produced marching orders for destabilizing other sensitive areas.

Who is active in Assam? Firstly the Hindu chauvinist, paramilitary RSS. At 6 a.m. on Gauhati’s main roads, clusters of RSS cadre conduct their daily shakhas [paramilitary drills]. Their activities and presence in Assamese Hindu areas are pointed out as good indicators of how communal the Assam situation has become. Their numbers have increased markedly in recent



Photo: Wide World

*India's strategic geography: The Assam region in the extreme northeast underwent riots this August between Moslems and Hindus.*

months, particularly since Mrs. Gandhi's government came to power. Not long ago, RSS chief Balasaheb Deoras came out with the theory that Hindu migrants in Assam are "migrants" while Muslims are "foreigners." Reenacting Partition days, the RSSers are preparing for a big confrontation with the Muslims.

It is clear that the RSS feels it is on firm enough ground that it need not mask its ties to anti-Muslim forces internationally. It has been promoting Moshe Dayan and Israel as its friend and sees the Assamese turmoil as an opportunity to fight for *Hindu rashtra*. Informed sources indicated that Israeli money, conduit-ed through Nepal by Israeli arms racketeers are helping the RSS activities.

According to one account of a secret strategy session of RSS leaning ideologues the reason for their involvement in Assam is: "We must impress upon people that Assam is in danger of becoming a Muslim majority state. We must raise a few thousands of rupees, set up a committee to monitor comments in the outside press and send emissaries to every corner of India to meet editors, businessmen, policy makers and to convince them about the gravity of the situation "

The rupees are coming into the area in a way similar to that of the 1960s Naga operation. Then, as now, the missionaries, Gandhi Peace Foundation and "minorities" or tribals have joined hands. At that time, the Naga struggle was centered around Reverend Michael Scott, an Anglican priest, who had been very active in African tribal problems on behalf of the British Colonial Office. After arranging several secret trips into East Pakistan for the Naga leader Phizo, Scott secured a Salvadorean passport for Phizo and had him delivered to London, smuggled out via Pakistan and Zurich, Switzerland. In London, Phizo was protected by Scott, a member of Britain's Chatham House instructed to

watch over the former colonies. Scott sheltered him, secured funds through the Bertrand Russell Foundation and put Phizo in touch with Israeli international arms merchants operating out of Europe. Arms came from Israeli sources; while training was provided by the Chinese. China was so attentive that it assured the tribals that it would not make them communists or attack their Christian faith; Mao was only interested in helping them fight for their self determination. Numerous training camps were set up in Tibet as part of Sino-Israeli cooperation to destabilize India.

Many feel the same game is on in Assam now with the added feature that tribal extremists are also operating out of Bangladesh.

Lastly, it is clear that the Gandhi Peace Foundation proposals are less than honest. During the Naga struggle this operation was led by Jayaprakash Narayan, one of Scott's closest collaborators. Together they formed part of another British intelligence front group, the Minority Rights Group, an umbrella organization to fight for minorities everywhere.

One pamphlet put out in 1972 by MRG denouncing the Indian government for atrocities against Nagas was penned by Neville Maxwell, an MI-5 operator. Maxwell is remembered as the author of the wildly distorted *India's China War*, a British intelligence coverup of the 1962 events in collaboration with some British agents in the Indian army. As a London *Times* correspondent he had freedom to be a contact man with many subversives for many years in India and also with honest intellectuals and government officials.

The latest Gandhi Peace Foundation proposals on Assam must be seen in this light. While parading as peaceful mediators, this group has sided with the All Assam Student Union. Perhaps this is the reason for the praise it is receiving from RSS circles lately.