

entirety of this expansion must be slated for domestic consumption, which if maintained on line to meet the 1990 fusion deadline, must increase at least two and a half times over the next five years.

However there is no reason for crash development of Mexico's oil to stop there. Additional investment should allow for exports to fuel rapid industrial expansion in other, less-oil rich areas. Ironically, one of the prime importers should be the United States. Not the United States of Carter, Brzezinski and Rockefeller, who are trying to drastically *reduce* U.S. energy consumption under "conservation" programs; who only want Mexican oil as a chip to break OPEC. Rather the U.S. of alliances between pro-growth industrialists and labor sectors who recognize that for the U.S. to take its necessary role in providing huge quantities of capital goods and technology to the Third World, and at the same time gear up a crash fusion energy program, interim fuels such as oil must be expended at greatly increased rates.

In the context of a debt moratorium, these exports can largely finance the \$5 billion and up capital imports needed for expanding the Mexican oil industry. They additionally should help finance the enormous capital goods import bill for the agricultural sector, transport, rebuilding the cities, etc. The remaining shortfall in these capital and technology accounts must be met from International Development Bank-style credits now outlined in European-Arab-Comecon monetary arrangements. Mexico stands in particularly good shape to enter such agreements with both the European Economic Community and the Comecon; Mexico has but to activate them.

Current *electricity* capacity of 12 million kilowatts is generated more than half from oil (about 7 million kw),

and the rest basically from hydroelectric plants (about 5m. kw). Total realizable hydroelectric potential for the country is 20 million. Given this potential, current plans calling for expanding hydroelectric power to 9 million kw by 1982 should be expanded. The additional generation of electricity to meet minimum goals of 30 million kw total capacity by 1982 must come from oil and fission nuclear energy.

It is possible some of this energy could come from coal as well, if current costs can be reduced. The recently announced Federal Electricity Commission program of building an expensive coal-burning plant to save miniscule quantities of oil is simply insane. Equally insane are any plans to use solar or wind energy as anything but museum reminders of the de-industrialization plans of Rockefeller and Ralph Nader.

Mexico's *fission* nuclear energy effort of Laguna Verde on the Veracruz coast, designed to produce 1.3 million kw from two reactors, or approximately 10 percent of current capacity, is extremely important for the country. The Mexican nuclear energy workers trained at Laguna Verde will constitute the core of trained labor able to man fusion reactors at the end of the next decade. Laguna Verde construction is reported to be recommencing soon, after damaging delays; it is imperative that it be immediately brought to completion.

Recent confirmation of 300,000 tons of uranium ore in Chihuahua, substantially raising current reserves, immediately opens the possibility of a large-scale program of expanded fission energy. Fission plants, operating with domestic fuel, can produce electricity at costs fully comparable to those of oil powered plants. An initial target of ten such facilities as Laguna Verde would not only vastly boost electricity generation but free substantial quantities of oil for other domestic use or export.

Colombia: Carter's Vietnam?

Speaking before a crowd of 50,000 demonstrators on Feb. 19 in Bogota, Colombian Communist Party (PCC) executive member Manuel Cepeda committed the PCC to an armed war of resistance against the threat of a fascist military coup and took the unprecedented step of publicly acknowledging the Fuerzas Armadas Revolucionarias Colombianas (FARC). Until now, the Communist Party has maintained strict silence on the FARC the armed guerrilla unit active in five fronts around the country with a broad base of popular support.

Two of the five FARC fronts in the country are located in southeastern Colombia in the province of Caqueta; one is in the central mountain range, one in the northeastern province of Magdalena Medio, and one in the northwestern province of Antioquia. A new front is opening up in Boyaca in the central eastern part of the country. A tightly organized and disciplined political entity, the FARC is the government in the areas of the country it controls. It collects taxes and provides protection to the

peasant population, whose support and loyalty it commands.

Support for the FARC is such that it operates freely in the areas it controls. Last week it raided the town of La Macarena in Meta province to replenish medical and food supplies and funds. The FARC laid siege to the police station, painted slogans on the walls and took with them a known CIA agent, Richard Starr, discovered in the town. During the period of occupation the inhabitants went about their business, ignoring the police chief's cries for help. Incidents like this are a common occurrence.

The FARC is mobilized and recruiting as peasants victimized by Army repression commit themselves to an armed, political defense of the population. FARC commander Marulanda Velez recently explained that "violence forces people to incorporate into the guerrillas to fight in defense of their rights ... if in Colombia there were total respect for human rights, including

democratic liberties ... if tyranny did not exist ... there would be no guerrillas or armed struggle."

The Colombian military and its U.S. "advisors" have responded to this situation by accelerating its war against the urban and rural populations. The statement made last week by a member of the E-2 military intelligence unit makes explicit what is on the agenda. He said the Latin American armed forces should be strengthened because they would inevitably face "new Vietnams" on the continent.

An End to Paternalism?

Colombia will be a key test for the Carter administration's purported "non-paternalistic" Latin American policy and "respect for human rights." Close Carter collaborator Albert Fishlow has effusively praised Colombia's "democracy" and particularly hailed the cornerstone of the government's economic program, the National development Plan (PND) as a "model" for the continent.

The attractiveness of the model from the Carter standpoint is not just its military aspect, but its commitment to economic warfare against the population. The PND is based on deindustrialization, subsistence agriculture and labor-intensive development projects. Colombia has one of the most highly skilled and educated labor forces on the continent and a high degree of industrial infrastructure. The Lopez government has worked for two years to dismantle this, drastically reducing credit to industrialists, providing incentives for the development of small labor-intensive industries and glorifying the potential for achieving a purely 'Colombian' mode of development — without modern technology.

Friedmanite "anti-inflationary" measures have gutted the population's living standards and destroyed the most basic health, education, and sanitation services. Prices of basic items today are soaring out of reach of the working class.

Two weeks ago, Finance Minister Espinosa Valderrama announced the imposition of a "war economy" to allow for accelerated payments of foreign debt. A new series of anti-inflationary measures will dry up the internal credit market and force industrialists to seek credit abroad. Restrictions on contracting foreign private loans are extremely strict however and credits from the World Bank, IMF and BID are conditioned on companies' willingness to promote labor-intensive technology and deindustrialization.

Implementing the War Economy

The only way the Lopez government has managed to impose austerity and proceed to dismantle industry is by stepping up the counterinsurgency operations, terrorism, and death squad activity which have been an integral part of Colombian "democracy" for years. During the 1960s, the U.S.-trained and financed Colombian military bombed, napalmed, and used biological warfare against the FARC and its peasant base. The Marquetalia campaign of 1963-64 equalled in intensity and atrocity the war waged by the CIA against the Vietnamese peasantry.

Over the past six months the government has intensified its assault on the population.

The country is now ruled by an "Occupation Army." Cities and towns are militarized under any pretext, using charges of "terrorist subversion" following deployments of synthetic terrorist creations or Maoist countergangs deployed to provoke the violence. The PCC has named the U.S. embassy and Military Mission to Bogota as the agencies giving direct orders to the Colombian Army and countergang provocateurs. The Drug Enforcement Agency carries out a highly secret operation in Colombia — undoubtedly cashing in on the vast contraband drug trade — under the protection of the U.S. embassy.

The countryside abounds with U.S. "advisors" called Rangers. Elite counterguerrilla units such as the "Lancers," financed, trained and equipped by the U.S., are deployed within the country's designated "war zones" — the areas of greatest PCC-FARC influence and activity — to carry out terror campaigns and death squad activity against the peasantry.

Over the past two years, numerous top leaders of the PCC and its electoral coalition, the National Union of Opposition (UNO), have been assassinated by a systematic death squad deployment. Military officials in the zones where the assassinations occur publicly brag of their knowledge and endorsement of such action. Most recently, UNO councilman in Cimitarra, Josue Cavanzo was assassinated by a death squad with the prior knowledge of the military officer in the town. Peasant witnesses in the areas of heavy military deployment such as the provinces of Huila, Santandar, and Magdalena Medio report on the death squad modus operandi: Individuals are kidnapped and tortured until they "confess" their ties to the FARC. One peasant kidnapped in Yacopi in October 1976 was tortured and thrown alive from a helicopter, a standard practice used in the CIA's "Operation Phoenix" in Vietnam.

Also in October 1976, during the height of the military terror campaign directed at the population of Cimitarra, Colonel Richardson of the U.S. Southern Command's Canal Zone counterinsurgency training school arrived unexpectedly in Colombia. He travelled directly to Cimitarra. At that time the town's pro-PCC citizenry was subjected to a barbaric campaign — hundreds were illegally arrested, herded like animals to a detention camp, tortured and kept there for days. Col. Richardson reported he was in the region to observe the "orchid collection" of a national politician.

UNO councilmen legitimately elected to their posts are prevented from meeting, and jailed on trumped up charges. In Yacopi the entire city council has been prevented from meeting and its UNO councilmen sentenced to death for being "chicken thieves."

Population Mobilized

FARC Commander Marulanda Velez explained in a recent interview that the "program for the Revolution and the platform for immediate struggle in benefit of the population and its liberation are important in the popular struggle for power. In the present revolutionary process, we count on political labor and peasant leaders who complement our revolutionary work."

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)