

high-technology capital-goods industry. India "must get back to the kind of thinking which achieved levels of growth of up to 10 percent," LaRouche told a gathering of eminent economic journalists. "The key thing which most people overlook" in analyzing the Indian economy is that "you have the postwar period of 1947 to 1962-64, the Nehru Period, in which you have the first two Five-Year Plans that centrally laid the foundations for a great nation." The subsequent wars with China in 1962 and Pakistan in 1965, and the 1966 devaluation of the rupee, destroyed that momentum, LaRouche added. "But these are not solely an Indian problem. This is a reflection into India of conditions which have developed in the international monetary system. India can develop, but India requires low-interest, long-term credits to develop," Larouche said.

Alongside the necessary international arrangements, LaRouche emphasized the need for India to select two or three areas of science and technology in which it can become "the best in the world"—just as under Nehru, Dr. Homi Bhabha initiated the nuclear energy program

which has given India the most advanced atomic-energy program in the developing sector.

From Bombay, Mr. and Mrs. LaRouche visited the country's premier scientific establishment, the Bhabha Atomic Research Center (BARC) in nearby Trombay. On their arrival, they were met by its Director, Dr. Raja Ramanna, an eminent nuclear physicist, who gave them a briefing on the evolution of the center into a scientific facility employing over 12,000 people, including more than 3,500 scientists and 5,000 technicians—a facility unique in the world. The LaRouches and their party toured the 40-megawatt CIRUS, the experimental reactor built in 1960 with Canadian assistance; the agricultural applications laboratory, where radiation is being used for the preservation of food and for developing new, improved plant strains; and the laser experiment section, which is working on a high-power neodymium glass laser for research in plasma physics.

Throughout his discussions with scientists and economists LaRouche emphasized the need to forge ahead in other frontier areas of science and technology. Speak-

'Passion for development must be revived in India'

At the conclusion of his visit, Lyndon LaRouche summed up some of his impressions of India—since he was last there in 1946—in an interview with the newsweekly New Wave. Excerpts follow.

It is very obvious that the passion and the attention span in general are less than they were in 1946, that the fire and creative passion associated with the independence struggle are not as great today. The first desire I have in this is to say, "How can that passion, or that *quality* of passion be reactivated?"—because that's the only force that can build the country in the face of its present problems.

The cultural pessimism which has hit Western Europe and the U.S. is hitting here, and I would think that it is fair to say that India—at least in terms of the university campuses I visited—is approximately at the point of danger that we faced in the United States and Western Europe in 1966-68. That is what must be reversed. I see an appetite in the country for great projects that will inspire the people and give them a sense of cohesion—some purpose, some self-mobilization—and that's the key, just thinking back to 1946 and comparing it to now. That's the most immediate emotional, personal reaction I have.

For example, I recall how back in 1946 on the

Calcutta Maidan, coolies who were making between four and eight annas a day [approximately 5 to 10 U.S. cents] under the British Raj came up to me as an American soldier to find out if the United States was going to send textile machinery to India at the end of the war. I wish the passion of 1946 were active now to be focused on the tasks we have before us at this moment.

The problem here today is largely subjective, not objective. If you look at the situation not from India—as if it were an isolated country in which everything was determined by what happened within the country—but look at India in the world as a whole, compare this with developing countries, and compare the country politically with industrialized nations—India is better governed than the United States in terms of normal standards of government. It is a rich country with a lot of poor people. But the context and determining features of the distinction between the pre-1963-66 period and the post-1966 period—which is defined here by the devaluation of the rupee—the distinction is not domestic; the distinction is international. For the past 16 years the world has been sliding through monetary crises towards what has now become a depression. It is this international climate which largely determines the possibilities in India. The problem domestically in each of the countries affected by this international situation is how does the nation and particularly its leading political forces respond to the international situation?