

The British assassinate Mrs. Gandhi; more ominous than Sarajevo murder

by Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.

Lyndon LaRouche issued this statement on Oct. 31.

This morning, at 9:18 a.m., New Delhi time, assassins of a London-based terrorist cult murdered one of the greatest world leaders of our generation, India's Prime Minister Indira Gandhi. My wife and I, who loved her dearly, can not find words adequate to express our personal grief.

If India is destabilized as a result of this assassination, the effects could become quickly as dangerous as the murder of the Austrian Archduke Francis Ferdinand, on June 28, 1914, the incident which triggered World War I.

The bare facts of the assassination are as follows.

Credit for the assassination was claimed by a terrorist cult headed by a London-based associate of the Nazi International, Chauhan Singh. In an interview conducted in London today, the terrorist leader gloated over Mrs. Gandhi's murder, and promised more assassinations, including Mrs. Gandhi's son, Rajiv. Similar statements were televised by the California-based branch of the same terrorist cult.

The cult headed by Chauhan Singh, the so-called Khalistan Liberation Front, is an international terrorist organization created by British intelligence. The cult was manufactured as a "fundamentalist version" of the Sikh religion. The main conduit through which British intelligence deployed British-trained "Khalistan" separatists into India was a special, non-stop jet-flight of British airways, from Birmingham in England to Amritsar in India.

Chauhan Singh himself was a formerly semi-obscure Sikh separatist who virtually disappeared from sight, inside England, during the 1970s, occasionally surfacing at the Soviet KGB training-center in Tashkent, from which Soviet KGB operations into various parts of Asia and the Caribbean are run.

After this combination of British and Soviet sponsorship, Chauhan Singh emerged as a self-styled anti-Soviet right-winger, maintaining close associations during a recent period with the headquarters and front-organizations of the Lausanne, Switzerland-based Nazi International. The Nazi International's Algerian terrorist, Ahmed Ben Bella, was among Chauhan's associates during recent years.

Inside the United States itself, Chauhan Singh's sponsors

around Washington, D.C. have been chiefly circles of the Heritage Foundation, through which Singh was at one point foisted on a misinformed Sen. Jesse Helms. Through circles under investigation separately as suspected Soviet agents, Chauhan Singh's tentacles reached into the heart of the Afghan Rebels lobby, as well as into Khalistan terrorist circles based in California. The Indian government had complained that weapons apparently destined to be shipped to Afghan rebels through Pakistan were diverted into Khalistan terrorist circles inside India, instead.

The Nazi-Communist connection

Investigators for the *Executive Intelligence Review* had warned leading circles in India as early as spring 1983 of documented evidence proving that both the Soviet KGB and the Nazi International were deeply involved in Khalistan terrorist activities targeting India. Documentation included corroboration of Chauhan Singh's own admissions that he was in contact with the Nazi International in Europe. Documentation also included proof of massive collaboration between the Soviet KGB and those leading elements of the Nazi International with which Singh was in collaboration.

Soviet agents in India, unfortunately, deployed massively in the effort to discredit *EIR*'s documentation of the plot. The Soviet agents lied that Chauhan Singh was merely a British and American agent, who had nothing to do with the Nazi International.

However, it was the same Soviet agent who directed the operation against *EIR*, Rostilav Ulyanovskii, who first signaled the coming assassination of Mrs. Gandhi, in a statement issued in an interview in the *Times* of India on Sept. 30, 1984. Ulyanovskii, who had been awarded the Nehru Peace Prize by the government of India in 1983, stated that the Soviet Union was concerned about an alleged "strengthening of tendencies for power in one person"—Mrs. Gandhi.

There could be no doubt of the significance of Ulyanovskii's statement. Soviet official propaganda is based on a well-known glossary of code-phrases. For example, when Moscow's press orders someone's assassination openly, Moscow does not print the words, "Kill her." Moscow says something like, "Her usefulness has expired." The Soviet agents in the field throughout the world know exactly what



NSIPS/Uwe Pappert

Lyndon and Helga LaRouche, during a July 1983 visit to India. They are shown here with Dr. H. K. Jain, director of the Indian Agricultural Research Institute near New Delhi.

this means. Ulyanovskii's statement ordered Soviet agents throughout the world to do nothing to interfere with getting rid of Mrs. Gandhi.

For the past three weeks, there has been an international intelligence alert warning of a live assassination-plot against Mrs. Gandhi, a warning based on information received by informants to leading intelligence services. There was no doubt of what *Pravda* of Oct. 30, 1984 signaled. Moscow said that the responsibility for the assassination would lie with the United States. The assassination was actually conducted by a British intelligence front-organization, Chauhan Singh's. Very soon, Moscow will "reveal," that the "proof" that the United States was responsible, is that the Heritage Foundation, a British intelligence front-organization, is up to its ears in support for Chauhan Singh, and that the circles of Daniel Patrick Moynihan and Henry A. to their ears in anti-Gandhi plots.

A day before the assassination, Moscow published the announcement that Mrs. Gandhi's assassination was imminent, and she died within approximately 48 hours of the time that announcement went to press. Moscow reported that the United States would be responsible for Mrs. Gandhi's almost immediate assassination. This is the way in which Moscow officially announces an order for immediate assassination.

In short, certain factions in British intelligence killed Mrs. Gandhi, as a favor to Moscow, and Moscow will now blame the Reagan administration for the assassination. Which factions of British intelligence? Ask Britain's Lord Bethel, a close contact and ostensible political backer for Chauhan Singh.

Chauhan Singh, an avowed head of an international terrorist organization, sits under protection of the British Crown, bragging of his part in a wave of terrorist assassinations in interviews! So much for British "sincerity" on the subject of international terrorism.

Mrs. Gandhi and President Reagan

Mrs. Gandhi was informed that an attempted assassination of her was imminent. She referred to this in an interview with UPI three days before her assassination.

"If I were to die serving my country, I would be very proud. . . . I feel I have to fight evil, I have to fight what is wrong but you cannot be bothered about what is happening to you in consequence—you have to go on with your job."

I have received that message, and I shall now begin to act upon her instruction. I will tell what I know of her attitude toward President Ronald Reagan.

My wife, Helga, and I had been in occasional contact

with Mrs. Gandhi since our correspondence of 1977. There were a few exchanges of letters, and, less infrequently, confidential messages transmitted through trusted intermediaries. We were friends in the time her life and that of her family were threatened, when she was out of government; we were friends when she was reelected to government. Helga and I met with her in her office during both of our visits to India, in 1982 and in 1983. On both these occasions, I encouraged her to concentrate on developing her personal contact with President Reagan.

When I brought this up with her the first time, she nodded. She had met the President briefly during the Cancun summit and had liked him; but, she complained, those bureaucratic watch-dogs had broken up their discussion barely as it started. She said she wished an opportunity to discuss matters privately with him at greater length; I promised I would do my best to impart her view to relevant circles in Washington.

Quite naturally, we returned to the same subject during our 1983 meeting. To grasp the impact of our discussion, one must know what had happened in India just days before our meeting. U.S. Ambassador to India Barnes had committed an aggravated diplomatic affront to India on the eve of Secretary of State George Shultz's arrival.

Ambassador Barnes had called a special press conference, at which he dictated to Indian press representatives a declaration stating that India was being foolish in its handling of the Khalistan separatist movement. Barnes argued that the Khalistan terrorists were comparable to the Puerto Rican separatists in the United States. When India's press discreetly omitted that part of the interview from the published accounts, the U.S. Embassy issued the offensive remarks in an official release. This action by the ambassador caused the first popular demonstration against the U.S. Embassy in India on record.

I had my own evaluation of this atrocious incident. I had met Ambassador Barnes a year earlier, when he attended a reception held for me in New Dehli. He was a senior career diplomat, and no fool. He was no nasty clown, like an earlier ambassador to India, Daniel Patrick Moynihan. Ambassador Barnes would never have committed such a breach of diplomacy unless he had been ordered to do so from the State Department in Washington. He did so on the eve of Secretary Shultz's arrival in India. Only a paranoid liberal could imagine that the ambassador had not been ordered to perpetrate the diplomatic incident, as a way of setting the tone for Secretary Shultz's meeting with Mrs. Gandhi.

Mrs. Gandhi was too great a statesman to react emotionally to such an orchestrated insult by Secretary Shultz's State Department. Although the press of India was still raging with indignation at the State Department's crass, pro-terrorist meddling in India's internal affairs, Mrs. Gandhi and I wasted no breath on the wicked schoolboy pranks of our State Department. We concentrated on serious matters.

Mrs. Gandhi was a true friend of the United States, as her father, Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru, had been before her. This was her policy, despite the numerous abuses India

has suffered from our State Department since the time Daniel Moynihan was U.S. ambassador. She liked President Reagan personally, and she wished to develop understanding and cooperation with his administration, insults or no insults.

Small-minded idiots alleged she was pro-Soviet. Mrs. Gandhi understood clearly that although India is a superpower within the Indian Ocean region, India, like most of the world, is caught between two superpowers, and that the Soviet Union is the closer of the two geographically. Much as she liked a President such as Ronald Reagan, India must maintain a correct and cooperative relationship with the Soviet Union. Moreover, India is the largest of the Non-Aligned nations organization; Jawaharlal Nehru was one of the founders of that organization. India's correct policy, in the eyes of every Indian patriot, is to steer a course of national interest with maximum distance from the superpower alliances as such. If our State Department had understood the realities of that region of the world, it would have understood that Mrs. Gandhi sought friendship and cooperation with the United States from the standpoint of India's strict adherence to its position as a leading nation of the Non-Aligned group.

That was my understanding of India's vital self-interests. That is what I understood as the view of every leading Indian patriot, including Mrs. Gandhi. I understood it to be my duty, as an informed public figure of the United States, to attempt to inform relevant circles close to President Reagan of this point of view.

Mrs. Gandhi made it very clear to me, that she understood that despite my special great affection for India and its development, I am primarily a patriot of the United States. I think she would have despised and distrusted me if I were anything different than that.

I have met numerous influential figures, many of whom I have liked personally, but Mrs. Gandhi was in a class of her own. I say this not merely out of my great sorrow; this was my stated estimation of her, in private and in print, while she was alive. Whatever shortcomings she might have had, among all nations, she was the world's greatest statesman in the period since the death of that President Charles de Gaulle who had admired her with astonishment at the time when she, still a young woman, had spoken at a dinner at which both of them were present. I have never met another political figure with the quickness and breadth of detailed grasp of each of a variety of topics presented to her.

One of my great satisfactions was to know that the copies of *Fusion* magazine supplied to her were read regularly in her home, not only by her, but as source-material for her cultivation of the education of her grandchildren. She was a consummate statesman, who also found time to be efficiently a devoted mother and grandmother. Both Helga and I found that beautiful, small-statured woman to be infinitely tough-minded and also an entirely lovable personality.

She exuded brilliance of intellect, toughness, and a lovingness toward people at the same time. It was that toughness and lovingness which the poor of India correctly saw and loved in her. To them, she was India personified.