

disengagement. That is what he has done. I have no reason whatsoever to believe that he will change his habits.

EIR: Obviously, the next three years will be critical, in the move toward a stable, democratic country. What do you consider the possible pitfalls?

Anenih: It is not going to be easy. But because I have confidence in the transition program, because it is exactly the issues that we discussed at the Constitutional Conference that are being put in place now, the program is going to take care of state creation, of local government creation. It is going to create a Constitutional Court, which has never been in place before. It is going to build a Federal Character Commission, which will make sure that anything that is done has a federal character. Now there is also going to be a situation where the power of the federal government is reduced, and distributed to the states and the local government councils. That is why I feel strongly that I have to take part in politics, toward achieving a solution. I am satisfied with the program laid out for the transition.

EIR: You are a well-known political leader. What will you be doing in this three-year transition process?

Anenih: I would like to be one of the leaders of a political party that believes in justice, in forming a government of the people, by the people, for the people. Now that the elections are staggered—from the local government, to the state elections, to the National Assembly elections, to the Presidential elections—I am sure that any mistake, any logistical mistake that is made in one election, will be corrected in the second election. It would have been more dangerous, and very unsafe, to lump the elections together, because if one thing goes wrong with one, it will affect all. Now that it is staggered, I have hope that the future will be better than the past.

EIR: President Clinton has resisted pressures from other countries, including Great Britain, to put more pressure on Nigeria. If you had the opportunity, hypothetically, to give advice to President Clinton, what would you recommend as the proper relationship of the United States toward Nigeria, in the current transitional period?

Anenih: President Clinton is a politician, and he is playing it very safe. There are Americans who want sanctions to be imposed on Nigeria today; there are some who would want to sit on the fence and watch. I would make an appeal, that he hear both sides of the story, and help Nigeria to put in place an enabling environment, so that the transitional program can succeed. Because if you impose more sanctions, there will be more tension in the country than we have now, and that is not a step toward democratization. So if Clinton wants a democracy in Nigeria, he should help the Nigerian government to put in place a peaceful transition program.

'Alternate U.N.' promotes ethnicity

by Mark Burdman

The Unrepresented Nations and Peoples Organization (UNPO), based in The Hague, Netherlands, has been identified by key figures in the "ethnicity" movement as an international command center for separatist and secessionist movements.

The group was founded in 1991, on the basis of an initiative by Lodi Gyari, foreign minister of the Dalai Lama's Tibetan exile government. Gyari visited the Soviet Union in 1989, and looked up a fellow Buddhist, Far Eastern history professor Linnart Maell, himself from Estonia. They resolved to form an organization that, in Maell's words, would "work for small peoples."

The "Members List," as of February 1995, includes: Abkhazia, Aboriginals of Australia, Acheh/Sumatra, Albanians in Macedonia, Assyria, Batwa (Rwanda), Bougainville, Chechen Republic Ichkeria, Chittagong Hill Tracts, Circassians, Cordillera (Philippines), Chameria, Chuvash, Crimea (Crimean Tatars), East Timor, East Turkestan, Gagauzia, Greek Minority in Albania, Hungarian Minority in Romania, Inkeri, Ingushetia, Iraqi Turkoman, Kalahui Hawaii, Karenni State, Komi, Kosova, Kurdistan (Iraq), Lakota Nation, Maohi People of French Polynesia, Mapuche, Mari, Nagaland, Ogoni (Nigeria), Sanjak, Scania, Republic of South Moluccas, Taiwan, Tatarstan, Tibet, Udmurt, West Papua, Sakha Republic (Yakutia), and Zanzibar.

The UNPO is sometimes referred to as "the alternative United Nations."

The secretary general of UNPO is Michael van Walt, the son of Dutch diplomats, who had previously been a Washington lawyer and general counsel to the Dalai Lama, and had represented Tibet's case before the U.N. Human Rights Commission. Until his recent resignation (but not out of disagreement with the group's activities and aims), van Walt had been on the board of the Washington-based Institute for American Democracy. Also on the board are Joel McCleary, former treasurer of the Democratic National committee and staff member of the White House in 1978-80, and Robert Thurman, professor of Buddhist Studies and chairman of the Religion Department at Columbia University. The institute's development coordinator is Elsie Walker, a first cousin of former President George Bush. The institute's points of concentration have been Tibet, Mongolia, Burma, and China. It sponsored a 1993 conference on "The Allied Peoples of Turkestan, Mongolia, and Tibet," at which maps were de-

picted showing China cut more or less in half, after the "land claims" of the various "allied peoples" were met.

UNPO receives funds from Scandinavian churches and other organizations, as well as from the Dutch Foreign Ministry and the Canada-based International Center for Human Rights and Democratic Development. It works with Britain's Lord Avebury, chairman of Britain's Parliamentary Human Rights Group (interviewed in *EIR*, Oct. 13); the International Working Group in Indigenous Affairs (IWGIA), based in Copenhagen; and the Pan-European Union of the von Hapsburg clan. In October, UNPO and the PEU had "parallel conferences" in Estonia.

In March 1996, UNPO will coordinate a conference on self-determination in Tibet, East Timor, and the Western Sahara, at the U.N. in Geneva. Probable co-sponsorship will come from one or more of the following organizations: Pax Christi, Amnesty International, and the Society for Endangered Peoples.

'A key factor in geopolitics'

Obviously, many ethnic and minority groups have legitimate grievances. These include being denied adequate representation in the political process of the nation or nations in which they are located, poverty, disease, malnutrition, and the like. However, the "ethnicity movement" manipulates people, by removing such problems from the broader international framework of financial and moral crises, to exploit grievances in order to break up sovereign nation-states. The real aim of the van Walts, Walkers, and their ilk, is *geopolitical*: to impose a United Nations-run global neo-feudalist system. The current global financial disintegration is seen by these vultures, as providing an opportunity to accomplish this.

Van Walt et al. are quite explicit about all this.

As part of its promotional material, UNPO distributes a Feb. 1, 1993 article from *Time* magazine, in which van Walt is quoted: "There are some 5,000 distinct peoples in the world. But fewer than 200 states are recognized. Many groups want only basic human rights and their cultural identity. But others, perhaps 50, have the historical and political legitimacy to form new separate States." Commented *Time*: "The splintering of the Soviet Union and Yugoslavia has roused the expectations of restive peoples from around the world. Kurds from Iraq, Ogonis from Nigeria, Nagas from India, Frisians from Holland, Shan from Burma, Mapuches from Chile and Argentina." At the January 1993 conference, they all agreed on the goal of "self-determination." One "Achen" from Achen, which is part of Indonesia, told *Time*: "Indonesia is Yugoslavia a hundred times over."

The basic philosophy and strategic outlook of UNPO were enunciated by van Walt, in an Oct. 16 discussion. He stressed that "ethnicity has become a key factor in geopolitics." The implications of this are the following: "There are two areas in which ethnicity has become particularly impor-

tant. First, is the actual meaning and extent of sovereignty. Increasingly, this is no longer the exclusive domain of central State power. So, we see a general erosion of sovereignty, across the globe. Second, is the matter of borders. Some countries are either slated to break up, or there will be new arrangements, for groups forming relations across currently existing borders, with various forms of autonomy and self-determination being devised."

Targets: Russia, Indonesia

Asked what countries he had in mind for "breakup," van Walt mentioned Russia and Indonesia. "What happens in Russia, is very dependent on what will happen at the center of power, how the power struggles will be resolved. The situation there is very unstable, with many peoples simply waiting for the opportunity to break out, or get some autonomy. The Chechen war was supposed to nip this in the bud, but it has changed everything, with the exactly opposite effect. Russia is becoming a test case, in which statehood is being redefined, and in which local authorities are demonstrating extensive rights on the international level. Places like Bashkiristan, Tatarstan, are establishing their individual trade relations abroad, and defining their own rights. Whole sectors of Russia are moving in this direction."

As for his second example, he stressed that "Indonesia is in a precarious situation. As we've seen elsewhere, regimes that are so dependent on single individuals, are very vulnerable. It is a very difficult country to keep together. The East Timor problem will not be solved by its full integration into Indonesia." (Given that Indonesia was formerly a Dutch colony, and that the Dutch Foreign Ministry provides some of the funds for UNPO, there is obviously some special pleading involved here.)

As for China, van Walt said that the country would have a hard time holding together "in the long run." The immediate challenge would be from "the determination of Taiwan to preserve its de facto independence. I know the leaders of the Democratic Peoples Party [DPP] well, and their pro-independence views have had a big impact on much of the voting base of the Kuomintang, KMT. President Lee Teng-hui is increasingly on the DPP line, but in a more subtle way, with the 1996 Presidential elections in view. That election will initiate a major change in Taiwan's position on many issues, with the government's position closer, in practice, to that of the DPP than to the traditional KMT view. This, in turn, and over time, will affect the situations in Tibet and Xinkiang. Here, like in Russia, the outcome will depend on the outcome of the power struggles in China itself."

He also saw Burma and India increasingly challenged by these processes. "It is not sufficiently recognized, how much influence on international politics, regions and ethnic groups have. If you look at all the conflicts in the world right now, probably 70 or 80 have as their component, a grievance of a minority."