

LaRouche: Don't Try To Impose Kashmir Agreement

At his May 28 international webcast, Lyndon LaRouche answered question by Elias Hassan Choudhry from the weekly Mirror International in Houston: "India is on the verge of attacking Pakistan, the leading ally of the United States in the ongoing war on terrorism. What do you have to say about this issue?"

First of all, there is a high risk of an Indian military move in Kashmir. What is happening at the same time, is, there is something that is being said, which is highly *improbable*: That this state of tension could lead to a nuclear war attack by Pakistan, or a nuclear war in the Subcontinent. That I do not believe is possible. Why are people saying that? Because people in the U.S. government and other governments know exactly what was done to prevent the Pakistan use of nuclear weapons. The Indians know about it, are fully informed about it. The agreement is, among the nations of the area, that Pakistan weapons are sealed, so a nuclear attack from Pakistan can not occur at this time. And Pakistan is operating under guarantees—implicit guarantees and actual guarantees, from the United States and other countries, which say, "There's nothing for you to worry about."



It was only last July 14, that Pakistani President Gen. Pervez Musharraf was inspecting an honor guard of the Indian Army, during a summit with Indian Prime Minister A.B. Vajpayee in New Delhi. "Policies of Sept. 11" have changed all that. The West should now "keep its snout out," insists LaRouche.

Now, there is a problem in Kashmir. And, the problem is this—and some people in the United States are making *stupid* errors on this thing: One thing you do not insist upon, in the Kashmir question, as an American or any outsider, you do not tell them, they must negotiate a settlement on the Kashmir question between India and Pakistan. *No such pressure from outsiders must be made. Leave the situation alone.* The Kashmir issue is a long issue; the division goes back to 1946-47. It's been heated up since then. The only two parties, who should initiate any discussion on Kashmir as such, are India and Pakistan, *on their own initiative.* No outsider should stick his nose into it.

Now, if both parties want guarantees, for what they both want, then you should help them. But, if they don't invite you in, don't stick your snout in the situation. But, the problem is, that there are elements which the Pakistan government does not efficiently control. The United States government and British are more responsible. . . . [T]his kind of terrorism, which is talked about in Afghanistan and so forth, was introduced to the area *by the United States and Britain*, back under Brzezinski. Brzezinski was the guy who started the terrorism in Afghanistan, and operated, in a sense, through Pakistan to set up this thing, as a trap for the Soviet Union. Which worked.

Now, what they've done: They've gone in, and bombed Afghanistan—the worst, stupid thing they could do. But they did it! They said they had to do it, for the war against terrorism, because of what happened in New York and Washington. It had *nothing* to do with what happened in New York and Washington! New York and Washington was used as a *pretext*, for this bombing of Afghanistan. There's a

geopolitical operation, which is called the Clash of Civilizations, which is the controlling operation for this, as described by Huntington and others; the new Roman Empire operation, which is going into place, which might lead to a general war. But, neither Pakistan nor India wants a nuclear exchange, and they want a stable situation. *However*, the Kashmir situation is inherently unstable, and we just hope now, that we get through June without any war fighting.

Problem of Pakistan's Economy

There are no simple solutions! There's no simple right or wrong in this thing. This is an old, ugly wound. Our concern should be, to keep stability and peace in that area. That one of the big problems, is that Pakistan's economy is in terrible shape. The condition of the people of Pakistan is desperate,

in large part. The economy depends, to a large degree, upon Afghan drug-trafficking! Which is still going on, full force, bigger than ever from the area! The United States bombing of Afghanistan did not decrease the drug-trafficking, it *increased* it! You're going to have any government you try to set up in Afghanistan, is going to be less stable, than any previous government, since the last Afghan war started. The United States will never win the war in Afghanistan! *Never!* It will get worse, and worse, and worse. And the effects of continuing the war will spread, into the adjoining regions. The best thing the United States could do, is get out of there. Make that kind of decision: Get out of there. We made the mess. The best thing to do, is concern ourselves with helping Pakistan to build its economy up again, so it doesn't depend upon drug-trafficking, and so the drug traffickers in Pakistan do not have control in Pakistan politics. And, to find ways, with aid of other countries, such as China, and its discussion idea, to bring about some kind of equanimity in the situation. . . .

The long-term solution is, Pakistan's economy must be rebuilt. And Pakistan is going to be an inherently unstable country, until that is done.

The issue with India, and operations which were run from outside, into India, are also dangerous. There are forces in India, which are dangerous. And, you have to think about what you are doing, when you meddle in Indian affairs. Do you want the extreme right wing turned loose in India? The people who killed Gandhi, or that type? You want them turned loose? You can have Hell on the Subcontinent. Do you want the operation that the British and others are running in Nepal? Do you want that operation? . . .

This is likely the ugly Yankee, the "Ugly American" in Laos, years ago. We are bad! Get the picture clearly: The United States around the world today, is a bad guy! The U.S. military around the United States, and U.S. policy is a bad guy! Not liked; hated, and resented, and feared—in the Balkans! Increasingly hated in Europe, in Western Europe, in France, and Germany, and elsewhere! If they had their courage, in Germany, they'd speak up, but they don't. They've been through two wars with the United States; they don't want to have a third one. The hatred of what's happened in Poland, and Eastern Europe, the same. What the United States has done to Central and South America is *hated!* We're not the good guys! What the United States has done in Africa: We're not the good guys! Yes, the British have done things, too, of the same evil type. We're bad guys!

So, instead—I may be a good guy, but my government is not a good guy, right now. You want to me to intervene? Well, unfortunately, I don't have any means. But, I'll do anything to help these guys, if they want me, to help them get some peace; to have some amity. But our government is not of that disposition. Our government is trying to find "rogues." It's trying to find bad guys to bomb! But, they're the bad guys. . . .

Brookings Demands U.S. Troops in Kashmir

by Umberto Pascali

Only days after Lyndon LaRouche's webcast warning to Western nations to stay out of the India-Pakistan crisis—largely triggered in its current form by the U.S. "war on terrorism"—two of the most notorious Washington think-tanks joined forces on June 3 to demand an immediate U.S. military deployment, both in Afghanistan and Kashmir.

The Brookings Institution and the International Crisis Group (ICG), both dedicated to the annihilation of the idea of national sovereignty—threatened every sort of divine punishment if the Bush Administration listened to rational advice. Their forum was entitled "The War In Afghanistan: Is It Over? Did the U.S. Win? What's Next?"

New U.S. Military Doctrine?

The speakers' *leitmotif* was to call their forum a factional intervention in Washington, aimed at breaking the last formal resistance within the administration to a massive military operation. In particular, Brookings' Stephen Philip Cohen put all his hopes in the figure of Deputy Secretary of State Richard Armitage, pushing him, so to speak, to reveal himself.

Armitage, Cohen insisted, has a new plan and is going to make it public during his visit to India during the first week of June. Part of the ostensible Armitage plan is to make the Indians accept the deployment of foreign military monitors on their territory, considered unacceptable and insulting to Indian leaders. Cohen said, "The Indians have been putting pressure on the United States and Pakistan to change Pakistani behavior. It's the Indians who have been the judge, the jury, the accusatory, and presumably the executioners in this spirit. I think the Indians are going to have to concede some international or American or other monitoring of the Line of Control," which separates India and Pakistan in Kashmir.

Not surprisingly, Pakistan's President Gen. Pervez Musharraf was instigated to make the same suggestion in the same words on June 4 in Almaty, Kazakhstan.

Cohen presented an eerily precise scenario: "As sure as we can predict that the Sun will rise, when Armitage arrives in India, there's going to be an atrocity someplace up in Kashmir. Indians will blame the Pakistanis, the Pakistanis will blame the Indians. It will probably be caused by an independent group of radicals who would like to foment a larger crisis." This will launch a new American interventionist policy in Asia, Cohen claimed: "I think there's a realization growing that we cannot go on like this—crisis, after crisis,

after crisis, with two nuclear-weapon states, indefinitely, because that's what will happen. I suspect that Rumsfeld, or Armitage in particular, is probably going to bring some new idea with him. Otherwise it makes no sense in sending him out there."

"The best thing the world can do right now is to have an American B-52 bomber fly overhead once a day," cried Martti Ahtisaari, the former Finnish President and ICG Chairman, in his introductory speech. Ahtisaari explained that he is no expert on Afghanistan, but he has much experience in the Balkans. How, he asked, can anybody imagine that America can withdraw from Afghanistan when Bosnia, Kosovo—not to mention the formally independent East Timor—are still protectorates of the "international community," years after a humanitarian war?

The self-styled "win-the-peace" intervention of Ahtisaari—who is also a top official in several George Soros-run foundations—was followed by an array of calls for further military intervention in the Afghan area. Brookings' Roberta Cohen began her speech with these words: "My work is in the humanitarian area, but one cannot discuss humanitarian or human rights and development issues in Afghanistan independently of the war." Conclusion: an expanded role for the international security forces is required. "The Pentagon has rejected an expanded role, but this refusal ignores and contributes to the absence of security."

Gathering the New Legions

Michael O'Hanlon, another Brookings' Senior Fellow specialized in military issues, approved of the use of the B-52s as stressed by Ahtisaari, and mentioned other possible ways to achieve the goal: "For example, the recent attempt to assassinate the warlord [Gulbuddin] Hekmatyar—which I fully approve of, by the way, because he had allied himself with the Taliban." O'Hanlon also presented a plan for the deployment of about 30,000 troops in Afghanistan, which is "more than simple peacekeeping or simple monitoring." He admitted: "That's a tough force in and of itself to come up with. The United States would have a hard time generating the contribution. . . . I would propose one specific idea: that we contribute some of the forces, some of the Marines that are now at Okinawa, Japan."

O'Hanlon called for what LaRouche has been denouncing regularly, as the transformation of professional national armies into international mercenaries on the model of the Roman legions. He urged participation of Japanese, South Korean, and European militaries "that are not presently engaged as heavily in Afghanistan"; and beyond that, to go around "looking for countries who can give some soldiers. The best potentials appear to be within the future NATO aspirants." The Brookings plan seems to be to demand a pound of military flesh from all those countries who are deluding themselves they will find stability and economic survival once they are in the NATO club.