

Cubans Unmask Carter As A Trilateral Creation

Open factional warfare at the highest levels of the Cuban leadership has surfaced during the second half of May, in response to Jimmy Carter's "carrot and stick" approach to normalization of relations with that socialist country. Carter's negotiating line has been to offer the Cubans normalized diplomatic and economic ties in the near future, but demanding in return that the Cubans pull their troops out of Africa and make significant "human rights" concessions within Cuba, such as freeing various U.S. citizens who are being held as prisoners.

The clearest expression of Carter's position came two days ago, when he told the press: "I think we will have indications in the next few weeks of strengthened diplomatic relations with Cuba, far short of recognition... (However, I) would like very much for Cuba to refrain from this intrusion into African affairs in a military way."

Despite continuous attempts by the Western media to portray Cuban President Fidel Castro as softening before Carter's offers, the fact of the matter is that Castro has constantly explained that Cuba's commitment to Africa is not negotiable, at any price. Other layers within Cuba, however, including a faction of "pragmatists" who see the necessity of making concessions in order to achieve a new "entente" with the U.S., as well as a group of outright long-time agents of the Rockefeller interests who have been deeply imbedded in the top leadership of the Cuban Communist Party, have signaled their willingness to make a deal.

The most blatant statements to date from this anti-Fidel faction came on May 20, when Carlos Rafael Rodriguez, the Vice President of the Cuban Council of State and a Rockefeller agent for decades, went out of his way to praise the Trilateral Commission (see below.) Rodriguez has a background that on numerous occasions has raised doubts about just where his loyalties lie. In the early 1940's, "communist" Rodriguez was a cabinet minister in the government of the infamous Cuban dictator, Fulgencio Batista. A few years later he led up the Browderite faction in the Cuban Communist Party which favored the self-dissolution of the party. And throughout the 1950's, Rodriguez was a vigorous opponent of Fidel Castro and his "barbudo" movement, refusing to back him until a few weeks before he actually seized power.

Rodriguez' praise of Trilateralism was quickly answered by the Cuban "hard-liners", in the form of a feature article carried by *Prensa Latina*, the Cuban wire service, On May 30 (see below). We draw the reader's

special attention to the concluding paragraph of the Gómez feature, for its important analysis of the "Whiggish" tendencies in American political life which have historically and are now again resisting the assault on democracy.

Rodriguez: 'Carter's Moral Ingredient Much To The Liking Of Americans'

Statements made by Carlos Rafael Rodriguez, Vice President of the Cuban Council of State, to the magazine Cuadernos del Tercer Mundo, as carried by Prensa Latina May 20.

Today in Caracas and Mexico, Willy Brandt, Mario Soares and others are working to spread to Latin America the positions of western Social Democracy. I personally think that it would be wrong to consider this presence, which is no doubt useful to imperialism; as dangerous as that of the supporters of fascism...

It is difficult and premature to define the (U.S.) president. He has traces of Woodrow Wilson and of John F. Kennedy, but Carter neither taught at Princeton nor was he trained in the millionaire groups of Boston. He is a product of Plains, and he is marked by that initial formation. There is in him a moral ingredient much to the liking of the North Americans and which; after the disaster of Nixon, constitutes a recovery...

Carter has proposed to rescue that moral ingredient of foreign policy and for that reason reminds one of Wilson, but at the same time he wants to do it with a more liberal coloration, similar to that of John F. Kennedy. His style, however, is more peasant, and that is the trace of Plains...

It would be an error if it were not taken into account that the new policy-making mode under the Carter administration imposes the necessity of a different response to those provoked by the brutalities of Johnson and Nixon. The presence of Young in Africa is not the same as that of Kissinger although what is sought does not differ. What does not change is the essence of the imperialist positions. It suffices to analyze Carter's speech at NATO to understand that.

Detente will continue. It is almost inexorable. But the 'Trilateralism' the globality of criteria which Carter wants to achieve instead of Kissinger's Atlanticist hegemony, gives the international situation a new dimension.

Prensa Latina: Rocky's Trilateral Seizes U.S. Executive Power

Excerpted below is the article "United States — Uncertainty and Ambitions" by Yolanda Gómez, Prensa Latina Special Service. The article was released May 30.

...Analysts of U.S. internal politics claim that three important events led to a worsening of the domestic crisis:

* The smashing defeat given the U.S. by the Vietnamese...

* The economic crisis and the growth in unemployment rates.

* The first resignation of a president in the country's history, which showed publically the magnitude of the internal crisis.

...In the midst of the Watergate crisis, in 1973, the multimillionaire David Rockefeller and other representatives of the principal financial entities of the world created a team of 200 people which was given the name 'Trilateral Commission.'

From its birth the Commission began to draw up a plan which, following the short and inefficient administration of Gerald Ford, brought this sector to seize the reins of executive power with James Carter in the presidency of the country.

Their fundamental goal was to try to stop the process of decadence taking place in the so-called Western Democracies.

Many analysts consider the Trilateral plan to be a first serious attempt by these nations, headed by the multinational companies of the U.S., to draw up and develop some kind of joint state program in world and domestic economic, ideological and cultural fields...

...The plan requires a certain amount of support from the population. Internally they try to keep workers concerned with labor problems to keep them away from political worries and demands...

...The founders of the Trilateral promote so-called neocorporativism, in which production is dominated by the big businesses, which also possess the reins of political power, which permits them governmental control and the investment of their dollars in those sectors which serve their objectives.

...The maneuver also would serve to create a greater depolitization of the citizenry, in such a way that the dominant groups, grouped in the Trilateral, could carry out their plans without a confrontation with the population...

The naming of Andrew Young, an ex-Civil Rights activist in the 1960's, as U.N. Ambassador, is an example of the efforts of the Trilateral to confuse this (black) sector of the population, whose number exceeds 20 million...

The proclamation of a policy in defense of human rights, which has, among other objectives, trying to hide the history of the U.S. as an interfering country, an aggressor, and starter of bellicose adventures, is seen as another maneuver to attract the population.

But the existence of the Trilateral Commission does not mean, according to the analysts, that it has a solution to the so-called crisis of democracy.

The opposition of free enterprise, which served as the basis for the birth of the U.S. Republic, and the attempt to 'dominate' a population — which for more than a century has been sold the idea that they lived in the most democratic country in the world — constitute domestic contradictions which will be obstacles to the favorable development of this commission created by the multimillionaire David Rockefeller.

Mexico Fights Off Carter Oil Grab

MEXICO

The yearly U.S.-Mexico Interparliamentary meeting held in Hermosillo, Sonora ended May 29 with a firm and emphatic rejection of the Carter Administration's attempts to gain control of Mexico's oil. In addition to a strongly worded statement emphasizing Mexico's control over its oil and other resources, the final communique called for friendly relations based not on "opinions" but on "the views of the U.S. population" and "a democracy...which is based on the constant economic, social and cultural improvement of society."

The U.S. and Mexican Congressmen and Senators also signed a statement, dubbed the "Declaration of Hermosillo," condemning the "financing, cultivation, use and smuggling of drugs" which will be used to organize

other countries around an anti-drug position.

The stage for the meeting was set a few days earlier on May 23, when Mexico's Natural Resources Minister Jose Andres de Oteyza stated, "Mexico will not yield to any international pressures regarding the sale of its oil." De Oteyza's statement was a direct slap in the face to the Carter Administration whose recently appointed Ambassador to Mexico, Wisconsin Governor Patrick J. Lucey, had stated on the previous day that the White House was willing to "exert its influence" on Wall Street and international financing agencies to help Mexico increase its extraction of oil and "its export to the U.S." On the 24th de Oteyza responded even more directly to Lucey's statement by saying, "Mexico is not willing to commit its oil to the U.S. in exchange for financing received through the good graces of that country." The Minister added that Mexico will use its oil resources in a "rational" way for a broad development policy which will help increase the standard of living of the Mexican population.