

Behind the 'tough talk' from Alexander Haig

by Kathleen Murphy

After barely two weeks in office, Secretary of State Alexander Haig is already racking up a record of crisis-mongering and provocation rivaled in recent memory only by Henry Kissinger, his erstwhile boss at the National Security Council and fellow employee of British and Jesuit intelligence networks.

Haig's performance at Foggy Bottom thus far has been so strikingly similar to Kissinger's that one long-time Washington observer was prompted to comment: "If Al were six inches taller and 200 pounds heavier, you'd never realize that it isn't Henry himself running the State Department again."

The diminutive general has sent out a series of signals over the past days explicitly designed to exacerbate the hostile climate between the two superpowers created by the Carter administration. In particular, Haig's maneuvers are aimed at boxing President Reagan into a hardline posture vis-à-vis the Soviet Union, while simultaneously undermining the Brezhnev faction in Moscow, which has sought cooperation with the West based on a joint commitment to international trade and development.

In his first public press conference on Jan. 29, the self-designated "vicar of American foreign policy" set the tone for his reign by launching into a vitriolic, yet carefully orchestrated, diatribe against the Soviet Union. Haig's remarks on the Soviets, which were widely played up by the media, focused on two particular points. First, Haig attacked the Soviets' use of their "Cuban proxy" for "engaging in unprecedented risk-taking" in Latin America and Africa. "I can assure you," he said, "This is

a subject of utmost concern for this administration."

Second, he charged the Soviet Union with being one of the key forces involved in "training, funding, and equipping . . . international terrorism."

Just a few hours earlier, Haig had sent a stern warning to his Soviet counterpart, Andrei Gromyko, that any intervention into Poland would have a lasting impact on Soviet-American relations. Suggesting the "punk" quality underlying Haig's tough-man pose, the message was delivered in the form of a reply to a letter from Gromyko congratulating the secretary of state on his new post.

According to State Department sources, Haig has set up about 10 "high-level working groups" on areas classified as hotspots. The ones given the highest priority are Central America, including El Salvador, Iran and the Middle East, and Poland. Haig himself recently stated that Poland and Central America are the two most immediately important foreign policy issues facing the United States.

This is no accident. Poland and Central America are where Jesuit- and British-instigated destabilizations are most advanced, and the prospects for a provoked confrontation between the United States and the Soviet Union most imminent.

Over the last few days, the situations in both areas, especially Poland, have taken a sharp turn for the worse, meaning that Reagan may soon be faced with an extremely delicate and explosive crisis.

On Feb. 2, Polish communist party chief Stanislaw Kania charged the Jesuit- and British-linked Solidarists

with acting like a political party rather than a trade union, while Polish Politburo member Stefan Olszowski denounced “advocates of chaos and destruction” for being responsible for the Solidarist-connected wave of strikes in Poland.

These statements conform to the pattern of tremendous pressure being exerted on Warsaw from inside the Soviet bloc to crack down on Solidarity. The East German news agency ADN on Feb. 2 denounced Solidarity as “an oppositional political party” allied with “antisocialists” and responsible for “provoking anarchy and chaos day after day.” With charges of this gravity being leveled, most observers believe that the possibility of a Soviet military intervention is greater now than ever.

The situation in Latin America is nearly as ominous. Haig’s charge that Moscow runs international terrorism was aimed at creating the climate for a U.S. military intervention into El Salvador. On Feb. 2, Haig took definite steps in this direction when he met with the foreign ministers of seven Latin American countries to discuss the escalating guerrilla war in El Salvador. According to one of the ministers present, José Alberto Zambrano Velasco of Venezuela, Haig announced that the United States has verified massive Cuban intervention via Nicaragua in support of the guerrillas.

Haig’s revelations were intended to provoke an immediate response from the forces of El Salvador’s Jesuit-controlled right wing, as well as from the Cubans, who are already howling about his comments on them at his press conference. With the “left” versus “right” crisis escalating in this fashion, Haig hopes to steer Reagan into a military intervention which not only would sour the friendly relationship the new President has managed to establish with Mexico, but also lead to a head-on confrontation with Moscow. Significantly, a State Department spokesman said last week that the new administration will follow through on President Carter’s decision to send military equipment and “technical personnel” to the El Salvador government to help battle the insurgents.

Where Haig gets his lines

Although some foolish conservatives have talked themselves into believing that Haig—a protégé not only of Kissinger, but of the ultraliberal Cyrus Vance as well—is a hard-bitten soldier who wants to protect American capitalism from Soviet imperialism, nothing could be further from the truth. Haig is a tool of an international oligarchical network which is committed above all to halting global industrial and scientific progress, and which sees a confrontation between the Soviet Union and the United States a key means of sabotaging the progrowth tendencies represented by Reagan and Brezhnev. (Haig’s private endorsement of the Carter administration’s neo-Malthusian “Global

2000” perspective should give these naive conservatives something to chew on.)

There is ample evidence that Haig is acting in concert with this oligarchical faction. On the same day that he was ranting about Soviet aggressiveness, British Prime Minister Maggie Thatcher was telling the Anglo-American Pilgrims Society in London that she sees no sign of any genuine Soviet interest in détente, and urged other Western nations to follow the lead of the new U.S. administration in dealing with the Soviets because it “understood the challenge.” She also asserted that the time has come for a more “resolute” posture by the Atlantic Alliance, and that the Anglo-American relationship had a special role in achieving this. Thatcher is scheduled to visit the United States late this month—the first European head of state to do so—and is expected to work closely with Haig in trying to dupe Reagan into a confrontationist course.

Also indicative of higher-level coordination behind Haig’s recent actions is the fact that the president of Italy, Sandro Pertini, put out the Soviets-back-international-terror line just a few days before Haig. Pertini is a leader of the British-linked Italian Socialist Party, whose ties to Italian terrorism is an open scandal.

The Soviets have responded to Haig’s antics bluntly and quickly. On Feb. 1, *Pravda* accused Haig of being party to “an attempt to strike at the process of international détente, to justify the negative American stand on strategic arms limitation and other measures aimed at relaxation of international tensions.” The newspaper also attacked the U.S. administration for “playing a dangerous game” and conducting a campaign of “lies and hypocrisy.”

Nevertheless, the question of whether Reagan and the Brezhnev faction will be manipulated into a show-down by the British subversives operating in both their countries is still very much open. In an interview published in the Feb. 3 *New York Times*, Reagan said that he is willing to talk to the Soviet Union’s leaders whenever they were prepared to discuss “a legitimate reduction of nuclear weapons,” and also tried to soften some of the harsh remarks he made about Soviet intentions at his Jan. 28 press conference.

On the same day, the Soviet news agency TASS released a statement, authorized at the highest levels of the Kremlin, expressing the hope that the exchange of harsh words between the two nations will give way to “get[ting] down to really important matters” on which “the American side will find in the person of the Soviet Union a partner prepared for constructive dialogue.”

Such an agreement would not only cool down the dangerous level of confrontation which Haig and his controllers are stirring for, but will also allow the new President to concentrate on fulfilling his election mandate for sparking a much-needed economic recovery.