

Haig, media launch Salvador operation

by Kathleen Murphy

Soviet President Leonid Brezhnev's unexpected proposal for an early summit between himself and President Ronald Reagan has thrown a monkey wrench into the schemes for a superpower confrontation which U.S. Secretary of State Alexander Haig and his Socialist International cronies have been desperately trying to get off the ground.

Brezhnev's proposal, put forth in his speech to the Soviet Party Congress in Moscow, is the fruit of a coordinated, behind-the-scenes move by the Brezhnev faction in the U.S.S.R. together with the governments of French President Valéry Giscard d'Estaing and West German Chancellor Helmut Schmidt to help Reagan out of the crisis-management track that Haig has been steering him onto.

The summit offer comes after weeks of wild-eyed efforts by Haig—with crucial backup by the leading Eastern Establishment press outlets—to poison relations between the U.S. and its Western European allies, and the Soviets.

Shortly after being sworn in as secretary of state, Haig embarked on a campaign to turn the guerrilla war in El Salvador into a "test case" of U.S.-Soviet relations. Lying that the Soviets are the number-one backers of international terrorism and the key supplier of arms to the left-wing insurgents in El Salvador, Haig has been steadily pushing for a major blowup on the issue. Two weeks ago, he deployed three separate groups of State Department officials to Europe and Latin America in an effort to pressure U.S. allies into going along with his charges. While the missions met with little success, Haig

nevertheless increased the pressure by telling Congress that a substantial increase in U.S. military aid to the El Salvador junta was required, while intimating through the media that some kind of U.S. military intervention might be in the offing.

On the same day that Brezhnev issued his summit offer, Haig made a major publicity ploy by having the State Department release the "evidence" on Soviet involvement in the guerrilla war.

President Reagan's response to the Brezhnev offer underscores the potential for the two leaders to sit down and begin to work through some of the key problems that face them. Reagan told reporters Feb. 24 that he was "most interested" in the Soviet offer and that "it is now something that we will consider, among ourselves, and most particularly with our allies. . . . I am not sure what is in Brezhnev's heart," Reagan added, "but let me just say that I find his invitation interesting."

Significantly, Reagan also stressed that he has "no intention" of getting the U.S. into a Vietnam imbroglio in El Salvador, suggesting that the President is by no means as enthusiastic as his secretary of state for a new Cuban missile-style crisis.

Haig's sabotage

It is clear from the response by Haig and the Eastern Establishment media to the Brezhnev proposal that they want to delay a summit between the two heads of state for as long as possible. On Feb. 23 Haig said the summit proposal was "very interesting" and "innovative." Within 24 hours he was openly urging that the

summit be delayed. In an interview with French television on Feb. 24, Haig tried vigorously to throw cold water on the Brezhnev proposal, without exposing himself as a saboteur. While commenting, "We do anticipate and would strongly encourage a dialogue between ourselves and the Soviet Union, which I hope will be rapidly forthcoming," Haig bluntly continued, "We are not in a hurry for summitry." Summitry, he added, "should result in achievements" and "must be carefully prepared" in advance. "The number of differences between the parties to summitry should be on the verge of some kind of negotiated consummation. Consequently, I think, clearly we have a lot of preliminary work to do in the areas of East-West differences before summitry itself would be in order."

According to a Feb. 25 article by *Baltimore Sun* correspondent Henry Trehwitt—an admirer of Haig with high-level sources at the State Department—"American diplomats" in Washington "see little prospect of early progress in American relations, and even less for a meeting soon between Presidents Reagan and Leonid Brezhnev." Trehwitt cited Haig's French television interview as evidence that he personally shares this "practical view" and reported that Washington sources believe that Haig's initial response to Brezhnev was merely propaganda cover, motivated partly by the presence in Washington of French Foreign Minister Jean François-Poncet.

Haig's attempts to sabotage the summit are being bolstered by the press, particularly the "dovish" *New York Times*. One of the few newspapers to report Haig's comments to French TV, it simultaneously downplayed Reagan's own open reaction to Brezhnev. In a lead editorial Feb. 24 which dovetailed perfectly with Haig's remarks, the *Times* urged Reagan to issue "a counter-proposal" to invite Brezhnev to Washington "along about Labor Day"—six months from now. The *Times* said that one important benefit of such a counterproposal would be to "resume the Nixon pattern of annual summit conferences, so that these gatherings will appear reasonably routine rather than overblown efforts to settle every issue."

The *Times* editorial gives away the game that Haig and his Socialist International allies are playing. Essentially, it involves delaying a face-to-face meeting between Reagan and Brezhnev until the international climate can be so overheated by provoked crises that a summit, if it did eventually occur, could only produce a deadlock. If the Brezhnev-Reagan meeting were to take place before this confrontation atmosphere could be set, the fear is that Reagan, despite his traditional anti-communism, may find important points of agreement with Brezhnev, particularly on the question of economic development, an outlook which both men share. This happened at the Reagan's meeting with Mexican Presi-

dent López Portillo last January, much to Haig's consternation.

Vance's game

The *Times*'s playup of Haig's TV interview and its cited editorial are part of a deliberate game it is playing to foster the KGB confrontationist faction in Moscow.

Cyrus Vance, a member of the *Times* board of directors before joining the Carter administration as its "dovish" secretary of state, is playing a key behind-the-scenes role in this same operation. According to a source close to both Vance and the *New York Times*, the former secretary of state conveyed a message to the Moscow leadership two weeks ago that they would find "no real friends in the Reagan administration" and that the anti-Soviet sabre-rattling policies of Secretary of State Haig reflect "President Reagan's thinking." Vance's message was reportedly couriered to Moscow via Georgii Arbatov, head of the KGB-linked U.S.-Canada Institute. Like Vance, Arbatov is a member of the Socialist International-linked Palme Commission on International Disarmament, and received Vance's message while attending a recent commission meeting in Vienna.

Vance's role underscores the total cynicism—and coordination—of the Haig-Socialist International operation. It was Vance who elevated Haig to a position of stature in the early 1960s. Vance, then secretary of the army, hired Haig as his special assistant, and when Vance was later named to the number-two post at the Defense Department under Robert Strange McNamara, he brought Haig with him. Haig functioned both as special assistant to Vance and to McNamara. According to John Lehman, Reagan's newly appointed navy secretary, who knows both men intimately, the fact that Vance's soft-line posture in the Carter administration apparently put him at odds with then-NATO Supreme Commander Haig's tough anticommunist stance was meaningless. "Haig and Vance consulted constantly. That's not surprising—even though their policies might seem to diverge, they actually see eye-to-eye on everything of importance."

It is clear from a review of the major U.S. media over the past week that the plan is to paint Reagan as an unreconstructed hawk with no interest in working out a viable modus vivendi with the Soviets. Aside from the coverage of the Brezhnev proposal and the administration response, the media have been hyping the El Salvador crisis, focusing particularly on the potential for substantially increased U.S. involvement.

These stories had reached such a peak that a Defense Department official was prompted to tell the *Washington Post* that "there is more action in the newspapers than in the Pentagon." Exemplary was a blaring headline in Rupert Murdoch's Feb. 24 *New York Post*,

“More U.S. Advisers May Be Sent to El Salvador.” The story reported that the U.S. was “actively considering sending additional military advisers to El Salvador” and that this “added to the sense of impending crisis that has been developing during the past few days over El Salvador—which has taken on overtones of both the Vietnam and Cuban missile crises.”

The media are pointedly omitting any mention whatsoever of the *admitted* role of the Second International and the Jesuit order in the insurgency, in favor of Haig’s provocative charges of Cuban involvement.

That the press will stop at nothing to box Reagan into a corner became clear during an appearance by top White House aide Edwin Meese on ABC-TV’s “Issues and Answers” Feb. 22. After repeatedly refusing to be drawn into a discussion of administration options on the El Salvador crisis, Meese was finally badgered into saying that the administration had not ruled out any options, including a naval blockade of Cuba. The next day, the major press blared scare stories claiming that the administration was actively considering a naval blockade.

Documentation

What Haig left out of his White Book

by Gretchen Small

Around the world, emissaries of Alexander Haig delivered the State Department’s “White Book,” titled *Communist Influence in El Salvador*. “Political direction, organization, and arming of the insurgency is provided by Cuba, with the aid of the Soviet Union, Vietnam, and other communist countries,” an introduction to the volume asserts.

Using this document as proof of his charge that El Salvador is a “textbook case” of an international communist conspiracy, Haig made Central America the current centerpiece of American foreign policy. Relations with the United States, allies were told, stand or fall on the basis of their response to Haig’s campaign on El Salvador.

The document is a deliberate lie, and its publication and dissemination has damaged the credibility of Amer-

ican intelligence and policy-making capabilities in the way Jimmy Carter had specialized in. Recipients of the White Book did not endorse its conclusions.

Mexican President José López Portillo, speaking at a state dinner shortly after the visit of Haig emissary Gen. Vernon Walters, stated, “We are determined to demonstrate that it is possible to set up a rational order in the region,” and called for a negotiated settlement to the fighting, impelling Haig’s press conduits to paint him as a Castro ally.

The sharpness of López Portillo’s rejection of the use of “arrogant military power” and his challenge to the State Department definition of the Caribbean as a zone of battle between the superpowers was, according to Brazilian press accounts, provoked by Walters’s message that the U.S. wants a “military,” if “temporary,” response to the conflict.

In Bonn and Paris, both foreign ministers called for economic assistance to Central America instead of military aid. West German Foreign Minister Hans-Dietrich Genscher announced Feb. 25 that his government is prepared to mediate a settlement, in statements paralleling the Mexican calls. The *Christian Science Monitor*, reflecting Haig’s reaction, remarked that the West German proposal was hardly what Haig envoy Lawrence Eagleburger had urged the Germans to do.

Haig’s omissions

The network within East bloc countries and the Soviet Union itself, a network the Haig document traces out, exists and the White Book indeed provides useful leads for tracking those Eastern European and Cuban elements involved in support operations for liberationist armies and terrorist groups throughout the Third World. But the document lies not so much by what it says, but *by what it omits*.

Extensive evidence was suppressed on the roles of the Socialist International, of the Jesuit order, and other Theology of Liberation networks, and of elements of the European “black” nobility, in arming, financing, and even leading the Salvador guerrillas—even though many of these operations are carried out openly from the United States itself!

Haig’s document amounts to an effort to protect the actual international alliance that generated the Central American crisis.

Many of the data concerning these Western networks’ collaboration with the Cuban and Soviet operatives are in the public domain. They are certainly well known by every competent intelligence agency in nations allied with America. Answers to the question “whom did Haig protect?” are a useful vantage point for grasping Haig’s grandstand play on El Salvador this week.

- No mention is made of the prominent role of the

Socialist International in financing and arming the guerrillas. On American television in December, the sodden head of that organization, Willy Brandt, publicly declared that the Socialist International was funneling finances to arm the guerrillas.

Guillermo Ungo, the head of the Democratic Revolutionary Front (FDR), which leads the Salvadorean left opposition, is a member of the Socialist International, and FDR representatives have met with Socialist International leaders in Europe and Latin America to arrange aid. Yet the only State Department allusion to these well-known facts is the statement in the document that "less than 700 non-Marxist guerrillas" are involved in the fighting.

- No mention is made of the **Jesuit** role in supplying arms, leadership, and funding to the left, despite the known history of the Society of Jesus in helping to create nearly every "left" group in El Salvador, and occupying leading positions in them. Top Social Democrats in the FDR came out of a Jesuit think tank in San Salvador located at the Universidad de Centro America, including Guillermo Ungo himself.

Haig's own Jesuit training and connections are not a trivial aspect of his career, as *EIR* has documented over the past two years. But it would be unfair to call this aspect of the White Book a personal coverup, since the State Department as a whole has never fingered the Jesuit role in creating synthetic revolutions. Nor have most European spokesmen dared to do so, in contrast to the mounting Italian public dossier on Socialist International sponsorship of insurgency and terrorism.

Yet internationally, senior members of the Society of Jesus have been quite open in their support for the radical left. Father Simon Smith, S.J., the order's chief of missions for the Third World, told a reporter in December that the Jesuits "are coordinating closely with the Socialist International forces in El Salvador."

Father Zweifelhofer, the Jesuits' head of Third World policy coordination, reported in another recent interview from his base in Munich, West Germany that it is the Jesuits who are granting the Cubans any influence they have in Central America (see *EIR*, Jan. 13, 1981).

- The Christian Democratic government of **Costa Rica** is explicitly cleared by the State Department of any complicity in the arms traffic that is acknowledged to run through that country. Yet Costa Rica's own congress has held hearings to investigate the role of prominent government figures in protecting this traffic. At those July 1980 hearings, the former head of criminal investigations of the Costa Rican Interior Ministry, Col. Guillermo Martí, testified that Interior Minister Juan José Echeverría Brealey was involved in arms traffic, and that Echeverría's chief of staff, Willy Azoifeifa, had personally flown to Cuba to pick up arms.

Outlined by Colonel Martí and others during those hearings was the connection between arms-running to the Sandinistas in 1979, and current trafficking in El Salvador. Caches of weapons procured throughout the Western world, not only from Cuba, during the Nicaraguan civil war, are now being resold to the El Salvador insurgents.

The Costa Rican case bears further investigation in developing the map of overlapping right and left, Eastern and Western networks behind the arms-running. Particularly interesting is the fact that the Carazo government was installed with financing from leading "right-wing" networks in Latin America, including the Chilean intelligence service DINA, and self-proclaimed Guatemalan fascist Sandoval Alarcón.

Collaborating with Carazo's government in the arms-running to Nicaragua was the "right-wing" leader of Costa Rica's Social Democratic Party, José "Pepe" Figueres. Figueres, who publicly acknowledged his role in aiding the Sandinistas (including sending his son to fight), opens a particularly revealing network for investigation: the so-called democratic left set up and run by American figures like Adolf Berle, Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., and Cord Meyer. Meyer, CIA station chief in Western Europe following World War II and a close associate of Italian black nobility networks, used his period in Costa Rica at the beginning of the 1960s to personally oversee the creation of various institutions in Costa Rica which then trained every leading social democratic figure in Latin America today.

- **Eden Pastora**, the head of Nicaragua's Popular Militias and an open advocate of aiding the Salvadorean guerrillas, is another relevant product of these overlapping networks. A Costa Rican trained by the Jesuits, a member of the Socialist International, linked with Pepe Figueres, Pastora brags of his cooperation with the KGB!

- "Panamanian" **Hugo Spadafora** provides another angle for immediate investigation into arms trafficking. Spadafora, carrying the name of the Italian noble family associated most publicly with the international assassination bureau called Permindex, was a member of the Italian Socialist Party (PSI) during his days at the University of Bologna, and has a long history as an international mercenary for "national liberation" movements.

Hugo Spadafora announced in the pages of the *New York Times* last December that he was forming an "international" brigade to fight not only in El Salvador but "anywhere in the continent where the armed struggle is the only avenue left for peoples." A social democrat, Spadafora argues that "authentic unity of all revolutionaries, of Marxists, of Catholics, of Social Democrats, or progressive Christian Democrats" is required.