

## Why Al Haig should be tried for treason

by Richard Cohen, Washington Bureau Chief

Two days prior to Secretary of State Alexander Haig's April 30 treacherous and miscalculating announcement committing the United States to military and political support for the United Kingdom's war effort in the Malvinas Islands dispute, the manic Secretary, speaking to a meeting of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce here, revealed the long-term global strategic plan which he and his collaborators inside and outside the Reagan administration have been trying to ram into the head of the President for many months. Although senior Presidential aides still loyal to the President were conceding that Haig's "made-in-Britain" Malvinas tactics had by the morning of May 5 resulted in a disaster, a disaster which sent many of them scurrying to control its damage, sources close to the White House warn that only a powerful national movement in this country and vocal European opposition could now stop President Reagan from public endorsement of Haig's long-term strategic folly prior to the June North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) summit.

In his speech, Haig based his entire approach on the outworn and dangerous Kissingerian postulate that the "Soviet Empire" is collapsing. Haig emphasized that "Soviet prospects have dimmed" at home and abroad with "Moscow's allies in deep economic trouble, the Soviet growth rates declining, and agricultural shortfalls persisting." Haig went on to identify these "Soviet vulnerabilities" as the basis for suggesting that we now have a "historic opportunity in dealing with the Soviet Union." He also points out, referring to the Soviet

succession that, "As a new generation of Soviet leaders emerges, we can signal the benefits of greater restraint."

### The START approach

Haig, whose approach of bluff, bluster, and the threat of force failed in intimidating Argentina into relinquishing claims of sovereignty, now suggests that we exploit so-called Soviet internal and external vulnerabilities in order to force them into similar concessions. In order to effect this insane game, Haig urged that START ("Strategic Arms Reduction Talks") begin immediately. Sources in the State Department have told me that Haig considers it essential that the START framework and timetable be clearly announced by the President prior to the June NATO summit. While his longer-term goal is to secure both NATO and Warsaw Pact commitments to outlaw breakthrough technological developments bearing weapons applications, Haig's immediate moves are primarily directed at Western Europe.

On May 3, speaking before the Center for Strategic and International Studies at Georgetown University, Undersecretary of Defense for Policy Fred Iklé, a longtime friend of Haig's and an immediate covert ally in promoting Haig's strategic policies at the White House, revealed the broader aim of the Secretary's appeals for greater centralization of authority in NATO. Iklé reported, "We, i.e., the administration, had emphasized the desirability of planning for the possibility . . . that in areas such as Southeast Asia, particularly these



*Soviet Maj.-Gen. Alexander Knyrkov (r) and U.S. Army Col. Jack Callaway inspecting a West German army unit on maneuvers in Kassel five years ago. The choice for the U.S.: in-depth strength and cooperation with Moscow, or the "arms-control" ploy.*

areas outside the North Atlantic Alliance . . . [we would have] to continue the conventional defense effort for a long period of time." Both Iklé and Haig propose to sizably increase NATO conventional capabilities for deployment outside the traditional NATO zone, while decreasing Western strategic defenses. This policy was ratified at the May 7 NATO Defense Ministers' meeting (see International).

This policy formulation was vehemently endorsed two days after Haig's Chamber speech by former Secretary of Defense James R. Schlesinger and Carter Defense Secretary Harold Brown in testimony before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. Arguing for immediate arms talks, Schlesinger said that the United States "is losing more . . . both strategically and politically . . . by failure to negotiate than it would be going to the negotiating table with a somewhat weaker hand." The "limited nuclear war" author said the United States should not develop its high-technology military programs, particularly space-based lasers, adding, "If the allies don't build up conventional capabilities, we may be forced to turn to a technological breakout." Brown, also arguing for immediate arms talks, alleged, "The Soviets do not have, in my judgment, anything like strategic superiority in the sense of a militarily or politically usable advantage in strategic nuclear forces."

Both Schlesinger and Brown argued that emphasis should be put on the buildup of conventional forces. The day before, outgoing Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff David Jones argued for the same fundamental

points. Joining the chorus, Secretary of Defense Caspar Weinberger told the same committee on April 30 that a new generation of space-based "beam weapons" capable of drastically changing the strategic balance would not be deployable until at least the year 2000. Weinberger went on to add that this forecast was optimistic according to the estimates of Defense Department "experts." Weinberger's defense budget also emphasizes the downplaying of longer-term strategic requirements, whereas the Soviet Union is vastly outspending the U.S. in those areas.

In addition to Senate efforts to force the President's hand on arms control, various members of the House of Representatives have been adding their voices to the clamor. Recently, Rep. Albert Gore (D-Tenn.) revealed that the Director of the Institute for U.S.A. and Canadian Studies in the Soviet Union, Georgi Arbatov, found his proposal an "interesting basis for negotiations," after being presented with it by former Rep. Donald Fraser, now Mayor of Minneapolis, and representatives of the leftist Institute for Policy Studies on a recent visit to the Soviet Union.

### **The Gore proposal**

The crucial element of the "Gore proposal" is to eliminate future new developments in strategic counterforce weapons and anti-ballistic missile systems.

This proposal calls for an immediate freeze on the MIRVing (adding multiple warheads) of existing counterforce missiles and a negotiated elimination of all



*U.S. troops on NATO maneuvers: will they be sent into depopulation warfare?*

MIRVing of missiles—i.e., one missile, one warhead—an equation which eliminates the possibility of a counterforce first strike. This proposal, with its emphasis on the total subversion of technological developments and breakthroughs that may have weapons applications and the elimination of first strike capability, represents the essential elements of the Haig approach.

The overall expansion in NATO conventional expenditures under stricter centralized deployment is, under the Haig plan, to be used for direct or indirect policing operations in the developing sector—operations which are considered to be more necessary as world trade and debt repayments decline and general depression sets in.

Washington think tanks and State and Defense Department analysts are said to be working overtime on a number of scenarios for the projection of this increasing conventional force into the developing sector. Even National Security Council staff have admitted to me that the Malvinas incident, especially the commitment of U.S. materiel and logistical support to the United Kingdom solely on the basis of the United States' NATO relationship to Britain, represents a paradigm for future actions. Yet the general consensus among Washington think tankers and Capitol Hill sources is that the extension of NATO forces into the developing world will have to occur through more subtle mechanisms than the Malvinas model. Competing alternatives include the suggestion of direct respon-

sibilities on the part of NATO member countries for developing sector areas; others suggest that those responsibilities be more logistical, and that regional forces be organized to play the visible role.

Ironically, White House sources report that the strategic plan encompassed in Haig's Chamber speech fundamentally represents what the Reagan campaign and Mr. Reagan personally fought against; indeed, the manic Haig plan seeks to roll back the sovereignty not only of the Soviet Union, Western Europe, and the developing world, but also of the United States itself.

Already, responsible members of the U.S. military and business are screaming as they count the losses from Haig's most recent assault on sovereignty in the Malvinas. Intelligence sources have told me that 10 years of intensive work in Latin America has been lost as a result of Haig's Malvinas tactic. They say that included among the losses was a long-term Latin America-wide anti-terror operation, as well as negotiations with Argentina for secure routes should the Panama Canal ever be jeopardized.

Leading U.S. trade associations, since the morning of May 3, have been sending warnings throughout Washington that they are on the verge of tremendous losses in Latin America.

### **Presidential capitulation?**

Ironically, hemispheric relations and security were an original cornerstone of the President's own foreign-policy approach. Under pressure from the traitor Haig and the wide range of collaborators inside his own administration, the President capitulated on the Malvinas question. There are now serious indications—above all, the May 7 NATO ministers' decision to expand into "out-of-area" deployments—that the President has also capitulated on the broader strategic policy, again under the influence of this poor man's version of Henry Kissinger. The implications of such an overall capitulation are very grave indeed.

On May 5, at an *EIR* conference in Bonn, West Germany, *EIR* Board Chairman Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr. demanded that Secretary of State Haig be tried for his treason. At the same time, LaRouchè, warning that the current world strategic situation is the most dangerous in the 20th century, stated that the only real solution to this crisis must describe a new "great enterprise" for humanity including the development of the Third World and the colonization of outer space. He further emphasized that this task can only be accomplished in the context of U.S.-U.S.S.R. cooperation (see Editorial).

On April 27, rumors spread through the capital that Reagan himself would make a major speech this month on East-West relations, and announce a proposed date for the initiation of START.