

state economic model touted by Milton Friedman's Mont Pelerin Society.

Other influential figures are supporting the dissidents from the "right" side of the destabilization. The mayor of Mexico City, Carlos Hank González, an ally of the Mexican drug-running oligarchy, has privately expressed his support for the dissidents. Sánchez Vite is known to be close to the mayor as well.

'Indigenist' demands

A top-level group of anthropologists, environmentalists, terrorist controllers and radical priests gathered this week in Rotterdam, Holland, for the "Fourth Russell Tribunal," where they will judge cases of alleged extermination of Indian communities in the United States and Latin America. According to the Mexican radical mouthpiece, *Uno Mas Uno*, the Tribunal will examine approximately 30 cases of "ethnocide," three of them supposedly perpetrated against Mexican Indian groups.

The Tribunal has become a rallying point for those Mexican radical circles the *EIR* has identified as a key component in a script to ignite an Iran-style rampage against modernization using impoverished and brutalized Indian populations as their cannon fodder.

In a preparatory conference on what is called "indigenism" in Merida, Mexico, last week, Guillermo Bonfil Batalla, a guru of Mexican anthropologist networks and a member of the Russell Tribunal's jury, issued the call to battle.

Bonfil called for separate states in Mexico's federal system for each different ethnic group. He also clearly identified on what grounds he and his cothinkers charge human-rights violations of the Indian communities: "the advance of [modern] cattle-raising in Indian lands, of agroindustries and of oil development."

Huasteca: a case study

Sources close to Bonfil state that one of the cases of alleged human-rights violations he will take with him to Rotterdam concerns the Indians of the Huasteca region in Hidalgo state, north and east of Mexico City. That area is the site of a showcase oil development project called Chicontepec, which will feature extensive cattle-raising, irrigation and agroindustrial projects as an integral part of the oil exploitation efforts.

Working closely with Bonfil in preparing "Indian versus oil" clashes in the Huasteca region are two veterans of previous efforts to hobble the oil development, Heberto Castillo and José Alvarez Icaza.

Castillo, founder of the radical-environmentalist Mexican Workers Party, is a celebrity of the interna-

tional zero-growth environmentalist circuit and has received particularly favorable coverage in the *New York Times*. Alvarez Icaza, head of a Jesuit "information center" specializing in human rights, CENCOS, will attend the Russell Tribunal in Rotterdam to give a "first-hand report" on the Hidalgo case. According to well-informed sources, he is traveling with all expenses paid by the Jesuit University of Louvain in Belgium.

The Russell Tribunal

Now that these radical networks have laid the groundwork for an Iran-style rampage against the modernization efforts, the Russell Tribunal is prepared to provide them with a higher level of international capabilities and experience.

In the case of Iran, the same Tribunal took advantage of the regime's repressive acts to build up international investigations whose only purpose was to provide credibility for Khomeini.

One of these veterans of the Iranian destabilization, Noam Chomsky, professor of linguistics in the Massachusetts Institute of Technology and a key controller of terrorist groups in the U.S., is now being promoted as a "star" in the Tribunal's advisory group.

The main target: the state

These radical circles are determined to stop any effort to bring progress to the backward areas where Mexico's four to six million Indians live. They have said in so many words that the modern national state is their most important enemy. In his speech in the Merida meeting, Bonfil Batalla called on his radical fellows to dismantle the Mexican federal state to form a Yugoslavi-style union of backward ethnic entities. "A Mayan or a Yaqui state would be more legitimate" than some existing Mexican states, said Bonfil.

The "indigenista" script closely follows the war games of Princeton professor Bernard Lewis, whose formulas for "balkanizing" the Middle East into ethnic entities and dismantling nations like Iran guided the destabilization of that country.

In statements to a Mexican journalist this week, Shelton Davis, director of the Boston-based Anthropology Resource Center and a member of the Russell Tribunal advisory council, laid out a parallel scenario to build up confrontations between Latin American governments and Indian groups. The nation-state, he charged, is "inherently" opposed to the Indians' survival since it will "always try to integrate them into the national way of life." Davis said that Indian communities in Latin America and the United States should be administered by international laws and institutions that would supersede national sovereignty.

The past and future of Aztec primitivism

The December 1980 issue of National Geographic contains perhaps the most extensive justification of Aztec cannibalism and human sacrifice since the painter Diego Rivera's autobiographical revelations that he and his circle had regularly cooked and eaten corpses from the Mexican morgue in celebration of primitivism. Excerpts follow from Associate Editor Bart McDowell's article, titled "The Aztecs."

I began to like the Aztecs—to feel a kind of friendship—the day the sorceress kissed my hand.

Respect was another matter: Who has not felt an awe for Aztec achievements? They mastered millions of people and a domain 200 leagues across. Yet, as we read about the endless Aztec wars, the human sacrifice, the ritual cannibalism, who has not felt a queasy revulsion?

"But they also had a gentle side," my old friend architect Hector Hinojosa always argued. "You can't understand modern Mexicans without seeing that. The Aztec farmers were patient, hard-working people—close to the soil. Their descendants are the kindest people you can imagine." . . .

In old Aztec tradition, the ideal sorcerer was described as "wise . . . a counselor, a person of trust . . . keen, careful, helpful; never harms anyone." Even the Spanish missionaries wrote respectfully of Aztec priests: "None . . . were proud; none . . . unruly . . . a pure life . . . None then told lies . . . very devout."

Doña Rufi stood in this kindly tradition. She prayed to a god who was nourished by the blood of children, yet she herself fanned stillborn babies into life. Good people, bad gods: I was learning about the Aztecs.

So are others these days. Along with the surging self-confidence brought by oil discoveries, Mexicans generally are exploring their sense of self, their cultural and political origins. . . . Aztec customs, ceremonies and outlook [are] very much alive. . . .

After sacrificing and skinning the daughter of a Calhua ruler in the valley, the devout Aztecs were driven into the swamps of Lake Texcoco. . . . Dedicating their Great Temple in 1487, they sacrificed between 10,600 and 80,400 people, depending on different sources; at least we know that the ritual killings continued without pause, four at a time, from sunup to sundown for four days. The whole city stank.

Grisly business. But also surrealistically humane. One

scholar has said that the Aztecs were "amateurs at human sacrifice since they had no concept of torture." At the foot of the temple, priests even prayed for the victim. . . .

Afterward, noted chronicler Sahagun, the priests "cooked each one a bowl of a stew of dried maize, called *tlacatlaolli*, which they set before each, and in each was a piece of the flesh of the captive." The feast was itself a sacrament, a means of participating in the divine grace of the victim. . . . Their regard for the human body was entirely respectful. . . ."

The following excerpts from the keynote speech of leading Mexican anthropologist Guillermo Bonfil at the Eighth Interamerican Indigenist Conference are translated from the Nov. 21 edition of Uno Mas Uno.

The advance of cattle ranching, agro-industry, and oil production onto Indian lands as an expression of the dominant interests, in collusion with other privileged sectors of the population, is one of those mistaken policies leading toward a situation from which there is no turning back. . . .

It is evident that the Indians are living under abominable conditions, many of which have existed for 500 years. When you look at a history which since the colonial period is filled with a chain of rebellions, however, it becomes evident that the Indians have not been passive; their resistance has often been violent. This has been unimportant, since during all these years it was difficult for a rebellion in one village to bring about anything more than a massacre, period. But today things are different.

The question of how the state has fomented this violence is a profoundly important problem. Since the time of independence, Mexican rulers have tried to build a state on a model out of correspondence with the real society. They have used a model which implies a homogeneous society, a single language, a single behavioral norm. This has resulted in the policy of trying to incorporate the Indian by force.

Which would be more legitimate? the existence of a state like Colima [a small state west of Mexico City] or of a Mayan state? That is, on a historical basis, a Mayan or Yaqui state would be much more important, much more legitimate, because the present division into states and townships is a politically and administratively arbitrary division, born in the internal conditions of colonialism and political struggles.

In summary, a system of ethnic representation by peoples who could possess well-defined territories would be much more legitimate than the present political division. A fine example is Yugoslavia. . . . Mexico must grant official status to the indigenous languages.