

operation in 1983; the test reactor and training center at Pátzcuaro, a \$30 million facility, is just at the ground-breaking stage.

The reference to the Pátzcuaro facility was appropriate because in the preceding days a new group, calling itself the "Ecological Defense Committee of Michoacán," had suddenly made a bid for national prominence with threats to stop the facility.

The environmental-leftist daily *Uno más Uno*, which gave the committee every favorable mention it could, had to admit that few responded to the call. A glance at the lead speakers in a protest meeting March 13, however, confirmed that an international coordinated intensification of environmental activity was involved.

The most significant name on the speaker's roster was Dr. Adip Sabag, director of the Mexican Public Opinion Institute (IMOP), a subsidiary of the newly constituted Mexican Social Democratic Party, seeking official affiliation with Willy Brandt's environmentalist, proterrorist Socialist International.

Speaking with Sabag was José Arias, head of an offshoot of the United Nations environmentalist apparatus called the "Association of Appropriate Technologies," and Jean Roberts, a collaborator of counterculture brainwasher and guru, Ivan Illich.

Some government officials are playing along. Public Works and Housing Minister Pedro Ramírez Vázquez has put environmentalists on the ministry's payroll and promoted solar energy as Mexico's energy future. Jorge Castañeda's foreign ministry is cosponsoring a late March "new and renewable energy" forum with the U.N.'s Economic Commission on Latin America. Its focus will be the technologies of the 14th-century—windmills, sailing ships, beasts of burden, and swamp gas.

Yet the tide is unquestionably running against these greenie efforts in Mexico. The government has announced that bids will be taken this summer for the next 2,000 to 3,000 MWe of nuclear power construction. The new official Energy Plan calls for 20 new plants by the year 2000. And at the Third Pacific Basin Nuclear Conference in Acapulco in February, government spokesmen sent a strong message to the Reagan administration that one of the actions that could most quickly undo the damage of the Carter years would be to reverse Carter's restrictions on nuclear exports (see *EIR*, March 17).

The aggressiveness of the nuclear advocates, spurred and reinforced by the LaRouche statements, was most audible in the rejoinder of Nuclear Workers Union spokesman Arturo Ponce to diatribes by countercultural columnist Mauricio Schoijet (see box). To Schoijet's likening of the pronuclear labor unions to the workers who built Hitler's gas ovens, Ponce simply asked Schoijet to put a figure on how many millions will die under his own regime of primitive technologies.

Hijacking could clinch to Pakistan—and undo

by Paul Zykofsky, New Delhi correspondent

The Pakistani air hijacking drama that ended in Syria last week has set the stage for a chorus of demands that U.S. arms be rushed to Gen. Zia Ul-Haq's military dictatorship in Pakistan to "meet the Soviet threat." Pakistani government charges that the Soviet Union and Soviet-backed regime in Afghanistan operated in collusion with the hijackers were repeated two days ago by the U.S. State Department.

But, despite the overtly anti-Zia nature of the hijacking, the affair has aroused deep suspicions in neighboring India and elsewhere that Gen. Zia Ul-Haq may have run the hijacking himself as a pretext for gaining U.S. backing to embark on dangerous adventurism to maintain himself in power.

One Indian politico-military analyst did not hesitate to describe the entire incident as a "setup" carried out with the complicity of the Zia regime to brand the opposition as "terrorists." The opposition is the Pakistan Peoples Party (PPP), founded by executed former Prime Minister Zulifkar Ali Bhutto, and the nine parties the PPP recently united into a Movement for the Restoration of Democracy.

The analyst reported that he had first received this impression when, on the second day of the hijacking, British Broadcasting Company had reported from Islamabad that Pakistan was blaming India for the incident. His view was reinforced, he noted, when the head of Pakistan International Airways, Gen. Rahim Khan, went out of his way to charge that the hijacking had been carried out with the full support of the PPP and the Bhutto family. The subsequent arrest of PPP leaders Mrs. Nusrat Bhutto and Benazir Bhutto, the wife and daughter of the former prime minister executed by the Zia government, and of hundreds of opposition members, was taken as further evidence of the suspicious nature of the hijacking.

Some confirmation of these suspicions emerged over one week after the hijacking when a small item appeared in the Indian press to the effect that the head of the hijackers, "Algimir" (also called "Tippu"), was a former member of Pakistan's Secret Service Group (SSG). According to sources near the Pakistani border, the press

U.S. arms shipment General Zia's hold

account stated, the hijack leader had received special guerrilla warfare training in the Pakistan-occupied portion of Kashmir under Chinese instructors.

In a television speech after the hijacking, General Zia tried to link the PPP to the affair, and also charged that the plot involved unspecified "foreigners." Zia went from this totally unsubstantiated claim to say that there was an "anti-state conspiracy" which was trying to lead the country away from the Islamic fundamentalist path his military dictatorship has been pushing. The crack-down against opposition parties was described as a move to crush this "conspiracy."

Indian analysts thus explain the hijacking affair as the culmination of a year-long effort by the Zia regime to brand the political opposition—and particularly the Bhuttos' PPP—as terrorists with links to Libya and the Soviet Union. Pakistan's expulsion of several Libyan diplomats over the past few months, and leveling of charges that some of them were Soviet KGB agents, is thought to be part of this premeditated effort—possibly conducted with the cooperation of Libya.

The moves against the opposition had been made all the more urgent when the recently formed Movement for the Restoration of Democracy demanded an end to the military regime and the holding of elections. In fact, just a few weeks prior to the hijacking, the Zia regime had been shaken by the outbreak of the most widespread unrest to take place in the nearly four years of the regime's existence. Before the military dictatorship was able to crack down, the ferment had spread to include students, doctors, and lawyers fed up with General Zia's rule.

Will Washington arm Zia?

Despite the evidence that it was a setup job, the message being put out in Washington is that General Zia's unpopular regime must be supported for strategic reasons. *Baltimore Sun* correspondent Henry Trehitt, reporting on the State Department's accusation of Soviet involvement, put it this way: "Pakistan's relative security will influence the administration's developing policy for the entire Persian Gulf region, and its oil.

That consideration is magnified by the Soviet presence in Afghanistan and instability in Iran."

The policy of building up Pakistan as an armed base in the Persian Gulf region has its origins in Britain, whose Thatcher government has been pushing the Reagan administration to take this path. British Foreign Minister Lord Carrington will visit Pakistan March 27. According to reports in the Indian press, he will discuss British arms sales to Pakistan and increased arms supplies to the Afghan rebels operating out of bases in Pakistan.

Despite doubts in Washington about the wisdom of such a policy, the Reagan administration appears ready to provide substantial military and economic assistance to prop up the ailing Zia regime. And, given the mood created by Secretary of State Alexander Haig, what better way to get U.S. support than for dictator Zia to portray himself as a "defender of democracy" against terrorist opposition?

India: reason to worry

There is little question that India will react sharply to any large-scale U.S. military aid to Pakistan or to the Afghan rebels. Despite claims that the military supplies will be used to defend Pakistan against the threat of Soviet forces in Afghanistan, neighboring India has reason to be worried. First of all, as Indian analysts point out, there is the historic precedent of Pakistan's use of foreign-supplied arms in past confrontations with India. Furthermore, since the Soviet intervention into Afghanistan, Pakistan has yet to redeploy its forces to face the alleged Soviet threat. Instead, two-thirds of its military forces are reportedly still lined up along the border with India.

Large-scale arming of the Afghan rebels, another mooted policy in Washington, would probably hasten the downfall of General Zia—both as a result of increased Soviet pressure on Pakistan, as well as from the growing unrest in the northwest frontier region, where the more than 1 million Afghan refugees are camped out. Recognizing this, Zia has taken a public posture in opposition to arming the Afghans.

Most Indian specialists think that the United States' arming of the Pakistani junta and the Afghan rebels would only undermine America's own interests in the region, while intensifying dangerous tensions with the Soviet Union. Nor has the late-March visit of British Foreign Minister Carrington to Pakistan heartened the Indians. Commented one foreign policy expert in New Delhi: "In the 1950s, the British dragged you into the Cold War mess to undermine America's relations with the developing and newly independent nations. Is Reagan going to allow the British to once again set the U.S. up for a major foreign policy disaster in this region?"