

The damage such a misrepresentation of U.S. official policy could inflict on the two presidents' meeting cannot be overemphasized.

Given its leading role in misinforming Mexicans on White House policies, USICA's involvement in an upcoming U.S.-Mexico media symposium should be closely watched. The meeting, sponsored by the American Committee of the International Press Institute, will take place May 17-20 in Washington, D.C., only two weeks before the Reagan-López Portillo meeting. USICA is funneling funds into the symposium and actively promoting it.

Although some of the participants may not be aware of it, all indications are that the meeting will discuss propagandizing minor disagreements between the two

countries, and turn them into causes célèbres.

From the Mexican side, one of the main speakers will be Andrés Rozental, director general for North American affairs in the foreign ministry. Rozental, Foreign Minister Castañeda's stepson, is widely known to be a major "official" source of leaks to both U.S. and Mexican radical journalists, and has been accused of having close ties with Israel's Mossad.

Also helping to promote this editors' meeting is former U.S. ambassador to Mexico John Jova's Meridian House, nominally a cultural exchange center based in Washington, D.C. Meridian is now helping to organize an international symposium on solar energy to take place in Philadelphia at the end of May, to which Mexican officials have been invited.

A scenario from the London Economist

The Economist of London, an outspoken and widely read outlet for British intelligence propaganda, devoted five pages to a major feature on Mexico in its April 18, 1981 issue.

From the outset it made clear London's hostility to a successful Reagan-López Portillo summit. Paragraphs of glib analysis portray cultural differences and historical grudges of overwhelming weight. The two neighbors are "ripe for misunderstanding," "Mexican history demands some psychological distance from its overpowering and wildly different Siamese twin. . . . This same reaction colors the whole familiar gamut of Mexico-United States relations: illegal immigrants, oil prices, prisoner exchanges, fishing rights, water, drug smuggling. Since it is a politically necessary reaction for the stability of Mexico, Washington's new-fangled attempts to 'improve' relations are self-defeating, a misreading of the Mexican mind."

After repeated calls for Mexico to get out of the business of heavy industry and into "decentralized industry" as "the answer to the deepening rural crisis," *The Economist* lays its cards on the table. "For all its 60 years of political stability, Mexico plainly has great problems—its extremes of rich and poor, its overcentralized political system, its long history of violence—which makes chaos a strong possibility, if

not a probability, over the next 20 years."

The Economist then helpfully provides a four-point manual on "different ways in which a revolution could start."

1) "**Urban violence.** Mexico's last revolution began among country peasants. The next one is likelier to spring up from the urban dispossessed. Mexico City, now with over 12 million people, the largest built-up sprawl in the world (as well as the most polluted and probably most chaotic), is a terrorists' seedbed. So far the occasional outbreaks of political violence have been contained," says the account. "But if bombings and kidnappings were to become a weapon of extreme left or extreme right they could rapidly grow out of control. One likely starting place is the 300,000-strong university in the heart of the city: an unwise concentration of political mercenaries."

2) "**The unthinking right,**" which "resent[s] the healthy explosion of a new middle class."

3) "**Sentimental Mexican expatriates,**" a favorite *Economist* phrase to refer to Mexican undocumented workers and Chicanos living in the United States. "Perhaps, like the Iranian students, they will start to rail against 'American imperialism' toward their homeland. . . . Perhaps they will demand that the human rights they enjoy north of the border should be forced upon a different system south of it."

4) "**A president who breaks the rules.**" "Great leeway is allowed to the president of Mexico during his six years in office." But what if, "say two-thirds of his way through his term," a president "went off the rails"? Then "the whole system would be in jeopardy." López Portillo just happens to be two-thirds of the way through his term. What does the *Economist* have in mind?