

victims? And herein lies the perfidy of the Anglo-American condominium with Moscow, in the form of the INF treaty, since the treaty has already *removed* precisely those ground-based nuclear weapons which were threatening Soviet territory! What now remains in Europe, are NATO ground-based nuclear weapons which could only be deployed against the nations of Eastern and Central Europe—especially against West Germany itself. In the event of Soviet aggression against Western Europe, NATO would have to use its ground-based nuclear weapons against Germans, Poles, Czechs, and Slovaks, across whose territory the Red Army would be moving in order to attack Western Europe.

Only the Soviet leadership—and not the Honeckers, the Jakes, or the Jaruzelskis—would ever risk an attack on Western Europe. But ever since the INF treaty has been in force, the Soviet Union's own territory has lain beyond the range of NATO's ground-based nuclear weapons—modernized or not! That is the underlying reason why those Germans who firmly back NATO, are less than enthusiastic about modernization.

The way out of the “modernization dilemma”—insofar as it concerns actual problems of NATO's deterrence—must therefore be to modernize those NATO nuclear weapons which can effectively deter the Soviet Union itself.

Airborne nuclear standoff weapons offer just such a potential. These include missiles, or cruise missiles, which are carried by fighter-bombers (such as the Tornado or the Mirage 2000), and are launched at a distance from their target. The range of the standoff weapon is limited only by the carrying capacity of the “mother plane,” making its effective range the sum of both. Standoff weapons make it possible to attack targets without ever exposing the combat aircraft carrying them to the target's anti-aircraft defense. The French Air Force already possesses a standoff weapon called ASMP with a range of 120 kilometers. The U.S. Air Force is currently developing a standoff weapon called SRAM (Short Range Air Launched Missile) with a range of about 200 kilometers, which, in collaboration with Great Britain, is to be boosted to over 400 kilometers. In addition to these ballistic missiles, the U.S. Air Force is working on a tactical cruise missile. NATO already has available an adequate number of carrier aircraft which can penetrate enemy defenses—especially the West German Air Force's Tornado fighter-bomber. Beyond that, West Germany, in cooperation with France, ought to get to work on the further modernization of the French ASMP standoff weapon.

Thus, if the actual issue at hand is the modernization of NATO's nuclear weapons, then the development and production of such airborne standoff weapons must be energetically pursued. Indeed, this solution to the “modernization dilemma” corresponds to NATO's overall military and political necessities. Anyone, on the other hand, who acts to prolong the current “modernization fracas,” is merely revealing his intentions against NATO as a whole, and against West Germany in particular.

‘Paddock Plan’ for is back on the U.S.

by D.E. Pettingell

The “Paddock Plan,” named after its main author, American agronomist William C. Paddock, has been brought to the center of U.S.-Mexican relations. In August 1980, the Mexican press published front-page stories on Lyndon H. LaRouche's charges of how then-National Security Adviser Zbigniew Brzezinski was trying to implement the Paddock Plan, a blueprint for genocide against the Mexican people.

The original impetus for LaRouche's charges were statements made by Paddock in the 1975-76 period that “the Mexican population must be reduced by half. Seal the border and watch them scream.” Asked how population would fall so drastically, Paddock explained at the time: “By the usual means—famine, war, and pestilence.”

On Jan. 26, the Washington-based Federation for American Immigration Reform (FAIR), founded by Paddock in 1979, proposed just that. In a 90-page report titled “Ten Steps to Securing America's Border,” which has been widely distributed in Congress and sent to the Bush administration, FAIR argues that closing the U.S.-Mexican border “is not as difficult as it might seem at first.” FAIR proposes to build a “sunken fence” along the “most heavily crossed stretches” of the border, identified as the areas near the cities of San Diego, California and El Paso, Texas.

As the accompanying drawing shows, the “sunken fence” is a concrete wall topped by a metal fence “curved at the top” to make it impossible for Mexicans to climb. On the side facing Mexico, FAIR proposes to dig a ditch 12 feet deep. “The concrete construction and dirt backfill of the sunken fence makes it virtually impossible to cut,” the report states. FAIR proposes that the construction of the sunken wall be done by the Army Corps of Engineers at a cost of \$3 million per mile. Where does FAIR plan to find the financial resources for sealing the border? Very simple: From the Mexicans crossing “legally.” “By collecting a \$2 toll from each land border crosser,” says FAIR, the U.S. government can raise over \$500 million a year.

In addition to the wall, FAIR has called for increased use of electronic sensors, lighting, night-vision devices, helicopters, all-terrain vehicles, horses, and dogs along the border, and permanent highway check-points in U.S. border states to catch illegals. On the U.S. side, FAIR demands that the

killing Mexicans policy agenda

“enforcement of employer sanctions” be stepped up, and takes special pride in the fact that it was thanks to their lobbying in Congress that the Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1986 included stiff sanctions against Americans who dare to hire “illegals.”

FAIR threatens that if their plan is not implemented by the Bush administration, sooner or later, U.S. armed forces would have to be placed along the border, as Alan Nelson, Immigration and Naturalization Service commissioner, has been suggesting since 1986.

A policy of genocide

The inhuman nature of FAIR’s proposal can only be fully understood by meeting the insane minds behind it. FAIR’s board of directors reads like a who’s who of the genocide lobby. Chairman of the board is Colorado’s former governor Richard Lamm, who is on the record justifying cannibalism as a way of “survival”; Paul R. Ehrlich, author of *The Population Bomb* (1968) and known, along with Paddock, as a pioneer of the zero population growth movement; Dr. John Tanton, close collaborator of Paddock in the 1970s and former president of the Zero Population Growth organization; former Attorney General William French Smith, who was granted an award by FAIR in 1986 for his role in shaping

their racist immigration policies; and Paul Paddock, the son of William and heir of his genocidal philosophy. William Paddock is currently retired, living on a Caribbean island.

In its report, FAIR reveals that the Border Patrol is planning to dig a “four-foot-deep concrete-lined” ditch to halt the “thousands of drive-throughs” that occur every day; it presents this project as part of FAIR’s own seal-the-border plan.

The story of the “ditch” provoked a storm of political protest inside Mexico. Mexican legislators called the idea “stupid” and “hostile.” Mexican newspaper cartoons depicted U.S. immigration authorities with a “ditch” in their brains.

In the midst of this uproar, INS Commissioner Nelson confirmed the plan for building a ditch. Speaking before a recent meeting of U.S.-Mexican border states’ governors in Saltillo, Mexico, Nelson announced that the construction of the ditch will begin in 60 days, in the Otay Mesa flats south-east of San Diego. Nelson said that the purpose of the ditch is both to serve for “water drainage” and to stop “dangerous” illegal border crossing of vehicles, which often smuggle drugs into the United States.

It is no accident that FAIR decided to make their long-standing plans public a week after George Bush took office. In an interview published in *EIR* in September 1980, Paddock said that his favored candidate for President was George Bush, and lamented that he had been defeated in the presidential primaries.

The Paddock Plan, as LaRouche charged in 1980, is the plan for Mexico of the Eastern Establishment, whose point-man is Henry Kissinger. With the Kissinger group back in power, the “genocide lobby” is back in control of U.S. foreign policy. In fact, George W. Ball, an elder statesman of the Eastern foreign policy Establishment, wrote in his 1976 *Diplomacy in a Crowded World* that Paddock and Ehrlich’s work on population reduction were formative influences on his thinking. In his book, Ball calls for “stringent measures” to cut down the Mexican population and prevent “unwanted” Mexicans from crossing the border.

