

Aga Khan wants 'new world order' solution for Gulf refugees

by Mark Burdman

On Dec. 11, Prince Sadruddin Aga Khan, who is currently the United Nations secretary general's personal representative for humanitarian assistance in the Gulf crisis, authored the lead commentary in the London *Times* entitled "Prepare now for more Gulf refugees." The prince recalled that, in the days following the outbreak of the Gulf crisis in August, "hundreds of thousands of low-paid foreign workers streamed across the desert into Jordan." Most of these 750,000 or so have since been repatriated, but, he warned, "the humanitarian problem will not be behind us until stability in the region is restored. More than a million foreigners remain in Iraq and Kuwait, many of whom may yet wish to leave. The camps in the Jordanian desert may be empty for the time being, but at the first sign of hostilities, the human flow will start again—this time perhaps including Iraqis and expelled Palestinians (from the east or the west). It would be tragic if the world was again unprepared."

The prince, who was the U.N. High Commissioner for Refugees (HCR) from 1965 to 1977, drew attention to the threats posed to the "already overstrained economies of those developing countries now having to reabsorb hundreds of thousands of workers who previously sent back significant sums in foreign exchange." For these countries, "the effects will be devastating." Jordan itself is under particular strain, magnified by the deleterious effects of the international anti-Iraq sanctions, because of Jordan's considerable economic links to neighbor Iraq.

Controlling 'global population flow'

It would be hard to disagree with the Aga Khan up to this point, and one welcomes his drawing attention to the plights of the refugees of the Gulf crisis. This crisis has already caused massive damage to the economies of the Philippines, India, Yugoslavia, Sri Lanka, Pakistan, Thailand, Bangladesh, Egypt, and others. In the case of India, for example, it was estimated already in mid-September that India would lose at least \$100 million annually from lost remittances from workers who had been working in Kuwait. Very conservative estimates were that the Philippines would lose \$40 million annually, and Sri Lanka \$60 million.

There are, however, two notes of caution that need be made about his article. The first involves his policy recom-

mendations. In the latter part of the article, he expresses hope for "improvements in the international system," drawing attention to the "excellent report" by U.N. officials Brian Urquhart and Erskine Chalders, published by the Ford Foundation and the Dag Hammarskjöld Foundation, entitled "A World in Need of Leadership: Tomorrow's United Nations." But their ideas for reinforcing traditional U.N. approaches to such problems as refugees, he says, are not enough. What should be done, is to appoint a "U.N. Special Representative for Humanitarian Affairs, who would *monitor all situations likely to produce sudden population movements*" (emphasis added). Such a measure to "contain the humanitarian dimension of such crises as that we currently face in the Gulf," would be important for the creation of a "new international order, as both superpowers are rhetorically suggesting."

By invoking the "new international order," the prince is, in effect, advising that the refugee crisis be resolved precisely by those policies of the Thatcher and Bush regimes which created the problem in the first place. Likewise, his recommendation for preemptive action to deal with potential population flows, within the context of a strengthened U.N. system, cannot be isolated from the discussion ongoing in the leading oligarchical policy institutions, such as Britain's Ditchley Foundation, the Inter-Action Council, the Club of Rome, and others, to subordinate the strategic policies of the NATO member-nations to malthusian demographic considerations of population control and population reduction.

In October 1989, long before the Gulf crisis erupted, the Ditchley Foundation held a conference on "Political and economic refugees: problems of migration, asylum and resettlement," at which the concern was expressed that "the principle which seems to underlie both immigration and refugee law in modern international society is that which endorses the legitimacy of the sovereign nation-state." This was an impediment to what must now be done. According to a report from that meeting, participants differentiated between two kinds of states, "senders and receivers," and discussed measures to deal with what were labeled "refugee-generating countries."

On this basis, the Ditchley participants developed a notion of limited sovereignty: "Consideration should be given to making habitual refugee-sending countries pay for what

should be considered a delinquency.” Some participants called for “sanctioning outside intervention into the refugee-sending countries in order to eradicate the source of the problem. . . . Strategies of shame were discussed as being applicable,” so that “senders would be disgraced in the eyes of other states.” Advanced sector nations were referred to as “the gatekeepers seeking to control global population flow.”

It is one step from this talk of “intervention” and “control,” to making “the refugee question” into a matter for military action. Indeed, such thinking has now intruded itself into the highest councils of NATO. Speaking before the North Atlantic Assembly in London Nov. 29, NATO Secretary General Manfred Woerner enunciated an expansion of NATO’s role to deal with threats outside the traditional NATO area. He stressed: “Along the southern perimeter of Europe, there is to some extent an arc of tension from the Maghreb to the Middle East. Tensions are exacerbated not only by the ambitions of dictators like Saddam Hussein, but also by population growth, resource conflict, migration, underdevelopment, religious fundamentalism, and terrorism.”

Such institutions seek to exploit the issue of “refugees” to reinforce their conception of a “new world order,” in which supranational rule overrides national sovereignty. They seek to implement a self-fulfilling prophecy: If certain conditions are imposed on developing sector and eastern European nations, then people will flee from such conditions. Usurious policies, like those of the International Monetary Fund, and environmental degradation caused by looting and austerity, destroy nations and cause conditions for refugee flows and migrations above normal levels of global population movement. The habit in Ditchley and related circles, of making a distinction between “environmental” or “economic” refugees on the one hand, and “those fleeing from political persecution” on the other, becomes an absurdity.

Those who have transformed the Iraq-Kuwait conflict into what they call a “test case for the new world order” are not unaware of the massive dislocations they would cause. As the Gulf crisis highlights, and what the prince omits to say, is that no solution to the crises of refugee flows is possible without regional economic development for the Middle East and the Third World in general.

Prince Philip, Bush, and John Train

This leads to the second note of caution. Prince Sadruddin Aga Khan himself could hardly be considered an innocent humanitarian observer. He is one of the most powerful individuals in molding supranational institutions, through the U.N., through his own elitist Bellerive Foundation in Geneva, and through his positions as honorary member of the Club of Rome and leading member of British Prince Philip’s World Wildlife Fund (recently renamed World Wide Fund for Nature). He is intimately linked to those circles which started the Gulf crisis. For years, George Bush would stay at

his villa in Geneva whenever Bush was visiting that area. Their friendship dates from the time when Bush was U.S. ambassador to the U.N. It is not surprising that the prince is enamored of the “new international order.”

Sadruddin Aga Khan was also the roommate, during his student days at Harvard, of the New York-based CIA-connected banker and financial adviser, John Train. The two have remained good friends ever since. Train is one of the “insiders” in the Anglo-American establishment who was called on, about late 1982-early 1983, to coordinate a multi-level task force to destroy the man who had become the number one threat to the Anglo-American establishment, Lyndon LaRouche. It was the Reagan-Bush administration’s witchhunt against LaRouche, and the rejection of LaRouche’s economic and development policies, which created the conditions in which such crises as that now erupting in the Gulf and Middle East became inevitable. If the prince wants to resolve the identified problems in the Middle East/Gulf region, he should prevail on his oligarchical chums free LaRouche.

The Dayal affair

The sensitivity of the “refugee question” is seen in a little-publicized controversy at U.N. headquarters in New York. The matter concerns the replacement for Thorvald Stoltenberg as U.N. HCR, following his leaving to join the new government of Gro-Harlem Brundtland in Norway. The first name put forward as his replacement was India’s Virendra Dayal, the chief of staff of U.N. Secretary General Javier Pérez de Cuéllar. Dayal is highly regarded within the U.N. as a loyalist to the U.N. system.

Despite such credentials, his appointment was vetoed by the United States and other donor nations. Dayal’s reaction was to accuse the advanced sector nations of racism, and to charge that he had been blackballed. The story received some media coverage for a couple of days, but was then hushed up, and today the U.N. bureaucracy will say nothing about it. To this day, there is no agreed-upon candidate for HCR, with 17 names under consideration.

Although no U.S., British, or other officials would say so publicly, Dayal is undoubtedly correct. Even if the U.N. HCR is yet another U.N. supranational institution whose functions would be better served through agreements between sovereign states, the Dayal case reveals the mentality of those who are fashioning the “new world order.” At a time when the Anglo-Americans are committed to North versus South resource-grab wars, when India is suffering from the consequences of the Persian Gulf crisis, and when India is known to be on the “target list” of southern nations facing destabilization, why would a dark-skinned Indian be allowed to carry out such a sensitive function?

On what side does Prince Sadruddin Aga Khan, whose family is from the Indian subcontinent, stand in this sordid affair?