

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-

counted that he had been in New York in early May, and had received a briefing from U.N. Secretary General Boutros Boutros-Ghali and other senior U.N. officials, on the issues of poverty, population growth, etc. When he asked them why the question of population control was not to be discussed at the summit, there was "an uncomfortable silence" in response. According to Carey, "We were faced with religious issues and, I have to say, with respect, the dominant dogma of the Roman Catholic Church about contraception." By contrast, he gloated, U.N. officials praised Britain's significant contribution to the Earth Summit, which brought him "great joy."

The *Telegraph* commented: "The intervention of the Anglican Church in the environmental debate comes at a critical time, two weeks before the United Nations Earth Summit in Rio de Janeiro, at which the Holy See, supported by the Philippines and Latin American countries, is expected to oppose discussion on population issues."

Carey, according to the *Telegraph's* paraphrase, "warmly commended the speech on population by the Prince of Wales last month." He was referring to Prince Charles's April 22 address in London to the Brundtland Commission, the U.N.-mandated agency which catalyzed the Earth Summit in the late 1980s, during which speech the royal heir implicitly but unambiguously identified the Vatican as the main institution that was obstructing an agreement on population control during the preparatory discussions for the Earth Summit.

The queen herself, who is forbidden by British convention from commenting on political issues, has nonetheless jumped on that bandwagon during the past months, with one speech at a royal banquet in the southern African nation of Namibia warning that population in Africa could exceed the "carrying capacity" of the land, and with her March 9 "Commonwealth Day Speech" calling for a Commonwealth mobilization for the Earth Summit (see *EIR*, March 20). On theological affairs, one of her chief advisers in the Church of England hierarchy is the father of Martin Palmer of Manchester, England. Martin Palmer is the chief adviser on ecological affairs to Prince Philip, the queen's royal consort and international president of the World Wide Fund for Nature.

'Human life' is the problem

In his *Telegraph* discussion, Carey also launched a broader theological-philosophical diatribe, charging that the Catholic Church's problem was enshrined in the 1968 papal encyclical *Humanae Vitae* of Pope Paul VI. This encyclical, in the archbishop of Canterbury's view, "actually stopped theological thinking," which creates a problem for the whole world, "in the sense that all of us are caught up in it."

As various British press stressed in reporting the primate's comments, this is an unsubtle attempt to intervene in papal deliberations, precisely at the moment that the pope is

preparing two encyclicals in the coming months on "moral theology" and "sexual ethics."

But it is clear that the archbishop of Canterbury's real target goes beyond the sensitive issues of birth control and contraception as such, and rather aims at the fundamental doctrines of Christianity itself. This subversive intent is encapsulated in his comments that "Christians have a direct responsibility, set out in the Book of Genesis, to be stewards or caretakers of nature. . . . The Christian tradition of environmentalism is based on stewardship. . . . It was a western misunderstanding of this tradition which took man's dominion over the beasts of the field to mean that man could exploit nature."

This is straight Gnosticism, of the sort that emanated into Europe via Calvinist and related circles who were deeply influenced by a Middle Ages cult of Bulgarian origin called "bogomilism," which held that there was a complete split between spirit and matter, and that the material world was the evil work of Satan. Carey himself comes from the "evangelical" wing of the Church of England, and represents a fundamentalist-Calvinist trend within the church.

The 'green primate'

His penchant for Gnostic beliefs is nothing new. As the *Telegraph* noted, "The archbishop developed an interest in the environment in the 1970s. In 1990, as bishop of Bath and Wells, he wrote an address to the local Green Party, entitled 'Is God Green?' later published in a book, which set out his views on the importance of the Creation in Christian thought."

At the time of Carey's approval by the U.K. Crown Appointments Commission as the successor to then-Archbishop of Canterbury Robert Runcie, the July 26, 1990 edition of the Milan daily *Corriere della Sera* described him as "the green primate." The paper quoted from his "Is God Green?" tract: "The question is, is God green? The answer is, emphatically yes. God is more green than me and you."

The British press at that time quoted a speech by Carey to a meeting sponsored by the U.K. Green Party: "In nature, predator numbers are always fewer than their prey, but the human species is unique in attaining such a high density, that the structure of our environment is in danger of breaking down under the huge punishment." The Green Party welcomed him as Britain's "first green primate."

Upon appointment in July 1990, he said that his mission would be to get the church to work out an ideology for greener living, to ease ecological pressures, since "we have to modify lifestyles to take into account diminishing resources."

He reiterated this view in his May 18 *Telegraph* interview, declaring that it was the responsibility of the world's 80 million Anglicans to "lead simple lives, less dependent on natural resources." The paper commented: "He gave the example of the American family who had given up cars in favor of bicycles."