

Chief Buthelezi is now asking from President Botha that he produce an explicit statement of the plans for abolishing the apartheid system, in order to lay the basis for common action toward a constitutional system of shared power with the black population, in contrast to the demand of the present ANC for a power transfer from whites to blacks.

Chief Buthelezi has in the past consistently and successfully refused to accept the independence of the KwaZulu homeland in the northeast of the country. Buthelezi is fighting for an important principle: that of a South African nation whose geographic area is accessible to all, with a single definition of citizenship for each and all, independent of ethnic membership. Chief Buthelezi's goal is a federal constitution, through which the nation will be divided into different provinces according to a federative principle, and under a central government.

Buthelezi can register his greatest success in KwaZulu/Natal. A month ago, the legislative assembly of KwaZulu and its government moved into new parliamentary and governmental buildings in Ulundi, a city rich in tradition. In this northeast region of South Africa, in the southern corner of which lies the industrial harbor city of Durban, there are presently two regional governments: the white provincial government of Natal, with its seat in Pietermaritzburg, and, in Ulundi, the black government of KwaZulu, whose territorial limits are determined only with difficulty, since it is scattered throughout Natal. The inefficiency of this system is shown by the duplication of all administrative functions—there are two health ministers, two education ministers, etc.

Here, Chief Buthelezi has seized upon an important initiative—a conference, to be designated an *Indaba*, which will include political representation from all ethnic groups, whites, blacks, Indians, and coloreds. This conference is sanctioned by the Pretoria government, and is currently working on the *modus operandi* for a unified government for the total province, which will possibly come into existence under the name KwaNatal. The goal of the *Indaba* is to demonstrate that blacks and whites can rule together without racial discrimination. Members of the conference report marked progress, and there is general agreement that the success of the *Indaba* will have a signal effect on the future constitution of the country.

The political changes in South Africa in the last 18 months prove the existence of responsible leaders in the country who intend to work out the necessary changes in the constitution without violence or chaos. But the success of this undertaking is dependent not only on the internal political situation, but also on the effect of the international strategic situation, which is constantly growing more dangerous. Aggressive resolution and courageous far-sightedness are now demanded of the leaders of South Africa, in order to transform the strategic attacks on South Africa into effective weapons against the enemies of their country.

From New Delhi

Playing the British Labour Party card

by Susan Maitra

It is one of those cardinal principles of Indian politics that British Labour is a defender of socialism and the oppressed, and a “friend of India” in particular. Nearly two years of stonewalling by the Thatcher government over Indian complaints of British protection of wanted Sikh and Kashmiri separatist terrorists, has made it seem truer than ever.

Thus it was no surprise when the visit to India of Neil Kinnock, leader of the opposition Labour Party and a man touted for the premiership following the 1987 British general elections, was announced. Kinnock and his wife—who has her own “One World” bandwagon—enjoyed a nine-day red-carpet tour here starting May 25 at the invitation of the ruling Congress Party. The visit included meetings with the top brass, including the prime minister, as well as a special fact-finding mission to Punjab.

No one on the Indian side, starting with Congress Vice-President Arjun Singh, who received the special guests and oversaw their tour, minced words on the aim of the Congress initiative.

As *EIR* was among the first to document, the 1984 assassination of Indira Gandhi was directed from London, where Sikh separatist extremists not only made public their campaign for the breakup of India, but also their determination to murder the prime minister as well. Jagjit Singh Chauhan is the “tip of the iceberg” of the terrorist apparatus, which is not only still intact in London, but also has been assisted by the British government over the past 18 months even while it kept up a steady stream of threats against the current Indian prime minister, Rajiv Gandhi.

As *EIR* has exposed, the Sikh separatists enjoy high-level patronage. One of their guardians, Lord Nicholas Bethell, is a British MP, former lord-in-waiting to the Queen, a peer of the Realm, and, according to charges which forced him to resign a ministerial post in the Heath government in 1971, a KGB agent. Bethell is otherwise distinguished as the creator and controller of the “Afghan freedom fighters.”

What is scandalous, if not surprising, is that presented with the fact, the British government has felt no compulsion to alter its behavior. The trouble began soon after Mrs. Gandhi's assassination, when the British balked at Indian re-

quests for cooperation in shutting down the extremist operation in the U.K. As a result, in early 1985, India canceled a planned U.K. aerospace exhibition, put several defense deals with British firms into deep freeze, and blocked the visit of several British ministers.

Public exposure of the scandal has been accompanied by private diplomatic entreaties by India at every level. Factual details of ongoing criminal activities and their impact in India were provided to back up the requests for deportation of extremists and for a comprehensive extradition treaty between the two countries. Not a few of the extremists harbored in England have committed murder and other terrorist acts in India.

Following the October 1985 stopover visit of Rajiv Gandhi to London, a panel was set up to go into the matter. But the effort faltered after one session. Britain rejected India's proposed extradition agreement—modeled on the treaty Britain has proposed to the United States to cover extremists from Northern Ireland!

By the end of March, as relations worsened, British Foreign Minister Sir Geoffrey Howe paid a hasty visit to India, presumably with a "fresh start" in his briefcase. "The Geoffrey Howe visit didn't take us very far," Indian Foreign Secretary Venkateswaran told foreign correspondents on April 29. We have noted that recently British authorities were able to deport 21 Libyans at the drop of a hat, he said, and yet they haven't been able to get even one Sikh extremist out. When they protest that nothing can be done, Venkateswaran said, "it strains our credulity."

(Amazingly, Britain defends itself on this score on the grounds that the Libyans will meet a "hero's welcome" when they are forced to return to their country, whereas the Sikh terrorists will face trial in India.)

It must have been slightly jarring, then, when Neil Kinnock, after an unusual briefing-visit to Punjab, was asked by his Punjab Congress Party hosts to help change the attitude of his government, he treated them to a lecture that ranged from the need to honor democratic traditions and values to a litany of legal obstacles to dealing with the terrorists in the U.K.

Stink of hypocrisy

According to press reports from Chandigarh, he sounded for all the world like an echo of Sir Geoffrey Howe. Whether it was his assurances on behalf of Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher, the British government, and everyone in Britain that no one wanted to break India's unity—could a Briton ever harbor such a desire?—or his pompous claims that there has been insufficient evidence presented against the terrorists in Britain, the stink of hypocrisy was too familiar.

In an interview in Bangalore, Kinnock first said his visit to Punjab had convinced him that "the freedom fighters of Khalistan" were terrorists—perhaps he's a slow learner, but

better late than never. But in the next breath he added that it was difficult to take action against Sikh extremists in the U.K., because under British law, action could be taken only against those shown to be involved in and supporting terrorism!

"It's not a matter of policy, but one of basic principle," Kinnock stated, referring to the principle that terrorism is a problem. Of course, he assured his Indian friends, "a Labour government would be fully committed to the effective assertion of this principle."

In retrospect, Kinnock's virtual panic at the thought of India leading a march out of the Commonwealth, a threat Rajiv Gandhi had raised over the southern Africa issue, was a tip-off to his basic orientation. Like the independence of the Malvinas (Falkland) Islands, the prospect of dissolving this last shadow of the British Empire presents the kind of situation in which, in Indian novelist Salman Rushdie's recent words, "All the old imperial values are yanked out again."

The prospect of being legally bound to respect India's sovereignty has the same effect. The worst thing about it, according to Rushdie's observation of the Malvinas war phenomenon, is that it's "impossible to know which way your friends are going to jump."

Kinnock has, however, it would seem, made himself perfectly clear.

Derivative Assassination: Who Killed Indira Gandhi?

by the Editors of
Executive
Intelligence
Review

Order from:
Ben Franklin
Booksellers, Inc.
27 South King St.
Leesburg, VA 22075

\$4.95 plus shipping
(\$1.50 for
first book, \$.50 for
each additional
book). Bulk rates
available.

