

---

## Interview: Jan Lopuszanski

---

# Eurasian Land-Bridge could prove to be fruitful for Poland

*Mr. Lopuszanski is a Deputy in Poland's Sejm (Parliament), a member of "Our Circle" (a parliamentary coalition of Deputies from several parties), and a member of the Christian National Union party. He was interviewed in Warsaw in December 1998 by a member of the Polish Schiller Institute.*

**EIR:** You gave a spirited speech in the Sejm recently, on the sovereign right of a nation to defend itself against financial speculators, especially in the context of the ongoing collapse of the global financial system. Could you comment on that?

**Lopuszanski:** I have been brought up in an environment which was convinced that a people should live in its own nation-state. According to this belief, if a nation's rights are violated in international relations, then human rights are also violated. One can give many examples, from Europe, from the Balkans, in which the violation of national rights meant incredible suffering of many individuals and whole social communities.

We are very worried by the more and more common phenomenon that the political authority of the sovereign state is being substituted for by various supranational bodies, and it seems that the final goal is to establish some global polity. . . .

When we look at what is being proposed to us today, we see those huge supranational giants. It is well and good to propose such things during periods of prosperity, but when we look at history, we see that in various historical cycles sometimes we have prosperity, sometimes we do not. We think that constructing a political order should be based on more profound foundations than just the idea of profit, and making money.

When it comes to making profit today, we see that it is done mainly in speculative ways. Economy stops being a method for making things and services which are needed by the individual and by society, and instead, for people who play according to the rule that profit is the highest and almost the only criterion in the field of economy, economy becomes a tool in the struggle for dominance over others; a tool to gain influence, in a fight which has political character—but a political order established according to this principle is not a human one, but a wolfish one.

My friends and I, due to our vocation and legal status, are responsible for the good of a national community, which is

constituted by the Polish people, living in its own nation-state. We want to strengthen this state, and in this way strengthen its independence, its sovereignty, which means that it is a nation which rules its state, while we are confronted now with proposals that we accommodate to various international standards.

In Poland, one can make a career very easily by applauding various international concepts, but one is quickly marginalized if one tries to define—more or less successfully—wherein lies the good of the nation, what is good for various social groups, and for the state as a whole.

This is the core of the discussion we are engaged in. The debate about the budget was one of its elements, concerning how to accumulate state resources, and how to use them.

**EIR:** What role could Poland play today in the Eurasian Land-Bridge project?

**Lopuszanski:** Concerning the concept which has been now undertaken by the Chinese and the Japanese, it is not new, because already at the turn of the 1970s and '80s, big Western financial centers discussed a proposal to invest heavily in China. That was dictated by the Western policy toward the Soviet Union. It was expected that China would invest in the metal industry, mainly in heavy industry, which was a basis for military industry.

However, the Chinese proposed to their Western partners that they would like to use the money to invest in their own infrastructure. Unfortunately, it turned out that in such a situation, the capital did not reach China, and the sum under consideration was much bigger than what was coming to Poland at that time. That is quite telling.

Concerning the idea of development, I am deeply convinced that only by building various types of useful infrastructure, are we able to stimulate the economy in the proper way. Investment in such enterprises means that we can generate money which is not useless, or wasted on consumption only, but is used in a wise way for great enterprises.

Of course, one has to make a judgment about an economic equilibrium, because it's difficult to reach an agreement between people who think that there should be a certain relationship between goods and services on the one hand, and the volume of money on the other, and people who

claim that the balance can be maintained by introducing new speculative systems, which only patch the holes in the systems which had existed before.

From this point of view, all great infrastructure projects, wherever in the world they are commenced, can have a healing effect on the economy, not only in the region where they are being built.

Of course, there is one more aspect to this project; that is the role of Poland. Poland is one of the important Western elements of the Eurasian Land-Bridge. On the one hand, I would like to mention that, during many parliamentary debates, I had an opportunity to talk about the necessity of engaging Poland in organizing trade exchange between East and West. This would create tremendous opportunities for Poland.

On the other hand, there are certain problems involved. Right now we are following a certain worrisome investment in Poland, namely, a pipeline construction from Russia to Germany, through Polish territory. Construction is going on under conditions which are causing a scandalous violation of the interests of Poland. These conditions interfere with the economic, political, and social life of Poland, and they are not consistent with our criminal law, and the principles of state sovereignty.

I think that such an investment as the Eurasian Land-Bridge, if it is treated as some sort of imperial scheme—which comes easily in this part of the world—could lead to many serious conflicts, but if it is treated as an initiative guaranteeing all nations and all participants a just share and a just development, on the basis of partnership, as we understand it, it could prove to be very fruitful for Poland.

**EIR:** In your opinion, what are the main points of interest in Lyndon LaRouche's memo, "What Each Among All Nations Must Do Now" [*EIR*, Oct. 9, 1998], which was distributed here in Polish?

**Lopuszanski:** All of them are inspiring. The most important, from our point of view, is the statement that a sovereign nation-state is the highest political authority, and that an international policy should be established on the basis of agreements among nation-states rather than on the basis of creating authorities which impose on nation-states global solutions. Of course, also, the thesis which refers to the relationships among nations based on ethics—without even going into a complicated debate about ethics systems—referring to simple decency. We know from experience that even people speaking different languages and coming from different parts of the world are able to reach an agreement on the grounds of human decency. So why couldn't politicians, or people involved in big business, build the future of their nations on this groundwork?

But, I have another great dilemma connected to those postulates: Mr. LaRouche says that nations "should" do this or that, and states "should" do this or that, but I realize that

this kind of decision has to be made by some sort of political center, and what has happened to nations in our contemporary world—due to the actions of the globalist faction—is that national centers, political centers, or economic centers, have been eliminated, as supposedly the biggest enemies. As a consequence, nation-states, formally equipped with the sovereignty of their governments and parliaments, very often implement policies which are put together outside a given government or parliament, while politicians are only puppets.

Today we see the first signs of the financial storm and a great danger resulting from it—the collapse of the financial system, and with it economic exchange. This may lead to horrible human catastrophes. But on the other hand, we are wondering whether this can give us a great chance, this painful fall, because in the process of the collapse, the mechanisms which enchain nations of the world, may also disappear.

**EIR:** Thousands of citizens and officials of the United States and nations around the world have signed an appeal to President Clinton to name Lyndon LaRouche as an economic adviser. How would that affect Poland?

**Lopuszanski:** Many of LaRouche's postulates are for me much more understandable, in an intellectual sense, because they are more adequate to what is going on in the real world, than the postulates of many politicians in the world, or their imitators in Poland, who consider extremist liberal and monetarist models as a prescription for everything. This prescription leads to the spiral of ever-higher taxes, higher interest rates, smaller and smaller possibilities of producing, and ever greater dependence on international speculation as a source, only temporary of course, of the means of economic existence. When this system collapses, and it will collapse, we will see many tragedies. Using Poland as an example, I can say that in the framework of so-called international adjustment conditionalities, it is impossible to have either a national policy to promote industry, or aid for agriculture, for trade or maritime economy, or in the area of protecting Polish property, strengthening the Polish currency, establishing an educational system consistent with Christian, Catholic, Polish tradition. I am saying that because we observe a dramatic decrease of productivity in Central Europe that includes Poland, as well as a collapse of Polish trade.

For this reason, I propose to introduce national economic policies for Poland, the Czech Republic, Germany, France, etc. Is the strategy of the United States important for those processes? Undoubtedly, yes. I remember the words of one American commentator, when Americans shamefully abandoned their allies in South Vietnam. He said that from the point of view of the U.S., it is not important whether communists take over power in this or that part of the world, but it is important to make sure that in no place on this globe do national forces take control. I cannot understand why this kind of doctrine would be in the interest of the American nation,

because this contradicts common sense, and despite everything, I do believe in common sense in America and other nations.

However, I cannot exclude that there are plans to use the U.S. as a powerful tool to realize these kinds of plans, but if so, we have to say openly that this is very destructive.

Is President Clinton capable of resisting these kinds of tendencies? I do not know — so far he has been kept on a short leash, which was put on him with the help of various Ms. Lewinskys and others. The Presidency of the United States is being degraded in various ways, as an institution — which does not diminish the seriousness of the accusations. After all, we can expect serious behavior from a politician in a serious position; he should not give such pretexts. But who is hitting this institution? When one looks carefully, one can see who creates those pretexts.

However, the way this matter is handled leads to a situation in which the American state seems to be a helpless booty dragged by hyenas, despite all its physical, economic, and political power.

It is very instructive to recall what happened to President Kennedy when he tried to find a way to a greater independence of the institution of the American Presidency in relation to various forces exercising pressure on it.

In view of this, one can pose a question whether appealing to President Clinton can change anything. May God grant that it will! I understand people who do not want to neglect this measure; however, I remain very skeptical.

**EIR:** One precondition for preserving national sovereignty is a well-educated population. In the past, Poland had a high standard of Classical, humanist education, but in recent years, liberal economics has had a negative effect. Could you comment?

**Lopuszanski:** Of course, this is not just a Polish phenomenon. The accomplishments of ancient Greece, as well as Rome, which passed those accomplishments to later generations, are the source of Classical education, which decided the identity of Western civilization.

The Church picked up this tradition and certain elements of it are continued to this day.

Wherever this tradition was dominant, there was also an understanding about what universalism is. However, the period of the Enlightenment brought a change. A completely different concept of a man appeared, according to which a man exists only to the extent to which he knows something or can change something — that is, this concept defined a man completely by external parameters, rejecting what he is in his awareness, in his capacity to love truth and seek truth. As a result, we got encyclopedic education. The practical drama was that, at the end of 18th century, the entirety of human knowledge was so huge that even the greatest geniuses could not assimilate it. Knowledge can be a blessing if a man, ruling over himself in the sense of his identity and morality, will use

wisely the wonderful benefits given to us by civilization, the development of science and technology. However, if a man is stripped of what constitutes his inner life, in terms of intellect and spirituality, and in consequence his moral capabilities are harmed, how is he supposed to deal with such things as a nuclear bomb or genetic experiments?

The lack of moral and intellectual maturity is frightening.

How did the Classical world educate its youth, our great creators of civilization, when they were not great creators yet? First, they studied the *trivium*, that is, grammar, logic, and rhetoric; then the *quadrivium*: dialectic, the art of conversation, writing letters, literature, history. Then they learnt arithmetic and geometry, astronomy, and natural science. The third level included philosophy: metaphysics, that is, the theory of being, providing the answers to the questions of what is, and why it is. There was anthropology: Who is man, what is his vocation? Then ethics: What is good, what is evil; relationships between human beings.

The whole educational system was connected to that, in families, in schools, in public education. This system included awareness of the responsibility of every man for his actions, bad or good. This system included the development of virtues, that is, the capacity to do good; and elimination of vice, that is, the capacity to do evil.

The fourth element included politics, that is, realization of the common good. John Paul II talks about politics as caring for the common good. How many contemporary politicians understand that they are involved in an activity which was lectured about as a part of philosophy?

After passing all that, students could study the liberal arts. For example, theology. The *Summa Theologica* by Thomas Aquinas is difficult for contemporary students, but it was written as an introduction. Liberal arts included also law and medicine, etc.

People need a common language to communicate, especially in the area of abstract ideas. Intellectual upbringing gives the possibility of freely moving in the world of abstractions, and then one can start a dialogue.

Let's look at the matter of truth. We have two extreme approaches. One says, there is truth; the other says, there is only opinion, because truth is a reflection of the reality in the human mind. . . .

Sometimes conflicts in the spiritual sphere are more disastrous for man than physical conflicts. Spiritual death is the worst kind of death. This is why our circle is studying the Pope's encyclical *Faith and Reason*. It includes the key matters concerning human existence, human relations.

If we want to introduce educational reforms today, in Poland, the U.S.A., or Malaysia, we have to reach for those models, because only then can we create an intellectual basis adequate to the task of developing the whole of the human person. If we do not do that, we can, of course, punch each other in the nose, and the strongest will prevail. But a civilization built on that cannot be called human.