

VIKALP

Alternatives

APRIL
2005

Revisiting the Spirit of Bandung
Celebrating Fifty Years

APRIL
2005

Revisiting the Spirit of Bandung in 2005

Editorial

The city of Bandung in Indonesia was witness to the fiftieth year celebrations of being the 'liaison city' for the freedom fighters of Asia and Africa. The city had served as an asylum for those who had escaped the shackles of colonialism in Asia and Africa and had received inspiration to awaken nations that were oppressed under the vagaries of the colonisers. The celebration took place in Bandung from 18th to 23rd April 2005. During the event, the Indonesian government and other Third World countries reflected on the solidarity of Asia and Africa in the context of the new geo-political situation. At the same time, some NGOs celebrated the spirit of Bandung from the people's perspective.

The first **Bandung Conference** had taken place on April 18, 1955 and was attended by all the great political luminaries of the newly independent Asian and African countries. Twenty nine countries had assembled to launch the cooperation between developing countries 'on the basis of mutual interest and respect for national sovereignty'. These countries came together to establish their own identity and were opposed to colonialism. Despite all this, there were still some countries that were under colonial rule. This first conference was significant in the sense that it was the first attempt of the collective effort by the Afro-Asian nations to assert their presence on the world scene and persuade the western powers to consult them on decisions affecting them. It is also significant in the sense that these countries of the South were attempting to come together, renew ancient links (economic, cultural, communications transport, etc) that had been severed, both within and among the neighbouring countries under colonialism. The newly independent countries had got together to endorse their stand as against imperialism and thus provide support to liberation movements in Africa and Asia. It was a vision for a new world. The **Final Communiqué** of the Asian- Africa Conference was convened upon the invitation of the Prime Ministers of Burma, Sri Lanka, India, Indonesia and Pakistan. The delegates considered issues of (a) **economic cooperation**; (b) **cultural cooperation**; (c) **human rights and self determination**; (d) **problems of dependent people**; (e) **promotion of world peace and cooperation**.

There was no follow up meeting thereafter, but it did pave the way for the **NAM or the Non Aligned Movement** that was created in 1962. The idea of a self-reliant nation was endorsed by NAM in all respects. The member countries formed alliances so as to overcome the issues of underdevelopment, poverty and dependency that riddled the developing nations. Around the same time as NAM, a number of developing countries were joining the United Nations to voice their discontent with the international economic and social system.

Regional block and alliances have also been formed since then mainly SAARC, ASEAN etc. but the South South co-operation failed to form into an effective political force or power to challenge the hegemony of the US-European block as these countries were by and large, dependent for their growth and survival on these powerful block of nations.

Socio-economic and geo-political changes that have encompassed the world over the last three decade have obviously not left the Afro-Asian countries unaffected. These changes are the collapse of Soviet bloc, the end of the cold war, the emergence of the uni-polar world, marginalised role of the UN system and the victory of the neo-liberal economic and political agenda. These have not only affected the country's international relations but also India's domestic economy and political structures and policies.

In the emerging global situation the international position of the South has considerably weakened. There are a number of reasons for this. The South has become more and more dependent on the West and institutions controlled by the West – the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund. Their domestic economic policies are increasingly dictated by these forces. Economic dependence has reduced their political manoeuvrability in the international arena at a time when the end of the cold war has challenged the '*raison d'être*' of nonalignment. The South has yet to articulate a coherent position in the post-cold war period.

It is in this context that we need to redefine the spirit of the Bandung Conference of 1955. The 50th anniversary pioneered the opportunity to reflect on the challenges that face the developing world. It is not

just issues of development, upliftment and eradication of poverty anymore. Many Third World countries feel that they are politically marginalised and excluded from the benefits of globalisation in a uni-polar world. Hence, the need to invoke the Spirit of Bandung has been deeply felt.

At the recently concluded Conference leaders from countries in Asia and Africa signed the **New Asian- African Strategic Partnership (NAASP)** and the Prime Minister of India felt that Asia and Africa should set their efforts towards the “democratisation of global institutions such as the United Nations, the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund ...and that the need of the hour was horizontal globalisation”. Speaking on behalf of all the Asian countries he emphasised that the solutions to the problems could be found amongst the countries of Asia and Africa itself. Further, the NAM should be used as a valid and effective instrument to ensure the creation of a just and fair global order, and to “make it a vehicle for social and economic emancipation today”. Thus, maintaining horizontal linkage was most important for the countries of Asia and Africa. The decision to meet once every four years as well as the Plan of Action outlined would provide a new momentum to NAASP. Under this plan, the need to promote practical cooperation has been emphasised- cooperation between the two continents in trade, industry, investment, finance, tourism, information and communication technology, energy, health, transportation, agriculture, water resources and fisheries. The goal was for the people of Asia and Africa to live in “stability, prosperity, dignity and free from fears of violence, oppression and injustice”. Existing initiatives that link the two continents, i.e. the Tokyo International Conference on African Development (TICAD), the China-Africa Forum, the India-Africa Cooperation, and Indonesia-Brunei-Dar-es-Salam sponsored South-South Technical Cooperation for Non Aligned Movement Countries etc are to be encouraged and supported further.

Vikas Adhyayan Kendra has dedicated the April 2005 issue of E – Vikalp to revisiting the Spirit of Bandung in the era of a newly globalised world. The challenges offered at the 1st Conference have lingered even today. Again it is the issues of national sovereignty, liberation from poverty and restructuring of global super powers that

have come to the forefront. The Bretton Woods Institutions and the WTO have emerged as the super powers that make or break a nation state. As the countries of Asia and Africa face the growing multifaceted challenges of globalisation and the changing geopolitical situation in the world, it was imperative that the Bandung Conference 2005 be used to discuss issues of poverty and underdevelopment, global peace and security, international terrorism, equitable international economic order, trade relations, the promotion and expansion of investment, erasing the debt burden of the developing countries and the restructuring of the global exercise of power for a sustained development and social justice.

The first article by Joseph P. Widyatmadja called ***“The Bandung 2005- An Alternative Paradigm”*** discusses the history of colonialism in the world and then traces aspects of solidarity, inter-faith and race, and lastly, globalisation. It is in this respect that Bandung’s 50th anniversary becomes an occasion to celebrate a common future rooted in people’s aspirations. The article emphasises the importance of the fact that the summit would not only be a gathering of governments, but also a summit of the people of Asia and Africa. Hence, Bandung 2005 could serve as an alternative paradigm.

The second article is written by Samir Amin and called ***“Laying New Foundations for Solidarity among People of the South”***. As the name suggests the article talks about building solidarity amongst the countries of the South. He traces the history and the significance of the NAM as a result of the first Bandung Conference. He then comes down to the rebirth of a Southern Front post Non-Aligned Summit in Kuala Lumpur. He also provides guidelines for a far reaching alliance as a basis for the eventual reconstruction of solidarity among people and states of the South. Lastly, he provides eight hypotheses forming the basis of the strategic proposals situated in this context.

The third article is written by Hamid Henry and called ***“Revisiting Bandung Spirit: Needed a New Thinking (A Sub Continent Perspective)”***. In the article Hamid Henry examines the historic moment of the Bandung Conference in 1955 in the perspective of propaganda that the people of the developing countries were advised to look towards the West and the United States and their system. He goes on to trace the various military conflicts that are taking place in

South Asia, the role played by NAM and the alliances formed. In this arena, the SAARC comes to play an integrating role and thus further strengthening the Bandung initiative, economically and the increased possibilities of its international role in a world free of threats of war and total annihilation.

The fourth article is titled ***“The Lessons of the Bandung Conference- Revisiting Richard Wright’s The Color Curtain 40 Years Later”*** written by Mathew Quest. The article reviews the book *The Color Curtain* written by Richard Wright in the context of the Bandung Conference in 1955. Mathew Quest reviews the same book in the context of the Golden Jubilee celebrations of the same conference in 2005. The book chronicles the events of the conference in 1955. He examines various aspects from the book such as Non Alignment and Communism, Pan Islam, Pan Arabism, and Pan Africanism and summarises with the fact that though Bandung had helped forge the modern identity politics of race, religion, and nationality, the legacy of the great leaders involved is a sad one. According to him, Nehru, Nasser, Nkrumah, Chou En Li, Ho Chi Minh were in practise authoritarian, undemocratic, sexist and complicit with furthering neo-colonialism and /or establishing state capitalism.

The fifth article is titled ***“Porto Alegre: Today’s Bandung?”*** and written by Michael Hardt. In this article Hardt talks about imagining the World Social Forum in Porto Alegre, the World Economic Forum in New York to be a distant offspring of the historic Bandung Conference. The only difference being Bandung had representatives from Asia and Africa and Porto Alegre was predominantly a white event. He also says that the Porto Alegre forum was celebratory and not conflictual enough on the issue of anti capitalism and national sovereignty.

The sixth article is written by Kinhide Mushakoji and called ***“Bandung Plus 50- A Call for Tri- Continental Dialogue on Global Hegemony”***. The article discusses how equally relevant the second Bandung Conference is in the context of a people’s movement and a new global order. In the write up he has discussed the Bandung Conference in the Cold War context, the new global colonial

(dis)order against global hegemonic governance and lastly, the People's Bandung.

The last article in this issue is titled "***International Research Conference in Bandung – Commemorating the Golden Jubilee of Asia Africa Conference, 1955***". This is a statement issued by IBON International (Philippines) about the meeting that took place recently in April 2005. The write up talks about the challenges that have emerged for the Asia Africa Summit to be held in Bandung from April 22nd - 23rd 2005.

In this issue we have also provided a collected version of smaller write-ups that have emerged on the occasion of the Golden Jubilee celebrations. There are relevant links and web resources provided too.

Revisiting the Spirit of Bandung Celebrating Fifty Years

- **The Bandung 2005- An Alternative Paradigm:** *Josef Purnama Widyatmadja*
- **Laying New Foundations For Solidarity Among People Of The South:** *Samir Amin*
- **Revisiting Bandung Spirit: Needed a New Thinking (A Sub-Continent Perspective):** *Henry Hamid*
- **The Lessons of the Bandung Conference - Reviewing Richard Wright's *The Color Curtain* 40 Years Later :** *Matthew Quest*
- **Porto Alegre: Today's Bandung?:** *Michael Hardt*
- **Bandung Plus 50 - A Call for a Tri-Continental Dialogue on Global Hegemony:** *Kinhide Mushakoji*
- **International Research Conference in Bandung - Commemorating the Golden Jubilee of Asia Africa Conference 1955**
- **Other Articles on the Fiftieth Anniversary of the Bandung Conference**
 - China visit unites people of the South- *Letter from the President*

- The Spirit Of Bandung - Address to the International Conference in Support of the Liberation Movements of Southern Africa and in Support of the FRONTLINE States, *Lusaka, APRIL 10, 1979*
- I wish I had met Richard Wright at Bandung in 1955 (reflections on a conference attended by both Wright and the author) – *The Mississippi Quarterly, Spring 1997, Zhang Yan*
- Remarks by H.E. DR. N. Hassan Wirajuda (Minister for Foreign Affairs) of the Republic of Indonesia At The Launching of the Theme and Logo for The Asian-African Summit 2005 and The Golden Jubilee Commemoration of the Asian-African Conference 1995
- An Afro Dalit Story- www.raceandhistory.com
- Interreligious and Intercultural Charter on Global Solidarity for Life: *Wolfgang R. Schmidt, Bangkok-Herrischried, October 2003*

References and Links on Bandung Conference – 50 Years

1. **Fifty years on from the 1st Bandung Conference - Pedro Azze Besil** (*Special for Granma International*)
<http://granmai.cubaweb.com/ingles/2005/abril/mier6/15bandung.html>
2. **BANDUNG+50: The Conference 50 Years Later- Marian's Blog**
http://marian.typepad.com/marians_blog/2005/01/bandung50_the_c.html
3. **The Spirit of Bandung- Josef Purnama Widyatmadja - *The Jakarta Post*, 6 April 2005**
http://yaleglobal.yale.edu/display_article?id=5521
4. **President Mbeki to lead South African Delegation to Indonesia and Singapore**
<http://www.dfa.gov.za/docs/2005/asia0414.htm>

5. **Foreign Ministry Spokesperson Qin Gang's Press Conference on 12 April 2005**
<http://www.fmprc.gov.cn/eng/xwfw/s2510/t191585.htm>
6. **Myanmar top leader to attend Asian-African summit**
http://english.people.com.cn/200504/18/eng20050418_181572.html
7. **China develops good-neighborly relations with Asian countries** http://news.xinhuanet.com/english/2005-04/19/content_2849910.htm
8. **'Bandung spirit' lives on after 50 years - By Cao Desheng (China Daily)** http://www.chinadaily.com.cn/english/doc/2005-04/19/content_435352.htm
9. **Asia-Africa summit may be sidelined by China-Japan row**
http://www.reuters.co.za/locales/c_newsArticle.jsp;:4264a893:115055d7532235fa?type=topNews&localeKey=en_ZA&storyID=8220337
10. **MMS to release stamp - TIMES NEWS NETWORK[MONDAY, APRIL 18, 2005 10:40:11 AM]**
<http://economictimes.indiatimes.com/articleshow/1080738.cms>
11. **Indonesia re-asserting itself - Dean Yates (Reuters) Jakarta, April 18, 2005 (19:12 IST)**
http://www.hindustantimes.com/news/181_1325216,0005.htm
12. <http://www.raceandhistory.com/historicalviews/>
13. http://www.findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_qa3729
14. http://www.anc.org.za/ancdocs/history/or/or79-6.html#N_1_#N_1

**REVISITING BANDUNG SPIRIT: NEEDED A NEW THINKING
(A Sub-Continent Perspective)**

Hamid Henry

The Bandung Conference (1955) took the whole world by storm. The people in the East, in particular were extremely excited. They welcomed the movement with open arms. Nehru, Sukarno, and Nasser were acclaimed as the world's most popular leaders. The establishment in the US and most of its allies in the West, however, was visibly upset. They could not oppose, for any valid reason, the thrust of the Bandung peace offensive in international politics, which was based directly on the policy of non-alignment in the bi-polar world. They, however, raised issues to blunt the impact of this policy. They said they were not sure of the intentions of the anti-colonist forces in this behalf. When the intentions began to physically manifest themselves within the Third World countries, they began to say that Bandung's success was doubtful. On the other hand, they unleashed propaganda that the pioneers of the Bandung Conference, though claiming to be neutral in the power struggle of the bi-polar world, were essentially left-oriented and seeking

to make alliances for ideological support with the eastern block. It is in the wake of this propaganda that the people of the developing countries were advised to look towards the West and the US and their system. Anti-imperialist struggles must therefore be abandoned and neo-colonialism be accepted as the inevitable fate of the Third World.

This is not meant to examine in detail the development of non-alignment policy during the past 50 odd years and then to analyze the essence of the Bandung Spirit and its offshoot the Non-Aligned Movement (NAM) based on the principle of struggle against imperialism and neo-colonialism and the use of moderation in relations with all big powers. Suffice it to say that the transformation of the exploitative system into the new arrangement based on the Bandung Spirit was the inevitable dialectical process going on in the Third World – the process which did not cease in the post-colonial societies and which was now manifesting itself in the movement that sought to remove the bottlenecks in the creation of a new society on the basis of Panch Sheela (five principles) i.e. respect for sovereignty and

territorial integrity, mutual non-aggression, non-interference in each others internal affairs, equality and mutual benefit and peaceful co-existence without indulging into the 'ideological rivalry' of the super powers. These principles aimed to reorganize the super structure, economic as well as political, keeping in view the state of development of the Third World societies and its future needs. It required re-assessment of formulations enormously made and to reshape international relations on the basis of new thinking. Bandung and its off shoot NAM – and subsequently their under currents SAARC and ASEAN - in short, were measures to enrich the Third World societies by taking it to new heights of “collective and cooperative peace” and social development with the “spiritual and moral force” of Asia and Africa and through diplomacy based on ‘constructive pragmatism’. The new thinking aimed to involve entire people both intellectually as well as physically in the building of egalitarian societies in the poor countries. It recognized the need of uniting all the people of the Third World for establishing peace, advancing the cause of suffering humanity and containing the evil desires of the war mongers.

The cold war was not the sole or only critical issue on the agenda of the Bandung/NAM. A cursory glance at the history of the NAM reveals three basic elements, which influenced the approaches of the Movement to international issues. These are the right of independent judgment, the struggle against imperialism and neo-colonialism, and the use of moderation in relations with all big powers. In the present day context the Movement not only remains focused on the above areas but also works towards the restructuring of the international economic order.

It is now 57 years since the Indian Sub-continent overthrew the suppressive rule of the colonizers. The great Independence Movement was accomplished by forging “the unity of lot” and by creating “unity of attitude and unity feeling”. The colonial history of the Third World countries tells us that the poor people of these countries fought a heroic battle against imperialist forces. Although they lost many battles yet they offered countless sacrifices to save their national and cultural identity in the face of ruthless imperialism and colonialism. As Albert Camus says, their cry was: “Don’t walk in front of me, I may not follow. Don’t walk behind me, I may not lead. Just walk beside me and be my friend”.

In the wake of World War II, liberation movements in several colonized countries took decisive shape. They achieved independence with the right of self-determination. The internal

and external victories of the liberated countries echoed what Martinique Aime Cesaire says: “We do not wish to revive a dead society... we must create a new society... rich with all the productive capacity of today, warm with all the brotherhood of old.” It looked to a leadership – political, religious and traditional – with a social vision rooted in the spirituality of a common future, a spirit of freedom and hope. As Nehru observes: “It is the spirituality of a common future, which brings people from different faiths to work together for justice, peace and equality for all. It will continue to stay, as a beacon guiding the future progress of Asia and Africa”. To eliminate the dangers to the world peace and to enable to usefully employ the Bandung spirit for development of the Third World a new thinking is necessary to develop – a new pragmatic thinking where the entire Third World, notwithstanding the differences in social systems, must act in unison. None else but the great anti-colonial leaders who had led the freedom movements in the colonized lands advanced the idea of peaceful co-existence.

There are several aspects of Bandung initiative, national and international, organizational, economic, social, cultural, world peace and humanistic and it is difficult to understand its true spirit without contemplating the contemporary realities of Asia and Africa, where about two and a half billion people are suffering under the miseries of poverty, hunger, malnutrition, illiteracy, ignorance, inhuman living conditions, alarming child mortality and epidemics which are the common features of these people suffering under a neo-colonial structure of societies. And against the backdrop of these realities one sees a need of revitalizing the spirit of Bandung, for global stability will only be realized if poverty, hunger and injustice are overcome.

During the post-colonial era, regional conflicts were created, maintained and further aggravated by the imperialist states.

There has been no end to the provocative activity of the imperialist countries against national liberation movements and the states with patriotic regimes, arms purchases are increasing, military industrial complexes of the imperialist countries are further encouraging the militarized activities in the Third World.

Trans-national Corporations are sucking the wealth of developing countries and the economic productivity in these countries is in a state of further deterioration.

The general situation in the Sub-continent is also not different from the other developing countries as all the three major

countries India, Pakistan and Bangladesh have adopted the capitalist road of development and are under the imperialist domination. These countries have common factors of miseries of poverty, hunger, illiteracy, ignorance, unemployment, inhuman living conditions, lack of medical care, national, ethnic and communal conflicts etc. with more or less inter connecting common social, cultural and linguistic relations. But the situation of democratic institutions and traditions and the level of political consciousness of the people is different in each of these states which is also very important to consider for the assessment of the effects and implications of Bandung and NAM with regard to regional and international peace, human rights situation, restructuring economic system, democratization, and the working class movement.

After independence of the Sub-continent from the British colonial rule in 1947, the dominating ruling class in India was the national bourgeoisie with their own party being the Indian National Congress which had adopted the road to capitalist development by abolishing big feudalism and the princely states

with secular and bourgeois democratic principles at the state level. Thus by successive democratic elections under its constitution, the democratic institutions and traditions are strengthened. India from its very independence has adopted a very balanced foreign policy and later on in 1961 became one of the pioneers of forming the non-aligned movement of the Third World countries and since then playing a major role in the regional and international politics. Internally, the Indian bourgeois ruling classes could not solve the socio-economic, national ethnic problems like any other country under the capitalist system, rather the situation has been aggravated by the development of monopolies in India and by the entrance of the Trans-national Corporations as their allies and partners for further plundering the wealth of the Indian people causing further miseries of life.

The former Indian Prime Minister, I.K. Gujral is famous for a speech he made when foreign minister in January 1997 at Colombo, during which he delineated a new direction that Indian foreign policy, could and should take in its relations with its South Asian neighbors. The ideas embodied in that speech he named after himself as the Gujral Doctrine. The Gujral Doctrine enunciated five principles that were borrowed from the earlier *Punch Sheela* agreement, signed between China and India on April 9, 1954, that in turn derived its provisions

from clauses in the UN Charter. Although, the overt purpose of the 1954 agreement was to facilitate Sino-India trade through Tibet, it reflected wider aspirations – the desire to establish a “solid foundation for peace and security”, so that “the fears and apprehensions that exist today would give place to a feeling of confidence”. Jawahar Lal Nehru’s apprehension was obvious: he feared China’s hegemony, and therefore sought reassurance. Under the Gujral Doctrine 43 years later, India aimed at placating the fears and apprehensions amongst its smaller neighbors – Sri Lanka, Bangladesh, Bhutan, The Maldives and Nepal. India did not ask them for “reciprocity”, only “good faith and trust”. However, India did expect that no South Asian country would “allow its territory to be used against the interests of another country in the region”, or “interfere in the internal affairs of another”. Further, all South Asian countries would “respect each others territorial integrity and sovereignty”, and would “settle their disputes through peaceful bilateral negotiations”. Implicitly, relations between India and Pakistan fell outside the Gujral Doctrine because they were already covered most notably by the Simla Agreement of 1972.

While considering the socio-political situation in Pakistan, one notes complete different scenario. At the time of independence the society was tribal and feudal in general, the national bourgeoisie was non-existent. Some Muslim capitalists shifted from India to Pakistan finding a completely free and open market for the development of their capital. The political power went in the hands of feudal lords and civil bureaucrats. By characteristic of the ruling classes, the capitalist road of development was adopted without abolishing the big land holdings and without

introducing any land reforms. Even after a long struggle of the people of Pakistan for democratic rights and establishment of civil rule no fundamental change took place in the economic and foreign policy of Pakistan although all the democratic forces in Pakistan are with the democratic process against the forces of reaction and retrogression.

The dispute with India on the Kashmir issue forced Pakistan to look towards the West for support and for its national security. At a very early point after the death of Quaid-I-Azam Mohammad Ali Jinnah (father of the nation), Pakistan took a strategic decision to seek an alliance with the West. This relationship was a reactive one because of the Indian proximity to the Soviet Union, even though India ostensibly professed non-alignment. The Indo-Soviet relationship enabled Indian armed forces and its economy to have hardware and economic support. Pakistan at the time had no other option. During President Ayub Khan's military rule of one decade the strategic partnership with the West was cemented through SEATO and CENTO. Pakistan became a key Western ally in the cold war against the communist block. The region saw the 1965 and 1971 wars between India and Pakistan during Ayub Khan and Yahya Khan's military rule respectively. However, when ZA Bhutto was in power (1972-77), there was some remarkable success in the field of foreign policy. For example, it was in that period that the Shimla Accord was signed. It was also during his tenure that Pakistan became an important member of the non-aligned world. And because of the 1973 Arab-Israel war, the oil embargo and the OIC summit in Lahore, Pakistan became one of the principal players in the Muslim and the non-aligned world. This period came to an end with the removal of ZA Bhutto from power by Gen Zia in 1977. With the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan in 1979, Pakistan suddenly came at the center stage of the great game played during the cold war.

In an unprecedented move, President of Pakistan, Gen Pervez Musharraf proposed a 'simple' solution to the Kashmir dispute in an interview with India's 'Asian Age' newspaper published on October 13, 2004. According to a press report (the daily Dawn, Karachi, October 14, 2004) Gen Musharraf "sees a 'simple' solution to the Kashmir dispute: India should pull troops out of the Himalayan territory and agree to a compromise over its status". Gen Musharraf said both sides needed to step back from these 'maximalist' positions after which, he added, they could find a solution in just a day if they really wanted to. "It is simple – identify the region, demilitarize it and change its status," he told. Last year, Gen Musharraf told Reuters he could set aside Pakistan's demand for a plebiscite and meet India half-way. At that time he also suggested Pakistan was not really interested in the mainly Hindu Jammu region or Buddhist Ladakh, but only in the Muslim majority Valley, the nucleus of a 15-year resistance against Indian rule. Gen Musharraf, speaking on the fifth anniversary (12 October) of his taking power in a coup, said both sides needed to recognize the other's concerns. "We are at present on a maximalist course: if there has to be an agreement, both sides have to step down," he said. "I know that Pakistan cannot dictate terms to India, and also that there can be no military solution", he said. What President Musharraf said in this interview echoes the Bandung spirit and implies an unprecedented new thinking in the bilateral relations between India and Pakistan.

Subsequently, as reported in the press (Dawn, Karachi, October 25, 2004) President Musharraf called for a national debate on ways to resolve the Kashmir dispute, with options to include independence or joint control of the Himalayan state. The President proposed identifying the available regions, demilitarizing them and changing their status before looking for possible options to resolve the dispute. He said the status quo

in Kashmir was unacceptable. As a starting point for a step-by-step approach on the option of demilitarization, Gen Musharraf said the regions on both sides of the Kashmir divide would need to be analyzed for local culture and demographic composition. After identifying these regions, there could be gradual demilitarization following which the two sides could discuss whose control these areas should be under, he said. He proposed that Pakistan and India could also have joint control of these areas or the United Nations could be asked to play a role. "It is just a proposal, food for thought, on a way to finding a permanent solution, he said.

As Pakistan and India prepare for the second round of their dialogue, it is encouraging that a sense of realism is beginning to mark the approach of the two governments. Islamabad and New Delhi have now considered it fit to keep their negotiations away from the media glare and not create exaggerated expectations about the goodwill that has come to characterize their exchanges. But more than that, both have come to realize – and have even conceded to each other – that they will have to

move away from their respective fixed positions on Kashmir and explore new options. In this context, President Pervez Musharraf has done the right thing by calling for a debate on Kashmir options. He has rightly said that the status quo offers no solution. In the past neither war nor diplomacy has produced any definitive results. With no solution on the basis of UNCIP resolutions in sight, common sense demands that alternative approaches be tried rather than remaining stuck in the old groove.

President Musharraf has called for a debate to explore new openings. This would have two advantages. First, it should encourage people to think of new solutions which they have not tried for many years, having been conditioned to think of the UNCIP resolutions as being the only feasible basis, for a Kashmir solution. Secondly, by holding a debate the government will allow new ideas and proposals to be discussed out of which something feasible may emerge. That is how countries which have lived with an unresolved problem for years have managed to extricate themselves from a bad situation. This has also given them the time to prepare public opinion for an

impending change in outlook by educating the public about the pros and cons of a new approach. There have been cases when the compulsions of history and politics and the pressure of public opinion have forced even a mighty state to accept an about turn in its policy. The sagacity of a leadership is proved by its ability to carry the people along with it in a situation of change, to lead rather than be led. It does not have to impose its will on the people if it can persuade them that a change is essential and inevitable.

After having fed the public on a lot of propaganda for over 50 years, the establishment has led the people to believe that Kashmir can be taken with the force of arms and that every Kashmiri wants the state to join Pakistan. Now a strong section of opinion in Pakistan – though a small one – knows that this approach will only harm us. The peace activists want peace with India and believe that other options are feasible which would satisfy the Kashmiris as well. It is also time that the people of Kashmir on both sides of the LoC are treated as the key

stakeholders who should have a major say in the debate on the options being explored.

In Bangladesh also, after a short period of civil rule, Sheikh Mujeeb-ur-Rehman's Awami League in coordination with other left and democratic forces started to introduce economic reforms and decentralization of power at the lower level, but the military took over and since then brutalities against the peoples power and militarization is being observed by the world at large in the country.

Regional conflicts between the states of the Sub-continent, especially India and Pakistan, are long existing since independence under considered policy of British colonial rulers and these conflicts have become a source of military build-up and a major part of national budgets of these countries is being spent on import of military hardware and building of arms industries. In Pakistan about 80% of the national budget is being allocated and spent on the defense, debt servicing and

administration. Total budget on the social sector is not coming more than 10%, which includes hardly 3.5% for education and health.

Apart from political domination and imperialist economic exploitation in the Sub-continent, the physical presence of military bases like Diego Garcia and naval fleets in the Indian Ocean are a source of constant danger to the peace and political stability in the region against which the people of the region in general and India in particular are constantly demanding for a free Indian Ocean and establishment of a peace zone.

With this scenario of socio-political situation in the Sub-continent in mind as well as this short assessment of the socio-economic conditions of the South Asian countries, when we see the implications of Bandung with regard to new political thinking in the international relations, the thrust of the Bandung spirit has deep and clear impacts. It has made possible a dialogue between the developing countries. It has improved inter-state

relations between the East and the West and it has also made possible settlement of regional and local conflicts.

SAARC and ASEAN are indeed new manifestation of the Bandung Spirit and a desire for peaceful co-existence of the Asian countries. In 1995, the ASEAN heads of states and governments re-affirmed that “cooperative peace and shared prosperity shall be the fundamental goals of ASEAN”. The ASEAN represents the collective will of the nations to bind themselves together in friendship and cooperation and, through joint efforts and sacrifices, secure for their peoples and for posterity the blessings of peace, freedom and prosperity. The ASEAN Declaration states that the aims and purposes of the Association are: (i) to accelerate the economic growth, social progress and cultural development in the region through joint endeavors in the spirit of equality and partnership in order to strengthen the foundation for a prosperous and peaceful community of Southeast Asian nations, and (ii) to promote regional peace and stability through abiding respect for justice and the rule of law in the relationship among countries in the

region and adherence to the principles of the United Nations

Charter.

SAARC is a manifestation of the determination of the peoples of South Asia to work together towards finding solutions to their common problems in a spirit of friendship, trust and understanding and to create an order based on mutual respect, equity and shared benefits. The main goal of the Association is to accelerate the process of economic and social development in member states, through joint action in the agreed areas of cooperation. Cooperation within the framework of SAARC is based on respect for the principles of sovereign equality, territorial integrity, political independence, non-interference in the internal affairs of other states and mutual benefit. Such cooperation is to complement and not to substitute bilateral or multilateral cooperation and should be consistent with bilateral and multilateral obligations of the member states. The Second SAARC Summit (Bangalore, 1986) laid special emphasis on promoting people-to-people contact in the region and approved different initiatives for trust building among the member countries.

To further strengthening the Bandung initiative, economy and the increased possibilities of its international role in a world free of threats of war and total annihilation, is a matter which has its direct impact on the totality of the world situation and in particular on the situation in developing countries which continue to suffer from the neo-colonial strangleholds. However, the revival of the Bandung spirit together with a new political thinking and constructive pragmatism reminds us that ideological differences should not be transferred to the inter-

state relations, nor should foreign policy be subordinated to them, for ideologies may be poles apart, whereas the interest of survival and prevention of war stand universal and supreme. In the final analysis, problems of human survival have priority over all other struggles including the class struggle.

The strength and confidence of A-A Conference and its concern for higher human values has been proved by its peace initiatives. Its principles can be universally applied, particularly in states having totally different and backward socio-economic structures and political forces, who continue to suffer under monarchies, sheikhdoms, kingdoms, remnants of tribalism, feudalism, primitive and higher stages of capitalist development and where the multinationals are not allowing the building of home industry and market. The working class and peoples movements in these countries are adopting the course of just struggle for the independence of their economy from the stranglehold of neo-colonial system. However, the fact remains that imperialism continues to be the main cause of miseries and continues to pose a threat to world peace. Elimination of war is

the first priority. This is the common objective of all the people of the world. But as long as the people of Asia and Africa remain subjugated, the imperialists shall thrive. Peace initiatives blunt their war machinery and armament production while the struggle of developing nations for economic and social independence, breaks the hegemony of imperialist powers - a condition precedent for long-term peace and a necessary basis for social development.

The rise of globalization, growing economic interdependence, spread of new international organizations and the power of multinationals suggest that the future lies in new forms of global and regional governance. Iraq's recent resistance movement has reminded the world of the power of self-determination, of the resentment felt against rule by an overweening power from an alien culture and race. This was the lesson of the anti-colonial struggles, which somehow had been conveniently forgotten.

What would be the future of South Asian people against the tidal wave of globalization? This and other questions are indeed the vital issues that arise today. A correct answer to these alone shall free the people of that world which has come to be known as the third world. The explosion of knowledge, modern information technology, the growth of means of transportation and communication have enabled different cultures and

civilizations to positively interact and bring about that unity in diversity which is essential to achieve for the unity of humankind. In the garb of globalization, the powers that be are operating in a uni-polar world under the tutelage of the most advanced monopoly capitalism of the US. Following in the footprints of colonial imperialism, they are bent upon destroying everything worthwhile in the civilizations and cultures of Third World countries.

The prevailing desperation is the result of globalization and the war on terror. The question is, will the weak be able to organize themselves to bring about changes or not? Will the weak develop an internal strength and a political strength to challenge the rulers that are? These are the questions posed by the world in which we live; and which makes the Bandung message relevant even today.

Bibliography

1. NAM, ASEAN & SAARC Websites.
2. Statement of Jawahar Lal Nehru reported in daily Dawn, Karachi, August 26, 1954.
3. “*Let a New Asia and a New Africa be Born!*” speech by President Sukarno at the opening of the Asia-Africa Conference, April 18, 1955.
4. Siddiqui, Kamil, “*The Gujral doctrine*”, daily Dawn, Karachi, January 25, 1997.

5. "Co-Chairs' Statement: Asian-African Sub-Regional Organizations Conference, Bandung, Indonesia, 29-30 July 2003..
6. Saif, Samiur Rahman, "*The rebel: Albert Camus*", Dawn, Karachi, September 12, 2004.
7. Barsamian, David, [quoting Tariq Ali] "*Louder than Bombs*", Dawn Magazine, Karachi, September 19, 2004.
8. Excerpts from the interview of President Musharraf reported in daily Dawn, Karachi, October 14, 2004.
9. Jacques, Martin, "*The nation state still thrives*", daily Dawn, Karachi, October 24, 2004.
10. Khalique, Ibrahim Khalique, "*For the love of Lucknow*", Dawn Magazine, Karachi, October 24, 2004.
11. Interview entitled "*The future is bleak*" of Sardar Assef Ahmed Ali, former Foreign Minister of Pakistan (1993-1996) appeared in daily Dawn, Karachi, October 24, 2004.
12. Statement of President Musharraf appeared in daily Dawn, Karachi, October 25, 2004.
13. Aijazuddin, F.S., "*Gujral Doctrine revisited*", daily Dawn, Karachi, October 25, 2004.
14. Editorail of daily Dawn, Karachi, October 27, 2004.

International Research Conference in Bandung

Commemorating the Golden Jubilee of Asia Africa Conference 1955

We the participants from 14 countries and 40 organizations have gathered at the Permata Bidakara Hotel, Bandung 14-15 April 2005 to commemorate the spirit and vision of the Asia-Africa Conference held fifty years ago.

The Asia-Africa conference was the culmination of the struggles of the peoples of Africa and Asia for national independence, freedom from colonialism and a just and equitable society. The Bandung Declaration committed the states of Asia and Africa to ten principles of peaceful co-existence including: respect for territorial integrity, non-aggression, non-interference, equality and welfare. The conference brought together the nations oppressed by colonialism and imperialism in Asia and Africa to resist domination and militarism and to build solidarities of the peoples.

Fifty years later, we find that formal independence has not automatically led to the end of economic exploitation, militaristic intervention, cultural oppression and all other features of domination and control under capitalism and colonialism. Though Bandung called for a free Palestine today Palestine is under more intensive occupation and the list of states under occupation has increased with US occupation of Iraq and Afghanistan.

The people of Indonesia, hosts of Bandung conferences then and now, find themselves trapped in debt and poverty, environmental degradation, political intervention and erosion of their democratic aspirations.

The victory of Western imperialism at the end of the Cold War has created a new and unprecedented situation for the peoples of Asia, Africa and others in the South Economically, the capitalist-imperialist policies have intensified the appropriation of the wealth of Asia and Africa to capitalist nations. Politically, the people are subjected to violation of their democratic rights, new forms of militarism, fundamentalisms and violation of national sovereignty. Culturally, ever more sophisticated means of subordination through control of mass media, and propagation of monocultural consumerism,

masquerading as cultural freedom has colonized the minds of the people.

At this juncture the Asia Africa Summit to be held in Bandung from 22-23 April 2005 faces major challenges. We call upon the leaders of Asia and Africa gathered at the meeting to act on the pledges made by their predecessors at the first Bandung conference. More specifically, we call upon them to reject the proposals for UN reforms in the report "In Larger Freedom" as suggested by the UN Secretary General to the forthcoming Summit. We demand that the leaders at the Summit:

1. Resist increasing militarism in the region and condemn the continuous unilateral military interventions by Western powers, in particular the US, against sovereign nations under the pretext of war against terrorism.
2. Oppose international economic policies which exploit people and resources of the South, demand debt cancellation, introduce comprehensive equitable land reforms and commit to peaceful means for ending conflicts.
3. Disengage from, and work for the abolishment of undemocratic financial and trade institutions such as the WB, IMF and WTO and commit the States of the region to the democratization and fundamental reform of the UN.
4. Ensure democratic rights and civil liberties of peoples within the countries of the region, including the right to determine their economic, political and cultural futures.
5. To renew the pledge to defend the right of self-determination of peoples against imperialist powers.

Today we the people and social movements present here in Bandung reaffirm our commitment to continue the struggle for independence, self-determination and peace against imperialist war and globalization.

Jazminda Lumang-Buncan

General Secretary
Asia Pacific Research Network
C/o IBON Foundation, Inc.
3/F SCC Bldg., 4427 Interior Old Sta. Mesa,
Manila 1008 PHILIPPINES
Tel Nos. +632-7141831, 7132729, 7132737
Fax No. +632-7160108
Email: secretariat@aprnet.org
URL: www.aprnet.org

The Bandung 2005 - An Alternative Paradigm

Josef Purnama Widyatmadja

Afro-Asian solidarity and friendship is rooted in the history of African and Asian people. This solidarity and friendship is based on freedom, mutual respect and not on conquest, slavery, occupation and colonialism. As a historian once said, 'When Columbus came to the American continent, and Vasco da Gama came to Cape of Hope, they took land and brought native people to be slaves. But fifty years before the voyage of Columbus and Vasco da Gama, the admiral of Ming dynasty Chenghe, from China (1421) had reached Africa and Asia countries. He did not bring a single person to be enslaved and neither did he occupy an inch of local land. Instead of bringing local people to be enslaved and occupying native lands, Chenghe promoted technological, cultural and goods exchanged. Free and fair trade between Africa and Asia came about through the Silk Road.

For several centuries, African and Asian countries were under severe exploitation and oppression by colonialists. They lost their economic and political sovereignty. The struggle for independence and freedom spread throughout Africa and Asia for centuries. During the cold war, newly independent African and Asian countries were at crossroad in choosing whether to be part of the communist bloc led by Soviet Union or the capitalist block led by United States. The African and Asia leaders tried to avoid becoming objects of these super power blocs. These leaders decided to master their own destiny and history by creating an alternative bloc based on freedom and a common future through the Asia-Africa Conference in that was held in Bandung, Indonesia on 18-24 April 1955.

The Conference successfully promoted notions of peace and justice not only in Asia and Africa but also the whole world considering the context of cold war. The conference delegates came from independent Asian and African states and they also included representatives from liberation movements from Africa and Asia. In a supremely bold and visionary manner, liberation movements from Africa (Ghana and South Africa) and Asia (Malaysia) were invited to participate in the meeting. In addition, Adam Clayton, the Black

American civil right movement leader from Harlem, New York, also attended the conference. The desire and hope for a new and just world united people from the two continents. It was a new departure in the world history that the leaders of African and Asia peoples could meet to discuss and deliberate upon matters of common future.

Inter faith and race

In Bandung, different races and religions of Asia and Africa met on equal footing and dignity. Diversity in race, language, and religions did not divide people's solidarity. It was not an Islamic Conference, a Christian Conference or a Buddhist Conference. It was not a meeting of Malay, of Arabs, nor one Chinese or Aryan stock. It was neither an exclusive club nor a bloc that sought to oppose any other bloc. Rather it was a body of enlightened, bearing tolerant opinion that sought to impress on the world that all people and all countries had their place under the sun. It impressed on the world that it was possible to live together, meet and speak to each other without losing one's individual identity and to contribute to the general understanding of matters of common future, and to develop a true consciousness of the inter-dependence of people and nations for their well-being and survival on earth. All religions worked together to promote peace with justice -- worked together to look for a new world without oppression and weapon of mass destruction.

The unity and solidarity of Afro Asia became a key in establishing a new world order, as Soekarno pointed out:

“ When the Lion Sai Dragon of China works together with then New Nandi Cow of India, with the Sphinx of Egypt and the Peacock of Burma, with the White Elephant of Siam with the Hydra of Vietnam, with the Tigers from the Philippines and with the Banteng Bull of Indonesia, then it is certain that international colonialism will be smashed to bit ...”.

The Spirit of Bandung empowered the struggles for political freedom in Ghana, South Africa, Algiers, Congo, Angola and Mozambique. At that time, Afro-Asia countries did not have military and economic power. They had only the power of solidarity in diplomacy. The people of Africa and Asia had little physical power and guns. They

expressed solidarity in common struggle through international diplomacy and commitment.

Solidarity

A good example of solidarity among oppressed countries was manifested by India during the struggle of the Indonesian people for freedom and independence. India convened a Conference of Afro-Asian Nations in New Delhi to protest against the injustice committed by the Netherlands against Indonesia and to lend support to Indonesia's struggle. The diplomacy blockade was broken! The Indonesian delegates flew to New Delhi and learned, first hand, of the massive support that was being given to Indonesia's struggle for national freedom. Solidarity among Africans and Asians is not only the business of government, but as a people's concern.

In 1952, America imposed embargoes upon Sri Lanka and China. During the Korean War, it made economic intimidation to China and Sri Lanka. This made it impossible for China to buy rubber from the rubber-producing countries such as Malaysia. At the same time, Sri Lanka was forced to buy rice from Ecuador and America on very expensive price. Sri Lanka then attempted to get 50 million U.S. dollars loan to resolve their country's problem of starvation but they failed. Hard economic crises hit Sri Lanka because the international price of rubber, palm oil and tea fell sharply and the price of rice was dramatically increased by 38% from 1951-1952. The extraordinary high price of rice was unbearable by Sri Lanka. At that most crucial time, the Minister of Trade of Sri Lanka, R.G. Senanayake, bravely took a very controversial decision. He signed a letter of trading cooperation, which was later known as the Rubber Rice Pact, with China in 1952. The deals in the Rubber Rice Pact allowed Sri Lanka to buy rice from China at a price lower than the world market price. In return, China would buy rubber from Sri Lanka at a more expensive price. This economic cooperation lasted until 1977.

Tragedy

The Spirit of Bandung's significance lies in the clearly stated conviction that there were alternatives outside the two giant political blocs of the Cold War era. The leaders clearly decided not to join either bloc. The chosen methods of liberation and political transformation were to be non-violence and persuasion, not the use

of power and military force. The participating countries also agreed to enforce moral and ethical values as the foundations for nations and people to live out lives of equal opportunity> Tragically, the struggles and processes that emanated from Bandung suffered an abrupt standstill because of the brutal assassinations of its key leaders or military coups such as Nkrumah of Ghana, Patrice Lumumba of Congo, Sukarno of Indonesia and Nasser of Egypt. The light from Bandung dimmed and gradually evaporated into the political wilderness. The vacuum this left proved disastrous, notable in the post Cold-war era and the emergence of a uni-polar world accompanied by the unified actions of the rich trading blocks in Europe, Japan, and North America through economic globalization.

Globalisation is not a new phenomenon. The Spirit of Bandung has predicted its emergence as a new threat. Colonialism has not really died. Because colonial powers have been compelled to give way to national rule, globalisation is the colonialism that has appeared appears in a new dress. Sularno had mentioned the same in his opening address in Bandung in 1955. In addition Kwame Nkrumah in his speech in “Fourth Afro Asia Solidarity Conference” in Winneba May 10th 1965 spelled out clearly as following: *“The emergence of African and Asian independence made necessary for imperialism to invent and put into operations methods of exploitation which were almost unknown before in the era of colonialism. In the newly independence countries, indigenous force had found as secret partners and agents in the process of exploitation”*.

Today, after the war on terror and globalisation, the world has become a monopolar world. Those who have military and economic power can impose their will to intervene and invade other weaker nations. The U.N. has functioned well because certain rich countries could control the world body.

People’s voice

We are encouraged to learn that the fiftieth anniversary celebration of the historic Bandung Conference for Afro Asia Solidarity will be held in Bandung, Indonesia from 18- 22 April 2005. It is also encouraging to know that certain NGO groups, people’s movement and faith based group are making parallel

plans to celebrate the Spirit of Bandung by voicing the people's perspective on the meaning of the Afro-Asia solidarity in the age of globalization. Coming from various backgrounds and continents, these NGOs plan to organize a People's Summit on "***The Bandung Spirit- Towards a Common Future rooted in peoples aspirations.***" Its intent is to articulate and revise the Bandung Spirit from the perspective of the processes of globalisation that has, in reality, victimized millions of peoples.

The summit will effectively serve as an encounter for those whose political journeys have been similar to the struggle to dismantle colonialism and in its place, install democratic political institutions that will bring justice, development, and dignity to the peoples of Africa and Asia. People from Africa and Asia also demand that their respective governments oblige to respect and uphold human rights and democracy. In addition, these governments should also dismantle all forms of discrimination within their own nations. No ethnic and religious group should be subject to discrimination under the new Spirit of Bandung. The encounter will serve to generate and recover the spirit of the anti-colonial struggles and all other forms of struggles against discrimination- both domestically and internationally. It would also generate fresh energy for a renewed struggle against colonialism's newest form and structure-globalisation. Hopefully, it will not stop at that. Logically, and ideally it must proceed to initiate a continuous stream of encounters between people across the social, economic, and political spectrum and between the two continents. In more ways than one, large parts of Africa and Asia share a common political experience and heritage- the colonial experience, and an enormous array of common cultural characteristics. If indeed, the new spirit of Bandung must reach at its original and intended destination, then there is no question that it will come only from active interventions and organizations of people. Governments today need to be prodded, pressured, and supported to keep alive the spirit of Bandung based on clear and concrete alternative to what has become of Afro Asia realities.

The Bandung Spirit of 2005 must not only be a gathering of governments, but also be the summit of the people of Africa and Asia. The 1955 conference in Bandung confronted the reality of the old

form of colonialism. Bandung 1955 became a spiritual force for the anti-colonial struggles around the world. Bandung 2005 faces a somewhat different geo-political situation.

The “War on Terror” has further divided the marginalized. The war on terror, however, is a strategic moral weapon and a camouflage in the hands of market forces to gain legitimacy in their attempt to determine what is normative. Unlike the time of Bandung 1955, colonial forces today determine what is good and what is evil.

People are no longer in the outdated eras of colonialism and the cold war. People are under a new dress of colonialism and the “war on terror”. Religious and ethnic conflicts, border disputes and economic competition have hindered the solidarity of Asian and Africa people in eliminating the roots of poverty and conflict. The people forget that their real enemy is economic exploitation and military threats from global powers. There is still a way out from the old and new forms of colonialism. The voice of this spirit and vision is indeed small and almost inaudible and trivialized by mass media and many people, but the voice will echo across time and space and will firmly enter and dwell in the hearts of those with have good will. They are the dreamers and the advocators of a world where wolves and lambs can live and eat together, and tigers and lions are no longer a threat to goats and lambs. The Christians are no longer a threat to the Moslems and Hindus, and the other way around. China is neither a rival of India nor an enemy of America, and Timor Lorosae is no longer afraid of Indonesia. It is a new world full of justice and peace. This is an alternative paradigm: a new Spirit of Bandung, a Spirit of Common Future.

Bandung Plus 50

A Call for a Tri-Continental Dialogue on Global Hegemony

Kinhide Mushakoji

Introduction

The year 2005 will be the fiftieth anniversary of the Bandung Afro-Asian Conference. This paper is an attempt to present a few arguments about the importance to hold a second Bandung Conference, broadened to the Tri-Continental regions including Latin America and the Caribbean region in it. The Second Bandung should be a Peoples' Bandung, while the First Bandung Conference was a Conference of the newly emerging States of Asia and Africa. This is because the realities of the Post-Cold-War globalization require the peoples to form a larger counter- hegemonic alliance, whereas in 1955, it was the new nations who were the only agents of change who decided to form a counter-hegemonic alliance in face of the Cold War bi-hegemony.

We will first present an overview of what Bandung meant to the emerging Third World during the Cold War. We will try to show that it played a historical role in starting-off a process of counter-hegemonic activities which developed political, economic and cultural projects which succeeded in putting an end to the Cold War. We will then analyze the new hegemonic order which was formed at the end of the Cold War led to the emergence of a uni-trinitary hegemony of the United States in a Trilateral alliance with Europe and Japan, where the major agents of Bandung were co-opted by the hegemonic alliance. This is why a new Bandung has to propose a new project to form a new counter hegemonic coalition.

This paper is not meant to present a complete picture of the historical and contemporary conditions which call for a Second Bandung. It will only propose a few entry points for further dialogue among the social forces to be involved. It is assumed that the organic intellectuals of the Third World will develop further the points made in this very preliminary discussion about Bandung plus 50.

The Bandung Conference in the Cold War Context

The Bandung Conference has played a constructive role in mobilizing the counter-hegemonic forces of what was to become known as the Third World against the bi-hegemony which emerged in the Post World-War-II period, a (post-colonial, neo-colonial) global colonial period.

The Bandung Conference proposed ten principles for the counter-hegemonic alliance of the newly emerging nations. These principles were based on the Pancha Silla, the five principles of peaceful co-existence which were proposed as an inter-State framework for all the counter-hegemonic nations to form an alliance in spite of their political, economic and cultural differences.

The five principles enabled the cooperation of not-only the States but also the people of Asia and Africa, to which the Latin American States joined in later. The Principles, first proclaimed by India and China, represented an imaginative reformulation of the Modern Western international political framework of the Westphalian system. It based the cooperation among the newly independent States on the Western principles of sovereign States adding to it a non-Western ethical position stressing mutual respect and mutual benefit in the place of the Western concept of international "anarchy".

It was especially meaningful that these principles were first adopted by India and China, two new States with a long imperial history which had accustomed them to put themselves at the centre of a concentric world order of nations of unequal status, which were in spite of their inequality, basing their relations on mutual respect and mutual benefit. Obviously, two such orders could not co-exist without accepting to live in a non-concentric world order recognizing the equality among its members. Thus was proclaimed mutual respect for each-one's territorial sovereignty, affirmed mutual non-intervention, and non interference in each-one's domestic affairs, first by India and China, and then by all the participant nations of the Bandung Conference.

These three principles, already regulating the relations among the Western modern States, were of special relevance for the two Asian

civilizations to overcome their ego-centric concepts of world order. Their combination with the last two, gave to the Pacha Silla an entirely new meaning to the inter-State relations, by putting them in a cooperative framework in stead of an anarchic one. Mutual benefit and peaceful coexistence were two principles which was absent from the anarchic principles of the Westphalian System, and created a community of States, economically complementary and politically non-hegemonic.

The five principles were, and still are, important to any anti-colonial and counter-hegemonic alliance, in refusing the intrusion of the hegemon and of all the rich countries of the North in the Third World affairs, proclaiming their collective self-reliance and non-violent cooperation. After fifty years, the importance of the Pancha Silla has not decreased. Bandung has, nevertheless, been forgotten even by its initiators who are too busy, nowadays, in their efforts to survive in the global mega-competition with industrial States and MNCs, to refer back to their common historical experience of half century ago.

The globalization of the international political economy was accompanied, especially in the Third World by the emergence of ethnic, religious and other identity communities who challenged the State's legitimacy and power, and the framework proposed at Bandung which assumed the indivisibility of national State sovereignty is no more viable. We will discuss later the reasons why Bandung has a powerful message for those who want to form a counter-hegemonic alliance under quite different conditions of the global age. The application of the Bandung principles is valid on the condition that it is re-conceptualized in full accordance with the new realities of this time of global colonialism.

Already, the Bandung message was affected by the neo-colonial divisive forces which characterized the Cold War. It was regrettable that the Sino-Soviet dispute, a "socialist" version of colonial North South inequality between the Soviet Union and China, brought in the Afro-Asian Solidarity Movement discord and division. Yet the message was clear and was further expanded by the Non-Aligned Movement and by the G77 movement, both logical continuations of the Bandung Conference.

Bandung triggered-off a process which prevented a nuclear annihilation of humankind, by providing the ground for the Non-Aligned Movement, which played a precious role in the United Nations against the nuclear arms race of the co-hegemons, the two nuclear super powers. Truly enough, the two hegemonic powers preferred to negotiate the adjustment of their nuclear strategic policies, and the major agreements on nuclear "arms control and disarmament" were negotiated between them, excluding the United Nations General Assembly where the Non-Aligned countries were adopting resolutions opposing nuclear tests and nuclear arms race. The end of the Cold War came, however, when the Soviet Union, recognized unilaterally the recommendation to start a process of disarmament proposed by the Non-Aligned Countries and by the international peace movements. Under the leadership of Gorbachev.

It helped his decision that the position of the Non-Aligned States was shared by the international anti-nuclear movement which involved not only States but also peace activists and pacifist groups from all over the world including the Capitalist countries. It is important to take note of this fact, since the Non-Aligned Movement, anti-hegemonic and anti-nuclear, was receiving a large support in the civil societies of the North, i.e. of the Cold War West. The end of the Cold War was, in a sense, the product of this large alliance involving Third World Non-Aligned States and the peace-loving sectors of nations from the North and from the South.

The Bandung Afro-Asian Conference prepared also the emergence of the Third World economic platform, the G77 which was formed later in the 1960s, by the Tri-Continental alliance demanding a more equitable terms of trade between the rich industrial countries of the North and the poor countries of the South which surplus was sucked-up by the North by the trade mechanisms providing the primary commodities under unequal terms of trade. The G77 demands led to the project of a New International Economic Order in the 1970s. Truly enough, the demands of the G77 were often motivated by their neo-mercantilist position aiming at preparing the ground for rapid industrialization, and their political leadership often led to development despotic States pro-hegemonic in their attempt to obtain economic aid from the hegemons. This negative aspect of the G77 movement was, however, largely compensated by the fact that its

demands triggered-off a broad based search for "alternative development" including "eco-development" by a large sector of the civil societies, both in the North and in the South. Thus, several versions of "New International Orders" were proposed.

A New International Cultural Order, a New World Information Order, a New International Constitutional Order, and several other new orders were proposed, officially and unofficially. These projects raised serious questions about the hegemonic order supported by, and maintaining unequal colonial relations between the North and the South. Unfortunately, the globalization of the world political economy evolved in stead of these proposed international orders a "new international division of labour" which after the end of the Cold War, led to the hegemonic "New World Order" proposed by President George Bush.

The present global hegemonic order (or disorder) seems to have put under its effective control the developing nations, eliminating the political economic projects of the Third World originating in Bandung. The historical trend of globalization led to the present uni-trinitary hegemony, under which the corporate sector of the Trilateral regions prosper and the Tri-Continental regions are partly co-opted by and partly excluded from this global hegemonic alliance.

In spite of its apparent failure to implement its political-economic projects, the variety of myths, utopias, and projects of which Bandung was the origin, continue to be valid in their critique of the political-economic myths and projects of the neo-colonial hegemonic Alliance. We will study the present global hegemonic colonialist structures against which a new counter-hegemonic alliance has to be built. This will become possible, we will argue, only on the basis of a new interpretation of the powerful myth of Bandung.

The New Global Colonial (Dis)Order

The peoples' insecurity is one of the basic characteristics of the present global age. It is a consequence of the "New Colonial Global Order" or "disorder". The contemporary world economy is global in the sense that it is in the final (global) stage of a capitalist economic expansion of the world system which has so far been able to feed its economic/technological growth by the exploitation of the surplus from

its frontier land, the periphery, i.e. the colonies or economic peripheries. The global economy is global in that it has reached a stage where such frontiers do not exist any more. So, the exploitation of the surplus can be done nowhere and must be done everywhere possible since the global economy needs surplus for its mega-competition and for its speculative activities.

The structures of the global political economy is composed by three segments. A global segment of mega-competition among MNCs and States is at its core. Technocrats, workers of MNCs, global civil society agents and intellectuals, operate within this segment within the neo-liberal framework of the global hegemonic governance. A second segment, peripheryic to the first one, serves the interest of the global hegemonic alliance, passive subject of the global hegemony. This segment is composed by the subaltern agents of the first sector, including small and middle industries, the majority of Third World States unable to compete with the MNCs and the States in the first segment, as well as a large part of the civil societies which serve the technocratic elites and support the global hegemony. A third segment is composed by all the sectors of the societies in the South and in the North, excluded even from the subaltern sector. Many social groups and categories, women, indigenous peoples, landless peasants, and many agents who failed to remain in the subaltern segment compose this third segment of the global political economy. The so-called informal sectors are an increasingly important part of this segment.

This is an excluded segment by and from the global economy. It does not mean that it is excluded from the contemporary historical process of global transformation. It has two important characteristics as a matrix for new agencies.

Firstly, it includes a variety of identity communities who are preserving the "asabiya" lost by most civil societies in the "global city". This sense of identity and dedication has to become the basis of a counter-hegemonic alliance as indicates the analysis of hegemonic change by Ibn Khaldun. Secondly, the excluded sector includes a large sector of the migrants, especially migrant workers moving from South to North, and infiltrating into the civil societies of the industrialized Trilateral North. They are victimized by the global

segment of these societies, but can form an important political force if they succeed in forming an alliance with the civil societies in their host countries.

The exclusionary processes of the global market creates insecurity for all the subaltern exploited social formations and all the peoples in the South and in the North who are in the excluded segment of the global structures. A variety of colonial relations of exploitation and exclusion cross-over in the surplus extraction from the South by the North, from women by men, from the rural by the urban sectors, from the local communities of each country by its metropole, from the ethnic minorities by the global "majorities".

This structure of the global political economy is quite different from the North-South structure of the Cold War days where legitimacy was put into question by the Third World nations at the Bandung Conference. The global political economy has created a situation where the three segments exist in both the South and the North, and where their difference lies in their relative proportion. This is why the counter-hegemonic alliance which was formed by the Third World States in Bandung, can not remain limited to the Third World States. It should include non-state agents in the subaltern and the excluded segments of the Trilateral regions.

The above analysis of the global political economic structure may lead to the wrong conclusion that the historical bloc formed in Bandung by the emerging Third World nations is no more valid under the global colonial situation which extracts surplus not only from the South but from the subaltern and excluded segments of the North. If the global hegemony had not developed a new exclusionary structure between the Trilateral North and the Tri-Continental South, we may not need to go back to Bandung in our attempt to build a new counter-hegemonic alliance.

However, the United States and its Trilateral allies are creating a new divide between the North and the South by their efforts to strengthen their security, both national and "human", by strengthening the "Human Security" of the Trilateral (North Atlantic plus Japan) security community and by making "humanitarian" interventions in the Tri-Continental regions. In spite of the political-economic elimination of

the borders between the South and the North, the North/South divide has not been finished, since the hegemonic security project of the New Global Colonial Order excludes the South and intervenes in it.

This creates a new North-South exclusionary structure where the Bandung myth and projects become highly relevant for the building of a counter-hegemonic alliance.

The New Global Colonial Order is composed by one single "security community" in the global North which is built on a complex network of inter-dependent overlapping "security communities" inter-dependent on each-other, and a network of interacting fragmented "security communities" excluding and suspecting each-other, in the global South. The global North is the core region of the New Global Colonial Order, it is the "North Atlantic security community" plus Japan, a fortress "protected" by the hegemonic alliance of NATO plus x (in Asia). The global South, the periphery of the same Order, is composed by States surviving in the mega-competition of multinational firms and "welcome States" by welcoming foreign capital even by sacrificing their role of "welfare state". They have to renounce their role of "security community" for their people. The peoples are fragmented and are forced to organize their own "security communities", on ethnic, religious or any other "identities".

All the domestic conflicts involving States vs. ethnic groups or ethnic groups against one-another, are all part of this web of fragmented "security communities" fearing each-other and over-reacting to each-other's attempt to increase their security. Their sense of insecurity is, to a large extent, caused by the harshness of the exploitative process sucking their surplus, the scarcity of essential resources to satisfy their needs, the failure of the governments to play a minimal welfare role, all caused by the exploitative and exclusionary nature of the global political-economy.

Unlike in the global North where all States do not fear that others would attack them, in the high risk environment of the global South, each "security community" perceives other's efforts to increase their security as a threat to their own security. The mega-competition which engages MNCs in the core of the world system, takes the form of militarized competition among "security communities", States,

religious groups, ethnic minorities etc.. What is believed to be pre-modern conflicts of under-developed traditional groups in the developing regions are ultra-modern (or post-modern) conflicts of identity groups engaged in a violent mega-competition in the periphery of the New Global Colonial Order complementing the "peaceful" mega-competition of the TNCs and States in the core of this Order.

The present global political economy thus generates in the North various sources of insecurity within the "security", It also generates insecurities between "security communities" in the South. It also generate all sorts of global insecurity in both North and South. This is why the New Global Colonial Order has developed the concept of "global governance". This "governance" is colonial especially in that it is based on the tutelage of the South by the North which deploys its military forces in high-risk regions, ready to intervene anywhere where the interests and values of the global hegemonic order is put into question.

The Trilateral hegemons from the global North intervene in the conflicts between different "security communities" to punish the culprits who they designate as the ones who have started these conflicts, be it the case of Saddam Hosain in West Asia or of Miloshevic in the Balkan. This intervention is in most cases arbitrary and lacks international legitimacy as it was the case in the past centuries when the Western Powers were intervening in the South on any pretext and thus were expanding their colonial influence.

Such interventions by the North requires the maintenance of a network of forward-deployed military bases. It assumes, as in the old days of traditional colonialism, that the Western industrial democracies have the right and obligation to act as the missionaries of universal values, and assume the role of a global constabulary, as a "white-men's burden". They should better realize that the conflicts are caused in most cases by the pressure from the global economy which forces each "security community" to maximize their power to grab some resources in order to achieve a minimum level of security. Their competition over the scarce resources is a zero-sum process where each community perceives others as competitors and potential threats to them. The only way to overcome these conflicts is to build

into their inter-community relations some plus-sum elements and enable them to seek a common security.

This is where the Bandung principles of peaceful coexistence and mutual benefit become indispensable, not only in inter-states relations of the global South, but also in all relations among the different types of security communities, gender-based, class-based, ethnic, religious etc.. The Trilateral security community should cease to intervene on "humanitarian" ground, and should rather eliminate all the exploitative and exclusionary mechanisms of its neo-liberal global political economy. It should also cease to restraint the South to North migratory trends and rather regulate its criminal tendency to violate the basic rights and security of the migrants, especially of the victims of trafficking and smuggling of persons. A non-hegemonic system of governance must be built to replace the present global hegemonic security system. This should be a project for the New Bandung alliance, which comprises both a security dimension comparable to the non-aligned movement security project, and an economic dimension comparable to the G77 demand of economic reforms.

Against Global Hegemonic Governance

The present system of global hegemonic governance is a hegemonic process accompanying the New Global Colonial Order giving to it a "civilized" appearance. For the mega competition among MNCs and States to sustain itself in the core of the global order, it needs to get a sufficiently broad support from the international public opinion not only in the North but also in the South, i.e. from the "civil societies" composing both parts of the world. The hegemonic alliance needs to develop a set of "stable" universal values in the name of which it can exercise its "governance". It has to build a security system of surveillance, control, and punishment not only of the states, hegemon and allies, but of the global economy and of the civil societies. It needs to create enough room for the "dissidents" in the civil society not to revolt against the New Global Colonial Order.

To use a neo-Gramscian definition of the New Global Colonial Order, the hegemonic forces, the United States and its allies, the Trilateral alliance or the G7, are engaged in developing "passive revolutions" in the South, and to a certain extent in the non-Western region of the North, i.e. East Asia, in order to prevent the formation of an anti-

hegemonic alliance. The global States in the South and their global intellectuals use the discourse developed by the globalizing civil society of the North and of the co-opted parts of the South, "democracy and human rights", "human development", "human security" etc.. They co-opt their efforts to build alternatives, e.g. human development now is adopted by the World Bank. The hegemonic North supports "human security" as if they were ready to renounce their inhuman national security projects.

Global hegemonic governance involves, in this way, two major problems. Firstly, on the economic and social level, it supports and sustains the neo-liberal global economy which is nothing but a global casino which distributes, among the gamblers, the surplus produced by the exploited and excluded majority of the people, both women and men but especially women, both in the North and in the South, but especially in the South.

Secondly, on the political-military level, it is a hegemonic governance (in the Gramscian sense) system, based on a broad alliance not only of the big industries and big powers of the global segment of the world, but also of the smaller enterprises and States, intellectuals and civil society agents of the subaltern segment, who hope to survive and join-in one day the mega-competition of the first segment. In the subaltern segment, quite a number of the workers of the sub-contracting firms of big industries hoping to survive harsh labour-cuts by working harder for their companies, and there is also quite a number of civic leaders who hope to get concessions from governments useful for the people, support "passively" the neo-liberal New Global Colonial Order for lack of alternatives.

The "passive revolutions" is now taking place in the South in the name of "democracy", and in the North in terms of "human security". The conflicts in the South, and the "Peace" (doubtful in the subaltern and excluded segments of the societies but existing among states) in the North enables the neo-colonial myths of Pax Democratica (peace through the propagation of "democracy") to serve as a pretext for the hegemony to intervene militarily in some of the conflicts of the South which endanger the global economy, or simply meet the disapproval of the United States' military/industrial/technocratic complex.

The intervention of the hegemon is highly selective and depends more on their interests than on a realistic assessment of the local situations they intervene into. This is why they create everywhere more insecurity than security, yet it is believed to bring democracy to the South "undemocratic" countries.

The hegemonic alliance of the "industrial democracies" combines with this interventionist policy into the global South, a rejection policy vis-a-vis all "undesirable" elements to the "human security" of the civil societies of the North, coming from the South. This includes AIDS/HIV, drugs, trafficked women, terrorists and "illegal" migrant workers. They exercise a kind of "triage" and cultural cleansing to protect the "human security" in the global segment of the North.

In this way, the New Global Colonial Order combines an interventionist policy vis-a-vis the Third World with an exclusionist policy vis-a-vis its peoples. This creates a new North-South relations of dominance, intervention and exclusion, different from the North-South relations of the Cold War period to which the newly emerging nations objected in Bandung. The Tri-Continental South is no more a producer of primary commodities, but comprises a segment highly developed engaged in the mega-competition, and a subaltern sector co-opted and exploited by it, though quite small in comparison with the same segment in the Trilateral nations. Its excluded segment is quite large and is more and more left to itself by the States, the civil society and the intellectuals.

Most conflicts take place between security communities whose majority of members belong to this segment, and yet it does not receive the attention due to it, because the global States (called sometimes "welcome States") are more concerned about inviting in transnational agents and in receiving international economic cooperation than about strengthening their national integrity and meeting the social security needs of their people. The welfare States are now replaced by welcome States!

This is why a new Bandung involving the peoples of the Third World and not only the global States, has become indispensable. Otherwise, the Tri-Continental regions will remain divided. Politically and militarily. It will remain divided among different security communities within each dis-unified States. Economically it will

continue to be divided into its global and subaltern segments and its excluded segment. The uni-tyrannical hegemony of the United States in alliance with Europe and Japan, will continue to divide and rule it.

The Third World intellectuals have to play a key role as integrators of their national societies, by building a political framework for the common security and common prosperity of the ethnic, religious and other security communities, refusing the useless and harmful interventions from the Trilateral hegemons. Economically, the intellectuals will have to reintegrate into the national division of labour the excluded sectors. This implies culturally that they will have to cease to serve the interest of the global States and develop an endogenous cultural base for the national and regional integration, endogenizing the exogenous global culture. They will have to reinterpret all the values of the civil societies so that they can be shared by the peoples of the excluded sectors. Only when they assume this arduous task can they be called "organic" intellectuals.

The above considerations indicate how much needed is the message of the Bandung Conference, its myth of Afro-Asian solidarity broadened to the Tri-Continental regions, and its Projects of political non-intervention, economic co-prosperity, and cultural solidarity. They all have become relevant in this new context of the New Global Colonial Order.

The Peoples' Bandung

This leads us to propose a Bandung plus 50 celebration, which would be an occasion to reignite the fire of the Bandung spirit in the contemporary context of global colonialism. It will be a Peoples' Bandung, organizing a counter-hegemonic alliance crossing the border of North and South, but under the hegemony of the Third World peoples. It will build an alliance between the subaltern social formations, and the civil societies with the peoples in the excluded segment of the different world regions. Their alliance will be made possible by the myth and projects of Peoples' Bandung.

Bandung plus fifty can, in deed, provide the global myth necessary for the organization of a counter-hegemonic alliance, a broad alliance of the civil societies of the South and of the North with the excluded and marginalized peoples, women, peasants and workers, indigenous

peoples, as well as the marginalized peoples in the informal sectors of both industrial and developing societies. This broad alliance should be organized under the hegemony of the peoples of the Third world. They should constitute a post-colonial and post-modern global "Prince" following the historical path of the "Prince" of Machiavelli and of Gramsci.

The organic intellectuals of the Tri-Continental regions should translate the myth of the peoples' Bandung into a series of projects, political, economic and civilizational. To the hegemonic project of "pax democratica" which presents, with the support of globalist technocratic intellectuals, the hegemonic alliance as a defensor of human security, human rights and human development, the counter-hegemonic political project should oppose the exogenous, formalistic formulation of these values by denouncing their abstract nature, and propose in their place endogenous projects embedded in the life-environments of the peoples, and based on their own will and praxis. A truly human security should be a people's security. A truly human approach to the rights of the peoples should be based on the rights to life and to development of each and every human communities. A truly human development should be endogenous, rejecting outside imposition of exogenous models. The principle of peaceful coexistence should be expanded to all human security communities, and non-interference in domestic affairs should be guaranteed to these groups, as well as to each individual in all human communities whose self-determination should be respected by the larger units, be it States, regional organizations or TNCs.

Bandung plus Fifty should oppose the neo-liberal version of the global political economy. It should especially regulate the casino capitalism harmful to both the subaltern and excluded segments of the world. It should also reject hidden hegemonic economic projects of global or regional neo-mercantilist nature. It should aim at regulating the "global standards" imposed by the neo-liberal economy in order to guarantee that all peoples of the world can have a decent work in a humanly acceptable working condition. The new "enclosure" movement of the transnational capital affecting, among others, the land rights of the indigenous peoples should be regulated. The gender inequity and all other forms of discrimination built in all aspects of the global political economy should be eliminated from all

aspects of the economic life, production, reproductions, service and consumption.

The political-economic projects of the peoples' Bandung has to be negotiated between the agents in the subaltern segment of each national communities and the marginalized social classes and categories through the mediation of the organic intellectuals, and the door should be kept open to the non-hegemonic members of the technocratic elite who accept the people's hegemony. Mutual benefit can thus become a principle for all the different groups joining the counter-hegemonic bloc.

The New Bandung intellectuals have especially an important role in developing a civilizational dialogue among all the participants of the counter-hegemonic alliance, as well as with the Trilateral hegemonic alliance. The combination of the two dialogues are the only way to avoid the hegemons to trigger-off a "clash of civilization". The Peoples' Bandung and its organic intellectuals have to engage in a critical dialogue, with the modernizing elites with a neo-liberal, technocratic vision of a Euro-centric progress of human civilization. All the post-modern and post-colonial intellectuals will have to be invited to join in the dialogue. The organic intellectuals have an extremely difficult task to involve in their dialogue, the voice-less peoples who know the risk they take in opening their mouth. They have also an impossible task which is to invite even the fundamentalists, who reject any dialogue, to take part in their counter-hegemonic epistemological exercise. The "peaceful coexistence" of the different anti-hegemonic intellectual currents and civilizational projects should be established and respected by all intellectuals.

In all of its principles, the Pancha Silla has to be applied to the relations between the different epistemic communities, who should respect each other's autonomy, agree not to interfere in each-one's internal debates, develop a mutually profitable exchange of thought between these communities in a state of peaceful coexistence.

The above points need further reflection and deepening. It is our hope that the present very preliminary notes can become an entry point for the organic intellectuals of the Tri-Continental regions to begin their collective reflection in preparation of Bandung plus Fifty.

The Lessons of the Bandung Conference Reviewing Richard Wright's *The Color Curtain* 40 Years Later

Matthew Quest

"The despised, the insulted, the hurt, the dispossessed—in short, the underdogs of the human race were meeting. Here were class and racial and religious consciousness on a global scale. Who had thought of organizing such a meeting? And what had these nations in common? Nothing, it seemed to me, but what their past relationship to the Western world had made them feel. This meeting of the rejected was in itself a kind of judgment upon the Western world!"-

Richard Wright

Richard Wright's *The Color Curtain* [University Press of Mississippi, 1994], originally published in 1956, chronicles the Bandung Conference of April 18-25, 1955. The gathering of leaders of 29 African and Asian nations considered how they could help one another in achieving social and economic well-being for their large and impoverished populations. Their agenda addressed race, religion, colonialism, national sovereignty, and the promotion of world peace. Despite the pragmatic premise for such a meeting, it would take on monumental importance for the shaping of future Cold War and identity politics, bearing important lessons for political struggle today.

Bandung was sponsored by the Asian nationalist leadership of Indonesia, Ceylon (now Sri Lanka), Burma (now Myanmar), and the Philippines. The foremost figure of these nations was Ahmed Sukarno, president of Indonesia, who from Wright's description clearly ruled over a police state, however strident his anti-imperialist rhetoric. The prominent personalities were Jawaharlal Nehru, prime minister of India, Kwame Nkrumah, prime minister of the Gold Coast (later Ghana), Gamal Abdel Nasser, president of Egypt, Chou En Lai, premier of China, Ho Chi Minh, prime minister of Vietnam, and Congressman Adam Clayton Powell of Harlem, USA. Lesser-known representatives of Algeria, Morocco, Tunisia, Lebanon, Syria, Japan, the Philippines and others would make interesting contributions.

The strategy of militant Afro-Asian states was to strengthen their independence from Western imperialism while keeping the Soviet bloc at a comfortable distance. This strategic bloc, which was supposed to be independent from the superpowers, was the beginning of what came to be known as the "non-aligned" movement and the "Third World."

Non-Alignment and Communism

Richard Wright recognized the dynamic, yet-undefined relationship between the concept of non-alignment and the specter of communism through the relationship of Jawaharlal Nehru of India and China's Chou En Lai.

Nehru, a pivotal presence at the conference because of his credibility as spokesperson for neutrality for Asian and African nations in the Cold War, was deeply influenced in his political thinking by his participation in earlier international conferences. He attended the Congress of Oppressed Nationalities in Brussels, Belgium in Feb. 1927, undoubtedly a major pre-cursor to Bandung. As a representative of the Indian National Congress he met envoys of colonial peoples and their European and Latin American supporters—radical nationalists along with socialists and communists. In 1947 he hosted the first Asian Relations Conference, which an impressive gathering of scores of Asian nations attended. He stressed in his inaugural speech Asia's "special responsibility" to Africa.

Wright found Nehru to be "logical, quick, observant, and knowing." Yet Wright thought Nehru, who shared with him an attraction to communism and a disdain for its concept of absolute truth, was being used by "coy" Chou En Lai.

The Chinese leader approached the conference participants with "utmost friendliness and reserve...turning the other cheek when receiving ideological slaps". Wright was surprised, but thought "clever" Chou En Lai's effective moves at the conference. His speech stressed Asian-African unity instead of attacking the West or pushing communist ideology on newly "free" nations. Nehru ran interference for the more critical questions put to the Chinese leader. "Pan-Asianism" was legitimated and empowered by the weight of

communist China. Chou En Lai's seemingly weak, but tactical stance at the conference only ensured a de facto bloc against the West. In the late 1950s it provided China with the wedge it needed for the Sino-Soviet split. China's relationship began to decline with India in 1959 over the question of Tibet, and was finally destroyed in the border clashes of 1962.

Cuba, which became "independent" in 1959 under the leadership of Fidel Castro and Che Guevara, aligned itself with the Soviet Union despite similar sovereignty tensions (epitomized by the Cuban Missile Crisis of 1961), and in the spirit of Bandung forged the Havana Tricontinental Congress (1965), of course excluding China.

"Pan-Islam"

The author of *The Color Curtain* did not let religious ideological forces at the conference escape his notice. Dr. Mohammed Natsir, former prime minister of Indonesia and at the time head of Indonesia's largest political party, Masjumi, was a leading proponent of a theocratic Muslim state and what he called "Pan-Islam." His conception of "Pan-Islam" was that it would make communism obsolete because it would be "socialist in nature." While it would be internationalist, "Pan-Islam" would be non-aligned and neither communist nor capitalist. He also predicted that the West would collaborate with what the media now calls Muslim "fundamentalists" as a lesser evil against communism.

"Pan-Arabism"

Gamal Abdel Nasser was a prominent figure at Bandung because he was laying the foundations for both Pan-Arabism and Pan-Africanism, which he would be synonymous with in years to come. He denounced the United Nations and the West for complicity in the displacement of the Palestinians from their homeland. Lebanon, another stronghold of refugees from "Israel," would add its voice. Nasser was a dynamic secular figure who challenged the West by "nationalizing" the Suez Canal (1956) and uniting for a short time Egypt with Syria (the UAR, United Arab Republic) through Michael Aflaq's Arab Ba'ath Socialist Party.

Algeria, as well as Tunisia and Morocco, denounced French colonialism at the conference. Nasser's Egypt, which had to liberate itself from both British and French influence, supported their resolution. Algeria, which became officially independent in 1962, was led by Ahmed Ben Bella. Along with Nasser, he consciously linked the destiny of the predominantly Arab north with Africa south of the Sahara through Pan-Africanism. Yet even for their bourgeois statist ambitions, Ben Bella and Nasser had petty scraps with Kwame Nkrumah. When Patrice Lumumba's Congo came under neo-colonialist attack five years after, no one, save Nkrumah, would jeopardize their sovereignty to intervene. Nkrumah's advice was poor. All but Nasser would be overthrown by 1966.

"Pan-Africanism"

Kwame Nkrumah, whose emerging Ghanaian revolution (1957) was chronicled by Richard Wright in another travelogue, *Black Power* (1954), does not have a visible voice in *The Color Curtain*. Wright shows disappointment with the "weakness" of "Negro Africa" at the conference even in terms of awareness.

Pan-Africanism, an ideology associated with Nkrumah, clearly informed how African-American identity was shaped at Bandung. The very concept of the term "people of color" and Africans in America not being a "minority" may have been born at Bandung. This significance was recognized in the speeches of Malcolm X.

Lessons of Bandung?

From "People of Color" to the "Third World," Bandung clearly helped to forge the modern identity politics of race, religion and nationality. Historically, hope for and fear of world revolution has followed what seemed to be unprecedented emerging dignity expressed by statesmen that wielded "Pan-" ideologies which, to the ear, transcend nationalism and pointed to internationalism. What may be left from Bandung is an earlier and equally ill-defined Islamic Fundamentalism.

The legacy of these "great" leaders and their regimes represented at Bandung is a sad one. The personalities that were worshipped (Nehru, Nkrumah, Nasser, Chou En Lai, Ho Chi Minh), however great their oratory, were in practice authoritarian, undemocratic, sexist, and

despite major theses to the contrary, complicit with furthering neo-colonialism and/or establishing state capitalism.

Non-alignment was clearly a tactic, not a philosophy. Skillful Cold War diplomacy gained some leverage for state sovereignty, but what of the people? In today's one-superpower world no maneuvers are comparably impressive. In a manner similar to much-criticized communist and so-called non-aligned regimes, many nationalists rally the people for "independence" only to seize power in their name and suppress their aspirations for true freedom.

A fundamental aspect of class struggle is to uphold oppressed nationalities' rights of self-determination. This usually entails all struggles against racism. However, it should matter what form the struggle takes. Are we capable of critical support? If our solidarity is not wanted are we capable of withstanding being race-baited, called Uncle Toms, counter-revolutionaries, class-collaborationists? Should we give our support to everyone who raises a flag and fashions a revolutionary song?

Frantz Fanon and Amilcar Cabral, two of the very few principled Pan-African figures (most of whom died young and never wielded state power at all or very long, other good examples are Malcolm X and Patrice Lumumba), were critical of the "national bourgeoisie" and called for them to commit "class suicide" to help fulfill the promise of a national liberation struggle.

We must have the courage to take nationalists to task. We must not allow bourgeois nationalist "people of color" to define the national liberation struggle as authoritarian, undemocratic, statist, homophobic, sexist, or "scientifically" racist. We must ignore hypocritical "Sounds of Blackness" and march to the beat of our own drum.

PORTO ALEGRE: TODAY'S BANDUNG?

Michael Hardt

New Left Review, 14th March 2002

Rather than opposing the World Social Forum in Porto Alegre to the World Economic Forum in New York, it is more revealing to imagine it as the distant offspring of the historic Bandung Conference that took place in Indonesia in 1955. Both were conceived as attempts to counter the dominant world order: colonialism and the oppressive Cold War binary in the case of Bandung, and the rule of capitalist globalization in that of Porto Alegre. The differences, however, are immediately apparent. On one hand the Bandung Conference, which brought together leaders primarily from Asia and Africa, revealed in a dramatic way the racial dimension of the colonial and Cold War world order, which Richard Wright famously described as being divided by the 'colour curtain'. Porto Alegre, in contrast, was a predominantly white event. There were relatively few participants from Asia and Africa, and the racial differences of the Americas were dramatically underrepresented. This points toward a continuing task facing those gathered at Porto Alegre: to globalize further the movements, both within each society and across the world—a project in which the Forum is merely one step. On the other hand, whereas Bandung was conducted by a small group of national political leaders and representatives, Porto Alegre was populated by a swarming multitude and a network of movements. This multitude of protagonists is the great novelty of the World Social Forum, and central to the hope it offers for the future.

The first and dominant impression of the Forum was its overflowing enormity; not so much the number of people there—the organizers say 80,000 participated—but rather the number of events, encounters and happenings. The programme listing all the official conferences, seminars and workshops—most of which took place at the Catholic University—was the size of a tabloid newspaper, but one soon realized that there were innumerable other unofficial meetings taking place all over town, some publicized on posters and leaflets, others

by word of mouth. There were also separate gatherings for the different groups participating in the Forum, such as a meeting of the Italian social movements or one for the various national sections of ATTAC. Then there were the demonstrations: both officially planned, such as the opening mass May Day-style parade, and smaller, conflictual demonstrations against, for example, the members of parliament from different countries at the Forum who voted for the present war on terrorism. Finally, another series of events was held at the enormous youth camp by the river, its fields and fields of tents housing 15,000 people in an atmosphere reminiscent of a summer music festival, especially when it rained and everyone tramped through the mud wearing plastic sacks as raincoats. In short, if anyone with obsessive tendencies were to try to understand what was happening at Porto Alegre, the result would certainly have been a complete mental breakdown. The Forum was unknowable, chaotic, dispersive. And that overabundance created an exhilaration in everyone, at being lost in a sea of people from so many parts of the world who are working similarly against the present form of capitalist globalization.

This open encounter was the most important element of Porto Alegre. Even though the Forum was limited in some important respects—socially and geographically, to name two—it was nonetheless an opportunity to globalize further the cycle of struggles that have stretched from Seattle to Genoa, which have been conducted by a network of movements thus far confined, by and large, to the North Atlantic. Dealing with many of the same issues as those who elsewhere contest the present capitalist form of globalization, or specific institutional policies such as those of the IMF, the movements themselves have remained limited. Recognizing the commonality of their projects with those in other parts of the world is the first step toward expanding the network of movements, or linking one network to another. This recognition, indeed, is primarily responsible for the happy, celebratory atmosphere of the Forum.

The encounter should, however, reveal and address not only the common projects and desires, but also the differences of those involved—differences of material conditions and political orientation. The various movements across the globe cannot simply connect to each other as they are, but must rather be transformed by the

encounter through a kind of mutual adequation. Those from North America and Europe, for example, cannot but have been struck by the contrast between their experience and that of agricultural labourers and the rural poor in Brazil, represented most strongly by the MST (Landless Movement)—and vice versa. What kind of transformations are necessary for the Euro-American globalization movements and the Latin American movements, not to become the same, or even to unite, but to link together in an expanding common network? The Forum provided an opportunity to recognize such differences and questions for those willing to see them, but it did not provide the conditions for addressing them. In fact, the very same dispersive, overflowing quality of the Forum that created the euphoria of commonality also effectively displaced the terrain on which such differences and conflicts could be confronted.

Anti-capitalism and national sovereignty

The Porto Alegre Forum was in this sense perhaps too happy, too celebratory and not conflictual enough. The most important political difference cutting across the entire Forum concerned the role of national sovereignty. There are indeed two primary positions in the response to today's dominant forces of globalization: either one can work to reinforce the sovereignty of nation-states as a defensive barrier against the control of foreign and global capital, or one can strive towards a non-national alternative to the present form of globalization that is equally global. The first poses neoliberalism as the primary analytical category, viewing the enemy as unrestricted global capitalist activity with weak state controls; the second is more clearly posed against capital itself, whether state-regulated or not. The first might rightly be called an anti-globalization position, in so far as national sovereignties, even if linked by international solidarity, serve to limit and regulate the forces of capitalist globalization. National liberation thus remains for this position the ultimate goal, as it was for the old anticolonial and anti-imperialist struggles. The second, in contrast, opposes any national solutions and seeks instead a democratic globalization.

The first position occupied the most visible and dominant spaces of the Porto Alegre Forum; it was represented in the large plenary sessions, repeated by the official spokespeople, and reported in the

press. A key proponent of this position was the leadership of the Brazilian PT (Workers' Party)—in effect the host of the Forum, since it runs the city and regional government. It was obvious and inevitable that the PT would occupy a central space in the Forum and use the international prestige of the event as part of its campaign strategy for the upcoming elections. The second dominant voice of national sovereignty was the French leadership of ATTAC, which laid the groundwork for the Forum in the pages of *Le Monde Diplomatique*. The leadership of ATTAC is, in this regard, very close to many of the French politicians—most notably Jean-Pierre Chevènement—who advocate strengthening national sovereignty as a solution to the ills of contemporary globalization. These, in any case, are the figures who dominated the representation of the Forum both internally and in the press.

The non-sovereign, alternative globalization position, in contrast, was minoritarian at the Forum—not in quantitative terms but in terms of representation; in fact, the majority of the participants in the Forum may well have occupied this minoritarian position. First, the various movements that have conducted the protests from Seattle to Genoa are generally oriented towards non-national solutions. Indeed, the centralized structure of state sovereignty itself runs counter to the horizontal network-form that the movements have developed. Second, the Argentinian movements that have sprung up in response to the present financial crisis, organized in neighbourhood and city-wide delegate assemblies, are similarly antagonistic to proposals of national sovereignty. Their slogans call for getting rid, not just of one politician, but all of them— *que se vayan todos*: the entire political class. And finally, at the base of the various parties and organizations present at the Forum the sentiment is much more hostile to proposals of national sovereignty than at the top. This may be particularly true of ATTAC, a hybrid organization whose head, especially in France, mingles with traditional politicians, whereas its feet are firmly grounded in the movements.

The division between the sovereignty, anti-globalization position and the non-sovereign, alternative globalization position is therefore not best understood in geographical terms. It does not map the divisions between North and South or First World and Third. The conflict corresponds rather to two different forms of political organization. The

traditional parties and centralized campaigns generally occupy the national sovereignty pole, whereas the new movements organized in horizontal networks tend to cluster at the non-sovereign pole. And furthermore, within traditional, centralized organizations, the top tends toward sovereignty and the base away. It is no surprise, perhaps, that those in positions of power would be most interested in state sovereignty and those excluded least. This may help to explain, in any case, how the national sovereignty, anti-globalization position could dominate the representations of the Forum even though the majority of the participants tend rather toward the perspective of a non-national alternative globalization.

As a concrete illustration of this political and ideological difference, one can imagine the responses to the current economic crisis in Argentina that logically follow from each of these positions. Indeed that crisis loomed over the entire Forum, like a threatening premonition of a chain of economic disasters to come. The first position would point to the fact that the Argentinian debacle was caused by the forces of global capital and the policies of the IMF, along with the other supranational institutions that undermine national sovereignty. The logical oppositional response should thus be to reinforce the national sovereignty of Argentina (and other nation-states) against these destabilizing external forces. The second position would identify the same causes of the crisis, but insist that a national solution is neither possible nor desirable. The alternative to the rule of global capital and its institutions will only be found at an equally global level, by a global democratic movement. The practical experiments in democracy taking place today at neighbourhood and city levels in Argentina, for example, pose a necessary continuity between the democratization of Argentina and the democratization of the global system. Of course, neither of these perspectives provides an adequate recipe for an immediate solution to the crisis that would circumvent IMF prescriptions—and I am not convinced that such a solution exists. They rather present different political strategies for action today which seek, in the course of time, to develop real alternatives to the current form of global rule.

Parties vs networks

In a previous period we could have staged an old-style ideological confrontation between the two positions. The first could accuse the second of playing into the hands of neoliberalism, undermining state sovereignty and paving the way for further globalization. Politics, the one could continue, can only be effectively conducted on the national terrain and within the nation-state. And the second could reply that national regimes and other forms of sovereignty, corrupt and oppressive as they are, are merely obstacles to the global democracy that we seek. This kind of confrontation, however, could not take place at Porto Alegre—in part because of the dispersive nature of the event, which tended to displace conflicts, and in part because the sovereignty position so successfully occupied the central representations that no contest was possible.

But the more important reason for a lack of confrontation may have had to do with the organizational forms that correspond to the two positions. The traditional parties and centralized organizations have spokespeople who represent them and conduct their battles, but no one speaks for a network. How do you argue with a network? The movements organized within them do exert their power, but they do not proceed through oppositions. One of the basic characteristics of the network form is that no two nodes face each other in contradiction; rather, they are always triangulated by a third, and then a fourth, and then by an indefinite number of others in the web. This is one of the characteristics of the Seattle events that we have had the most trouble understanding: groups which we thought in objective contradiction to one another—environmentalists and trade unions, church groups and anarchists—were suddenly able to work together, in the context of the network of the multitude. The movements, to take a slightly different perspective, function something like a public sphere, in the sense that they can allow full expression of differences within the common context of open exchange. But that does not mean that networks are passive. They displace contradictions and operate instead a kind of alchemy, or rather a sea change, the flow of the movements transforming the traditional fixed positions; networks imposing their force through a kind of irresistible undertow.

Like the Forum itself, the multitude in the movements is always overflowing, excessive and unknowable. It is certainly important then, on the one hand, to recognize the differences that divide the activists

and politicians gathered at Porto Alegre. It would be a mistake, on the other hand, to try to read the division according to the traditional model of ideological conflict between opposing sides. Political struggle in the age of network movements no longer works that way. Despite the apparent strength of those who occupied centre stage and dominated the representations of the Forum, they may ultimately prove to have lost the struggle. Perhaps the representatives of the traditional parties and centralized organizations at Porto Alegre are too much like the old national leaders gathered at Bandung—imagine Lula of the PT in the position of Ahmed Sukarno as host, and Bernard Cassen of ATTAC France as Jawaharlal Nehru, the most honoured guest. The leaders can certainly craft resolutions affirming national sovereignty around a conference table, but they can never grasp the democratic power of the movements. Eventually they too will be swept up in the multitude, which is capable of transforming all fixed and centralized elements into so many more nodes in its indefinitely expansive network.

**Other Articles on The Fiftieth Anniversary of the Bandung
Conference**

Article I

**I wish I had met Richard Wright at Bandung in 1955 (reflections
on a conference attended by both Wright and the author)**

Mississippi Quarterly, The, Spring 1997 by Zhang Yan

OVER FORTY YEARS AGO IN APRIL 1955, THE FAMOUS Asian and African Conference was held in Bandung, Indonesia. This was the first time in history that leaders of former colonial or semi-colonial nations in Asia and Africa, including the then newborn People's Republic of China, had gotten together to discuss their common issues without the interference of any Western colonial powers. Ever since, the Bandung spirit of peaceful co-existence between nations has been prevailing all over the world.

Among the foreign correspondents covering the conference, Richard Wright was probably the only black American. It was a great pity that I did not meet or even hear about Wright at Bandung. It was reported sarcastically that the United States had sent the biggest "delegation" of over seventy "journalists" there, though it was not represented at all in the conference itself. The implication was that the United States was in all ways trying to have its voice heard in the first ever international conference without a single colonial power. I did notice there were several blacks sitting in the American press area, among whom some were obviously not journalists at all. Under that circumstance, it was not possible for Chinese journalists to communicate with their American colleagues freely. I didn't even try.

Wright came from far away with a special approach. A novelist, poet, and reporter born in Mississippi in 1908, he secured his literary reputation in the 1940s with the publication of his *Native Son* and *Black Boy*. With his own development from a childhood amongst the remnants of slavery, he focused at the Bandung Conference on the two powerful urges far beyond Left and Right which he found at work there: religion and race. So he called his book on the Bandung Conference, published in 1956, *The Color Curtain*.

Unfortunately, it was almost forty years later that I came across the book when I happened to be in Jackson, Mississippi. A xeroxed copy of the then out-of-print book was made especially for me by Edwin King, an associate professor at the University of Mississippi Medical Center, when he found out that I was a Chinese journalist who had covered the same conference and coauthored *Diaries of the Asian and African Conference in Chinese*.

Having read Richard Wright's book with enormous interest, I was taken back to the beautiful resort city of Bandung that, in 1955, hosted an event of far-reaching influence, and could look with satisfaction at the entirely new face of the world.

Richard Wright and I headed to the island of Java from different directions. He took off from Paris, where for years he had lived in exile from the United States of America. I left from Beijing, where the capital of the People's Republic was established in 1949 after the victory of the Chinese Revolution. We were, however, equally excited and fully aware of the significance of what was happening. As he put it in his book: "This was a meeting of representatives of almost all of the human race living in the main geopolitical center of gravity of the earth. This meeting of the rejected was in itself a kind of judgement upon the Western world! . . . I felt that I had to go to that meeting; I felt that I could understand it."

Though subtitled "A report on the Bandung conference," *The Color Curtain* wasn't simply on-the-spot coverage of the conference. It was, in essence, a series of in-depth observations on the postwar relations between the uprising national liberation forces and the declining colonial powers, with a historical and very special personal perspective. Weeks before he arrived in Indonesia for the conference, the author did a survey among his Asian informants with a list of relevant questions. He sought to elicit responses bearing on broad, general issues in order to grasp a wide range of different attitudes before he was drawn into the whirlpool of the conference rooms.

Long before the conference, the Boston-based *Christian Science Monitor* for January 23, 1955, had already summed up its meaning in the following terse phrases: "The West is excluded. Emphasis is on the colored nations of the world. And for Asia that means that at last

the destiny of Asia is being determined in Asia, not in Geneva, or Paris, or London or Washington. Colonialism is out. Hands off is the word. Asia is free. This is perhaps the great historic event of our century" (quoted in Wright, p. 86).

But, as Wright found out, the animus of the Western press against the conference had never stopped. In pursuing their tirade against the exclusion of the United States and Europe from the conference, the Western journalists, he said, "seemed to have forgotten that for centuries Asian and African nations had watched in helpless silence while white powers" had "disposed of their "destinies" (p. 82). They even predicted that the West would emerge victorious from the delegates' clash with China's Zhou Enlai.

In his book Wright focused at length on the attacks against China instigated by the Western powers, particularly by the United States, with its policy of "containment of Communism," and on how China dealt with these attacks. If China reacted wrongly, according to the strategy of the United States, the conference would be disrupted.

However, "Communism at Bandung," as Wright noted, "was conspicuous for its shyness, its coyness, its bland smile and glad hand for everyone. Zhou Enlai, clad in a pale tunic, moved among the delegates with the utmost friendliness and reserve, listening to all arguments with patience" (p. 157). Some scenes and warm cheers of the people in that garden-like city in west Java remain fresh in my mind.

"The first intercontinental conference of the colored people in the history of mankind," the words of the late President Sukarno of Indonesia in his opening speech on April 19, aroused thunderous applause from the profoundly moved delegates of twenty-nine Asian and African countries, and the press, including me, a Chinese correspondent. The conference was held in the renamed Merdeka (Freedom) Building, once an exclusive Dutch nightclub where imperialists had for seventy-five years schemed how to enslave and persecute the Indonesian people.

"For long years we Asian and African people," Sukarno continued, "have tolerated decisions made in our stead by those countries which

placed their own interests above all else. We lived in poverty and humiliation. But tremendous changes have taken place in the past years. Many peoples and countries have awakened from centuries of slumber. Tranquility has given way to struggle and action. This irresistible force is sweeping the two continents."

He hoped this conference would give evidence "that a new Asia and a new Africa have been born." The primary task was to achieve mutual understanding because doing so would strengthen respect for one another, from which collective action could rise. "Brothers and sisters," Sukarno said, let us not forget that to achieve this end our Asian and African people must be united."²

Over four decades later, President Sukarno and most of the influential personages there are no longer living-including Indian Prime Minister Nehru, Indonesian Prime Minister Sastroamidjojo, Egyptian President Nasser, Chinese Premier Zhou Enlai. Were they alive, I believe they would feel gratified, because their tremendous contribution to the conference wrote a brilliant page in history. Bandung, as Sukarno predicted, has pushed history forward. The "Bandung spirit" embodied in the Five Principles of Peaceful Coexistence has become the criterion for international relations opposed to hegemonism and power politics, and has gained significance on a world scale.

The convocation of Asian and African countries in the 1950s, without the participation of the Western powers, signalled the failure of the post-World War II attempts by the imperialists and colonialists to obstruct the national independence movements. Already then, many newly emerging countries had made their appearance on the world political stage, but it was only a beginning. A number of them had only through struggle shaken off the yoke of colonial rule. Not yet having won independence, others, like Morocco, Tunisia and Algeria sent only observers. In the United Nations a small number of powers still had the final say in everything. Even the People's Republic of China, with a quarter of the world's population, deprived of its rightful seat, had no voice there.

Today's world is fundamentally changed. One after another, countries have won national independence. The Third World has become a

decisive force. The days when a few powers decided the world's destiny are gone forever. Restoration of the People's Republic of China's legitimate seat in the United Nations in 1971 added considerable weight to the Third World countries in the international balance

China visit unites the peoples of the South

THE BANDUNG CONFERENCE of African and Asian countries was held in Indonesia in 1955. It was attended by the governments of 29 independent countries. Reflecting the continued colonial domination of our continent, only 6 of these governments were African.

Our own movement was represented by such leaders as Moses Kotane. Ahmed Ben Bella represented the then fighting people of Algeria. The African-American population sent the legendary Congressman Adam Clayton Powell of Harlem.

Present at what was the founding Conference of the Non Aligned Movement, were the outstanding leaders who had successfully led their peoples in the struggle against colonialism. I refer here to such leaders as Ahmed Sukarno, Gamal Abdel-Nasser, Kwame Nkrumah, Zhou En Lai, Jawaharlal Nehru and Ho Chi Minh.

Speaking at the opening of the Conference, President Sukarno said: "So, let this Asian-African Conference be a great success! Make the

Deleted: ¶

¶
¶
¶
¶
¶

'Live and let live' principle and the 'Unity in Diversity' motto the unifying force which brings us all together."

He went on to say: "If we succeed in doing so, the effect of it for the freedom, independence and the welfare of man will be great on the world at large. The Light of Understanding has again been lit, the Pillar of Cooperation again erected. It is for us to spread (this) message all over the World."

The Final Communiqué issued at the end of the Conference reflected the 'Light of Understanding' and the 'Pillar of Cooperation'.

Deleted: This 'Light of Understanding' and 'Pillar of Cooperation', were reflected in

Deleted: t

Deleted: .

Among other things, this Communiqué said: "The Asian-African Conference recognised the urgency of promoting economic development in the Asian-African region. There was general desire for economic co-operation among the participating countries on the basis of mutual interest and respect for national sovereignty. The proposals with regard to economic co-operation within the participating countries do not preclude either the desirability or the need for co-operation with countries outside the region, including the investment of foreign capital. It was further recognised that the assistance being received by certain participating countries from outside the region, through international or under bilateral arrangements, had made a valuable contribution to the implementation of their development programmes. The participating countries agreed to provide technical assistance to one another, to the maximum extent practicable, in the form of: experts, trainees; pilot projects and equipment for demonstration purposes; exchange of know-how and establishment of national and, where possible, regional training and research institutes for importing technical knowledge and skills in co-operation with the existing international agencies."

Twenty-seven years after Bandung, in 1982, the then leader of the Chinese people, Deng Xiaoping, made the following statement: "We are very pleased that Third World countries have put forward the question of South-South cooperation. Of course, the question of relations between the South and the North should also be resolved. With the Third World so heavily in debt, how will its people be able to survive? If the developed countries don't use their money to help the

developing countries expand their economies, they won't have any market in the Third World. As a Chinese saying goes, the richer a man is, the meaner he is. So it is not enough for the Third World to place its hopes on a change in relations between the South and the North. There must also be South-South cooperation. If we want to change the international economic order, we must, above all, settle the question of relations between the South and the North, but at the same time we have to find new ways to increase South-South cooperation."

This week, we paid a very successful visit to China at the invitation of President Jiang Zemin. Our delegation consisted of Cabinet Ministers and government officials, members of our country's private sector, the business world, and our mass media.

Quite correctly, the Chinese Premier, Zhu Rongji, described ours as a Goodwill Visit. Indeed it was. The warmth with which we were received will remain permanently in the hearts and minds of all of us who had the privilege to visit the great cities of Beijing, Shanghai and Hong Kong.

The central purpose of our visit was to strengthen the relations between South Africa and China. Both sides agreed that this objective was achieved. This success was, of course, based on exchanges that had taken place between our governments and countries previously. In this regard, I would like to mention especially, the visit of President Jiang Zemin to our country in April last year and our relations that stretch back to Mapungubwe, a millennium ago.

I began this Letter by referring to the Bandung Conference of 1955 and remarks made by Deng Xiaoping in 1982. I did this to locate our visit within its historical context. What we cited points to the fact that as South Africa and China work to strengthen their cooperation and their relations, they do so within the framework of a long-shared vision of the peoples of the South, of the strategic importance of South-South cooperation.

At the same time, the Bandung Final Communiqué made the correct point that South-South cooperation does not 'preclude either the desirability or the need for cooperation with countries outside the

region'. Deng Xiaoping added the equally correct observation that 'if we want to change the international economic order, we must, above all, settle the question of relations between the South and the North'.

What all this means is that, as countries of the South, we are faced with three important tasks. These are:

- To strengthen South-South cooperation in all areas;
- To work in a harmonious and mutually beneficial manner with the countries of the North; and,
- To work to restructure the relations between the North and the South for the benefit of both North and South.

In the context of South-South cooperation, we agreed with our Chinese counterparts on the further expansion of our economic relations, on cooperation and exchanges in areas of science and technology, education, culture, international relations, parliamentary systems, law enforcement and so on.

The Chinese government also informed us of the important decision it had taken to grant our country approved destination status for Chinese tourists. This will enable us to promote our country as a tourist destination among the 1,3 billion citizens of China who constitute almost 25 per cent of the world's population. Agreement was also reached that we explore the possibility of arriving at a free trade agreement, which, inter alia, would facilitate the entry of South African products into the vast and rapidly growing Chinese market. These critically important discussions will begin early in the New Year.

With regard to scientific cooperation, we must mention, especially, the development of pebble bed nuclear reactors for the generation of electricity. One of the pre-eminent universities of China, Tsinghua, is conducting important research in this area. Our own Eskom is also working in the same area. These two institutions are already cooperating on this project and will further extend their collaboration in a venture that is focused on helping human society globally to meet its energy needs, in a manner that addresses legitimate universal concerns about safety and the environment. Together, Tsinghua and Eskom, globally, occupy the cutting edge in the development of this technology.

During our visit, we also participated in the launch of the South Africa-China Binational Commission. The rapid expansion of relations between our two countries since 1998, covering many areas, necessitated the establishment of this Commission. It will ensure that we develop our relations in a comprehensive and balanced manner.

We were privileged to be in China at the precise moment when she became a member of the World Trade Organisation (WTO), which development we have supported over the years without hesitation. The Chinese economy is the seventh largest in the world. Its ranking will further improve in the coming years. China's membership of the WTO therefore helps to address the issue raised in Bandung, of healthy relations between the Afro-Asian region and the rest of the world.

Because of the standing of China, which is also one of the five permanent members of the UN Security Council, while being a developing country, it is clear that her membership of the WTO will also improve the possibility successfully to deal with the critical issue of North-South relations. This includes the life and death matter for us, of Africa's relations with the developed world. Accordingly, we agreed with our Chinese friends that we will work with them for the success of NEPAD and the Sino-African process of cooperation agreed at a Chinese-African ministerial meeting held in Beijing last year. We will also work together to ensure the success of both the forthcoming post-Doha WTO Development Round and next year's Johannesburg World Summit for Sustainable Development.

The Bandung Conference expressed its "wholehearted sympathy and warm support of the courageous stand taken by the victims of racial and political repression, more particularly the peoples of African and Indian origin in the Union of South Africa. The Conference also pays its tributes to all those who oppose racial doctrines and have joined their fellow citizens in their struggle for equality, justice and human rights".

We were pleased, once more, to thank the government and people of China for what they had done to support us in our struggle against apartheid tyranny, against 'racial and political repression', for

wiping out of colonialism from the African and Asian continents and the reemergence of hundreds of millions of people in world politics as free and active participants in the collective construction of a better human destiny.

We are moved to recall the words of our late President Chief Albert Luthuli when he opened the 42nd Annual Conference of the ANC in 1953. To this day we repeat after him: "Our interest in freedom is not confined to ourselves only. We are interested in the liberation of all oppressed people in the whole of Africa and in the world as a whole... Our active interest in the extension of freedom to all people denied it makes us ally ourselves with freedom forces in the world."

The struggles of this alliance, of "freedom forces in the world" have brought us to the threshold of the realisation of the goals set out at Bandung. Beyond that threshold lie two great Asian and African questions of contemporary international politics, viz., the liberation of the people of Palestine and the restoration of their national rights and the liberation of the peoples of southern Africa and the restoration of their national rights.

Deleted: struggles of this alliance, of "freedom forces in the world" has

It is therefore appropriate that this conference should take place in Lusaka, the capital of the Republic of Zambia, because, for Africa, this great Republic represents both actually and symbolically, physically and politically, the threshold to total liberation which we have reached as a result of the struggles of the people of this country acting in alliance with the freedom forces of the world.

This very setting, the commitment and the daily participation of the people and government, UNIP and the President of this country, Dr. Kenneth Kaunda, in the struggle for the liberation of southern Africa, immediately suggest what tasks face this very important conference.

We think it is proper that this conference should strive to reach a comprehensive understanding of southern African actuality and on the basis of that understanding and as fellow combatants for a common cause look once more into the question - what is to be done?

Formatted: Font: (Default) Arial, 14 pt

Important Questions

The question whether southern Africa would ever be liberated was answered many years ago, and practically, by the victories of the African forces of national liberation over British, French and Belgian colonialism. These victories both prove that colonialism had outlived its time, and gave birth to a vast rear base which made possible the raising of the level of confrontation in those countries which were as yet in bondage.

The second question, whether the African liberation movements could in fact succeed in their struggles despite the stubborn armed resistance of the colonial Powers was answered also in the affirmative, in the first instance by the victory of the people of Algeria under the leadership of the FLN.

The victories of FRELIMO, the PAIGC and the MPLA and no less that of the Vietnamese people over United States imperialism, brought the lesson to the very doorstep of extreme and entrenched imperialist domination in South Africa, Zimbabwe and Namibia. The answer was simply this - that yes, the liberation movements will win regardless of what the enemy does to deny us our victory.

The third question, what kind of liberation this would be has, for us in southern Africa, been answered again practically by the realisation of popular power in Angola and Mozambique and the process of social transformation which that popular power has started in those two countries.

Imperialism recognises that even in southern Africa and in Palestine, naked colonial rule can no longer be maintained. The colonised peoples themselves are demonstrating in practice and in full view of the imperialists themselves that they are determined to achieve victory or to perish in the pursuit of that victory.

Of course this is not the first time that imperialism has been faced with this reality. We all know what happened historically - the imperialists had to concede independence to the colonised peoples, as they will surely be forced to do in southern Africa.

However, as an inevitable consequence of the development of the African revolution, as we have said, the liberation movements of

southern Africa as well as the imperialists themselves are faced with the question, what kind of decolonisation shall this be!

The fact that this question has become an issue of practical and immediate politics in southern Africa is a sign of how much the balance of forces has changed in this region, in Africa and in the world. A mere 20 years ago, this question was being laughed out of court as premature within the milieu of African politics.

Today, the imperialists themselves recognise the immediacy of this question. Thus while imperialism recognises that the time for the decolonisation of South Africa, Namibia and Zimbabwe has come, it wants a type of decolonisation which will leave its interests, its hegemony and its power in the region intact, a form of liberation therefore which will be incomplete and fraudulent, leaving the peoples of southern Africa bound hand and foot to the imperialist system of economic, military, political and other relations, the objects of imperialist exploitation and domination under a new guise. In short, imperialism aims for a neo-colonialist decolonisation.

Enemy Maneuvers

Formatted: Font: (Default) Arial, 14 pt

The continuation of imperialist hegemony in Zimbabwe, Namibia and South Africa aims not only to protect the immense imperialist interests in these countries.

Thus imperialism wants to maintain its hegemony in Namibia, Zimbabwe and South Africa in order to use this area as its base to put back under its hegemony the independent States of southern Africa. Conversely, imperialism is haunted by the spectre that more than 30 million people of the non-liberated south of Africa will succeed to break the chains of imperialist domination and achieve complete and genuine liberation, an event that would have radical and fundamental repercussions, further altering the relations between Africa and the imperialist world in favour of the masses of the ordinary working people of our continent.

The critical factor that confronts imperialism is that its antagonists as represented by the PLO in Palestine, SWAPO in Namibia, the Patriotic Front in Zimbabwe and the ANC in South Africa represent a future that is not anti-colonial merely but anti-imperialist as well.

These liberation movements are the midwives of a future which will be characterised by the transfer of all power to the people: by "all power" this conference should understand exactly that we mean political power, economic power, and military power - a genuine and meaningful transfer of power to the people.

It would be of little moment to the racists of southern Africa, the Zionists in Israel and their international allies if these organisations represented a minority tendency on the fringes of a largely so-called "moderate" broad liberation movement.

The fact however, is that these movements are the genuine representatives of their peoples. They constitute the core and the vanguard of the liberation forces of their respective countries without whom and against whom no just and lasting solutions of the fundamental problems of the Middle East and southern Africa are possible.

The imperialists themselves recognise this reality. Take, for instance, the statement made by Chief [Lennox] Sebe, appointee of the South African regime who has the task to administer the Ciskei bantustan. Here is what he said at the end of last year:

"The Rhodesian and South West African questions will be settled one way or other within the next six months and an evaluation of certain aspects of the conflict which occurred there needs to be made as it is relevant to our own future... It would seem inevitable that immediately the Rhodesian and South West African problems are settled, the ANC will begin a determined onslaught against South Africa, both externally and internally in a bid to obtain added recognition for itself, initially among third world Powers, but later internationally. Events of the past have shown that should the ANC be determined enough in their efforts, they have a very good chance of success. Firstly, they can succeed in obtaining recognition for themselves as being the only relevant opposition to the white South African Government, with United Nations membership to back their claim. Once that happens, the leaders of homelands and independent (bantustans) will be in an invidious position."

We should however remember that exactly because they recognise this reality, the imperialist Powers are carrying out maneuvers of all kinds so as to ensure that the fall of the racist regimes does not mean the final liquidation of their interests, their hegemony and their power in the region.

To achieve this result imperialism has embarked on an ambitious, integrated and brutal offensive designed to produce a solution in southern Africa and the Middle East which will guarantee the permanence of its hegemony in these regions.

What are the principal moments of this offensive?

- a. The racist regimes and their allies aim physically to liquidate the liberation movements in southern Africa, both within their respective countries and in their areas of sanctuary in the Frontline States;
- b. Simultaneously they aim to compel the neighbouring independent States to turn against the liberation movements. For this purpose, as we all know, they have resorted to regular military raids deep into the Frontline States, annihilating hundreds of people and destroying property;
- c. They are also very busy creating such forces among the black oppressed as would replace the white minority regimes as the guarantors of the permanence of imperialist hegemony in southern Africa in exchange for high-sounding titles and a life of luxury for a handful of black traitors;
- d. Imperialism is at the same time continuing to pour military and economic support into South Africa and Rhodesia to ensure that the racist regimes in these countries remain continuously the principal factor determining the content and pace of any process of decolonisation;
- e. Imperialism has also stepped up its intervention within the world democratic movement, to turn this movement away from its anti-imperialist positions and step by step to detach from it important contingents and use these in its global offensive against the forces of national liberation, social progress and peace.

Among other things, this strategy means that:

In opposition to each genuine liberation movement created by the masses of the oppressed people to serve as the representative of their aspirations, imperialism is trying to create its own "decolonisers" whom it describes as internal as opposed to our being external and therefore not representing the people, to serve as the representatives of continued imperialist domination.

In direct relationship as the forces of reaction are doing everything in their power to bolster these hired decolonisers, so also are they intensifying their campaign physically to liquidate the authentic liberation movements within their respective countries and in their temporary homes in the Frontline States, to ensure that we who are dying to secure our liberation do not force our people to vote for their own liberation!

Simultaneously as they raise a clamour about human rights and shuttle to and fro between Pretoria, Salisbury and Windhoek and the capitals of the Western world professing a determination to bring about a just and peaceful solution, the imperialist countries are stepping up their aid to the racist regimes, to guarantee the continued existence of these regimes.

To our strategic line that armed struggle is a necessary and decisive factor in securing victory, imperialism answers by seeking to cut us off from Frontline States, the socialist countries and the rest of progressive humanity while working rapidly to create new puppet military forces in southern Africa and to increase the level of participation of foreign mercenaries, amid more strident calls for a peaceful solution and touching expressions of grave concern that unwittingly we have turned ourselves into tools of so-called Soviet imperialism.

In the Middle East the desperate American effort to establish peace and work towards the restoration of the national rights of the Palestinian people has resulted in the detachment of Egypt from the rest of the Arab world, the heightening of tension in the region, a treaty undertaken by Egypt not to allow the Palestinian people to continue their struggle from Egyptian soil, the offer of bantustans to the Palestinians and the release of Israeli pilots to fly combat missions against the peoples of southern Africa.

In the Far East the normalisation of relations between the People's Republic of China on the one hand, Japan and the USA on the other, aimed, we were made to believe, at the relaxation of international tensions and the extension of the frontiers of peace, have been followed by the abrogation by China of a peace treaty of long standing, the invasion of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam and military missions from Peking to acquire the most modern weapons from the Western world.

It should therefore be clear that the perspective that confronts us here in southern Africa is one of an intensified counteroffensive by the racist regimes and their allies. This offensive is made all the more necessary from the point of view of the enemy by the very fact of the strength of the liberation movements and the level of consciousness among the broad masses of our people. The steadfast support for and involvement in the common struggle of the Frontline States, the rest of Africa, the socialist and other progressive countries as well as other contingents of democratic mankind, including the forces represented at this Conference, have enabled us to raise the intensity of the confrontation between the forces of progress and those of reaction. The genuine liberation of southern Africa is nearer today than it has ever been in the past.

As a result of this, the fascist regime of Botha and Vorster is confronted with the further deepening of the general crisis of the apartheid system. It finds itself unable to solve any of the fundamental problems that inexorably lay at the basis for its own destruction.

As the racist regime sees a greater need to entrench the apartheid system, the more the masses of our people and the international community reject it, compelling even the most timid to cry out - enough, no more!

It is this failure which has resulted in the so-called information scandal whose significance lies in the fact that it has exposed to the white population what the black people have always known to be true: that the apartheid system is based on murder, theft, lies and corruption, all perpetrated by a group of people who would like everybody to believe that they are deputies elected by God.

Similarly the implementation of the bantustan programme serves further to convince our people that by sacrificing their lives in the struggle for the seizure of power, they have nothing to lose, and their country to gain.

Mahlangu - Unbroken and Unbreakable

Formatted: Font: (Default) Arial, 14 pt

In his brief but full life Solomon Mahlangu towered like a colossus, unbroken and unbreakable, over the fascist lair. He, on whom our people have bestowed accolades worthy of the hero-combatant that he is, has been hanged in Pretoria like a common murderer. Alone the hangmen buried Solomon, bound by a forbidding oath that his grave shall remain forever a secret, because, in his death the spirit of Solomon Mahlangu towers still like a colossus, unbroken and unbreakable, over the fascist lair. To malign him, to malign his comrades and his organisations which have yet to discharge their historic mission, and which will avenge the assassination of this and other prisoners of war, the fascist tyrants put out the story that Solomon had ceased to be as we know him, brave, confident and fearless of death. But we knew they lied. Now the whole world knows that he approached the gallows as befits a loyal and disciplined combatant of *Umkhonto we Sizwe*, sworn to liberate his people whatever the cost, as that Solomon who had volunteered to serve his people until victory or death.

On behalf of the African National Congress, our people's army *Umkhonto we Sizwe* and the struggling people of South Africa, we would like to take this opportunity to salute all who are gathered here for the battle you fought to save the life of Solomon. We would also like to extend that sentiment to those others who are not with us here, governments, national and international organisations, communities and individuals who also added their voices to the demand to save the life of Solomon.

Our people inside South Africa have done as we expected them to. Unequivocally they stood by Solomon to the last moment because to them he was a son, a brother, their product, his cause theirs, his death a challenge spurring them to greater efforts to remove the

regime which continues to display such callous disregard of everything that is moral and just and humane.

At the end of the day, the fascist regime of Botha and Vorster stood alone in front of all humanity, alone in its regard of the pursuit of freedom as a crime punishable by death, alone in rejoicing that a life so young and so full of promise had so suddenly and so brutally been terminated.

In Pretoria, on the 6th April, at dawn, a heinous crime was committed against our people, against humanity. For our part, there can only be one reply to the murder of Solomon Mahlangu and that is to intensify our general offensive against the regime of assassins that holds our people in servitude. The African National Congress, *Umkhonto we Sizwe* and our people have the will and the determination to succeed. Indeed with such stalwarts as Solomon Mahlangu in our mist, things could not be otherwise, especially in this centenary year of the victory of our people at Isandlwana, a year which our people designate as the Year of the Spear.

A Clear Call

Formatted: Font: (Default) Arial, 14 pt

We are convinced that out of this very important conference a clear call will come:

- To consolidate and raise the level of unity among all anti-imperialist and anti-racist forces;
- To increase material and political support to the ANC, SWAPO and the Patriotic Front, and rally to the support of the PLO;
- To increase support to the Frontline States;
- To isolate further the fascist regimes in Pretoria and Salisbury;
- To compel the Western countries to cease their support for these regimes.

The dangerous situation that has arisen in southern Africa, itself a reflection of how close we are to real and genuine victories throughout southern Africa, makes imperative the practical realisation of these demands. We can, with certainty say that such is the nature of the forces represented here that the results of this Conference will indeed take us one giant step nearer to the full accomplishment of the tasks laid down at the Bandung Conference.

**Remarks by H.E. DR. N. Hassan Wirajuda (Minister for Foreign
Affairs) of the
Republic of Indonesia
At
The Launching of the Theme and Logo for The Asian-African
Summit 2005 and
The Golden Jubilee Commemoration of the Asian-African
Conference 1995**

Excellencies,
Distinguished Guests,
Ladies and Gentlemen,

Formatted: Font: (Default) Arial, 14
pt

Almost fifty years ago, countries from Asia and Africa met in the city of Bandung, Indonesia to forge closer cooperation. It was a bold effort to escape from their lack of development and to challenge the predominant world order at the time. United by recent similar experience in the hands of colonialists, the participants of the 1955 Asian-African Conference planted the seeds for a bridge linking the two continents as equal and mutually beneficial partners.

The event was a defining moment in the history of these countries, and its resultant Spirit of Bandung became the underlying inspiration for the continued striving towards the attainment of a just, peaceful, progressive and prosperous world.

Since then, however, the evolution of this partnership has been full of challenges, as unfavourable circumstances persistently hindered the realization of the ideals and vision expounded during the Bandung Conference. Many Asian and African countries remain at the margins of the economic globalization and unable to fully benefit from the opportunities offered by the evolving digital age.

Even though significant political advances have been achieved in many of these countries, progress in the social and economic fields has been somewhat limited to only a few of them. Ultimately, the lacking economic potential has seriously posed difficulties against efforts to fully harness the potential of their hard-fought political independence.

Countries in Asia and Africa must prevail over the pressures from both globalization and integration process. In Asia, we have developed bridges of cooperation across the Pacific Ocean through APEC, ARF and FEALAC. While with Europe, we have developed ASEM at Summit level. However, a bridge of cooperation across the Indian Ocean is notably absent. Hence, we must not fail to move forward.

Deleted: Asia ,

Formatted: Font: (Default) Arial, 14 pt

It was with the intention to rekindle the "Bandung Spirit" and establishing a new "bridge of cooperation", that Indonesia and South Africa co-hosted the Asian-African Sub-Regional Organizations Conference (AASROC), appropriately in Bandung in July 2003.

Formatted: Font: (Default) Arial, 14 pt

The success of this event was then followed by a second conference a year later in Durban , South Africa . By emphasizing the need to develop links through more tangible and feasible means, the AASROC process generated the development of a New Asian-African Strategic Partnership, which is based on an idea that is visceral, a connection that has historical roots, an understanding founded on common experience, and a mutual desire to pursue the goals of promoting peace, progress, and prosperity.

Formatted: Font: (Default) Arial, 14 pt

This strategic partnership will be launched during the Asian-African Summit in Indonesia on 21-23 April 2005, which will be held in conjunction with the Commemoration of the Golden Jubilee of the 1955 Asian-African Conference.

Deleted: ¶

Excellencies,

Ladies and Gentlemen,

The theme of this event, ***"Reinvigorating the Bandung Spirit: Working Towards a New Asian-African Strategic Partnership"***, aptly marks the dawn of new cooperation among countries in Asia and Africa. It is recognition of the continued validity of the Spirit of Bandung, which core principles are solidarity, friendship and cooperation, in resolving global issues of common concern and fostering better relations among countries. It is our sincerest hope that the event and its outcome would pave the way towards the creation of better living conditions for the future of the peoples in the two continents.

Formatted: Font: (Default) Arial, 14 pt

Deleted: Africa .

Formatted: Font: (Default) Arial, 14 pt

Deleted: a recognition

Formatted: Font: (Default) Arial, 14 pt

As part of efforts to welcome the events in April 2005, the Department of Foreign Affairs held a contest to determine a logo that would, in unison with the theme, symbolize the resilience and evolution of the Asian-African partnership. The concept of the winning logo, which was selected among a number of contest entries, represents the partnership's striving towards world peace, prosperity and progress.

The colour "red" symbolizes Asia, while "green" Africa, which together join to form the shape of a dove as well as the number "50" representing the Golden Jubilee Commemoration. The round, blue border of the logo represents the world and globalism, while the dove, carrying an olive branch and facing right in an upward motion, symbolizes a peaceful spirit in achieving a better tomorrow.

Deleted: Asia ,

Formatted: Font: (Default) Arial, 14 pt

Deleted: Africa ,

Formatted: Font: (Default) Arial, 14 pt

Excellencies,
Ladies and Gentlemen,

The development of the theme and logo as well as their launching today officially kick starts the beginning of preparations towards the events in April 2005. It is therefore with a deepest sense of honour and pleasure that I shall invite you to join me in witnessing the unveiling of the theme and logo for the Asian-African Summit 2005 and the Golden Jubilee Commemoration of the Asian-African Conference 1995.

Formatted: Font: (Default) Arial, 14 pt

Formatted: Font: (Default) Arial, 14 pt



Formatted: Font: 14 pt

An Afro-Dalit Story

On January 30, 1998, I went on air with Ron Daniels for his two-hour radio program on the National Urban Radio Network. The theme for the show was Gandhi and Dr. King, since it was the 50th anniversary of Gandhi's assassination. After a brief back and forth, we went to the phones. From the first call onward, folks asked about Gandhi's relationship with the Dalits as well as the condition of Dalits in contemporary India. One caller referred to the Dalits as Black Untouchables and asked if I knew a book by V. T. Rajshekar.

I was very pleased with the experience, mainly because it is rare to find a U.S. audience so informed about things Indian. But I was also curious to know about this interest amongst African Americans for the social struggles of Dalits. I knew that in India the progressive community took a keen interest in the lives of Black Americans, from the time of the 1931 Scottsboro incident through the persecution of Paul Robeson and now with the trials of Mumia Abu Jamal. Solidarity with African Americans is second nature to the Indian Left: when King came to India in 1959, he was overwhelmed by the reception accorded him.

The intimation of solidarity that King felt in India was an aftermath of the great Afro-Asian Conference held at Bandung, Indonesia in 1955 (covered by Richard Wright in a fine book, *The Color Curtain*). The Bandung Spirit reflects an anti-racist and anti-imperialist experiment with solidarity, one that floundered in the vise of the Cold War. The people who asked about the Dalits, however, did not seem motivated by Bandung. They saw the Dalits as long-lost Africans, people so identified by the color of their skin (if not their genetic roots). I found this puzzling.

I turned to V. T. Rajshekar's *Dalit: The Black Untouchables of India*, first published in 1979, but reprinted in an expanded edition by Clarity Press of Atlanta in 1987. Rajshekar's book began with the premise

that Dalits are part of the African diaspora and that they are the first settlers in the Indian subcontinent. "It is said," he writes, "that India and Africa was one land mass until separated by the ocean. So both the Africans and the Indian Untouchables and tribals had common ancestors. Besides," he argues, Dalits "resemble Africans in physical features."

This was just what Runoko Rashidi says he saw during his 1999 tour of India. "In Orissa," he says, "I saw and photographed the blackest human beings I've ever seen. In fact, it is my impression that the blackest people were here most highly esteemed and considered better than the others, who were not so dark." These "blackest human beings" Rashidi identified as the Dalits, the Black Untouchables.

In the mid-1980s, as a young student Rashidi heard Ivan van Sertima speak at UCLA. Van Sertima was already well known for his attempt to show that Africans came to the Americas long before the Europeans. "What we are doing," he has since said, "is reconstituting the history of African people around the world. We have come to reclaim the house of history." Van Sertima encouraged an enthusiastic Rashidi to pursue his thoughts about the ancestry of ancient Indians.

"All people came from Africa," Rashidi argues, "but some people more than others." He adopts the arguments that humanity begins in Africa (whether in Aramis, Ethiopia, Kanapoi and Allia Bay, Kenya, or the Jukskei River, South Africa). All people are African, he told me, but that was millions of years ago. Some people are African more recently. Dalits fall into that category.

In 1999, Human Rights Watch (New York) published a report on the Dalits (literally broken or oppressed people) of India, a population that now numbers about 160 million. Before the growth of a self-conscious Dalit movement a few decades ago, the terms most commonly used to designate this population were 'Untouchable' and "Harijan" ("Children of God," a term used by Gandhi). Human Rights Watch found that the situation of Dalits was deplorable and called their condition "hidden apartheid." Despite India's very progressive laws, HRW found that Dalits do not enjoy the protections to which they are entitled.

Deleted:

“If there are any people more oppressed than Dalits,” Rashidi notes, “I don’t want to see it. Nothing compares to that.” Ken Cooper, who was bureau chief for the Washington Post in New Delhi, notes that “as an African American I used to think American racism was the most stifling obsessive system of oppression in the world, with the exception of what was South African apartheid. After my stay in India, I am sure the caste system was and continues to be worse—it has religious sanction and has been ingrained for 3000 years.” Comparative oppression is not a useful exercise, since each society seems to conjure up its own form of barbarity. Nevertheless, both Rashidi and Cooper make the case quite forcefully that Dalit life is painfully hard.

Little that HRW catalogued is new to either the Dalits or to the many agencies and political organizations who have been at work for social justice in India. As with social justice work elsewhere, there are many factors that prevent the emancipation of the Dalits. The main causes of atrocities against Dalits, the Indian government acknowledges, are “disputes and conflicts arising from land, wages, bonded labour and indebtedness.” Without widespread economic change, any movement for social justice will falter.

Many Dalit groups, taking their cue from civil liberties organizations, ignore much of the economic ground for untouchability. Communist leader Brinda Karat notes that “only Communist inspired movements, enabled by the active participation of Dalits, have led to concrete gains against casteism.” In West Bengal, she shows, the Communist government initiated land reform that now forms “the backbone of Dalit self-respect and dignity in the State.”

If the Dalits, now one-sixth of the Indian population, did forge a united bloc, then it might be easy to fight the power of untouchability. However, there are many oppressed communities across the country who are considered Dalit by the government and by scholars, but who do not see unity amongst themselves. In a recent book of synthesis, the Belgian scholar Robert Deliège argues that Dalits “do not constitute a uniform community with its own culture; they are widely integrated into the local communities and share the basic values of these communities. If untouchability can be said to have

one primary characteristic, it is this fragmentation, which binds them inexorably to the very communities that reject them.” The Dalit movement, of late, has attempted to forge this unity, and it has found the going rough. In June 1972, the Dalit Panthers was formed in Bombay (named from and inspired by the Black Panthers), a group who attempted to be a main agent of unity. However, it has since degenerated into bourgeois nationalism.

Racialist nationalism, of the sort preached by Rashidi and Rajshekar, is an understandable reaction to racism, but it is not an effective, nor morally defensible, anti-racist strategy. “We say you don’t fight racism with racism,” said the late Black Panther leader Fred Hampton (in 1969 before his assassination by the U.S. government). “We’re gonna fight racism with solidarity.” Rashidi, who has been to India three times, was contrite about the way he represents Dalits in the U.S. “I feel bad about it. I oversimplified to make it palatable to a Black constituency. I’ve given the impression that Dalits are Black people. Dalits, I now find, are a social and economic group, more than a racial group.” Nevertheless, Rashidi holds that “large sections of the Dalits would be seen as Black people if they lived anywhere else” and that the connections between Africans and Dalits “go beyond phenotype.”

In the 1920s, several Black American writers took an interest in the struggles led by M. K. Gandhi. While writing of the non-violence campaign, they also wrote at length about the Dalit struggles for emancipation. Sudharshan Kapur’s *Raising Up a Prophet: The African American Encounter with Gandhi* (Beacon, 1992) offers a useful catalogue of these writings and of the deep interest taken by African Americans in Dalit lives. However, few African Americans felt the need to seek biological kin with the Dalits, since they argued (like Dr. Howard Thurman) that the two communities “do not differ in principle and in inner pain.”

Seventy years later, Ken Cooper, in Delhi, sought out Dalit intellectuals who soon took refuge in his office. “African Americans and Dalits share a common history of oppression based on skin color,” Cooper says. Skin color, however, is a very unclear mark for oppression, since in India skin color does not directly correlate to one’s caste.

If the basis of oppression is not identical, at any rate two oppressed communities can certainly share strategies of struggle with each other. That King drew from Gandhi is one example of this. Since Dalit rights are enshrined in the Indian Constitution, Cooper wondered what the implications would have been had the Civil Rights movement won that position in the U.S.? Troy Duster of the University of California at Berkeley is currently at work on a comparative project on caste oppression in the U.S., South Africa, and India.

The question of political linkages is of interest to the Black Radical Congress's International Commission/Caucus (June 19-21, 2000), which will meet to discuss, among other things, the Dalit situation. The BRC and Cooper stay along the grain of W. E. B. Du Bois, rather than Rashidi and Rajshekar. In 1940, Du Bois reflected on his relationship with Africa. "Neither my father nor my father's father ever saw Africa or knew its meaning or cared overmuch for it," he wrote. "But the physical bond is least and the badge of color relatively unimportant saves as badge; the real essence of this kinship is its social heritage of slavery; the discrimination and insult; and this heritage binds together not simply the children of Africa, but extends through yellow Asia and into the South Seas. It is this unity that draws me to Africa."

Deleted: badge of color relatively unimportant save

During his 1999 trip to India, Rashidi was greeted by a section from the Communist Party at Trivandrum airport with shouts of "Free Mumia Abu-Jamal" and the moderator at his program in Bhubaneswar read extracts from Claude McKay's autobiography. Such emblems of internationalism come to us frequently from anti-colonial nationalism. It is no secret that the first Afro-Asian Conference at Bandung (1955) did not attempt to erase differences, but brought different people together on a platform to combat racism and imperialism. The Bandung style, however flawed, provoked people across the world to put their shoulder to the wheel of other people's struggles, to give solidarity.

Vijay Prashad is assistant professor of International Studies at Trinity College, CT. He is the author of Untouchable Freedom: A Social

History of a Dalit Community (Oxford University Press) and Karma of Brown Folk (University of Minnesota Press)

Inter-religious and Intercultural Charter on Global Solidarity for Life

*Wolfgang R. Schmidt,
Bangkok Herrischried, October 2003*

References

The idea of planning an international and inter-religious event on the occasion of the 50th anniversary of the Asia Africa Conference in Bandung 1955 was born by the previous Indonesian President Abdurrahman Wahid during a meeting with the Thai author, publisher and social activist Sulak Sivaraksa in December 2000. Wahid's proposal was enthusiastically saluted by well-known South-East Asian intellectuals, publishers and politicians like Somchai Homlaor (General Secretary of Forum Asia), Bischof Labayan (President of the Asian Cultural Forum on Development), Dr. Habib Chirzin (Editor of an Indonesian Quaterly), Dr. Chaiwat Sathaanand (Director of Peace Information Centre, Thammasat University, Bangkok).

On the occasion of a number of conferences, a Bandung II concept for 2005 was discussed frequently and with different people and experts:

- Peacemaking and International Insecurity in the 21st century, AIT, Bangkok, February 2002
- Democratisation in the Context of Global and Regional Conflicts, Oxford, March 2002
- Asia-Africa Beyond Globalisation, Maranatha University, Bandung, June 2002
- Muslim-Buddhist Dialogue, Jakarta, Indonesia, July 2002

- Buddhist-Muslim Dialog-Conference, at UNESCO, Paris, May 2003
- Internat.Conference on Religion and Globalization, Payap-University, Chiangmai, Thailand, July/August 2003
- Extended Bandung II Working Group Meeting, Chiangmai, July/August 2003
(Nagoya / Japan, April 2004; Barcelona, July 2004)

The following is the result in form of a project which is in line with the rational of the previous Bandung II perspective, but is situated within the changing historical framework.

1. Network Forum

1.1 SEIN Associates and Cooperation

During the conference in Paris a wider interfaith network was initiated. It was confirmed in Chiangmai to support an inter-religious and intercultural Charter on Solidarity for Life. This supportive network was called: Socially Engaged Interfaith Network (SEIN). The main and unifying purpose of SEIN is to carry out a Bandung conference based on the Bandung 1955 legacy based on experienced mutual friendship and trust, seeking interfaith cooperation in the formation of a civil, just, sustainable and participatory society.

As “Associate Members” the following groups / organizations / NGOs were supposed to join SEIN:

- the International Network of Engaged Buddhist (INEB)
- the Museum of World Religions (MWR)
- the Global Family of Love and Peace (GFLP)
- the Asian Muslim Action Network (AMAN)
- the Islamic Millennium Forum (IMFO)
- the International Movement For A Just World (JUST)
- the Advanced Institute for the Study of Life (AISL) through which informal contacts are established with a foreseen WCC, WARC, CCA, NCCP based Global People’s Forum on Peace for Life
- Others sharing the SEIN targets.

1.2 Organization

There is a Bandung Working Group (BWG) which consists of six persons and a low profile office in Bangkok located in INEB.

1.3 Programmatic Concerns

While implementing the main goal, that is to carry out the Bandung legacy in search for better life for humanity, SEIN intends a multicultural and multidimensional approach to life. In its holistic concept of unity it seeks to a form of spirituality in harmony with nature.

All joint programs and common activities have to be discussed and unanimously agreed upon, based on:

- the spirit of mutual acceptance, co-existence and appreciation
- equal participation of all
- transparency on all levels
- mutual accountability
- openness to personal and institutional change
- contribute to qualitative growth for life
- respect for religious, cultural, etc differences

2. Concrete Targets

The following goals of SEIN are supposed to lead towards and to be supportive of the envisioned Bandung-process. They may be implemented by individual associates or as joint projects.

- Create local centers for global learning
- Support to the establishment of global institutions like the International Court for global jurisdiction (theory, inventory, sanctions, practice) to be implemented also for Sustainable Economy, Communication, Culture, Religion etc, that is aiming for equality in safeguarding and distribution in all fields of life
- Nurture a sense of history with a spirituality in harmony in nature (in order to see and to know how things have come into being and what the potentials for life are)
- Implement cultural exchange and immersion programs, supported by educational scholarships

3. Legacy of Bandung 1955 as Historical Background

3.1 Legacy

Bandung I (1955) was aimed at initiating a 3rd political way between the two superpowers and their respective ideological systems. It was not an option for either one side or the other. Therefore, Bandung I (1955) included differing and differing economic and cultural options.

Bandung II (2005) shall look for a 3rd way in economics and culture between a) a centralizing globalization and b) mere rejection of globalization and the claim of cultural/economic self-sufficiency.

3.2 Cold War Charters

In principle, SEIN agrees in principle with various Charters supported by the United Nations (UN) of which some are originated by the Non-Aligned-Movement (NAM). SEIN could support documents like:

- Human Rights Convention
- Earth Charter
- UN Climate-Protocol
- UNESCO Inter-religious and Intercultural Charter
- UN Charter of Global Ethics
- Human Security Convention

Many of these international charters are outdated because they perpetuate what was rejected by the Bandung Conference 1955, namely:

- In-comprehensiveness in dealing with the vital life-issues
- Major issues like human rights, peace and security, ecology and various social and cultural issues reflect the defunct East-West Bloc situation
- They are still based on the concept of nation states and corporate institutions.

Developed in the time of Cold-War, they are only partly adequate to meet the current global situation.

3.3 Concern Not only about States but prior about Movements

What usually is not included into UN- and other global charters are the emerging pronouncements and charters on human rights, peace

and security, life among people's, citizen's and religious **movements**, of which some are of high quality. In line with the Bandung 1955 legacy the peoples' experience must be consolidated in a unifying comprehensive and forward looking framework of Solidarity for Life

4. Priority Project: Charter on Global Solidarity for Life

4.1 Objective, Methodology, Timing

The SEIN-Bandung-2005-Group proposes study process aiming towards a Charter of Global Solidarity for Life and contributes towards a systemic management of globalization processes that is:

- To draft a Charter
- To write an inter-religious and inter-cultural document
- To develop legal frameworks on basic specific issues
- To develop a comprehensive framework of a people's tribunal against violations

Regarding methodology and timing, the SEIN-Bandung-2005-Group proposes

- To continue study work until end 2004
- To draft the Charter which will be presented to the Bandung Conference April 2005

The Charter must go beyond moral demands and develop a comprehensive strategy for solidarity for life

- In the area of global ethics and sanctions
- In the area of global education / ecology
- In the area of global economy / trade
- In the area of global social security / peace
- In the area of global communication

4.2 Relevance

The conference process, including the final Bandung event, shall try to find and discuss possibilities of progressive networking between the extremes of centralization and pluralism, i.e. it tries to find patterns for networking in terms of participatory justice and "respective response". Respective response would be a method to solve the problems on the level where problems arise. It requires a systemic re-entry of information and correction. This would be precisely a "systemic management of globalization processes" or a

conscious steering of those processes. Here, indicators for a successful systemic management could be:

- Reciprocal action/correction on the level of local units with global perspectives in view
- Interaction of economic processes and cultural factors
- Sustainability (ecological and cultural) which balances the preservation of multiplicity and the need for identity

These concerns are of an urgent nature. If they are not taken care of we will end up in ecological and cultural entropy. This urgency gives the justification for the entire conference process and its policy.

Hopefully the Charter will

- Provide an advanced and comprehensive base and framework also for various movements and not only nation states
- Challenge existing inadequate and unjust laws, conventions and charters on the global and regional, national and local level
- Provide an alternative framework for people's cases at an alternative and global people's tribunal.

5. Focus on Systemic Management of Globalization Processes

5.1 Preliminary focus for processing the Charter on Global Solidarity for Life

The focus of the entire process towards the final Bandung II Conference in April 2005 should be sharpened so that the entire process should be focused under the topic: **Systemic Management of Globalization Processes.**

5.2 Strategic Notes for the Implementation of the Conference:

- Seek close co-operation between economists, political activists, religious groups and educators, because all these aspects are interconnected
- Visions for change shall be presented in short theses and reacted upon by the invited speakers

5.3 Three Basic Assumptions

1. What has been called participatory justice is the possibility of communication and co-operation of as many groups and individuals in the economic and cultural processes of decision making and performance. It requires a networking of multiple perspectives and values.
2. This presupposes patterns of a civil society in global interaction.
3. Further, a civil global interaction requires institutions which
 - facilitate networking (a restructured UN and sub-divisions)
 - check those processes like the creating of the International Court for Criminal Affairs as well as aiming for similar Courts concerning economy, communication, information technologies, cybernetics and media-power.

5.4 Dialogue in Three Perspectives

The three assumptions mentioned above, call for dialogue in three perspectives:

1. Between global financial institutions (banks, international companies etc.) and people's organizations/associations
2. Between competing cultural/religious educators and institutions which set values and people's organizations
3. Between the media and people's organizations (for a more balanced authentic reporting on alternative practices and models etc.)

5.5 Application of Systemic Management to Four Areas

What has been called systemic management needs to be applied at least to four areas (topics). The conference would focus on these areas in such a way that each topic is addressed by mixed panels of economists, political action groups, religious thinkers and educators:

- Economics
- Political co-operation of different institutions of the global civil society
- Religious groups in action (not only religious leaders) – what has to be implemented are databanks which facilitate interaction and setting of priorities
- Educational processes (economy, politics, culture and religion)

6. Towards the Establishment of an University of World Religions

The project is proposed by the Museum of World Religions (MWR). It is still under discussion and in need of expertise and concrete experience.

6.1 Vision and Purpose

The University of World Religions (UWR) is envisioned as a higher institution of learning dedicated to

- The promotion of global peace
- Intercultural and inter religious understanding and co-operation
- Ecological healing of our planet earth.
- UWR will encourage research to expand the frontiers of human wisdom and knowledge along directions of global peace, ecological healing, and intercultural and inter-religious understanding and co-operation.

6.2 Implementation

6.2.1 Educational Activity

The university of World Religions will offer a four years program of university level education. The first two years will focus on the grounding and cultivation of attitudes and values to which it is dedicated, and the next two years, in continuity with the first two, will aim at the broadening of knowledge and sharpening of skills to enable its prospective graduates to serve the global community in various capacities in accordance with its founding spirit.

The first two years will be called the period of Foundational Studies, the second two years the period of Specialized Studies such as Languages, Economics and Political Sciences or International Law, Ecology and Environment. and will build up on the first two years. While continuing the formation in the various areas already begun, it will also enable the students to choose specialized areas to focus their time and energy.

A student choosing any of the above areas of specialization will also take representative courses from the other areas to ensure a well-rounded education.

Students will be advised to spend the first of the two-year period of specialized studies in a respective country and will register with an educational institution in that country and taking courses of the student's choice, with the guidance of a faculty member of the UWR who will serve as the student's advisor.

In sum, every student will be given the opportunities for learning and training, whether in campus of the University of World Religions, or in living and study situations in other countries or cultures arranged through cross-registration or exchange programs with the University of World Religions, so that each prospective graduate will be fluent in a contemporary language other than one's own, be able to understand and appreciate the historical and cultural, as well as economic, political, and ecological factors that shape our world today, and thus be able to offer himself or herself to serve the world in a way that would promote global peace, intercultural and inter-religious understanding and co-operation, and ecological healing.

6.2.2 Spiritual Value Formation

Understanding this education in knowledge and skills will be spiritual value formation, which will give students guidance in seeking their existential place in the universe, ground them in the realization of inner peace and the cultivation of wisdom and compassion in their lives. This formation will include an exposure to the teachings and practices of various world religious traditions from an inter-religious perspective. Such spiritual formation would hopefully inform their basic values and way of life and cultivate a global as well as engaged and ecological spirituality, and empower them to choose a livelihood and occupation that would not be based on self-seeking and ambition and the amassing of wealth for oneself, but rather, that would be at the service of global peace, intercultural and inter-religious understanding and co-operation, and ecological healing.

6.2.3 Advanced Studies

Given the above four-year university formation, a prospective graduate who so wishes will be ready to continue further advanced studies in the master's or doctorate level at other institutions of learning in different parts of the world, to further prepare themselves for service in their chosen fields.

6.2.4 Interdisciplinary Organisation

To carry out the above educational objectives, there will be five departments that will relate and work with one another along interdisciplinary lines, to offer students a wide spectrum of physical, spiritual, and mental cultivation.

- a. The Department of Spiritual Formation provides guidelines not only in spiritual disciplines, but also training in physical education and ritual arts, as well as supervise field education and immersion programs students will undertake in other countries and cultures.
- b. The Department of Languages and Literature, provides training in linguistic and communication skills.
- c. The Department of Humanistic Sciences (Including World History, World Religions and Philosophies, Fine Arts and Performing Arts)
- d. The Department of Social Sciences (Including Economics, Political Science, International Law, Sociology)
- e. The Department of Ecological and Environmental Studies, includes Environmental Biology, BioChemistry, Geology, Interdisciplinary Ecological Studies.

Faculty members will be apportioned to these five departments based on projected needs, and will meet on a regular basis and communicate with one another along interdisciplinary lines to ensure an integrated and holistic education of the students under their care.

6.2.5 Research

Faculty members may also belong to specialized Institutes under the aegis of the UWR. Among these will be an Institute for Global Peace Studies, an Institute for Intercultural and Inter-religious Studies, and an Institute for Ecological and Environmental Studies. These

Institutes may also invite members who are not full-time faculty members of the UWR, but will serve as Researchers, Visiting Fellows, or Consultants, to further the goals of the respective institutes.

6.2.6 Divers

Location: To be determined

Number of Full-time Faculty according to specialization: To be determined

Number of Students per academic year: To be determined

Time schedule for Opening: To be determined

6.2.7 Planning

Planning Committee Members:

Master Hsin Tao, Lingjiu shan Monastery, Taiwan

Dr. Maria Reis Habito, Museum of World Religions Consultant,
Dallas, Texas

Dr. Ruben L.F. Habito, Southern Methodist University, Dallas,
Texas.

Prof. David Chappell, Soka University, California.

Prof. Michael v. Brueck, Ludwig Maximilians University, Munich,
Germany.

Dr. Wolfgang Schmidt, Germany.

Others to be determined

LAYING NEW FOUNDATIONS FOR SOLIDARITY AMONG PEOPLES OF THE SOUTH

Samir Amin

This working paper is intended to provide some food for thought to a working group to be set up on the theme defined under the above title. In fact, at present, the Southern countries' solidarity, which was vehemently expressed from Bandung (1955) to Cancun (1991), both politically (non alignment) and economically (common positions adopted by the Group of 77 within the UN institutions, especially UNCTAD), appears to be no longer existent.

No doubt, the pattern of integration of Southern countries by the three international institutions entrusted with that mission (WTO, the World Bank and IMF) mainly accounts for the weakening of the G-77, the Tri-continental group (that no longer exists) and the Non-Aligned Movement (which is nevertheless showing signs of a possible rebirth). Also contributing to this trend is the widening developmental inequalities in the G-77 system, with the emergence of countries seriously engaged in a process of industrialisation and competing on the world market with both the triad countries (United States, Europe and Japan) and some Southern countries in the same group, on the one hand, and the drifts plaguing countries now referred to as the Fourth World, on the other hand.

The Southern countries might no longer have the same interests in putting up a collective defence. This certainly applies to parties solely concerned with the short run and the immediate conditions governing the "benefits" that any party anticipates – or think they can derive - from the liberal globalisation. But that is not true in the long run, because the existing capitalist system does not have much to offer to popular classes of the South nor even to the Nations it does not help to "catch up", in other words, to assert themselves as equal partners,

positioned like the central entities (the triad) in shaping the world system.

But it is again from the political angle that the awareness of the need for solidarity among Southern countries begins. United States' arrogance and the implementation of their plan "to control the globe militarily" by fabricating interminable wars "made in USA", unilaterally planned and decided by Washington, are the root cause of the positions taken in the recent Non-Aligned Summit (Kuala Lumpur, February 2003).

1. A glance over the past – the Bandung era (1955-1981)

Heads of State of Asian and African countries that had attained political independence met for the first time in Bandung in 1955.

The Asian and African leaders were far from being identical with one another. The political and ideological movements that they represented, their visions of the future of the society to be constructed or reconstructed and its relations with the West were among the themes that underscored the difference. Nevertheless, a common project brought them closer and gave meaning to their reunion. The completion of the political decolonisation of Asia and Africa featured in their joint basic programme. Moreover, they all understood that the recovered political independence constituted only the means, because the end lay in the conquest of economic, social and cultural liberation.

Despite their differences, the Non-Aligned thought that building a developed and independent economy and society (even if within a framework of global interdependence) implied a certain degree of "conflict" with the dominant West (the radical wing felt that it had to stem the control of national economy with capital from foreign monopolies).

Moreover, in their anxiety to preserve the recovered independence, they refused to enter into the global military game and serve as a base for encircling the socialist countries tentatively imposed through

America's hegemonic tendencies. However, they also thought that refusing to join the Atlanticist military camp did not imply the necessity to be placed under the protection of USSR, the latter's enemy. The result was "neutrality" or "non-alignment", the name of the group and of the organisation that emerged from the spirit of Bandung.

From Summit to Summit during the 1960s and 1970s decades, "non-alignment" was expected to rally almost all the countries of Asia and Africa plus Cuba and gradually smooth out the positions of, on the one hand, political solidarity based on support to liberation struggles and rejection of military pacts and, on the other hand, of putting up a kind of "trade union" organizing common economic claims to the North. In this regard, the Non-Aligned rallied around the peoples if not the States of Latin America (that had never joined the Tri-continental body). The Group of 77 (the entire Third World) expressed this broad new Southern alliance. The battle for a "new international economic order", initiated in 1975, after the October 1973 war and the revision of oil prices crowned this evolution to sound the knell, as accomplished in Cancun (1981) by the diktat of Reagan, supported by his European allies.

Although it was often implicit and vague, the political economy of the non-aligned movement may be defined by the following elements:

- The will to develop productive forces and to diversify productions (particularly to industrialise),
- The will to entrust the conduct and monitoring of the process to the nation-state,
- The belief that the "technical" models constitute "neutral" data that can only be reproduced if it meant mastering them,
- The belief that the process does not primarily call for popular initiative but rather the popular support to State actions,

- The belief that the process is not basically in conflict with participation in exchanges within the world capitalist system, even if it creates momentary conflicts with this system.

The circumstances of capitalist expansion during the 1955-1970 period somewhat facilitated the success of this project. The page of this history of non-alignment appears to have been turned ever since the global system entered – as from 1980 – into a redeployment phase on the basis of a neo-liberal globalisation. But has it really turned? The forms of resistance to the current globalised vision are being intensified throughout the world, both in the North and the South. It is in this context that one can situate a possible revival of the Non-Aligned Movement, so that it becomes “non alignment with liberal globalisation and US hegemonic tendencies”.

2. Rebirth of a Southern Front?

- ***The Kuala Lumpur Summit***

The recent Non-Aligned Summit (Kuala Lumpur, February 2003) probably surprised some lethargic chanceries, which were convinced that the South was no longer a factor to reckon with in the new liberal globalisation. Subjected to the devastating schemes of structural adjustment, strangled by debt service levies and governed by comprador bourgeoisies, the Southern countries seem to be no longer in a position to challenge the international capitalist order, as they tried to do between 1955 and 1981.

The general surprise consisted in the Non-Aligned Movement's condemnation of the imperialist strategy adopted by Washington, its inordinate and criminal ambition to assume the military control of the planet, its deployment through the perpetual spearheading of wars “made in USA”, unilaterally planned and decided by the United States.

The Southern countries are becoming aware of the fact that the neo-liberal globalised management has nothing to offer to them and that

being the case, the neo-liberal system had to use military violence in order to be established, thereby playing the game enshrined in the American project. The Movement is becoming - as suggested - that of "non alignment with liberal globalisation and US hegemony".

The collapse of Soviet "socialism", the course taken by China, and the drift of the populist regimes of the Third World had created the hollow impression that "there might be no alternative". Adhere to the exigencies of the globalised neo-liberalism, play the game and try to draw some benefit from it, if possible. No alternative. Within a few years, the practical experience shattered the naïve hopes placed in this so-called "realistic" logic.

• ***Guidelines for a far-reaching alliance as a basis for the eventual reconstruction of solidarity among peoples and States of the South***

The positions taken by certain Southern States and the ideas propounded suggest that the guidelines for the eventual revival of a "South Front". These positions concern the political sphere as well as the economic management of the globalisation process.

a) In the political sphere: denunciation of the new principle of United States' policy ("preventive war") and the demand for evacuation of all foreign military bases in Asia, Africa and Latin America.

The choice made by Washington in respect of its zone for military interventions uninterrupted since 1990 is the Arab Middle East – Iraq and Palestine (for the latter, through the unconditional support of Israel) – the Balkan States (Yugoslavia, new US installations in Hungary, Romania and Bulgaria), Central Asia and the Caucasian region (Afghanistan, the former Soviet Central Asia and Caucasian region).

The objectives pursued by Washington comprise several aspects: (i) controlling the world's most important oil-producing region, and exerting pressure in the process, with a view to relegating Europe and Japan to the status of subordinate allies; (ii) establishing permanent American military bases in the heart of the Old World

(Central Asia equidistant from Paris, Johannesburg, Moscow, Peking and Singapore) and thus preparing other future “preventive wars” primarily against the powerful countries likely to impose themselves as partners with which “one would have to negotiate” (China in the first place, but also Russia and India). This goal may be achieved by establishing in the countries of the region concerned, puppet regimes imposed by United States’ armed forces. From Peking to Delhi and Moscow, it is becoming increasingly obvious that the wars “made in USA” ultimately constitute a threat to China, Russia and India more than to their immediate victims, such as Iraq.

Coming back to Bandung, the policy of “no American military bases in Asia and Africa” is now a topical issue, even though, under the present circumstances, the non-aligned have remained silent over the attitudes of American protectorates in the Gulf region on the subject.

At Kuala Lumpur, the non-aligned members took positions akin to those defended by France and Germany at the UN Security Council, thereby helping to intensify the diplomatic and moral isolation of the aggressor. For its part, the Franco-African Summit strengthened the eventual alliance taking shape between Europe and the South. For one thing, this Summit was not a “Francafrica” meeting, in view of the presence of English-speaking African countries.

b) Also taking shape, in terms of economic management of the world system, are guidelines for an alternative that the South could defend collectively, since the constituent countries share common interests in these respects.

(i) The idea that international capital transfers must be controlled has assumed topical dimensions again.

In fact, only one goal is targeted by the opening of capital accounts, which is imposed by IMF as a new dogma of “liberalism”: facilitating substantial transfer of capital to the United States to offset the growing deficits incurred by America, which are at the same time the product of economic deficiencies in the United States’ economy and of the deployment of its strategy for the military control of the planet.

The Southern countries have no interest in facilitating in that way the siphoning of their capital and possibly the devastations caused by the speculative raids.

As a result, the subjection to all the uncertainties inherent in the system of flexible rates of exchange, which comes as a logical deduction from the requirements for opening capital accounts, should be called into question. Systems of regional organisations guaranteeing the relative stability of exchanges should be established instead and this could be examined through research and systematic negotiations within the Non-Aligned Movement and the G-77.

Incidentally, in the course of Asia's financial crisis of 1997, Malaysia took the initiative in restoring exchange control and did win the battle. IMF itself was compelled to recognise that fact.

(ii) The idea of regulating foreign investments has resurfaced.

Certainly, the Third world countries do not envisage closing their doors to all forms of foreign investment, as some of them did in the past. On the contrary, direct investments are solicited. But the procedure for hosting such investments are again subjected to critical reflections to which certain governmental sectors of the Third World have remained sensitive.

In relation to this regulation, the notion of intellectual and industrial property rights, which the World Trade Organisation (WTO) wants to impose, is henceforth contested. It is understood that, far from promoting "fair" competition on open markets, this notion was rather intended to strengthen the monopolies of multinational companies.

(iii) Many of the Southern countries have realised again that they cannot do without a national agricultural development policy that takes account of the need to protect peasants from the devastating consequence of their accelerated integration under the influence of the "new competition" that the World Trade Organisation wants to promote in this domain and to preserve food security at the national level.

In fact, the opening of agricultural commodity markets, which allows the United States, Europe and a few Southern countries (those of the Southern cone of America) to export their surpluses to the Third World does threaten in that way the objectives of national food security, without providing compensation, as productions of the Third world peasantry encounter unbearable difficulties on the Northern markets. And yet this liberal strategy disintegrating such peasants and accentuating their migration from the rural areas to urban slums accounts for the reappearance of peasant struggles in the South, which now constitutes a source of anxiety among the public authorities.

The agricultural issue is often discussed in the WTO arena in particular, from the sole angle of subsidies granted by Europe and the United States not only to their farmers produce but also to their farmers' agricultural exports. This focus on the sole question of world trade in agricultural commodities eclipses straightaway the major concerns mentioned above. It also creates strange ambiguities, because it urges the Southern countries to defend positions that are even more liberal than those actually adopted by the Northern governments amid the World Bank's applause (but since when has the World Bank been defending the interests of the southern countries against those of their Northern counterparts?). Nothing makes it impossible to separate the subsidies granted to farmers by their governments (after all, if we defend the principle of income redistribution in the South, the Northern countries also have that right!) from those intended to sustain the dumping of agricultural exports from the North.

(iv) Debt is no longer solely considered as economically unbearable. Its legitimacy is now being called into question. A claim currently taking shape is designed to enforce the unilateral renunciation of odious and illegitimate debts, as if to pave the way for an international law on debt – worthy of this term – which does not yet exist.

A generalised debt audit would actually make it possible to present a significant proportion of illegitimate, odious and sometimes even

criminal debts. And yet the sole interests paid on these debts have reached such levels that the legally justified demand for their refund might actually help to cancel the current debt and reveal the entire transaction as a really primitive form of plunder. To that effect, the idea that external debts should be regulated by a normal and civilised legislation, like domestic debts, should be sustained through a campaign aimed at promoting international law and enforcing its legitimacy. Obviously, it is precisely because the law is silent in this sector so the question is resolved only through brutal balance of power. Such relationships therefore make it possible to legitimise international debts which would bring debtor and creditor to court “for criminal conspiracy” if they were domestic debts (and the creditor and debtor hailed from the same nation and are governed by its legal system).

3. New international perspectives

In terms of its basic structures, the world system today is too different from that of the post Second World War to allow for a “remake” of Bandung. The Non Aligned was situated in a militarily bipolar world that prohibited, as such, the brutal intervention of imperialist countries in their affairs. Moreover, this bipolarity cemented the partners of the capitalist centres – United States Western, Europe and Japan – in a unified camp. The political and economic struggle for liberation and development therefore brought Asia and Africa into confrontation with a unified imperialist group. The concept of self-centred development and de-linking and the strategies they inspired addressed this challenge under the circumstances.

The world today is militarily uni-polar. At the same time, there seems to be latent dissensions between the United States and certain European countries over the political management of a globalised system that now adheres to the tenets of liberalism, at least in principle. Are such cleavages solely linked to economic circumstances and of limited scope or do they herald lasting changes? The hypotheses forming the basis of the strategic proposals situated in this context must be explained so as to facilitate discussions on their possible validity.

- **1st hypothesis:**

Imperialism has now become a collective imperialism (of the triad).

In the course of the previous phases of deployment of capitalist globalisation, the centres were always conjugated in the plural. These centres maintained among themselves relations marked by constant violent competition even to the extent that the conflict of imperialisms was at the centre of the historical scene. The return to globalised liberalism as from 1980 compels the structural review of the contemporary centre of the system. For one thing, at least in terms of the liberal economic management, the states forming the central triad constitute an apparently solid bloc.

The indisputable question to be answered is therefore to know whether the said evolutions portray a lasting qualitative change - since the centre is no longer conjugated in the plural but has become definitively “collective” – or that they are only attributed to economic circumstances.

This evolution could be attributed to the change in the conditions of competitiveness. A few decades ago, the big firms waged their battle for competitiveness mainly on the national markets, and these could include that of the United States (the world’s largest national market) or even those of the European States (in spite of their modest size, which put them at a disadvantage in relation to the United States). The winners of the national “rounds” could occupy ideal position on the world market. Today, the market size needed to be a winner of the first round of matches is estimated around 500 – 600 millions “potential consumers”. The battle must therefore be waged straightaway on the world market and won in that arena. And it is those who win the match on this market that will impose themselves then and afterwards on their respective national grounds. Extensive globalisation is becoming the primary operational framework for the big firms. In other words, in the national, world couple, the terms of causality are reversed. Formerly, the national power dictated presence at the world level but today, it is the opposite. As a result, the multinational firms, regardless of their nationality, have common interests in the management of the world market. Such interests are

superimposed on the ordinary market conflicts that define all the forms of competition peculiar to capitalism, irrespective of what they are.

- **2nd hypothesis:**

In the collective system of imperialism, the United states has no conclusive economic advantages.

The current opinion is that United States' military strength is just the tip of the iceberg prolonging this country's superiority in all fields, particularly in the economic or even political and cultural spheres. The subjection to hegemonic tendencies which it claims might therefore be inevitable.

In fact, the United States' productive system is far from being "the most efficient in the world". On the contrary, none of its segments might be sure of defeating its rivals on really open world market, as purported by liberal economists. A typical testimony is United States' trade deficit that is worsening from year to year, increasing from 100 billion dollars in 1989 to 450 in 2000. Moreover, this deficit concerns virtually all the segments of the productive system. Even the surplus that the United States boasted in high technology goods, which stood at 35 billion in 1990, has now given way to a deficit. The competition between Ariane and the NASA space rockets, Airbus and Boeing, attest to the vulnerability of America's advantage. If faced with Europe and Japan in terms of high technology products, with China, Korea and other industrialised Asian and Latin American countries for ordinary manufactured goods, and with Europe and the Southern cone of Latin America in the area of agriculture, United States of America would probably not win any match without resorting to "extraeconomic" schemes that violate the principles of liberalism and on rivals!

In fact, the United States does enjoy comparative advantages exclusively in the arms sector precisely because this field amply gets round the rules governing the market and also receives state support. Certainly this advantage has some repercussions on the civil sector (Internet is a well known example, but it is also the root cause of the distortions that constitute handicaps to many productive sectors).

The North American economy operates as a parasite at the expense of its partners in the world system: "The United States of America covers 10% of its industrial consumption through imports which are not covered by national commodity exports". The world produces for consumption by United States of America (whose national savings are virtually zero).

The United States "advantage" is comparable to that of a predator whose deficit is covered by inputs from others, granted by consent or by force. The means employed by Washington to compensate for its deficiencies are of diverse kinds: repeated unilateral violation of the principles of liberalism, arms exports, the search for oil rents (which entail the brutal control of producers, the actual motive for the wars in Central Asia and Iraq).

It remains that the bulk of America's deficits is covered by capital inflows from Europe and Japan, and from the South (rich oil-producing countries and comprador classes in all of the Third World countries, including the poor ones) to which will be added the debt service levy imposed on almost all the peripheral countries of the world system.

- **3rd hypothesis:**

The purported military control of the planet is intended to compensate for the United States' economic deficiencies. This phenomenon poses a threat to all peoples of the Third World.

This hypothesis logically follows from the previous one. Washington's strategic decision to take advantage of its military superiority and resort, in this context, to "preventive wars" decided and planned by the country alone, is calculated to dash all hopes of a great nation (like China, India, Russia and Brazil) or of a regional coalition in the Third World to acquire the status of a real partner helping to shape the world system, be it capitalist.

- **4th hypothesis:**

The South must and can be liberated from the liberal illusions to embark on renewed forms of self-centred development.

There is no doubt that, for the time being, governments of the Southern countries still seem to be fighting for a “true neo-liberalism” whose Northern partners, like those of the South, would agree “to play the game”. The Southern countries can only realise that this hope is completely illusory.

They will then have to revert to the inevitable concept that development is necessarily self-centred. To develop oneself means defining, in the first place, national objectives allowing for the modernisation of productive systems and creating internal conditions that uses it to promote social progress, and then subjecting to the exigencies of such logic, the modalities governing relations between the nation and developed capitalist centres. This definition of delinking (formulated by Samir Amin) – which is not autarky – situates the concept miles away from the opposite principle of “structural adjustment” to the exigencies of globalisation, which is therefore necessarily subjected to the exclusive demands for expansion of the dominant multinational capital, thereby deepening inequalities at the global level.

- **5th hypothesis:**

The United States’ option for militarised globalisation poses a serious threat to the interests of Europe and Japan.

This hypothesis follows from the second one. Among other concerns, the United States’ objective of controlling militarily all the important resources of the planet (oil in particular) is geared towards relegating the European and Japanese partners to the status of vassals. America’s oil wars are “anti-European” wars.

Europe (and Japan) can partially react to this strategy by drawing closer to Russia, which is capable of supplying some oil and a few other essential raw materials.

- **6th hypothesis:**

Europe must and can be freed from the liberal virus; nevertheless, this initiative cannot be taken by segments of the dominant capital, but by the peoples.

The dominant segments of capital, whose interests the European governments are still bent on defending at all costs, as an exclusive priority, are of course the defenders of the globalised neo-liberalism and that explains why they accept to pay the price of their subordination by the North American leader.

People throughout Europe have a vision different from the European project that wants to assume social dimensions from their relations with the rest of the world, which they want to be governed by law and justice, as they have recently been expressing in their overwhelming majority by denouncing the United States' draft. If this humanist and democratic culture of the "old Europe" prevails, which is possible, then an authentic cohesion between Europe, Russia, China, the whole of Asia and the entire Africa will constitute the foundation on which will be constructed a multi-centrist, democratic and pacific world.

The major contradiction between Europe and the United States is therefore not the contrast between the interests of the dominant capital here and there but rather the type identified in their political cultures.

The imminent conflict lies in the arena of political cultures. In Europe, one leftist alternative is still possible. It might simultaneously impose a break with neo-liberalism (and the shattering of the vain hope of subjecting the United States to its exigencies, thereby allowing the European capital to wage war on the mine-free field of economic competition), for instance, by conforming to the United States' political strategies. The surplus capital that Europe has so far opted to "invest" in the United States could therefore be assigned to economic recovery and social rehabilitation projects, without which the latter will be impossible. But since Europe might then choose to give priority to its economic and social progress, the artificial health of the United States' economy would decline and the American ruling class would be confronted with its own social problems. The meaning I give to my conclusion is that "Europe will go left or not be".

To that effect, Europeans must rid themselves of the illusion that the card of liberalism should – and could – be played "honestly" by all and that in this case, things would get better. The United States

cannot renounce its option for an asymmetrical practice of liberalism because this is the sole means whereby America can compensate for its own deficiencies. The price of America's "prosperity" is the stagnation of others.

The European question can be situated here. In fact, its impact cannot be ignored, even if the South-South project considered here is not the forum for in-depth discussion of what I refer to as the "quicksand in the European project".

"European political cultures" are diverse, even if they somewhat contrast with that of the United States. There are political, social and ideological forces in Europe that lucidly support the vision of "another Europe" (social and friendly in its relations with the South). But there is also Great Britain, which has since 1945 made the historical option of enlisting unconditional support for the United States. These are the forces among the ruling classes of Eastern Europe that are moulded by a culture of servitude, bowing yesterday to Hitler, then to Stalin, and to Bush today. There are "pro-American" rightist populisms (style of those nostalgic for Francoism and Mussolinism in Spain and Italy respectively). Will the conflict between these cultures split Europe? Will it result in an alignment with Washington? Or in the victory of progressive humanist and democratic cultures?

- **7th hypothesis:**

The reconstruction of a strong Southern front entails the participation of its peoples.

The political regimes set up in many of the Southern countries are not democratic, to say the least, and are sometimes really odious. These authoritarian power structures favour comprador groups whose interests consist in expanding the global imperialist capitalism.

The alternative — the construction of a front comprising people of the South, which can materialise through democratisation. This necessary democratisation will be a difficult and long process but it certainly cannot be realised by establishing puppet regimes to open their countries' resources to plunder by North American multinational companies, regimes that will consequently be even more fragile, less credible and less legitimate than those they succeeded under

protection by the American invader. Incidentally, the United States' goal is not to promote democracy in the world, despite its purely hypocritical discourse on that subject.

- **8th hypothesis:**

A new internationalism of peoples associating Europeans, Asians, Africans and Americans is therefore possible.

This hypothesis emanates from and concludes the preceding one. This means that there exist conditions capable of promoting closer relations between at least all the peoples of the ancient world. This union could be given concrete expression at the international diplomatic level by thickening the Paris—Berlin—Moscow—Peking axis, that could be strengthened by developing friendly relations between this axis and the reconstituted Afro-Asian front.

Obviously, initiatives in this direction reduce the United States' inordinate and criminal ambition to nothing. Washington would therefore be compelled to accept coexistence with nations determined to defend their own interests.

At present, this objective must absolutely be considered as a priority. The deployment of the American project over-determines the stake inherent in all struggles: there will be no social and democratic progress so long as the American is not smashed.

- **9th hypothesis:**

Issues concerning cultural diversity should be discussed as part of the new international perspectives outlined here.

Cultural diversity is a fact. But it is complex and ambiguous. The forms of diversity inherited from the past, however legitimate they might be, are not necessarily synonymous with diversity in the construction of the future, which should not only be admitted but also advocated.

Dwelling exclusively on diversities inherited from the past (political Islam, Hindutva, Confucianism, Negritude, chauvinistic ethnicity, etc.) often constitutes a demagogic formula of autocratic and comprador powers that enables the latter to dodge the challenge of universalising civilisation and actually submitting to the diktat of the dominant trans-national capital. Moreover, the exclusive emphasis on such legacies divides the Third World in setting political Islam and Hindutva in Asia, Muslims, Christians and followers of other religions in Africa against one another. Such divisions sustained by American imperialism can be surmounted through new foundations for a united political Southern Front. But what are and may be the “universal values” on which the future can be founded? The Western-centrist and restrictive interpretation of these values legitimises unequal development, the immanent product of the past and present-day globalised capitalist expansion. It must be rejected. But in what way can authentically universal concepts enriched with inputs from all parties be put forward? At any rate, even though this debate does not form part of the actual objective of the project considered, it can by no means be ignored.

4. Work Programme

- In a first phase, a selected working group comprising about fifteen high-level Asian and African personalities will be set up. One category of personalities shall be well informed about the experience spanning the Bandung and G-77 decades (in their political and economic dimensions), while the other category shall have a good mastery of debates concerning present-day challenges (also in their geo-strategic, political and economic dimensions).

Choice of a Chairman

Choice of Principal Co-ordinator

Exchange of views on the selection and final appointment of members of the working group.

- Organisation of a “brainstorming” workshop. Before then, each of the group members should have been invited to first resubmit a written response to the suggestions outlined in this paper.
- It is obvious that these suggestions do not constitute a closed framework of questions and hypotheses. Other elements may be put forward and argued by members of the working group.