

# European arms control: hostage to Gorbachov?

by Our Special Correspondent

A May 31 seminar on arms control held in Utrecht, The Netherlands has revealed, in rather brutal terms, the new Soviet tactics particularly following the “more human” summit between President Gorbachov and President Bush. In the past, the expanding military capabilities of the Soviet Union and its Warsaw Pact allies were designed to speak much louder than any Soviet diplomatic initiatives, as a means to achieve Soviet arms control objectives. With the collapse of the communist regimes in Eastern Europe and the momentum toward the German reunification, these tactics have changed. The propaganda value of the threat of the Red Army has been replaced with the image of civil war in Russia, “with all its uncertainties and dangers,” and the bogeyman that a united Germany supposedly poses to the West’s darling President Mikhail Gorbachov. Rather than simply being hostage to the Red Army, the West must now become hostage to Gorbachov.

The seminar, “Defensive Technology, Conversion, and Arms Control” brought together arms control experts and peace researchers, depending on which side of the political spectrum they were from. Two leading Soviet arms control experts were in attendance—Aleksander Konovalov of the U.S.A. and Canada Institute of the Soviet Academy of Sciences and B. Komzin of the Institute of the World Economy and International Relations (IMEMO). Konovalov was the first Soviet arms control specialist to brief the U.S. Senate Armed Services Committee and Foreign Affairs Committee. He has also briefed the NATO staff in Brussels.

## Western aid for the Red Army

The Soviets’ new line became obvious in an exchange that occurred when a Dutch parliamentarian suggested that the Netherlands government help finance the Soviet troop withdrawal. One of the very pro-NATO speakers declared the proposal a “scheme and a lot of bula [sic]”; Konovalov jumped to the microphone and blurted out: “I am asking whether the West is interested in unleashing civil war on one-sixth of the planet who have stockpiled 10,000 nuclear warheads with unpredictable consequences. . . .” He, of course, then demurred, “I am only speaking for myself as a Soviet citizen.” The pro-NATO speaker sharply retorted that we in the West “do not in any way support the Soviet military. There are other ways to help your economy, such as relaxation of the CoCom rules, or other means, but the military is your own problem, like our military is ours.”

Konovalov’s outburst might also have been prompted

by an earlier presentation by Prof. G.C. Berkhof, a retired lieutenant general of The Netherlands Royal Army and current professor of strategic studies at the University of Leyden. Speaking on strategy and technology Professor Berkhof explained how a revolution in the military field is taking place, where technologies are being developed aimed at mastering the electromagnetic spectrum, including lasers, particle beam weapons, and electromagnetic weapons. Berkhof brought forward ample evidence that both the United States and the Soviet Union were deeply involved in researching these technologies.

Konovalov vigorously, if not convincingly, denied that the Soviet Union was engaging in such unpeaceful endeavors. Nonetheless, the presentation prompted comments that the Soviets’ unilateral troop withdrawals and the demobilization of 500,000 soldiers were going slowly. Konovalov returned to his original threat: “Be serious; this is a very serious question, because now we are in a situation of very serious tension, the nationalities, the economy—we are in the marginal area of very high instability and uncertainties, and if we add to these problems 500,000 soldiers and their families who are very dissatisfied and are trained to use machine guns, this could be the last drop that could create a social explosion.”

In his formal presentation, Konovalov launched into an attack on the potential of a united Germany to be a threat to the internal stability of the Soviet Union and hence the ability of Gorbachov to survive. “The potential military danger of a united Germany is a very important internal question for the Soviet Union, because, up until now, we have had some sort of idiosyncracies about the military threat of a united Germany. We saw Germany at the gates of Moscow and participated in two wars. . . . A change at the genetic level for the Soviet citizen would be required to change his view, that the German threat is the permanent threat, especially when we allow them [Germany] to reunify, and especially if the Western side insists on a united Germany in NATO. I admit the current level of threat is not serious, because of nuclear weapons . . . but this is not an argument for the Soviet public, and I think we have to discuss the problem of a new security system . . . where neither a NATO nor a Warsaw Treaty will exist . . . in which Germany and the Soviet Union will be included.”

## Emasculating the new Germany

In private, Konovalov elaborated on the German question, indicating that within the framework of the Vienna talks—specifically with respect to the so-called Central Zone—which include both Germanys, the United States, and the Soviet Union, proposals are possible: “We can indirectly establish very strong limits on the potential of the Bundeswehr or a united German army. This situation must be fixed into the future because, as I said, we have some sort of idiosyncrasy and some sort of genetic feeling that the military threat is associated primarily with Germany. This is still the

## Albrecht arrest sheds light on Stasi-terror tie

Susanne Albrecht, a key figure in the assassination of Dresdner Bank chairman Jürgen Ponto in June 1977, was arrested by East German police on June 6, a few days after her return to a two-year stay (she says) in the Soviet Union. For the eight years before that, she had lived under the false name of Ingrid Jaeger in East Berlin and worked as a chemicals specialist in a laboratory.

The arrest of Albrecht, and, by June 15, six other safehoused "first generation" Baader-Meinhof terrorists, sheds new light on the role of the East German State Security police—the hated Stasi—in running "Western" terrorism. It also reopens the file on the targeting of Lyndon LaRouche by Communist secret police for well over a decade.

LaRouche was informed in 1977 that his name was high on the same terrorist hit-list with Ponto, a hit list now revealed likely to have been East German- or even Moscow-inspired. Ponto had been involved in mapping out infrastructure investments in the developing sector in ways that dovetailed with LaRouche's famous International Development Bank proposal of 1975.

Albrecht, a friend of the Ponto family, gained access

to the household for the terrorists. After Ponto's murder she went underground and later was reportedly spotted in the Mideast, at Syrian-controlled terrorist safehouses. It turns out now that she also spent some time in Czechoslovakia, entered East Germany from there in 1980, and applied for citizenship—which was granted her in an unusually short time. This affair alone indicates that the ubiquitous Stasi had an active interest in letting her into the country.

Albrecht rose in the intervening years to the level of the privileged *Reisekader*, who were sent abroad by the regime to work. It is rumored that in fact she has worked in Syria for the past two years, and not in the U.S.S.R., whence she returned to East Germany by plane a few days before her arrest.

For years, the role of the DKP, the West German-based Communist Party, and other front organizations of the East German SED regime, was well known in the radical anti-nuclear movement in the Federal Republic of Germany and in the Berlin-Kreuzberg terrorist scene. It is also well known that selected DKP cadres were trained in secret East German camps in conspiracy and sabotage methods, which are strikingly similar to those of the terrorists. The "first generation" of West German terrorists around Ulrike Meinhof had direct contacts back into the German Democratic Republic, and their rise in the West German radical left enjoyed powerful backing from East Berlin.

fact of real life." Reiterating that the Soviet position is that a united Germany "will not become a military power" and a united Germany must "bear the burden" of East Germany's economic commitments to the Soviet Union.

While claiming he "supports Lithuanian independence," Kononov thanked the West for not coming to the support of the Baltic states, because it would "undermine Gorbachov." This elicited the sharp response from one of the Western panelists, "Do you mean to say that the West let you off the hook?"

Directly reflecting thinking within the Bush administration and the Soviet Foreign Ministry to turn the current Vienna confidence-building and conventional forces in Europe (CFE) talks into a Congress of Vienna-style system, Kononov proposed that such superpower cooperation would help solve the "balkanization" in Eastern Europe, particularly Romania. He concluded by again stating in foreboding terms that the Soviet Union should not be pushed too hard on conventional arms control, because "I am absolutely sure everyone in Europe will enjoy a very dangerous result."

As frequently happens, the most interesting portion of the seminar was during the drinks afterward. The chairwoman, "peace research manager" from the University of Amsterdam,

proceeded to distribute an "International Experts' Statement on German Unification," dated May 25, 1990. Among the "expert" signatories were Dr. Frank Barnaby, former director of the Stockholm Institute for Peace Research (SIPRI); Rear Adm. Elmar Schmähling of the West German Navy, who was suspended for violating the official NATO secrecy codes; Dr. Paul Walker of the Institute for Peace and International Security in the United States; Maj. Gen. Valentin Larionov (ret.), Soviet Academy of Sciences; and Dr. Aleksander Kononov.

The statement, subtitled "German armies must become non-offensive," declares that a united Germany within NATO "can easily be perceived as a grave disturbance of the existing balance of forces on the continent," and proposed that the German army, by international mandate, be converted to a totally defensive force without sophisticated aircraft and other weapons systems considered "offensive." According to the document, this situation would be permanently guaranteed through a Berlin "crisis management center" that would include the Four Powers.

Our "peace research manager" guaranteed that this statement had been given to the highest circles in time for the Washington summit.