

talk about the fears that were induced in the Baby Boomer generation. But I think that I, too, have fears as a result of the influence of my mother and my father. I don't know if there's a real truthful fear of immortality that gets in the way of understanding that the LYM is doing things of real importance, due to what Lyndon LaRouche has done over the last year. There's something that's a brake on the impulse we have. How do you resolve this problem of fear confronting us in the inherited generational problem?

LaRouche: You know, when you come from a generation that went to war, a big war, the question has a different ring to it. Fear of this type comes from a lack of sense of immortality. I mean, if you know that you're doing something for society, and you think it's important enough to take the risk of being killed for it, the effect of the aversive circumstances doesn't go away, but you don't get flight forward or cowardice. I don't know anybody but a psychotic who doesn't tend to get frightened under acutely aversive circumstances. But the question is, how do you cope with it? And so, don't try to find a place where there is no fear. That is dangerous. To seek freedom from fear—fear if it's not under-controlled, is a very valuable emotion. It helps you. It helps you do the right thing, as long as you don't panic. And the other thing is to develop capability; if you're confident of your development, your capability—and the essential capability is largely intellectual.

For example, the LYM in California is now getting close to seven, eight years old. Some of the youth members of some years ago are now elected officials of various parts of the Democratic Party. Some of them have leading scientific capabilities that have emerged over this period. They are influential in the society around them. It's good. And that's the other side: Development of capabilities, no fear of fear itself, and no tendency to fly forward into fear. You can always lose your life; it can happen tomorrow by accident. So live every day as if it were the last one.

Q: My question is one of curiosity. I'm a member from the LaRouche Youth Movement of Mexico. If you have a principle of action which you represent with a machine-tool, and if you have this same principle present in musical instruments in the form of the human singing voice, will we in the future be able to have some other instruments created by this action, based on the same principle, but creating different instruments, or perhaps different than string quartets? Or is there some limit in this idea of machine-tools which you build for music?

LaRouche: Essentially, you know, music comes from the human singing voice, and all decent musical instruments are reflections of the principle of the human singing voice. Now, unless you invent a different design of human being. . . . There have been some attempts to broaden the variety of human beings and other things. I don't know any I'd recommend.

LaRouche 1981 Proposal

Growth Approach Is Key To Immigration Law

On April 13, 1981, as Mexico and the United States were preparing for the second summit meeting between Presidents José López Portillo and Ronald Reagan, the National Democratic Policy Committee (NDPC), founded by Lyndon LaRouche, issued a statement on immigration, under the title: "No Migrant Law Will Work Without a Growth Approach."

The U.S. Senate was debating immigration policy at that time, with two contending bills at the center of the fight.

One, submitted by New Mexico Senator, and Reagan ally, Harrison Schmitt (R-N.M.), entitled the "United States-Mexico Good Neighbor Act of 1981," called for immigration to be addressed from the standpoint of "strong economic and political cooperation between the United States and Mexico [which] will benefit not only the people of these countries, but will also help to eliminate Western Hemispheric tensions." It explicitly ruled out "attempts to seal our vast border with Mexico to the flow of migrants" as a policy "doomed to failure."

The opposing bill, the "Immigration and National Security Act of 1981," was submitted by Sen. Walter Huddleston (D-Ky.), and it argued that the United States could no longer continue its historic policy of welcoming immigrants, because of "resource shortages" and limitations—a bill drafted in close consultation with the hard core of the Malthusian genocide lobby: Zero Population Growth, and William Paddock's Environmental Fund and Federation for American Immigration Reform (FAIR).

Although the adoption of such lunacies as North America Free Trade Agreement has created situations in both the United States and Mexico, which are now far, far worse than the problems of 1981, the NDPC policy statement of 1981 is highly relevant to the debate taking place in the U.S. Congress today. It began:

. . . This long-standing bone of contention between the United States and Mexico actually offers the opportunity to take a long step in the direction of establishing an overall positive bilateral relationship with our neighbor to the south, which—centered on cooperation for the rapid, high-technology industrialization of both countries—can serve as a model for North-South relations as a whole. . . .

At the heart of the immigration issue is nothing less than the constitutional purpose for which our nation was founded.

As established by our Founding Fathers in the Constitution, America was created as a temple of liberty committed to the continuous industrial progress of its people. We not only welcomed the world's "tired, poor and hungry" to American shores; we quickly absorbed them into the mainstream of our booming economy, an economy in which they in turn helped develop through their applied skills.

There isn't an American today who isn't the descendent of an immigrant from one country or another. This "melting pot" approach—premised on a constantly growing economy—is the American way. . . ."

The policy statement then takes up the specifics of the contending Schmitt and Huddleston bills, the first of which upholds that American tradition, while the second, which maintains, in the NDPC's characterization, that "the Era of Progress is over for America, and that we have to tighten our belts and adjust to British-style economic contraction." The Huddleston bill," the NDPC noted, would implement the genocidal "Paddock Plan" which Lyndon LaRouche brought to national attention in 1976, when he denounced as genocide, on national television, Paddock's call for Mexico's population to be cut in half by the end of the century, which is further detailed in the statement. It continues:

[W]here the Schmitt bill falls short is on the point of the necessary framework of joint industrialization, which is the *sine qua non* of an immigration policy which does not encourage a fight for too few jobs. In a word, in the absence of an economic boom on *both* sides of the border, an immigration policy acceptable to both the United States and Mexico, simply cannot be devised. That the Schmitt bill does not contemplate such a context of economic growth is evident, when it states that "the vast majority of jobs that will be taken by Mexicans are in the agricultural and service industries"—precisely the degrading stoop-labor jobs that would be rapidly eliminated under conditions of industrial expansion. . . .

The NPDC therefore endorses the Schmitt bill, while proposing its amendment on the following two points:

- Premise the entire immigration policy on establishing economic accords with Mexico around the idea of trading oil for technology, measures which will guarantee economic boom conditions on both sides of the border; and
- Increase the funding for border law-enforcement activities against arms and drug smuggling.

Under such conditions the United States can safely open the border to virtually unlimited flows of Mexican workers, who would be absorbed into an expanding high-technology industrial sector in the United States, since this sector would quickly become labor-short. This, combined with the necessary adoption of minimum wage and basic social security benefits for the migrant labor, will guarantee both the foreigners' well-being, as well as protect the jobs and labor rights of

American workers. Encouraging the capital-intensive development of Mexico will also guarantee that Mexicans have attractive jobs to return home to, once they have acquired adequate skill levels in the U.S. . . .

Restating our proposals for immigration policy in summary form, the NDPC believes Congress should:

1. Establish a bilateral, oil-for-technology economic accord with the Mexican government. Use this as the bedrock on which to build an industrial boom on both sides of the border. Reject the "North American Common Market" and similar schemes [i.e., today's NAFTA—ed.] as unworkable.
2. Grant two- to three-year work visas to Mexicans who wish to work in the U.S. and their families. Guest workers will be allowed to work in any geographic area or industry they desire, but an emphasis will be placed on absorbing them in higher-technology sectors, in an effort to rapidly upgrade their skill levels.
3. The best protection of American workers' jobs is to vastly expand the demand for skilled labor—which will result from the proposed oil-for-technology accord. An interim quota system can be established if necessary . . . but with first-year quotas set in the 1.5 to 2 million range. Beyond that, the border can and should be virtually open.
4. Minimum wage guarantees and all federal educational and welfare services will be provided to all foreign workers.
5. Expand Mexican consular services within the United States to help protect the labor and human rights of Mexican guest workers.
6. Reject employer sanctions and the proposed national I.D. card, as measures that are discriminatory and endanger our democratic system.
7. As the new system takes hold, normalize the status of foreign workers—both documented and undocumented—currently in the United States.
8. Significantly increase the funding for the border patrol and other law enforcement agencies, in order to crack down on the illegal flow of arms and drugs across our border with Mexico. Expand cooperation with the Mexican government in this regard.

HOTLINE

LaRouche and EIR Staff
Recorded Briefings
—24 Hours Daily
918-222-7201, Box 595