

Those which are importers only, have attained high or medium levels of development, and have been able to adjust their growth to their energy needs.

And those which are not only exclusively importers but are also underdeveloped, and must therefore make enormous sacrifices, even where essential national projects are involved, to obtain the petroleum and petroleum derivatives they need.

From another point of view, it should also be remembered that the industrialized, market-economy countries absorb 60% of all the energy produced in the world. With less than one-fifth of the world's population, they consume two out of every three barrels of petroleum produced.

In that context, we might ask ourselves the following questions:

—How much longer will we be able to keep the world moving at its present rate with our available sources of energy? At what cost? To what end? And for whose benefit?

—How and when can we and must we find substitutes for our present sources of energy?

I prefer not to mention the ideological or political aspects which would add to the complexity of approaches to the problem. I want to speak only of the facts, to say things that have been said before—things that, in one way or another, everyone thinks or knows. I trust I will be saying nothing new. It would be grave indeed if at this point in the crisis there were still something new to be said.

Race against time

We must race against time to find new solutions before our present sources run out. Let us place a proper value on what we have, before we lose it.

An extravagant and wasteful use of petroleum has been made in the decades when its price was low; it was only when prices were raised in order to revalue this resource that efforts to develop alternate sources began. For the most part, it has been used as a fuel. That period will be branded with the stigma of folly, for having burned petroleum that could have been turned into foodstuffs and petrochemical products of prodigious benefit to the whole of mankind.

We have turned the petroleum industry into a gigantic mechanism for producing profits and tax revenue to meet urgent short-term needs.

We had forgotten the importance of the future, which, in recent years, has become a drastic present. What is in short supply becomes expensive. What, then, is the price of a commodity whose supply is running out? What is the price of that which no longer exists?

The countries that produce petroleum—a nonrenewable resource, and one that for many countries represents the sole resource provided them by nature—want to invest in ways that will permanently ensure their

'Oil isn't sugar,' Mexico tells Latin delegation

In the months preceding the formal presentation of the energy proposal at the UN, Mexico conducted one of its most intensive diplomatic efforts of the post-war era, soliciting suggestions, reactions and support for the conception. Among the nations declaring favorably were France, West Germany, Cuba, Saudi Arabia, Bulgaria and the Soviet Union.

Perhaps the region of Mexico's greatest diplomatic effort—and the region pledging greatest support as a bloc—was Latin America. In response to the Mexican efforts, the Latin American Energy Organization (OLADE) declared its support for "making energy the common responsibility of mankind" in the Declaration of San Jose, the document which emerged from the organization's June meeting in Costa Rica.

At the United Nations, Mexico's new ambassador, Porfirio Munoz Ledo, held extended discussions with the Latin American group in the weeks just prior to Lopez Portillo's arrival. Immediately after addressing the General Assembly, Lopez Portillo addressed the Latin American delegations. In the following excerpts

future. Now organized, they are for the first time successfully defending and revaluing a raw material. They attribute the escalation of prices to monetary and trade disorders and to the ensuing devaluation of foreign exchange, and refuse to discuss oil prices alone, outside the context of a complete new international order.

The industrialized countries feel they are being victimized by the petroleum-producing countries, whom they accuse of being responsible for inflation and recession; they collectively follow a system of circumstantial and therefore fleeting rationalization; they draft unilateral policies designed to reduce their dependence and consumerism, and they insist on discussing the price of crude oil exclusively without considering other questions of vital importance to all.

The poor countries—those without oil, dependent, coerced, and sometimes anguished; those without the ability of the wealthy countries to transfer the impact of oil prices to their exports, since these consist solely of underpriced raw materials—are forced to import everything, from energy to inflation and recession. They see with despair that despite the noble and singular,

from these remarks, the President explains why he proposes constructing a new framework for energy discussion first, and then turns to the specific forms of energy to be considered within that framework.

...In order to advance the process of giving content to the economic rights and duties of nations, we must understand that the present conflict between the industrial countries and the producers and exporters of oil is not a problem of principles, but of method; it is a problem of strategy, that is, the directing of our forces up to the field where the decisions must be made....

Gentlemen, we must understand that the purpose of our efforts is to solve a problem of transition—definitely *not* one of prices or scarcity. It is a problem of transition, to take advantage of these decades to move from one energy stage to another. That must be the objective of our analysis and our decisions. If we share that understanding, we can put the world in order, take advantage to the maximum possible of what is going to run out—oil—and prepare for the coming of other new sources. These are in sight but we haven't resolved to use them because we are supposing that hydrocarbons are the problem. No, gentlemen: the problem lies in understanding the two stages of humanity which it is our destiny to witness. We are protagonists. We can be mere actors

or we can be authors. And this is a problem of political will.

I've tried to speak today to the political will of the world so that, once we understand the problem as a methodological one, and not of conflicting principles, once we understand that the solution is strategic and not tactical ... order will have to come.

...If we fail to understand energy sources not only as raw materials, but also as today's motor, our proposals will miss the mark. Oil is not sugar; oil is not coffee; oil is not cotton. Oil is an energy source which is moving the world. If we solve the problem of energy in the transition between two stages, I am absolutely certain that we will have agreed on a more just order and that this will be the path to peace, which is not an abstraction, but rather a concrete problem which demands concrete solutions linked fundamentally at this moment with the energy problem.

Gentlemen, I believe this fully justifies the contemporary history of Latin America, which is fighting glorious battles. And I am proud, gentlemen, of belonging to this generation of Latin Americans, conscious of the crisis and capable of winning the domestic battles ... and battling internationally for decolonization. Let us come together, to the extent of our modest conceptions, to try to bring order to the world.

albeit insufficient efforts of the organized petroleum producing countries, petrodollars continue to be recycled in the powerful economies.

Positions made extreme by transnational structures

The developing world's point strategy for enhancing the value of all its raw materials runs the risk of being divided, since to date, although oil has itself been revalued, this has not served to trigger a proper revaluation of other raw materials. We must take care to preserve the unity that was achieved with such difficulty.

Hydrocarbon prices cannot be considered a matter for bargaining and for a testing of strength between producers and consumers, particularly when their respective positions are made more extreme by the intervention of other, generally transnational structures, many of which no longer recognize any home country and consequently acknowledge neither social obligations nor political solidarity. Let us reconcile conscience and national values with the interests of fertile and harmonious internationalism.

Conflicts of interests among countries must be re-

solved not through the annihilation, but rather through the dialectical integration of such opposing interests.

What is not foreseen becomes a problem; problems that are not solved accumulate, and accumulated problems discourage evolution and foreclose possibilities of development.

'Men are dying today'

In order to avoid being overtaken by events and as a means of facing the challenges that clearly loom before us, we must not wait until crisis compels us to take hasty, piecemeal decisions and then find ourselves bound to those that outweigh the rest by reason of the force, and not the right, they represent.

Men are dying today. Let us not offer remedies for tomorrow. In the face of harsh reality, let us not propose idealized stoicism; in the face of true but difficult roads, artificial, dead-end labyrinths; in the face of concrete obstacles, would-be shortcuts; in the face of hard-to-overcome lethargy, ephemeral and selfish solutions; in the face of sound arguments, threats and lies; in the face of the power of intelligence, the brute force of