

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

guest at Patrick Flores' 1970 investiture as bishop was José Angel Gutierrez, the Chicano radical who founded the La Raza Unida Party together with Denver's Corky Gonzalez, founder of the "Crusade for Justice."

La Raza Unida's paramilitary arm, named "Brown Berets," was suspected of arms and drug running operations across the border with Mexico. LRUP's founding principles were explicitly those of "Aztlán" separatism. Its Washington, D.C. coordinator, Frank Shaffer Corona, stated two years ago that "We're linking up with the PLO and the Quebec separatists. . . . What would the U.S. do if faced with coordinated action between Belize, the PLO, Quebec, Aztlán and Puerto Rico?"

For the previous decade, Flores had been a driving force behind the Church-run activist organization, Citizens Organized for Public Service (COPS). In the late 1960s, it joined activities and personnel with the then-emerging "Chicano Power Movement" bankrolled by the Ford Foundation, which also set up a laundering

agency, the Mexican American Unity Council, to funnel money to José Angel Gutierrez' Mexican American Youth Organization (MAYO). The base of MAYO's operations: St. Mary's College in San Antonio, opened by Flores.

One touchstone for understanding the Liberationist operation is the case of Mário Cantu.

Cantu, a small-time restaurant owner in San Antonio, served four years in jail in the mid-1960s for heroin smuggling. While in prison he was "radicalized." In 1976, when he was convicted on charges of hiding undocumented workers, he was already in touch with the most experienced terrorist controller in America, William Kunstler, best known for his defense of Weathermen, FALN terrorists and the Baader-Meinhof gang.

Given four years' probation, Cantu established personal liaison with one of Mexico's scattered mountain guerrilla bands active at that time, the United Proletarian Party of the Americas, declared his affiliation with the party, and insisted that Chicano liberation was

'Theology of the Americas'

The following are the "Hispanic Community" subsections of the working document circulated in preparation for the Detroit II conference, "Theology of the Americas," July 31 to August 6, 1980.

. . . 60. It is no longer possible to classify Hispanics as either an immigrant group or a racial minority. Moreover, like the Native Americans, Hispanics do not have to turn their eyes to a distant continent to find their homeland. The majority of Mexicans and Puerto Ricans have never become a part of the United States—they only belong to it [definition of Supreme Court of Puerto Rico's status]. The resistance to Americanization is not to be considered a sign of Hispanic backwardness, as some sociologists would have us believe: rather the persistence of a distinctive culture, music, dance, and religion is a badge of strength and courage.

. . . 61. However, Hispanics are divided as to the best way to respond to the future. There is one tendency to define Hispanics as a new kind of "minority group" within the United States. Being a minority group entitles Hispanics to participation at all levels of the present society. By the use of affirmative action and racial quotas, such a strategy ensures a rapid and sudden expansion of Hispanic presence into areas

where few, if any, Hispanics had previous access. But this strategy does not change the system—it only supplies different managers. This points up the necessity for immediate steps to confront the adverse consequences of the "minority group mentality." This is a challenge to Hispanic leadership.

62. Rejection of a future within the United States by Puerto Rico, and increased solidarity of Hispanics with Latin America, would necessitate a new economic order in the Americas. Such a change would require a regionalization of production and energy consumption. Moreover, this kind of shift would likely favor the autonomy of homogeneous political units in which the environment would be preserved and citizens could establish collective social goals instead of being victims of consumerism. The cohesiveness of the Hispanic people becomes a linchpin of the future of the entire United States. There are some Hispanic leaders who visualize the creation of Aztlán from parts of conquered Mexico in the Southwest. They do not necessarily aspire to the creation of a new republic, free and independent from the United States, but they do urge the reinsertion of their people and lands into the cooperative reality of a new hemisphere in which the Latin American peoples work as equal partners with Anglo-America.

63. To be or not to be a minority of the United States? Most of Hispanic theological reflection will hinge upon this question.

possible only on the basis of violent revolution in Mexico. Mexican authorities in Monterrey sought him on gun-running charges.

Cantu fled to Europe for a year of mysterious wanderings through Europe's terrorist circuits in late 1978. The only recorded stops were with Amnesty International in Paris and in the Basque separatist region of Spain. His return a year later was prepared by a highly publicized "Defense Committee," including Kunstler; "Red Bishop" Méndez Arceo of Cuernavaca, Mexico's best-known terrorist controller; and Patrick Fernandez Flores.

Patrick Flores and his PADRES organization have moved on to become major backers of Cantu's latest project, an "international tribunal," Bertrand Russell-style, to expose human rights crimes against Chicanos.

Test-tube radicals in the Land of Aztlan

by Dolia Pettingell

Over recent decades, the creators of cultural relativism and the drug counterculture have constructed a synthetic belief structure for the Mexican-American population, the second largest ethnic group in the United States. The message is that Mexican-Americans are a state within a state, an alienated minority with their own "roots," wholly opposed to "Western values."

This contrived ideology has been hammered into Mexican-Americans to the point that subgroups of this population can now be used to destabilize against both the United States and Mexico, with credibility as a "sociological phenomenon."

An appropriate operational plan for this purpose was assembled by top U.S. policymakers and elaborated at London's Tavistock Institute, a branch of British intelligence. The plan is to induce Mexican-Americans to fight for their liberation, as defined by "their own name, their own language, and their own nation." In this way they can regain their "historical roots," which must be traced back to the period before any foreign force came to "impose" its culture—that is, back to the bestial Aztec civilization of pre-Columbian Mexico.

In order to incubate the radicals required for this package, Tavistock launched an operation to revive the use of ancient Mexican hallucinogens, in the form of peyote or mescaline, employed in pseudoreligious rituals. Simultaneously, intelligence outlets like the Institute for Policy Studies and the Ford Foundation began to develop within Mexican-American radical groupings the

needed infrastructure for this new combination of drugs and cultural relativism. The most notorious of these groups were those originators of the "Chicano movement" who agitated for a nation to be named Aztlan, the mythical fatherland of the Aztecs.

One base of the operation was the MK-Ultra project set up in Zihuatanejo, Mexico by Timothy Leary, who had been purged from Harvard University for his rampant drug experiments. Leary and his mentor, British intelligence operative Aldous Huxley, chose this isolated Indian resort for further experiments with LSD and peyote. Huxley's American research group included the late Gregory Bateson, husband of Margaret Mead; it was Mead who devised the term "cultural relativism" to provide a cover for her racist studies of blacks and Indians, whom she considered inferior creatures unsuited for anything but neocolonial existence.

An 'Aztec' version of *The Doors of Perception*

Before 1963 was over, the Mexican government had thrown Leary and his group out of Mexico. Five years later, at the peak of the countercultural student-radical movement throughout the world, Tavistock launched a broader offensive that summed up years of experiments with drugs and ethnic manipulation techniques.

The project was a book titled *The Teachings of Don Juan: A Yaqui Way of Knowledge*, supposedly written by one Carlos Castañeda. Though widely played up for the U.S. counterculture as a whole, the book was specifically aimed at testing the "Aztec" version of the drug counterculture among Mexican-American radicals. It soon became an effective recruitment tool.

Many have raised doubts about the actual existence of Castañeda, a supposed Mexican-American anthropology student. The book's resemblance to Huxley's benchmark drug advocacy in *The Doors of Perception* in any case marks it as a spinoff of an MK-Ultra operative or team of individuals. The style and content of both books is virtually identical; Huxley's is the "Western" version of how to find a "different," "non-ordinary" reality through LSD and other drugs. Castañeda translates the line into "Aztec." "Peyote" is presented as a person with feelings who will keep its users "pure," not contaminated by progress or urban society.

In the Chicano movement, the combined efforts of the Institute for Policy Studies, the Ford Foundation, and British intelligence have significantly accomplished what Aldous Huxley first proposed in 1934, when he wrote:

To industrialize and civilize primitives may be impossible. But to introduce a salutary element of primitivism into our civilized and industrialized way of life—this, I believe, can be done.