
Lobbying as a way of influencing the decision making process in the United States on any issue is a recently discovered resource for the Mexican foreign policy towards that country. However, it is necessary to evaluate this instrument in its fair dimension. As the NAFTA case shows, the success of a policy which includes lobbying, depends on many factors. The most important one is to find allies within the United States that have enough legitimacy to exercise pressure on the political leadership and, at the same time, can identify their causes with the national interest of the United States.


The negotiation of NALCA was preceded by an intense labour cooperation program between Mexico and the United States, on the one hand, and Mexico and Canada, on the other. The Mexican negotiation of the parallel agreement was based on three premises: to not reopen NAFTA, to defend national sovereignty and to prevent parallel agreements transforming themselves into new forms of protectionism. These premises were respected, as the characteristics of the labour cooperation agreement show. This is an instrument that seeks to respond to the present needs and, a year past since it began, it seems it is fulfilling its objectives.
Carlos Rico Ferrat, *Particularities of the Mexico-United States border and its impact on the bilateral relation.*

The Mexico-United States border has its own characteristics and particularities that affect both the administration and the negotiation of the diverse issues of the border agenda, and contributes to define the composition of the bilateral relation. Inequalities between each side of the border, the asymmetry, followed with a larger and growing vinculation and integration on the border cities are some of these characteristics. Thus, the Mexican-United States bilateral relations are different from those of Latin-american countries, because they not only include national interest issues, but they must also include the border agenda. Moreover, the differences in political and judicial systems at each side of the border, the way in which they operate and the difficulties vinculated with the Mexican federal government need to identify, for each issue, its most appropriated counterpart or interlocutor, introduce additional elements of complication to a complex bilateral relation and constitute important challenges for the Mexican diplomatic practice.

Carlos González Gutiérrez, *Mexican immigrants organization in Los Angeles; the natives loyalty.*

Mexican immigrants in the United States keep in touch with their native regions. Loyalty towards their region is a natural organization mechanism that, as Los Angeles case shows, allows them to reaffirm their identity. Furthermore, the immigrant clubs, which are initiatives of the own Mexican community, have shown an important role in the defense of their own interests as well as in the development of their native towns. The Mexican government has contributed to consolidate these organizations and still can support them further. Its assistance can be the determinant factor in the Mexican foreign communities' success in defending their interests and stimulating their national feelings. This is the ideal moment to strengthen the rapprochement with Mexico since loyalty appears stronger among the first generation of immigrants.


There are 23 Mexicans sentenced to death in the United States, 8 of them in Texas. The help offered by the Mexican government to these compatriots, through the consulates, includes contact with them and their families, their lawyers,
governmental organizations that can help their cause, and others. The assistance given varies from executive clemency requests, judicial assistance during the process, economic assistance when it is necessary due to the condemned family's lack of resources, etc. The Mexican government carefully follows each of these cases, watches that all processes of law respect the United States judicial norms and, considering the generalized feeling in Mexican society against the death penalty, tries to avoid, within the permitted resources of the American jurisprudence, the execution of our compatriots.

Samuel Berkstein, *Order and disorder in the transformation of international society*.

The euphoria and the confidence that followed the end of the Cold War were soon replaced by frustration and anxiety. This is because the bipolar world order that followed the Second World War, despite of being so rigid, was predictable; the rules marked by the rivalry between powers were very evident. These rules have changed and, in many cases, disappeared. International order, after the end of the Cold War, is not predictable anymore. The post-bipolar order requires some functional prerequisites in order to avoid unnecessary tensions, instability and frustration: the recognition that international society is a creation by the States and for the States; that this society is, by nature, anarchic in the sense that it does not recognize supranational authorities; that it is based on international law, developed by and for sovereign entities, and others. The construction of a new stable, secure and durable international order, poses important challenges for all the countries. Mexican diplomacy will have to be able to face them.

L.M. Singhvi, *History of three cities*.

Between June 1992 and September 1993 three important world conferences that became a symbol of the world's worries and aspirations were celebrated: the Earth Meeting, in Rio de Janeiro; the Human Rights World Conference, in Vienna; and the World Religions Parliament Meeting, in Chicago. Each of these conferences had different results, the history of these three cities is different, although there is a notable coherence in shared worries, in human basic values. Although different, the history of each one of these three cities is, therefore, also the history of the three of them.
Antonio Dueñas, *Iran and the security in the Persian Gulf.*

The Islamic Iranian revolution changed the security schemes that had prevailed in the Persian Gulf. Among other actors, Saudi Arabia, the United States and the Soviet Union were forced to face the new situation. The Iran regime itself, when it saw its survival threatened, had to compromise the revolution's ideals in order to save the Islamic state. For Iran, the consequences of the Iran-Iraq war and, later, the Iraq invasion of Kuwait, threatens its pretensions to establish an Iran-lead peace in the Persian Gulf. All seems to indicate that pacific living in the region will demand more concessions from Iran.

José Trinidad García Cervantes, *Regional integration politics: the cases of the North American Free Trade Agreement and the Southern Common Market.*

Paradoxically, the international tendency towards globalization has consolidated the regional integration process. European integration through the European Union (EU) is a good example. The Southamerican integration effort through the Southern Common Market (SCM) is yet another. The comparison between SCM and the less ambitious mechanism of the North American Free Trade Agreement, can be useful for Mexico since an eventual union between both mechanisms would favor the Mexican diversification efforts. Furthermore, Mexico could play an important role as this union's intermediary.

Nils Castro, *Panama and the full implementation of the Canal Treaties.*

Panama is a Bolivarian, Caribbean, Centroamerican and consciously Latinamerican nation. It is also a north to south bridge in the American Continent, a link between the Pacific and the Atlantic Oceans. With the Canal Treaties, Panama recovered its territorial integrity and the dominion over its main natural resource: the strategic position that allows the country to make the interoceanic transit possible. The reduction of the foreign forces that stay in Panama is progressing according to the provision established in the Treaties. It is a good opportunity for Panama to transform military bases into industrial and commercial bases, in order to build a maritime-port center of world importance, as well as into superior teaching and research institutes; in short, a space of shared opportunities.
Interventions have always presumed pretensions of legality, there always have been arguments to justify them, even through novel forms as in the recent case of the so-called ‘‘Right to Intervene’’. However, intervention is expressly and universally outlawed. That is why countries such as Mexico have sponsored and defended the non-intervention doctrine, the same that has been recognized by the United Nations and by the International Court of Justice. In the presence of violations that the non-intervention-principle suffers, it is necessary to frame a definite judicial regime in order to enforce it. It will be also necessary to regiment judicial regulations for the very precise cases in which some intrusion could be tolerated, as in the case of the so-called ‘‘intervention for humanitarian reasons’’. The purposes, ways, controls, etc., of such an action must be grounded on an unquestionable judicial basis and the approval of the states.