

policy initiative favored by Kennedy and Brzezinski in a *Washington Post* op-ed Jan. 15. The U.S. should force Mexico to adopt "large-scale labor intensive development programs in Mexico's rural areas." He then added a scarcely veiled borderclosing threat: "Legislation, not reinforced by strong and effective programs to provide relief for persons who may be returned across the border, will create a grave threat to the stability of Mexico."

What Mexico is saying

Business Week, in a mid-January cover story on Mexican oil, succinctly endorsed the essence of the false dichotomy now being presented to U.S. business factions to break interest in partnering Mexico's ambitious profitable development plans. We face a conflict, the weekly lies, between "U.S. interest in getting more Mexican oil" and an "even greater stake in Mexico's long-term stability," i.e., that large-scale growth and stability are irreconcilable.

But the Mexican government is ready to push oil development just as rapidly as it can arrange solid domestic development projects to absorb the growing revenues. In a press conference Jan. 4, President Lopez Portillo insisted that oil revenues will be pegged to what the country can "digest."

Far from posing a necessary limit to Mexico's oil expansion, as the *New York Times* and London's *Financial Times* wilfully misrepresented it, the Mexican president was posing a fundamental challenge to Mexico's potential foreign partners: 'can you provide the reliable and massive back-up which our development requires? Help us in bigger development deals, and we'll pump more oil.'

As *Executive Intelligence Review* editor Quijano told his New York *EIR* seminar audience Jan. 11, "Those who start with the question, 'how do we get Mexico's oil,' are precisely *not* going to get the oil. Those who start with a vision of what joint collaboration in development will mean — not just for Mexico but for the Third World as a whole — will find the oil is part of the deal."

— Tim Rush

Who's saying: 'Mexico could be another Iran'?

The story that Mexico must cut back on its oil-financed growth "to avoid the fate of Iran" is an intelligence print-out — and threat — from "New Dark Ages," anti-industrial factions in Britain and the U.S. The major press conduits with this line follow:

"If the revolutionary unrest that's shaking Iran is not disturbing the sleep of Mexico's ruling establishment — and of policymakers in the United States, for that matter — it ought to be.

"The situations in Mexico and Iran obviously are not identical. . . . You don't have to be an expert, however, to figure out that sudden oil wealth could trigger the same kind of revolutionary ferment in Mexico that is now visible in Iran. . . .

"Considering the apparently huge size of Mexico's oil wealth, the country should have a bright future in the long run. But in the years just ahead the ruling establishment may be sitting on a time bomb very much like that which has exploded under the Shah of Iran."

Ernest Conine, *New York Post*, Dec. 21, 1978

"Will the new-found wealth cause instability among Mexico's 60 million population, as it has in Iran?"

— *London Economist*, Dec. 30, 1978

"(President Lopez Portillo's statement Jan. 4) reflects Mexico's deep awareness of the financial, economic and even political problems suffered by some major oil producers such as Iran, whose current turmoil stems in part from an inflation built by a rapid expansion of revenue."

— *New York Times* correspondent Alan Riding, Jan. 5, 1979

"The push-pull factors of social challenge and economic opportunity that could turn Mexico's oil boom into a dangerous explosion are already being felt. . . . The threat is this: if Mexico does not keep tight control both of what it earns and spends, it could blow the whole thing. . . . When will the time bomb explode? . . . The lesson of Iran, which went so far with its modernization that it alienated a traditionalist society, is all too current."

— Gilbert Lewthwaite, *Baltimore Sun*, page 1, Jan. 14, 1979

"The upheaval in Iran. . . has given warning of the social and political risks that Mexicans will run if they mismanage their oil windfall."

— *Business Week*, Jan. 15, 1979