

# Cuban Press Maintains Hardline on Carter— 'Carefully Fabricated Product of Trilateral Commission'

*Cuba has consistently taken a hard line against Jimmy Carter, mincing no words in describing who he is, who picked him and shaped him, and his lack of a popular mandate in the democratic sense. As the following selection of excerpts from the Cuban press shows, Cuba puts forth no illusions about the serious political crisis the U.S. faces and the kinds of decisions the Trilateral Commission presidency will make.*

*From Prensa Latina's review of the year by Arnaldo Hutchinson:*

The rise of James Carter to the presidency, electoral abstention, the deterioration of the economic situation, and bribery by multinational companies fought for the front pages in the United States during 1976.

During November, Carter was elected to sit in the presidential chair in the White House for four years, with the support of slightly more than 40 million of the 150 million persons eligible to vote.

A simple arithmetic calculation shows that only about 26 per cent of the electorate voted in favor of the man who will become president Jan. 20....The governor of the southern state of Georgia reached the presidency in one of the most crucial moments in the country's history — a time comparable only to the epoch of the war between the North and the South a century ago and to the period of the economic crisis of the 1930s....

*From the Cuban weekly Bohemia Nov. 19 in an article by Mario Kuchilan Sol called "He Who Sows His Peanuts:"*

What "wave length" are you on Mr. Carter? What's your game?

What produced the Nov. 2 election results and what "changes" do they entail for the U.S. and its relations with the world? The determining factor, despite the traditional skeptical absenteeism and the routine criteria that the reelection of an incumbent is a cinch, was the strategy of building a coalition that could give a majority on election day in the bourgeois democratic tradition of "the biggest minority."

The "I never lie and never will" peanut farmer is far from being a "naive dreamer." The legend of his political "spontaneity" is a myth. Carter is a carefully fabricated product, offered to the public as a needed change by the Trilateral Commission, a private "non-profit" organization that reflects forces which in the U.S. are identified with the Rockefeller clan, with the banking elite of England, with Giscard in France, with Giancanni (Agnelli) of FIAT in Italy, and with the samurais of heavy industry in Japan. The North American branch has 74 members — all bankers, industrialist, diplomats, financiers, politicians, intellectuals and journalists linked to a limitless economic power and owners of the mass media. They chose Carter from a list of governors presented by Averell Harriman with the suggestion, "We can't go on with old faces. Why don't we target a young

southern governor?" And he had Carter in first place. That was back in 1972 and thus they began to build the image of "the new politician," "the champion of morality," the "truth maniac," the farmer who carried off the nomination and the election against the machines, but within the context of the traditional popular abstentionism of people who don't believe unbelievable electoral promises. They studied the feelings of the nation, people's reactions to the problems and they emphasized changes in society and in the economic structure in order to catapult the peanut farmer technically, fallaciously, and propagandistically into the White House....

*The following excerpts on debt are from the official Cuban daily Granma Dec. 28 as reported in Prensa Latina:*

One of the most efficient instruments used by the leading capitalist countries to preserve and perfect the exploitation of the Third World is accelerated indebtedness.

The financial capital of those countries penetrates and progressively takes over the economic structures of the non-oil exporting underdeveloped world.

These loans and credits are granted only at high interest rates to be amortized over ever-shorter terms.

The backward socio-economic structures which burden most of the underdeveloped countries force them to seek credits, which makes their foreign debts grow excessively.

This results in a dramatic vicious cycle which obliges the debtor countries to ask for more loans to pay their debts.

The debt owed by the underdeveloped countries to the capitalist countries and international financial bodies already has reached the astronomical sum of \$150 billion.

In 1975, the underdeveloped countries paid these nations \$11.5 billion in debt service, while only \$9.4 billion in new loans were issued, which meant a negative flow of \$2 billion.

On top of this, the multinational companies pulled out net profits of more than \$23 billion between 1973 and 1975, according to UNCTAD (United Nations Conference on Trade and Development) statistics.

Latin America suffers the effects of this dramatic situation more than any other region.

At the beginning of 1976, according to Inter-American Development Bank data, Latin America's foreign debt was \$55 billion of which half was due before 1979. The most indebted Latin America country is Brazil, which at the beginning of this year owed more than \$17 billion, while Chile and Argentina each owed more than \$5 billion.

What is most grave is that almost half of this fantastic foreign debt has to be repaid within the next three years.

Because of this, during the fifth summit (of the non-aligned countries-ed) held in Colombo this past August, the struggle for a new world economic order became the

center of debates. This struggle accurately expresses the sharpening of the general crisis of capitalism.

## Panama Gov't Abruptly Shifts to Endorse Carter Administration

In an abrupt about-face last week, General Omar Torrijos Herrera, Panama's Chief of Government, reversed Panama's long-standing opposition to Jimmy Carter. The incoming Carter Administration, Torrijos said in a speech Dec. 19, "seems to have more integrity than the previous one."

Echoing the new position of the government, the pro-Torrijos daily *Critica* called Carter a "defender of political morality," while Foreign Minister Aquilino Boyd declared that Carter's appointment of Cyrus Vance as Secretary of State had "restored the vitality of the State Department."

These declarations of support for Carter contrast sharply with the almost daily attacks on Carter made by government spokesmen and the Panamanian press before the Torrijos speech. Carter was accused of obstructing peaceful canal negotiations, and the press suggested that he was behind the wave of bombings and other terrorist acts that have plagued Panama in recent months.

The Torrijos regime adopted the new stance toward Carter because of indications that the incoming U.S. president will grant Panama a new Canal Treaty along the lines of the recommendations of the Commission on U.S.-Latin American Relations, headed by Rockefeller associate Sol Linowitz. Torrijos met with Theodore Sorensen, Carter's appointee as director of the CIA, immediately before he announced his new line; and the next day, Dec. 18, the U.S. negotiator Ellsworth Bunker indicated that the U.S. was willing to move ahead on the long-stalled negotiations.

Observers have speculated that the Carter move to negotiate a Canal Treaty is to end Panama's leading role in the Caribbean opposition to the U.S., clearing the way for a U.S. hard line against Cuba.

Torrijos concretized his alignment with Carter by making public Dec. 19 a series of austerity measures, including a revision of the Labor Code. His concessions on the Labor Code, long demanded by the business sector, put Torrijos in a shaky position domestically, since among his staunchest supporters are the labor unions led by the communist Partido del Pueblo. The Partido del Pueblo has stated repeatedly that it "will never allow any revisions" in the Labor Code.

Immediate approval for Torrijos, however, came from the International Monetary Fund which three days after Torrijos' speech awarded Panama with an \$18 million loan.

### *The Carter Record in Panama*

Torrijos, who has pushed development policies in the past, had been subjected to continuous destabilization attempts and both the press and government officials had linked these terror tactics — bombings and provoked riots — directly to Carter.

The official Panamanian news agency, Panapress, listed as one of these destabilization attempts, the highly publicized "staged bombing" of the car of AFL-CIO representative in the Canal Zone, William Drummond, after Drummond had sued to have the Canal negotiations halted in October. The pro-Torrijos daily *Critica* commented at the time that Drummond was suing "on behalf of his little friend Carter." *Critica* is the same paper that last week praised Carter as a defender of "political morality." Another pro-Torrijos daily, *Matutino*, wrote Oct. 30, "Mr. Carter's friends are so desperate that they are determined to use any and all resources at hand to discredit the opponents."

Carter was also implicated in other bombings. Panapress wrote after the arrest of three terrorists who had placed bombs in Panama City Dec. 6 that the terrorists: "belonged to a Miami-based group of conspirators that has friendly relations with the man who directs Carter's policies. He is trying to arrange a meeting with them and the president-elect."

The press and government comments were also sharply critical of Carter's war mongering. Foreign Minister Boyd said Nov. 10 in his annual report to the Asamblea Corregimiento, Panama's legislature, "Neither Carter nor any other U.S. politician will be allowed to turn the Canal negotiations into a propitiatory victim of U.S. policies."

The daily *Matutino* followed up two days later with an even more explicit condemnation of Carter: "Carter has stated that he will not deal with blocs of nations but only with individual countries. That is the old policy of divide and conquer....Those Latin American countries that accept the old framework of relationships between the strong and the weak are putting themselves at the mercy of the Washington government with no option but subjugation and dependency....(Latin America must unite) in the face of the divisionist policies that the U.S. will follow when Jimmy Carter assumes the presidency."