

German military expert: Stop wasting time, integrate Russia now

Brig. Gen. Paul Albert Scherer (ret.), the former head of the West German Military Intelligence and Counterintelligence Service (MAD), concluded a week-long visit to Washington with a press conference at the National Press Club on April 30. Scherer argued that no time must be lost in integrating the new republics of the former Soviet Union into the West, and condemned the "shock therapy" approach. He forecast civil wars in some of the former republics, and said that under no circumstances should the West intervene. His remarks are translated and slightly edited.

It is very difficult these days to get a clear orientation toward the fast-moving events in the former Soviet Union. And yet only a systematic overview of the situation as it has developed historically gives us the possibility for any clarity in our analysis. We must take into consideration the fact that there is an external argument as well as an internal argument to follow.

I'd like to say in the beginning that I'm not a doomsday prophet, but weigh my prognoses very carefully. I don't want to overdramatize. Secondly, I come here as an independent observer, and am not a member of any group or any party.

Let's begin in December 1979, in order to obtain a quick overview of the historical process. The pressures on the Soviet Union were at that time colossal. It was at that point that the Soviets invaded Afghanistan. I want to mention this in order to place the question before us as to whether it was at that time already discernible that the Soviet empire had reached the beginning of the end.

The year 1984 was filled with events which clearly indicated where things were going: The death of Yuri Andropov on April 9; the appointment of Konstantin Chernenko, as a completely opposite type to Andropov, on April 13; and the most improbable, and rather surprising, firing of Marshal Nikolai Ogarkov on Sept. 16. Also at that time, Defense Minister Sergei Ustinov, who had opposed the invasion of Afghanistan, died on Dec. 22. Those who understood the internal quarrels in the Politburo, where Leonid Brezhnev and Ustinov had opposed the invasion, could foresee the shape events were taking.

Gorbachov's incompetent role

On March 10, 1985, Chernenko died a broken man. The very next day, on March 11, Mikhail Gorbachov, as Andropov's chosen crown prince, took the reins of power. He was to play the role of the rather incompetent bankruptcy administrator over the breakup of the empire. I believe that anybody knowledgeable of the internal situation in the Soviet Union would recognize that the Soviet empire was coming to an end. You must also realize that in the former German Democratic Republic (G.D.R.), already in 1982, finances were drying up.

In the meantime, the Soviet Union has indeed collapsed, but we in the West are stuck in a mire of grand illusions. And this is largely the result of "Gorby-mania" and a belief in "Gorby the magician." And we believe, and have believed during the last months, that everything would be the same after the attempted coup, that total disarmament would be accomplished, and that we could convert our military industries. We also expected a quick Soviet withdrawal from Afghanistan.

In fact, the withdrawal from Afghanistan was a rout. We have to assume that the troops were withdrawn in order to save them from destruction. Heavy equipment was left in place. It was a flight, a total rout, although General Gromov put on a nice performance, trying to portray it as a peaceful withdrawal, conducting his cortège of tanks over the bridge out of Afghanistan.

Actually, conditions in the Soviet Union have gotten much, much worse as a result of the emergency. Whenever things got bloody, Gorbachov was always on vacation. The overall aim of the Gorbachov presidency was to maintain the Soviet Union in some form, and a somewhat "cleansed" Communist Party. In reality, Gorbachov was the manipulator and the disinformant *par excellence*.

Two characteristic examples of him in this role: The first was his continual lying about the murder of 40,000 Polish intellectuals at Katyn, Poland by Soviet troops. He also consistently denied that there ever was a Hitler-Stalin Pact, and it was only at the point that there were found in the cellar of a German diplomat papers proving unequivocally that Stalin

had actually signed the pact, that Gorbachov would admit to that fact. Then, the struggle in the Baltics was always manipulated by Gorbachov to keep himself in power.

A race against time

Now I come to the situation now facing us. We are in a race against time. We are at a disadvantage with regard to the strategic factor of time, since we have wasted six years with Gorbachov, and now have lost a further nine months with Yeltsin. All strategic factors which we could in any way utilize—space, strategic potential, the psychological situation, logistics—all are negative.

This means that if we look at the situation quite soberly, without any overdramatization, we can observe only negative characteristics in the conditions now prevailing in the successor states of the former Soviet Union.

I'll just give you a few figures, rather current and new, to indicate that my analysis is thoroughly grounded in fact. Some 290 million tons of grain is the yearly consumption in the Soviet Union. Last year was the worst harvest year since 1984, with 170 million tons produced, a deficit of 120 million tons. You have to realize also that during last year, Germany, in particular the German Defense Forces, have provided the populations of seven major cities of the Community of Independent States with food and supplies to make it through the winter. In addition, there have been a good deal of private contributions made to relieve the situation.

Inflation is now 350% and, according to many analysts, will reach 1,000% at least, and possibly 1,500%, by December of this year. Anyone who knows what that kind of inflation really is, and how it unfolds, realizes that this will mean chaos. I myself experienced this type of inflationary development as a child, in 1923 and 1924.

Shortage of capital, jobs

I'd like to now discuss a bit some key factors of irritation—money and capital. The internal resources of Ukraine, Kazakhstan, Belarus, and Russia are in such dire shape that everybody is looking for capital. The search for capital has presently become the primary concern. At the moment, there is only a system of barter. Some \$140 billion have at this point gone into the East bloc, from the autumn of 1990 until the present moment.

Up to this point, \$18 billion has been given to fill credit gaps. Some \$13 billion is now being given by the Group of Seven countries, but only \$2.2 billion of that sum has been pledged by Japan. Some \$6 billion is earmarked for ruble stabilization, and the German banks have up until now granted a moratorium on \$3.6 billion [in debt repayments] until the end of June. Since Gorbachov had simply massively printed up bank notes, there is no outlook for ending the inflation.

In addition to the search for capital, there is also the search for jobs. The larger grouping of the *nomenklatura*

comprises around 22 million people. The workers and the technicians belonging to the military-industrial complex comprise another 12 million people. Add to that roughly 2 million soldiers, and we arrive at a total of around 40 million people, people whose fate is now in a state of total turmoil. In addition, there are about 100,000 scientists in the former Soviet Union, and about 3,000 of these possess the most important secrets of nuclear weapons production. Anyone can figure out that you can't easily dispose of such a great amount of people.

The next stage of development concerns the search for identity. On the one hand, you have the search for identity expressed in a growing nationalism; and this, in turn, is moving toward increasing demands for separation, because every tiny state wants to jump the stranded ship. Twenty autonomous republics have created, with little effort, great unrest within Russia itself. For instance, 7 million Tartars want to take possession of the area around the city of Kazan, and they want to create there a fully independent state, since they have enough diamonds, oil, and other resources with which to survive on their own. Currently, there are no goods crossing the border except by way of barter. The role that Kazan played as the last capital of the Tartar Khans, represents something of an historical irony, since Kazan is the city where Czar Ivan the Terrible finally defeated the Mongolian Tartars, slitting the throats of the leaders. There are similarities in the present situation—with no exaggeration whatsoever.

'Shock therapy' has failed

There has been a universal search for a new faith, new beliefs. Over 1,000 new sects are now flourishing, and this is without taking into consideration the many large and small political parties built in the former Soviet Union since March 1990. Whoever talks to the leading people in the new republics realizes that this is an attempt to gain influence in a situation in which there is no longer a clear order of things. There is no more authority in society. And it's part of human nature to want quick solutions and to apply traditional models to the new situation. Consequently, the American policy has effectively suffered a major defeat. An example of this defeat is the unsuccessful shock therapy policy of Dr. Jeffrey Sachs in Poland.

Let me say a few words about the possibility of the development of some kind of democratic force in the republics. There are a lot of different interests moving in some way in the direction of democracy, but without any clear concept guiding them. The conflict of the nationalities in the former Soviet Union fundamentally prevents the development of democracy. The corresponding potential of strength, in summary, looks something like this: 150 million Russians living in Russia itself; 25 million Russians dispersed throughout the rest of the republics; 52 million people in Ukraine; 16 million Kazakhs in Kazakhstan, in addition to 5 million Russians;

20 million Uzbeks; 10 million White Russians; 8 million Azeris in Azerbaijan, and 10 million Azeris in northern Iran in the border areas.

I'll get back to the smaller states in the area after I take a look at the course of development in the larger republics. The number of "westernizers," those who look positively toward the West, is probably something less than 30%. The majority are still orthodox—orthodox in terms of their attitude toward the empire. These also involve groupings with a more or less fascist character. These have their origin in the Army and in the Navy. There was initially a strong refusal by sections of the Army and Navy to accept the new states. Consequently, I insist that the *nomenklatura* is only apparently dead.

Crisis in the military

Look at the number of staff officers who have taken back the oaths they had sworn to the Community of Independent States. As a result of that development, I conclude that the Army cannot survive without some form of Bonapartism. Until 1991, I was convinced that the Army and the Navy would under no conditions accept, or contribute to, the establishment of a military dictatorship. But the disillusionment of the soldiers and the sailors at the present moment is unbelievably great.

Put yourself in the place of the Soviet soldier and his family who were forced to move from their bases in East Germany back to their own republic, where they have to live in a tent. The disillusionment is much greater since the Germans have indeed built housing for the troops that were to be removed from East Germany, but this housing has already been otherwise distributed by the local and regional authorities. In addition, the aircraft which have been pulled back, or the ships which have been moved to the harbors in the Kola Peninsula, are just sitting there. Therefore, the officers have the feeling that the Navy ships and the aircraft are just waiting to be sold. The struggle between Moscow and Kiev is less a question of control over the Black Sea Fleet as a naval force, than a question of who's going to sell it. From this we must conclude that the psychological factor is now becoming the predominant factor.

Then I come to the conclusion that it's highly possible that there will be moves toward the establishment of some form of military dictatorship, even within the year. With the continuing situation of ungovernability, it's possible that this will mean not one central dictatorship, but several. The possibility of developing new forms of authority is relatively great. The possibility of any peaceful course of development through 1992 is, in my opinion, out of the question.

Civil war imminent

Let me just say a few words about the Muslim southern belt of the former Soviet Union. The developments in this vast area will very seriously affect the fate of Europe and the

United States. The northern boundary of this area is over 3,000 miles long; the southern borders are around 2,800 miles long. The latest information on the internal situation has it that the Tajiks, predominantly Farsi-speaking, have been called upon by the Iranians to reconquer the holy cities of Bukhara and Samarkand in Sunni Uzbekistan for the Shiites. There is a lot of money flowing in from Teheran. Four and one-half million Tajiks against 20 million Uzbeks: That means that civil war is imminent—and it's certainly not excluded that the Afghan situation, where there are almost 1 million Tajiks, will become intertwined in such a civil war.

We've got to have recourse to history. The first great empire, which covered almost all of East Asia, was the Persians. Then the Mongols, or the Huns, migrated over the entire area; and then came the Turkic peoples, who took possession of the area. And only during the occupation of Russia was there a 240-year period when it was controlled by the Tartars.

I just want to point this out, in order for you to understand the complicated religious and psychological conditions that exist here, with serious political implications. The Turkic peoples would like to build together, in collaboration with Ankara, a large area of predominantly Turkic influence. They have a western alphabet and would have a western orientation. This is not the way the Iranians see it. Formally, the Iranians are neutral, but not so friendly. Their arms buildup will, by the end of 1993, reach over \$90 billion. It's possible that [President] Rafsanjani, after the elections, will tend more toward the West. But it's very difficult for anyone to get a clear picture of this area and of the consequences of its policies. And here, the ignorance of the West carries its own penalties, when the West, with such nonchalance, allowed the Shah to be overthrown and Khomeini put into power.

Let's now take another look at the critical search for employment in the former Soviet Union, especially as regards East Asia. I'd like to remind you that in 1945, the German scientific cadre of the new rocket age under Werhner von Braun emigrated to the United States, although 7% of the German scientists were compelled to emigrate to the Soviet Union. These 7%, together with the German scientists in the United States, launched the "rocket age." I ask you, what would happen if 7% of the Russian scientists emigrate to Beijing? I presume, however, that it will be more than 7%. I think that this represents a real danger, which could affect the destiny of the western world as we enter the 21st century. We should never underestimate the fact that the global, expansive wave of technological civilization is ever more strongly affecting the situation in China.

In addition, I suggest that the West should look with a somewhat more friendly attitude toward Japan than we have until now. We have got to admit that the West—that is, the Germans and the Americans—both bear a certain responsibility for having lost industries to the Japanese—in the Ger-

man case, the photographic industry, and in the American case, the auto industry. We can't just lay the blame on the Japanese. We need a rather sober evaluation of the situation. The Japanese must, in this entire strategic situation, be lifted into western civilization.

NATO's flanks

Let me say a few words about North Africa, emphasizing, of course, the strategic role of Turkey. I'd like to remind you that Turkey is the great southern pillar in the security architecture of NATO. The coast opposite it, the coast of Africa, which is lying opposite this southern flank of NATO, must not be lost to western influence. That means that there is a genuine point of cooperation between the NATO countries—Turkey, Greece, Italy, and Spain—and the countries of North Africa—Egypt, Libya, Tunisia, Algeria, and Morocco. We've got to see that the interdependence of these nations in a very short time could be subject to very explosive pressures. We have to assume that the situation in Algeria has changed radically. Putting the fundamentalists into camps in the desert was, of course, successfully accomplished. But, nevertheless, the fundamentalists have in the last week called for armed struggle.

The Muslim Brotherhood has for a long time been active in this kind of struggle. The Moroccan king and Egypt have for a long time had a pro-western orientation, and therefore they're being targeted. I think also in this area we will see a very difficult period ahead. It would be totally wrong, in my view, to begin any kind of military circus in Libya. Such an action would mean giving direct support to the destabilization of Egypt, Algeria, and Morocco.

Let me now get back to the situation in Europe, focusing in particular on Yugoslavia. The destabilization in this area is veering toward a general conflagration in the entire Balkan area. It was totally incomprehensible for anyone who understood the historical and political conditions under which the state of Yugoslavia was founded, that Secretary of State James Baker would go to Belgrade and tell the Serbian leaders that he wanted above all to maintain the unity of Yugoslavia.

Now don't think that I am an opponent of the Americans; on the contrary, I'm a very good friend of the United States. By my own professional and personal orientation, I have always been an Atlanticist. I have always seen the Atlantic Ocean as something of an interior lake of western civilization. But I must say that European public opinion has been shifted in a very negative way with regard to the United States, because of these developments and U.S. actions in Yugoslavia.

I'd like to just very briefly say something about Poland. I previously said that the policies of Jeffrey Sachs in Poland have had no positive effects whatsoever. The Poles have a particular fear of the coming civil war in Russia, just on the other side of the Bug River. They would have preferred

joining NATO yesterday rather than today. They have already proposed that the German Bundeswehr, together with Polish forces, build a division on the Bug River. That, however, is not possible at the present moment, obviously, because all the troops in Germany are NATO troops. The same fear of a civil war in Russia exists also in Hungary, Czechoslovakia, and Romania. The German economy has been heavily involved in the Czech economy, with Volkswagen and Mercedes and other German companies setting up shop there.

We are in a race against time. We are at a disadvantage with regard to the strategic factor of time, since we have wasted six years with Gorbachov, and now have lost a further nine months with Yeltsin. All strategic factors which we could in any way utilize . . . all are negative.

The financial conditions in Germany are not now so favorable; that they cannot give to the East bloc countries DM 80 billion [about \$50 billion] per year. It's also the case that the largest part of that sum will be going to the former G.D.R. Eastern Europe is also burdened by the fact that the Slovaks are attempting to separate from Czechoslovakia. Western observers estimate that there will be a second revolution in Romania, and they also calculate there will be a civil war in Bulgaria, between the ethnic Turks in Bulgaria and the Bulgarians, if there occurs a civil war in the former Soviet Union.

Three possible scenarios

Let me, in conclusion, give you three different scenarios which might develop. First of all, let me say that we're going to need very strong nerves in order to be able to deal with the upcoming situation, and by "we" I mean the political circles in the West.

The first scenario involves the outbreak of one centralized civil war in Russia, involving a struggle between an alliance of fascist, anti-democratic, and communist forces, on the one side, against the reformers. I think in this scenario, the year 1993 is going to be a very difficult year.

The second scenario involves a decentralized dissolution over a large area, with civil wars raging throughout the republics. I think that Ukraine will remain free of civil war, unless there develops a war between Russia and Ukraine. I think there will also be a relatively peaceful development in Belarus.

The third scenario involves a total conflagration in the area of the southern Muslim belt of the former Soviet Union, with serious global strategic consequences. I don't think we're going to be able to avoid civil war, either in Russia or in Kazakhstan, and especially not in the Muslim southern belt. It is my personal expectation that probably around the year 1995, this process of self-castigation will have exhausted itself.

The decisive thing is that the West not intervene. There can be no repetition of the 1918 period, when you had Allied attempts at intervention into the Russian Civil War—the French through Crimea, the Americans through Archangel, the Germans through the Baltic, the Japanese through Vladivostok—this must not occur. We've got to understand that this time there are 30,000 nuclear weapons in Russia, and only 3% have been dismantled. And it's not certain that all of them have been dismantled. I don't believe it. The nuclear era is definitely not at an end. As many as several thousand nuclear warheads may be dismantled; that doesn't mean that the nuclear era is over.

Don't get me wrong. I don't assume that the long-range missiles are going to be used against the United States or Europe. I think that that is pretty much excluded, since the second-strike capabilities of the United States are too great. That's the essential point.

It's thus very important that the United States forces in Europe not become too weak, that deterrence remain credible; and it's necessary, therefore, under these conditions, to have an army and an army high command, so that the area encompassed by the NATO countries is defensible.

Now, I've had to give you a picture that does not present a very pleasant view, because it would be unfair to leave you with the idea that things are just hunky-dory. I believe, however, that I might be called a positive thinker, although not an optimist. I believe that out of such a period of self-purgation in the former Soviet republics, the world will be pushed forward toward an epoch where we will see the development of a new sense of human dignity.

The civil war, or civil wars, is the price that will be paid for the 74 years of holding people in the condition of wild animals. That means that the end of colonialism begins around the year 1995. It's very important to realize that after such a conflict, there can no longer be a condition of dominance and control in world politics.

I'd like to just add briefly to my third scenario, the possibility of a conflict between Siberia and western Russia. Both states could be in a position to become great powers. We've got to allow this to occur, because the situation must sort itself out. I presume that Russia, no later than the year 2010, will have become quite a great power. It will have to be. And during this time, the Chinese could make an attack against Siberia.

These are, however, prognoses in the context of possible scenarios, nothing more.

Queen's archbishop attacks the Holy See

by Mark Burdman

The Church of England, whose official head is Queen Elizabeth II, has declared war on the Vatican and Pope John Paul II, because of the Holy See's opposition to the imposition of enforced measures of population reduction in the countries of the developing sector. The attack, mounted by Archbishop of Canterbury George Carey, primate of the church, has been crafted as part of the British monarchy's offensive to force the issue of population control onto a prominent place on the agenda at the June 2-12 U.N. Conference on Environment and Development (the "Earth Summit") in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil.

On May 18, Carey gave an exclusive interview to the London *Daily Telegraph*, the house organ of the Tory wing of the British establishment, owned by the influential Hollinger Corp. of Toronto. In the interview, Carey warned that the Holy See's opposition to birth control was contributing to global poverty and environmental degradation, especially as "the population explosion was an obvious strain on the planet's resources." He said he wanted to take up this issue with the pope during a private visit to Rome during the early part of the week of May 25. Carey claimed insidiously that relations between the Anglican and Catholic churches were "very cordial," and his hope was that they could help each other with such "difficult philosophical issues" as population growth. "I try to understand the Roman Catholic position" on contraception, he affirmed. "I don't fully understand it. I do believe it is a very important issue that they have got to address."

As it turned out, supposedly for reasons of protocol, Carey did not bring up the birth control/population controversy when he met the pope. Even if the atmosphere of the Anglican-Vatican discussions in Rome appeared to be generally cordial—with the exception of a spat on the question of ordination of women priests—the Carey declarations promise to bring in a new era of Anglican philosophical-political war against the Holy See, on issues that are fundamental to whether the human race survives the next decades or not. The queen and her theological minions are determined to remove impediments to the kind of malthusian world order that the Rio summit is supposed to codify.

In his *Daily Telegraph* interview, the archbishop re-