

# Soviet-backed separatists begin shattering the national integrity of India and Pakistan

by Judith Wyer and Ramtanu Maitra

Powerful separatist movements are beginning to dismember Pakistan, with the support of the Soviet Union, while the separatist threat to the integrity of India is also acute.

The ringleader of the separatist Baluchi movement, Ataullah Khan Mengel, former minister of Baluchistan, said from his exile post in London that Pakistan's break up is inevitable. Speaking to the press on Oct. 9, Mengel declared: "I will return to Baluchistan, but it will be an independent Baluchistan, free from Punjab rule which has brought Pakistan to the brink of disintegration. . . . The Baluchis have fought two wars with Pakistani troops, in 1963 against [Prime Minister] Ayub's regime and 10 years later against the government headed by Zulfikar ali Bhutto."

Mengel stated that the Baluchis might need help from outside to "take on the Pakistani army" and "to liberate Baluchistan." Mengel, who is known as a wholly owned British asset, has been featured recently in the Soviet daily *Pravda*, attacking the Zia regime's military cooperation with the United States. One of Mengel's primary sources of funding and arms is Libyan dictator Muammar Qaddafi. In a recent interview, Qaddafi stated his support for separatism on the subcontinent and his contempt for the highly centralized Indian government.

The most recent issue of the journal of the Soviet Oriental Institute, *Asia and Africa Today*, has endorsed the Baluchistani movement for autonomy, noting the wealth of natural resources, including oil and minerals, which Moscow appears to be eager to control if a cooperative tribal chieftain such as Mengel can be installed.

Last month the clandestine National Voice of Iran, which broadcasts from Soviet Azerbaijan, endorsed the overthrow of Zia, calling him a U.S. stooge, and endorsed the opposition coalition to Zia, the Movement for the Restoration of Democracy, which has a number of separatist elements.

The same broadcast also attacked alleged U.S. assets within the Khomeini regime. Should the Baluchistani separatist movement succeed, it will very likely take with it chunks of Iran and Afghanistan inhabited by the Baluchistani tribe. In the case of Iran, there is very little standing in the way,

since the Khomeini regime has not penetrated the remote southeastern region of Iranian Baluchistan.

## Autonomy drive and India-Pakistan tensions

In late September a meeting was held in London with leaders of the opposition to Pakistani dictator Zia ul-Haq; participants included tribal leaders from Pakistan's Sind, Baluchistan, and Northwest Frontier Province. Then came a press conference by the Pakistani justice minister under the slain President Zulfikar Ali Bhutto, Hafiz Pirzada, who called for giving Pakistan's provinces "real autonomy." According to the *Hindustan Times*, the London meeting of anti-Zia leaders is part of a "restructuring of the subcontinent," extending through India to Sri Lanka. Subcontinent press sources report that certain of the tribal leaders present at the London meeting, notably the leader of the Pakistani Baluch tribe, Ataullah Mengel, now warn that if they are not given complete provincial autonomy, separatist upheavals will break out.

Around the same time as the London meeting, the opposition to Indian Prime Minister Indira Gandhi met in Srinagar, India, to discuss "centre-state relations," i.e., weakening central government rule. A special group, the Sarkharin Commission, was established to study this subject. The opposition, which includes the Indian Communist Party, appears to be moving along the same lines as its Pakistani counterpart in London. Though the Indian opposition was quick to state that they were not working with the Indian communalists (religious agitators) who have already forced emergency rule in the Punjab, their move has de facto given the radical Indian separatists even more momentum.

London has become rife with rumors of Indian support for Pakistani opposition and Pakistan's backing for the Indian opposition, a signal that Britain is pushing for an Indo-Pakistani war on its old colonial turf. In early October, the notorious drug-pushing governor of the Northwest Frontier Province of Pakistan, Fazlur al Haq (who is no relation to Zia-ul-Haq) called for a Pakistani military mobilization against India

for backing Zia's opposition.

The Pakistani press, meanwhile, has stepped up its anti-India vitriolics, citing Jagjit Singh Chauhan, the London-backed leader of the Indian separatist Khalistani movement (see *EIR*, March 8, 1983), who charges that Mrs. Gandhi is in direct contact with rebel Pakistani politicians at the United Nations. Chauhan is further attempting to incite Indo-Pakistani conflict by claiming that Mrs. Gandhi is planning an invasion of Pakistan "before the Commonwealth conference in New Delhi in November."

India for its part is showing public concern over the continued buildup of General Zia's U.S.-supplied arsenal. On Oct. 11, Indian Defense Minister Venkataraman told the Indian air force commander: "Hitherto Pakistan got arms under the pretext of events in Afghanistan. With the acquisition of naval missiles like the Harpoon, even this excuse has worn thin." He cautioned that this development, including the steps taken by Pakistan to add to its naval strength, "offer a threat to our industrial and scientific installations along the coast."

At the same time, Indian officials have also claimed that large caches of arms and other forms of assistance are coming from Pakistan to aid the militant Sikh agitators in Indian Punjab. The newly appointed governor of Punjab, P. D. Pande, has been alerted, and this situation is being monitored by a high-powered committee dealing with national security, according to a New Delhi source. The New Delhi government has also decided to augment the deployment of paramilitary forces in the area and maintain a vigil on the border.

In mid-October Mrs. Gandhi imposed central government control on Punjab, following bloody communal rioting between Sikhs and Hindus which culminated in a Sikh attack on a bus, killing at least six Hindus. Shortly after the emergency was declared, rioting broke out in the neighboring state of Haryana, as Hindus pledged revenge for the Punjab atrocity. For the first time the British media, including the British Broadcasting Corporation and the London *Guardian*, are openly editorializing that growing unrest in India may lead to the dismemberment of the former British colony.

## LaRouche on Pakistan: 'I told you so'

Over two months ago, I warned that the so-called movement for democracy in Pakistan was nothing but a Soviet-coordinated trick aimed at the early dismemberment of that nation and the probable establishment of a new separatist entity called Baluchistan as a Soviet client state providing Moscow a warm-water port on the Indian Ocean.

I also warned that the Soviet-coordinated insurgency in Pakistan would be the occasion for unleashing separatist activity on the Indian side of the Punjab, as well as the Pakistan side.

This assessment of the situation was largely premised on monitoring of collaboration between the Soviet KGB and the Nazi International-overlapped "Endangered Peoples' Movement." This latter association is the mother-organization for most of the separatist movements of the world, as well as the terrorist organizations associated with such separatist movements, and also with the networks traced to the direction of the late Bertrand Russell.

This warning went largely unheeded when it was first issued, and was widely rejected once again when I issued an open letter to Pakistan President Zia ul-Haq outlining patriotic remedies for the danger.

Now, breaking developments fully corroborate my earlier warnings. One hopes it is not too late for those who misguidedly ignored those warnings.

This reminder should be noted in Washington, D.C. and Western Europe, in addition to the nations of southern Asia. In Washington, too many are so much concerned with the outcome of the November 1984 elections that they choose to overlook issues which may decide whether or not elections will in fact be held on that date, or, if so, whether the President inaugurated on January 1985 will preside over a virtually helpless, bankrupt, second-rate power. In relevant locations in Asia, the notable delusions are of a different specific content than in Washington, but not less deadly.

It is most unfortunate that in most developing nations, long-cultivated "Third-Worldist" prejudices serve as truisms which blind most leading parts of populations and leading institutions to the nature and importance of the factional divisions and issues which interplay in shaping the global reality. These dearly held delusions have been sometimes regarded as a greater interest than the altered perceptions by which even the very existence of the nations concerned might be obtained. Some developing nations can be sometimes just as foolishly, arrogantly stubborn in defending a "sacred delusion," as we see otherwise in blind arrogance of officials of the Soviet Union, the United States, or Western Europe.

Similarly, that reputedly ever-peace-loving Soviet leadership has recently installed SS-21s in Syria, SS-23s in Eastern Europe, and the installation of SS-20s proceeds merrily while the installation of Pershing IIs has yet to begin. Meanwhile, the most obvious strategic asset the Soviet leadership ever had, Henry A. Kissinger, pushes a U.S. unilateral "build-down" through channels of his crony Brent Scowcroft. We know, of course, that the Soviet leadership is "ever-peace-loving" because Democratic National Committee Chairman Charlie-the-banker Manatt and the seven moral dwarfs—Mondale, Glenn, Cranston, Hollings, Askew, Hart, and McGovern—all assure us that this is a fact.

It's a great world, folks. The only question is, do the inhabitants of this planet of ours—anywhere—still command the moral fitness to survive?