

circumstances, not only would the Mexican resident families and friends of persons living in the U.S. . . . be involved—and possibly injured and killed—but the border itself would assume a strategic importance that it has not had for more than a century.”

As we document below, the development profiled as the principal trigger for widespread unrest in the borderlands and Mexico itself—a crackdown on undocumented Mexican workers in the U.S.—is now fast becoming reality. Attorney General Civiletti, a member of the Select Commission on Immigration and Refugees, is in the thick of this hardline push.

As this happens, a vast apparatus of “migrant rights defense” groups on both sides of the border is ready to go into action. One of the leaders of the May 25 San Diego gathering, Hernán Baca, heads just such a defense committee. On the Mexican side, over 80 organizations, reaching as far as the giant labor umbrella group, the Labor Congress, joined forces in April to promulgate a “Migrants Rights Charter.”

At the same time, the “police brutality” issue is as hot in the Hispanic communities as in the black communities, and is being made still hotter by Department of Justice action itself.

Civiletti asks his Hispanic Advisory Board to “inform” him if any Chicano *barrios* are about to explode. Maybe Mexican-Americans should ask *him* for the advance warning?

## Tightening up on immigration

“You will notice that Attorney General Civiletti, speaking to the national LULACs [League of United Latin American Citizens], edged up to two or three very, very significant points that would have to be considered [for an effective crackdown on illegal immigration], including the possibility of a universal work card. A lot of things like that are now being discussed openly. Some of them, over the past year and a half, have been very sensitive to the Hispanic-American community, or to employers, or to the humanitarian groups. To have all these things aired out now to the detail that they are is extremely useful from a public policy standpoint within the United States. . . .”

This is Richard Rubottom speaking, chief border policy adviser to Gov. Bill Clements of Texas. This was the “timely context,” Rubottom told a reporter this

week, in which Clements had presented a comprehensive program to control undocumented labor from Mexico to a June 26-27 meeting of U.S. and Mexican border state governors.

There was every reason for Rubottom’s stress on how “sensitive” some of these taboo topics are. Work cards, no matter what their pretext, can turn into a means of worker regimentation as they did in Nazi Germany—especially under the kind of profound economic dislocation now hitting the U.S. Other proposals re-emerging, after rejection in a first round of public discussion at the time of Carter’s ill-fated August 1977 anti-illegal immigration package, are sanctions against employers who hire undocumented workers; strengthened border patrol; and elimination of any temporary work permits, especially in the agricultural area.

The highlights of the new barrage of anti-immigration agitation:

- The decision by the Select Commission on Immigration and Refugee Policy to “go public” with its hardline, heretofore private, year-and-a-half deliberations.
- The amendment Kentucky Sen. Walter Huddleston put through the Senate at the end of June specifying that total legal immigration to the U.S. for the fourth quarter of 1980 cannot pass 100,000—a reduction of at least 30 percent in currently mandated levels and the first time ever that a house of Congress has acted to set a ceiling in this manner.
- The 15 percent hike in border patrol personnel voted up by the House just before the July 4 recess, along with a \$22 million supplemental appropriation to the INS.

### Approaches to the problem

Two ways of viewing the issue of illegal immigration are at issue here.

One, presented by Democratic Presidential candidate Lyndon LaRouche to the same LULAC convention where Civiletti spoke, seeks to end the abuses and exploitation of foreign workers, particularly Mexicans, that are possible precisely because they are “illegal.” The focus of this approach is how to restart the U.S. economy as a whole, and within this climate of expanding demand for skilled labor in the U.S., build a legal framework for incorporating foreign laborers heretofore drawn in without provisions for giving them legal status.

The other approach is to view the current U.S. depression as a heaven-sent opportunity to shut down the entry of foreign labor under any arrangement; and the entire controversy over “illegal aliens” as a way to introduce previously impossible regimentation of the work force as a whole. Top planners in this group repeatedly told *EIR* that the ugly incidents which erupted around resettlement of Cuban refugees two months

## The nation's most candid planner of genocide

In 1976, one of the leaders of the zero population growth movement in the U.S., agronomist William Paddock, told an interviewer that the "Mexican population must be cut in half. The way to do this is by closing the border. Close the border and watch them scream." When the interviewer asked how closing the border translated into the deaths of over 30 million Mexicans, Paddock replied calmly, "The usual way. Through famine, war and pestilence."

Paddock is not, unfortunately, an isolated homicidal Malthusian. He is at the center of a nexus of Washington lobbying groups—including Zero Population Growth, the Environmental Fund, and FAIR—which are coordinating the renewed drive toward a crackdown on undocumented workers.

In a recent interview made available to *EIR*, Paddock had this to say:

**Q:** What's your view of the current situation in Central America and Mexico?

**A:** I think Central America is down the tubes. In a reasonable amount of time the same can be said of Mexico. If you look at the recent rate of population growth, there is no, absolutely no logic that will show that stability is going to remain there. Take Mexico City. How can you visualize Mexico City not exploding over the next five, ten, fifteen years.

Development is impossible with the current rate of population growth. Unless you let everyone into the U.S.—and [in that case] there's going to be a reaction in the United States. It's coming, and it should. One of these days, there's going to be a very violent reaction toward Mexico. Look at the Cuba thing [the protests against Cuban refugees].

**Q:** Isn't there a possibility of economic growth rates to keep pace with the population growth?

**A:** Well, I don't think that's a very mature question, really, for someone who's knowledgeable about the area. Some problems there are no solutions to. Maybe 25 years ago, something could have been done. Now the problem is here. Even if you stopped all births, they're here, they're eating, they're walking around the place. . . . I believe there is no country on earth that is not overpopulated.

ago demonstrated that the temperature of public opinion is now right for a major crackdown program.

The second view is the predominant one in the new flurry of debate. And the Select Commission is definitely the "big boy on the block" in shaping this debate.

### Hesburgh and Co.

The Commission was created in October 1978 on the initiative of Sen. Edward Kennedy, with the concurrence of Congress and the White House. The Commission was structured for maximum "blue-ribbon" prestige. The 16 members are drawn one quarter from leaders of the Senate, one quarter from the House, one quarter from the Executive Branch—the secretaries of State, Human Services and Labor and the Attorney General—and one quarter from private life. There is a careful mix of Democrats, Republicans and "independents." Among the individuals from "private life" are Jack Otero, the AFL-CIO's leading Hispanic lobbyist, and the Commission's chairman, the ubiquitous Father Theodore Hesburgh. Hesburgh is also chairman of the Rockefeller Foundation and a director of the New York Council on Foreign Relations.

Though the final report is not due until March 1981, the statements of members of the Commission such as Civiletti, press leaks, and reliable private sources, reveal the following composite of the Commission's hard-line recommendations:

- Some form of worker ID system;
- Federal sanctions against employers of undocumented workers;
- A specified total of legal immigration per year, perhaps 750,000;
- Some form of amnesty for undocumented workers currently residing in the U.S. with a job history;
- Additional resources for the border patrol;
- No program for a seasonal work pass system, called by some a "guestworker" system.

Despite the inclusion of an amnesty provision, the thrust is toward "turning off the spigot" in an atmosphere of heightened labor controls across the country.

### The hard core

Working in parallel with the Commission is the hard core of rabid zero-growth ideologues, based in an interlocking nest of lobbying groups in Washington. These include the Zero Population Growth organization, the Environmental Fund, and the Committee for Fair Immigration Laws, generally known as FAIR.

The mentor of the group is William Paddock, an agronomist who *explicitly* states that he sees shutting the border with Mexico as a required measure for the elimination of half of Mexico's population through "famine, war and pestilence." (See box.)

Paddock, who used to be on the board of ZPG, is

currently on the boards of both FAIR and The Environment Fund.

According to sources in FAIR, confirmed from Sen. Huddleston's office, the Huddleston amendment lowering the limit for legal immigration in the fourth quarter was entirely the result of collaboration between Huddleston's office and FAIR. It is not known if Huddleston is aware of the Paddock connection.

FAIR is similarly serving as the direct consultant to House Republicans Ham Fish and Clair Burgenor, both deeply involved in immigration control efforts. Fish is a member of the Select Commission, and FAIR has testified numerous times to the Commission directly.

Illustrative of FAIR's media influence, an upcoming Roper poll will show that "91 percent of Americans" favor an all-out campaign against illegal immigrants. How does FAIR know already? Bud Roper shares a spot on the Environmental Fund's board of directors with Paddock.

Extensive direct media exposure has included the McNeil-Lehrer Report, *Newsweek*, and the *Washington Post*; even more significant, FAIR officials boast of "planting all the recent *New York Times* coverage of the issue, particularly the stories by their new Justice Department reporter, Robert Pear. That's entirely us, telling them what's going on."

In its latest move, FAIR is attempting to publicize the research of Texas professor Ronald Grenness as a counter to the currently hegemonic work of San Diego specialist Wayne Cornelius. This is much more than a war of academic pens.

Cornelius's research showed that most Mexican undocumented workers came on a seasonal basis, generally tied to agriculture, and were not seeking permanent work. His studies have served as the basis for several major "guestworker" proposals, most notably those of Sen. Harrison Schmitt (D.-N.M.) and Clements.

In the minds of at least some adherents, such a guestworker program would allow Mexico a continuing, substantial "safety valve" arrangement, and reduce some of the abuses of the current "illegal" status for such workers. The proposal is not the same as LaRouche's, which aims at eliminating agricultural "stoop labor" through mechanization and creating job openings in other, higher skill areas; but it nevertheless tends away from Paddock's "shut the border" crusade.

Grenness' research reportedly shows that a large and increasing proportion of Mexican immigrant workers come from urban areas, not rural, and already have significant skills. They come to the U.S. seeking permanent, skilled employment.

The implication, especially in a time of shrinking skilled employment in the U.S.: shut the border down tight. And that's the direction the Select Committee is moving in.

## Civiletti proposes work cards

*Backing and filling and sweating over every word, this is how Attorney General Civiletti broke the news to the nation's Hispanic community that he is working with the other members of the Select Commission on Immigration to legitimize the hated concept of a work card for all American workers. He was speaking to the national convention of the League of United Latin American Citizens (LULAC) June 27 in Washington, D.C.*

"... Legislation in the area of employer responsibility has been considered by Congressional committees since the early 1950s. However, recent efforts to penalize employers who knowingly hire undocumented aliens have been strenuously opposed by Hispanic civil rights organizations because of the legitimate fear that employers would cautiously but discriminatorily prefer not to hire persons who look Hispanic or would ask *only* Hispanics if they had proof of citizenship or permanent resident alien status. To counter these fears, some proposed to the Select Commission [on Immigration and Refugee Policy] a national work authorization card or permit, the theory being that since every person regardless of race or nationality or ethnic background entitled to work must possess a card when he or she applies for a job, employers will not be tempted to exercise discretion which might discriminate against Hispanics and other minorities regardless of their residency, their lawfulness, or their citizenship.

I personally am not concerned about adding another card similar to my driver's license or my Social Security card to the many which I already carry. However, I am very sensitive to the fact that many Americans are concerned and are fearful of what is sometimes erroneously referred to as a national identification card and the invasion of privacy and freedom implications of such a document. Finally, as a law enforcement official, I am not convinced of the potential for success of an overly broad employer responsibility law. If an employer responsibility law becomes a part of the Select Commission's recommendations, and I think there is some good support for that concept, I will urge that such a law be

designed so that it is fair and reasonable and has a good prospect for being obeyed and enforced. . . . Also, in order to protect against unequal enforcement or intrusions into privacy, I would recommend a very simple identification or work card; that is to say, one which contains a limited amount of information—

[No! No!—audience]

I'm saying *if* that was the route chosen by the Commission. I'm not saying that I'm recommending the card at all. In fact, I'm very sensitive to the fact, as I've expressed earlier, that people are absolutely opposed, lots of people of all kinds and varieties, to any kind and that sentiment has been expressed to the Commission. But consistent with the view of many Hispanic leaders, an employer bill is acceptable, of any nature and kind, only if everyone is subject to the same—everyone, citizens, aliens and those not—is subject to the same pre-employment request whatever it may be and whatever the formula that is worked out. . . ."

## ***New York Times* backs I.D. system**

*Without blinking an eye, the "liberal" patrician New York Times swung in behind the Civiletti call in a lead July 6 editorial:*

"The issue is how to stem the tide of illegal immigrants crossing the border from Mexico. The proposed solution is to give all Americans a forgery-resistant Social Security card and require that it be shown to employers in order to get a job. But [some] recoil from use of such a card. It would, they fear, lead to national identity papers and police state-ism. We're inclined to think, 'No, it won't.'"

True, the *Times* notes, "Americans no longer seem so concerned about the dangers of a police state; . . . they would rather be searched at airports than hijacked in the air." Also true, that "the FBI, for instance, might wish authority to ask people for their cards in the course of trailing fugitives. In the wake of an assassination, say, or a shocking terrorist episode, could Congress resist yielding such authority?"

However, "It is no more sensible to reject the identification idea because of potential problems than to ban telephones because they can be tapped."

# **Liberation theologians prime terrorism**

by Carlos de Hoyos

At the top levels of the Chicano separatist movement leadership today are found, not the "Chicano radicals" of the late 1960s, but the priests of the Jesuit-inspired Roman Catholic dissident movement known as the "Theology of Liberation."

"Resistance to Americanization is not to be considered a sign of Hispanic backwardness," proclaims the draft document of the Liberationists' upcoming "Theology of the Americas" conclave in Detroit. It is "a badge of strength and courage."

This is an extraordinary manifesto, one that should send chills down the spines of American readers. The same Theology of Liberation which, under Jesuit direction, is building terrorism and fratricidal polarization throughout Central America has established an entrenched position in our own Southwest—and is openly identifying with the cause of "Aztlán"—a Chicano Tehran.

The Hispanic section of the Detroit document was authored by officials of PADRES, the organization of Hispanic priests founded by Archbishop Patrick Flores of San Antonio, the leading "liberationist" figure in the U.S. Catholic hierarchy. When *EIR* attempted to reach him in mid-June, we could not be put through; he was involved in private meetings with the Peruvian liberationist priest, Gustavo Gutierrez. Gutierrez is considered the "father" of Liberation Theology, coining the term in a 1968 work. He was the "grand presence" at the 1975 Detroit I conference; he has been integral to the planning of that conference's sequel.

And just as in Central America, the Jesuit role is decisive. The executive director of PADRES, an organization controlled by the liberationists, though it includes more traditionalist factions, is Trinidad Sánchez, S.J. Seed money for the PADRES newspaper, *Entre Nosotros*, came from the Jesuits. Archbishop Flores is now establishing a network of special schools for children of undocumented workers with a \$75,000 grant from Jesuit headquarters in Rome.

## **'Cops' and la Raza Unida**

The close interaction of Flores and the Chicano radicals of southern Texas is longstanding. A special