

Elephants and Donkeys by Kathleen Klenetsky

Alexander Haig imitates LaRouche . . . sort of

Al Haig is about to throw his hat into the presidential ring—he's scheduled to formally announce his candidacy at a New York gala in late March—and is boning up on policy issues in anticipation.

Judging by some recent remarks, the retired general and former secretary of state has been carefully studying Democratic presidential candidate Lyndon H. LaRouche's writings.

About a year ago, Haig, who has extensive business dealings in Virginia's Loudoun County, where LaRouche resides, started to mimic LaRouche's attacks on "neo-Malthusianism," specifically citing the *Global 2000 Report*, a study commissioned by the Carter administration which preached the need for population control and resource conservation on "limits to growth" grounds. LaRouche has repeatedly denounced the report since it first appeared in late 1980.

Lately, Haig has adopted, at least in part, LaRouche's unique analysis of why despair and pessimism have overcome so many American youth. In a speech to the Great Falls-McLean (Virginia) Republican Women's Club Feb. 12, Haig identified the source of the problem as "the message we gave U.S. youth during the dreadful decade of the 1970s, when we told them we were running out of resources, and that

they had no future. No wonder they became estranged when we told them their future would be an agonizing fight over dwindling resources."

Unfortunately, it's all rhetoric and no substance. Instead of adopting any of the substantive proposals which LaRouche has advocated to give kids a future, by getting the nation back on the track of economic growth and technological progress, Haig is resorting to the same old Republican platitudes—reducing the deficit, further deregulating the economy, cutting taxes—which characterized the economic disaster known as the "Reagan recovery."

Haig is even more irresponsible on the AIDS issue. When *EIR* recently asked him to explain what he would do to stem the epidemic—an issue which he almost never addresses voluntarily—he made a few vague references about the need for greater resources, and then hastily moved on to the next question.

If Ledeen goes to jail, can Haig be far behind?

Though Haig is outwardly elated by the fact that Irangate is hurting George Bush's presidential prospects, inwardly he must be smirking less, and worrying more about how the scandal is bound to affect him: He was smack in the middle of the whole sordid affair long before President Reagan got in on the act.

The Jan. 19 *Los Angeles Times* printed an op-ed by former National Security Council senior staff member Roger Morris blasting Haig for espousing a "cynical, belligerent" worldview, and calling him the author of the Irangate policies. He specifically charged that Haig made U.S. intelligence and diplomacy "hostage to Israel."

Morris noted that Haig was the pa-

tron of Michael Ledeen, the administration "consultant" who has come under increasing fire from congressional investigators for his key role in arranging the Iran deal.

Sen. David Boren (D-Okla.), chairman of the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence, which recently completed a probe into the Iran-Contra affair, appeared on ABC-TV's "Nightline" early in February to charge Ledeen was a representative of a "parallel government" which has been running U.S. policy "since the time of Lumumba and the Bay of Pigs."

Ledeen served as a consultant to Haig at State and is reliably reported to be working closely with the Haig campaign apparatus, especially in lining up support from the international Social Democracy.

Haig himself has gone on record defending the policy of supplying weapons to what he calls Iranian "dissidents." He told a Virginia State Republican Party gathering Dec. 6, "I would have been very, very concerned, if our President had not been reaching out to dissident elements in Iran. I do not agree with those who say there are no dissident elements. There are."

He suggested that if the United States failed to provide some military support to Iran, Iran would fall into Moscow's arms. He claimed that an Iran "poorly equipped on the battlefield," faced with defeat by Iraq, will turn to Moscow for military aid.

Although Haig criticized the Reagan administration for exchanging arms for hostages, he made it clear in talking to *EIR* that he favors arming the "dissidents." He said he would first want to establish their *bona fides*, but then the United States should give them support, including weapons. He also insisted that, "of course," the communist Tudeh Party should be categorized as "dissidents."