

are the Iranian Arabs, the Baluchis, and, of course, the Kurds. The Kurds will grab what they can get. All of them are assets. The Muslim restoration will soon hit the Soviet Union as you will see.

Of course, it's necessary for us to maintain an island of Western culture in the area. We can't go all the way back to the 13th century. That's why we're pushing the women's liberation movement, that's the reason Kate Millet and Ralph Schoenman were there. In order to keep control, English speaking people in the Khomeini camp and other centers of power must have freedom of action. In the insurgency against the brutal and arrogant Shah, American and British-born agents were limited in what they could do. So we had to work almost solely through American and British-educated Iranians, especially around Khomeini.

Q: *Speaking of the ethnic groups and insurgencies, do you anticipate anything along these lines in Europe?*

Bell: In the immediate future there is going to be a big wave of terrorism across Europe. If you were a betting man going to the race track you could take my tip and come out a big winner (laughing). Sort of a sure bet if you know what I mean. In Italy, terrorism will keep up and escalate sharply, and watch for the rise of the right.

One of the keys is what we call the "ethnic pools." The Turks in Berlin, for example: the Turks in Germany are not being absorbed and that creates tinderbox conditions. This will cause no end of problems for the Schmidt government. Also the West Indians in West Germany. You know the West Indians' profile — aggressive and violent! The Germans are going to have a real problem on their hands!

Of course, there will be a reaction to this. There will be a rise again of classical fascist movements. I expect the fascist right to take power in Italy within a couple of years. In the tradition of Mussolini — the bankrupted middle class, the uprooted workers, the underclass will be the shocktroops, and strong fascist leaders will emerge. There will be neo-Nazism in Germany that can take power also. The conditions are ripe and all the old inhibitions have broken down. Ethnic terrorism will be the spark and many of the ethnics themselves will later try to join fascist forces. It's definitely going to happen.

Q: *How do you view Carter's performance as President: Do you think Alexander Haig has a chance?*

Bell: I think Carter is now implementing the very same policies that Al Haig has advocated and would pursue if he were President. Carter has many accomplishments under his belt, especially recently. Our China policy has proved a smashing success. Carter's accomplishment with Camp David is tremendous, of great strategic significance. We would stick with Carter for now. Al Haig would be excellent. The only thing I worry about is that the last Republican military man (Eisenhower—ed.) turned out to be a total disaster.

A sharp look at

Alexander Haig is now the leading candidate to succeed Jimmy Carter as President of the United States. His candidacy is being promoted by the British oligarchy through a number of British institutions and networks, including the Royal Institute for International Affairs, the British-based Ditchley Foundation, the Lazard Freres investment bank of London and New York, the Tufts Fletcher School of International Diplomacy, the inner circle of the New York Council on Foreign Relations, the Anglo-Zionist Committee on the Present Danger, Her Majesty's Order of St. John of Jerusalem (of which, according to Mexican sources, Haig is a secret member), and the Heinz family of Pittsburgh.

An attempt is being made to see Haig, the candidate for war, as a great American Republican military man in the tradition of Douglas MacArthur and Dwight David Eisenhower. The British public relations specialists have got to be kidding. That image just won't wash.

Far from greatness, Haig has never even attained mediocrity in any of his endeavors.

Hardly an American — despite the coincidence (unlike Henry Kissinger) of having been born in this country — Haig is a complete acolyte of the British aristocracy.

Republican? Haig has never been a member of the party and has a record of doing a hatchet job on leading Republicans, including his notorious inside job on Richard Nixon in the Watergate affair.

Military commander? Not only has Haig never commanded men in battle, but this British created General has tried to force upon NATO policies that would ensure defeat for the United States and Europe in a general thermonuclear war. Wags say that the only deployment the General has proved in the least competent is moving the paper clips from one secret NATO document to another.

The British are orchestrating the campaign

The Haig campaign is a straight British operation — and carefully orchestrated. It was kicked off last year — before European pressure, especially from the West Germans, forced Haig out as head of NATO — with a warmongering appearance at Ditchley Park 11 miles outside London. At an event sponsored by the Ditchley Foundation, a planning body for a "New Dark Ages," composed of the Anglo-American inner oligarchic elite and numbering among its members U.S. Secretary of State Cyrus Vance, Lord Tweedsmuir, Lord Gore-Booth, Paul Nitze, and Amory Houghton, Haig demanded a massive NATO buildup and for the NATO

Alexander Haig's career

alliance to become immediately involved in Anglo-American military operations in the Middle East and Africa in behalf of the World Bank and IMF — and in abrogation of the NATO treaty. Haig's declaration of intent to become the "War President of the United States" opened a British propaganda barrage that later induced the dangerous, if pathetic President Carter to adopt the very same policies.

Since that time, Haig has been sponsored in a number of speaking engagements designed to test the waters for his presidential candidacy by British networks in the

"Alexander Haig is the hero of our times. Sound Jesuit training. What an honorable man. What a martial spirit. Never dazzled. The world's leading opponent of Soviet totalitarianism. What principles. Alex agrees completely with the famous saying I used to have on my desk at the Defense Department: 'The tragedy of our era may be that World War III was never fought.'"

—Fritz Kraemer, mentor of Henry Kissinger and Alexander Haig

United States. At the Tufts University School of International Diplomacy, a training ground for Daniel Moynihan, James Schlesinger, and the proconfrontation Committee on the Present Danger crowd, for example, Haig threw his presidential hood in the ring, while denouncing SALT, OPEC, and the Arab nations and calling for a showdown with the Soviets over Iran.

According to informed sources, money for the Haig presidential war chest is being funneled through New York's Council on Foreign Relations figure Arthur Ross and the Lazard Freres investment bank, as well as the Heinz family of Pittsburgh, which has sponsored speaking engagements for Haig in Pittsburgh. Operational control for the Haig presidential drive is being exercised through the Order of St. John of Jerusalem and the Ditchley Foundation in the person of

oligarch Arthur Amory Houghton. Houghton has turned his Wye Plantation in Salsbury, Maryland into a base of operations to boost the conspiracy for fascism and war under Haig. Specifically, Houghton is bankrolling and organizing from there a so-called Conference on the 1980 Race to be run through the Aspen Institute and to provide a forum for the Haig plot to capture the Republican Party and the nomination.

A despicable career

Alexander Haig is one of the clearest examples of British agency ever to run for the Presidency of the United States.

He received his training as a cultist at Georgetown from the Jesuits. There, the center of the Anglican Church-controlled "American Catholic Heresy," Haig imbibed the tradition of Ignatius Loyola and the Inquisition. Significantly in the modern period, both the conspiratorial British Round Table grouping, organized by Cecil Rhodes and his banker Lord Rothschild, and the Nazi SS under Heinrich Himmler (Hitler's "Black Jesus") were consciously organized according to Loyola's principle of organization and in line with the cultist and sado-masochistic practices of Loyola.

The British boosted Haig's miserable career every inch of the way. His mentor and sponsor was the displaced German oligarch Fritz Kraemer who, in the 1960's, insinuated colonel Haig into the position of official Army liaison to Allen Dulles's CIA and later secured his admission as a member of the inner circles of the New York Council on Foreign Relations. Groomed on Rand Corporation war game scenarios, the incompetent Haig was hated by fellow military professionals, which helps explain why he was denied a combat command post during his stint in Vietnam.

It was fellow Kraemer protégé Henry Kissinger who gave the real big boost to the paper clip general, bringing him onto the National Security Council as an aide in 1969.

Kissinger managed to introduce an entirely new principle into the practice of military promotion during this period. Within a couple of years, as a White House military aide working under Kissinger and the NSC, Haig leapfrogged over 50 professional military men ahead of him. He was promoted from colonel to four star general. Haig's "military" work during this period involved such notable successes as helping to prolong the disastrous Vietnam war long after military traditionalists in all three services had turned against it, helping his British confreres to plan the 1973 Arab-Israeli war, and instigating the oil hoax that followed to

try to impose a war economy on the United States, Europe, and Japan.

But, Haig's biggest operation in behalf of his British controllers during this period was the Watergate destabilization of President Richard Nixon — an inside-outside operation which Haig and Henry Kissinger coordinated with the aid of British, Kennedy, and Lazard *Washington Post* networks. "Alexander Haig is running for reelection, you know," one New York Council on Foreign Relations insider recently commented, noting that Haig had actually seized the reins of power from Richard Nixon long before Nixon was ac-

tually ousted. A coconspirator on the inside with Haig and Kissinger in this Watergate coup d'etat against Nixon was Winston Lord, now the President of the New York Council on Foreign Relations.

Rewarded for services rendered to the British monarchy, Haig was shortly thereafter made head of NATO. Haig views NATO as an occupation army in Europe which must prepare, in the immediate future, to fight (and lose) World War III at a time when the European governments and the Soviet Union are in serious economic and disarmament negotiations which could ultimately lead to the gradual dismemberment of the

Aspen's Cleveland: what's up for NATO

"The Third Phase of NATO," according to a December 1978 NATO Review article under that title by Harlan Cleveland, is fascism. Of course, Mr. Cleveland, director of the International Affairs Program at the U.S.-based Aspen Institute, a branch of British intelligence, does not use exactly that word. He states simply that "runaway technologies" have rendered republican forms of government, indeed, any form of nation-state, obsolete; that a "new skepticism of science and technology" and "a new emphasis on ecological causes and effects" demand "a new willingness" on NATO's part "to think in terms of global perspectives...." Under NATO, or international bodies "cloned" from NATO for this purpose, science and technological progress must be strictly regimented, and society reorganized for "selective growth."

The resemblance to "His Imperial Majesty" Otto von Habsburg's "Europe of the regions," and H.G. Wells's science-for-the-oligarchy, is not coincidental.

The following are excerpts of the Cleveland article.

I think it is fair to think of NATO as having three phases, of which we are at the beginning of the third. The first was getting defence and deterrence organized, and establishing an astonishing stability with essentially unusable weapons.... A second phase was the beginnings of a caucus on how to make peace with the Russians — SALT, MBFR, Helsinki and the rest.... My own favorite definition of detente (is) "the continuation of tension by other means." ... And now we come ... to a time when "security problems are more than anything else the product of how we govern ourselves."

...The central problem is clear enough; it is not 'limits to growth', it is limits to government. Let us not fudge the facts: in the industrial democracies, being developed has come to mean a chronic crisis of govern-

ance ... our governments revolving in endless and ineffective coalitions...

And yet the yeast is rising. In every industrial nation a large number of people, often beginning with the young, have started to do some rethinking of growth patterns. In the United States, for example, the size of families has declined to about the population replacement level. The historic trek from rural to urban habitats has slowed down, leveled off and then gone into reverse. The ecological ethic in its many manifestations has started to make its influence felt in the market place and in politics. A revolution has begun in the roles and status of ethnic minorities and the female half of the population. Local communities insist on gaining more control over their own growth.

...We are moving from an ethic of indiscriminate growth as the central organizing principle — growth unfairly distributed, growth wasteful of our resources and damaging to our surroundings, growth that neglects needs, growth preoccupied with the supply rather than the requirements...

...I will simply recall the paragraph in the 'Limits to Growth' study ... that started with the words, "the final, most elusive and most important information we need deals with human values."

...In sum: a tidal wave of change of values is well under way, and the main obstacle to converting these new values into policies and institutions is not the limits to physical resources or the limits to intellectual resources but the limits to government....

Political leaders keep up a brave front, but their incapacity for decision-making is becoming more and more visible to the rest of us. Central economic planning, popularized around the world partly by industrial democracies who will not touch it with a ten-foot pole

competing blocs.

Alexander Haig is a fraud. Anyone who has seen him interviewed on television sees a hollow man, a thorough dullard. Inarticulate, dumb, and carried solely by infantile, narcissistic macho impulses, Haig cuts an image of the mother-dominated fair-haired boy who is not even particularly slick. Like his close friend Schlesinger, the chain-smoking Haig reaches for his pipe whenever the interviewer demands more than his banality can handle.

—Robert Cohen

A candidacy made in England

Who's supporting Al Haig? As this publication reported earlier this year, the NATO Supreme Commander has already garnered an outright endorsement from at least one leading London publication, the *Daily Telegraph*.

But a more revealing insight into the relationship between Haig's supporters in the United States and his supporters in London is provided by examining the relationship between a late February policy statement from the Royal Institute for International Affairs, and a closely following March 1 statement by the Republican National Committee.

The Royal Institute's statement came in the form of the *Survey* magazine article by General Hackett which predicted that Jimmy Carter's geopolitical "weakness" would make it possible to replace Carter with a "more reliable" Republican. Hackett has also outlined a policy of confrontation with the Soviets, leading, he projected, to a NATO victory over the Soviets in World War III — fought by 1985.

Using precisely the same formulation, a March 1 statement by the Republican National Committee, based on the findings of its "Strategic Alternatives Team," charged Carter with Neville "Chamberlain-like" appeasement of Soviet "dictatorship."

Republican National Committee chairman Bill Brock went further, to call for a Churchill-style "strong man" to replace Carter and square off against the Soviet Union. He said that the Administration's "vacillation" and "inadequate intelligence" in the Iran crisis will serve as a major GOP campaign issue.

The knee-jerk anticommunist profile being used by the British to manipulate the GOP into its current militarized stance is identical to that used by Sir Winston Churchill and Lord Halifax in the late 1940s to push the Republicans into "bipartisan" support for President Truman's made-in-Britain Cold War policy.

At the top of the party, however, the British Haig policy is being conducted through committed Anglophile patrician circles, notably including George Bush, as well as Pennsylvania's Heinz family and former Secretary of State Henry Kissinger (though the latter is reportedly in a "jealous rage" over the fact that, as a naturalized citizen, he himself is ineligible for the presidency.) These Republican circles interface with pro-Haig Democratic Party forces on such levels as the New York Council on Foreign Relations, the Ditchley Foundation, and the Aspen Institute.

Under the London guidance, the GOP has embarked on an unabashed campaign of confrontationism.

themselves, is nearly everywhere in disarray. The new migratory proletariat streams across national frontiers whether national immigration laws permit it or not. Ethnic and religious rivalries and sub-national separatists threaten the integrity of long-established nations: South Africa, Nigeria, Ethiopia, Jordan, Lebanon, the United Kingdom and Canada are only the most current examples. Power is leaking out of national governments in three directions: to local communities seeking more discretion, to non-government enterprises that can do things so much faster and more flexibly than governments can, and to international agencies which must attempt somehow to manage new technologies that transcend national jurisdictions.

The institutions of government, in short, are left over from the era for which they were designed — the era of undifferentiated growth in which the many different kinds of growth did not have to relate to each other... When it comes to governance there is one thing worse than doing bad things on purpose, and that is doing good things but not relating them to each other.

In conclusion I would like to make two quick suggestions ... about the NATO Science Committee...

...Why not use our NATO fellowships to bribe more integrators and not bribe only the best of the specialists ... I mean people who are graduating from quality work in a specialty to face the ambiguities and puzzlements of bringing it all together...

My other suggestion is this: If the industrial democracies are in trouble because they are not yet wrapping humanizing institutions around runaway technologies, why do not the NATO Council and Secretary General bring the NATO Science Committee ... into the mainstream of ... research and development strategies...

I have argued that we are already in transition to a new ethic of purposeful growth ... But great ideas are never noisy on arrival. They slip into minds unannounced. Remember Albert Camus. "Great ideas ... come into the world on doves' feet. If we listen closely we will distinguish amidst the empires and nations, the gentle whisper of life and hope."