

competing blocs.

Alexander Haig is a fraud. Anyone who has seen him interviewed on television sees a hollow man, a thorough dullard. Inarticulate, dumb, and carried solely by infantile, narcissistic macho impulses, Haig cuts an image of the mother-dominated fair-haired boy who is not even particularly slick. Like his close friend Schlesinger, the chain-smoking Haig reaches for his pipe whenever the interviewer demands more than his banality can handle.

—Robert Cohen

A candidacy made in England

Who's supporting Al Haig? As this publication reported earlier this year, the NATO Supreme Commander has already garnered an outright endorsement from at least one leading London publication, the *Daily Telegraph*.

But a more revealing insight into the relationship between Haig's supporters in the United States and his supporters in London is provided by examining the relationship between a late February policy statement from the Royal Institute for International Affairs, and a closely following March 1 statement by the Republican National Committee.

The Royal Institute's statement came in the form of the *Survey* magazine article by General Hackett which predicted that Jimmy Carter's geopolitical "weakness" would make it possible to replace Carter with a "more reliable" Republican. Hackett has also outlined a policy of confrontation with the Soviets, leading, he projected, to a NATO victory over the Soviets in World War III — fought by 1985.

Using precisely the same formulation, a March 1 statement by the Republican National Committee, based on the findings of its "Strategic Alternatives Team," charged Carter with Neville "Chamberlain-like" appeasement of Soviet "dictatorship."

Republican National Committee chairman Bill Brock went further, to call for a Churchill-style "strong man" to replace Carter and square off against the Soviet Union. He said that the Administration's "vacillation" and "inadequate intelligence" in the Iran crisis will serve as a major GOP campaign issue.

The knee-jerk anticommunist profile being used by the British to manipulate the GOP into its current militarized stance is identical to that used by Sir Winston Churchill and Lord Halifax in the late 1940s to push the Republicans into "bipartisan" support for President Truman's made-in-Britain Cold War policy.

At the top of the party, however, the British Haig policy is being conducted through committed Anglophile patrician circles, notably including George Bush, as well as Pennsylvania's Heinz family and former Secretary of State Henry Kissinger (though the latter is reportedly in a "jealous rage" over the fact that, as a naturalized citizen, he himself is ineligible for the presidency.) These Republican circles interface with pro-Haig Democratic Party forces on such levels as the New York Council on Foreign Relations, the Ditchley Foundation, and the Aspen Institute.

Under the London guidance, the GOP has embarked on an unabashed campaign of confrontationism.

themselves, is nearly everywhere in disarray. The new migratory proletariat streams across national frontiers whether national immigration laws permit it or not. Ethnic and religious rivalries and sub-national separatists threaten the integrity of long-established nations: South Africa, Nigeria, Ethiopia, Jordan, Lebanon, the United Kingdom and Canada are only the most current examples. Power is leaking out of national governments in three directions: to local communities seeking more discretion, to non-government enterprises that can do things so much faster and more flexibly than governments can, and to international agencies which must attempt somehow to manage new technologies that transcend national jurisdictions.

The institutions of government, in short, are left over from the era for which they were designed — the era of undifferentiated growth in which the many different kinds of growth did not have to relate to each other... When it comes to governance there is one thing worse than doing bad things on purpose, and that is doing good things but not relating them to each other.

In conclusion I would like to make two quick suggestions ... about the NATO Science Committee...

...Why not use our NATO fellowships to bribe more integrators and not bribe only the best of the specialists ... I mean people who are graduating from quality work in a specialty to face the ambiguities and puzzlements of bringing it all together...

My other suggestion is this: If the industrial democracies are in trouble because they are not yet wrapping humanizing institutions around runaway technologies, why do not the NATO Council and Secretary General bring the NATO Science Committee ... into the mainstream of ... research and development strategies...

I have argued that we are already in transition to a new ethic of purposeful growth ... But great ideas are never noisy on arrival. They slip into minds unannounced. Remember Albert Camus. "Great ideas ... come into the world on doves' feet. If we listen closely we will distinguish amidst the empires and nations, the gentle whisper of life and hope."

Included in the RNC "Strategic Alternatives Team" assessment is their answer to Carter's handling of SALT II negotiations. Claiming that the "most pressing matter" for U.S. security is the Soviet Union's sophisticated missile arsenal, the report argues for the MAPS plan (Multiple Aim Point System), a revamped game of Chinese checkers in which land-based missiles would be switched around between underground silos, leaving some empty to "confuse" Soviet efforts to pinpoint actual missile location.

Equally ominous was a recent *Washington Post* Op-Ed by Sen. William S. Cohen (R-Me), ranking minority member of the Senate subcommittee on arms control. Cohen dared the Administration to respond to the "harsh realities of geopolitical strategy" by linking SALT to "the current state of world events," a formulation identified with pro British geopolitician Henry Kissinger. While the U.S. is "wracked by indecision," Cohen says, "...the Soviet Union...is aggressively and arrogantly exploiting, if not inciting, turmoil throughout the world." Cohen's solution: a new arms buildup to foster "world peace through a program of strength."

'Front men for Haig'

In a briefing to reporters March 19, Steve Bryen, a coordinator of Patrick Moynihan's pro-Zionist Coalition for a Democratic Majority and a former top pro-Israel aide in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee who had been under investigation for passing American state secrets to the Israelis, outlined the following perspective on the prospective presidential candidacy of General Alexander Haig on the Republican ticket:

There's certainly a lot of talk in Washington about a Haig candidacy. He's a very bright guy, very able, but he's not yet decided to run. On foreign policy, we like his policy, but we have to find out more about his domestic policies. In any case, he could be "the dark horse General" candidate.

The problem as I see it is that he's well-known in Washington among key circles, but he's not well known out there to the public. He needs a front man. George Bush is likely to front for him, but Bush only has 1 percent support from the polls. So, what's needed is something like somebody of the stature of Gerald Ford doing the job: if somebody like Ford were to start saying "Haig is the man," then the situation would begin to develop in the appropriate direction.

The Republican Party

Despite the flurry of backroom organizing behind Alexander Haig's presidential candidacy, those who want to put the NATO commander in the White House have so far refrained from openly publicizing their protégé.

This has little to do with the fact that Haig's resignation as NATO Commander-in-chief will not take effect until June, thus ruling out active campaigning as a matter of protocol. In fact, it reflects the realization of strategists at the Council on Foreign Relations that under normal conditions, Haig is simply not an acceptable candidate to the American people.

Haig promoters have decided instead to bide their time until the situation is ripe. As Bob Richardson, of the American Security Council, an advisor to Haig explained in a previously reported interview with the *Executive Intelligence Review*:

"If there were a series of crises...Iran goes down the tubes and there is an oil cut-off to the U.S. — then the man in the street will get scared and start saying 'We need a military man...' That's when Haig's candidacy becomes real..."

The Haig strategists also hope to corral Republican leaders and voter support for candidates who are acting, wittingly or not, as stalking horses for Haig. Their plans hinge on creating a climate where the issues and debate will be dominated by Alexander Haig's presence. The intent is to deprive the American public of a viable alternative to Haig.

Bush and Baker

At present the most obvious front men for Haig are George Bush and Howard Baker. New York Senator Daniel Moynihan is functioning similarly, in conjunction with the more conservative Zionist lobby wing of the Democratic Party.

Both Baker and Bush are putting forward the "geopolitical" foreign policy programs that will popularize the economic austerity and military policies which will define a Haig administration.

That the two have been assigned this role should come as no surprise. Bush, who assiduously cultivates an image as a conservative Texan, is actually the scion of an old, patrician New England family. He is blueblood from Connecticut who graduated from Yale University, thoroughly indoctrinated in that institution's High Anglican traditions which include official ties with Oxford University, the alma mater of Cecil Rhodes. His impeccable Eastern Establishment credentials derive in part from his father, Connecticut Senator Prescott Bush,