

Freeing of Jordanian will set back British gameplan

by Muriel Mirak-Weissbach

On Nov. 10, Laith Shubeilat, the popular Islamic parliamentarian in Jordan, was sentenced to 20 years hard labor, commuted from the death sentence. The military court had pronounced him, another parliamentarian, and two shopkeepers guilty of illegal weapons possession, and conspiring to overthrow the state in order to establish an Islamic dictatorship, with Iranian backing. Two days later, the news was leaked to AP in Amman that Shubeilat and his co-defendant Yacoub Qarrash, would be freed by His Majesty King Hussein. It was expected that the surprising announcement would be made on the occasion of the monarch's birthday, Nov. 14. In the best hypothesis, the king's act would be not a pardon, but a declaration of the charges as null and void, and the subsequent restoration of Shubeilat to his parliamentarian dignity.

How is such a fairy-tale ending possible in this day and age? What are the implications for Jordan, for the Middle East, and relations with the Great Powers?

From the arrest of Shubeilat in late August, U.S. statesman Lyndon LaRouche had hypothesized that the case were the leading edge of a broader assault on the part of the Anglo-American establishment (and Israel) against the Hashemite Kingdom. LaRouche viewed it as the lever for effecting a strategic shift in the region, which would aim at forcing Jordan to accept a U.S.-brokered separate peace with Israel, and turn its back on Baghdad, which it had supported—in virtual isolation—during the Persian Gulf war. Shubeilat was to be sacrificed because he embodied the opposition to a second Camp David separate peace treaty with Israel, and because he stood up for Jordanian sovereignty against the supranational dictates of the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and Bush's new world order. Shubeilat was a particularly appetizing target for Washington and London because

he had openly endorsed the policies and presidential ambitions of Lyndon LaRouche. As a respected independent of the Islamic movement, Shubeilat reflected the growing political power of the Muslims, not only in Jordan, but in Algeria, Sudan, Egypt, and elsewhere. Smashing him would signal a crackdown everywhere. According to Anglo-American scenarios, the act of sacrificing the popular Shubeilat could unleash massive unrest, triggering chaos in Jordan and even war.

Sometime in August, as Shubeilat was completing his parliamentary commission's probe into corruption in high places (including past ministries), the order went out from the United States and London to nab him. He was arrested on Aug. 31. As it was leaked by the Paris daily *Le Monde* just recently, it was just prior to that date, on Aug. 22, that the Israelis managed to get the Jordanian peace negotiators to initial an agreement on an agenda, which was to lead to a peace treaty. The significance of the document for the Israelis was symbolic: They consider it a sign of capitulation. This agreement was engineered, significantly, in the absence of the king, who was in the United States for cancer surgery.

No evidence; witness recants

The legal case bore all the markings of a classical frame-up, as we have chronicled during October. Since the state security prosecutor running the trial in a military court had no evidence, it had recourse to a dangerous ruse, a "secret witness" introduced in "secret, closed session." The witness, presented as a Syrian businessman, "Yassin Ramadan Al-Yassin," provided damaging testimony against Shubeilat; he said he had carried 300,000 deutschemarks (\$200,000) from the Iranian government in Teheran to Amman for Shubeilat. This would prove that Iran backed the conspiracy to over-

throw the state. Shubeilat's defense lawyers abandoned the case in legitimate protest against such outrageously fraudulent tactics, and the accused started a hunger strike. With a court-appointed lawyer whose defense he rejected, Shubeilat sat through the remaining sessions, until the trial ended Oct. 30.

On Nov. 6, a man named Ali Shakarchi contacted the offices of the Schiller Institute in Germany, with a bizarre tale. He said he was an Iraqi-born German citizen, who had been lured to Amman and coerced into providing false testimony against Shubeilat. He was the real "Yassin Ramadan Al-Yassin" and, having safely returned home from a wild adventure, wanted to tell the real story. The Schiller Institute had been mobilizing for Shubeilat's freedom since early September, and had generated protest telegrams, petitions, and inquiries from parliamentarians, trade unionists, political and religious figures throughout Europe, the United States, and Ibero-America. All these messages had reached Jordan. A representative of the Schiller Institute had attended court sessions with French lawyer Claude Pernet in the first week of the trial, as observers.

Shakarchi's story (see affidavit) is an incredible account of how secret services function to frame up people. Once his version had been certified by a lawyer, the affidavit was presented to the German government (considering his citizenship) and to the Jordanian authorities. The German Foreign Ministry, incredibly, refused to accept it, explaining later that it did not want to be "involved." In Jordan, the affidavit circulated among the top political elites and selected press. Abroad, in Europe and other Arab countries, the news of it spread like wildfire. The most damning information contained in the affidavit was Shakarchi's charge that the persons who had coerced his false testimony were the very same persons running the trial: the state prosecutor, the judge, and secret service agents. Furthermore, he named by name the highest military judicial authority, the Attorney General.

Thus, when Prosecutor Hijazi and Judge Lt. Col. Yousef Faouri convened on Nov. 10 to deliver the verdict and sentences, they were fully aware of what had transpired. The judge commuted the death sentence to 20 years. Furthermore, he found Shubeilat not guilty of certain charges, such as undermining relations with Iraq, or slandering the king. He was found "not responsible" for instigating insurrection or slandering parliament. Regarding the convictions, the only "proof" the judge had was what was contained in statements made in testimonies of the third and fourth defendants, two shopkeepers named Ayoubi and Idkedek, who had confessed to weapons possession; during heavy interrogation, they had implicated Qarrash as a leader of the conspiratorial organization, and only indirectly mentioned Shubeilat, though never having had contact with him. For example, a document which Judge Faouri referred to, outlining the alleged conspiratorial organization's internal policy and structure, was, ac-

ording to the same two confessed defendants, "dictated" by Qarrash, but "probably inspired" by Shubeilat.

Most surprising in the sentencing was what the judge had to say about "Yassin Ramadan Al-Yassin." Suddenly the man who had been the crown witness was no longer useful! Faouri said he was not accepting his testimony because of his "lack of credibility" and the impossibility of verifying what the "Syrian businessman" reported. Evidently, Faouri and Hizaji were trying to control the massive damage done.

Unfortunately for them, one day following the sentencing, a major European paper, *Le Monde*, broke the story of the Shakarchi affidavit. The floodgates were opened. Many other leading media were ready to follow suit, some willing to publish the entire affidavit.

And one day after that, the news of the king's decision to free Shubeilat was leaked. Insiders reported that a key role had been played by Speaker of the Parliament Abdul Lattif Arabiyat, who made public his intention to call on Prime Minister Sharif Zeid Ben Shaker to order a retrial. Many parliamentarians of different political tendencies protested the verdict. The prime minister has the power to augment or reduce the sentence, or order a retrial. The government can propose a general pardon, which, if endorsed by Parliament and approved by the king, would restore Shubeilat and his co-defendant to their parliamentary seats.

What will happen in Jordan now?

The best outcome would be the full restoration of parliamentary dignity to Shubeilat. The king, who is beloved, would only gain support from his people. Furthermore, it will be important, as Muslim Brotherhood bloc parliamentarian Ibrahim Khreisat stated, to dispel the fear engendered in the country as a result of the trial. It became obvious to every citizen that if such charges could be made against a parliamentarian of Shubeilat's stature, no one was safe. In addition, the fact that the military court accepted illegally tapped phone conversations as court admissible evidence, threw the entire population into paranoia, as everyone feared his phone might be bugged.

What must come out

To dispel all fears, and restore confidence in the institutions, the whole true story behind the Shakarchi affair will have to be told. This means that several questions will have to be answered. First, who are all the players in the drama? Locally, they appear to be contaminated elements of the military and secret services, popularly known as the "Mafia," known to oppose the king's democratization plans and to challenge his authority. It can be expected that many will be removed from their positions, as they obviously constitute a threat to the democratization process inaugurated in the country. Secondly, who are their partners abroad? The consistent references in the trial to Syrian and Israeli inputs provide good leads: The secret witness was provided with an apparently authentic Syrian passport and identity; the prose-

cution cited Syrian law as its precedent for allowing tapped telephone conversations as evidence, and so on. Israel was even more important. The first key witness for the prosecution was one of two brothers, serving a prison term as a convicted Israeli spy. Under oath, he retracted his written deposition (incriminating Shubeilat) and confessed that he had been offered a reduced jail term if he would perjure himself. Finally, what is the significance of the attempt to blame the alleged conspiracy on Iran? It fits like a glove into the buildup of press propaganda in the West regarding the emergence of a new threat in the region.

If the full truth is found, it can lead to a very healthy process of clearing the air of those elements which are truly plotting to undermine Jordan's sovereignty from abroad. There are tumultuous upheavals rocking the elites in Great Britain and in America's lame duck administration at present; it is precisely in this process that earnest investigations into the "Great Powers' " role in the Shubeilat frameup can yield important discoveries.

Documentation

Text of the Ali Shakarchi affidavit

The following affidavit was made on Nov. 6 by Ali Shakarchi, who admitted that he had been coerced into giving false testimony on Oct. 17 against Laith Shubeilat.

Having been informed of the possibility of legal prosecution in case of falsely or not fully delivered statements in an affidavit, [and] also having been notified of the possibility that my written statement could be used in front of a German or foreign court, I herewith declare in lieu of an oath:

I. Regarding my person:

Name: Ali Shakarchi
Date of birth: 1/1/45
Place of birth: Nasiriyah
Profession: Car dealer
Family status: Married, 2 children
Citizenship: German

II. Regarding the Case:

On Oct. 8, 1992 I received a call from Amman at my residence in Munich. The caller presented himself as a high official of the Jordanian Royal Palace of King Hussein. He

gave his name as Hafez Amin. He told me that the king wanted to make my acquaintance. When asked, the caller replied that he had heard of me from a Dr. Galeb who had told him that I had been in Iran. He, Mr. Amin, was in possession of a certain picture. He said I probably knew the person in the picture and therefore he asked me to come to Amman to look at the picture and to tell the king if I knew the man or not.

I was very disturbed and asked again how he came to call me. He repeated that he had got my name from my friend.

Later that evening Mr. Amin called me again. He told me that a ticket was ready for me at the Royal Jordanian Airline counter at the airport. It was a first-class ticket. My stay in Amman would only be for one or two days and I would return safely.

I agreed with these terms, but told him that I would only fly the day after tomorrow.

On Oct. 13, 1992, I flew from Munich to Frankfurt, to fly from there to Amman. I had picked up my round trip ticket Munich-Frankfurt-Amman at the counter [of Royal Jordanian] at the Munich airport. As I took my seat on the plane in Frankfurt I noticed sitting next to me a well-known German nuclear physicist (small, well-fed, with glasses and a moustache). I knew him from his TV appearances from the time of the Gulf war when he had been often in Baghdad on certain missions.

Suddenly I realized that my wallet was missing. Probably I had left it somewhere while doing some shopping. In the purse I had around 18,000 Deutschmarks. I left the plane and asked in the office for lost objects. I also inquired at the office of Royal Jordanian. When I was at the office of the airline a Mr. Abu Haithem happened to call in. I did not know him, but he must have been a high official of the Palace or the prime minister. He had called there to inquire if I had actually flown off to Amman. The secretary of the airline told him, that I was still in Frankfurt and put me on with Mr. Abu Haithem. I told him about my lost wallet. Mr. Haithem told me that they would reimburse me and that I should fly to Amman.

I did not want to fly to Amman with empty pockets. So I flew back to Munich. That same evening I received a call from Mr. Amin who asked me why I had not flown to Amman. I told him the reasons. Mr. Amin said I should at least fly the next day. He said it was very important. He swore by the head of King Hussein that I could go back immediately and that my passport would not be stamped and that I would not have any difficulties. At this point I would like to explain that such an oath means a lot to an Arab.

On Oct. 14, 1992, the next day, I flew to Frankfurt again to go to Amman from there. Mr. Amin was very nervous and telephoned repeatedly to the airline to inquire if I had actually boarded the plane to Amman. This was reported to me later in Jordan.

At my arrival in Amman I was picked up at the airport

Amnesty International sees 'nothing blatantly unfair'

Another head that may roll as a result of the developments in the Shubeilat case is that of the murky "human rights" outfit known as Amnesty International. The day before Laith Shubeilat, Jordanian Member of Parliament and head of the Commission on Public Corruption of the Jordanian Parliament, was condemned to 20 years hard labor, a Jordan-sector Amnesty International spokesman in London, named "Claudio," found "nothing blatantly unfair" about the proceedings, and "nothing which could justify calling the trial a farce." For example, he pointed out that the prosecutor had not referred at all, in his final peroration, to the fact that the star prosecution witness had been a secret witness, with a false identity! As though the recourse to such means in order to obtain a guilty verdict, were not enough, by itself, to taint the entire proceedings.

When "Claudio" was told of the story circulating that the anonymous witness was a false witness, and when asked what he would say if an affidavit to this effect by the false witness existed, "Claudio" spluttered that this

might just dent the credibility of the prosecution and the court.

According to sources in the European Parliament, Amnesty International had warned callers from the European Parliament inquiring about the trial, that "there might be substance" to the allegation that Shubeilat was a terrorist! Amnesty's blanket statement that the trial was fair was cited by German ministers, in letters responding to inquiries, as a guarantee.

At the beginning of October, Ian Martin, secretary general of Amnesty International, visited Jordan for a week, and popped into the Shubeilat trial one day. Amnesty refused to issue statements on the trial.

Amnesty International is notorious in Great Britain, the state where it is based and whose interests it represents, for refusing to touch the Birmingham Six and the Guildford Four cases of Irishmen who had been framed by British security forces. Most damning is the fact that Amnesty has consistently refused to look into the LaRouche case. On the latter, spokesmen for the Americas Desk of Amnesty told *EIR* that their organization "never has anything to do with conditions in jails," that they had "no information whatsoever" on the case—an outright lie—and that they believed Mr. LaRouche to be a common criminal.

by a man with a white moustache, bald head, blue eyes, slim, and around 50 years old. I thought it was Mr. Hafez Amin. But the gentleman told me that Mr. Amin was still on his way to the airport.

Several men with walkie-talkies took me to the special VIP lounge, normally reserved for the welcome ceremony of high-ranking guests. I was treated in a very polite manner.

We then left the airport and after about 10 minutes a Mercedes arrived. In this car were a Mr. Mohammed Hijazi, the State Attorney in the trial as I learned later, and a Mr. Abu Hashim, a man of the Secret Service, as I also later learned. They were in plainclothes.

They took me to a villa outside of Amman in the suburb called Sweleh.

On the table in the villa were two albums, a red one and a black one. In one of them was a huge picture of Laith Shubeilat and another one of Mr. Qarrash. I was asked if I knew these people. I told them that I did not.

In the following encounter I was asked by every one of the people present again and again—I was pushed—to look at the pictures very carefully and to think very carefully if I did not know the respective persons or if I had not met them somehow in Teheran. I declared again and again that I neither knew these people nor had ever met them before in my life.

After I had answered these questions in this clear way,

Mr. Abu Hashim suddenly changed the subject and told me that I was of Iraqi origin and that he had heard that I was against Saddam Hussein and that I had connections to the Iraqi opposition. At this moment it became clear to me that I had run into a trap. I felt that I had two possibilities, either to do everything that was asked of me in the hope that I could return to my family in Germany, or to have made a journey without return. I had to take into account that Mr. Amin in the telephone conversation with me in Munich had sworn by the head of the king. I knew that this oath was false. An Arab who misuses such an oath is capable of anything, as I know. Also it became clear that I was not to see the king as I had been told in the telephone call in Munich.

My fear grew significantly as I thought of my wife and my children. I thought for a moment of fleeing, but then saw no possibilities for escape. The only way out that I saw was to play along with the game and to do what I was told to do. I eventually agreed to behave as I was ordered to do.

After my consent, the conversation was ended at this point and adjourned to the evening. In the evening I was picked up and taken to the office of the Military Court, Alqadaa Alaskari.

I was taken to the room of Mr. Hafez Amin. I was told the judge, Yousef Faouri, would come soon.

After about 10 minutes Mr. Faouri arrived. He was in

In memory: Indira Gandhi, 1917-84

November 19 marks the 75th anniversary of the birth of Mrs. Indira Gandhi, world leader and prime minister of India, who was brutally gunned down in her garden by two Sikh bodyguards on Oct. 31, 1984. Little does the world know the enormous vacuum of leadership that her death has left in the world today.

Indira Gandhi was born into the independence movement for India against the British empire, that was being led by Mohandas K. Gandhi, her father Jawaharlal Nehru, and her grandfather Motilal Nehru. As a youth, she read the play about Joan of Arc, *The Virgin of Orleans*, by the German poet Friedrich Schiller, and determined that the young maid of Orleans would be her inspiration to save her own nation, India.

This, Mrs. Gandhi accomplished. Mrs. Gandhi was prime minister of India from 1966 to 1977 and again from 1980 to her death in 1984. In those years, her selfless devotion to her nation, which she placed above all other concerns throughout her life, enabled her to steer the ship of state of a nation of 700 million people. After a famine of 1966-67, Mrs. Gandhi determined that India must end its dependency on U.S. PL-480 food shipments, which always carried the threat of political blackmail with them. India would become food self-sufficient, in defiance of the malthusian claim that an independent India was destined for famine and starvation. Through the work of agronomist C.S. Subramaniam and the Green Revolution, India had achieved this goal by the end of the 1960s.

In 1974, India detonated a peaceful nuclear explosion for a dam-building project, thus signaling to the world that India has a nuclear capability.

From this position of strength, Indira Gandhi gave India the ability to carry out an independent foreign policy, and in the last years of her life, she was seeking to vastly improve relations with the United States to balance its long-standing relations with the Soviet Union.

At the time of her death, Mrs. Gandhi was a world

leader, the premier spokesman for the rights of the poverty-stricken millions of the developing countries. Following in the footsteps of her father, a founder of the Non-Aligned Movement, she was its undisputed leader at the time of the March 1983 summit in New Delhi.

"Non-alignment is national independence and freedom," Mrs. Gandhi said in her speech to the summit. "It stands for peace and the avoidance of confrontation. It aims at keeping away from military alliances. It means equality among nations and the democratization of international relations, economic and political."

Then, Mrs. Gandhi threw down the gauntlet to the malthusians of the West: "Non-alignment may shield us from war, but science is important for us to eradicate poverty. However, at present 97% of the world's research



Indira Gandhi is welcomed in Srinagar, the capital of the state of Jammu and Kashmir. Where would humanity be today, if Mrs. Gandhi were still alive to uphold the inalienable rights of every human being?

plainclothes and he welcomed me. At this point the following persons were present besides Mr. Faouri and myself: Mr. Hafez Amin, Mr. Mohammed Hijazi and Mr. Abu Hashim and two more persons in uniforms.

The judge, the State Attorney and the Secret Service officer discussed what kind of passport I should get. They agreed on a Syrian and that I was supposed to have been born in Dir Alzur. This town is situated in Syria near the border to Iraq. The decision was motivated by my Iraqi dialect.

They thought that the defense would become the least suspicious about my true identity. I was also told to speak in Modern (High) Arabic.

These people also discussed what my testimony in court should look like. They suggested that I was to have received DM 300,000 from Iran to deliver the money to Mr. Shu-beilat.

It was further decided that I would receive an artificial beard, a moustache, and Arabian clothing. Then the meeting



Indira Gandhi speaks in Washington at the National Press Club in July 1982. To her left is her son Rajiv Gandhi, the future prime minister who was, like his mother, assassinated by the enemies of a sovereign India.

is not relevant to us because it is earmarked for the priorities and to the induced appetites of technological leaders. . . . Each of our countries must strengthen its domestic base of science and technology and collectively we should devise more effective mechanisms for the pooling of our experiences. Earlier Non-Aligned gatherings have considered this subject. At this summit, let us move forward to make collective self-reliance a reality.”

Under Mrs. Gandhi’s leadership, the 1983 Non-Aligned summit put forward the boldest demands for ending the financial and economic tyranny of the western banks and their enforcer, the International Monetary Fund. The final declaration called for an “international conference on money and finance for development,” to be held outside the auspices of existing financial institutions, and stated that the mission of this conference should be to create a new world monetary system whose purpose would be to finance global development. “I am amongst those who believe that no sustained revival in the

North is possible without the development of the South,” Mrs. Gandhi stated in a subsequent Unctad meeting in June 1983.

It was at this point, when Mrs. Gandhi’s stature as a world leader in the fight for a new just world economic order was also at its height, that the British-orchestrated Sikh secessionist movement in Punjab dramatically escalated. *EIR’s* 1985 book *Derivative Assassination* fully documented the British origin of the plot to murder Mrs. Gandhi. The final go-ahead for Mrs. Gandhi’s murder came in August 1984, when the London *Economist* published a cover caricature of Mrs. Gandhi as Kali, the Indian goddess of destruction. By the end of October, Mrs. Gandhi had been killed by bodyguards, as she was on her way to an interview with British Trust operative Peter Ustinov.

“She is no more” came the announcement of Mrs. Gandhi’s death.

In the years since Mrs. Gandhi’s assassination, world events have redefined the global strategic chessboard. The collapse of the Soviet empire and the liberation of eastern Europe from the communist yoke offered humanity a unique opportunity to create the new just economic order that Mrs. Gandhi and the Non-Aligned Movement had fought for. Instead, the IMF and the looters of the West have descended upon the East like vultures; the Non-Aligned Movement stands in disarray, questioning its very existence. Where would humanity be today, if Mrs. Gandhi were still alive to demand the inalienable rights of every human being to economic development and national independence? Would the Anglo-Americans have been able to carry out the U.N. war to obliterate Iraq, if Mrs. Gandhi had been there to speak out against it? Would London-trained bureaucrats in the U.N. be able to dismiss national sovereignty as a bygone concept, with Mrs. Gandhi still on the world scene?

Like Joan of Arc before her, Mrs. Gandhi’s life was an inspiration for those who would take all of humanity into their hearts and summon the courage to give the leadership the world so desperately needs today.

—Linda de Hoyos

ended in this office.

The next day I was taken to the building of the Secret Service. I met there with a small, fat person wearing a moustache and another tall person of ca. 1.80 meters and fair hair. They had a suitcase full of cosmetics out of which they took a beard and moustache and put it on me. Then they took photographs. One person told the photographer that he should be careful not to get any chairs or doors of the room into the picture. He should only have the empty wall as

background. They took about six photos of me without the Arab clothing. But they gave me a different dark jacket to wear.

After that I was taken back to the villa for lunch.

Soon afterwards Mr. Abu Haithem arrived and thanked me for my collaboration. He told me that I would be paid back for the loss of the DM 18,000 and that I would receive more. I told him that I didn’t need anything else except what I had spent on expenses.

In the evening I was taken to the Alwaha restaurant in Amman. We had dinner and also drank alcohol. Present were Mr. Abu Hashim, Mohammed Hijazi and about 3 to 4 other persons.

After dinner we drove back to my villa. There I was told to make a phone call to Mr. Hafez Amin and tell him that I knew Mr. Shubeilat, that I had received DM 300,000 from Iran and that I had delivered that amount of money to Mr. Shubeilat. Abu Hashim then dialed a number not known to me. I was put on with Mr. Hafez Amin and told him accordingly.

As I said before, I played along in this game because I feared for my wife and my children.

The next day, Friday, was a day off. In the morning I was driven to the Dead Sea in an American car. There I was photographed several times. In the afternoon we returned to the villa. Abu Hashim was already waiting for me. He was impatient because we had been out for such a long time.

Mr. Abu Hashim explained to me that we had to rehearse my testimony. He then went through with me that my testimony was to be as follows:

My name would be Yasin Ramadan Al-Yassin. I was to have been born in 1945 in Dir Alsur. My profession was to be a businessman who traded with Syria and Iran. I had been to Iran, and met Mr. Hussein Shirazi, a high government official with the President of Iran. He had given me DM 300,000 which I was to deliver to Mr. Shubeilat. I was to deliver the money to Mr. Shubeilat only after he had given a secret code word "my birthday on Friday." Furthermore, I was to testify that I had visited the Jabri restaurant in Amman and that I had called a Mr. Abu Ahmed from there. He was reached and had told me that he would come by in half an hour. He had asked me how he could recognize me. I had told him that I wore an Arab-style long shirt and a jacket. I was to be waiting in front of the restaurant.

Furthermore, I was to state that a car had arrived with Mr. Shubeilat inside. We had then driven to a flat. Inside the flat Mr. Shubeilat had given me the secret code-word and I had given him the DM 300,000.

All of this was to have happened on April 4, 1992. The 4th of April was chosen because I had actually arrived in Amman on that date and therefore it was sure that I would definitely remember this date. But I was to state that I had flown from Teheran to Damascus on April 4, 1992 and then had traveled on to Amman by bus.

Furthermore, I was told to state that I had received two letters from Mr. Abu Ahmed two days after the delivery of the money. The letters I was to have delivered to Mr. Hussein Shirazi in Iran. Then I was to have flown to Iran and later heard the news through the media that Mr. Shubeilat had participated in a coup attempt against the king. For this reason, I had then decided to voluntarily travel to Jordan to offer myself as a witness.

I was then given a white piece of paper on which I should

confirm as Yasin Ramadan Al-Yassin that I had offered myself out of my own free will as a witness. I then wrote the pre-formulated text in handwriting on the paper and also signed.

Then I had to continually rehearse this testimony with the present people who were: Abu Hashim, Mohammed Hijazi and one to two more persons.

Early in the morning on Saturday I was picked up. I was given my Arab clothing. A beard and moustache were glued on my face.

Mr. Abu Hashim told me that I had no reason to be afraid but should speak as normally as possible. The judge and the State Attorney were in the know and I would only be asked questions by the judge. The defense lawyers would be allowed to ask questions to him only through the judge and the judge would not allow such questions.

We arrived at the Military Court where the State Attorney was already waiting. I was asked to introduce myself to the State Attorney, who was accompanied by other persons, as a witness.

I did as I was told. I was taken to the room of the State Attorney where I spoke with him. He told me that in my disguise even he would not recognize me any more. The State Attorney then said that he had to leave because he did not want to be seen with me by the defense lawyers. After half an hour, he came back to tell me that the beginning of the session would be a bit delayed because the defendants had to be brought to the court from different prisons in Amman. Because Laith Shubeilat had already arrived in the court building, the State Attorney told me that he was already here, that he was wearing a light-colored shirt with short sleeves, that he had glasses on and had a slight beard and that he would be sitting in the first seat on the defendants' bench. After about one and a half hours the session started. I was called into the courtroom. On the details of the arrangements of the seats for the lawyers, State Attorney, defendants' bench, and the defense lawyers, I refer to the enclosed sketch of the courtroom.

I was called to the witness-stand on which the Bible and the Koran were placed. Judge Faouri asked me for my name, family status, and my profession. I testified as rehearsed. The judge then asked me for my passport. I passed to him the Syrian passport that had been handed out to me only that same day. The defense lawyers wanted to see the document, which the judge refused to grant. He said that the number and the date of the passport, which he had announced, had to suffice for them.

I was then asked if I knew any of the defendants. As I had been instructed, I stated that I knew Mr. Shubeilat. I turned around and pointed toward him.

The judge then asked me in which context I had met Laith Shubeilat. I then told my story as worked out before.

After my testimony, the defense requested a copy of my passport in order to inform the Foreign Ministry of Iran and the Syrian embassy in Amman. The judge refused.

A dispute ensued between the defense and the court.

After my testimony, I was taken away and driven to the office of the Secret Service. I was greeted by Abu Hashim. He kissed me and thanked me for my testimony by strongly shaking my hand. Later on, also the State Attorney, came who also kissed me and also thanked me heartily.

I had to hand in my Syrian passport. The beard and moustache were removed. I gave back the Arab clothing (except for the long shirt).

I was taken back to my villa. Mr. Hafez Amin told me there that he was going to Cairo the next day and asked if I would like to accompany him. I refused by saying that I wanted to return to my family.

At 7 p.m. I met with the chief of the Military Court, Mr. Mohammed Mango. As a present, I was given a bust of King Hussein, made of marble. Also Mr. Mango thanked me heartily for my testimony.

Afterwards we went for dinner to the restaurant Attilal Assabaa. We stayed until midnight.

I was taken back to my villa. I was left alone with a servant. I was very nervous, and strong fear crept up on me. I asked the servant to call Abu Hashim and ask him how I would get to the airport. He did call Abu Hashim and he tried to quiet me down by saying that somebody would come and pick me up.

At 3:30 a.m. the bell rang. At 5 o'clock we left for the airport in an American car. We had to wait for two more people there who arrived at 6 o'clock. I was taken to the plane and left for Munich via Frankfurt.

The next day, I called from Munich the publishing company of the newspaper *Ad Dastour* in Amman and asked them to give me the telephone number of lawyer Bakr. They gave me the number and I called Mr. Ibrahim Bakr and told him the whole story. Two hours later I received a call in Munich from Abu Hashim who threatened me. He said that they would get rid of me, and if they did not do it, the Iraqis or the Iranians would do it. I replied to him that they could do as they pleased and hung up.

Several days later I called the private number of Mr. Shubeilat. I talked to his daughter and apologized to her for my testimony. I told her the whole story and asked her for understanding of my situation.

About three hours later, the wife of Mr. Shubeilat called back and told me that I could tell her everything without fear of being listened to because she was not calling from her private phone. I told her the whole story. I also offered to answer any further questions.

I have read this protocol and confirm the truthfulness of its content.

Munich, Nov. 6, 1992 [signature of Ali Shakarchi]

The questioning of the witness was conducted by me. The answers were fully incorporated into the protocol.

Munich, Nov. 6, 1992 [signature of Dr. Guenter Seefelder]

Is Kashmir slipping away from Pakistan?

by Ramtanu Maitra

With the failure of the Jammu and Kashmir Democratic Alliance (JKDA) to cross the line of control from the Pakistani-held part of Kashmir on Oct. 26, Pakistan is coming under pressure on the Kashmir issue for the first time.

What has emerged from the theatrics which highlighted the JKDA's proposed crossing of the line of control between India and Pakistan to unify Kashmir, is that Pakistan, despite popular support, cannot afford to allow the JKDA-led adventure to continue and risk plunging Pakistan into a likely war with India. At the same time, the Indian part of Kashmir, mainly the valley, remains in turmoil and the Indian security forces have their hands full trying to control militant Kashmiris who are demanding secession from India. Nevertheless, India is continuing its no-nonsense posture on the Kashmir militants and is slowly pushing Pakistan into a corner.

Internal pressures

Despite rhetoric implying that Islamabad is prepared for a *jihad* to liberate Kashmir and make it a part of Pakistan, Pakistan is afraid to go beyond arming, training, and instigating militants to carry out anti-India activities within the Kashmir Valley. The Pakistani Army has also shown that it is ready to shoot down anyone who violates the line of control in Kashmir, as Pakistani troops fired on Kashmiri militants in February and again in October.

Given Pakistan's strategic constraints, the independence-seeking Jammu and Kashmir Liberation Force (JKLF) is gaining credibility throughout Kashmir. The JKLF is led by Amanullah Khan, headquartered in London, and calls for a Kashmir independent from both India and Pakistan.

Pakistan is also losing its ground on its diplomatic position internationally. At the end of October, German Foreign Minister Klaus Kinkel, visiting Islamabad, brushed aside the longstanding Pakistani position that the Kashmir conflict be resolved by a 1940s U.N. resolution calling for the right to self-determination of the Kashmiris. Such rights are confined by the resolution to a decision whether to join India or Pakistan, and do not allow for an independent Kashmir.

Kinkel told his hosts that the U.N. resolution is dated, and that the Shimla Agreement of 1972, signed by the late Prime Minister Zulfikar Ali Bhutto and Mrs. Shrimati Indira Gandhi, to resolve all bilateral issues between India and Paki-