

Those peasant and labor leaders, members of the PCC and the UNO, are mobilizing the population against government military and economic warfare. Tens of thousands of politicized workers, organized or strongly influenced by the PCC linked trade union federation, the CSTC, have stated categorically that they will not accept the imposition of the "war economy" outlined by Espinosa Valderrama. Workers in every important sector of the economy are on alert and preparing to go out on strike in the next two weeks.

The PCC and the UNO are organizing for the creation of a National Liberation Front as a defense against a fascist coup. The PCC is calling for productive in-

vestment of the "coffee bonanza" reserves in expanded industrial development projects. The demonstration of 50,000 addressed by Cepeda last week was one of several held around the country as part of a week-long series of protests against the state of siege and declaration of economic warfare made by the government.

The PCC-FARC decision not to submit to the policies of genocide and deindustrialization and to lead a mobilized working class in an armed war of resistance promises to be a thorn in the side of Carter and the Trilateral Commission and their ability to put their alleged concern for "human rights" and non-paternalism over on any Latin American nation.

Brazil Tells Carter: We're Drawing The Line On Nuclear Power

Brazilian Foreign Minister Azeredo da Silveira informed Washington that his government is drawing the line on just how far it will allow itself to be pushed around by its "special partner." Speaking to the press in response to President Carter's statements last week indicating that he would wield the full force of his administration to halt the Brazil-West Germany nuclear accord, da Silveira retorted: "Well, it's true that the United States is powerful. But we're a sovereign nation, and we're not afraid!" Referring to Secretary of State Vance's announcement that he will go — uninvited — to Brazil, da Silveira told the press "Carter can send his emissary any time, but the (Brazil-BRD) deal is non-negotiable."

Defiant irritation with Carter's presumptuous meddling in the affairs of two sovereign nations who have traditionally been the key U.S. partners in Europe and Latin America has been expressed outside Brazil as well. Chancellor Helmut Schmidt's envoy to the U.S. on the matter, State Secretary Hermes, was reported to have staunchly defended the deal with Brazil. Afterwards, Hermes reported sardonically that Carter administration arm-twisting "was no worse than expected." The German *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung's* correspondent in Brazil reported on the 21st that Carter's "moralistic foreign policy" and economic warfare against other countries has the counterproductive effect of creating "national outrage."

In Argentina, a similar response has been evoked. Over the last few weeks the government has launched a public campaign of support for the Brazilian nuclear energy accord, poohpoohing the "non-proliferation" thesis forwarded by Carter. Admiral Carlos Castro Madero, director of Argentina's nuclear program, declared that his country's "solidarity with Brazil is based on the fact that there are no risks of fabrication of

nuclear weapons...Although this does not seem sufficient to convince leading nuclear energy nations..."

U.S. pressures have continued despite the interests of the economics involved, pushing otherwise cautious spokesmen to take off their gloves. Senator Vargas of the Brazilian government's Arena party urged representatives of all political stripes to unite behind the government's adherence to the nuclear program. The U.S. opposition to the deal on the basis of non-proliferation he continued, is suspect "given that the U.S. is the only country ever to use the bomb over cities, in a situation which was militarily dubious."

Brazilian and Argentine vehemence is based on the fact that both countries are in short supply of vital fuels for industrial use. Carefully calculated austerity measures and rationing have been imposed to allow the countries to pay their debts to New York creditors while maintaining a reduced productive capacity, during the interim period leading to functional nuclear energy plants. The forcefulness of Washington opposition to the deal has thus called into question what the actual objectives of Carter's "new diplomacy" are.

The Argentine daily *Clarín*, noted that Carter "seems to have another, not manifest, interest...to prevent countries like Brazil and Argentina from developing technological independence." The Brazilian press linked to industrial interests dependent on a guaranteed energy source has been more pointed. The industry oriented *Folha de Sao Paulo* questioned in several editorials and op-eds the difference between Carter's Linowitz policies and those of Secretary of State Henry Kissinger. The conclusion drawn by the Sao Paulo daily is that the "Carter-Trilateral Commission approach...is based on the preservation of multinational interests," at the expense of the economic wellbeing of its neighbors. Within that policy the paper warns the "laws of (sovereign)

nations could be dealt with as non-binding...as during Kissinger's period." "Trilateralism," writes Newton Carlos in *Folha*, "...is the invention of the multinationals which created and financed the Trilateral Commission. One of the many Kennedy intellectuals...Arthur Schlesinger, says it was a hard fight during a Paris conference to convince (people) that that commission is 'something decent'."

The "decency" of the Carter team came into further disrepute last week when the prominent Rio daily, *Jornal do Brasil*, ran a full page of Edward Korry's testimony before the U.S. Senate on Cyrus Vance's confirmation as Secretary of State. The damning evidence contained in the testimony printed under the banner headline "Ex-U.S. Ambassador to Chile Denounces Democrats", presages a "warm welcome" for Mr. Vance in Brazil.