

## Editorial

### *Beyond NATO*

History was made last week, when, for the first time in the 50-year life of the North Atlantic Treaty Alliance (NATO), a number of European nations vetoed a proposal by the United States. In particular, Belgium, backed by France and Germany, cast a veto against the U.S./British proposal for NATO to provide military support for Turkey, so that nation could defend itself in the midst of an impending war against Iraq. In fact, the Belgians argued, such an act of “defense” actually implied allied aggression against Iraq, an aggression which neither the United Nations, nor any individual nation, had justly declared.

In this case, one could actually agree with the rhetoric of the Bush Administration: NATO has proven itself “irrelevant.” But, in fact, this irrelevance has been proven many times over for 12 years now. It’s time for NATO to be buried in peace.

Lyndon LaRouche made the point about NATO in a most pithy way back in May 1997, when the drive for expansion of the alliance into the backyard of Russia was in high gear. What he showed was that NATO was totally irrelevant to the real strategic threats of the day, threats ranging from the London-sponsored terrorism of Osama bin Laden, to the destruction of the sovereignty of the European nation-states through the adoption of the Maastricht Treaty. In fact, LaRouche pointed out, the dominant ideology of NATO, involving the spread of “free trade” and other such monetarist insanity, was a surefire way to *destroy* the nations which the alliance was pledged to defend.

Added to that was the fact that the Utopian faction in Britain and the United States was determined to make NATO an instrument of their one-world-government Malthusian policy toward the Third World. It was clear then, in 1997, to those with a commitment to peaceful relations among nations, that NATO’s time had passed.

What then was the rational alternative to NATO? LaRouche identified it in 1997 as being reflected in the then-recent agreements between the Presidents of Russia and China, which were dedicated to intensified eco-

nomics cooperation between the two nations. Today, the alternative has taken an even more concrete shape, in the form of the nexus of relations between China, India, and Russia, on behalf of Eurasian Land-Bridge development. In truth, the Eurasian Land-Bridge policy *is* the best defense of national security for the nations of Europe and the Americas—and the rest of the world’s nations as well.

In other words, how does one define “national security”? Is it a matter of military hardware, or are we talking about the ability of countries to provide for the living standards of their populations? How can a nation have national security, if it does not control its credit system? Or its food supply? What is the pathway toward nations achieving this kind of national security?

Back in the period *before* NATO was established, when Franklin Delano Roosevelt was conceiving the post-war order, there was a viable conception of a concert of nations, organized around the idea of economic cooperation, national sovereignty, and economic development. Roosevelt’s intent, as he put it forward in extensive discussions with Churchill and others, was to eliminate the hideous poverty and degradation which imperial rule had created, through the new financial institutions being created at the War’s end. All that changed with Truman’s succession, and the Churchill-instigated launching of the Cold War, which effectively ruled out economic cooperation between East and West Europe, and left the world to be dominated by geopolitics instead.

When the Soviet Union collapsed in 1990-91, all semblance of a rational foundation for NATO disappeared. It was for that reason that LaRouche put forward at that time, as he had already done back in 1988, in anticipation of Soviet collapse, a vision of East-West collaboration known as “the Productive Triangle,” to solve the desperate economic problems of the East. Unfortunately, the geopoliticians prevailed.

Now, the opportunity has arisen again. Let’s bury NATO—and implement the Eurasian Land-Bridge instead!