

# The 'Iranization' of the Mexican republic

by Dolia E. Pettingell

*EIR's* sources report that high Mexican government officials now believe that U.S.-Mexican relations are at their worst point ever. An important turning point in the relations was the Mexican government's recent refusal to extend the ex-shah of Iran's tourist visa in early December 1979. Mexican officials argued that the presence of the ex-shah in Mexico "was against our nation's interests."

It may have been evident to the Mexican government that the return of the Shah to their country would have been the occasion for significant "leftist" protest-activity. This could easily have destabilized the government at the point that "rightist" forces similarly deployed in counterattack. It was also undoubtedly evident to the Mexican government that those elements in the U.S. government pressing for Mexican acceptance of the Shah's return looked forward with some eagerness to such a "left-right" destabilization.

In a new year interview, Mexican President Jose Lopez Portillo himself, made his first public statement regarding U.S. government and press accusations that he "reneged" on a commitment to take the Shah back. President Lopez Portillo, in very strong terms, said that Mexico never gave the Shah political asylum, but only a tourist visa, and that he never committed himself—"even less with the U.S. government"—to let the Shah back in.

Since then, the U.S. government and media have continued to escalate pressures against Mexico. "Mexico Threatens Cut Off of Oil Supply", "Mexican Standoffishness," are typical of headlines that American readers encounter daily in the U.S. press.

The media's anti-Mexico campaign along with gross diplomatic affronts by the Carter administration, are directed toward what certain U.S. sources describe as a conditioning of the U.S. population to view Mexico as "our Iran to the South." Actual "Iran-style destabilization" of Mexico is the obvious next step.

As in the mooted case of the Shah's return, any form of intelligence-agency promoted destabilization of Mexico depends on the initial, street-level activation of a "mass of leftists," or alternatively, a wave of terrorism credibly associated with a "leftist" cause. While the Mexican government's susceptibility to certain forms of scenario-manipulation may be reflected in their apparent, occasionally expressed perception that the right-wing "Monterrey group" of oligarchist financial and landlord interests is the principal threat to the Mexican republic, in fact, the "Monterrey group" can perform significantly in such a scenario only as a "rightist" countergang capability to the principal effort, which will be "leftist."

This touches upon the fact that, although the U.S. Carter administration may be the "government-of-record" in the kind of threats that Mexico now faces, the survival of the Mexican republic depends on recognizing and acting on a set of networks associated with the *Societas Jesu*—the Jesuit Order—acting "above" the policy of governments, and through various U.N.-connected agencies that exert influence on the posture of the Mexican government itself. U.S. intelligence capabilities in Mexico are significant as they overlap the assets of the Jesuits—who are the key to the "Iranization" project.

Admittedly, the Hapsburg-led "black nobility" of Europe and their allied branch-families in Latin America have close associations with the "Monterrey group" oligarchists, and also exert decisive policy-influence in the international intelligence operations of the Jesuit Order. However, while Monterrey's fascist hand will be a coordinated feature, the principal leverage-capabilities of the Jesuits in Mexico, as throughout the continent, is "leftist" in fact, networks deployable under auspices of the notorious "liberation theology."

It is this factor, the Jesuit subversive networks on Mexico's "left"—with its included, highly developed

capability for precision-deployed terrorist acts—that is central to the kind of scenarios now being mooted in such U.S. quarters as (Jesuit) Georgetown University.

In a recent issue, the American magazine *Gallery* lays out an exact scenario of how the “Iranization” of Mexico could work. The article, by Institute for Policy Studies founder Karl Hess, entitled “The Day the U.S. Invaded Mexico,” portrays a situation which begins with a severe shortage of oil in the U.S. due to cut-off of supplies from the Middle East. The President of the United States decides to “encourage...terrorist activities by Marxist anti-American guerrillas” in the oil fields in the south of Mexico. This “two weeks of provocations,” lays a basis for a U.S. military takeover of Mexico’s oil fields. The Mexican government announces new oil discoveries; OPEC countries decide to outrageously increase oil prices; and the U.S. cabinet admits that a militarization of the Middle East will mean total suppression of that region’s oil supplies. At the end of two weeks, the President of the U.S. announces that U.S. troops have just taken over the Mexican oil fields.

Although some readers might tend to dismiss this scenario as another fantasy of just another pornographic rag, it is, in fact, a “live” operation of top Anglo-American policy-makers.

This week a top executive of the Center for Inter-American Security, a Washington thinktank closely tied to the Kissinger networks at Georgetown’s Center for Strategic and International Studies (Jesuit), revealed that the current Anglo-American “concern” is with a terrorist threat in the oil rich area of Mexico that borders Guatemala: an exact replica of the *Gallery* scenario.

The CIS source reported that there has recently been an escalation in “Baader-Meinhof type” terrorist activities in the Mexico-Guatemala border area and that the terrorists’ “ultimate target is the Mexican oil fields, especially in the state of Tabasco...”

Mexico’s response to this very real military threat has become more and more defensive as the Middle East crisis worsens. Only days after the government-linked Mexican newspaper *El Dia* reported the *Gallery* article, the Mexican Defense Minister Gen. Felix Galvan Lopez responded with a highly unusual interview.

Answering a reporter’s question, Gen. Galvan stated that Mexico does have the “means” and readiness “to defend our nation’s natural resources,” in the event of a military attack by U.S. troops. Recently, Gen. Galvan visited the Soviet Union where he was warmly received by top Soviet officers.

## Mexico in the UN

Taking advantage of Mexico’s fears, Anglo-American circles operated in the U.N. over a period of months to extend Mexico the enticement of the seat in the U.N. Security Council originally intended for Cuba. It appears

that the aim is to draw Mexico into byzantine wheeling-and-dealing leading toward concessions.

One of Mexico’s first dangerous concessions came on Jan. 9, two days after it was elected to the Security Council as a compromise between Colombia, the U.S. proxy, and Cuba. Arriving to personally oversee Mexico’s first action in the council, Foreign Minister Jorge Castañeda stated that “there is no doubt whatever that we are in the presence of an invasion” of Afghanistan and that the Security Council must demand “the withdrawal of the foreign armies.”

Foreign Minister Castañeda, reiterated Mexico’s historical posture of “non-intervention” in “other countries’ affairs”, adding that Mexico will not support “countries” but “principles.”

The Mexican vote against “Soviet intervention” in Afghanistan surprises many in the diplomatic community, since Mexico is known to be acutely aware of the madness of Washington and London’s current strategic doctrine which provoked the Soviet Afghanistan operation.

Many political observers took Mexico’s vote as an expression of their own fears that a “similar” invasion from the U.S. against Mexico would take place. British press conduits pointedly drew the same lesson, thus confirming Mexico in its strategic blindness.

The Mexican statement, very close to Washington’s formulations on the issue, immediately raised voices of protest from representatives of other governments. In a clear reference to the Mexicans’ abstract defense of the principle of “non-intervention,” the Cuban Ambassador to the U.N., Raul Roa Kouri told the general assembly Jan. 14 that “it is not the right to sovereignty that needs to be discussed.” Cuba has and will always stand for such a right, he added. “But when in the name of that right one intends to justify evil imperialism...” we will never line up “on the side of the forces that imposed genocide on the people of Vietnam, the forces that invaded Mexico and grabbed half of their territory...”

Mexican press editorials and commentaries excused Mexico’s stance by again emphasizing that the principle of “non-intervention,” if applied against the Soviets now, might help later in case of a U.S. military move to take over Mexico’s oil.

Mexico’s susceptibility to manipulation in its new Security Council seat is magnified, in the view of observers, by the role of Foreign Minister Castañeda. Castañeda is a personal collaborator of Ervin Laszlo, the director of the United Nations Institute for Training and Research (UNITAR) and current coordinator of Jesuit-based efforts to create an antiscience, antitechnology version of a “new international economic order.” Castañeda was indoctrinated in such “one world” theories in over 20 years of diplomatic work among UNITAR-contaminated U.N. layers.