

Kissinger-Haig policy on Mexico fed to conservatives

Mexico's stated commitment to use its vast oil reserves, probably surpassing those of Saudi Arabia, to finance rapid industrialization, has prompted tremendous interest in U.S.-Mexico relations. The policy proposals which have appeared from U.S. sources in recent months, whether "liberal" or "conservative," pro- or anti-Administration, have shared the same basic concerns: how to assure U.S. control over Mexican oil, and prevent Mexico from developing as an advanced industrial "Japan south of the border," in the words of National Security Council chief Zbigniew Brzezinski.

The "conservative Republican" version of this U.S. policy toward Mexico was formulated with great fanfare last week, in two days of briefings to some 55 to 60 congressmen and top military officers provided by the Council for Interamerican Security. The council is a Washington, D.C.-based think-tank and lobby closely tied to Henry Kissinger and his protégé General Alexander Haig and spawned out of Kissinger's current base, the Georgetown University Center for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS). The conservatives attending the CIS festivity were treated to a heavy dose of British geopolitics: Mexico may become a "new Vietnam" threatening the U.S.'s southern border.

According to the Council's prospectus for its "Mexico 2000" project, a "new Mexican Revolution would spill over into the U.S. There have been repeated allegations of Soviet-Cuban plans to move terrorists across the porous U.S.-Mexican border, secreting them into the Southwest's ever-growing pool of U.S. 'Chicano' population."

"Mexico 2000" project director Lt. Gen. (ret.) Gordon Sumner—who resigned his post as head of the Interamerican Defense Board last year to run the CIS campaign against the Administration's Panama Canal Treaty—declared that "the Soviets want nothing better than to create a hostile border," and proposed that Mexico and the U.S. seek "joint formulas to facilitate the increase of security along the border," according to the Mexico City daily *Excelsior* March 14. Sumner backed up his allegations of the "weak southern flank" with the revelation that the "threat of revolution" in Mexico in 1976 was a focus of great concern by the U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff.

The Mexican press has already reacted with vehemence to the Sumner "red scare." Both the dailies *Excelsior* and *Uno Mas Uno* ran major exposés of the Council's policy push in the form of interviews with Gen. Sumner.

Although the Council's policy prospectus gives lip service to Mexico's need to develop, the substance of its economic policy proposals is no different from the World Bank, an anti-industry policy espoused by the Carter Administration itself.

Mexico, maintains the Council, needs to focus on agriculture to provide food and jobs for its population or face an explosion of the "population time bomb." Never mentioning development of the capital goods sector or industry generally, the "Mexico 2000" policy urges exploitation of mineral resources, fishing industry, and tourism.

Its treatment of the flow of undocumented workers to the U.S. is double-edged: clear is the threat to "seal off the border," setting off internal chaos and destabilizing "revolution" in Mexico, while the CIS attack on U.S. union (job) "protectionism" suggests an intent to use Mexican migrants as cheap labor to bust U.S. unions.

The "Mexico 2000" document is little different from the "liberal" policy line advocated by Edward Kennedy and Gov. Jerry Brown for a "North American Energy Common Market." The common market proposal, drafted by the investment research firm Blyth, Eastman Dillon and widely distributed to government and other officials, makes the same scarcely veiled threat of invasion of Mexico if that country fails to accede to U.S. policy dictates.

Haig Campaign Committee

In effect, the policy orientation toward Mexico—and by extension toward the Third World in general—pushed by the Council for Interamerican Security is a preview of the policy of an Alexander Haig presidency in the U.S.; the Council itself is functioning as a de facto campaign committee for Haig, organizing basically protechnology but gullible conservatives and Republican Party hopefuls around the need to protect U.S. national security. The Council's working basis is an undiluted

Kissinger-Haig geopolitical view of the world revolving around "Western irresolution" in meeting the "Soviet-Cuban" menace to the strategically vital Southern Hemisphere. Without naming it, the Council, citing Alexander Haig, poses the need for a South Atlantic Treaty Organization to guard "the exposed flank of the NATO Alliance ... Africa and South America, the allies' Southern Flank." Haig's name, in fact, was mentioned favorably throughout the two day briefing session, according to insiders' reports. Mexico 2000 project director Sumner is reliably reported to have admiringly dubbed Haig the "South African candidate."

The Council's directors and advisors include well-known Kissinger collaborators such as Georgetown CSIS Latin American Director Roger Fontaine, author of the 1977 Rockefeller Commission on Critical Choices report on Latin America; Lt. Gen. Daniel Graham, formerly of the Defense Intelligence Agency and best-known for his role in Brzezinski-Kissinger Mideast war games; and Georgetown-linked Rep. Robert Bauman, who took over presidency of the American Conservative Union in February.

—Mary Goldstein

The council talks about itself

Following are excerpts from a brochure distributed by the Council for Interamerican Security.

"Danger on our southern flank"

"... Organized in 1976, the Council grew out of the recognition that the global character of political and military competition between the Communist bloc and the Free World has entered a new phase ... perhaps a turning point.

"Strategic, political geography is rapidly changing. The growing Soviet military advantage is increasingly in evidence in parts of the world which were until recently beyond the reach of the USSR. This Soviet advantage is a prelude to Communist political gains in many parts of our globe. In the Southern Hemisphere, NATO's unprotected flank, a new and protracted conflict is being fought for ultimate world hegemony.

"General Alexander Haig, U.S. Commander of NATO, warned in early 1978 that the Soviets are not likely to militarily challenge NATO in Europe any time soon. Instead, their challenge is visible 'on the periphery as the Soviet Union exploits targets of opportunity'.

"A close look at Africa and our South Atlantic basin reveals three important geo-political objectives for the Cuban-Soviet Axis: 1) control of oil routes, 2) domination of the mineral wealth of the African subcontinent, 3) military and political penetration of South America. These are the objectives of Communist hegemony in the Southern Hemisphere. This is what CIS seeks to thwart.

"If successful, this Soviet-Cuban initiative will

change the face of international politics for the rest of the century. The Soviet Union realizes that the greatest potential weakness of the industrial West is our near insatiable demand for raw materials, particularly oil and rare metals not found in the Northern Hemisphere.

Lifelines of the West

The very lifelines of the Western economy are the sea lanes connecting Africa and the South Atlantic trade routes ...

"By controlling the Horn of Africa or the port and fueling facilities along the African coast, in Mozambique, Angola and Southwest Africa, the Soviet-Cuban alliance could pressure Western oil supply routes. The axis would seek to control the course of sea traffic from the Caribbean to the South Atlantic. Meanwhile, Soviet strategic power in the Caribbean, in the form of a submarine or missile force, could effectively neutralize the United States to the north; thereby creating a protective nuclear shield or buffer for Cuban guerrilla and terrorist activities to the south, along the West African and South American coasts, and in central America.

"And what of Mexico's oil? Vast Mexican petroleum reserves could be the Free World's energy 'ace'. Unstable Iran and feudal Saudi Arabia are already prime strategic targets for the USSR. The problematic future of Mexico is the concern of a CIS Task Force headed by Gen. Gordon Sumner ...

"CIS has two objectives:

* Halt the unilateral disarmament of the United States.

* Forge a new cooperative alliance between responsible anti-Communist people and governments from Canada to Argentina that will protect the U.S. Southern Flank.

"CIS activities throughout the United States and the Americas defend our vital security and counteract the anti-defense and pro-Marxist lobby in Washington.