

Bangalore Conference Will Change World History

by Mary Burdman

“Some events become turning points in history, and the second Iraq war is one of them” stated T.N. Chaturvedi, Governor of the state of Karnataka in southern India, in his address as chief guest at the international conference “World Situation after Iraq War,” held in his state’s capital city of Bangalore on May 26-27.

The conference, sponsored by the Centre for Social Justice and the Schiller Institute, carried on the discussion launched at the Schiller Institute conference on “How to Reconstruct a Bankrupt World,” held in Bad Schwalbach, Germany on March 21-23. Bangalore, like Bad Schwalbach, was a “different kind of conference”; all groups of society were mobilized to organize it. This was the work of Chandrajit Yadav, former Union Minister of India and chairman of the Centre for Social Justice.

Participants likened the impact of the U.S.-U.K. war against Iraq on the international situation, to the impact of the end of the Soviet Union in 1991, or the Sept. 11, 2001 attacks in the United States. The war has not ended, and the “post-Saddam war,” as one speaker named it, could escalate into a conflict much worse than the three-week military assault by U.S.-U.K. forces.

The conference, where Lyndon LaRouche, pre-candidate for the Democratic Party nomination for President in 2004, and Helga Zepp-LaRouche, chairwoman of the Schiller Institute, delivered important addresses, showed how all groups—India’s national and regional political and intellectual leaders, Indian youth, women’s groups, and international representatives—have dismissed out of hand the allegations made by Washington and London to justify their unilateral attack on Iraq. This war, it was stated repeatedly, was against national sovereignty, and all the international efforts over the past half-century to end colonialism and establish a new and *just* world economic and political order. The “Bangalore Declaration”

drawn up by the conference (see page 26) states that by moving concerted now to create this just order, the spreading war against nations can be stopped.

The “chicken-hawks” of Washington and London would do well to read the nation-wide Indian press coverage of which continued for days after the Bangalore meeting.

Lincoln and Gandhiji

A second feature meriting attention from American policymakers, especially, is that the words of Abraham Lincoln, on government “of the people, for the people, by the people”; of Martin Luther King; and, of course, of Mahatma Gandhi—three great changers of world history—were repeatedly quoted. And there was full recognition of the role Lyndon LaRouche is playing, especially with his campaign for the Democratic nomination for the U.S. Presidency. As one representative of the youth organization Nehru Bal Sangh said, “This is an historic movement. The LaRouches have spoken our hearts out.” We have learned that we must search out not just our enemies, but our friends, the young man said—as in the growing relations between India and China. “We in Eurasia will not miss our chance of joining this cosmopolitan agenda” of the LaRouches, which is so very well combined with that of the Centre for Social Justice in India. The younger generation of activists in India is “200% behind you.” We “must take up the challenge” of many great leaders since Lincoln and Gandhi, he concluded, who have tried to create a just world order.

In his response to the ongoing proceedings, made on May 27, Lyndon LaRouche told the participants that the failure to win such an economic order is also a “failure of a cause associated with the United States, as a modern republic. If in Eurasia, which is going to be “the central part of humanity,” LaRouche said, there is “growing unity, about the great eco-



Lyndon and Helga LaRouche are greeted on their arrival in Bangalore, for a history-making stay.

conomic missions of development and recovery, . . . that becomes a force, which will be valuable in influencing the process inside the United States. The point is, to convey to the American people that there is a movement in the world, in Eurasia, which is moving toward unity, which is a movement of potential economic power, and an optimistic future.” LaRouche called the Bangalore conference “extremely important, not because it mobilizes a peace movement, but because it mobilizes a movement for the improvement of the condition of humanity.”

Helga Zepp-LaRouche, who discussed the dialogue of cultures (see page 21), told the conference that Bangalore will become known as the place of beginning, for a movement in which leadership is taken back by the people. We will put development back on the agenda, she said, and called on young people, who face the same problems of a “no future” generation whether in India, Europe, or the United States, to make “both a revolution and a renaissance,” as the only way to succeed.

‘Peace for Development’

Governor Chaturvedi said on May 26 that the Iraq war has caused “prolonged agony for the human conscience,” and its perpetrators have shown a “very peculiar callousness and insensitivity to world views,” to the costs of the war to the world, and to the institutions created over the last century “to try to weave people of the world together.” Stating that he was happy to associate himself with the meeting, Chaturvedi noted that Bangalore and Karnataka, places of light, learning, and history, are not new to international conflict. The rivalry of the British and the French in the late 18th Century, including fighting in this region of India, was part of a “world war” that was fought out in Europe and North America, culminating in the American Revolution. Bangalore, one of India’s most international cities, is the site of its famous Institute of Science, and is also the center of high-level technology in

computer and military areas.

Only peace will allow us to usher in development, the Governor stated. Power blocs did not bring peace; now, the one superpower, which had been looked upon as a country which would try to ensure peace and development in the world, is beginning the 21st Century by launching war. There is concern that “anything can happen anywhere.” Discussion used to be of a new international economic order; now, there is only the “borderless world” of globalization, which in reality means the “homogenization of world culture,” and the “political dominance of one group.” I wish LaRouche well, he said; the United States must take its decision on its policy direction. Here at Bangalore, we know that we must move towards “peace for development”; that is why this “conference is extremely urgent,” the Governor concluded.

Other leading ministers of Karnataka took part. The Minister of Public Works, Dharam Singh, called the war on Iraq an “act of madness, condemned by all.” He recalled Mahatma Gandhi, who throughout the great conflicts and problems of winning independence for his nation, never advocated violence, or lost patience. Gandhi said that you cannot defeat violence with violence, and this is true today, Singh said. He pointed out that India’s freedom struggle was not against the British people, but imperialism itself; nor today is the world’s problem with George W. Bush, but with the imperial cabal which has caused the total transformation of America’s perspective.

Senior Minister K.H. Ranganath, presiding over the first session, called the war an attack not just upon Iraq, but also on the sovereignty of nations worldwide. Opposition to this war is not opposition to the United States, he agreed; rather it is a great threat to all the people of the world, including all Americans. India itself must consider this problem for its international policy, Ranganath said: Civilized people must ask whether we are moving towards a sane, or a fascist world? Calling LaRouche a “universal campaigner” for a new world

economic order, he declared himself happy to learn that LaRouche is organizing against the disastrous imperial war policy, inside the United States and worldwide.

A leader from the Mideast, Nouri A.R. Hussein of Cairo, Secretary-General of the Afro-Asian Peoples' Solidarity Organization, attacked the role of the U.S. neo-conservatives, inspired by the late German-Jewish fascist Leo Strauss, in launching the Iraq war; but Hussein also warned of the urgency of rectifying the weaknesses within the Non-Aligned Movement. From the Embassy of Cuba in India, also, the role of the war party in Washington, and their threat to all nations, was addressed.

Did the UN Fail?

Later on May 26, Minister of Social Welfare A. Krishnappa declared that if the global attack on national sovereignty launched by the Iraq war is not stopped, a "new colonialism" will become reality. This is an historical turning point in relations between the United States and other nations; Krishnappa's view was that the European nations, the UN, and the Non-Aligned Movement had failed miserably in preventing the war. He reviewed the impact it would have on developing nations' economies; they must consider the impact that the "National Security Strategy" of the Bush Administration, including economic liberalization, is having on their own interests. "Time-tested Indian values," he said, including respect for humanity, the human hunger for equality, spirituality, and morality, must now be mobilized, to help direct world opinion against the war policy.

Air Commodore Jasjit Singh, director of the Centre for Strategic and International Studies, however, called on participants to consider whether the United Nations had really failed. The UN is not a collective security organization, he noted; it made every effort to use preventive diplomacy. This did not succeed. But the UN refused to sanction this war. The real failure, he said, is in the current policy of Washington. In the months leading up to the attack on Iraq, American diplomatic and military policy *failed*, Singh said. Only Britain, Australia, and a few small nations backed Washington. "If this is a 'superpower,'" Singh said, "there is something to worry about." Even a few years ago, the United Nations would have given a mandate for this war. The United States has great military force, Singh said, but "you cannot lead by coercion."

Bangalore University Professor Jayaramm suggested that the open discussion in Washington and London of "regime change" for so many tens of countries, combined with American neo-conservatives' desire for control over Central and West Asia, could mean a potential threat to move into Kashmir. This has been openly suggested by some in Washington, Jayaramm noted. He said that despite the end of the Soviet Union in 1991, these circles still want to contain Russia, as an "enemy." India must consider the importance of rebuilding ties with Russia, China, the European Union—the key players in the multipolar world, Jayaramm concluded. The "strategic

triangle" of India, Russia, and China has common interests on many issues, strategic and economic. The great problem is to get the United States to agree that multilateralism is the answer.

The Chinese People's Association for Peace and Disarmament was unable to send a delegation from Beijing due to the strict regulations being taken to control the SARS epidemic, sent congratulations and called for international cooperation among China, India, Germany, the United States, and other nations. Conference discussions noted that at the time of the attack on Iraq, the Chinese people were also fighting a war, against SARS. Both indicate new international dynamics. The SARS epidemic showed the contradictions which arise between mankind and the environment, which is one of the greatest challenges to development; and the Iraq war, the contradictions within humanity.

In China, as in India, it is understood that the war on Iraq has ended, but the conflict this war aroused in the world has not. The impact of this conflict is fully comparable to that which arose in the early 1990s, with the demise of the Soviet Union and the transformation of East Europe, or the impact of the Sept. 11, 2001 attacks in the United States. There are two concepts of the world political and economic order: One is of a unipolar world, and the other a multipolar world. The conflict between these contrasting concepts of what the world should be, could be long, and severe.

However, thinkers in China, as in India, are convinced that there can be a fundamental transformation of the world situation toward peace, and for an extended time. "Harmony is most precious" is one of the most important cultural values of China. This view resembles that of the American statesman, John Quincy Adams, that international relations should be based upon a "community of principles" among sovereign nations, so that they can resolve their conflicts in their joint interests.

The Young Generation

The work begun in Bad Schwalbach and carried on to Bangalore, will not end there. A number of other Indian states want to have followup conferences on these themes; it was proposed that other Eurasian nations do the same.

The great problems faced by the people and nation of India are not so different from those confronted in the United States and Europe. In Lyndon and Helga LaRouche's discussions with Chandrajit Yadav and 55 national leaders of the Centre for Social Justice, held before the Bangalore conference began, it was agreed that the terrible problems imposed by the brutal regime of "globalization" have struck every nation.

India now needs its "second freedom struggle," to free itself from poverty, unemployment, and communal conflicts. India is, in many ways, going *backwards*. Education is one example. Costs are rising rapidly, and can only be met by the wealthy. For a student even to gain admittance to a medical college, has already cost him or her the equivalent of

\$40,000—comparable to the enormous costs of education in the United States. Indian education is becoming de facto a divided system, as it already is in the United States. Legal attempts to deal with these problems, such as the “reservation” of a fair proportion of employment opportunities and social benefits for women or members of the “backward” castes, do not answer the great problem. Only a just world economic order can change this. Helga LaRouche told these social and political leaders that the split between rich and poor is now out of hand, in the United States and Germany as well. She asked to mobilize Asian and European nations together: “The world is in one boat.”

Most important, all the leaders concurred, was the mobilization of the young generation. There were many young participants at Bangalore, from city colleges, and especially from the Nehru Bal Sangh, the youth organization of the Centre for Social Justice. Dedicated to the ideals of Jawaharlal Nehru, India’s great freedom fighter and first Prime Minister of the Republic, this group has for 20 years led work among young people in India aged 13-20. In this nation of so many different languages, religions, and cultures, Nehru Bal Sangh has held

27 national integration conferences to promote “national integration, peace, harmony, a sense of national unity, and international understanding,” as Chandrajit Yadav said.

One young lady from a Bangalore College told the conference, “So many people today think youth are useless. But Chandrajitji Yadav does not! We think youth can play an important role.” Older people have experience; young people have new ideas—these must be combined, she said.

On May 27, the conference commemorated the death anniversary of Jawaharlal Nehru. Yadav told the participants, “Man does not die; his body goes, but he remains forever.” The same day, Amrik Anuja, of Nehru Bal Sangh, said that “action is called for, to mold youth into people with beautiful souls.” This legacy for young people represents the future of India, of all Asia, of Europe, and of the Americas.

See last week’s EIR for additional coverage of the Bangalore conference, including presentations of Lyndon LaRouche and Natwar Singh. The transcript of the Bad Schwalbach conference is available as a Special Report from the LaRouche in 2004 Presidential campaign.

Helga Zepp-LaRouche

Build Economic Recovery and Peace Upon Universal Principles of Culture

This presentation was given to the Bangalore conference, “The World After the Iraq War,” on May 26, by the Chairwoman of the Schiller Institute.

Dear Mr. Yadav, dear guests, distinguished guests and hopefully, friends of the Schiller Institute. I want to speak to you today about the dialogue among cultures as the alternative to the already-existing clash of civilizations. But before I do that let’s quickly look at the world as it is right now, because this clash is already fully on.

In Afghanistan, no peace; you have the opium war-lords running the country; in Iraq you have tens of thousands of Muslims—Shi’ites and Sunnites—demanding that the occupying powers should leave. In the Near East, the forces who control the Israeli government, from both inside Israel and also the United States, conduct fascist policies against the Palestinians, modelled, according to their own admission, to the policies of the Nazis in the Warsaw Ghetto. Suicide bombings against Israel follow. Supposedly al-Qaeda terrorism has hit in Chechnya, Saudi Arabia, and Morocco; before that, in Bali and Tunisia. And all of this occurs in the context of the so-called war against terrorism declared by President Bush.

It seems that the war against terrorism generates a lot more terrorism. What happens if the words of the ex-CIA chief Woolsey would be proven to be right: that the war against terrorism will take 100 years, and that there are 60 countries in the world that are not democratic, and therefore need a regime change? It is very clear, that if this trend is not stopped, then Mahatma Gandhi is right, when he said, that if one follows a policy of “an eye for an eye,” in the end the whole world will be blind. And if the whole world is blind, that is just another name for a Dark Age.

Eurasia: The Lesson of Thucydides

Supposedly, this war against terrorism was the reaction to Sept. 11. But whatever ominous development occurred on that day, it gave the group around Cheney, Rumsfeld, Wolfowitz, Perle, and others, the opportunity to implement policies which they already had written about in 1991, ’96, and ’98: namely, the idea of an American unilateralism and pre-emptive nuclear war. When the Soviet Union collapsed, this same grouping—Rumsfeld, Cheney, and so forth—around the old President Bush, declared that the United States was now the only superpower left, and that it now was time