

# 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



to become a world empire.

If you think about it, the United States at that point had no more enemy. The Soviet Union had disappeared. It was at the same point like Classical Greece, when they had defeated the Persian Empire. There was no major adversary left, and it would have been very easy to have a peaceful alliance with the other states. In the case of Greece, they could have had a peaceful alliance with the other city-states and members of the Attic sea alliance. But as the first famous historian, Thucydides, describes in his book about *The Peloponnesian War*, Greece turned its allies into subjects, and it started the campaign against Sparta, and it decided to become an empire. Actually, I advise the young people to look at this book by Thucydides, because if you want to understand present American policy, there is no better historical reference point than that.

Because of the economic domestic crisis of Greece, and the material, and moral, overstretching with the campaign against Sicily, ancient Greece finally collapsed.

The United States, in the period between 1989-90, when the Soviet Union collapsed, could have put the East-West relationship on a completely new basis. It could have built a peace order very easily, because there was no threat; no major adversary was left.

And this is when Mr. LaRouche proposed the Eurasian Land-Bridge as the way to integrate the countries of Eurasia, economically, infrastructurally, for the first time. It was the idea which we brought into many countries. We had conferences in Russia, China, many countries, many cities in the United States, all of the European countries, East and West. And we proposed the idea to connect the entire Eurasian continent, from Europe, to Russia, to China, to Southeast Asia, to South Asia, through so-called “infrastructure corridors”: the idea to have an integrated highway-railway-waterway sys-

tem, connected through computerized stations; and to have, then, these transport arteries, 100 kilometers wide. So, basically, we would not just bring infrastructure into all of Eurasia, but to have energy production, energy distribution, communication. And this way, you would have the ideal conditions to build new cities. We want to build 1,000 new cities in the undeveloped areas of Eurasia. And the idea was basically to create, for the first time, the conditions—in the landlocked areas of Eurasia, which have no access to the sea or to the rivers—which normally only countries have which are lying on the sea or have big river systems, and therefore have favorable conditions, from the standpoint of transport and so forth.

So, with these Eurasian infrastructure corridors, for example, Central Asia, the large spaces of Russia, or the interior regions of China, they all could be brought up—and naturally, India—they all could be brought up to the level of development of Western Europe.

This obviously is not only an economic program, but it would have created the basis for peace, a permanent basis for peace through development.

## Zero Growth and Imperial Policy

Now, this proposal was on the table, and it is becoming, fortunately, a reality today.

But at that time, the group around Cheney and others, insisted to implement their ideology, and they proposed programs which were in the tradition of H.G. Wells, Bertrand Russell: namely the idea, that now was the moment to create an Anglo-American empire which should dominate the world. This tendency was there in American politics throughout the entire 20th Century: For example, the fact that the United States bombed Hiroshima and Nagasaki without a military reason—because Japan had already capitulated—was an expression of that imperial tendency. This is a policy which, in principle, was followed by Samuel Huntington, Brzezinski, Kissinger. Brzezinski’s infamous book about the “great chess game”: How do you manipulate the forces of, especially, Central Asia, to control the raw materials of Central Asia? Brzezinski was also the one who developed the idea of playing the “Islamic card” against the Soviet Union. If you want to know, why you have Islamic fundamentalism in Afghanistan, why you have “Afgansis,” ask Mr. Brzezinski, because it was the Anglo-American idea to transform Muslims into this kind of fundamentalists.

Kissinger, in 1974, when he was National Security Adviser to Nixon, wrote the infamous report NSSM-200, which you can look up in the Internet, and in which he states very clearly that all raw materials of the world really belong to the United States, and it is therefore in the interest of the United States to push population reduction, especially in those countries where those raw materials are located, because if there are too many people, they eat up too much of raw materials which really belong to the United States.



*Helga Zepp-LaRouche (right, with Chandrajit Yadav and Natwar Singh): "Let's quickly look at the world as it is right now, because this clash of civilizations is already fully on."*

Then Samuel Huntington, already in 1957, wrote this book *The Soldier and the State*, which was not only a defense of the Nazi policy, but it gave the concept of how to build an imperial army of mindless soldiers, who just follow policy and do not think themselves. This same Samuel Huntington, in 1996, wrote this very stupid book called *The Clash of Civilizations*. And, I say a "very stupid book," because I tortured myself and I read it, and this man has no knowledge about Christianity; he has no knowledge about Hinduism, about Islam, or Confucianism, or anything, because he says that between all these great cultures and religions, that there is nothing in common; that they have no unifying principles, and therefore tribal conflict on global scale will be the only way for the future.

And obviously this *is* operational American policy right now, with the idea to play up the *differences* between cultures and religions.

### **Dangerous Role of Leo Strauss**

Now, Cheney, and Wolfowitz, and these people, they not only implmeneted, or want to implement this H.G. Wells/Bertrand Russell policy, but they mixed it with the very evil policies of Leo Strauss: a name to really pay attention to, because if you want to understand the thinking of the war party in the United States, you have to look at Leo Strauss and his disciples. Leo Strauss was a German Jew in the 1930s; so, he emigrated to the United States and became a Professor in the University of Chicago. And, the *New York Times*, at one point, wrote that he was the godfather of the policy of Newt Gingrich of 1994, "Contract with America," which is a fascist program. *Time* magazine called Leo Strauss one of the

most influential men in American politics. And, well—he is, unfortunately, because he has many followers.

His main ideas are: that liberalism is very dangerous and it has to be reversed; he also thinks that philosophers should never say what they mean, because the message is only for a few, only for those who are fit to receive it; what he means by "philosophers" is not philosophers as normal people see this notion, but he likes Nietzsche and Nietzsche's idea of the superman. But, since this notion is a little bit discredited, he said, let's call the supermen "philosophers." And these supermen, or philosophers, are supposed to have the remedy for what their time needs, and in order to get the message across, it is legitimate to spread the glorious myth, the "noble lie," and the pious fraud. In other words, to manipulate religion, manipulate every message. Because, according to him, there is an irreconcilable conflict between the interest of the state, and society. And that can be only camouflaged through lies and deception. The best means for lies is religion, because the image of man of Leo Strauss, is that man is selfish and self-centered. It is in the tradition of Hobbes, that man by nature is evil, and the wolf against the other person. And because he is evil he is not willing to sacrifice. And therefore, what you need is a god, who punishes and rewards, so that people are shuddering and fearful.

Therefore, since the existence of such gods can not be understood through reason and philosophy, you need a "shuddering one," needed to terrorize and civilize society. If Karl Marx said, "Religion is opium for the people," Strauss said, the people just need opium and they should have it.

He wanted to reverse liberalism and modernity and the enlightenment; he is part of what, in European philosophy or

history, is called the “Conservative Revolution.” These were people who wanted to reverse the ideas of the American Revolution of 1776.

So, Leo Strauss said, to implement this policy you need the right kind of intellectuals, who agree that all truth is fabrication, that justice is just doing good to friends, and doing evil to enemies, and that the truth is only for a small elite, to govern. You have to cultivate this elite, and you have to train them in the virtue of lying. Have you ever seen this in politics? Maybe not in India, but in the United States and in Europe for sure. Because the aim is power, raw power, cunning—you have to lie. Their worldview is demonic, and the idea that the world is overrun by evil, and they are the saviors, defenders of the world.

Strauss also agreed with the Nazi law philosopher Carl Schmitt, saying that the fundamental distinction in politics is between friend and foe. Schmitt admired the Nazis because they exterminated the enemy—namely the Jews, the Gypsies, and so forth. And they said, “It is always, ‘we against they.’”

Now, you all have heard press conferences with President Bush, where he said, it is “either with us or against us,” “we or they”; there is no middle. And if there is no external threat, says Strauss, it has to be manufactured. This is why when the Soviet Union collapsed, and there was no reason to have any adversary policy, they manufactured the enemy: Islam.

### Cusa’s ‘Peace of Religions’

On Sept. 11, President Bush said, “You are either with us or you are with the terrorists.” And, with the war against Afghanistan—for which, up to today, there is no evidence which could be held up in the courts, that there is a connection between Sept. 11 and al-Qaeda—but nevertheless, with war against Afghanistan, the Clash of Civilizations began. Days later, I issued a call for an urgent dialogue of cultures which was supposed to be based upon a beautiful writing by Nikolaus of Cusa, the famous founder of the nation-state, who lived in the 15th Century. And he was a Cardinal and foreign minister of the Vatican at that time, but also the founder of modern science and an eminent predecessor of Gottfried Leibniz.

He, in 1453, when Constantinople was taken at that time—and there was a certain mini-Clash of Civilizations, because there were reports coming to Europe about rapings, killings, and blasphemies, and so forth. And Nikolaus of Cusa, who had just been in Constantinople before, wrote a beautiful dialogue, in the tradition of the Socratic dialogues, called *De Pace Fidei*, about peace in religion.

Now this is a very beautiful idea, because in the dialogue, 17 representatives of different religions and nations go to God, and they say: “We all fight in your name, and we kill each other, all in your name; that can not be your wish; can you not help us?” So God says: “Well, you are all not only religious leaders, but you are also sages, wisemen; and as sages and philosophers, you know, that there can be only one

truth.” They say: “Yes, as philosophers we can understand that there is only one truth. But, why do we still fight each other?” So God says: “Well, you make the mistake, that you mistake the word of the prophets and the word of God.”

The philosophers say, “Yes, but give us more help.” So God said, “You also make the mistake, that you mix up the traditions, which are many, with the one truth.” And, they can say, “Yes there are many different traditions, but there is only one truth.” So, then they say, “But since we have shed so much blood, and we fought so many wars, how do you think we can go back to our people and say that they should now follow a new religion? They will not accept that.”

So God said, “Well, they don’t have to accept a new religion; they should accept the one religion, which is above all the other religions, and before.”

### Universal Principles of Hinduism

Now, I was very intrigued when I read this dialogue, and I said, “I will look if this idea exists in other philosophies.” And I turned to the *Rigveda*, and—lo, and behold! as you already know—there you have exactly the same idea, that there is one religion, which is above all and before all. In Hinduism it is called the Sanatana Dharma, which is even above the Hindu Dharma. And it is very interesting that Swami Vivekananda, in his famous speech to the world parliament of religions in Chicago, at the end of the 19th Century, used almost exactly the same words like Nikolaus of Cusa: That the followers of different religions quarrel and fight among themselves because of the narrowness of their outlook, and their failure to understand that the supreme being is infinite. I don’t know if Swami Vivekananda knew Nikolaus of Cusa, but it does not really matter, because I think that that truth is so self-evident, that every person of good will eventually will come to this idea.

Now, very interestingly, on Jan. 20, a contemporary philosopher, with the name of Karan Singh wrote an article in the *Hindustan Times*, in which he intervened in the present debate: If India should be based on *hindutva* or not? Should India become a more fundamentalist state, where religion and state are mixed, or should it not? And he points out, that there are certain master principles of Hinduism which are eventually found in the *Upanishads*, which give the answer. And he emphasizes five particular ones, which deserve special mentioning. And I will look at these five principles, and then how they find an echo in European and other cultures.

Now, first of all, the most basic concept is that of the all-pervasive *brahman*: the “*ishawaram idam sarvam jagat kincha jagatvam jagat*”: “Whatever exists and wherever exists is permeated by the same divine power.” Now, the same cosmic dimension of existence one finds in the Platonic tradition of European religion and philosophy.

We already mentioned: Nikolaus of Cusa, for example, has the idea of the (this is now Latin) “*quod libet in quo libet*”, that the One, the universe, as the most perfect of the order of

nature, is *before* everything else, so that everything exists in everything else. The reason why I can relate to the other human being, is not because we exist as self-evident, independent, atomic beings or particles in the universe, but because we are *both* permeated by the One. You find the same concept in Leibniz, in the idea of the *monad*: that the entire lawfulness of the universe exists in each individual soul.

The second principle is that the *brahman* exists within each individual consciousness, in the *atman*. The *atman* is the reflection of this all-pervasive *brahman*; it is the individual consciousness, but it is not ultimately separate from the *brahman*: The concept of “*ishwara sarvabhutanam idise tishtati*”, “the lord resides within the heart of each individual.” The relationship between the *atman* and the *brahman* is the pivot upon which the whole Vedantic teaching resolves.

In Christianity, one finds the similar notion of man as *imago viva Dei*, as the “living image of God”: It’s “living image,” because man is not just a static image of the divine principle, but is himself capable of the creative principle. He is *capax Dei*, capable of the participation in God.

A third Vedantic concept is, that all human beings, because of their shared spirituality, are members of one single family. The *Upanishads* use the notion for the human race, “*amritashya putra*”, the “children of immortality.” In Christianity, God, of which man is the living image, has the characteristic of existing in the simultaneity of eternity. If man contributes in his lifetime, a valid universal principle, which is based on necessary predecessors and which lays the basis for necessary successors, he provides new value, through his work, to the importance of the past, and he enriches the future. Thus, he connects his mortal existence to the infinite chain of humanity.

The fourth concept of the *Upanishads* is the idea of the essential unity of all religions, of all spiritual paths, “*ekoham svat virpra bahuda vadanti*”: “The truth is One, the wisemen call it by many names,” as it is said in the *Rigveda*. Nikolaus of Cusa resolves the old paradox of the One and the many, with the idea that the One is of a higher power, or magnitude, and precedes the many. Once the universal Oneness is established, one can be happy about the multiplicity. In the *Rigveda*, it says: God wanted the many cultures, because otherwise he would not have made them.

## The Common Good

At the highest, Hinduism and Christianity are universalist religions, the opposite of fundamentalism. In Christianity, this is the Platonic tradition, in which there is no contradiction between reason and faith. One example is the famous dialogue of the Jesuit Matteo Ricci, he had in China, where he proceeded on the basis of a unity in faith and the difference in rites; that the rites are really not so important.

A fifth Vedantic concept is that of the welfare of all beings, by “*bahujana shukhaya bahujana hitaya cha*”. At its highest, Hindu philosophy seeks “the welfare of all human beings and

all forms of life on this planet.” In European philosophy, there is a concept of natural law, which must be the guidance for all concrete positive law. According to this, a government has only legitimacy, if it is committed to the common good and the welfare of all citizens. According to Nikolaus of Cusa, there can only be harmony—concordance in the macrocosm in the universe at large—if all microcosms develop their potentialities in the fullest.

This idea, that there can be only peace in the world, if all nations develop their fullest potential, this idea which is deeply rooted in all philosophy, *must* be the basis for a community of principles among perfectly sovereign nation-states. Peace is only possible, if each nation is permitted to develop fully its own characteristics, its own potentiality, and it regards it as its fundamental self-interest that all others develop equally to their maximum.

If mankind is supposed to reach the Age of Reason, which hopefully is the case in our lifetime, and is hopefully the case through the establishment of the Eurasian Land-Bridge, as the basis for a just, new world economic order; or if man reaches the age of the spiritual man, as Sri Aurobindo would call it; or the time of the domination of the Noösphere, as the Russian scientist Vernadsky called it; then such a cosmic ontological foundation of the political order is necessary.

Despite of all the good principles of the UN Charter, the main weakness of it is, that such a metaphysical or cosmic dimension is lacking. What we need today, is leaders in each nation, who, with an almost tender passion for the development of mankind, act as *rishis*, as sages, who teach this idea.

In India, we have the perfect basis to embrace the entire human race with the concept of the *brahman-atman*. In Christianity, political and spiritual leaders are called upon to act on the basis of *agapē*: love. In Chinese culture the Confucian principle of *ren* must be the basis of politics. *Ren* means love. The idea in the New Testament, in the I Corinthians 13: It says you need all three, faith, hope, and love; but of these three, love is the greatest. If you don’t have love, you have nothing.

Swami Vivekananda, in one of his lectures, says: Europe is in imminent danger if it does not turn to its spirituality as its basis for life. And, I fully agree: Europe *is* in mortal danger, and we have to work to change this. This is why the Schiller Institute is called according to the great Poet of Freedom, Friedrich Schiller, because he developed the concept of the beautiful soul; that each man must develop a beautiful soul. A beautiful soul is a person for whom duty and passion, freedom and necessity, are one and the same. Somebody who is a good Samaritan, who does the good without thinking about his own self-interest.

So therefore, let’s build the Dialogue of Cultures, on the idea that what is common to all cultures and nations on this Earth is an image of man, that must be beautiful. Let’s work, so that each person becomes a beautiful *atman*.