

# The oligarchies of East and West declare war against nations of Asia

by Linda de Hoyos

On Oct. 31, 1984, after a total of 17 years as the Prime Minister of the world's largest democracy, Mrs. Indira Gandhi, leader of India and chairman of the Non-Aligned Movement, was assassinated in the early morning as she crossed her garden to meet an appointment. The murder of this leader, as Lyndon LaRouche stated upon hearing of her death, has brought the world closer to war than the murder of Archduke Ferdinand at Sarajevo. For India, as her son and successor, Mr. Rajiv Gandhi stated, her assassination was an attempt to "rip the country" to pieces.

But no matter what tactical or geopolitical considerations entered into the motivations of those in ultimate control of the two Sikhs who gunned her down Oct. 31, Indira Gandhi's assassination was a declaration of war by the oligarchical forces headquartered in London, Moscow, Switzerland, and New York against an idea. That idea is that concept of nationhood that Mrs. Gandhi stood for, the idea that each nation-state has the inalienable and sovereign right to set its own course toward its own self-improvement as the vehicle through which its people contribute to all humanity and to the generations of the future.

Until the last quarter of 1983, the countries of Asia had gained a margin of isolation and security against the economic and social mayhem that has been tearing at the countries of Ibero-America, Africa, and the Middle East. With the exception of the Philippines, the Asian economies have been able to maintain a growth rate despite the downturn in world trade and production. In August 1983, destabilization hit the continent, beginning with the violent unrest directed against Pakistan's martial law administrator Zia ul-Haq, followed in rapid succession by the murder of Philippines opposition leader Benigno Aquino, which produced a bankers' credit cut-off to the Filipino economy; the Soviet downing of the KAL-007 airliner signaling Moscow's intentions on the region; and the Rangoon bombing-murder of most of the South Korean cabinet.

The escalating destabilization of the region has now led to the assassination of its most prestigious leader. Nearly without exception, every country in Asia is endangered with one or more of the following threats: growing separatist insurgencies funded and directed from outside the country; left-

wing opposition insurgencies sponsored by Moscow; or, as especially in North Asia, Soviet military pressure and the threat of outright attack. For Pakistan, India, the Philippines, potentially Thailand and Indonesia, and soon for South Korea, nations do not face mere government crises, but crises of the very institutions of government.

The forces operating to effect this destabilization of the countries of Asia are those already identified by the *Executive Intelligence Review* as being co-responsible for the murder of Mrs. Gandhi: British intelligence through its many assets in the region and its control of such supranational bureaucracies as the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank; the Swiss-based Nazi International, which funds the Sikh separatist operation of the London-based Jagjit Singh Chauhan, for example, and through its shared control of Iran and Libya funds Islamic insurgencies from Pakistan through to Southeast Asia; and the Soviet Union, which operates through its own insurgent networks and agents of influence and which has built up Soviet military strength in the region now exceeding that of the United States and its allies.

These powers, with the People's Republic of China delegated a role as junior imperial partner, may not be coordinating their actions but they are of one mind in their goals: to break up the nation-states of Asia into impotent warring ethnic, tribal, and religious entities in order to impose a new order of economic exploitation.

Take the Sikh separatist movement in Punjab, India, as a case study of this operation. The Sikh separatist murder of Mrs. Gandhi was carried out on orders of British intelligence, approved publicly by the Soviet Union's second in command of the Communist Party Political Department, Rostislav Ulyanowskii, and executed through British channels laundered through the United States with the help of the Heritage Foundation, the Anti-Defamation League, and multi-agent Jon Speller.

In the 1970s, the Punjab was chosen by the government for a massive input of tractors, fertilizers, and high-grade seeds. Today the Punjab produces 70% of India's rice and 50% of its wheat. India, with a population of 700 million, is self-sufficient in food thanks to the tremendous advances in agricultural productivity in the Punjab. In June, *EIR* con-

firmed that Chauhan is funded by the André Swiss grain cartel, whose motives are obvious. Furthermore, it has been determined that Chauhan's financial advisers are centered at the World Bank. One of them, Inderjit Singh, has written a paper, "Small Farmers and the Landless in South Asia," calling for a return to labor-intensive agriculture. The objective of the British controllers of the Khalistan movement is the *destruction of the Punjab breadbasket, causing Africa-conditions of famine in India.*

The oligarchy has declared war on the countries of Asia. To destroy these countries, however, one other condition must be achieved: the strategic withdrawal of the United States from the Pacific and Asia theater.

### **The hoax of the Pacific turn**

In February of this year, Zbigniew Brzezinski declared that the basic orientation of U.S. policy is "dramatically shifting" toward the Pacific Basin. This goes hand in hand with carrying out the Kissinger policy of decoupling from Western Europe: "Increasingly," opined Brzezinski, "the American view is that Europe is beginning to stagnate and is becoming obsolescent, and this is having a negative, political, international effect, and the Europeans are becoming less confident, less dynamic."

Ironically, Brzezinski, now a leading member of Henry Kissinger's Georgetown Center for Strategic and International Studies, was speaking in Manila. For U.S. allies in the region, the Philippines exemplifies the U.S. continuation of the 1969 Kissinger declaration for the strategic withdrawal of the United States from Asia, the so-called Guam Doctrine.

Even though it is the site of the United States' most crucial bases in the Pacific, Clark Field and Subic Bay, the United States has stood by while the combined forces of the International Monetary Fund and the Soviet-backed opposition and New People's Army are working to turn the Philippines into a new Central America. While President Reagan, toward the end of the election campaign, declared his commitment to the Marcos government and the stability of the Philippines, his policy was directly countered the next day by the State Department. State Department officials freely admit that if Marcos attempts to carry out IMF austerity while carrying out economic reforms, his government will fall and the communist insurgency will take over. The State Department is now known to be pursuing options to remove the U.S. bases from the Philippines to Indonesia, Thailand, or the nearby island of Palau.

America's Southeast Asian allies also could not be reassured by the statements of Secretary of State George Shultz at the July meeting of the Association of South East Asian Nations (ASEAN). Within this year, official representatives of the U.S. government, including Ambassador Jeane Kirkpatrick, have announced that Thailand's security guarantor is no longer the United States, but China. The Southeast

Asian countries, concerned over the military collaboration between the United States and China and over harsh U.S. protectionist measures against their trade, demanded assurances from the Secretary of State. Shultz's reply was a classic in State Department no-speak: "The basis of U.S. relations in Southeast Asia are the ASEAN countries."

If the United States were to display the same degree of weakness and neglect in North Asia that it does in Southeast Asia, this area would likely already be at war. The Reagan administration has reversed the Carter administration policy of withdrawal of U.S. troops from South Korea and reaffirmed the U.S. nuclear umbrella over this country that functions as a front line for both the United States and Japan. The United States has succeeded in tightening its strategic alliances with both Seoul and Tokyo, and the visit of South Korean President Chun Doo Hwan to Japan in September, the first time a Korean head of state has visited Tokyo, has created a unity of outlook among these allies that is absolutely indispensable in the face of increasing Soviet military threats.

But in the South Pacific, the ANZUS treaty, between Australia, New Zealand, and the United States, has been placed in jeopardy by the new Socialist International government of David Lange in New Zealand and Australia's Bob Hawke, who have declared their intention to turn the Pacific into a "nuclear-free zone." This would mean that U.S. nuclear-carrying and nuclear-fueled ships would no longer be able to port in the South Pacific, at a point that the Soviet Pacific fleet has been built up to surpass the U.S. Seventh.

Meanwhile, Socialist International and Soviet assets have fanned out from Australia and New Zealand to rev up similar feelings in the islands of Micronesia and France's New Caledonia. On the island of Kwajalein, in the Marshall Islands, a drive has suddenly arisen to oust the U.S. base there. This base is the site of all U.S. anti-missile defense systems testing, the program the Soviet Union is determined to bring to a halt.

### **The superpower nutcracker**

On the Indian subcontinent, the State Department and the Kremlin have acted in effective concert to put the region's countries into a "superpower nutcracker," as one Indian commentator called it in September. For months, the Soviet Union has been regularly issuing dire threats against Pakistan, punctuated with Soviet bombing attacks on Pakistani villages near the border. On the other side, according to a Pakistani defense journal, "a former National Security Adviser"—either Kissinger or Brzezinski—informed Zia that Pakistan has two options on Afghanistan. It can escalate the war being carried out by the Afghan rebels. Or, it can de-escalate, in which case Pakistan will likely face a cut-off of funds from both the United States and Saudi Arabia.

Between the State Department and Moscow, there has been a concerted effort to spark a war between Pakistan and

India. This year, tensions between these two countries have been rising over primarily two issues: Pakistan's newly developed capability to build the bomb, and some degree of support from Pakistan for the Sikh separatists of the Punjab. In August, TASS issued the news that the Soviet Union had conclusive proof that Pakistan was preparing a war against India. At the same time, reports started appearing in odd places like the Jerusalem Post that India was preparing a strike on Pakistan's nuclear facility at Kahuta, and in early October, the State Department released to the Pakistanis news



**"I** want India to be a better place. When I say a better place, I mean not only materially, not only a better standard

of living. There's been so much advance in knowledge. . . . Now we must concentrate that knowledge on being better people, on making the world a much better place in every possible way. And if the rest of the world can't or won't, at least India should try her best."

—Prime Minister Indira Gandhi, October 1984

that two Indian squadrons of fighter planes were heading their way, according to U.S. satellite reports. It later turned out that the planes had merely disappeared under cloud cover. In the second week of October, U.S. ambassador to Pakistan, Deane Hinton, fresh from his previous posting in Central America, where he played a similar provocatory role, declared that Pakistan faces no real threat from the west—that is, Afghanistan—but from the east, that is, India.

Throughout the same period, leading up to the assassination of Mrs. Gandhi, the Soviets loudly decried Pakistani-U.S. imperialist designs against India and demanded that the Indian government cease its talk of the problems created by "two superpowers" and attack only one, the United States.

These superpower games epitomize a hideous policy that victimizes most Asian nations, only more intensely played in

the case of the subcontinent. The effect is to step-by-step decrease a nation's ability to act independently to determine and carry out its own interests, forcing it to defensively react to the conflicting pressures of superior military powers.

The commitment to lead the underdeveloped nations to seek their own destiny—in opposition to the *colonialist* outlook of the Anglo-American oligarchs of the West and the Soviet Union—was the foundation of the Non-Aligned Movement and the hallmark of the leadership of Mrs. Indira Gandhi.

The last year has demonstrated that to the extent the United States follows such neo-colonialist policies, whose ultimate source is the British Foreign Office or its arrayed think-tanks conducted by such personages as Henry Kissinger or Zbigniew Brzezinski, the Soviet Union emerges as the sole strategic gainer. Destroying the nations of Asia and the operation to force the strategic withdrawal of the United States from this region are one and the same. This is because the United States, despite the gross contamination of its conduct by the Kissinger faction in the State Department and elsewhere, remains objectively and in the minds of America's allies the protector of their freedom from Soviet rule and the model for economic progress.

If over the period of 1983-1984, the oligarchs of the West and the Soviet Union have combined to declare war on the allied nations of Asia, the events of the next year, even the next months, will determine whether they will succeed or not. This presents the United States with an urgent responsibility. To the extent that the second Reagan administration demands loyalty from its allies with mere phrases of commitment to their security, the United States and these countries—holding with them one-fourth of the world's population—will lose. The United States endorsement of the austerity policies of the International Monetary Fund, the evil manipulations of the State Department, and the thug-like protectionism of the Commerce Department must be brought to a halt.

The United States must have a three-part policy toward Asia: it must commit itself totally to the defense of the region in the face of the Soviets' escalating threats; it must commit itself to take all actions to protect the integrity of the nations of the region and to especially cool out the tensions on the subcontinent; and it must commit its resources to the great projects of economic development that will assure the region's industrialization. Any attempt to circumvent this challenge with an alternative policy toward China will, as Henry Kissinger has proved, result in dismal failure. An American System U.S. policy toward U.S. allies in Asia is in fact the precondition toward positive relations with a rapidly changing People's Republic.

On Jan. 2, 1985, President Reagan will meet with Japanese Prime Minister Yasuhiro Nakasone, a ready partner in bringing the American System back into Asia.