

ARTICLE APPEARED  
ON PAGE A-1

NEW YORK TIMES

3 MARCH 1982

# HAIG CLAIMS PROOF OUTSIDERS DIRECT SALVADOR REBELS

## PREDICTS PUBLIC SUPPORT

Evidence of Foreign Control Is  
'Overwhelming, Irrefutable,'  
He Tells House Group

By BERNARD GWERTZMAN  
Special to The New York Times

WASHINGTON, March 2— Secretary of State Alexander M. Haig Jr. said today that the United States had "overwhelming and irrefutable" evidence that the insurgents in El Salvador were controlled from outside that country by non-Salvadorans.

Testifying before the House Foreign Affairs Committee, Mr. Haig sought to rebut the contention of the Salvadoran guerrillas that their insurgency was an autonomous Salvadoran effort without external assistance but he did not specify who the non-Salvadorans were.

Mr. Haig, in a vigorous defense of the Administration's approach to the Central American and Caribbean regions and in the face of some skeptical and hostile questioning, also predicted that Americans would support the Administration's policies so long as they were convinced "that we are going to succeed and not flounder as we did in Vietnam."

### Comments on Poland

On other matters, Mr. Haig made these points:

¶The Administration will be ready in a few weeks to open negotiations with the Soviet Union on strategic arms reduction but will do so only when the "climate, the conditions" for such talks existed, by which he meant after the situation in Poland improved.

¶The United States will not do business as usual with either Poland or the Soviet Union "while repression in Poland continues," and further sanctions will be undertaken if the Polish situation did not improve.

¶Although selling Hawk mobile anti-aircraft missiles to Jordan could poison relations with Israel, it is important to keep such moderate Arab countries from becoming buyers of Soviet arms. He did not say whether he favored such sales to Jordan.

### He Denies Plan to Intervene

Although the hearing was supposed to concentrate on East-West relations, much of the questioning was about the Caribbean region.

Mr. Haig said that preventing Communist domination of the Caribbean and Central American region was "in the vital interest" of the United States, but he tried to reduce apprehension that the Administration was planning any direct military move.

When Representative Stephen J. Solarz, Democrat of Brooklyn, asked if he meant that he favored using military force to prevent armed Communist takeovers, he replied: "No, not at all. I don't know of any official of the executive branch who has suggested for a moment that consideration was being given for the direct involvement of American forces in Salvador."

In answer to a question from Representative Lee H. Hamilton, Democrat of Indiana, Mr. Haig said the United States had "overwhelming and irrefutable" evidence that the insurgents in El Salvador were controlled and directed by non-Salvadorans outside the country.

He declined to provide details, however, saying it would jeopardize intelligence sources. Later, however, Senator Barry Goldwater, Republican of Arizona, chairman of the Intelligence Committee, said that on Feb. 25 William J. Casey, Director of Central Intelligence, and others briefed his committee and "left no doubt that there is active involvement by Sandinista Government officials in support of the Salvadoran guerrilla movement."

"This support," he said, "includes arrangements for the use of Nicaraguan territory for the movement of arms and munitions to guerrillas in El Salvador, the continuing passage of guerrillas in and out of Nicaragua for advanced training in sabotage and other terrorist tactics and the presence of high-level guerrilla headquarters elements in Nicaragua."

Mr. Casey, in this week's issue of U.S. News & World Report, is reported to have said that the insurgents were being directed from Nicaragua with the help of Cuba, Vietnam, the Palestine Liberation Organization and the Soviet Union.

The magazine quoted Mr. Casey as saying that "this whole El Salvador insurgency is run out of Managua by professionals experienced in directing guerrilla wars."

Mr. Haig went to some lengths to rebut the argument that El Salvador would become "another Vietnam."

"I think much has been done to suggest there are strong parallels between the American approach today to Salva-

dor and to Vietnam some years ago," Mr. Haig said. "I think this is a terrible distortion of reality and one which overlooks a number of fundamental differences."

He said that "first and foremost" was the "strategic importance" of Central America to the United States because of its prominence in American trade and the fact that half of American oil moves through the Caribbean and the Panama Canal. In time of trouble in Europe, the area would be crucial, he suggested, to shipping supplies overseas.

"So this is a vitally important region and it is a region today that is plagued by two extremely urgent dangers," he said. "One is social-economic resulting from the inflated cost of energy to those governments, sometimes twentyfold, and the simultaneous decline in the remuneration for their one- or two-product economies."

"Secondly," he said, "it is the willingness of the Soviet Union and Cuba to manipulate these human tragedies in the interest of spreading totalitarian Marxist-Leninist ideology."

Mr. Haig said that the trouble during the Vietnam era was that the Government never decided if that region was or was not vital to American interests. If it had decided it was, he said, "I believe they would have taken actions commensurate with that judgment."

"If they had concluded negatively, then we would never have become involved in the first instance," he said.

"Now let me tell you I come down on the side of, in such an assessment in Central America, that the outcome of the situation there is in the vital interest of the American people and must be so dealt with," Mr. Haig said.

"Now it is an area of vital interest to the American people and, as I said recently, I know the American people will support what is prudent and necessary, providing they think we mean what we mean and that we are going to succeed and not flounder as we did in Vietnam," he said.

STAT