

Rajiv Gandhi takes point against obeisance to Washington

by Susan Maitra and Ramtanu Maitra

In the weeks since the Bush administration launched its war against Iraq, former Indian Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi has stepped forward to pose an alternative to New Delhi's current abject obeisance to Washington foreign policy diktats. "The war in West Asia is getting out of hand," stated Gandhi in a document released Feb. 7. Speaking in his capacity as chairman of the National Congress Party, Gandhi decried the obliteration of Iraq and called for urgent steps to stop the war, including an immediate cessation of hostilities; replacement of the present multinational force by a U.N. force under Chapter 7 of the U.N. Charter; withdrawal of Iraq from Kuwait; and a just, comprehensive, and definitive settlement to the Palestinian question.

The next day, the *Times of India* endorsed the Gandhi statement in an editorial entitled "Rajiv Must Act Now." It called upon the Congress Party leader to take over the government and push his proposals onto the international negotiating table.

Nuclear weapons policy may change

On Feb. 12, Gandhi released a bombshell statement that indicated his deep concern over the current course of events in the Gulf. In a letter to the prime minister, Gandhi stated that if the United States were to use nuclear weapons in the Gulf war, India would be left with no option but "to convert our nuclear weapons capability into nuclear weapons capacity." This statement by the Congress Party leader marks a major reversal in the party's policy on the peaceful uses of nuclear technology and its assiduous work for international disarmament. Stating that he was disturbed by the three successive statements of key U.S. authorities indicating Washington's active consideration of the use of nuclear weapons in the Gulf war, Gandhi stated that U.S. President George Bush's refusal to categorically reject the nuclear option was a reflection of an ugly phase of the emerging post-Cold War international scene. "The personalized frenzy that has been whipped up against the Iraqi President Saddam Hussein in the West has created an atmosphere in which large segments of public opinion have become desensitized to the horrors of nuclear war in relation to Iraq," said Gandhi.

Since Feb. 6, Gandhi has met with Indian President R. Venkataraman three times, the latest to explain this shift in the Congress Party's nuclear policy.

Earlier, on Jan. 20, in a three-page open letter to current Indian Prime Minister Chandra Shekhar, Gandhi had noted that India "had lost the initiative and been reduced to hapless spectators" in the Gulf crisis. "There is no clear articulation of our national interest being jeopardized by war in West Asia." Stating that the Indian government should have used its position as a leading nation of the Non-Aligned Movement, Gandhi called upon Chandra Shekhar to return to the spirit of foreign policy initiatives taken by Gandhi's grandfather, Jawaharlal Nehru. "Opportunity has come your way with India's resuming its seat in the Security Council from Jan. 1, 1991. It puts us in a key position to influence events. But it is a role that can be played within a clear framework of principles and plans of action. This framework has to be prepared at the highest level."

Gandhi is stepping forward because Indian government policy is bringing the nation disgrace, in the eyes of the population. Iraq is a leading country of the Non-Aligned Movement, which Jawaharlal Nehru helped found. Iraq was the first nation to recognize Bangladesh in 1971, and Iraq has always worked to ensure that Pakistani efforts to raise the issue of Kashmir against India in Islamic conferences and gatherings were thwarted. In repayment, the Indian government of Chandra Shekhar has permitted U.S. Air Force C-141 transport planes to land for refueling at the civilian airports of Bombay, Agra, and Madras on their way to war against Iraq from their home bases in the Philippines.

This pathetic state of foreign affairs has been brought about by a number of factors, including the collapse of the Soviet Union as a parallel power to the United States and its yet-preserved silence on the Gulf war. Also, Prime Minister Chandra Shekhar, a master manipulator of the domestic political scene, is next to ignorant about foreign affairs.

As one politician observed, "Our prime minister's knowledge of things extends from Bhondsi," in the state of Haryana where the prime minister maintains a charming farmhouse, "to Ballia," in eastern Uttar Pradesh where he has his constit-

uency, "but Baghdad is a little too far." Besides knee-jerk reactions, mostly triggered from Washington and elsewhere, Chandra Shekhar has maintained a stoic silence on the Gulf war crisis. In his stead, Foreign Minister V. C. Shukla reiterates the government line which amounts to the position that there can be talks only after Saddam Hussein retreats from Kuwait.

Chandra Shekhar's lack of credibility became highly visible during his recent telephone conversation with his Pakistani counterpart on the Gulf issue. If press reports are to be believed, the Indian prime minister told Pakistani Prime Minister Nawaz Sharif that, despite his best efforts, India has not been able to establish contact with the Iraqi President once the Gulf war began. It is unthinkable that such a situation could have arisen during Indira Gandhi's days. It also shows the poor image of not only the Indian prime minister, but also of the country which, even in the 1980s, was considered the leader of the Non-Aligned Movement and the developing nations.

The Anglo-Israelis

In the vacuum, the Anglo-Israeli lobby in India has become increasingly active since the December 1988 electoral defeat of the Congress Party. Commerce Minister Dr. Subramanian Swamy, an avowed anti-communist with known links to the militant Hindu chauvinist groups, has long been in contact with the Israelis. He was recently accused by a Member of Parliament of holding "clandestine" meetings with both Israeli and U.S. officials, during his visit abroad for the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) talks. Swamy, who studied and taught at Harvard, visited Israel in 1981 and goes so far as to certify them as "non-expansionists," cloaking the fact of Israel's territorial conquest in the guise of greater national interests.

Backup to Dr. Subramanian Swamy is provided by another Anglo-Israeli asset, K. Subrahmanyam. The former director of the Institute for Defense and Strategic Analyses and a Pugwash participant, Subrahmanyam worked in London's International Institute for Strategic Studies on deputation and is linked to the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute. He was also the secretary for defense production in the Ministry of Defense for about seven months beginning August 1979, during the fag end of the Janata Party rule. One of the Janata Party's major components was the Jan Sangh, the precursor to the present-day Bharatiya Janata Party (BJP), the Hindu chauvinist group which has been accused of instigating many Hindu-Muslim riots in 1990.

Over the years K. Subrahmanyam has taken a rabid anti-Pakistan stance, which often verges on being fanatically anti-Muslim, rivaling that of the Hindu chauvinists belonging to the BJP. His stance on the Pakistan military and its nuclear program is the same position that the Israelis have long been

U.N. did not intend Iraq to be destroyed

Rajiv Gandhi, the former prime minister of India, who now is the president of the Indian National Congress, issued the following statement, "The War in West Asia," on Feb. 7, 1991.

The war in West Asia is getting out of hand. None of the objectives for which the war is being waged in the name of the United Nations is anywhere near being achieved. We must now give peace another chance.

We were deeply concerned at the outbreak of hostilities because we felt that all avenues for a pacific settlement of the dispute had not been quite exhausted. We were also firmly of the view that the Security Council's authorization to use "all necessary means" to secure Iraqi compliance with its resolution did not mean only a resort to arms. . . .

There is also a dangerous escalation in the kind of weaponry being used and, worse, that is proposed to be used. The escalation that is imminently possible extends to non-conventional armaments like fuel air weapons as well as chemical and other weapons of mass destruction. Clarifications and denials notwithstanding, we are yet to see brought on record a categorical refusal to resort to nuclear weapons under any circumstances. The illusion that the technology of warfare has moved to the point where Iraq's capacity to fight can be reduced to naught without causing any serious damage to human life or civilian property has been exposed for what it is: sheer illusion.

propagating, accusing Pakistan of being in the process of making the "Islamic bomb."

The glee of the Israeli lobby in India following Israel's successful strike on the Iraqi nuclear research center at Osirak in 1981—violating all international norms—is not unlike the glee shown by K. Subrahmanyam following the massive U.S. air attack on Baghdad in the early hours of Jan. 17 and since.

In his daily "analysis" of the Gulf war carried by a local English daily, Subrahmanyam's Anglo-Israeli, anti-Muslim bias is explicit. He has acknowledged, for instance, that U.S. Ambassador to Iraq April Glaspie, only seven days before Iraq's march into Kuwait, gave Iraqi President Saddam Hussein the green light, only to dismiss this fact in the

Iraq is being used as a testing ground for new weapons technology. The idiom in which the war is being advocated, propagated and fought gives the impression almost of a game, or a war machine that is so taken in by its technological superiority that it seems to have forgotten the price in human suffering it is exacting. The bombing of Iraq has taken a horrendous toll of innocent human life. There are children out there in Iraq whose lives are being psychologically blighted by the relentless, round-the-clock bombing. Who knows how many children this war has already killed, how many more are destined to die, how many orphans this war has left untended, how many it has left destitute, from how many their laughter and play has been stolen, how many have been robbed of their childhood? We do not believe that the mandate of Resolution 678 extends to the destruction of Iraq. The Security Council cannot have authorized the liberation of Kuwait through the obliteration of Iraq. . . .

As India is a member of the Security Council, I have written to our Prime Minister suggesting that the four ingredients on the basis of which we might be able to "restore international peace and security in the area" and ensure sustained peace in West Asia would include: an immediate cessation of hostilities; the replacement of the multinational force by a U.N. Force under Chapter 7 of the U.N. charter; the withdrawal of Iraq from Kuwait; and a just, comprehensive and definite settlement of the question of Palestine. . . .

The specific and well-defined mandate of Resolution 678 is to secure an Iraqi withdrawal from Kuwait and "to restore international peace and security in the area." These are objectives with which we wholly concur. We are also entirely in agreement with the directive to secure these objectives by "all necessary means." The war, however, is not contributing to the achievement of these objectives.

surmise that, perhaps, the United States was giving Iraq the nod to claim the Rumailah oil fields along the border and nothing more. But besides such deceptions and half-truths, Subrahmanyam is carrying out the Anglo-Israeli propaganda campaign to the letter, focusing on character assassination of Saddam Hussein, drooling over U.S. technological warfare superiority and precision bombing, describing the multinational forces as "allies," and attacking the Iraqi President for "communalizing" the conflict by invoking Islam, among other things.

The Anglo-Israeli lobby's anti-Muslim campaign has already begun to bear fruit. In Ghaziabad, an industrial town close to Delhi, when a procession of Muslims wearing Saddam Hussein badges, shouting pro-Saddam slogans, and

On the contrary, it is serving only to entrench the Iraqi presence in Kuwait and aggravate instead of abating the breach of "international peace and security in the area." Our plea is for a return to the letter, the spirit and the purpose of Security Council Resolution 660 to 678 relating to the illegal Iraqi occupation of Kuwait, a sovereign and independent member of the United Nations.

Let us give peace another chance. We have seen the U.N. Secretary General's confidential report to the Security Council of his last conversation with President Saddam Hussein. Parts of this report have appeared in the press. Now that we have had the opportunity of seeing a copy of the report, we are persuaded that the report contains elements which could be built upon to even now secure a satisfactory resolution of the issues through pacific settlement within the framework of Security Council Resolutions on the subject, under the aegis of the United Nations and strictly in conformity with the provisions of the U.N. Charter. . . .

Possible solutions must look beyond the present conflict to the long-term arrangements to be put in place to ensure the security of the region. Suggestions have been made for regional security arrangements involving the continuous and indefinite participation of non-regional forces. Past experience and political wisdom suggest that any excessive reliance on, or the indefinite stationing of, non-regional forces for security in the West Asian region or, indeed, any region of Asia, Africa or Latin America would add to and not diminish the security problems of small and developing states. It would also fuel grave political instability and international tension. The proper agency for maintaining and restoring international peace and security in any area in the world is the countries concerned themselves, acting in concert with the United Nations and within the framework of the U.N. Charter. . . .

carrying an effigy of President Bush, went by, Hindu chauvinists engaged them in a violent clash. There were reports of Hindu fanatics trying to break down the doors of Muslim homes and knifing people. This has been the first such riot ever in the suburban town. In Aligarh, where many Hindu-Muslim riots have taken place before, the pro-Saddam student community at Aligarh Muslim University claims that they were being constantly confronted by the Hindu chauvinists who burn Saddam Hussein's effigy and raise anti-Muslim slogans.

Comes the controller

Whatever may be the merit of such "analysis," the clout of the Anglo-Israeli lobby in India cannot be underestimated.

In early 1989, an Anti-Defamation League (ADL) team, led by Burton Levinson, Jess Hordes, and Abe Foxman, visited India. The team held meetings with then-Foreign Minister P.V. Narasimha Rao, a senior member of the Congress Party, as well as then-Secretary of the External Affairs Ministry A.S. Gonsalves (now ambassador to the Soviet Union) and then-Joint Secretary P.K. Singh.

The circumstances under which this trip was arranged are shrouded in mystery. The ADL visit becomes even more puzzling because in 1987, the same organization issued a blistering report that charged India with "frequent disregard for the minimum standards of civility and law required among nations." This is a reference to India's severe scrutiny of visa applications for Israeli delegations, even for international conferences.

It is not that the report went unnoticed, but incredibly, it was published soon after the Indian government had allowed an Israeli vice consul to be posted at its consulate in Bombay! There are other reasons for surprise. *EIR* has documented the ADL's involvement with the pro-Khalistani Sikhs in the United States. Not accidentally, immediately after the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO)-inspired Intifada uprising began in the Occupied Territories, Israel publicly denounced charges of brutality against Palestinians by saying *that its handling of the uprising was nothing compared to what the government of India was doing to Sikhs*. Nonetheless, the ADL team visited India, led by Burton Levinson, who had signed the 1987 report.

Sikhs volunteer for Bush

Sikh separatists in India have now come out volunteering their terrorist services for the Bush administration's genocidal war against Iraq. On Feb. 7, S.S. Mann, the leader of the Sikh Akali Party in Punjab, presented U.S. Ambassador to India William Clark with an open letter, in which the separatist leader declared that he could send "Iakhs" (hundreds of thousands) of Sikh militants to the Persian Gulf to fight with the multinational force against Iraq. Mann declared that Sikhs want to repeat their role in World War I and World War II, when they were used as soldiers by the British Empire, who admired their "martial spirit." Mann also asked Clark to send the Sikhs' regards to British Prime Minister John Major, U.S. President Bush, and the Emir of Kuwait.

Until December 1988, when he was elected from Punjab to sit in the national parliament, S.S. Mann was in prison, after his trial and conviction for conspiracy in the October 1984 assassination of Indian Prime Minister Indira Gandhi. As *EIR* editors wrote in a 1985 book on the Gandhi murder entitled *Derivative Assassination*, the Sikh separatists who designed and executed the plan to murder Mrs. Gandhi enjoyed the sponsorship of both British and Israeli intelligence networks.

Brazil resists U.S. on Gulf war policy

by Lorenzo Carrasco and Cynthia Rush

Unlike the rest of Ibero-America's governments, the Brazilian government of Fernando Collor de Mello is putting up some resistance to the United States' imperial policy in the Persian Gulf. It officially supports the U.N. Security Council resolutions and calls for Iraq to withdraw from Kuwait, but insists on maintaining a neutral stance and has refused to collaborate militarily with the anti-Iraq alliance. Brazil's nationalist military and scientific sectors, which have fought over the past three decades to develop the nation's technological and industrial capabilities, provide much of the impetus for the government's resistance.

They understand that Bush's "New World Order" will not tolerate any such display of economic or scientific independence, and that Brazil could be punished in much the way Iraq has been for making similar attempts. Statements such as those made by Foreign Minister Francisco Rezek before the Foreign Relations Commission of the Brazilian Congress, in which he publicly described the goal of the U.S. Gulf policy as seeking a "Pax Americana" and "unipolar world," reflect the pressure coming from these sectors. It was Rezek also who, immediately after the war began, called for a ceasefire.

Brazil's position regarding Iraq, with whom it enjoyed strong diplomatic ties prior to the war, has provoked a bullying response from the Bush administration. The U.S. knows that the Collor government doesn't represent any threat to the allied military action in the Gulf, but fears that it could inspire opposition in the rest of Ibero-America to Bush's "New World Order." Such opposition could undermine the Eastern Establishment's "Enterprise for the Americas" free trade scheme, conceived of as a new "Fortress America" plan to subjugate the Ibero-American subcontinent to the Bush-Thatcher war economy.

Brazil's refusal to fully endorse U.S. policy could pose an immediate threat to the stability of governments such as Argentina's where President Carlos Menem has toed the Anglo-American line to the point of sending two ships to join the anti-Iraq coalition in the Persian Gulf. Even the mild opposition offered by Mexico and Brazil in the Caracas