

## A two-sided paralysis in American foreign policy

by Lonnie Wolfe

One year into the Reagan administration, the U.S. government is gripped by paralysis in foreign policy. Some of the more vocal participants in what is called foreign policy formulation would disagree. But their wishful thinking does not make for an adequate or coherent foreign policy. If the chaos is not resolved in the coming months so that a sane U.S. foreign policy emerges, the world is headed for disaster.

The dynamic governing U.S. foreign policy is as follows. The Haig State Department has spent much of the year blustering and trying to provoke a confrontation with the Soviet Union or its surrogates in nearly every conceivable corner of the globe. As is the case with many blowhards, Mr. Haig has fortunately been short on substantive action. The White House and in particular the President himself, while declaring insistently that Haig speaks for the administration, has attempted to rein in the Secretary of State and his worst confrontationist schemes.

So Haig has a rhetorically tough policy of confrontation, but no ability to carry it out, while the White House view of foreign policy can best be described as seeking to avoid disaster.

Neither the White House nor Alexander Haig is aware that a major strategic shift is under way, a shift that neither view of foreign policy is capable of handling intelligently.

This is made clear by examining U.S. foreign policy

adventures during the week of Jan. 11-15.

First we had the spectacle of Haig running off to Europe declaring that he was going to press the NATO allies meeting in Brussels to support the U.S. sanction policy against the Soviet Union, a goal of two failed missions to Europe by Haig and his top aide Lawrence Eagleburger. Haig delivered a raving speech about the "Red Peril," which sounded like it was borrowed from an old text of Sen. Joe McCarthy. In the end, the NATO allies approved a communiqué with some tough words directed at the Soviets, but no endorsement of the sanction policy. Haig immediately hailed this as a "great development" and a "wonderful victory."

European sources say that Haig is out of touch with reality, believing that the world is as he wishes.

The issue of European support for sanctions against the Soviets was in effect settled when the President told Haig that he had no desire to re-institute the grain embargo under any circumstances. West German Chancellor Helmut Schmidt, in his meetings with Reagan this month in Washington, told the President, according to reliable sources, that West Germany fully understood the reasons why the United States would not want to re-impose the grain embargo, and that he was sure that the President understood why West Germany could not afford to impose sanctions. There was never any chance that the NATO allies would impose any sanctions, no matter how much Haig blustered.

On a more fundamental level, Haig refuses to accept what is actually happening in Poland. Last month, in a speech before the Commonwealth Club in San Francisco, the Secretary of State intoned that "martial law in Poland cannot and will not succeed . . . it cannot stabilize Poland." En route to Brussels, he repeated that great chaos and Soviet military intervention were still on the agenda. Soviet military intervention is certainly what Haig and his friends in such places as the New York Council on Foreign Relations had desired—and expected from the Soviets. It didn't happen, and it won't happen.

Haig's entire anti-Soviet policy is a shambles. He believes that he can scare the Soviets with words. The Soviets—and much of NATO—aren't listening.

The decision on arms sales to Taiwan this week also reflects the administration's paralysis. By deciding not to sell Taiwan advanced fighter planes, but continue the co-production of the F-5E, the White House made a non-policy decision (see article page 41).

### 'The Reagan problem'

This stalemate is unacceptable to the CFR promoters of confrontation with the Soviets who control Haig. The problem for their design of destroying both superpowers is, as they see it, the President.

"Reagan has fooled us," said one of these creatures, with close connections to British intelligence circles around Foreign Secretary Lord Carrington. "We thought he would react like an anti-Soviet ideologue to something like Poland. He reacted cautiously. He reacted practically, from his standpoint. . . . We need Reagan to be more of an ideologue."

These circles particularly want to upset any chance of a summit between Reagan and Soviet President Leonid Brezhnev. They point to the fact that Reagan seems influenced by one to one relationships and meetings. They say that it's the President's personal regard for Chancellor Schmidt, for example, that has stymied many of the worst intrigues of the State Department to topple what they consider to be the pesky German.

According to Capitol Hill sources, the Washington, D.C.-based Heritage Foundation, the British Fabian Society's Trojan Horse on the right, has devised a strategy with operatives in the Democratic Party around Sen. Scoop Jackson and his Coalition for a Democratic Majority (CDM) to end the policy paralysis in favor of the Haig confrontationist faction. Their plan includes an attack on the administration for abandoning issues associated with the so-called New Right, like abortion, the school prayer, and busing. A strategy session will take place in Washington on Jan. 21, featuring 50 of these so-called New Right leaders, including Rev. Jerry Falwell of the Moral Majority, Ed Feulner of the Heritage Foundation, the British intelligence-linked mail order czar Richard Viguerie, and Howard Phillips,

another Anglophile who heads the Conservative Caucus.

Simultaneously, and more importantly, the Heritage networks and their CDM-liberal allies are launching an attack centered around the idea that "Reagan is soft on the Soviets." This features two points of argument. First, Reagan "has capitulated to the Soviets on Poland," refusing to bash Schmidt and re-impose the grain embargo. Second, they will claim, our sources report, that the Reagan defense posture is not geared for a confrontation with the Soviets. Here they will be joined quite openly by Jackson and Sen. Gary Hart, the Colorado Democrat who holds the dubious distinction of running George McGovern's 1972 presidential campaign.

Rumors are floating around Washington, following a column by George F. Will, the Heritage-linked conservative, that "a top administration official" will resign in disgust over Reagan's capitulation to the Soviets. Speculation centers on CDM-Jackson operative Richard Perle, currently an Undersecretary of Defense. It is thought other resignations among Heritage and CDM moles are also possible.

In addition, our sources report that should the White House fail to respond, some senators and congressmen controlled by the so-called Madison Group of Heritage-and CDM-linked aides, will introduce legislation to revive the grain embargo against the Soviet Union and threaten legislation to pull U.S. troops out of Europe.

The press conduits of this network are already pouring out the line. Liberal pundit Joe Kraft carried arguments almost identical to Wills's, denouncing Reagan's softness. That same day Katherine Graham's *Washington Post* carried a news analysis piece by Walter Pincus decrying the Reagan administration's defense policy as "unilateral disarmament." Economic oracle Elliot Janeway, part of the outer orbits of the Mont Pelerin Society's Heritage Foundation networks, told a defense symposium in Minnesota Jan. 13 that the administration's defense policy is not geared toward the immediate conventional arms readiness status needed for confrontation.

Both groupings in the foreign policy fracas, the Reagan "disaster-avoiders" and the Haig "confrontationists," have failed to heed the advice of Chancellor Schmidt, offered during his recent visit to Washington. In the communiqué, Schmidt stressed that the current economic depression is the greatest threat to Western national security. In the end, it is the administration's failure to deal with the Volcker problem—the high interest rates and related policies that are destroying the U.S. and European economies and in-depth military capabilities—which makes a mockery of all U.S. foreign policy.