

sultative" OPEC meeting has been organized for March 26 to discuss the market situation. The New York Times reports that, if the current pattern continues, a decision may be taken in March to hold a price setting meeting in response to the Anglo-Dutch speculative gambit. But officials in both Venezuela and Nigeria have openly attacked moves to get a new OPEC price hike, reflecting the Saudi position.

The Saudis, however, are themselves under heavy pressure to bend to the oil crisis scenario. Saudi Arabia is being threatened with the "Iran treatment" — rumors of terrorists in the oil fields, "Islamic fundamentalist" unrest spreading from Iran, and so forth — in terms that reveal hopes that an Iran-style cutback of oil production can be imposed on the Saudis, too.

Simultaneously, U.S. Defense Secretary Harold Brown, the Queen of England, and others are pressuring the Saudis to join the Camp David axis against the rest of the Arab states, thus making the threats of terror in the oil fields all the more real.

Should OPEC be lured into a new price hike, the effects on the world economy will be disastrous, as is obvious from the plans for rationing, cutbacks, and shutdowns eagerly being made public by Energy Secretary Schlesinger and others. The cartel would do far better to begin singling out the culprits who are using OPEC crude as an instrument of economic war. OPEC would assuredly find plentiful allies among the oil-consuming nations if it adopted such a strategy.

— Judith Weyer

context of a global outlook.

This effort to deliver a strong shock of reality to the bungling Carter Administration was made very explicit by the Mexican government. Before Carter's arrival, President Lopez Portillo had conveyed his nation's preoccupation with the current trend in U.S. foreign policy during a press conference at which he warned that further U.S. errors in international politics would be "madness or violence." Foreign Minister Santiago Roel had driven the point home one day later when he denounced the "paranoid mysticism" and "territorial ambitions" from which certain "other countries" suffer. Roel had concluded his remarks with a direct message to the American people: "I think the best thing you can do is wake up."

But the Carter Administration has shown no signs of waking up. Before even leaving Mexico, Carter and his officials made it clear that they would continue threatening Mexico with sealing the border — a move which would undermine Mexico's industrialization efforts and could potentially foment social turmoil. In the final communiqué, President Carter insisted on including a paragraph announcing the intention to enforce his proposed legislation against "illegal aliens." To carry this out, Carter announced the creation of a blue ribbon commission on immigration — a proposal made by Senator Edward Kennedy — which will be chaired by former governor of Florida, Reuben Askew.

A more blatant indication of the course that U.S. policy towards Mexico will take in the months ahead was provided by columnist James Reston, Secretary of State Vance's man at the *New York Times* who, perturbed by Mexico's insistence that the U.S. adopt a positive role in world affairs, called for the U.S. to "shout out against this free and easy advice from abroad about what the U.S. should do in the world."

Lopez delivers shock of reality to Carter

Reports in the U.S. press this week that President Carter's visit to Mexico was a "fiasco" are very misleading. From the U.S.'s standpoint, it would be more accurate to say that the visit was a fiasco for the policies of confrontation promoted by National Security Advisor Zbigniew Brzezinski and Energy Secretary James Schlesinger, but a success for those forces in the U.S. committed to progress and industrial development.

This can be clearly seen from the final communiqué issued at the conclusion of the three-day visit (under the insistence of the Mexican government) which emphasizes the need to establish a "new international system" to insure that resources are used "for the economic and social development of a nation's population" and to "encourage the industrialization" of the Third World.

This clear invitation for the U.S. to join in the development of the Third World — a potential market of hundreds of billions of dollars for U.S. industry — was coupled with the firm rejection of Brzezinski and Schlesinger's efforts to secure Mexico's enormous oil resources as a "strategic reserve for war." Mexican President Jose Lopez Portillo was adamant that energy questions could only be negotiated within the context of a "new world order of production, distribution and consumption of energy resources" based on the higher interest of humanity and not on deformations or bilateral demand." And on other key issues, such as the construction of a gas pipeline to the U.S. and the immigration of unemployed Mexican workers to the U.S., the Mexican President was equally insistent that they could not be solved in an isolated way but only within the