Poland, Russia, and the Question of NATO: A Response

At the June 10 symposium, “Development Is the New Name for Peace,” in Warsaw, Mr. LaRouche was asked—as a friend of both Poland and Russia—to comment on the strategic issue of Poland’s joining the NATO alliance.

Of several questions which I could respond to, I’ll respond to only one, which I think is most important: this question of NATO, which is a matter which has lately concerned me very much. It has also concerned some high-ranking Western military circles, who are friends of mine. It also excites a certain concern, which, it may not surprise you, is similar to my own, among certain more rational circles inside Russia today. And I am concerned. I have to do something practical about this, in terms of my representations to circles of my President.

I am very much in favor of the proposition that the United States and Germany, in particular, have a moral responsibility for the security of Poland; because the United States is the most powerful state on this planet, and Germany is the most powerful neighbor of Poland to the West. But I would not wish to have Poland become again a pawn.

Look at what we have.

We have the movement from the President of Belarus for the reconstitution, or partial reconstitution, of the Soviet Union. The problem is, we do not want a situation again where you have adversarial troops on the Polish-Russian border, under which people like Henry Kissinger and his friends in Britain play what they now advertise to be their policy: a two-part North-South game, Northern Europe against Islam, and East versus West. This is the same thing as the I.M.F., only worse.

One of the problems here, is that we must as quickly as possible act—and this is largely the responsibility of the United States—to take certain I.M.F.-type pressures off Russia.

You in Poland have lived in conjunction with Russia for a long time. You understand certain things. Since the Tatar period, the Russians have never been conquered. They have a tendency, therefore, to react differently than people in Poland. The reaction can be extremely violent. They’re no longer a world power as they were before, but they’re still powerful. If a certain type of tyranny were to come into power in Moscow, it would be extremely dangerous.

I will advise my friends in government of what I think must be done to delay that danger. I would advise that NATO in its present form not be the agency to go to the border of Poland and Russia; but that it is proper for the nations of Europe, together with the United States, to have a security alliance based on the principles which I would identify with the Productive Triangle. That is, the development of Asia through a land-bridge, as part of a general revitalization of the economy of all Eurasia, is of vital interest to all the states of Eurasia, and is of vital interest to this planet.

We must develop a sophisticated approach to avoid the fostering of a tyranny in Moscow, which means primarily a responsibility of the United States to relieve the pressures which Poland and Russia and other states are feeling from the I.M.F. I shall report to my government that my present estimate in Russia is that an explosion could occur within less than six months, or as long as within eighteen months. I believe I have reason to think that my estimate is an absolutely accurate one.

Therefore, I believe that the United States should make an absolute commitment to a group of nations for security against all balance-of-power games, by defining certain principles which are in the common interest of Eurasia, which any decent, honest nation will support, which use development corridors across from Brest in France to the coast of the Pacific and down to the Indian Ocean, as the cement of common interest which maintains the peace. I think that’s the proper approach. An alliance with support on the basis of a principled commitment to building Eurasia, yes. A balance-of-power game again, using NATO as a tool for balance-of-power conflict and Poland as an expendable frontier for that conflict, I am opposed to.