

LATIN AMERICA

Carter's Soft Line on Latin America:

Alliance for Genocide

Nov. 19 (NSIPS) — The foreign policymakers behind Jimmy Carter have begun to retail an apparent "soft line" in Latin America and the Third World generally, designed to forestall until at least February any move toward debt moratorium and development. The content of this soft line is a fairy tale which would be credible only to the agents and the terrified.

Writing in the October issue of *Foreign Affairs* magazine, Abraham Lowenthal, Director of Studies of the Rockefeller-controlled Council on Foreign Relations, calls for an end to interventionism and paternalism in U.S.-Third World relations and, in the interest of this new found "adult" relationship, for an end to special policies for Latin America. Lowenthal's article, entitled "The United States and Latin America: Ending the Hegemonic Presumption", is a preview of the soft line which will be retailed for the credulous in the forthcoming foreign policy recommendations to be published by the CFR-connected Commission on United States-Latin American Relations (CUSLAR) in mid-December.

According to the CUSLAR policy line, the illegitimate Carter administration will mean an end to U.S. interventionism and 'destabilizations' in the Third World, an end to U.S. support of military dictatorships, the gradual normalization of relations with Cuba, an increased emphasis on the importance of human rights.

In a publicity stunt to give credibility to this human rights focus, Kissinger-installed Chilean dictator Pinochet has released nearly 200 political prisoners this week purportedly because of Carter's anti-dictatorship remarks.

CUSLAR's rhetoric is accompanied by an economic line calling for Third World autonomy, the diversification of Third World exports, and hinting at case by case rescheduling or partial moratoria on debts, and the granting of a commodities indexing package. Already this week Carter transition spokesmen such as CUSLAR's Richard Gardner, and Carter appointee Anthony Lake, have been organizing in the Third World diplomatic community using their hints of case by case debt moratoria to try to force the postponement of the crucial Paris Conference on International Economic Cooperation — the North-South talks, where unilateral debt moratoria is on the agenda — until after Carter's inauguration.

The reality behind this time-buying window dressing is revealed by the fact that the core of CUSLAR-Carter economic policy is a genocidal plan which cannot be implemented by anything other than a military dictatorship. Only two aspects of the cover story represent the reality of the economic policy planned by Carter's backers: the insistence on a case by case approach, and the intent to stimulate exports from the Third World in order to pay the debt. By their own admission Carter's backers plan this so-called stimulation of exports with no new investment, and no aid. One CUSLAR member said in an interview this week: "There should be no new grants; Latin America already gets more than its share of total U.S. grants Concessionary assistance should be cut out altogether." Similarly Albert Fishlow of the University of California in an article in the Brazilian press this week pushed the new "soft line" while explicitly saying that the United States must stop lending to the Third World.

The farce involved in the human rights cover on this policy is exposed by Fishlow's identification of the total cannibalization program embodied in Colombia's labor intensive National Development Program (PND) as the model for "independence and autonomy" in the Third World. At the same time the *Journal of Commerce* on Nov. 18 pointed to Colombia as the "next 'boom' country in Latin America," in an article which also mooted Colombia's withdrawal from the development-oriented Andean Pact, a move complementary with Carter's stated intention in a recent *Time* Magazine interview "to treat developing nations as individuals, not as a bloc." Behind the sweet talk on autonomy and adult relations is a genocidal plan to pack up everything that can be moved and export it to the advanced sector in order to pay the debt.

There is nothing sophisticated about the snow job Carter's backers are trying to pass off on the Third World. It is designed to capitalize on the fear instilled in the Third World by the terror tactics of the Rockefeller-Kissinger machine behind Carter, in order to stall the declaration of unilateral debt moratorium at the North-South talks long enough for Carter to consolidate his war machine in the advanced sector. By February, when a Third World attempt to implement debt moratorium would no longer make any difference, Carter's backers expect to implement their economic program under military dictatorships or NATO occupation armies in the Third World.

The transparency of the new soft line is obvious. In the last week NSIPS has interviewed nearly a dozen individuals directly involved in creating this new soft policy line. Only the wishful desire to believe that the world is different than it is would make them convincing. Unanimously they squawk "human rights," and "adult relations," like so many parrots repeating words which have no meaning for them.

For those who remain gullible yesterday's statements in Mexico from Latin American affairs chief for the State Department Harry Shlaudemann may provide a rude shock. Shlaudemann, universally known as a butcher and Kissinger agent for his role in the 1973 Chile coup, parroted Carter's soft line at a meeting of the North American Chambers of Commerce in Mexico where he praised Latin America's break from economic dependence on the U.S. and announced that the preferential trade law will be revised to provide increased exports from Latin America to pay the debt.

An End to Paternalism?

The following passages are excerpted from "The United States and Latin America: Ending the Hegemonic Presumption," by Abraham F. Lowenthal, Director of Studies for the Council on Foreign Relations. The article appeared in the Fall 1976 issue of Foreign Affairs.

The first step toward an improved Latin American policy would be to realize that for most purposes we probably should not have a distinct Latin American policy at all. The main

problems the United States will face in the Western Hemisphere over the next decade are not regional but global questions....

(On) how the United States should try to gain help from Latin America and the Caribbean for dealing with global concerns...five key principles may be advanced:

1. In the United States we should free ourselves — in rhetoric, attitude, and practice — of the legacy of interventionism and paternalism....(This) means renouncing overt and covert intervention, abandoning coercive or discriminatory procedures, reaching an agreement with Panama which treats that country as a juridical equal, and making mutual respect the basis of our approach toward Cuba and every other country in the region....
2. In dealing with Latin America we should...focus less on security questions in the narrowly defined military sense....It means realizing that nations other than Cuba, particularly in the Caribbean, may choose socialist means of production and organization without implying any threat to this country.
3. We should resolve to help make the Americas safe for diversity....Putting this principle into practice means refraining from interference in the domestic affairs of other nations, while maintaining a legitimate concern for the protection of universally recognized rights....While we have no right to "destabilize," we do have an obligation not to aid those who torture and repress, and to assist the victims of repression whether they are victims of the Left or of the Right.
4. The United States ought to devote special priority to improving its understanding of and relations with three sets of countries: those where U.S. economic interests are concerned (primarily Brazil and Mexico); those likely to exert particular influence in international forums (primarily Brazil and Venezuela, but also Cuba, for different reasons); and those most closely tied to the United States by patterns of trade and migration (particularly Mexico and the island territories of the Caribbean).
5. Finally, we should recognize that the end of U.S. hegemony implies that we cannot expect to achieve all of our goals in the region.

...Devising sensible procedures for resolving investment disputes may run counter, at least in the short term, to the perceived interests of particular U.S. corporations. Insisting on the protection of essential human rights may tend to threaten the political stability our corporations expect abroad. The expansion of Latin American exports may involve increasing sectoral unemployment in our country, to which we will have to respond either by restricting imports or by providing effective adjustment assistance to displaced companies and workers....

'Depoliticize Poverty'

Nov. 16 — The following are excerpts from an article "Fishlow criticizes Special relations between the U.S. and Latin America" in Estado de San Paulo, today.

Professor Albert Fishlow...working directly under Henry Kissinger...was principally concerned with U.S. relations with Venezuela and Peru...In his spare time, especially at night, he met informally with a group of professors who collaborated with the then candidate to the presidency, Jimmy Carter.

In June, Fishlow broke definitely with the State Department...and wrote a document on the "Changes in the Latin American economy, to which the U.S. has been insensitive"...Fishlow breaks with the State Department because "we (the U.S.) cannot function as arbiters, nor as the means and ends of internal affairs of other countries."

In some of his works, Fishlow defends "the necessity of increasing taxes on the higher level echelons of society and altering educational policy in order to pay greater attention to the rural sector"...As for (third world) exports to the industrialized countries like the U.S., Fishlow says that "if countries like Brazil create export subsidies, it is because somehow there is an economic war against the U.S....My opinion is that the U.S. should establish universal rules...and special rules in special cases, so the export subsidies problem could be avoided."

"...The gradual abandonment of the programs of the Alliance for Progress created a vacuum which slogans vainly attempt to ignore...One of the reasons for the failure of (U.S. policy towards Latin America) is the profound changes in the aid potential of the U.S. itself. This is not sufficient reason for despair, but it urgently requires a redefinition and a coherent economic policy for the hemisphere...Regionalism must give way to universalism."

"With rare exceptions, Latin America...would be better off without the client status imposed by assistance programs...In 1975, Colombia voluntarily decided to end its assistance program."...After citing the "paternalism" of such assistance, Fishlow affirms that the U.S. should mobilize international resources in favor of the poor countries of Latin America and the "Fourth World"..."with (measures) of the same virtue: to depoliticize the problem of abject poverty."

'We're Not Talking About Concessions'

The following interview was conducted this week with a member of the Commission on U.S.-Latin American Relations (CUSLAR), which is sponsored by the New York-based Center for Inter-American Relations and will shortly publish a report on policy recommendations for the Carter administration.

NSIPS: What is the committee's recommendation to Carter for top priority in Latin America?

CUSLAR: The committee's official position is not yet published but speaking for myself and many others I can say that top priority should be the Panama Canal issue. Second, but less urgent is the need to establish more normal relations with Cuba. Beyond the need for action on these two questions there are three areas of general political priorities: human rights — and this is a U.S. priority rather than a Latin American priority — economic questions, and the Caribbean.

On the human rights question the problem is how to transfer this issue into bilateral relations and this is still being worked on. This will be a top priority for Mr. Carter.

NSIPS: What about the economic question? Prof. Fishlow in a recent article seemed to be criticizing the abandonment of the Alliance for Progress.

CUSLAR: On economic questions there are two schools, there are those who think we should have special policies for Latin America. This is the old current and there are fewer people thinking this way every day. On the other hand there is the more progressive approach of dealing with the Third World on the basis on the north-south forum. This is towards the end of establishing new trading and new political relationships on a whole new set of issues working from a more mature and equal standpoint. We're dealing with adults now. It would be a misreading of Fishlow to think that he was advocating a return to the Alliance for Progress. He was saying that the Alliance for Progress was dropped too unilaterally, creating a backlog of unmet expectations. We're not talking about concessional

assistance; there should be no new grants; Latin America already gets more than its share of total U.S. grants; the amount they get is too high.

NSIPS: What about the specific demands being made by the Third World?

CUSLAR: The specific issues from the standpoint of the Third World are debt, trade expansion, and commodities. Debts can be rescheduled. The most important issue from our standpoint is trade expansion. To finance development you need capital. Capital can be obtained through increasing debt, which won't work, concessionary assistance, which should be cut out altogether, ordinary capital from central facilities, or short term capital from commercial banks, but this is what has ruined the Third World in the first place. The most logical place to get capital is through diversification of exports. We will have to give the Third World increased access to export industries.

NSIPS: What will be the effect of this domestically?

CUSLAR: Some sectors would be hurt; there would have to be an assistance adjustment program.

NSIPS: Will things like the Humphrey-Hawkins bill help this?

CUSLAR: Yes, well I know what you mean about Humphrey-Hawkins. There already is an apparatus for such an adjustment assistance program set up for workers and firms hurt by increased imports in the Trade Act of 1974. There is \$400 million allotted there annually. This type of assistance will have to be greatly built up.

NSIPS: What about the Caribbean?

CUSLAR: There are major political and economic problems here. First we have to create a program for managing and balancing the population growth there, like Mexico. Second we have to deal with the fact that there are no viable economies except Trinidad-Tobago and Jamaica. We need a new type of alliance with the Caribbean, one with no inherent paternalism. We have to encourage the increased autonomy of Third World countries, and end the defensive position they have been forced to take regarding their own nationalism. In the Caribbean we can bring in powers like Mexico and Venezuela, and maybe to some extent European nations. This will balance the foreign influences in the region. And then we can use the Caribbean Development Bank as a regional facility.

NSIPS: By foreign influences do you mean like those on Guyana?

CUSLAR: Yes.

NSIPS: What about the geo-political problems on the continent itself?

CUSLAR: Well, as I've already said we have to end our paternalistic relationship to these countries.

Human Rites

The following is excerpted from an interview with Robert Pfaltzgraff, member of the Committee on the Present Danger, Professor of Fletcher School of Law and Institute for Foreign Policy Studies.

Q: What do you think Carter's priorities for a transition policy for Latin America should be?

A: First and foremost, the question of human rights will have priority, as he has already indicated. However, in my own estimation, what he ought to concern himself with is the South Atlantic, which will assume increasing salience in American policies in the years ahead. The South Atlantic is important both for its vital sea routes — the energy flow routes from the Persian Gulf around the Cape of Good Hope — and of course the minerals and the fish at the bottom of the sea. The Soviets are becoming increasingly interested in fish, you know.

Q: Are you referring to the formation of a South Atlantic Treaty Organization, which has been mooted?

A: Oh no, absolutely not! What I mean is more an informal collaboration for the surveillance of (S. Atlantic) sea routes. Of course Brazil would be key in this, along with South Africa and Nigeria. Especially Brazil with her nuclear potential as a result of her deal with the West Germans. Argentina would be less important given her internal troubles.

Q: What do you think of the Brazil-Peru alliance apparently being formed?

A: I consider it a positive development from several points of view. First, it will have the effect of significantly reducing tensions between Chile, a country which has always entertained extremely cordial relations with Brazil, and Peru. Looking at the world in 1975 from Chile's point of view, Peru represented a grave threat. And of course, Brazil tends to act as a surrogate for the U.S. in minimizing the Soviet influence. And then, Brazil achieves an outlet to the Pacific which has long been her concern.

Q: Do you think it likely that Carter would attempt to reactivate some form of "Alliance for Progress"?

A: Oh no, the Alliance for Progress failed and is in the past. The complexion of the Latin American continent has changed considerably since the '60s and the time for "alianzas" is gone. Aid to a country like Chile, for example, would hardly be justifiable either to the U.S. Congress or to the American people.

Echeverría Expropriates Sonora Latifundists as Rightist Coup Threats Intensify

MEXICO CITY, Nov. 19 (NSIPS) — Mexican President Luis Echeverría this morning answered the demands of 50,000 peasants who have been demonstrating for land for six days in the Northwest state of Sonora with a Presidential decree that ordered the expropriation without compensation and immediate distribution of 100,000 hectares of land to more than 8,000 peasant families (text of the decree follows). The unprecedented decree — issued eleven days before the end of Echeverría's presidency — is the hardest blow struck against Mexico's right wing during Echeverría's six-year term as President. The Cuban press service, Prensa Latina, writes that it "fell like a political bomb." The decree means that the battle to the finish

between the Monterrey group of fascists and the Echeverría forces may well be decided within the next week.

The impact of the Presidential order, which was issued by the Agrarian Reform Ministry at 9:30 this morning, is all the stronger because it specifically mandated that the land be used to form collective farms, and announced that the National Rural Credit Bank will issue credits for technology and fertilizers to accelerate production.

Press reports this morning indicated that the land distributions "are being carried out as of today in accordance with the law."

During the 48 hours prior to the Presidential decree, the right-