

Technology will never stand still

by Brigadier General Heinz Karst

Brigadier General (ret.) Heinz Karst is an officer in the Bundeswehr, the army of the Federal Republic of Germany.

The hopes of Europeans now focus upon the talks between Shultz and Gromyko, which began on Jan. 7 and 8. Those who know the whole situation more precisely, know how tedious and difficult effecting solutions in arms-control and disarmament will be, if they ever actually come about. But it is beyond any doubt today, that the Soviets, in the years of illusory détente, in the era of Carter, Brandt and Scheel, unerringly exploited their opportunities, and brought their offensive armaments in all categories up to a level unparalleled in history. Our fixation on the nuclear medium-range missiles, on the SS-20 and SS-22 systems, hides from our view the exceedingly large Soviet naval buildup, their strengthening of conventional forces and their air forces. All of the economic and technological efforts of this major power have been devoted, since the time of Lenin, to building up the heavy- and light-armaments industry.

While in the West—with the recent exception of the United States—defense needs receive only the funds left over after the population is supplied with consumer-goods, the reverse situation prevails in the Soviet Union. That which is left over after meeting the requirements of the priority task, armament, then goes to cover the consumption of the population. This situation requires an explanation. The armaments of the Soviet Union are the fulfillment of an old dream of Great Russian Imperialism from the time of the Czars, which has been married with the messianic belief in the world revolutionary mission of Marxism-Leninism in its Moscovite version. With such military power, the Soviet Union can exert political pressure, wherever they think it necessary.

This is one side. The other consists in the fact that Moscow has understood how to make most of mankind into its enemy. Japan was willing to cooperate, if Moscow would return to Japan the Kuril Islands, conquered in World War II. But Moscow has never given anything back which it has once conquered. Thus, it will also never give up Afghanistan, but rather swallow it, unless there is a change in ideology. Red China is still in an adversary position against the imperialist conquest of Laos and Cambodia by the Vietnamese, who are loyal to Moscow. The assault upon and war in Afghanistan have earned the Kremlin the hostility of hundreds

of millions of Moslems, leaving aside Syria and Qaddafi, which play a special role. The free West, as little as it may give the external appearance of being united, is ultimately determined never to accept the hegemony of the Soviets.

From Moscow's standpoint, the excessive and economically burdensome armaments buildup finds its justification as the reaction to the feeling of being globally encircled. There is the additional element, that Moscow's satellite belt is not exactly secure. Events in Poland are an example of this. That in a communist state, secret service people are put on trial for a brutal assassination, and this trial is held publicly—that is equivalent to a revolution, just like the fact that a general heads up a communist state. Everywhere, where battles for freedom have occurred in Soviet satellite countries, there are Soviet tank and motorized divisions stationed: in Hungary, in Poland, in the German Democratic Republic, and in Czechoslovakia. In addition to the defense of the Mother

The armaments of the Soviet Union are the fulfillment of an old dream of Great Russian Imperialism from the time of the Czars, which has been married with the messianic belief in the world revolutionary mission of Marxism-Leninism.

Land, if one wants to define such defense benignly, these forces serve to discipline the allies, who are not trusted.

The Soviet Union has, nevertheless, managed to win an important victory in the battle for minds. Psychologically, the Soviet Union has by and large managed to restrict the application of the concept of totalitarianism to the fascism of the past, and to see to it that it is not applied to present-day communism. So, the idiotic slogans, like "Better Red than Dead," take hold of certain people, without them knowing just what "red" in this case would really mean.

Moscow has achieved successes on the field of psychological-revolutionary warfare among citizens of the West. Moscow's strength lies in this area, as much as in the area of armament per se. Moscow knows how to orchestrate its intentions, all the way from semantic fraud to targeted terrorism, slipping in agents and mediated control of "movements," quite effectively. Strategic adversary No. 1 for the U.S.S.R. is America, No. 2 Red China, and free Europe only No. 3. But from the standpoint of psychological-revolutionary warfare, Western Europe is No. 1, the U.S.A. is No. 2,

and Red China No. 3. General Rogers [NATO Supreme Commander—ed.] is perfectly correct when he emphasizes that the Soviets want to achieve victory without war, but the Soviets have also included war in their calculations if they see it as necessary—the surprise of the “bold thrust,” as the large-scale territorial maneuvers in 1984 proved. Their goal in this case would likely be to get their hands on the economic potential of Western Europe as intact as possible.

One of the paradoxes of our century is, indeed, that it is especially in the heart of Europe, in Germany, from which so many of the great ideas of the 19th and 20th centuries originated, including Marxism, people know Marxism itself very inadequately, even though the smaller German (part) state, the German Democratic Republic, has a Marxist gov-

The Strategic Defense Initiative policy of President Reagan is about to put a check on Moscow's dreams for world power.

ernment. There, people try desperately, in every possible and impossible way, to escape to freedom in the West. They know very well what it means not to have freedom, and they have a far clearer notion of red totalitarianism than many citizens of welfare-society in the West.

Now, the Strategic Defense Initiative policy of President Reagan is about to put a check on Moscow's dreams for world power. If the Soviets are already bleeding from the wound in Afghanistan, where, with more than 150,000 soldiers and the most modern armament, they have not managed to subject the “gangs” or “bandits,” as they call the freedom-fighters of the Afghan people—and, in stark contrast to the Vietnam War, the radicals are demonstrating almost not at all against the barbaric warfare there—Moscow nevertheless sees in Reagan's SDI a strategic development which could serve to make the previous nuclear potential of the world “impotent and obsolete.” If that happens, and if Moscow accepts the President's offer to mutually develop this program, Caspar Weinberger's words in his speech at the Foreign Press Center on Dec. 19, 1984, could become reality. But beam weapons are a “wide field,” to borrow the words of Theodor Fontane. Ideas about space-based and ground-based defensive weapons are still so abstract and uncanny, that most citizens and governments react negatively.

One must, however, take into account that the Soviets are working on the development of such systems. It is known, that they, true to the teaching of Lenin, only honor treaties for as long as they can draw advantages from them, or in any case as long as they do not harvest any disadvantages. In a totalitarian state, arms development, despite modern satellite

surveillance, remains in secrecy, while in the open societies of Western democracies, armaments projects are publicly discussed. That reason does not always come out on top is clear. It seems to me important that [U.S. Secretary of Defense] Weinberger's speech be thoroughly studied. Technology, and that includes weapons technology, will never stand still. New technological “pushes” have always emerged in the course of history. In any case, these vital questions can not be shrugged off with slogans, such as those that appeared immediately on the market, such as that in [the West German weekly magazine] *Der Spiegel* on Nov. 12, 1984, where beam weapons are called “weapons for Star Wars.” We are just at the beginning of the discussion about this strategy in our country. And it will be some years before they are deployed.

A patriotic self-respect

In the Federal Republic of Germany, where one knows that our external freedom depends upon the United States, there is an anti-American campaign which reaches from open terrorism to the activities of relatively small but very loud groupings. They do not, however, represent the majority of the German people. But majorities that do not speak out do not make the news. The impression can arise abroad that irrational minorities here are not hitting up against sufficient resistance. They will likely change, since the answers being given by these groups, among some right questions, are nearly all far away from reality. The major point is that the new, democratic Germany regains a patriotic self-respect, and asserts its role as the center of Europe in the North Atlantic Alliance, without overestimating itself.

In this connection, Friedrich Schiller is one of the leading figures of German history. It is characteristic, that the National Socialists first banned performances of “Wilhelm Tell,” and then “Don Carlos.” “Sir, give us freedom of thought!”—this line of the Marquis of Posa, which called forth storms of applause from the theater-going public in the “Third Reich,” was as uncomfortable as the assassination of the tyrant in “Wilhelm Tell.” Reorienting to Schiller and his great poetry, and to the classics and the German movement at the time of the Liberation Wars can be a way to renew the political culture of our people. But the challenges at the end of our present century also require new answers, because there are a number of phenomena that did not exist at the time of the friendship between Goethe and Schiller from 1795 to 1805. Our task is to overcome the cultural pessimism which has taken root in the left political camp, to put a stop to destruction of the environment, to overcome the anxiety-psychosis of “future shock,” to prevent any decoupling of free Europe from the United States, to unify Europe, to effectively fight misery in the Third World, and to mobilize every force to secure peace in freedom. The Geneva discussions could be a promising beginning. I say this as a private person, one who follows the work of the Schiller Institute with interest.