



Haig takes war candidacy to Europe and Latin America

Speaking to circles mainly outside of the United States, former NATO commander Alexander Haig has been put forward as the warhawk presidential candidate of 1980—and setting the pace for his Republican opponents.

In an unusual move, Haig announced in Mexico City—rather than in the United States—that “I will seek the nomination of the Republican Party for the presidency of the United States.” The Mexican press broadcast the announcement, but Haig’s speech went unreported in the United States.

The theme of Haig’s strategic pronouncements in Paris and Latin America has been that the real (or imagined) influence of the Soviet Union must be extirpated from the developing sector. Then the Third World must be organized into supranational entities modeled on the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO). These would include a South Atlantic Treaty Organization for Brazil and South Africa, and a Middle East Treaty Organization (an idea first suggested by Edgar Bronfman) which would place much of the Middle East under Israeli military might.

The Soviet Union can only regard Haig’s prescription as a determination for thermonuclear confrontation, since the policies the NATO general advocates would alter the strategic balance of power drastically.

In Mexico: Break cooperation of nonaligned and U.S.S.R.

In his announcement for the presidency in Mexico Nov. 12, Haig scorned the Carter administration’s mishandling of strategic affairs:

“Given the crisis through which Washington is passing and because many Americans seek a leader who

is capable of conducting current debates with a high quality of thought and comprehension of current affairs both internal as well as external,” he claimed that he could deal with the crisis.

The main objective of his foreign policy, Haig said, would be to break the nonaligned nations away from all cooperation with the Soviet Union, to whom he claimed the Carter administration was handing the Third World. “The nonaligned nations and the West must not accept the new two-level Soviet strategy which includes provisions to establish a correlation of forces inside the Third World states with the proposal to provide (Soviet) armaments and promote subversion, which later would serve as a justification of a Soviet intervention, directly or indirectly, to the end of establishing what in reality would be client states.”

Haig also indicated his enthusiasm for the “China Card” against the Soviet Union, an option launched by his former partner in the Nixon administration, Henry Kissinger. The Soviet Union “lives in a state of paranoia respecting” China, Haig asserted, and while we must not provoke “enraged bears,” we can seek the benefits of “multipolarity. . . . Peking will be progressively more influenced by its perception of the political consistency and trustworthiness of the West,” if we continue to support the Peking leadership against the U.S.S.R., as in Vietnam.

Previous to his trip to Mexico City, Haig had attended the “Third International Freedoms Conference” in Valley Forge, Pa. Oct. 25-28. Dominated by U.S. and British military officers, the conference focused on such topics as “democracy and social control movement,” “how religion can preserve liberties,” “what business can do to defend freedom,” and what to do about the Mexican government of Jose Lopez Portillo, according to one attendee.

In Paris:

'The Red Army: objective Europe'

In his Nov. 17 speech "The Red Army: Objective Europe" to the Paris conference on "European Defense and Soviet Strategy" sponsored by the newspaper *Le Figaro*, Haig not only stressed his usual theme of the Soviet threat to Europe. He also emphasized his belief that the Iranian crisis could easily be used to fragment the Soviet Union itself along ethnic lines. This is one of the desired results of the Bernard Lewis plan devised by the Princeton University professor of that name to destroy the nation states of the Mideast by splitting them along racial and ethnic lines.

"Already, we can see the organic failures that the Soviet Union is going through: stagnation of economic growth, chronic deficiency of agricultural production. The frustrations which the Kremlin's government imposes on the civilian population, while military production on the contrary does not slow down, will only be exacerbated. We know that during the 1980s for the first time in its history, the U.S.S.R. will suffer from a shortage of energy resources. Its oil reserves are running out. Another cause of anxiety for tomorrow's Russian leaders will be its demographic weakening. Half of the Soviet population is not of white origin. The other ethnic groups, notably those of the *Muslim republics* englobed in the Soviet empire, have a death rate much higher than the other republics. And if the demands for autonomy develop within these different ethnic currents, it is the entire policy of russification implemented since Lenin which will be thrown in the balance. ..." (emphasis added.)

Haig then attacked the concept of detente and disarmament, thus indicating that no SALT treaty would be negotiated under his administration. Haig ended his speech once again with praise of the U.S.-Peking alliance.

"I have followed all the talks between Washington and Moscow since the Cuba crisis in 1962. I can tell you that an American head of state, in front of a grave crisis, whether it be in Cuba, in the Middle East or Southeast Asia, chooses a line of conduct which obeys the rule of balance of forces. My fear is that during the early 1980s the Soviet Union will become clearly conscious of its superiority in the strategic domain. And act in consequence, to our detriment of course.

"It is therefore extremely important for the nations of Western Europe not to take lightly the problem of arms control and to deal with it in a realistic manner on the basis of their own requirements.

"That being said, history plays tricks on man. To us, Westerners, it offers some trump cards that we have to know how to exploit. The fragmentation of the Marxist-Leninist world plays in our favor, the animosity between Moscow and Peking is sharpening. Should we get involved in subtle tactical manipulations aimed at weakening the U.S.S.R. by favoring China, by betting on the hostility of one Marxist power towards another Marxist power? I think that it is especially important to bring out the advantages which the multipolarity of the world offers us.

"A period is opening up in which our policy vis--vis the two big communist powers must take into consideration the particular behavior of each of them. A change in direction has taken place in China. Mao's successors have opted for a pragmatic attitude, open to the Western world. Western Europe's interest, according to me, is to accept the constitution of a strong and independent China."

Brazil: South Atlantic NATO

While Haig was in Paris, advisors at the Georgetown Center for Strategic and International Studies were in Brazil. Led by Dr. Ray Cline, a delegation from Georgetown met Nov. 14-17 in Brazilia, Brazil, with the top echelon of the Brazilian, Colombian, Argentinian, and Peruvian military.

Cline's subordinate Roger Fontaine echoed Haig's warning of Soviet dominance in the Third World in his presentation, "After Havana, Reflections on the Non-Aligned." "In addition to the radical minority of those countries having increased in the last few years in relation to the moderates," he warned of snowballing Soviet influence in the Third World," the the tendency is for this to increase further towards the next non-aligned meeting in Bahgdad, 1982. ...The Cuba-Soviet perspective on the nonaligned movement...will necessarily strengthen in the short term."

The meeting therefore proposed the creation of a South Atlantic Treaty Organization, (SATO), a military alliance between the Latin American countries present, South Africa, and whatever black African states—Nigeria was mentioned—would agree to be included. Brazilian airforce adviser Lavenere Wanderly stated that "Brazil will have to make a great effort to adequately equip its armed forces in the face of the strategic evolution of the South Atlantic...specifically the ideological penetration of the Soviet Union...as shown by the expansion of its maritime power which shows its ambition of world power."