

tries started passing laws that banned all export of antique objects, and well before the era when documentation was provided or expected." Most artifacts, dealers claim, have little scientific value. (Archaeologists, however, say that is true only if the artifacts are removed from their original sites.)

The United States, virtually alone among art "consumer" nations, ratified a 1970 UNESCO convention, subsequently enacting the 1983 Cultural Property and Implementation Act. It also agreed with

Mexico to ban almost all imports of pre-Columbian artifacts. Even so, the destruction of archaeological sites in Latin America continues, as the trade, according to dealers, simply moved overseas.

Some specialists think the 1995 accord, if ratified by enough key countries, could drive the trade in undocumented objects underground. Schwartz, however, believes that tougher regulation might well prompt both dealers and buyers to behave a little more ethically.

OTHER NATIONS

The Americanization of Mexico

A Survey of Recent Articles

There is a growing division in Mexican society, and it is not along the usual regional, class, or ideological lines, reports Jorge G. Castañeda, a political scientist at the National Autonomous University of Mexico. The split, he writes in *Foreign Affairs* (July–Aug. 1996), is between the expanding minority of Mexicans—perhaps one-fifth to one-fourth of the country's 95 million people—who are "plugged into the U.S. economy" and the majority who are not. "It has become the most significant rift in Mexico's society," he believes.

The millions of migrant workers "who toil in the fields, valleys, and sweatshops of California and Florida and the restaurants and flower shops of New York and Chicago" are on the U.S. side of this divide, he notes, and more than 10 million Mexicans live directly off the nearly \$4 billion these workers send home every year. Then there are the Mexican businesspeople, workers, accountants, and lawyers involved in the rapidly growing export sector. The *maquiladoras* (border factories) employ more than 600,000 Mexicans, and the automobile industry more than 500,000. Other export industries—steel, garments, cement, mining, and glass—are thriving, too. The tourism industry employs an additional 600,000 Mexicans. And countless other Mexicans have various other ties to the U.S. economy.

Enough Mexicans are benefiting from American ties, and enough others are hoping, "however unrealistically," to benefit, Castañeda says, to make a second Mexican

revolution (the first occurred in 1910) virtually impossible. These fortunate Mexicans, he believes, are becoming "isolated from much of their country's economic tribulations and relatively complacent about its political travails."

Nora Lustig, author of *Mexico: The Remaking of an Economy* (1993), writing in the *Brookings Review* (Spring 1996), is more sanguine. Since the peso's collapse in December 1994 plunged the country into crisis, the economy has stabilized and even recovered somewhat, she observes. The forecasts for this year are for a modest growth in output of two to three percent. President Ernesto Zedillo "has repeatedly stated, and taken initial steps on, his commitment" to encourage a separation between the government and the long-ruling Institutional Revolutionary Party (PRI), turn more power over to state and local governments, and strengthen the traditionally weak congress and courts. He appointed a member of the main opposition party as attorney general. Zedillo also has indicated he intends to break with tradition and not handpick his successor. Mexico's congress is discussing political reform.

"I think the emergence of civil society in Mexico has been the driving force" behind the push toward democratization, Peter M. Ward, director of the Institute of Latin American Studies at the University of Texas at Austin, told journalist Suzanne Billelo.

The 1985 earthquake in Mexico City, which toppled hundreds of buildings and

crushed or buried more than 10,000 people, proved “a watershed for civil society,” Bilello writes in *Current History* (Feb. 1996). The disaster overwhelmed the government. In the aftermath of the quake, many neighborhood associations, environmental and human rights organizations, and “good government” groups sprang up.

The emergence of “ever more independent voices, pressure groups, and grass-roots organizations,” according to Daniel Franklin, Washington bureau chief for the *Economist* (Oct. 28, 1995) is “one of the most significant things happening in Mexico today.” It has received added impetus, he says, from the anger of the majority of Mexicans who are neither the extremely wealthy (“usually white and living behind guarded walls”) nor the extremely poor (“people with next to nothing, mostly rural and Indian”). The Mexicans in the middle, he says, “aspire to the sorts of things middle-class people want everywhere: safe streets, clean air, a decent education for their children, a chance to get ahead.” But they are not well-off, their incomes have fallen in the last 15 years, and they are seething with anger at the government.

“Mexicans are becoming increasingly

intolerant of the abuses of one-party rule,” Franklin writes. “They are insulted by the electoral fraud and indignant about the repeated crises. In particular, they are fed up with the pervasive corruption which they think lies behind much of Mexico’s current mess.”

Recent Mexican presidents, most notably Carlos Salinas (now living in self-exile, under a cloud of suspicion of having been involved in various shady dealings), have been technocrats favoring economic reform without political change. “This will no longer do: the one-party edifice is crumbling at the foundation,” Franklin says.

Mexico is indeed becoming more like the United States, he believes, and, without losing its “Mexicanness,” it must keep on doing so—by proceeding along the path of reform. “In economics, it means keeping faith with the market and, through [the North American Free Trade Agreement], integrating more closely with America. . . . In politics, it means reform leading to full democracy and to a Mexican constitution that begins to work in practice more like the American one it resembles on paper.”

The Ulster Obstacle

“. . . And Ulster Will Be Right,” by Peregrine Worsthorne, in *The National Interest* (Summer 1996), 1112 16th St. N.W., Ste. 540, Washington, D.C. 20036.

Whether peace comes to Northern Ireland, many people seem to think, is up to the Irish Republican Army (IRA) and the British government. Not so, argues Worsthorne, a columnist for the *Sunday Telegraph* (London). It is mainly up to Ulster’s Protestants. “IRA terrorism gets all the publicity,” he points out, “which makes it seem as if Southern Irish nationalism is the irresistible force and Ulster nationalism the moveable object.” The reverse, he says, is nearer the truth.

For the Protestant majority in Northern Ireland, Worsthorne says, “the thought of being governed by the Republic of Ireland is more than flesh and blood can be expected to bear.” This state of mind is deeply rooted, he says, going back to the royal establishment in 1609 of a self-consciously Protestant settlement in Ulster whose loyalty could be relied upon if the Catholic powers of France and Spain tried to use Ireland to force Britain back into the arms of Rome. Eighty-one years

later, the Catholic powers did try to use Ulster as a base, helping Britain’s deposed Catholic king James II to land an army there—but the Ulster Protestants heroically held his forces at bay for more than 100 days, until the fleet of Britain’s new king, William III, arrived. “Many nationalisms rest on less glorious folk memories than those of Protestant Ulster,” Worsthorne observes.

Unification would suddenly introduce into the Republic of Ireland, which today is “a happy, tranquil society, at ease with itself as it has never been before,” one million “alien and hostile” Ulstermen, Worsthorne points out. “The only result of pacifying the IRA, by giving them a united Ireland, would be to produce an Ulster National Army which would bomb Dublin and Cork instead of—as is the IRA’s way—Belfast, Londonderry, Birmingham, and London,” he argues.

Most Irish have abandoned the cause of a united Ireland, Worsthorne says, and do not