
REVIEW ESSAYS

CONTINUITY AND CHANGE IN MEXICO

Judith Adler Hellman
York University, Toronto

- MEXICO'S POLITICAL STABILITY: THE NEXT FIVE YEARS.* Edited by RODERIC A. CAMP. (Boulder: Westview Press, 1986. Pp. 279. \$26.50.)
- MEXICO: CLASS FORMATION, CAPITAL ACCUMULATION, AND THE STATE.* By JAMES D. COCKCROFT. (New York: Monthly Review Press, 1983. Pp. 384. \$12.50.)
- MEXICAN OIL AND DEPENDENT DEVELOPMENT.* By JUDITH GENTLEMAN. (New York: Peter Lang, 1984. Pp. 260. \$29.00.)
- MEXICO ANTE LA CRISIS.* Volumes 1 and 2. Edited by PABLO GONZALEZ CASANOVA and HECTOR AGUILAR CAMIN. (Mexico City: Siglo Veintiuno Editores, 1985. Pp. 435 and 425.)
- MEXICO: DEVELOPMENT STRATEGIES FOR THE FUTURE.* By DENIS GOULET. (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1983. Pp. 191. \$16.95 cloth, \$8.95 paper.)
- ECONOMIC POLICYMAKING IN MEXICO: FACTORS UNDERLYING THE 1982 CRISIS.* By ROBERT E. LOONEY. (Durham: Duke University Press, 1985. Pp. 309. \$37.50.)
- MODERN MEXICO: STATE, ECONOMY, AND SOCIAL CONFLICT.* Edited by NORA HAMILTON and TIMOTHY F. HARDING. (Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, 1986. Pp. 312. \$19.95 paper.)
- POLITICS IN MEXICO.* Edited by GEORGE PHILIP. (London: Croom Helm, 1985. Pp. 223. \$27.50.)

Increasingly, the term *docena trágica* is being used to denote the twelve-year period covering the presidencies of Luis Echeverría (1970–1976) and José López Portillo (1976–1982). This usage suggests that some analysts of Mexican political life view the period as distinct—set apart from the overall strategies and trends that marked Mexican development after 1940 and presumably different too from what observers currently witness in the de la Madrid administration and what they can expect to see in the regime to come.

To be sure, the notion of a “tragic twelve years” has considerable appeal because it implies that it is possible to identify a beginning, middle, and end to the horrendous problems afflicting Mexico and Mexicans during that period: the fall of the peso; declines in the terms of trade, export earnings, real wages, and food production; runaway corruption, hyperinflation, and ever increasing indebtedness. To give a label to those years is similar to drawing a heavy line on a bowling score sheet after missing several spares in a row: it neatly “fences off” the run of disastrous frames from the frames to follow.

Appealing as one may find the idea that the crisis-plagued years under Echeverría and López Portillo represent a special and essentially aberrant period in Mexican history, most of the studies under review suggest otherwise. They indicate that the problems confronting Mexicans in this epoch grew out of earlier contradictions in the development model and that most of these same factors are likely to persist in shaping Mexican politics and society in the future.

This interpretation should not imply that nothing has changed in the last two decades or that the Mexican system is static. On the contrary, the analyses offered by these authors highlight a number of significant changes that have altered Mexican political, social, and economic life during the last three regimes. The analytical challenge confronting scholars is to figure out which developments represent new tendencies, and therefore open new possibilities for fundamental change, and which are better understood as a continuation of long-term trends.

Discerning what is genuinely new in the Mexican system has always been made more difficult by official party rhetoric, which is designed to dress up small adjustments, minimalist reforms, and palliatives as major policy breakthroughs. As every Mexico-watcher knows, many Mexican events that are officially touted as “new” are anything but that. Typical of such “innovations” are the “moral renovation” campaigns that have so often characterized the opening months of presidential regimes. Thus familiarity with the language and style of Mexican politics makes it possible to identify obfuscatory slogans or grand new policy pronouncements that really constitute only “refried” versions of earlier, unsuccessful government programs. But the slow pace

and subtlety of the process of change in the Mexican system is such that it is often difficult to appreciate when some fundamental alteration *has*, in fact, occurred.

An example illustrating this point is the problem of capital flight under Echeverría and López Portillo. It has long been clear that the patriotism of the postrevolutionary Mexican bourgeoisie has always been tempered, to say the least, by their preoccupation with their short-term economic interests. During the Echeverría and López Portillo regimes, however, the self-serving behavior of Mexican capitalists crossed a new threshold. At this point, capital flight—always a factor to be considered in any discussion of the Mexican economy—became the central question around which the survival of the system revolved. According to one source, the amount of capital shipped out of Mexico during this period by a nervous and disaffected domestic bourgeoisie “was approaching the face value of that country’s total external debt.”¹

The possibility that incremental quantitative changes can have qualitative effects should be obvious to anyone who has had occasion to inhale a lungful of air in Mexico City during the last twenty-five years. Several of the transformations that these studies highlight—such as the expatriation of Mexican investment capital or the suppression of real wages—are changes of this kind. They are long-term features of the Mexican system that have now reached proportions that give them a new quality. Like the poisoned atmosphere of the Valle de México, these transformations have occurred so gradually as to be almost imperceptible until they reach critical levels dramatic enough to produce an international debt, political legitimacy, or public health crisis.

With a number of these processes, it becomes clear that one can sometimes invert the old cliché by asserting that the more things stay the same, the more they change. Not only can capital flight or wage suppression attain catastrophic dimensions at some critical point, but traditional political practices like electoral fraud may take on a new quality when computer technology is put to the service of vote switching and ballot-box stuffing. But while these examples suggest that some incremental shifts have given rise to genuinely novel phenomena, most of the features of the Mexican economic, political, and social system that have been heralded as new turn out on closer inspection to be recent elaborations or further developments of mechanisms in place since the emergence of the modern Mexican state.

Continuities

In this light, readers can appreciate the contribution of James Cockcroft’s *Mexico: Class Formation, Capital Accumulation, and the State*. Written in the 1970s and early 1980s, Cockcroft’s introduction to mod-

ern Mexico seeks to uncover the historical roots of the present crisis in the process of class struggle, capital accumulation, and the development of the modern technocratic-authoritarian state. Beginning with pre-Columbian Mexican society and its transformation under the impact of the conquest and colonial rule, the author traces the process of state and class formation through the struggle for independence and the Porfiriato. He concludes the first part of the book with an account of the Revolution and the consolidation of the modern state and capitalist class during the social upheavals of the 1930s.

The second section begins with what Cockcroft characterizes as the development of monopoly capitalism after 1940 and the peculiar class structure to which the Mexican form of development gives rise. Here he emphasizes the way in which both have been affected by state policies and the impact of U.S. investments and cultural influences. The heart of the study is the sixth chapter, "Classes and the State," where Cockcroft assembles the pieces of the historical puzzle to construct a model of social classes in relation to one another and to the state that enables him to account for a wide variety of contemporary phenomena. These developments, which are often described as "new" in other studies, include the proletarianization of the peasantry and sectors of the petty bourgeoisie, the "repeasantization" of rural wage workers and urban migrants, the immiseration of the poor everywhere (but particularly among indigenous groups), and the increasing polarization of social classes. Cockcroft also establishes the links between the rural bourgeoisie and the urban capitalist class, and between these two classes and foreign (particularly U.S.) capital. One of the most interesting, if not the most successful, aspects of this analysis is the author's effort to account for the ways that the processes of class formation and capitalist development affect the "middle sectors" and women. In dealing with social categories that are largely ignored in classical Marxist theory, Cockcroft is sometimes at a loss to work these groups into his broader framework. But his study is richer for his having attempted to incorporate these people into his analysis.

Like Cockcroft's book, the collection edited by Nora Hamilton and Timothy Harding, *Modern Mexico: State, Economy, and Social Conflict*, leaves little doubt that for Marxist analysts, the crisis of the modern Mexican state and economy represents less a new set of developments than the most recent manifestations of processes that can be traced back not just to 1940 or the Cárdenas years or even to the Revolution but to the nineteenth century and earlier. *Modern Mexico* consists of eleven of the thirty-eight articles on Mexico that appeared in *Latin American Perspectives* during its first ten years of publication. Many of the articles, authors, and debates covered will be familiar to readers of this journal. For example, the collection features historical analyses of

the development of the Mexican state by Juan Felipe Leal, Nora Hamilton, and James Cockcroft. The questions of state autonomy and ideological hegemony are taken up by Hamilton for the Cárdenas period and by Mary Kay Vaughan from the Porfiriato to the postrevolutionary period. David Barkan and Gustavo Esteva contribute articles on the economic performance of the Mexican economy in relation to the question of social peace, while Raúl Trejo Delarbre and Barry Carr write on organized labor. The central debates on the agrarian question are treated in Rodolfo Stavenhagen's classic essay on the collective *ejido* and Roger Bartra's research on the persistence of the peasantry under capitalism.

Similar to the *Latin American Perspectives* collection in breadth of coverage and the kinds of questions explored, but far more up-to-date, are the two volumes edited by Pablo González Casanova and Héctor Aguilar Camín. Divided into four sections, *México ante la crisis* contains forty-two articles by Mexican analysts who represent a range of "different theoretical perspectives and ideologies" and include many of the most articulate critics of official policy to emerge since 1968. Most of the authors will be familiar to readers of periodicals like *Unomásuno*, *Nexos*, and *Proceso*.

The first section of *México ante la crisis* sets the Mexican debt within the context of the crisis of the world capitalist system. The authors in this section deal with the global dimensions of the crisis, the changing roles of the United States and Mexico in inter-American relations, and Mexican foreign policy, particularly with respect to Central America. The second half of the first volume provides an overview of the economic crisis as well as studies isolating various aspects of the crisis: inflation, the decline in industrial production, the fall in food production, and the decline in oil prices.

The second volume is comprised of analyses of the social consequences of the economic crisis, including the impact of the debt on print and electronic media, the crime rate, the environment, and social spending for education, health services, and technological research. A particularly interesting article by Alicia Ziccardi explores the effect of the crisis on the formulation of state policy designed to cope with the problems engendered by the exponential growth of Mexico City. Along with discussing shortfalls in housing, transport, and the delivery of social services, Ziccardi outlines the limitations of the response of the parties of the left to the crisis of urban Mexico.

The collection closes, predictably enough, with a section devoted to the political consequences of the economic crisis. These articles focus on the response of organized labor, peasant movements, the church, and the middle classes. The formal proposals of right and left opposition parties are also presented. González Casanova concludes the sec-

tion on alternatives with an essay entitled "Prólogo a la crisis futura." In this piece, he underscores the degree to which the economic crisis has undermined Mexican autonomy vis-à-vis the United States, not only subjecting Mexico to IMF-imposed restrictions on policy options but depriving the country of the possibility of pursuing a nationalistic development policy or a dignified and independent line in Central America. González Casanova's closing words, which are more poignant for having been written less than a month before the catastrophic earthquake of September 1985, depict the confusion and ineptitude that prevailed as the de la Madrid administration attempted to formulate policy to deal with the debt crisis. The overall picture that emerges from the concluding essay and the collection as a whole is one of a dramatic decline in the capacity of Mexicans to control their fate, at the level of either the state or civil society.

Politics in Mexico, a collection edited by George Philip, consists of papers presented at a conference entitled "Mexico 1984," held at the Institute of Latin American Studies of the University of London. While roughly half of the articles were written by British and Mexican academics, the book is also enlivened by the contributions of William Chislett, Mexican correspondent to the *Financial Times* of London, John Rettie of the BBC, and Norman Cox, former British ambassador to Mexico. The broad range of topics addressed includes articles on most of the issues covered in *México ante la crisis* and in Roderic Camp's collection. Chislett writes on the financial crisis, Philip on the effects of the austerity program, and Diane Stewart on the nationalization of the banks. Cox focuses on changes in the political system and Antonio Juárez on the parties and formations of the left, while Mexico's foreign relations are examined in articles by Román Gío Argáez, Rettie, and David Walker. In addition, John Heath contributes an essay on food policy, and Lourdes Arizpe discusses agrarian issues.

Unfortunately, the editor's role appears to have been limited to collecting the conference papers and inducing the authors to revise them for publication. *Politics in Mexico* lacks an introductory essay and any explanation for the order in which the essays appear. The authors make no reference to the other contributions in the collection, and thus the reader must supply all the connections. Moreover, the conference's focus on 1984 led a number of authors to confine their perspectives to short-term, conjunctural analysis.

Despite these limitations and the uneven quality of the articles, *Politics in Mexico* is undoubtedly useful for anyone who closely follows events in Mexico. The essay by Lourdes Arizpe, which sets the problem of the state and "uneven agrarian development" into historical context, provides in a remarkably brief fourteen pages a wonderfully succinct synthesis of the central dilemmas of rural development. Arizpe's work

makes clear that most aspects of the current crisis in rural Mexico grow out of the pattern of development in place since the 1930s and 1940s.

Policy Studies

The other books under review, although different in many respects, share a basic policy orientation. To some degree, they all stress the new variables that have become part of the equation of Mexican development since 1970. But they also provide evidence of the essential continuity of the process of dependent capitalist development that has been occurring in Mexico.

Robert Looney, who has written more optimistically on long-term strategies and options for development in Mexico, has now produced *Economic Policymaking in Mexico: Factors Underlying the 1982 Crisis*. In this latest work, Looney rejects the notion that the current crisis should call into question the entire previous course of Mexican economic development. Instead, he portrays the present difficulties as “a cash flow problem more than a fundamental economic problem—a case of illiquidity rather than insolvency” (p. xvi). Based on quantitative analytic methods (a linear econometric model), Looney reexamines the monetary and fiscal policies of the Echeverría and López Portillo administrations. He attributes the difficulties they faced to the rapid increase in state participation in the economy as well as to the tendency to finance growth through external borrowing and a rapid increase in the internal money supply.

Looney proposes a series of alternate and short-run stabilization programs to alleviate the immediate crisis, and he constructs a macroeconomic model designed to meet the future planning needs of the Mexican economy. In this sense, *Economic Policymaking in Mexico* is directed toward Mexican policymakers. In addition, Looney poses his forecasting model as a “challenge to policymakers internationally, and especially in the United States . . . , to draw the proper lessons from the Mexican experience for strengthening the international economic system” (p. xvi).

Another policy-oriented study is Denis Goulet’s *Mexico: Development Strategies for the Future*. Writing in 1981 before the oil boom turned to bust, Goulet provides a wide-ranging exploration of alternative development strategies designed to maximize growth with redistribution, fulfill basic human needs and dignity, and preserve the environment, Mexico’s cultural heritage, and its national identity. The flavor of Goulet’s approach is nicely captured in the questions he poses at the beginning of the study: “What is genuine development and whom should it benefit? What incentive systems should Mexican society choose and how can the nation eliminate mass misery, social marginal-

ization, exploitation, and humiliating dependence on outside forces?" (pp. 27–28).

Juxtaposed with *México ante la crisis*, Goulet's book may easily depress the reader. Can it be only a few years ago that the central question for analysis was how Mexico's vast wealth could be productively invested to guarantee the greatest happiness for the greatest number of Mexicans?

Although events soon outran Goulet's analysis, the book is useful in two respects. The author provides interesting summaries of the thinking of a number of key Mexican intellectuals (Carlos Tello, Rolando Cordera, Leopoldo Solís, Rodolfo Stavenhagen, and Gustavo Esteva) who have been influential in setting the parameters of the debate on social policy in Mexico. In addition, Goulet's analysis reminds readers of the goals that long-term development strategies are supposed to achieve. This contribution is particularly significant at a time when it is difficult to think beyond the stopgap measures most appropriate for ameliorating the immediate crisis.

Although Judith Gentleman's account takes readers through the financial crisis of 1982, *Mexican Oil and Dependent Development*, like Goulet's book, reflects the fact that it was researched and written at a time when the problems confronting Mexican policymakers centered on how oil riches could be spent most appropriately. The study "was conceived as an opportunity to examine the impact that the condition of dependency would have upon Mexico's effort to develop its huge petroleum resources in the mid 1970s" (p. x). Gentleman asks whether the Mexican state's exploitation of petroleum resources could have opened the way for the pursuit of a more autonomous form of development or whether it inevitably tied the Mexican economy more tightly to the United States. In a thorough and useful discussion of the critical period under López Portillo, the author examines the impact of oil on expanding the role of the state, on the relative power and influence of national and foreign capital, and on the distribution of income, the social welfare of poor Mexicans, and class relations.

Not surprisingly, Gentleman concludes that what she has surveyed is "a failed development project" (p. x). She argues that, "Rather than constituting a harbinger of a new level of material well being for the mass of the population, the development of Mexico's petroleum resource signaled the opening of a new era of dependence for the nation" (pp. 231–32). Regrettably, Gentleman notes that "none of the goals set by the state were accomplished" (p. 229). "Despite enormous oil revenues, the state and private sector continued to adhere to standard development patterns. The process of industrial development continued to be dependent upon imports of technology and capital goods and reliant upon external financing. The external imbalance inherent in the

model was actually intensified by the oil boom, resulting in the choking of development" (pp. 229–30).

While Gentleman's assessment of the strategy for oil-led growth is not unexpected, she surprises the reader with a burst of candor rarely found anywhere in a policy-oriented study, let alone in the preface: "[T]he failure of the development project and the analysis presented here of that failure is not directly suggestive of a preferable development alternative" (p. x). What Gentleman rules out is the possibility that a "'socialist' model" might provide for "long term viability, self-directed development and essential political and human rights. . ." (p. x). What is odd about this statement is that at no point in the book does the author explore a socialist scenario. As a result, nothing in the 260 pages that follow supports this contention, and Gentleman's dismissal of an alternative socialist model ends up sounding gratuitous and puzzling.

U.S. policymakers are the intended first audience for the insights shared by the contributors to Roderic Camp's collection, *Mexico's Political Stability: The Next Five Years*. Funded by a grant from the U.S. Department of State, Camp was charged with the task of identifying the critical issues most likely to shape Mexican politics, economics, and society and to affect U.S.–Mexican relations through 1990. As the title suggests, the central concern of the authors, who met with U.S. State Department representatives to define and narrow the field of study, was Mexico's prospects for stability in the immediate future.

Significantly, the group managed to reduce the list of issues from seventeen to ten. Edward Williams writes on the military and U.S.–Mexican border relations, Daniel Levy on the implications of events in Central America and the political impact of the expansion of mass education and the media, William Glade on the economy, John Bailey on relations between the state and the private sector, Peter Smith on intellectuals, and both Bailey and Camp on the declining electoral fortunes of the Partido Revolucionario Institucional (PRI) and the rise of right-wing opposition. Once these topics were selected, each contributor was asked to propose possible scenarios for the next five years and beyond.

In formulating his projections, Bailey focuses on the growing strength of the right-wing opposition party, the Partido de Acción Nacional (PAN), the measurable decline in support for the PRI, and the movement for the reform of the official party. What is striking about this emphasis is that it suggests that with the surge of PAN strength in the state and local elections of 1983, electoral opposition has become a pivotal factor in the Mexican system. But at the same time, Bailey (as well as Smith and Camp) notes that the PAN, for all its new momentum, is no closer today to taking power through elections than it ever was. This party continues to draw its main base of support from the

peripheral regions of Mexico, still lacks a clear ideology, attracts few intellectuals into its leadership or ranks, and remains essentially an expression of opposition with no serious alternative program to propose.

Bailey's other indicators of political crisis—the PRI's difficulty in reforming itself, electoral abstentionism, and the expressed disaffection of the masses from the official party—are all aspects of a legitimacy crisis that was inherited from the epoch of discontent prior to 1968. They cannot be called new developments, although they may indicate a more aggravated and dangerous stage of a phenomenon that has been a long time in growing.

What is new, as Smith points out, is the complete alienation of intellectuals from the PRI and the emergence of opposition parties of the left as a home for disaffected intellectuals. While these parties are electorally weak and have limited access to the broader public, the development of Marxist discourse in Mexico has had an impact on the overall system by providing intellectuals with new conceptual tools for formulating alternative models. But the attraction of the new parties of the left for the most gifted Mexican thinkers is not matched by the attraction of these parties for voters. In effect, the left may have all the new ideas, but the right has almost all the opposition votes. Moreover, as Levy notes, while the left opposition has developed new, highly stimulating newspapers and magazines, these periodicals have only a small readership and thus are limited in their capacity to reach the mass of Mexicans.

What might also be appropriately labeled "new" is what Smith identifies as a change in the basis of recruitment into the political elite, along with a shift in the balance of power among elite actors from *políticos* to *técnicos*. As the basis of legitimacy has moved in the direction of a meritocracy, educational expertise has become more important than revolutionary political credentials or membership in revolutionary *camarillas* in determining who will rise in government circles.

As Levy points out, the political socialization process has shifted from institutions such as the PRI and the official unions toward television and other mass media that are overwhelmingly in private hands and largely outside government control. The socialization process has also shifted from state schools and universities to private educational institutions, foreign graduate training programs, and conservative think tanks modeled on North American research centers. Levy concludes that the "[t]raditional bases of legitimacy and stability are threatened by the extent to which modern means of political socialization lie with, and strengthen, both private and foreign interests" (p. 39).

For all the novelty of these developments, the discontinuity represented by these shifts should not be exaggerated. A meritocracy may have emerged, and theoretically, this trend should undermine a system

based on patronage awards. But in Mexico, the spoils of office are still distributed in much the same way as always. While a number of analysts have argued, as Smith does, that técnicos can develop the "requisite political skills," what this means in practice is that técnicos learn to play a political game in which personal loyalty, self-promotion, and the construction of a camarilla outweigh more rationalistic considerations in executing responsibility in public office. Furthermore, the class advantage of those who gain entry into higher education and the new importance of private and foreign educational training in ascending to high office does not obviate the need for camarilla building because membership in one of these groups remains the most effective way for those lacking personal fortunes to gain access to the new career ladders. When a técnico leads a camarilla, he may promote entrance and scholarship support for the members of his group in prestigious foreign graduate programs.

Thus educational attainment and the expertise it brings may now have become more important than in the past. But access to elite, specialized education is still determined both by social class and, in considerable measure, by a system of political favoritism. Moreover, although several contributors to *Mexico's Political Stability* argue that the new system is dangerous because the rise of ambitious middle-class Mexicans is thwarted by the decline in traditional patron-client relationships, this development may simply indicate that a new definition of *patronage* is needed. The "massification" of education, highlighted by Smith and Levy, to some extent reverses the trend toward exclusion of the middle classes by holding out hope to lower-middle-class individuals that they may find an avenue of entry into the state service after all.

Several phenomena discussed in these articles fall squarely into the category of long-standing features of the Mexican system that have become "new" as they have crossed a certain threshold. Among them I would include the breakdown of the unspoken contract between capital and the state with the bank nationalization of 1982, which is cited by Smith, and the movement of what Camp likes to call "private-sector refugees." Several contributors also point to the increasing role of U.S. media in Mexican life, a trend that threatens the distinctiveness of Mexican culture. This phenomenon also tends to create new tastes that, in turn, prompt mass changes in consumption patterns and diet. Linked to these changes are the displacement of the traditional production of beans and corn by luxury crops for the Mexican market and the general decline of agriculture to the point where it can no longer feed the Mexican population.

In addition to these changes, the authors note a new level of tolerance for corruption, a breakdown of social infrastructure, and a corresponding deterioration in social conditions manifested in crowd-

ing, pollution, and poverty on an unheard-of scale. Workers and peasants have progressively lost out over the last thirty years. But now, with spiraling inflation and peso devaluation coupled with IMF-imposed austerity programs, the prolonged and unrelenting nature of the squeeze on the poor means that the popular masses suffer in an altogether new way.

Of all of the issues—new or otherwise—raised by the contributors to this book, probably the most frightening is the question posed by Smith when he proposes his alternative scenarios. The most “plausible possibilities” he can imagine are three: a “reconstruction of the old-time alliances and political practices” (the compacts in place before 1982); a “genuine liberalization of the political system” involving an extension of the institutional reforms of the late 1970s and “an acceptance of meaningful challenges from both left and right”; or “a sharp increase in repression and a conservative alliance between technocrats and soldiers”—a “South Americanization” of Mexico that would make the country resemble the bureaucratic-authoritarian models of the Southern Cone (p. 114).

While Smith’s preference for a genuine liberalization is clear, he envisions this prospect as “the least congenial for present-day Washington.” It is also the alternative most likely to “increase the probability of friction with the U.S.” because it would involve the PRI in “an accommodation with (or cooptation of) intellectuals and other leftist groups” (pp. 114–15).

This way of framing the issue, I would submit, is genuinely new and clearly reflects the influence of Reaganism in limiting options in Latin America. When Smith poses his scenarios in terms of the amount of democracy the United States will “tolerate” in its neighbor, he points to a crucial difference in the context in which Mexican events have unfolded since 1980. But while Smith’s view may be an accurate portrayal of the attitudes that inform inter-American relations in present-day Washington, we may yet hope to see a post-Reagan shift toward a more enlightened understanding of U.S. interests. It may even be that after 1988, liberalization of the Mexican political system will come to be viewed in Washington—as it should in any country that claims to cherish democracy—as a happy prospect to be welcomed enthusiastically on both sides of the border.

NOTE

1. Joseph Foweraker, “The Debt Boomerang,” *In These Times*, 15–21 Oct. 1986, cited in Nate Laurie, “How Third World’s Debt Goes in Circles,” *Toronto Globe and Mail*, 27 Feb. 1987, p. 8.