

In early 1989, an Anti-Defamation League (ADL) team, led by Burton Levinson, Jess Hordes, and Abe Foxman, visited India. The team held meetings with then-Foreign Minister P.V. Narasimha Rao, a senior member of the Congress Party, as well as then-Secretary of the External Affairs Ministry A.S. Gonsalves (now ambassador to the Soviet Union) and then-Joint Secretary P.K. Singh.

The circumstances under which this trip was arranged are shrouded in mystery. The ADL visit becomes even more puzzling because in 1987, the same organization issued a blistering report that charged India with "frequent disregard for the minimum standards of civility and law required among nations." This is a reference to India's severe scrutiny of visa applications for Israeli delegations, even for international conferences.

It is not that the report went unnoticed, but incredibly, it was published soon after the Indian government had allowed an Israeli vice consul to be posted at its consulate in Bombay! There are other reasons for surprise. *EIR* has documented the ADL's involvement with the pro-Khalistani Sikhs in the United States. Not accidentally, immediately after the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO)-inspired Intifada uprising began in the Occupied Territories, Israel publicly denounced charges of brutality against Palestinians by saying *that its handling of the uprising was nothing compared to what the government of India was doing to Sikhs*. Nonetheless, the ADL team visited India, led by Burton Levinson, who had signed the 1987 report.

Sikhs volunteer for Bush

Sikh separatists in India have now come out volunteering their terrorist services for the Bush administration's genocidal war against Iraq. On Feb. 7, S.S. Mann, the leader of the Sikh Akali Party in Punjab, presented U.S. Ambassador to India William Clark with an open letter, in which the separatist leader declared that he could send "Iakhs" (hundreds of thousands) of Sikh militants to the Persian Gulf to fight with the multinational force against Iraq. Mann declared that Sikhs want to repeat their role in World War I and World War II, when they were used as soldiers by the British Empire, who admired their "martial spirit." Mann also asked Clark to send the Sikhs' regards to British Prime Minister John Major, U.S. President Bush, and the Emir of Kuwait.

Until December 1988, when he was elected from Punjab to sit in the national parliament, S.S. Mann was in prison, after his trial and conviction for conspiracy in the October 1984 assassination of Indian Prime Minister Indira Gandhi. As *EIR* editors wrote in a 1985 book on the Gandhi murder entitled *Derivative Assassination*, the Sikh separatists who designed and executed the plan to murder Mrs. Gandhi enjoyed the sponsorship of both British and Israeli intelligence networks.

Brazil resists U.S. on Gulf war policy

by Lorenzo Carrasco and Cynthia Rush

Unlike the rest of Ibero-America's governments, the Brazilian government of Fernando Collor de Mello is putting up some resistance to the United States' imperial policy in the Persian Gulf. It officially supports the U.N. Security Council resolutions and calls for Iraq to withdraw from Kuwait, but insists on maintaining a neutral stance and has refused to collaborate militarily with the anti-Iraq alliance. Brazil's nationalist military and scientific sectors, which have fought over the past three decades to develop the nation's technological and industrial capabilities, provide much of the impetus for the government's resistance.

They understand that Bush's "New World Order" will not tolerate any such display of economic or scientific independence, and that Brazil could be punished in much the way Iraq has been for making similar attempts. Statements such as those made by Foreign Minister Francisco Rezek before the Foreign Relations Commission of the Brazilian Congress, in which he publicly described the goal of the U.S. Gulf policy as seeking a "Pax Americana" and "unipolar world," reflect the pressure coming from these sectors. It was Rezek also who, immediately after the war began, called for a cease-fire.

Brazil's position regarding Iraq, with whom it enjoyed strong diplomatic ties prior to the war, has provoked a bullying response from the Bush administration. The U.S. knows that the Collor government doesn't represent any threat to the allied military action in the Gulf, but fears that it could inspire opposition in the rest of Ibero-America to Bush's "New World Order." Such opposition could undermine the Eastern Establishment's "Enterprise for the Americas" free trade scheme, conceived of as a new "Fortress America" plan to subjugate the Ibero-American subcontinent to the Bush-Thatcher war economy.

Brazil's refusal to fully endorse U.S. policy could pose an immediate threat to the stability of governments such as Argentina's where President Carlos Menem has toed the Anglo-American line to the point of sending two ships to join the anti-Iraq coalition in the Persian Gulf. Even the mild opposition offered by Mexico and Brazil in the Caracas

meeting of the Group of Rio in late January, scared the U.S.

Using the media, State Department emissaries, thinktanks and other "sources," the Bush administration has delivered a series of threats and warnings to Brazil to shape up or else. Although the contents of a personal letter sent by Bush to Collor on Jan. 28 have not been made public to date, judging from the government's response, there is little doubt that the U.S. delivered an ultimatum demanding "unequivocal and firm support" for the genocidal war against Iraq. Collor's Feb. 5 reply to Bush, made public by the President's Planalto Palace on Feb. 7, at first glance could be viewed as favorable to U.S. diplomacy, in that it supported the U.N. Security Council resolutions and condemned Iraq without any mention of U.S. war crimes. However, it also reiterated Brazil's decision not to be directly involved in the war.

"Brazil and the United States," the letter says, "fought side by side in other conflicts in the past against the threat of universal tyranny [during World War II] and for democracy and peace. I am certain that later on there will also be a role for my country in the current international crisis, when the forces necessary to consolidate a peace I hope is quickly won, will be called upon." What most annoyed Washington was Collor's implicit assertion that the United States should not remain as a permanent occupation force in the Persian Gulf.

Itamaraty is not 'a State Department appendage'

Collor's letter was couched in careful diplomatic language. But Foreign Minister Rezek was much more explicit in his tough response to the threats being thrown at Brazil. In a signed article in the Feb. 10 *Estado de São Paulo*, Rezek stated: "For the vast majority of countries, neither bipolarity, nor exclusionary multipolarity, nor unipolarity can constitute the ideal system of distribution of power among nations. Bipolarity puts security matters before those of development, and generates an arms race which threatens everyone.

"Multipolarity is benign only when it is not exclusionary: A limited circles of countries cannot be granted the exclusive right to run the international agenda according to their own interests. Unipolarity, which implies collective submission to a single hegemonic power, is undesirable at any time and under any circumstances, regardless of which country can be identified as the single pole. . . .

"Unconditional alignments, meanwhile, presuppose something which has never existed between two countries: an absolute symmetry in identity, in history, in interests. Itamaraty—it is embarrassing to note something so obvious—is the Foreign Ministry of Brazil." Thus Rezek responded unequivocally to those who, according to *Estado de São Paulo's* own Feb. 12 editorial, "think that Itamaraty is an appendage of the State Department."

Brazen threats

The U.S. response has been brutal. In the Feb. 9 *Jornal do Brasil*, Washington correspondent Manoel Francisco Brito reported that according to a "reliable U.S. diplomatic source," President Bush's letter to Collor "suggested that what we consider to be the Brazilian government's attempt to sit on the fence could hurt Brazil in the future." The same source said that Bush's letter "reminded Brasilia that its public stand demanding a cease-fire among the belligerents, places it on a collision course with Washington."

Bush's letter gave the go-ahead for a pressure campaign against Brazil, led by the State Department, which has significant assets among Brazil's largest newspapers such as *Jornal do Brasil*, *Estado de São Paulo*, and *Folha de São Paulo*. On Jan. 29, the day after Bush's letter arrived, former Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs Elliott Abrams gave a press conference in São Paulo together with U.S. Ambassador Richard Melton, in which they brazenly threatened Brazil with a total cutoff in foreign investment if it failed to submit to Bush's imperial dictates. As reported in the Jan. 30 *Gazeta Mercantil*, Abrams warned that "U.S. citizens and businessmen form judgments about countries, and Brazil's 'unequivocal and firm support' for the war effort would help to produce a favorable image of the country among the investors."

Ambassador Melton's "subtlety" was not far behind that of Abrams, his department head during the Iran-Contra scandal. In statements to *Gazeta Mercantil* Feb. 5, Melton pronounced: "To act like a member of the First World, one must assume the responsibilities that go with it. . . . The constructive voices of those that will be heard after the war will not come from those countries which did not get involved. . . . The hypothesis of serving as a mediator isn't going to occur."

Bush's representative in Brazil went still further in a Feb. 7 article in *Folha de São Paulo*. After a lengthy diatribe of war propaganda, he attacked Foreign Minister Rezek's statements before the Congress. Melton's public criticisms of Brazil's foreign policy were seen in many political circles in Brasilia as an intolerable intervention into internal affairs.

Brazil, next target of 'Fortress America'?

The State Department's specific targets are the political and military sectors which have had the audacity to attempt to convert Brazil into a scientific and technological giant, and which today are resisting the dismantling of advanced technology and the military industries, particularly nuclear and aerospace.

On Feb. 6, *Folha de São Paulo*, which often serves as the mouthpiece of the State Department, renewed its attack against the aerospace sector of San José dos Campos, Brazil's finest technology center run by the Air Force. *Folha* accused Brazil of helping to perfect the guidance system of

the Scud-B missiles, and accused the National Institute of Space Research (INPE) of helping Iraq to develop a remote-sensing satellite, a project later vetoed by the Brazilian government itself.

The slander campaign against retired Air Force Brig. Gen. Hugo Piva, who is responsible for most of Brazil's key technical advances in the area of missiles and satellite launching, has not satisfied the United States. Nor was it sufficient for President Collor to declare before the U.N. General Assembly that Brazil would desist in any efforts to build nuclear devices for peaceful purposes, after he theatrically plugged up the Cachimbo installations supposedly built to conduct nuclear tests. Nor was it sufficient for Argentina and Brazil to sign a joint agreement to open their respective nuclear installations to foreign inspection. The United States also did not give much account to the naming of José Goldemberg—the most virulent enemy of the Armed Forces' technological programs—as Science and Technology Secretary.

What Bush wants is nothing less than the dismantling, "of their own free will," of every one of Brazil's high-technology sectors, civilian and military; that is, the dismantling of Brazil's claims to independence. Hanging over the heads of Brazilians who resist, is the constant threat of using the U.N. Security Council, just as it was used to justify military aggression against Iraq.

This scenario can be seen in the Jan. 30 editorial of the U.S. daily *Miami Herald*, under the title, "Brazil Abets Iraqi Crimes." The editorial says that Brazil, like the Soviet Union, helped Saddam Hussein to equip Iraq with a modern military arsenal. But, unlike the Soviets—whom the paper praises for "having deployed its troops in Lithuania and Latvia, not in the Gulf," and for the "commendable help it has given the allies, with briefings on Iraqi tactics, installations, and equipment"—Brazil has remained neutral.

The *Miami Herald* accuses Brazil of bearing major responsibility for the development of Iraq's missile industry, and of continuing to technically assist its Astros II missile system, sold to Iraq by the Brazilian company Avibras Aeroespacial before the conflict. Despite Brazil's clarification and denial that this was the case, the paper demanded that "the Brazilian government must put a stop to such criminal behavior immediately." The editorial concludes that the denials are "criminal nonsense. Avibras Aeroespacial's 'technical assistance' is military. If the Brazilian government cannot stop its firms from helping Baghdad, the United States and its allies, including the cooperative Soviet Union, should ask the U.N. to condemn Brazil's lucrative and potentially murderous oversight."

The U.S. diplomatic response to President Collor's letter to Bush reflects the same attitude. In the coverage by *Jornal do Brasil's* Washington correspondent cited above, State Department sources are quoted saying that "the most serious aspect of the Brazilian President's letter for Americans, is

the affirmation that Brazil will continue to refuse any military collaboration with the allies in the context of the Gulf conflict." He added, "What the Americans desire is not the sending of Brazilian troops to Saudi Arabia, but information on a good portion of the nuclear and conventional weapons potential in Saddam Hussein's power."

The *Jornal do Brasil* coverage cites Gary Milhollin, an unofficial State Department and Pentagon agent who spies on Brazil's sensitive technologies through his obscure Wisconsin Project on Nuclear Arms Control. "What Brazil knows about this is not insignificant. . . . It is obvious that the allies could have gotten this information from other sources, but with Brazil's help, a good part of this work would be facilitated. . . . Brazil could . . . reveal where Saddam Hussein's centrifuges, his research teams, and his deposits of concentrated uranium can be found." Milhollin's real intentions came out during his testimony before the U.S. Congress last November, in which he demanded not only that all responsibility for technological development be withdrawn from the armed forces of Third World countries, but that the U.S. Defense Department be given oversight of any so-called sensitive technology transfer to such countries.

Jornal do Brasil also quotes Ethan Kapstein of Harvard University's Center for International Studies, a specialist on Brazil's weapons industry, who charges that "the current Brazilian position with regard to the war could be defined as a little mercantilist. Brasilia is certainly positioning itself to be favored should Saddam remain in power, a situation in which countries which have not involved themselves in the war could benefit from the reconstruction needs of the Iraqi economy. It would be very good if the allies limited their war aims to retaking Kuwait, and leaving Saddam in power in Baghdad. And this is the only hypothesis under which Brazil would derive any advantages. Because if, after the war, a government more aligned to Washington is established in Iraq, Brazilian companies will not be in any condition to compete in the market."

As reported in the Feb. 9 *Jornal do Brasil*, Rezek responded with annoyance to these statements. "We sent nothing because we weren't asked to, and we weren't asked because there's nothing very mysterious there. What is the Astros? They know. What is the quantity negotiated with Iraq? I can't imagine that this is a mystery either."

The U.S. conflict with Brazil is set up. Military and civilian sectors worried about the consequences for national sovereignty and Brazil's future of Bush's imperial "New Order," and intent on protecting the efforts of three decades of work in nuclear and aerospace technology, know that future U.N. resolutions regarding alleged environmental protection or halting technology proliferation mean giving the Anglo-Americans and their partners *carte blanche* to wage war against the country. To resist Bush's New Order today, is to refuse to provide the rope with which the nation will be hanged tomorrow.