

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.

Despite this firm public stand, two days later at the start of the Interparliamentary meetings, Senator Lloyd Bentsen (D-Texas) called on Mexico to lower the price of oil it exports to the U.S. "in exchange for" a reduction of tariff barriers for Mexican goods.

Augusto Gomez Villanueva, head of the Mexican delegation and leader of Mexico's Chamber of Deputies, reminded Bentsen: "We are not here to discuss oil. Mexico will sell its oil to the highest bidder." This position was driven home by the Mexican press. An editorial in the *Diario de Mexico* on May 28 noted that Bentsen is not representative of the U.S. population since he only represents "the House of Rockefeller." The official government daily, *El Nacional*, described Bentsen's statements as "a diplomatic blunder" and the Popular Socialist Party called the proposal "unac-

ceptable" since "our oil is not up for auction."

Only two days later, Bentsen was forced to eat his words when he stated that "the U.S. would never pressure Mexico to sell its oil...Mexico knows whether or not to sell the oil and to whomever it wants."

A positive approach to improving Mexican relations with the U.S. in the context of solving the current "international economic and financial disequilibrium" was presented by Gomez Villanueva in the keynote address to the meeting. After denouncing the Carter Administration's plans to impose fascist economies on Third World countries through debt strangulation Gomez Villanueva called for "alleviation of the foreign debt of the poor countries" through the formation of a new international economic order." Only in this way, Gomez added, "can the survival of international democracy be insured."

What U.S. Declaration Of Independence Means To Mexico

The following are excerpts of the speech given by Augusto Gomez Villanueva, head of the Mexican delegation to the 16th Mexican-U.S. Interparliamentary Meeting which was held in Hermosillo, Sonora, Mexico, May 27-29, 1977. The translation of the speech is by NSIPS.

Now in its bicentennium, the Declaration of Independence of the United States, signed by the fifty-six representatives of the first Congress of your nation, holds that all men were created equal before the law, to live in liberty and in pursuit of happiness. This humanist political conception became reality in the historic speech of Patrick Henry on March 23, 1775, before the House of Burgesses in Virginia, when he exclaimed, "Give me liberty or give me death."

The United States and Mexico share the North American geography but their people exhibit contrasting levels of development due to the unequal distribution of wealth which still clouds the vision of economic democracy conceived as their objective by the founders of our nations, by Benjamin Franklin and Hidalgo, by Adams and Morelos, by Lincoln and by Benito Juarez.

The inviolability of national sovereignty is the historical pact of neighboring countries, to guarantee the peaceful settlement of controversies and the achievement of friendly coexistence. This pact is based on the principle of nonintervention for which the weak countries have fought so long, for which we will continue to fight as long as neocolonial powers attempt to assume supreme privileges. Nonintervention and self-determination of nations are the reason and essence of Mexican foreign policy. They are the result of old and new battles in defense of our independence, and they constitute the only international law capable of preventing the triumph of bellicose interests over the search for peace on this planet.

Mexico has not only defended these principles for its

own benefit but to maintain respect for the sovereignty of all the nations of the world. In the event that the rights of self-determination of each country are jeopardized, we know that it would mean losing a part of their independence. For this reason we have historically defended the right of the Cuban people to choose their own form of government; it is for this reason that we have given our full support to the legitimate demands of Panama...

We approach these topics with the greatest objectivity and with the best intentions of contributing to the achievement of peace in the hemisphere, understanding that when a nation's economic and social rights are disregarded, peace can become a chimera.

The capacity of the human species to create a new world economic order is the best option for assuring international democracy and reducing the foreign debt of the poor countries which are already carrying a \$400 billion burden, which is the equivalent of the gross annual product of the ten richest countries on earth. To the extent that the peripheral countries are forced to resort to credits from the metropolitan centers of capital, their debt will increase through technology transfers, through manipulation of prices of basic export products, and through transnational investments that denationalize the productive plant and equipment of our nations, imposing subsistence living standards.

That is how a long-term breach in the equilibrium is generated, for which the foreign debt is an arithmetic global expression of international economic inequality which perpetuates deep chasms between the vast geography of hunger and its tiny islands of opulence.

We do not ask privileges but justice in all economic interchange: in commerce, in technology transfer, in credit, in investment and in the just treatment that migratory workers deserve...Justice that finds its pragmatic expression in the market; in the prices to which interchange is subject; in the terms in which tech-