

The snag in their operation occurred, when it became evident that the only concern of the Socialists, was that *they* be given the franchise to run the new government which the State Department plans to install in Panama.

The former Presidents, dubbed the "Vesco Three" for their ties with Robert Vesco's Medellín Cartel, joined by Uruguayan President Juan Sanguinetti, served as the mediators in negotiations between the Reagan administration and the governments of Spain and the Dominican Republic, to arrange exile for Noriega.

Thus, the international reports published throughout the week of March 13, that General Noriega was packing his bags for his final trip out of Panama, originated not in Panama, but in Washington, Caracas, and Madrid.

On March 15, Panama's *La Estrella* reported that West German Social Democratic leader Hans Jürgen Wischniewski had released a four-point plan to solve "Panama's profound crisis," put together by the Socialist International. Top on their list is that General Noriega must leave, "but as a decision of Panama and not of the United States," Wischniewski said. Likewise, the Socialists insist that supervision of Panama's government be managed by a "Latin American Control Commission," and not the United States. The report rocked Panama, because Wischniewski insisted PRD head Romulo Escobar Bethancourt agreed with the Socialists, both that Noriega should leave, and Panama's elections be placed under international control.

### The costs of intervention

The tottering, scandal-rocked Reagan administration, handing over its European and Asian allies one by one to the Soviet empire, chose Panama as the place where the United States would demonstrate its "toughness." Many involved in that decision to this day cannot imagine that when surrounded by U.S. military might, General Noriega and a broad majority of Panamanians may still stand up to the United States, and refuse to hand over their country to the drug-runners, money-launderers, and oligarchs in the "opposition" which the U.S. insists must run Panama.

But can the U.S. go "toe to toe" with Panama, and then back down? Thus, because of the Reagan administration's stubborn clinging to the insane "Project Democracy" policy in Central America discredited in the Iran-Contra scandal, the impetus for military intervention into Panama now grows, as the options inside Panama for overthrowing Noriega diminish. The costs of such an intervention, both politically and militarily, are incalculable. Any notion that an invasion similar to the Grenada operation can succeed against Panama, is lunatic. Civil war inside Panama is only part of the military equation to consider. The Americas as a whole will explode, in political turmoil and warfare. The crisis will then blow back into the United States itself. If the administration continues on this course, the United States will sink into a new Vietnam, on a much larger scale.

---

## Fact Sheet on Panama

---

# A test case of limited sovereignty

The series of recent measures enacted by the United States against the nation of Panama, constitute acts of war, undertaken with the intent of establishing a system of government in that country answerable to Washington and the international financial cartel.

As former U.S. National Security Council member Norman Bailey stated on Dec. 8, 1987, in a public forum in Washington, D.C., "Getting rid of Noriega is not all that important. Getting rid of the system is what is important. Getting rid of the institution [of the military]—that is what is important." Let there be no mistake: Project Democracy's war on Panama seeks to establish a new "Reagan Corollary," more extensive than the Roosevelt Corollary, which overturned the original intent of the Monroe Doctrine.

Under this new doctrine, the United States assumes the right to decide which governments are legitimate, and which not, to impose constitutional procedures which govern any nation, and to determine the size, deployment, and mission of the armed forces in those nations. Governments that object will find their nations faced with economic embargo, assets seized, treaties with the United States unilaterally abrogated, and their territory, perhaps, militarily occupied.

If the Reagan Corollary succeeds in imposing a new government in Panama, any debtor nation which refuses to starve their population to meet debt payments, can look forward to the same measures of war.

### I. Establishing a government in hiding

1) The crisis begins when, on Feb. 25, President Eric Delvalle announced that he was firing Defense Force Commander Gen. Manuel Noriega. Delvalle had been ordered to do so by U.S. Assistant Secretary Elliott Abrams, at their Miami meeting less than one week before.

Panama's Legislative Assembly met in emergency session that evening, and following the procedures provided for in Panama's Constitution, voted to remove Delvalle from office, on grounds that he was taking orders from a foreign nation. The Assembly named Manuel Solis Palma to replace

him, using the same procedures by which Delvalle had been named President in 1985.

2) The Reagan administration refused to recognize the Solis Palma government, declaring President Delvalle the legitimate government of Panama. State Department officials report that Delvalle is in hiding “but remained in communication with the United States through American Ambassador Arthur H. Davis, who has supported and advised Mr. Delvalle throughout the crisis.”

3) The State Department canceled diplomatic accreditation of 17 Panamanian consuls in the United States who recognized the Solis Palma government. On those grounds, New York state police, acting on orders of the State Department, entered Panama’s New York Consulate—Panamanian territory—and forcibly removed Consul General Donna Prescott on March 9.

4) On March 8, the U.S. succeeds in forcing Panama’s bickering opposition political parties, the Civic Crusade, and representatives of Delvalle, to sign a unity pact. The White House and State Department immediately issue a statement ‘welcoming’ the unity statement as “favoring a government of national reconciliation,” which the United States will finance once they come to power.

## II. Economic strangulation

1) On March 2, Panamanian government assets in the United States are frozen, by order of a New York federal judge. The order states that no government monies can be transferred to Panama, but must be placed in an escrow account at the U.S. Federal Reserve, held in the name of the “Delvalle government.” Approximately \$50 million were thus seized. The State Department issued a communiqué providing U.S. government guarantees for the four New York banks involved, and advising them that should they disburse any funds whatsoever to the Solis Palma government, those banks could be held liable in federal courts for the money.

2) The “Delvalle government’s” new representative in the United States, William D. Rogers, Henry Kissinger’s personal lawyer, announces that any financial transactions made to, or by, the Solis Palma government will no longer be considered legally binding, and that he will seek to have all funds, taxes, and fees owed the Panamanian government anywhere around the globe placed in escrow.

3) The U.S. Federal Reserve cuts off Panama’s banking system, refusing to send dollars to Panama. Under the terms of a 1904 treaty, Panama uses the dollar as its currency, with the Federal Reserve coordinating the necessary flow of currency back and forth between the two countries. U.S. officials also pressure major U.S. banks with branches in Panama

to stop lending funds to the National Bank of Panama.

4) On March 11, President Reagan announces that the United States will not pay out \$6.5 million in Panama Canal revenues owed to Panama in the month of March. The money is due Panama under the Canal Treaties, and includes payment for services provided by Panama for the Canal, including police and fire protection, street lighting, road repair, and sewage. Reagan also announces that Panama is now excluded from previous U.S. trade preference agreements, affecting some \$96 million in bilateral trade. Reagan promises “additional steps, if necessary to deny the transfer of funds to the Noriega regime.”

5) On March 12, U.S. Federal courts terminate Air Panama’s right to operate in the United States, and seize its assets, including its bank accounts, a Boeing 727 grounded in Miami, and all negotiable airline tickets. In a separate action, any *Air Panama* planes which enter U.S. airspace will also be seized, the court ordered. Fearing similar treatment, Petro Terminales de Panama, which runs the cross-isthmus pipeline, agreed to deposit the money it owes to Panama in an escrow fund.

6) The U.S. State Department seeks to ensure that no U.S. ally breaks the U.S. blockade, resorting to threats when they have done so. Japan receives notice of this attempted U.S. veto on March 5, when Elliott Abrams called in the Japanese chargé d’affaires in Washington to demand an explanation of reports that Japan recognizes the Solis Palma government.

## III. Treaty violations, military deployments

1) Under the 1979 Panama Canal treaties, the United States cannot carry out any unilateral military action inside Panama, without consultation with and authorization from the government of Panama. That provision has been ignored repeatedly since Feb. 25.

- On March 2, U.S. troops seize control of the Panama Canal administration building, without prior warning, on the pretext that someone had called in a bomb scare.

- U.S. National Guard maneuvers called *Total Warrior* are announced for March 12-April 12, to take place in “designated training areas in the Panama Canal area.” Panama’s foreign minister, joined by the military representative on the Canal Commission, Major Daniel Delgado, charge that the maneuvers are not authorized, will violate Panama’s airspace, and that U.S. troops have already occupied “strategic points” around the Canal. They report also that an unusual number of U.S. warships are off both coasts of Panama.

- On March 14, the U.S. Defense Department sends in 100 Marine and Air Force security specialists to Panama, drawn heavily from Marine Corps anti-terrorist forces. The deployment brings the number of security specialists in Pan-

ama to 700, and is the first increase in U.S. military force since the current civil unrest began.

Reagan administration officials, members of Congress, and U.S. newspapers have declared that U.S. military intervention against Panama will be taken, if necessary, to finally “get rid of the system” in Panama.

- Defense Secretary Frank Carlucci on Feb. 27 stated that military action is “in the contingency plans.”

- Vice President George Bush on Feb. 27 stated that the United States will “reserve the right to do whatever is necessary, including military force, to protect America’s sacred interests in that region of the world.”

- On March 6, Bush proposes that the United States kidnap Noriega. “The long arm of U.S. justice” has caught terrorists such as Younis and Hamada, Bush said. “I’m suggesting the system has a way of working to bring people to justice, and I hope it will in this case.” His plan was echoed on March 14 by the *Wall Street Journal*.

- “The United States cannot permit Noriega to remain in power, if it wishes to continue being respected by other Central American nations,” Henry Kissinger has been stating in recent U.S. conferences, Mexico’s *Excelsior* daily reported March 1. “Central American nations respect force. . . . If we overthrow someone in political power, we have obligation to stick to it, and assure that the successor be someone with whom we are in agreement.”

- Democratic Sen. John Kerry (Mass.) 26: “What you have to do is begin to precipitate a larger crisis, frankly. . . . I personally don’t think it will come to a civil war, though it could. . . [Military action] is an option for the U.S.”

- Republican Sen. Alfonse D’Amato (N. Y.) stated on Feb. 26: “We’ve got to put our troops on a full military alert . . . and be prepared to take whatever action necessary. . . . It is not without precedent that the U.S. move, and move strongly, to protect the interests of its citizens. Certainly we did it in Grenada. General Eisenhower—President Eisenhower did it in Lebanon. I think it’s the kind of thing that certainly is a very real option and one that we might have to use.”

- A *Wall Street Journal* editorial March 1 stated, “We do not wish to suggest that the only solution to the General Noreigas of the world is a U.S. military invasion. But we do suggest that when a country such as the U.S. sees its first duty as reassuring the region that its military won’t be used to defend helpless people, the General Noriegas will survive and their number will increase.”

- A *Washington Times* editorial opinion March 10 stated, “With the U.S. once again meddling blatantly in the internal affairs of a Latin American neighbor, it’s time for a closer look at the old shibboleth of non-intervention. . . . Does that give the U.S. the moral right to try to topple him from power? You bet it does.”

---

## Profile: Raymond Barre

---

# The would-be next of France is not his

*The first round of presidential elections in France are currently under way, to be followed by a second-round face-off between the two leading candidates in May. Incumbent François Mitterrand and Premier Jacques Chirac are among the candidates. Another leading candidate is a former premier, Raymond Barre. A dossier on Barre has been issued by the European Labor Party, which is well known in the country for having dared to sue a Soviet publication, New Times, in a Paris court for libel. The following article is based on that dossier.*

If Raymond Barre were to be elected President of France, it would put an end to France’s leading role in resisting the American Establishment’s sell-out of Europe to the Soviet Empire, and would give the European bureaucracy in Brussels easy control over French national policy. Although his own party, the CDS, is supporting his candidacy, support for him in the Republican Party (both these parties form a “family” known as the UDF), is lukewarm. Endorsements for Barre, including from former President Valéry Giscard d’Estaing, have been made, but with no great enthusiasm.

Raymond Barre can best be described as duplicitous: He plays a double game, using ambiguous language. He prides himself on being “above politics” and “Gaullist.” Yet, he is a leading member of the supranational Trilateral Commission. His is a common face at the ultrasecret Bilderberg group conferences. He is honorary president of the “Davos Seminars” of the European financial elite. And he is a member of the board of the Venetian insurance giant, Assicurazioni Generali.

He paints himself as a “Christian” concerned by “social conditions”; yet he has always favored a ruthless policy of austerity and praised the highly un-Christian looting of the Third World by the International Monetary Fund and related bankers with whom Barre confers “socially” in the organizations listed above. With false innocence, Barre states, “I am in politics by chance, only because I was asked to be.”