

From the Muslim Brotherhood: Chauhan also reports that he coordinates with the Indian Muslim Federation in London and the International Islamic Center in London. Both organizations are receiving financial support from the Saudi Arabia-based World Muslim League, headed by former Syrian fascist leader Maarouf Dawalibi. Dawalibi was a co-founder of the Geneva-based neo-Nazi organization, Islam and the West, whose other directors have included the late Aurelio Peccei of the Club of Rome; Swiss gun-running banker Nicholas Krul; and the British "Arab handler" Lord Caradon.

The center holds

From the Soviet Union to Washington to the European bases for the Muslim Brotherhood, these forces are united in their goal to bring down the Indira Gandhi government—with the full knowledge that there is no alternative force that can maintain the unity of the country. The goal is to tear the country into warring *politically and economically powerless entities* based on religion and ethnic identities.

It is therefore not surprising that the same forces turn up supporting the other entities that are working against the central government.

In Assam in eastern India, the Muslim Brotherhood is calling a strike of Muslims against the Hindus. Communal tensions between Hindus and Muslim immigrants from Bangladesh reached such proportions in 1983 that tribal groups carried out a massacre of some 4,000 Muslims.

The state government of Tamil Nadu is now in the control of a state regional party which has separatist leanings and tends to support the Tamil separatists in Sri Lanka, which are in turn funded by Libyan dictator Muammar Qaddafi and the Palestine Liberation Organization. Escalating terror and tensions in Sri Lanka therefore immediately spill over into Tamil Nadu in southern India, creating a crisis for and between both governments.

In late May, the great industrial center of Bombay was the site of Hindu-Muslim riots which killed hundreds and left 15,000 people homeless. Bombay is also growing as a drug transit center, as funds flow into the Muslim community from the Muslim Brotherhood. Radical Hindus in the state are represented by the Shiv Sena, a self-avowed fascist organization.

The gravest danger point could be the state of Jammu and Kashmir, which is contested territory with Pakistan. In London, its exiled and pro-Pakistani separatist groups all showed up at Chauhan's June 11 demonstration, and Muslims joined with Sikhs in Kashmir on June 9 to riot against the Gandhi government.

The eruptions of violence in these hot spots are orchestrated by oligarchical forces from outside India. Conversely, their defeat hinges not only upon the proven statesmanship of Mrs. Gandhi, but the unqualified and effective support for India's unity as a great nation-state from republican forces worldwide.

Anti-missile tests

by Susan Welsh

The first successful test intercept of a missile in space, carried out by the U.S. Army on June 11, has unleashed a storm of controversy in Western Europe, and particularly in Britain. Supporters of President Reagan's Strategic Defensive Initiative (SDI) who had hitherto remained in their foxholes in the face of widespread propaganda about how the "Star Wars" system was unworkable, are now moving onto the offensive. The London *Times* editorial of June 13 marks the most significant endorsement of the SDI yet by a leading British institution.

European opponents of the beam-weapons program scrambled to regain the high ground. The London *Financial Times* issued its own editorial the following day, titled "The dangers of space war," which denounced the *Times*' piece and insisted that strategic defense is impossible, since even if only 50 missiles went through the defensive shield, "it would be the end of civilization as we know it." Said a spokesman for the British defense ministry: "The piece in the *Times* was rather speculative. I would say very speculative. We have no comment. We've been skeptical on the whole thing, and we remain skeptical."

The House of Commons is scheduled to debate on June 18-19 what the London *Guardian* newspaper called "the recent 'star wars' invention by the Americans which could knock out interballistic missiles in space." This is the first time that the parliament has held an open discussion on the subject. *The Guardian*, a left-liberal paper, commented June 15 that "the governments of Western Europe must be extremely apprehensive about the development of an American Star Wars system which fails to provide an effective shield for Europe, and which imposes the wrong priorities for European defence. They should say it now before it is too late."

One London observer told this news service that the current shift underway in Britain is based on two factors: "first, the realization that there is no way the Soviets could be prevented from acquiring the weapons system themselves; and second, that the SDI will if anything enhance the American guarantee of European security."

Equally significant, however, is the *Times*' perception that the American public is solidly behind the SDI—indeed that opinion polls show 86% of Americans supporting the idea (a fact which the U.S. press tries its best to cover up)! This perception also figures for the first time in the latest

draw battle lines

Soviet commentaries on the Strategic Defense Initiative, such as the Radio Moscow interview with Academician Yevgeni Velikhov, the head of the Soviet laser research program, which we excerpt below. Velikhov attributes American support for the beam-weapons policy to the fact that one out of eight workers in such states as California have jobs in defense-related industries!

Documentation

Will Britain reject MAD?

The Times of London, published an editorial June 13, headlined "Star Wars":

Frederick the Great once warned his generals that he who would preserve everything, preserves nothing. "Therefore always sacrifice the bagatelle and pursue the essential," he said. In the business of security it is defence which is essential and self-defence one of nature's oldest laws. The bagatelle is the idea, born of the missile age, that since there can be no totally effective defence there should be no defence at all. Thus since the development of missiles, Western strategy has relied predominantly on a theory of deterrence which assumes that any attack can only be prevented by the threat of retaliation. The idea of partial defence—the less than perfect, but surely useful—has been in eclipse.

Since the 1972 United States/Soviet treaty to ban the construction of anti-missile defences, therefore, the East/West balance of power has been based on the appropriately named acronym MAD, standing for "mutual assured destruction." Its theory was that, since neither side had an effective defence against missile attack, but both had to rely on the threat of retaliatory forces, they would be mutually deterred from launching an attack.

The Star Wars system strikes at the very heart of that philosophy. It was initially ventilated by President Reagan in March last year. It has now advanced to the point of a first successful missile intercept in space carried out this week in

the Pacific. Congressional opinion is worried about the cost, yet 86 per cent of Americans support the idea and 73 per cent say that costs should not be a primary factor. The British and French are uneasy because they feel that a new round of defensive technology would destroy the ability of their smaller nuclear forces to get through, and thus invalidate their deterrent power.

These misgivings are misplaced since they assume that the strategic balance has remained stable since 1972. The opponents of a decision to acquire a new and more effective defensive technology argue that the United States would by so doing destroy that balance. In fact, in spite of the 1972 agreement, the Soviet Union has persisted with an active research and development programme into anti-missile defences. The provisions of the treaty could be lifted by either party but only one—the Soviet Union—would be in a position to follow that with some early deployment.

At least the Soviet Union's attitude to defence has been consistent. It has never embraced the theory that one can ignore defence and rely solely on retaliation. As Mr. Gromyko said to the United Nations as long ago as 1962, a policy of MAD would be tantamount to keeping the world in a permanent state of feverish tension and eve-of-war hysteria. When we see how effectively the peace movements have exploited the European public's unease about deterrent theory, and observe the Soviet Union's in orchestrating some of that unease, Mr. Gromyko's words are worth recalling. . . .

The Daily Telegraph of London ran the following editorial, "Space Arms Race," on June 13:

The apparent ability of the United States to destroy a weapon in outer space immediately raises questions about the future of arms control negotiations, and whether President Reagan's "Star Wars" defence programme will ultimately justify the huge sums needed to fund it. After three previous unsuccessful attempts the United States Army has managed a non-nuclear interception above the atmosphere of an oncoming Minuteman ICBM. This is a "first" and the Pentagon is, rightly, pleased. With the speed of summer lightning Moscow has called the experiment "yet another step along the lines of militarisation of outer space."

The significance of this most recent United States demonstration of its anti-ballistic missile technology will be the source of considerable argument as has been the whole "Star Wars" concept of a 21st-century defence against (Soviet) nuclear weapons. When President Reagan first became interested in a space-based defence against missiles and called for countless billions of dollars to be spent on furthering it, he came under strong criticism,

Some said that for the foreseeable future a total shield was technologically impossible. Anti-satellite weapons including laser beams—which the Soviet Union is undoubtedly developing at Saryshagan and other highly secret sites—were said to be a bad idea, whose time unfortunately had come, because

they were expensive, and inefficient, and an invitation to an arms race in space.

The Soviet Union has had an anti-satellite capability, however simplistic and easy to counter, since the 1960s. It could easily be upgraded. But the Russians now seem of the mind to quit the race. President Konstantin Chernenko could not have known of the immediacy of the American experiment when he proposed negotiations "without delay" on an agreement to ban further testing of anti-satellite weapons. . . . Just how serious Mr. Chernenko is about such talks . . . needs to be tested.

The Daily Telegraph, June 13, "Hitting a Bullet with a Bullet":

The American interception of a dummy missile warhead in space by shooting a rocket-borne net into its path did not mean the Pentagon was close to deploying such a defence system, officials stressed yesterday.

None the less it was a notable breakthrough. "We really tried to hit a bullet with a bullet, and it worked," said Mr. Amoretta Hoerber, a senior Army research and development official, at a Pentagon briefing. . . .

Our science correspondent writes: Whether such devices as "hitting a bullet with a bullet" would ever be able to avert a multi-missile attack is uncertain. Making the attack seem unprofitable would require almost as many interceptors as there were incoming missiles.

A more promising approach is the high-powered "X-Ray laser beams" now being developed at the Lawrence Livermore Laboratories in California. Many of these could be fired from the same vehicle.

Moscow: beams won't work

Soviet Academician Yevgeni Velikhov, a nuclear physicist and Vice President of the Soviet Academy of Sciences, gave a series of four interviews broadcast on Radio Moscow's program to North America May 23-26:

Radio Moscow: . . . You pointed out that in the seventies common agreement was reached concerning the impossibility of creating a flawless antiballistic-missile defense system and that therefore any attempt to develop an antimissile capability would be interpreted by the other side as a first-strike desire. In his speech of 23 March 1983 Reagan alluded to new defensive systems. Perhaps there has been some change after all?

Velikhov: Over that period nothing new has occurred insofar as technology and science are concerned. After the President's speech there was talk of discoveries in the area of laser and particle beams, but in fact studies conducted by

such unofficial organizations as the Union of Concerned Scientists . . . came to the same conclusion as did our studies. . . . Is it possible to create a real defensive weapon based on some new physical principle? The conclusion is that no, this cannot be done. . . .

Insofar as technology goes I would say this: If such a weapon system were created, this would be exceedingly dangerous. It would create a very precarious situation. The creation of this weapon by one side alone would serve as a terrible provocation and its being created simultaneously by both sides is out of the question.

Radio Moscow: In his speech of 23 March 1983, President Reagan probably had that in mind when he said that the United States would share this weapon with the U.S.S.R. so as to counter any imbalance and concern. How do you feel about this statement?

Velikhov: Keeping in mind that the Reagan administration today talks about not even sharing children's toys with us, I consider that statement to be nothing but an absolute bluff. There will be no sharing. Everything would be done under the cloud of secrecy. . . .

Radio Moscow: What about the negative [factors behind the "Star Wars" policy], in addition to the U.S. administration and the military industrial complex's activities?

Velikhov: There is one other aspect. It has to do with NASA. NASA is just about finished with the development of the shuttle, but NASA and the industries connected with it need contracts. This is a real factor of existence, one measured in tens of billions of dollars. The disturbing thing is that they would seem to lack imagination that would furnish NASA with the kind of program that would be good for humankind and for America. . . .

Regrettably, however, the American space program seems to center more on sloganlike targets—putting a man on the moon, planting the American flag up there, floating a fool-proof shield in space. I would call these rather hypocritical goals.

There are two sides to the issue. One is the slogan that creates the illusion among Americans that they can do as they please and live in total security. This is a great mistake, and a very dangerous one. America could well take half of humanity to hell with that illusion. I would call it an imperial instinct, something very common to Americans. The second is purely material. It concerns NASA and its industries. They need contracts right now; they cannot wait. This is especially important to some congressmen. Let's not forget that in California every eighth person is working in the defense industry. That at least in part is why the idea presented by President Reagan on 23 March of last year was accepted by some. But the fact of the matter is, and this is scientifically proven, that the idea is absolutely dangerous for all, including America.