

tion in the immediate aftermath of the formal announcement of the death of Deng Xiaoping, is now quite public, and is designed not only to fragment China but also to foment tensions between India and China. The All Party Parliamentary Group on Tibet handles Tibet operations in the British Parliament, and helps coordinate the Tibetan separatist movement internationally; Lord Avebury is one of its active forces. China human rights issues are directly handled out of Lord Avebury's office, in coordination with Helms's office in the United States.

Other insurgencies

Sudan: British operations against Sudan are part of the effort to provoke "Arc of Crisis"-style wars throughout the general region. In 1994, Lord Avebury and Baroness Caroline Cox co-chaired an international conference of their Christian Solidarity International in Bonn, which drew together a widely diverse mix of British-based and -run Sudanese opposition movements, including Christian tribalists from the south, pro-Egyptian Muslim groups from the north, and the Communist Party. Lord Avebury's CSI literature is so inflammatory against Islam that it classifies the Egyptian government of President Hosni Mubarak as "Islamic fundamentalist," even while Avebury promotes the objectives of the self-identified Kashmiri "Islamic fundamentalists." And while CSI has successfully organized Catholic support for its campaign against Sudan, it has also led a campaign against Catholic suppression of Baptist and other Protestant evangelicals in Mexico and Central America.

Iran: The Iranian regime of the Shiite ayatollahs was put in power by British intelligence, in coordination with its assets in the U.S. Carter administration. Since that time, Britain and the United States have continued to covertly aid Iran, while their provocative public efforts to isolate the regime have served to sustain it in the eyes of its own population.

In June, Lord Avebury held a press conference in London on his successful effort to mobilize members of parliaments throughout Europe against the Iranian government, and on behalf of the Mujahideen-e-Khalq (the "National Council of Resistance"), an Iraqi-based communist outfit.

Lord Avebury reported that 250 members of the House of Commons and 175 members of the House of Lords signed a statement that he circulated, denouncing Iran for executing 100,000 people since the revolution, and calling for "military, economic, commercial, political, and economic sanctions" against Iran. The statement called for support for the Mujahideen-e-Khalq. Mohsen Resaee, the first secretary of the Mujahideen-e-Khalq, reported at that press conference that a total of 1,700 members of Parliament and congressmen internationally supported the resolution, including 202 U.S. congressman.

The Mujahideen-e-Khalq is a terrorist organization condemned by the U.S. State Department but championed by Senator Helms. Although communist, the group coordinates

its operations with the Sipah e Sahaba (ASS), a Saudi-run, Sunni chauvinist movement which has carried out the anti-Shiite massacres in Karachi. The Sipah e Sahaba, which includes a considerable number of British Muslims in its ranks, is among the groups that were trained as Afghan mujahideen in Pakistan.

And, while leading the opposition to Iran, arm-in-arm with communists allied with anti-Shiite, Sunni fanatics, Lord Avebury has also professed himself in favor of "self-determination" for oil-rich Bahrain, a former Iranian colony in the Persian Gulf, whose wholly Arab population is made up of Shiites, while its ruling emirate family is Sunni. The Islamic Salvation Front for Bahrain, which leads the Bahrain self-determination movement, is also based in London.

Interview: Lord Avebury

British lord sees end of nation-state

The following interview with Lord Avebury on Sept. 26, was made available to EIR.

Q: I was interested in your assessment of India and the general region, specifically India, but the border countries as well.

Lord Avebury: The major problem politically, I think, in India, is the continuing dispute with Pakistan. The unsettled Kashmir dispute which has gone on since 1947, and which led both states to embark on programs of [acquiring] nuclear weapons, making the region the most likely one in the world where a nuclear war may break out.

Supposedly, the dispute is meant to be resolved by the Simla agreement, which was reached in 1972 between India and Pakistan, which provided that there would be bilateral discussions leading to the settlement of this issue. But, in spite of rather spasmodic attempts to get the talks going, they have never addressed the substantive issue of how the people of Kashmir themselves can be enabled to participate in the decision concerning their political future—although in 1947, both the then-governor general, Lord Mountbatten, and the prime minister of India, Mr. Nehru, had promised that the accession of Kashmir to India by the maharaja, who was of course a Hindu, governing a predominantly Muslim State, would be subject to ratification by means of a plebiscite. That [plebiscite] was never held, and the Indians subsequently claimed that the assembly which was brought into existence in 1952, and purported to ratify the accession, had closed the door on the matter, overlooking the fact that 72 out of 75

[members] of that assembly were elected without an opponent. That's the crux of the matter.

The majority of the people in the Indian-held part of the state believe that they should have a chance to review the decision that was made on their behalf by the maharaja in 1947, and Indians say they will not be given such opportunity.

The U.S. has a position which is intermediate between the Indian insistence that Kashmir is an integral part of her territory, and the Kashmiri insistence that they still have to have a vote on it. What the Americans say, and [Assistant Secretary of State for the Bureau of South Asian Affairs] Robin Raphel has articulated this view several times, much to the annoyance of the Indians, is that Kashmir is a disputed territory. She's gone some way toward saying that there should be some mechanism which removes that dispute, and settles that matter once and for all, although she hasn't gone so far as to suggest that it might be solved by a plebiscite. It's difficult to see whatever mechanism there could be.

Q: To what extent is the setup in India a legacy of colonialism, as in other countries, where the borders are artificial, where different ethnic groups are combined together?

Lord Avebury: Kashmir is a legacy of colonialism in a very broad sense, in that the rule that was laid down at independence was that the princely states, of which there were some 250, were all given the right to decide on their political future, ostensibly. I say ostensibly, because they were leaned on pretty heavily by Mountbatten to decide to go for either Pakistan or India—the record shows that pretty clearly. He went a long way in both Kashmir and Hyderabad, to dissuade the rulers from any thoughts of total independence, and of course in those days, world ideas on what was a viable State were quite different.

It was thought that you had to have large resources, both in terms of territory and manpower, to qualify for independence. Well, now we see tiny nations, like Vanuatu and Belize, take their place in the United Nations, and Kashmir, in fact, would be a substantial State in comparison with the vast majority of members of the United Nations. But they didn't think of that in those days. And anyway, Britain had originally intended to confer independence on the whole of India, including Pakistan and Bangladesh, and it was only with some reluctance, and under the pressure from [first President of Pakistan Mohammad Ali] Jinnah, that they came to the conclusion that the Muslims should have a separate State.

Q: To what extent would the population in other parts of India, such as the Northeast or South, if given a choice, opt, if not for full independence, at least for autonomy, within the State?

Lord Avebury: I think the latter is the case. In places like Punjab, Tamil Nadu, Assam, there would be a strong demand for a greater degree of regional autonomy, and that is exemplified by the growth of local nationalist parties, as, for exam-

ple, in Tamil Nadu, and this will certainly be a shock to the outside world in the next general election, because no one's really woken up to it yet, and they still think of the Congress Party as being traditionally the governing authority, and they can't come to terms with a new era in the subcontinent, where the Congress Party may disappear off the political map.

Q: And the regional parties—

Lord Avebury: —are on the up and up. And so, by the way, are the Dalit, the untouchable parties, which have never been very well organized politically, and which are now flexing their muscles a bit. I think in states like Orissa, they want to be separately represented, and form political parties, which will do just that. The tendencies in India will follow those in other parts of the world, a centrifugalism.

Q: What other countries are you thinking of?

Lord Avebury: I'm thinking of the break-up of the Soviet Union and Yugoslavia. Federal states which are not in accordance with the wishes of the people have these fissionable tendencies, and you might argue that Ethiopia is going in the same direction.

Q: Do you see the same tendency in Pakistan?

Lord Avebury: Oh, yes, most definitely! There are nationalist sentiments stirring. But it's complicated in Pakistan, because, in Sind, for example, there is a Sindi nationalist movement, totally obscured by the MQM [Mohajir Quam Movement]. So that's a rather different political problem, because it doesn't relate to a local nationalism which existed since time immemorial. It's a phenomenon that arose out of partition. So, it's all very recent. Whereas, if you're talking about Tamil Nadu nationalism, that arises from people who have been there for centuries, or millennia. Whereas, the MQM is of fairly recent origin, which might not make the feelings any less intense, it's just a difference in character.

Q: One gets the impression that the tendencies in Pakistan could lead to a Lebanon type of situation.

Lord Avebury: In Karachi and Hyderabad, I think that's right. There is no doubt that the MQM is a very strong force politically, and the government is not clear how to deal with that. And the military solution hasn't worked, and isn't working. And the political solution which was attempted by [Pakistan's Prime Minister] Benazir [Bhutto] was not genuine. I think I'm not being unfair, if I say she entered into those talks with a view to placating world opinion, rather than any genuine wish to reach some accommodation with the MQM, since they [Pakistani leaders] do think of them in very stark terms as a terrorist organization, and nothing else. There is a parallel [between] how Benazir views the MQM, and how the Turks view the PKK [Kurdish Workers Party]. They don't think of them as political organizations.

Q: Also in Sri Lanka—

Lord Avebury: —I think [President] Chandrika Kumara-tunga was genuinely committed to the peace process, and it was very much part of the election campaign. . . . Now she has had to come out with a scheme; most people say they don't like it. All my Singhalese friends say it's absurd to fragment a tiny country less than the area of Scotland, into nine political entities which are virtually autonomous, independent states, with their own powers of raising taxation, and so on. Knowing what nepotism is like, anyway, in Sri Lanka, I dread to think of the opportunities this structure would support for jobs for the boys.

Q: To what extent do the movements in Punjab have a radiating effect in the region, for example, on Tibet?

Lord Avebury: People in Tibet are obviously conscious of what is happening elsewhere in the region. But I think the immense power of the Chinese, and their attempts to change the demography of Tibet, make it quite different from any country in the region. And the Chinese do have the manpower to literally swamp Tibetans, as they have done with the Mongolians. In Mongolia, it is said, there are 10 Han for every Mongolian. And the same thing is gradually happening in East Turkestan [the current Chinese province of Sinkiang], where there is a substantial inflow of Han intended to outweigh the Muslim population, of Turkic origin, and also to persuade people to intermarry, as they have done in Tibet



LaRouche Campaign Is On the Internet!

Lyndon LaRouche's Democratic presidential primary campaign has established a World Wide Web site on the Internet. The "home page" brings you recent policy statements by the candidate as well as a brief biographical resumé.

TO REACH the LaRouche page on the Internet:

<http://www.clark.net/larouche/welcome.html>

TO REACH the campaign by electronic mail:

larouche@clark.net

Paid for by Committee to Reverse the Accelerating Global Economic and Strategic Crisis: A LaRouche Exploratory Committee.

and East Turkestan.

That option is available to the Chinese on a scale which doesn't operate elsewhere in the region. It's not so easy for the Javanese, for example, to do it in Indonesia, because there aren't so many Javanese compared with the minorities. They won't be able to send colonizers all over the place, and, as it were, breed them out of existence. Whereas the Chinese can do that very easily. It's also a difference between the Russians and their empire; the Russians, although they had substantial populations in the Baltic States, never intermarried to the extent it was necessary if they were going to extinguish the ethnic identity of the subject peoples. But that option is available to the Chinese and they are pursuing it very vigorously.

Q: So the long-term assessment is not hopeful?

Lord Avebury: I'm not optimistic about the Tibetan case, I must say. The only major plus point they have, compared with the other regional peoples, is the Dalai Lama, and the immense sympathy that he has in the world community. He's been tremendously effective, a wonderful man. To an extent, the Burmese have that with Aung San Suu Kyi, but not to the same degree, and, of course, she cannot travel.

Q: What do you think should be the policy of the United States, the United Nations, or other world bodies toward these questions?

Lord Avebury: I think the world needs to take a new look at the question of self-determination, without departing completely from the principle of territorial integrity, which is one of the founding axioms of the United Nations. The international community has to pursue various alternatives which give people control over their own affairs, even within the boundaries of a State. I think that the CSCE [Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe] has drawn up some rules which could be effectively applied, if there were a code of enforcement. The Copenhagen declaration of the CSCE, which deals with the rights of minorities, is quite a good document, but there is no mechanism for enforcement.

The regional organizations and the U.N. must address these lacunae. It's all very well for the secretary general to talk about preventive diplomacy, but unless that is backed up by some sort of sanctions against defaulting States, then you aren't going to get anywhere.

Q: What are your views of Africa in this context?

Lord Avebury: There are an awful lot of problems in Africa. One of the biggest is Sudan, and its role as a nest of Islamist tendencies that spread throughout the region, and the dangers of international conflict building up with all the neighbors. I mean Uganda, Eritrea, Ethiopia, and Kenya, and the difficulties that that creates for the reconciliation of the Sudanese problem itself. Because, of course, the IGADD [Inter-Governmental Association for Drought and Develop-

ment] process, which is supposed to be run by all these neighbors, cannot work, if there is a major breakdown of trust between Sudan and its neighbors, as there has been. That's one major problem. The possible disintegration of Nigeria is the second.

Q: You think it's that serious?

Lord Avebury: Oh, yes! We're dangerously close to that. We'll see what happens on Oct. 1, when the military regime is supposed to announce its program for transition to democratic rule, and the rumors are that they want four years to do that. And also they have to say what they are going to do about the alleged coup plotters, including former head of state [Gen. Olusegun] Obasanjo and his deputy, [Shehu] Yar A'dua, and some others sentenced to death.

Q: Do you think the policies of the regime are fostering a hardened tribal identity, in that sense of disintegration?

Lord Avebury: I think the regime itself—it's not actually the military, you're talking about the Caliphate. Now the Caliphate is a separatist idea, because, after all, if you're emphasizing that, you're rubbing in the distinction between the Muslim and the Christian sections of the country. And the ruling class is trying very hard to lay all the blame for the democratic opposition on people who don't belong to the north.

Q: What's your general assessment of Latin America?

Lord Avebury: There are ongoing problems in Guatemala and El Salvador, and I think the efforts being made by the international community, probably . . . there is quite a contrast when you look at it and you see the sheer amount of attention that Guatemala and El Salvador have received compared to conflicts elsewhere in the world—they ought to be all right. But the remarkable thing is that after you have all these agreements, shuffled and back and so on, nothing seems to change, and you still have people murdered all the time. The structures, the military structures which have caused the problem all along, have not been totally dismantled.

Q: Are there any non-governmental organizations [NGOs] that your parliamentary organization tends to work with?

Lord Avebury: Oh, yes. As far as across-the-board capabilities are concerned, Human Rights Watch and Amnesty International. . . . At the other extreme, you have the individual NGOs, of which there are a multitude. For example, here are some of the "Cs" listed in my computer: Christian Solidarity International, Central American Human Rights Committee, the Iraq National Committee, Caucasia, Catholic Institute for International Relations, Committee for Defense of Legitimate Rights in Saudi Arabia, etc. These are the people we deal with, multiply that by 26, and you have a large number of organizations.

Northeast India: target of British apartheid

by Ramtanu Maitra and Susan Maitra

Continuing terrorist actions and violent demonstrations over the last five decades have turned India's Northeast into a dangerous place. Large-scale introduction of narcotics and arms from neighboring Myanmar (Burma) and China has made this strategically crucial area a potential theater of violent secessionist movements.

Imbued with the British ideology of encouraging ethnic, sub-ethnic, religious, and linguistic identities—as opposed to the identity of a citizen of a sovereign nation-state—both New Delhi and the residents of Northeast India are marching recklessly along the very path prescribed by the British raj in 1862, when he laid down the law of apartheid to isolate "the tribals." While it is not clear how long this fateful road is, there is little doubt what awaits them at the end.

British mindset at work

Since India's independence in 1947, Northeast India has been split up into smaller and smaller states and autonomous regions. The divisions were made to accommodate the wishes of tribes and ethnic groups which want to assert their sub-national identity and obtain an area where the diktat of their little coterie is recognized. New Delhi has yet to comprehend that its policy of accepting and institutionalizing the superficial identities of these ethnic, linguistic, and tribal groups has ensured more irrational demands for even smaller states. It has also virtually eliminated any plan to make these areas economically powerful, and the people scientifically and technologically advanced.

A situation has now arisen in which New Delhi's promised carrot of economic development evokes little enthusiasm in the Northeast. Money from New Delhi for "development" serves to appease the "greed" of a handful and to maintain the status quo. On the other hand, fresh separatist movements bring the area closer to the precipice.

Assam has been cut up into many states since Britain's exit. The autonomous regions of Karbi Anglong, Bodo Autonomous Region, and Meghalaya were all part of pre-independence Assam. Citing the influx of Bengali Muslims since the 1947 formation of East Pakistan, which became Bangladesh in 1971, the locals demand the ouster of these "foreigners" from their soil. Two violent movements in Assam, the United Liberation Front of Assam (ULFA) and the Bodo Security Force (BdSF), are now practically demanding "ethnic cleansing" in their respective areas.