

ground into proxy wars and similar things after the Korean conflict. The truce in that war has been in place since about 1982, since the end of the Brezhnev era.

This second scenario is the one most dangerous for us, especially dangerous if the American political leadership should be so naive as to refuse to see this danger. If the American politicians are that naive, then it is possible that this rotten empire, economically rotten and psychologically rotten, could still prevail.

The third scenario is also extremely dangerous, because it seems to offer a softer line. The American strategy and American positions really play very little role in this third scenario, because the necessary precondition for the third scenario is that U.S. troops will have already left Western Europe.

You have still this idea of a balance of power, which the British have practiced in the past. You have a certain French nervousness about a united Germany with 85 million people, and that brings this kind of thing back into play. And nobody can deny that a market with 500 million consumers does exercise a certain fascination.

I am convinced that Gorbachov will fall, he will trip, he will stumble, in the same way that I predicted that Honecker would be out. I would add to that the prediction that Poland, for economic reasons, even with Western aid, simply will not make it.

We have ahead of us an extremely dangerous course of events. It is therefore obligatory that we proceed with our eyes open and our judgment sober. Gorbachov came to East Berlin for the celebrations of the fortieth anniversary of the G.D.R., and he made a very interesting comment: If you come too late, you pay with your life. What he meant was to apply to Honecker. But it applies to Gorbachov as well. If Gorbachov comes too late, and he does, he comes twenty years too late, then Gorbachov will pay with his life.

The Gorbachov group and Gorbachov himself are totally overestimated. It is a consequence of wishful thinking in the West, and of Western complete inability to understand the categories of thought and action that exist in the East.

All of the strategic factors I have indicated speak eloquently against the continued survival of Gorbachov in 1990. I feel that if we wish to save Western civilization in this crisis, it is necessary to examine these conditions I have referred to, and the basic facts are known to think tanks in the West.

We must be tough about drawing the consequences from these facts.

I will conclude with a quote from T.S. Eliot, from *Murder in the Cathedral*. "Man stumbles from unreality to unreality, because he refuses to see."

It is part of our own human evolution that we must fight to be able to see. If we don't want to be the victims of Soviet seers' disinformation, we have got to keep our positions the way they are until the summer of 1990.

## A dialogue with General Scherer

*On Oct. 19 at a luncheon in Washington sponsored by EIR, Gen. Paul Albert Scherer responded to questions from members of the U.S. military and intelligence community, both active and retired.*

**Q:** Is there any chance that things will get so bad, and maybe Gorbachov if he is tough enough, if not as tough as Stalin, or somebody else, will say, "Let's let the United States have it, and launch their atomic weapons"?"

**Scherer:** They wouldn't undertake a total thermonuclear assault, because they are not suicidal, in my opinion. The Soviet tactics in the START negotiations, the attempt to cut strategic weapons in half, indicates that the Russians would not attempt a thermonuclear first strike in the classical, full panoply. If there were to be a nuclear attack on the United States, it would probably come in the form of the destruction of a single, large city. They would probably expect that, in retaliation for that, one large Russian city would be destroyed. And I would say that the United States is not strong enough to wage a world war. Whether the Russians are strong enough is unclear. I would have to assume that they are.

**Q:** Returning to the concept of the idea of civil war, the fundamental problem of the Soviet Union today is economic. If the country falls into civil war, then how is the economic problem going to be solved?

**Scherer:** There is no solution to the Soviet economic problem. It won't be solved. You have to assume that, first of all, in this coming winter, several hundred thousand people, if not millions, are going to die of hunger. Whatever the West tries to deliver, and the West is talking about delivering wheat and freeing Jews, it won't work. It is a totally anti-human situation of the Russians. But there is no solution but civil war, it is anarchy. One force against another. It will be like China, when warlords took over.

**Q:** But then, how does the Soviet Union stay a world power?

**Scherer:** Modern nuclear missile war, which can be waged just by pushing buttons, is always possible.

**Q:** But they aren't suicidal.

**Scherer:** Yes, not total war. Look at it this way. We have to distinguish between a warning shot, a warning attack, wiping out one city, or one province, and an all-out total nuclear attack. The Soviet strategic rocket forces—assume they are getting their orders out of Moscow, that Moscow is waging civil war—they can't conceive of waging a total war, and there you are right. They are too weak for that. But for a nuclear warning shot, a way of saying, "You've got to give us aid immediately. Stop trying to play first violin, you people in the U.S. And after that, we Soviets will be satisfied with Europe." And I will give you three guesses if the U.S. would fight under those circumstances.

Please understand, I am not an enemy of the United States. We are all in one boat. We have a high Western civilization, which now faces this horrible challenge. The Russians are going to try to exploit every little opportunity. They are not crazy. They are not like Hitler. They are very deliberate in their planning process. They are highly suspicious, paranoid, afraid. This is a strategy that we might impute to them. Extremely terrifying threats, to soften the West, and the soft West then says, "Okay, let's have peace."

You can't conquer the whole world from Moscow. What you then get is an unbelievably anarchic course of events in the entire world for at least a decade. That could happen. And what we don't have is, in the West, governments that are tough enough to face that.

**Q:** What about conventional war?

**Scherer:** That is excluded. Remember that in Poland, they have to transfer their railway cars from the wide Russian gauge to the narrow European gauge. Right now, you have 20 Soviet divisions in East Germany, and that has become a very dangerous fort for them to occupy. And even an attack, from a standing start in East Germany, as long as we have a U.S. Army with nuclear weapons facing them on the other side, that would lead to a general war.

The Russians now assume that the U.S. withdrawals will begin by springtime at the latest, because of the U.S. financial situation. Any weakening of that United States troop contingent would mean that the U.S. would be out of Europe for good, with no hope of coming back.

**Q:** Does Margaret Thatcher's government have any idea of these things?

**Scherer:** No. No. The British government has gone onto a totally pro-Gorbachov line. Why? The British are now obsessed with a fear of a failure of their balance of power strategy in Central Europe. I am not against the British, I have many British friends. But British policy is quite antiquated. They always think about strategic magnitudes. There will be 85 million Germans. And the British look at that and think, "That's too many!" There will be at least 4 million Germans who will come out of the Soviet Union in the course of the civil war. So, the German population in Central Europe

will go up to 85 million. That is also something that [French President] Mitterrand is not exactly happy about.

Western politicians have not understood that Germans today are not the Germans of 1945. The politicians have it wrong. Most politicians were thunderstruck when this tremendous exodus out of East Germany began. I predicted it, some years in advance, but nobody believed it, even when they saw it happening. You now have 62 million Germans in the free, western part. They have so changed in their outlook that they are now absolute defenders of democracy, maybe even too much. Look at this Green movement. They are crazy. But they get elected. The result is that Germans are totally capable of integration into free Europe.

Looking at history, it will not be possible for a new Napoleon to occupy Europe, or a Stalin. There won't be another Hitler. You are not going to have Charles XII of Sweden conquering Europe. These great lords and dominators, conquering Europe, that time is gone. If you have 80 million speaking German and 40 million speaking English, or whatever it is, they will have to learn to speak the same language one way or another. The middle nations, the Swedes, the Norwegians, the Swiss, the Belgians—they all know that already. In Eastern Europe, up until 1945, German was the language of trade, and in Russia, everywhere. I visited Poland and Finland when I was young, and everybody knew German. And a lot of them studied in Germany. So if you want to get away from this crazy nationalism in Central Europe, then we have no problem. The Germans are ready to fit in.

But in Eastern Europe, the direction is exactly the opposite. There they have got to make up for things that they have been denied by history. For a thousand years, they have had a different kind of development. They have got to go through this period of nationalism.

That is why we have to expect civil war and insurrections in the Soviet Empire. You've got to remember that you are dealing with the biggest colonial empire in today's world. And even Lenin, back in 1905, said this is the prison house of nations. Today that is even more true that it was then. Look at Armenia, Georgia, Kazakhstan. I could talk for an hour just about these different nationalities. These nationalities are now rising up, because they are determined to live their own lives for a change. And when you have a sinking ship, the rats always leave it. Always.

I must say something very tough. President Carter kissed Brezhnev, in the middle of this maniac development of the Russian fleet, 200 billion rubles for ship construction only. Carter was kissing Brezhnev, and the Soviet rocket troops were being given new intercontinental missiles. You in America had the nuclear monopoly for four years. And you took your best generals and sent them home. Your best general was sent home because he wanted to use a nuclear bomb on the Yalu. I could catalogue American errors for an hour. I remain the friend of the United States, but among friends,

we have to say what went wrong. I can only hope that the leadership is more clever now. . . .

**Q:** A few minutes ago, you said that prospects for the immediate period are, Russia engulfed in a civil war, or you used the concept of a Fourth World War. Can you elaborate?

**Scherer:** I mean what I said. This would be the attempt of a post-Gorbachov leadership to get control of Western resources, to build this common European house, with Germany neutralized, and the Eastern Europeans Finlandized, Poland, Hungary, Bulgaria, Yugoslavia, and so forth, they would be Finlandized. But the Russian leadership being what it is, there would be an insurrection in Poland.

The Fourth World War wouldn't last too long. With modern weapons, you can change the entire situation within less than 30 days. The Fourth World War would not be six years, or like the Third World War, which in my view went from 1948 to about 1985. This would be a short war, but with very long turbulences associated with it. With anarchy, you don't have any normal government.

I spoke at my press conference yesterday about three post-Gorbachov scenarios. You could have fundamentalist Communists, who would nevertheless be able to offer the West a new government that would look reformist to some degree, which would be an attempt to gain time. They would attempt to master the civil war situation. I would say, it won't work.

The second possibility, you have the Great Russians, the racists, they would try to keep Russia, including Siberia. They expect a Japanese attack on Sakhalin, and that the Japanese would attempt to seize Siberian resources. This group, the racist group, would be ready to wage a Fourth World War if necessary.

The other group is a radical fundamentalist Communist group. They would be talking about this 500 million-person market. And they would say to the United States, "Either you go along with us, help us, or you get out of Europe, get your nuclear weapons out above all." What that would lead to is a period of perhaps 20 or 30 years, but ending with a war between the Russians on the one side, and the U.S., Canada, Latin America on the other.

You may notice that I do not have any scenarios that don't include war. I would say that there is a great deal of evil in man. Lenin was stupid, in the sense that he thought he could impose a dictatorship through education, and controlling the way people acted. It failed, and there will be more wars. But it doesn't have to be above the nuclear threshold. It can also be below. We have at least 38 countries with ballistic missiles of some kind. More than 10 countries have nuclear weapons, and there will be more tomorrow. And that looks like the way world history is going at the moment.

**Q:** I disagree that civil war will occur inside the Soviet Union. I agree that outside war is a possibility, just to settle

their domestic problems. But I disagree that conventional war is not possible. It is possible. Never in history was surprise so important. In no other war were you able to knock out the enemy in a matter of hours. It used to be weeks or months at best. Now, it is almost a matter of hours. Therefore, when the Soviets say something, they mean to deceive, just to create the element of surprise. And when we believe what they say, you are ready to be hit between the eyes. I think they will have war outside to avoid civil war.

**Scherer:** I would like to attempt to prove that civil war can begin in the Soviet Union at any time.

Back in 1904-05, at the time of the Russo-Japanese War, there was this revolution. The Trans-Siberian Railroad had been completed between 1896 and 1899. That rail line was occupied by strikers. The provision of the Russian troops in the Far East was cut off. In the western part of the empire, certain military units joined with the insurrection. But it wasn't strong enough, and therefore, the 1905 Revolution was a failure. Another example, 1917. Here what you have again is a collapse through transportation strikes. You can see that Gorbachov knows about these things, because that is his demand, that there be a strike ban for railroads and coal mines. If you have partial insurrection, it is guaranteed to lead to a general strike of coal miners and railroad workers.

Secondly, when you get, which you routinely have now, demonstrations of 100,000 and more, then the KGB and all of its auxiliaries are not going to be able to stop the insurrection. When you get that, all of these component republics, in the Transcaucasus, all of the peripheral states around the empire are going to rise up at the same time. And then, as happens in civil wars, individual military units are going to choose one side or the other.

Remember that the Poles got all the way to Kiev in 1920, so weak was the Red Army at that time. There was a White Army. Trotsky was able to wipe it out only because they weren't united among themselves. There were lots of ethnic groups that joined in with the invading troops.

So, to sum up, the revolutionary development starts with large ethnic insurrections, together with a general strike. You are going to have the defection of certain military units, and they are going to join together with bloodied sections of the population, people who have been shot down during the insurrection. Even today, without large military defections, you have a constant process of shooting at population groups and even at other military groups.

So, I would say that, by spring, you are going to have, first of all, insurrections, you are going to have hunger riots, general strikes, you are going to have the military coming in and shooting people down with a hard line. Then, some of them are going to desert, some to the people, joining on that side of the barricades—and with that, you have the full development of civil war. Only the core area around Moscow can be held.

But I don't have to be right, I would like to be wrong.