

SPECIAL REPORT

Haig in the Oval Office Again

Carter Administration already adopts Haig's policies for fascism and war

The boys at the New York Council on Foreign Relations have made their decision on the 1980 presidential question. They are going with General Alexander Haig and the Nazi-style policies of military dictatorship.

The decision comes straight from British oligarchical circles. The New York Council on Foreign Relations is the center of Anglo-American policy-making and was first established as a branch office of the Royal Institute for International Affairs. Haig's candidacy is a candidacy for war.

But no one, not the Council on Foreign Relations, not Energy Secretary James Schlesinger, not Great Britain, is waiting for Haig to formally assume the presidency.

The Carter Administration, in its policy commitments and outlooks, is already nothing more than a prelude to Haig's tenure in the Oval Office. That much was admitted by a colleague of National Security Advisor Zbigniew Brzezinski's — Columbia University's Bowyer Bell. What are these policies? "Anschluss"-style military aggression to force confrontation with the Soviet Union, and Schachtian economics at home and abroad.

Consider the events of the last week. The conclusion of Camp David has committed the Carter Administration to a policy of military alliance with Israel, even to the extent of offering the government of Menachem Begin a U.S. nuclear umbrella. The weapons negotiations in this "peace" treaty between Israeli Defense Minister Ezer Weizman, his Egyptian counterpart Hassan Ali, and U.S. Defense Secretary Harold Brown show that the United States is committed to a policy of busting the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries through any means — military or otherwise — in order to wreck the economies of Europe and Japan. In the light of what has developed at the same time in Southeast Asia, Iran, Turkey, Morocco, and southern Africa, the Mideast agreements complete an effort to encircle the Soviet Union with a hostile combination of powers based on the axis alliance of Washington, Tel Aviv, London, and Peking.

This is geopolitics, a doctrine most prominently

associated in the Carter Administration with Energy Secretary Schlesinger and his friends in the Committee on the Present Danger who are all avowed Haig backers, just like the "liberal" Aspen Institute, Fritz Kraemer, and the London *Economist*. Even among the ranks of the Carter Cabinet and within the Republican Party one can find Haig supporters: Secretary of State Vance and Republican stalking horses for Haig, Howard Baker and George Bush.

Put briefly, the geopolitical doctrine was designed by Halford MacKinder and the founders of the British Round Table to prevent the emergence on the Eurasian landmass of an industrial and technological progress-oriented combination of powers — much like the European Monetary System (EMS) today. The geopolitical policy of balkanizing the landmass into a divided mess of petty states has its economic component in the policies developed and pursued by Hitler's financial advisor Dr. Hjalmar Schacht. Divert a society's credit and related resources away from development of the work force and capital equipment through technological progress and into a zero-growth mode cannibalizing productive resources to maintain the political integrity of previous extensions of credit in the form of debt.

This is fascism which the Aspen Institute's Harlan Cleveland predicts is the next phase for the member nations of the NATO alliance.

Bringing these policies home

These policies — already applied to the Third World — lead to war. Now the U.S. is to be submitted to the same policies.

This week's Camp David energy summit was little more than a statement by the Carter Administration that it is committed to this policy turn. Schlesinger already had a deal in his pocket that the oil companies would absorb the losses of some of their foreign operations and support Haig in exchange for the price rises they will get through a phased decontrol of oil.

By hook or by crook, Schlesinger is going for an energy crisis which is the rationale behind legislating

various programs for "energy self-sufficiency" and labor-intensive employment. Vice President Mondale is back stumping for his make-work programs. The Conference of Northeast Governor's has resurrected its scheme for an Energy Corporation of the Northeast for energy self-sufficiency in a deindustrialized Northeast.

"The United States is on a course to becoming a military dictatorship," reads a statement issued March 17 by 1980 presidential candidate Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr. "We are heading rapidly toward World War III. In effect, Haig is already in the White House; the boys in New York have fixed it. Unless France and West Germany openly oppose this lunacy, unless they openly denounce the government of the United States, we will have World War III... It is a serious question as to whether the political forces abroad have the political courage and perception to do what's necessary."

Haig is making policy in the Oval Office again and the following report documents this as fact. The career of the paper clip general is presented, his supporters are listed, and his policy — foreign and domestic — is outlined as he would implement it and as it is now being implemented by the Carter Administration.

—Kathy Stevens

Zbig colleague sees fascism next in Europe

In an interview made available to this news service, J. Bowyer Bell punctuated a discussion of foreign affairs predicting the rise of mass fascist movements in Europe in the near future. Bell, a colleague of Zbigniew Brzezinski, is a "terrorism" and "insurgency-counterinsurgency" specialist associated with the Columbia Institute for the Study of War and Peace and the British International Institute for Strategic Studies; he is billed as "an advisor on terrorism to over 50 governments." During the interview, Bell emphasized that the domestic and foreign policies now being pursued by Jimmy Carter are exactly those that

Alexander Haig would pursue were he in the White House, and predicted the rise of overtly fascist movements to power in Europe.

Q: *How do you see the situation in Iran and the surrounding area developing?*

Bell: Iran will have unstable conditions for a couple of years. The rebellion in Afghanistan will grow and receive strong outside support although the prospects for immediate success are not encouraging. In Pakistan, we're dealing with two sets of people which means instability.

Now nobody can rule Iran. Khomeini can't rule, although you have to admit he's really dedicated. Bazargan can't hold power. The danger is that down the road, say in two years, there could be a self-styled, left-wing military coup like in Ethiopia, what I call the pious left, or the Algerian model. The danger does not come from the Tudeh party, the Communists. They are not significant, they are completely out of touch with the dynamics of the situation.

The Maoists in Iran are much more important and one of our assets — you know, they would be extreme conservatives if it wasn't for the Shah; that's their profile. They might have been selling condominiums. I personally know a lot of key people in the Fedayeen in Iran. They call themselves Marxists-Leninists but don't take that seriously. What's key is that they are staunch anti-Soviet fanatics and will be quite useful to us.

All in all, we've come out way ahead of the Russians in the Iran situation. The Russians are in big trouble. Despite the problems we face, we're in good shape — much better than we had with that megalomaniac the Shah. For example, the Islamic revolution's spillover into the Muslim areas in the Soviet Union will be explosive, will cause the Soviets grave problems — analogous to the freedom movements we've organized in Eastern Europe.

Always keep in mind geopolitics — that's crucial. Halford MacKinder and Karl Haushofer were absolutely right. It's the old question of the world island, the Eurasian land mass. We must prevent the Russians from dominating the Eurasian land mass. That's the big game. That's the context from which every political question in the world must be viewed. Whatever we're able to consolidate in Iran must be seen from the point of view of geopolitical struggle.

Q: *What role do you see the ethnic and tribal groups playing in the Iranian situation?*

Bell: They're of course extremely important, not only in Iran, but the role they're playing in the war against Soviet communism. Already our contacts in the Iranian government are cooperating with us in facilitating the movement of certain Muslim tribal groups armed to the hilt across the border into Afghanistan. The Turkoman tribe on the Soviet-Afghanistan border is important. So