

The original documents are located in Box 21, folder “Mexico” of the John Marsh Files at the Gerald R. Ford Presidential Library.

Copyright Notice

The copyright law of the United States (Title 17, United States Code) governs the making of photocopies or other reproductions of copyrighted material. Gerald R. Ford donated to the United States of America his copyrights in all of his unpublished writings in National Archives collections. Works prepared by U.S. Government employees as part of their official duties are in the public domain. The copyrights to materials written by other individuals or organizations are presumed to remain with them. If you think any of the information displayed in the PDF is subject to a valid copyright claim, please contact the Gerald R. Ford Presidential Library.

**NATIONAL ARCHIVES AND RECORDS SERVICE
WITHDRAWAL SHEET (PRESIDENTIAL LIBRARIES)**

FORM OF DOCUMENT	CORRESPONDENTS OR TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
	1 <u>Donna to Mr. Marsh. 5/28/76</u>		
1a. Memo	A/NIO/LA to DCI (1 p) <i>sanatind 9/98</i>	5/28/76	C(A)
1b. Letter	Draft letter to the President (2 pp) <i>opened 10/98 ut.</i>	Undated	C(A)
	2 <u>A/NIO/LA to DCI. 5/28/76</u>		
2a. Memo	Copy of item 1a (1 p.)	5/28/76	C(A)
2b. Letter	Copy of item 1b (2 pp.) <i>Sys. WHM 11/28/00</i>	Undated	C(A)
	3 <u>Hyland to Marsh. 6/4/76</u>		
3a. Letter	George Bush to the President (2 pp.) <i>opened 10/98 ut</i>	6/1/76	A

FILE LOCATION

Marsh Files
General Subject File
Mexico

Box 21

RESTRICTION CODES

- (A) Closed by Executive Order 12356 governing access to national security information.
- (B) Closed by statute or by the agency which originated the document.
- (C) Closed in accordance with restrictions contained in the donor's deed of gift.

WHM, 2/19/86

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

May 18, 1976

MEMORANDUM FOR:

JACK MARSH

FROM:

RUSS ROURKE *Rourke*

Jack, I am attaching the excerpts from the Record referred to in the "Letter to the President."

As I indicated to you, Sam Devine told me that he "didn't even remember who asked him to sign the letter, but that a cursory review of its content indicated that the situation described in the letter warranted an inquiry by appropriate government agencies."

Sam speculated that other House members signing the letter on the House floor did so with a similar purpose in mind.

Attachments



Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 94th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 122

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, APRIL 14, 1976

No. 57

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 o'clock a.m.

The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thine heart, and with all thy soul and with all thy might.—Deuteronomy 6: 5.

O God, who art the source of every noble impulse and the goal of every worthy desire, we bow in Thy presence these holy days of sacred memory, praying that humbly and sincerely we may receive Thy spirit anew into our all-too-needily human hearts. Grant that in the midst of troubled times and persistent problems we may be sustained by Thy presence, supported by Thy grace, and strengthened by Thy spirit. May we learn to love as we ought to love, to forgive as we ought to forgive, and to live as we ought to live.

We mourn the passing of our beloved colleague, William A. Barrett. May the life and labor of this dear friend be a fitting memorial of his presence in our midst. To his family and to all of us be Thou a tower of strength in sorrow.

Bless us as we leave for our recess. May we return ready to continue our work for this country we love with all our hearts. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Without objection, the Journal stands approved.

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Sparrow, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 532. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to amend retroactively regulations of the Department of Agriculture pertaining to the computation of price support payments under the National Wool Act of 1954 in order to insure the equitable treatment of ranchers and farmers.

THE HONORABLE WILLIAM BARRETT

(Mr. ADDABBO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join with my colleagues in expressing my sorrow at the passing of our beloved colleague, William Barrett.

Beyond our personal loss, and it is extensive because Bill Barrett always took time to help with the problems of others and to extend a friendly hand to those who needed it, the Nation has lost one of the true authorities on the Nation's housing problems.

Chairman Barrett led the way in alerting the Nation to the problems of its deteriorating housing problems in many sections of the Nation, and the statute book is filled with laws which originated by investigatory hearings of the Subcommittee on Housing and Community Development.

When Bill Barrett entered the House of Representatives in 1944, the Nation was at war and all domestic needs were being shunted aside to assure ultimate victory in that great conflict. And so it fell to Bill Barrett to help lead the Nation after the war to begin picking up the pieces at home, beginning the great chore of stimulating the country's economy and providing homes for a growing population to live in. He, and those who worked so closely with him through the decades after the end of the war, paved the way for those of us who came in the 1960's to begin a new social revolution. And for those of us then-newcomers who came seeking a better world, Bill Barrett was a steadying hand who gently demonstrated to us the ways in which we could best move.

There is no one who served in Congress with Bill Barrett who has not learned to appreciate his wisdom, his kindness, and his basic concerns with the people whom he served. The Congress has lost a good counsel, the Nation has lost a valuable public servant, and all of us here today have lost a good friend.

My wife and family join with me in offering our condolences to Congressman Barrett's family. But as sad as we all feel

today, we can find solace in knowing that we have known a truly good man.

AS IT WAS IN CHILE, SO IT IS IN MEXICO

(Mr. McDONALD of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. McDONALD of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, one of our items of business this week is S. 2662, the international security assistance bill, by means of which we purport to help other nations to resist communism.

As you know, I have little confidence in such measures, based upon past performance. And one of the reasons why such efforts are ineffective is because we do not pay attention to the important things which are happening within the countries we are allegedly trying to aid.

For example, how many of us here realize that the people of Mexico are threatened by the collectivization of their property—property of all types, holdings of all sizes. They face this threat at the insistence of their President, who has chosen to place in high official positions the very Communists who brought Chile to disaster, and who participated in similar attempts throughout Latin America.

A law drafted by foreign Communists is even now before an extraordinary session of the Mexican Congress, which is dominated by the President's party. In fact, Mrs. Hortensia Allende, the widow of Chile's marxist president, stated earlier this month that this law was precisely the one which her husband had planned to promulgate in Chile.

There is no mystery about how this occurs. The same individuals float from country to country, planning the Communist takeover of whatever nation is foolish enough to afford them the opportunity to do so. Should they succeed, they will fasten themselves forever upon the host society as bureaucratic parasites. And should they fail, they simply move to some other country, leaving their victims to suffer.

It is not for us, but rather for the people of Mexico, to question the wisdom of their President in providing perhaps a thousand foreign Communists

with important Government positions. And the Mexican people are indeed concerned. Lawyers are aghast at the liberties taken with their Constitution, and with the obvious, broad-front attack on all forms of property rights by those who are preparing the shackles of collectivization for their country. Businessmen are protesting punitive harassment by petty officials and, perhaps even more, the insecurity caused by vague new laws directed against them. Farmers, whether possessed of their own land or merely exercising the limited rights afforded them under earlier versions of Mexican socialism, are facing serious new problems.

Millions of Mexican farmers; under earlier "land reforms," have been permitted the use of small plots of land, but denied any title to them, so that they have neither equity nor credit, except what the government may afford them. And the government has recently adopted the view that these farmers should work collectively. When they refuse, they are denied credit, pressured in various other ways, and even thrown off the land they were allowed to use but never permitted to own. Need we be reminded that Communist "land reform" is never for the benefit of the peasants, but is merely a means of gaining rigid control of them?

Other farmers who do possess their land are being subjected to organized campaigns of intimidation and violence. The tactics are precisely those used to bring ruin to Chilean agriculture; small wonder, since the program is being run by the same individuals.

The Communist-inspired Law of Human Settlements, the Law of Urban Reform, new mineral laws, new patent laws—all are recognized by alert Mexican lawyers as a broad-front assault against property rights of all types, including "intellectual property." But a sizable portion of the legal profession, in Mexico as here, has been coopted by government employment, and/or carried away by enthusiasm for the immense amount of power available to them in a totalitarian regime.

Finally, as a companion bill, the President of Mexico has presented an amnesty law, also on the Chilean pattern, which would not only release the Red cadres and intellectuals convicted of responsibility for the bloody uprising in Mexico City in 1968, but which would make them eligible for government employment. The official Communist Party of Mexico has expressed total delight, saying that the law "opens the gates to political struggle" in Mexico.

Mexico has been governed by the same party for about half a century, and the Mexican Constitution gives to the President powers unmatched in any other country not generally designated as a dictatorship. The danger of such one-man government is becoming apparent at last. The outgoing President of Mexico has set his sights upon what journalists and others describe as "third world leadership." Part of the deal is apparently to deliver his own people to the misery of Communist collectivization and civil strife. To this end, he has made

the Chilean Communist, Pedro Vuskovic, Assessor to the Secretary of the National Patrimony, of all things. Just how much regard for the national patrimony of Mexico can be expected from a foreign Communist?

There is nothing better to be expected from the President's hand-picked successor, who promises to follow the long-term program devised for Mexico by foreign Communists, while denouncing those who defend their land as cowardly fascists.

We ought to be aware that merely appropriating money for military aid does not even address the problem of subversion, either at home or abroad. And we ought to consider what it would mean to the United States to have a Mexico in the condition of Allende's Chile, or Castro's Cuba. I hope that I need not belabor the point. It could happen, rather easily.

Further documentation of this information is provided in the Extensions of Remarks section of today's RECORD.

PERMISSION TO HAVE UNTIL MIDNIGHT TOMORROW, APRIL 15, 1976, TO FILE CONFERENCE REPORT AND STATEMENT ON H.R. 7656, BEEF RESEARCH AND INFORMATION ACT

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers may have until midnight tomorrow night, April 15, 1976, to file a conference report and statement on H.R. 7656, the Beef Research and Information Act.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas? There was no objection.

SOCIAL SECURITY INCOME LIMITATION SHOULD BE RAISED TO \$7,500 A YEAR

(Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, the March 6 issue of the Parkersburg, W. Va., News carried an outstanding article by Francis B. Hile, former managing editor of the Parkersburg News; This is one of the finest and most persuasive articles I have ever read.

Mr. Hile urges that the outside income limitation of \$2,760 per year on social security recipients is unrealistic, and prejudicial against senior citizens. For some time I have had legislation pending to raise this limitation to \$7,500 per year—which is more realistic. My bill, H.R. 6001, cosponsored by my friend and colleague Representative BEN GILMAN, of New York, and others, deserves strong support in the Congress. If Congress really wants to do something to help senior citizens, to help the economy, and to raise the morale and economic well-being of millions of Americans, then we should follow Mr. Hile's advice.

Mr. Speaker, I also include with my remarks an excellent editorial from the March 6 issue of the Parkersburg, W. Va., News:

WELL PRESENTED, MR. HILE

Elsewhere on this page today is an editorial written by Francis B. Hile, former managing editor of The News. It is an excellently structured expose, or, perhaps better phrased, as the mild-mannered Mr. Hile probably intended his expressions, a less than explosive reference to the inequities existing in the Social Security policy.

Mr. Hile ably points out the apparent weaknesses in the SS law, prohibitions against the senior citizen who is still willing to work but must limit his efforts to less than \$3,000 a year. Very important, we thought, was his idea that the employment of these senior citizens would not take away jobs from younger persons. It would, on the contrary, as Mr. Hile states, improve the general economic conditions by creating new sources of employment.

We strongly recommend Mr. Hile's editorial as one of the more informative and well written expressions presented on this page in many months. He is to be complimented upon his extremely effective approach toward the solution of a problem that has been neglected by our federal legislators.

MISUNDERSTANDING VIS-A-VIS DEBATE ON CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 7988

(Mr. PICKLE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, I want to clear up what I feel has been an honest misunderstanding. During Monday's debate on the conference report on H.R. 7988, Health Research and Health Services Amendments of 1976, I asked the chairman of the Commerce Committee, Mr. STAGGERS, some questions.

My questions dealt with that section of the conference report dealing with vitamins, and allowing Americans the freedom to buy vitamins as they please.

Upon reading the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for Monday, I feel that it does not reflect accurately the colloquy between me and the gentleman from West Virginia.

Please note that I have discussed the colloquy as it appears in the RECORD with the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. STAGGERS), and he agrees with my understanding of our remarks. In fact, he said so most emphatically.

The colloquy appears on page H3245 of the April 12, 1976, RECORD. I asked Mr. STAGGERS two questions. Those questions are accurately reflected in the RECORD.

Mr. STAGGERS and I recall that he answered me with very clear and emphatic yeses. The RECORD, however, indicates that his answers were qualified, and he only generally agreed with me.

If I had heard these qualifications, you can be sure, Mr. Speaker, that I would have asked more questions about the qualifications. It now appears that I am happy with the qualified response.

I recognize that to be legalistic, in the strictest sense, the answers of Chairman STAGGERS had to be qualified.

I take this opportunity, however, to say that I was satisfied with the unqualified yeses that I received on April 12; but I cannot express unequivocal satisfaction with the answers that appear on page H3245, of the April 12 RECORD.



words, is simply to give renters just one of the several tax advantages now enjoyed by homeowners.

I will include an article, at the end of these remarks, showing how rising mortgage and building costs have put owning a new home beyond the means of most Americans. Many persons rent because they have no alternative. They should not have to carry an unfair share of the tax burden.

While benefiting renters, Mr. HARRIS' bill would also deal fairly with landlords. The bill would not affect such landlord tax breaks as the depreciation allowance, or the deduction for mortgage interest costs. It would also actually reduce the taxable income of landlords, since they no longer would have to count the money used to pay property taxes.

As matters now stand, renters often have no idea how much of their rent is used by property owners to pay property taxes. I am told it is not unusual for 25 to 30 percent of this money to be siphoned off for taxes. If the tenants really knew the size of their stake in local affairs, they would doubtless be more active and interested in exercising the rights and responsibilities of citizenship.

Mr. HARRIS' legislation is sound and constructive. It would offer no special treatment to renters, simply a measure of equity. I am glad to become a co-sponsor of this legislation, and I hope that hearings can be scheduled at an early date by the Ways and Means Committee.

An article from the San Diego Union discussing the increasingly prohibitive price, for many Americans, of homeownership follows:

NEW HOUSE STILL A DREAM

(By James J. Mitchell)

Because of sharp increases in mortgage rates and the cost of housing, between half and two-thirds of all American families are now unable to afford new homes, according to two economists for the U.S. League of Savings Associations.

The situation is almost as unfavorable for existing homes, said Kenneth J. Thygeson, economist for the league, and Dennis Jacobs, assistant economist.

If Thygeson and Jacobs are right, the old American dream of having one's own house may go the way of trolleys and soda fountains.

A weak rebound in housing construction would also, of course, have an impact on the strength of the current economic recovery.

The economists presented their analysis of the cost of housing in the most recent issue of the Savings & Loan News, the foremost periodical of the savings and loan industry.

According to their data, the average sales price of new homes sold in 1965 was \$22,900, compared with \$42,600 in the third quarter of 1975. The average interest rate on a conventional loan with a 20 per cent down payment jumped from 5.81 per cent in 1965 to 9.17 per cent in 1975.

What this meant, Thygeson and Jacobs said, was a staggering increase in monthly payments.

If a buyer of the average new home sold in 1965 put 20 per cent down and borrowed the remainder with a 25-year conventional mortgage, the monthly payment was \$115.92. By 1975, the monthly payment for the same type of mortgage on the average house jumped to \$290, a whopping 2.5 times the 1965 payment. With a 30-year mortgage, the 1975 monthly payment for the same house was about \$278.

Using the traditional rule of thumb of having a mortgage payment equal to no more than 25 per cent of gross monthly income, to make a monthly payment of \$290 a homebuyer should earn almost \$14,000 a year.

Yet, according to the economists, nearly 43 per cent of all American working households earned less than \$10,000 in 1975. Nearly two-thirds of the households earned less than \$15,000, they said.

These figures do not only mean that most American families cannot buy the "average" new home. They also indicate that many families cannot afford any—new or existing—home that costs more than \$30,000.

For according to Thygeson and Jacobs, in order to finance a \$30,000 home with a 20 per cent down payment and a 25-year, 9.25 per cent mortgage, the buyer would have to make monthly payments of \$208. Using the 25 per cent of gross income rule of thumb, this means the buyer must have an annual income of about \$10,000.

To buy a \$40,000 home with the same type of mortgage, the homebuyer would have to afford monthly payments of about \$274, which requires an income of more than \$13,000. The monthly payments would be slightly lower with a 30-year mortgage, but the difference would not be significant.

"Thus, as a conservative estimate, somewhat between one-half to two-thirds of American families could not swing the financing on last year's average new home priced at \$42,600," the economists said. "The picture is not much brighter in the existing housing market, where the average sales price hit \$38,000 last year."

Thygeson and Jacobs point out that while higher interest rates play an important role in the rise of monthly payments, the most important factor has been the higher cost of houses.

The effect of rising interest rates, the economists said, would increase the monthly payments on a \$22,900 house (the average sales price of a new home in 1965) from \$115.92 to \$155.88. That is an increase of 34 per cent.

But if the 1965 average interest rate of 5.81 per cent is kept constant, while the new home prices are allowed to rise from \$22,900 to \$42,600, the monthly payment jumps from \$115.92 to \$215.64, or 86 per cent.

That is almost three times the rate of increase from higher interest rates. And, Thygeson said in an interview, the effect of financing would be even smaller if the comparison took into account the fact that 30-year mortgages, relatively rare in 1965, are common today. Lengthening the mortgage period reduces the monthly payment.

Thygeson and Jacobs blame the unfavorable housing situation on the country's recent bout with inflation, which they said was caused by "fiscal and monetary irresponsibilities of the past."

"A change in these policies could do more than any other government action to relieve the housing depression in the years ahead," they said. "Responsible monetary and fiscal policies would result in lower mortgage rates and at least a significant slowing in the escalation of new house prices."

"The combined impact of such beneficial trends would increase new housing availability for all Americans."

able certain documentation with respect to the present situation in Mexico.

The proposed, or recently passed laws which have generated broad opposition within Mexico are best described in a booklet entitled, "La Ley General de Asentamientos Humanos," published by the Instituto de la Opinion Mexicana, Taxco 14-405, Mexico, D.F. It contains a wide range of Mexican legal opinions on these revolutionary new laws.

The public statement of Mrs. Hortensia Allende, on April 4, was made in Toluca and carried in El Occidental of Guadalajara on April 5. Mrs. Allende stated that the Law of Urban Reform was identical to one which her husband intended to impose in Chile.

A description of the official position created for foreign Communists by President Luis Echeverria is contained in Novedades, a Mexico City daily, dated May 14, 1975. The Centro de Investigación y Docencia Económicas was created to allow these people to "serve" Mexico as they have served so many other countries, and "to fill a vacuum at the continental level." Noted Reds from the Allende government to be found therein include Pedro Vuskovic, Armando Arancibia, Eduardo Novoa, Luis Maira, and Fernando Fainzyber. Ranking Reds from other countries include Marcos Kaplan of Argentina and Samuel Lichtenstejn of Uruguay. This is, in short, an international Marxist "think tank" intended to produce measures by means of which to convert Mexico into another Chile.

By deliberately creating insecurity of land tenure, making all property rights subject to Marxist notions of overriding state interest, the Mexican Government has caused endless, needless difficulties for the productive economic sector. Mexican newspapers are filled with paid advertisements appealing for relief, inserted by beleaguered businessmen and farmers, while the news columns give accounts of land seizures by hundreds and even thousands of people organized and led by Communists. The victims rightly question why they receive little or no protection from the government.

While accounts of this resultant instability are to be found in Mexican newspapers over the past half-year, the furor caused by the amnesty proposal has erupted only in late March, when the bill was revealed. The text is quoted in El Dia for March 26, and a partial but nonetheless rather lengthy list of those to be amnestied appears in La Prensa for March 28. El Sol, on the same date, quoted Arnoldo Martinez Verdugo, Secretary General of the Partido Comunista Mexicano, stating that the Amnesty Law "constitutes a triumph for the democratic and progressive forces" and that "this attitude of the government opens the gates to the way of political struggle" in Mexico.

Earlier, on the 13th and 16th of October, La Prensa detailed the rewards, in terms of public office, given to the relatives of Lucio Cabañas, one of Mexico's most active Communist guerrillas before he was killed in 1974.

Further details of rural violence in Mexico will be provided when Congress reconvenes.

NOTES ON MEXICO'S LEAP TOWARD COMMUNISM

HON. LARRY McDONALD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 14, 1976

Mr. McDONALD of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, with regard to my remarks on the floor, I should like to make avail-

had self-employment income before 1967, had to file for the exemption on or before December 31, 1968.

It has come to my attention that at least some people may not have been aware of the restrictions on the right to file for this religiously based exemption. The bill I am introducing would permit such people to file applications at any time up to December 31, 1977.

Under present law, people who filed for this exemption before the end of 1968 were not only exempted from the tax for the future, but were permitted to recover all the self-employment tax they had paid back through 1951. Under the bill that I am introducing, however, an individual who takes advantage of this extended filing period—up to December 31, 1977—would not be allowed to recover the previously paid self-employment taxes. That individual would only be exempted from the self-employment tax for the future.

Even though these people would not be entitled to refunds of previously paid self-employment taxes, under the bill they would have to waive any rights to social security benefits based on their wages and self-employment income, so long as this exemption from the self-employment taxes continues. Although this proposal would result in some insignificant reduction in future social security revenues, it is highly likely that it would result in an even greater reduction in the social security trust fund's obligations, because these people must waive their rights to benefits, and must waive their survivors' rights to survivors' benefits.

LAND INVASION PROBLEM IN MEXICO

(Mr. McDONALD of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. McDONALD of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, the sense of what is happening in the Mexican countryside today, as a result of what must be a high-level decision in the ruling Institutional Revolutionary Party of Mexico, can be conveyed through extracts from the Mexican press.

Accordingly, a sampling is offered which indicates the widespread and persistent nature of the land-invasion problem, and the indifference of the government to the rights of landowners who are within the law and often possessed of special assurances from the government that they will not be affected by such acts.

It is well to remember that, after half a century of agrarian reform under a revolutionary government, and after the redistribution of over 150 million acres of land, this vaunted solution has not solved very much. Cries of "latifundia", the denunciation of owners of 250-acre farms, and calls for a limit of 50 acres are sheer demagoguery.

More than mere irresponsible demagoguery is involved, however. There are too many voices within the ruling party which speak in the stilted phrases of Communist propaganda. There are too many calls from leaders and party officials for "direct action" against em-

ployers, for "war" against selected elements of the Mexican population, calls for class warfare.

Then, too, it is instructive to compare all the turmoil over land seizures by allegedly landless peasants with the Mexican government's grant of 81,000 hectares—about 200,000 acres of land—to Yugoslavia for exploitation! The Mexican press reported on November 6, 1975, as follows:

Mexico and Yugoslavia are negotiating an agreement that provides for the scientific exploitation—using the most advanced technology—of 81,000 hectares of land of the Chontalpa in Tabasco, the largest agro-industrial complex in Latin America, Hydraulic Resources Secretary Leandro Roviroso Wade announced.

Yugoslav technicians paid a 45-day visit to Mexico to learn about the possibilities of accelerated exploitation of that rich southern region.

More typical of what is happening are the events reflected in the news items below.

Open letter to President Echeverria, carried as a paid advertisement in El Heraldo, March 29, 1976:

The undersigned organizations (more than fifty), which represent thousands of farmers, have addressed you on many occasions in the past two weeks, asking your intervention with only one object: That in the countryside there should be obedience to the law.

Unfortunately, until now, the situation has remained the same. The invaded properties continue to be occupied, disorder and anarchy prevail in our areas, the robbery of vehicles, and armed robbery of passengers grows greater, and now even includes the assassination of a small landowner. There is an absolute insecurity and total lack of guarantees.

The Authorities, in order not to divorce themselves from the people, ought to understand that their positions imply, more than a privilege, a strict obligation to comply with the law, and make others comply with the law.

We ask ourselves:

(1) Why is there permitted, ALL OVER THE COUNTRY, land invasions?

(2) Why has the Secretary of Agrarian Reform converted himself into the source, instigator, supervisor and coordinator of invasions who appear more a focus of communist subversion than a patriotic upright, impartial, authentic state secretary?

(3) Why does there exist this systematic, orchestrated attack, applauded by a servile bureaucracy, lacking common sense and without political-social sense, against private property, work, progress (the fruit of work and sacrifice everywhere, but primarily in the country, where it has brought a fall in agricultural production and lack of confidence in the intentions of the government.

Universal, April 10:

GUANAJUATO.—The Centro de Investigaciones Agrícolas del Bajío, one of the most important centers of agricultural research in the country, was invaded by peasants of the Organization of Mexican Workers and Peasants (UGOCPM), who destroyed experimental plantings of wheat, corn, sorghum, and other plants. The Director of the Center, Dr. Jesus Castro Franco, said the losses are incalculable, although they were initially estimated at 50 million pesos, considering that the Center will be unable to distribute improved seed wheat adequate for planting 80,000 to 100,000 hectares.

Excelsior, April 7, 1976:

LOS MOCHIS, SINALOA.—A group demanding land once more invaded a property of 1600 hectares in the municipio of Guasave,

where they paralyzed the harvest of several crops and the preparation of the land for new crops. At the same time, the invaders expelled more than 200 workers. Millions of pesos worth of tomatoes were lost.

Urgent Telegram to President Echeverria, March 17, 1976, carried as a paid advertisement in several Mexican newspapers:

With reference to the problem of invasions of ranches in Guanajuato, Jalisco, Tlaxcala and Zacatecas, and the danger of the disappearance of bullfighting, and having submitted these problems to the competent authorities, without any results, we urgently solicit you to concede us and audience. (Signed) Mexican Union of Picadores and Bandarrilleros; National Association of Bullfighters; Association of Mexican Bullfight Enterprises; and National Association of Fighting Bull Breeders.

Excelsior, March 21, 1976:

TLAXCALA.—Miguel Angel Candia asked for legislation "to punish the invaders of property" because if there is no legal protection for the small property owner, small farms "will disappear from the whole country." He pointed out that while there is legislation limiting the area of farms—"which we respect"—there are no laws against those who invade property. "We have seen that denunciations before local authorities are a dead letter." Candia said that in the whole state there is fear. "No one will sow because he is not sure that he will be able to harvest."

Ovaciones, April 7, 1976:

MEXICO, D.F.—In view of the scarcity of urban land, the increase in urbanization and intensity of settlement, one can no longer defend the luxury of private property. Land, nor permit that it continue, because "actual circumstances demand the highest priority to the social function of urban land." This is the statement of an official in charge of urban land planning, made before the P.R.I. presidential candidate, Jose Lopez Portillo.

Excelsior, March 15:

VILLAHERMOSA.—"Let us take the bull by the horns," said Jose Lopez Portillo to the P.R.I. youth. "It is necessary to consider the creation of a powerful organization of small workers that can fight against the real or simulated latifundistas. It is a clear formula that we can demand in the countryside."

Excelsior, April 9:

GUADALAJARA.—There are about 1,325,000 families illegally settled on plots of ground in Mexico, according to the Director General of the Regulatory Commission on Land Tenure. These is a grave problem of illegal trafficking in lots. He blamed intermediaries who enrich themselves in this way. The cities which have the greatest problem of land invasions are Mexico City, Monterrey, Guadalajara, Tijuana, Mexicali, and Culiacan.

Excelsior, January 7, 1976:

TOLUCA.—President Luis Echeverria today disposed of 1,063,000 hectares of land to almost 22,000 peasants, by signing 155 Presidential resolutions affecting 600 properties in 20 states. Almost at the same time, officials of the Agrarian Reform began the physical division of land, under the slogan, "Echeverria gives land, not papers."

Excelsior, April 8, 1976:

CIUDAD MADERO, TAMPS.—More than 5,000 families have invaded individual properties in this municipality during the past three days. The initial 700 "parachutists" took possession of land last Sunday, "because of the exaggerated increase in the price of living quarters."

El Sol de Mexico, April 6, 1976:

cannot but praise the significance of your gesture as once again you pledge allegiance to a Republic that is "one nation under God".

We earnestly hope that these reflections and this commemoration of your Bicentennial will constitute a rededication to those sound moral principles formulated by your Founding Fathers and enshrined forever in your history. There is so much in your tradition to urge you to look forward to the future with trust in God. May your land be indeed a land of upright conduct in personal and public life—a land where truth is respected, and where brotherly love is the criterion of greatness. We willingly join our voice to your own prayerful expression of challenge and resolution: "America! America! God mend thine every flaw, Confirm thy soul in self-control, Thy liberty in law".

And may you, the lawmakers of this land, and all your illustrious colleagues in government, recall with pride your role of service, and fulfill with dignity your solemn charge before the people.

In our own role of a universal ministry and of worldwide service to humanity—as a friend your people and every people—it is our prayer that America may go forward to a new era, humbly expressing gratitude for the immense blessings received from the Creator. With openness and concern for the needs of the world, may she guard the spiritual and moral heritage of her past, in order to ensure a future "with liberty and justice for all".

ANNA L. CHATMAN, OUTSTANDING
CITIZEN

HON. LOUIS STOKES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 29, 1976

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker. I rise on this occasion to pay tribute to a woman who has devoted her life and energies to the social, political, and moral betterment of the Greater Cleveland community.

Anna L. Chatman is a woman with boundless energy and a zest for life which amazes all of us who know her.

Similar to many of the leaders in our community, Mrs. Chatman's early involvement came through the church. As a child and young woman, Mrs. Chatman was raised in the Liberty Hill Baptist Church. All of the spiritual enrichment she received in those early years, she returned to the church tenfold as Sunday school teacher, church pianist, and director of the gospel chorus.

In 1939, Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Chatman became the bride of the Reverend Marcellus C. Chatman, founder and pastor of the Harvest Baptist Church. By his side, Mrs. Chatman continued her exemplary work. The social and economic needs of the parishioners in Cleveland's Black community were every bit as acute as their spiritual needs. Together, Rev. and Mrs. Chatman toiled in the human vineyards and together, they accomplished much. Since the death of her beloved husband, Mrs. Chatman has continued the religious and community involvement which she and her husband began together.

Up to this point, Mr. Speaker, I have spoken of Mrs. Chatman's relationship to her church and her community. Yet, I cannot fail to mention her relationship to me.

To say that Mrs. Chatman is my friend is true in every sense of the word. But even that term greatly understates the enormous warmth, affection, and respect that I have for this outstanding woman.

I owe much of my personal success to her continued devotion and hard work. As executive director of the 21st Congressional District Caucus, the leading black political organization in Cleveland, Mrs. Chatman has been my strongest supporter. Mr. Speaker, this woman though she has never held public office, functions expertly at every level of the political process, and has had a long-range impact on the political life of this city.

I often wonder myself, "Where does she find the time." Let me list but a few of her associations which will show you the extent of her commitment:

President, Cleveland District of Baptist Women.

Chorister, Ohio Baptist General Association for 31 years.

Vice President, Baptist Pastors Wives and Widows.

Member, Cleveland Urban League.

Member, National Association for the Advancement of Colored People.

Director and Organist, Harvest Baptist Church.

Executive Director, Twenty-First Congressional District Caucus.

Chairman, Twenty-First Congressional District Caucus.

Co-Chairman, State of Ohio Golden Jubilee Celebration of the Women's Auxiliary of the National Baptist Convention.

Pianist and Director for over 10 Churches in the City of Cleveland.

Founder and Administrator of the Harvest Day Care Center.

Vice Chairman, Corporate Board of the Ministerial Day Care Center.

Chairman, Women for Stokes for Congress Committee.

Recipient of Outstanding Citation from the Women's Business and Professional.

All of Mrs. Chatman's contributions carry her own unique, indelible mark. One can readily see this in her two fine daughters, Marcella Chatman McElroy, a schoolteacher, and Ruby Chatman Alexander, a social worker. Both young women have upheld their mother's tradition of service to the community.

Mr. Speaker, so many in Cleveland, and that includes myself, feel blessed by the presence of this remarkable woman. She is the anchor to which we hold and the center to which we gravitate.

Each Member of the House of Representatives sits here today because of the toil and undaunted effort of a man or woman like Anna Chatman. For that reason, I ask you to join with me in recognition of her many years of invaluable service to the Cleveland community. Mrs. Chatman will be honored at the annual luncheon of the Cleveland District of Baptist Women on May 8, 1976. I am sure that all of you join with me in extending congratulations to her on this most important occasion.

MEXICO IS BEING PREPARED FOR
RED TAKEOVER

HON. STEVEN D. SYMMS

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 29, 1976

Mr. SYMMS. Mr. Speaker, my colleague, the Honorable LARRY McDONALD of Georgia, placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 14, 1976, pages E3359-60 and E2051, some material on events taking place in Mexico that should give every thinking American cause for concern. We could and did maintain a very detached attitude when the Marxists took over in Chile some years ago. However, we have a common border with Mexico and in recent years relations have been very good. But, if the people presently guiding the land seizures and other maneuvers in Mexico have their way, the border separating the two countries could become one of conflict. Therefore, I believe that the article from the Review of the News dated April 28, 1976, written by Mr. McDONALD should be read by the Members of this body. The article follows:

MEXICO IS BEING PREPARED FOR RED TAKEOVER

(By Congressman LAWRENCE P. McDONALD)

The shadow of Cuba, and of Chile under Salvador Allende, has loomed over Mexico for the past six to nine months, arousing grave concerns there. President Luis Echeverría, due to leave office in July, has apparently decided upon a retirement present for his country. The present is Communism.

A "brain trust" consisting of veteran Latin American and European Reds has been busy laying the legal groundwork as President Echeverría and his hand-picked successor, José López Portillo, have cranked up the propaganda. Meanwhile an amnesty has been prepared for the tough Communist cadres who engineered the "student revolt" in Mexico City in 1968. Mexican Communist Party leader Arnoldo Martínez Verdugo finds in it both vindication for those who, under K.G.B. orders, caused the deaths of at least a thousand people, and great hope for the future. The amnesty would permit those released to enter government employment, and as Sr. Martínez so gleefully observes, it all "opens the gates to political struggle" in Mexico.

At the same time, President Echeverría has made changes in the Mexican Constitution and presented a series of new laws which take dead aim at private property of every kind. Should these be accepted by a Congress which is generally ready to go along with anything the President wants, no one in Mexico would be able to feel secure in the possession of anything. The "public interest," as interpreted by Marxist revolutionaries, would override all personal rights.

It is shocking that the mass media in the United States have chosen to overlook what is happening in Mexico. When the President of our southern neighbor starts sounding like Fidel Castro, and proposes laws identical to those which ruined Chile, something just might be going on that is important. And the whole stock-in-trade of the professional Communist propagandist is now to be found in the speeches of President Echeverría. All his opposition is described as fascist, decadent, oligarchic; all resistance is said to be provocation; all crimes, including the tragic events of 1968, are claimed to be the work of his Rightist enemies. How can he say that? As easily as Fidel Castro himself.



Now the word is that the Communists the President is about to remove from the pokeny to positions of power were doing something very "understandable," that they had "progressive motivations." According to Mexico's President, the 1968 criminal activity was really caused by "the Mexican oligarchic sector" which "financed" some "immature groups" and led them to extremes! This is the sort of silly claptrap which Fidel Castro can get away with because no one dares to call him on it. Now, it would appear, the President of Mexico thinks his own people have been made equally subservient.

In the popular mind, Mexico has always been devoted to "revolution." However, to bend a phrase, the 19th Century got the action and the 20th Century got the rhetoric. What makes the Mexican Revolution deceptive is that too much is subsumed under the word "Revolution."

The average American thinks of Mexican revolutionaries as anything from gore-splattered Robin Hoods to noble idealists and visionaries fallen victim to dark plots or seething passions. The average American also thinks of a revolution as a period of upheaval lasting a few months, or at most a few years, even though its effects are felt much longer. That is why Americans tend to get confused when introduced to the idea that the Mexico of today is engaged in the same now-deified Revolution which is supposed to have commenced in 1910.

What does a 65-year-long Revolution feel like? Well, at least 60 years of it feels like any other "one-party democracy." In Mexico the dominant party calls itself the Party of Institutional Revolution (P.R.I.). Other parties are now tolerated as long as they don't get feisty, and revolutions against the Revolution are made semantically unthinkable, a marvelous triumph over the mind of Man.

The dominant P.R.I. is, however, only a machine for retaining power. The government consists of a weak Congress and a President with near-dictatorial powers. It has been the custom of the Revolution that the President serves a single six-year term, and is then able to choose his successor, who is in turn elected by enthusiastic majorities. While it may seem incongruous to some that the citizen would think of himself as engaging in Revolution by confirming in office the same crowd that was in there 30 years ago, or that a paunchy bureaucrat would consider himself striking a blow for the Revolution with every squish of his rubber stamp, that is in fact the pattern.

Thus, throughout this century, Mexico has been awash in the rhetoric of revolution. The Mexican Constitution of 1917 is "revolutionary" enough for most Communists. It is statist, anti-clerical, anti-foreign, anti-private-property, and all for communal lands. Under that Constitution, beyond the rhetoric, there has come much real revolution. For many years there was expropriation of foreign-owned businesses, complete outlawing of the Church, and expropriation of large landholdings within Mexico and their redistribution to the Indians and *campesinos* as communal village lands or *ejidos*.

On the other hand, the Constitution of 1917 has been tempered, along the way, by everything from common sense to greed. After all, there must be production, or more accurately there must be productive cows to milk. So the Constitution does not outlaw private property or foreign investment, but simply makes them subservient to the Revolution as interpreted by the party's managers of the Institutional Revolution. As a result there has been considerable socialism in Mexico, along with a body of private property and private enterprise, as producers have come to terms with the ruling party. The rhetoric has remained flaming-Red throughout, but the actual situation has been tolerable.

Now, however, the Constitution of 1917, which was Red enough for most Communists, has proven not Red enough for Mexican President Luis Echeverría and his foreign Red friends. Within the past six months, as we have noted, Echeverría has fiddled with the Constitution and put forward ominous new laws which have all of Mexico worried. These laws come from a Presidential think-tank called the Center of Economic Investigation and Teaching (*Centro de Investigación y Docencia Económicas*). And this Echeverría brain-trust consists of Chilean and other foreign Communists who have brought to ruin one country after another and been driven out of one country after another. It is indeed ominous for Mexico (and for us) that they have settled like vultures on a high branch of the Mexican Government.

Why? Why would the President of Mexico do this to his country? President Echeverría is scheduled to take leave of office this July, when his successor, José López Portillo, is scheduled to be elected by the usual majority. Echeverría could look forward to both continued influence and well-cushioned retirement. But the title of "leader of the Third World" has been dangled before him by both Washington and Moscow—and he is snapping at the offer.

Part of the deal seems to be this: the Communists will call off their guerrillas and terrorists if Echeverría will install them in the Government!

Incredible? No. But hard to "document." The circumstantial evidence is nonetheless strong. Pitched battles in the countryside between guerrillas and the Mexican Army have subsided; the murder of policemen by the baker's dozen has slowed to a dribble; persistent trouble-makers are plucked from their homes, indicating that somebody has handed somebody else a list of home addresses. On the other hand, very much as if part of a deal, President Echeverría is moving to release from prison and make eligible for government employment the hardened Reds who participated in such bloody K.G.B. operations as the "student riots" of 1968. Indeed, much political power in the state of Guerrero (which includes Acapulco) has been handed to relatives of the late Lucio Cabañas, a Red guerrilla killed in December 1974.

So the Red cadres are, some of them, already Government officials, while others know they can rely upon Government toleration. And the Red "general staff" in the Presidential think-tank works directly with Luis Echeverría.

Who are the bad pennies who keep turning up in one country after another to affect these Communist coups? Try Pedro Vuskovic, the highest-ranking United Nations official to serve in the Communist Government of Salvador Allende in Chile. He was Allende's Minister of Economics, the one who wrecked the entire national economy. And it was no accident; Marxist revolution is not a matter of rule-or-ruin but of ruin-and-rule. Scores of lesser Chilean Reds serve under Vuskovic, who has been given the incredible title of Assessor to the Secretary of the National Patrimony. Communist refugees from Argentina like Marcos Kaplan, and from Uruguay, such as the former Rector of the University of Montevideo, Samuel Lichtensztejn, as well as a large number of European Reds, have flocked to the newest high perch in Latin America where they are working with Vuskovic.

Based upon past performance (see "The U.N. Worked For A Red Chile," in The Review Of The News for October 30, 1974), we can expect that the United Nations will provide all the Marxist "experts" President Echeverría can use. So you see it meant something last April 4th when Mrs. Hortensia Allende surfaced with her Cuban bodyguards

to state that President Echeverría's latest effusion in Mexico, sometimes called the Law of Urban Reform, is exactly the one her husband was going to institute in a Communist Chile. What it meant is that Mexican-brand socialism is being maneuvered to give the Communists a vast land base on our southern border.

Mexicans are beginning to realize what is happening, and much dissatisfaction is being expressed in the Mexican press—although the American press, so sensitive to every twitch of the body politic in, say, Chile, is still pretending to be indifferent. I believe that in fact such apparent indifference is a manifestation of Washington's quiet approval. Such approval would be wholly consonant with the Kissinger-Sonnenfeldt Doctrine that America's humble role in the world is to aid constructively in the emergence of the Soviet Empire.

Which is why Chilean-style, organized land seizures are in the news in Mexico as I write. This is simply incredible in view of the fact that 60 years of "agrarian reform" in Mexico has already involved the "redistribution" of at least 150 million acres. Privately owned land in Mexico is already deliberately limited in extent with the original idea having been to dispossess the latifundistas, the owners of huge estates left over from the colonial era or representing the spoils of public office. These states, especially in the drier areas, sometimes extended as far as the eye could see. That is an interesting point, since Marxist politicians in Mexico are now denouncing farmers with 250 acres as latifundistas richly deserving of despoliation.

The aforesaid "redistribution" of 150 million acres, in accordance with Mexican socialism, has permitted less than 3 million Mexican families to use (but definitely not to own) small farms with an average of barely 18 acres of arable land. Nearly all privately owned farms are also that small in terms of arable land; only 4 percent of private Mexican farms, in 1967, had more than 62 acres of cropland. There isn't really much left efficiently to expropriate.

But that sort of thing never restrains the hard-core Communist. The history of Communism in this century proves over and over again that Communists are fully prepared to wreck agriculture and bring famine to their victims, for the purpose of clamping tight political and economic control on the rural population. Communists are always prepared to sacrifice food production in order to enslave the people. After all, it is not the ruling Communist elite which goes hungry.

The same plan which was put into effect in Chile, by Vuskovic and his United Nations experts, is to be put into effect in Mexico in the very near future if President Echeverría can manage it. In Chile, the plan brought farm production to disastrous lows, which led to raging inflation and the subjection of the population to food rationing run by the Reds in a frankly political manner. The plan was to ruin the middle class and make everyone dependent upon the Communists for breakfast, lunch, and dinner.

This was not a mistake or merely a misfortune—this was the plan. And the same planners are bringing the same plan to Mexico today!

For example, Mexican newspapers are filled with stories of land-grabs involving up to 2,500 people. In the Yaqui Valley, an irrigated area of northwestern Mexico which ranks as one of the most productive in the world, one-third of Mexico's wheat crop is hostage to gangs of Marxist-led landgrabbers (who also grab harvest machinery and hostages). But is President Echeverría concerned about it?

Hardly!

His concern is with "clandestine, pro-fascist, anti-Mexican" Mexicans who have gotten a whiff of what's coming and who



don't like it. His chosen successor, José López Portillo, prefers to rant about "White Guards who are again assassinating peasants" and to rage about "latifundistas disguising themselves as small landowners." It is amazing that Sr. López has not yet so forgotten himself as to demand the liquidation of the kulaks as a class.

The owners of vast estates of 60 acres are indeed threatened with liquidation as a class, but the lowly *ejidatarios* are also in trouble. Allowing peasants to make their own decisions, on however humble a scale, and even to rent their land, or hire their neighbors, is absolutely intolerable to a true Communist—one who is serious about total power! And so we should not be surprised to hear Sr. López proposing a "better organization of the peasants in close identification with the government," by "organizing everyone, strengthening revolutionary ideals and actions, resolutely strengthening the genuine drive to struggle, and destroying the pretenders who disguise themselves as hoarders, monopolists, and *latifundistas* to fool the people and themselves. Let us fight those who are almost always basically confused with each other—the chieftains because the chieftains and *latifundistas*, the chieftains and monopolists, chieftains and hoarders are the same... we have declared war on them. We are going to wage that war to the end."

This utterly incoherent blether, rivaling in incomprehensibility the rant of Senator George McGovern in his more unhinged moments, nonetheless betrays its Castroite origins, and threats of "war" against whatever elements of the Mexican population may be flung by Communist agents cannot be overlooked by any sane Mexican.

The plan is to dispossess all private owners, and to force them as well as the *ejidatarios* into collective farms under tight government control. It is what every Communist government does. It is not going to boost production, but it is going to put every peasant where the Communists think he belongs, in peonage to the government.

What then? Will the United States feed Mexico as it feeds the Soviet slave empire? Or will the United States receive five or ten million Mexican refugees from Communism, including the usual proportion of Red agents?

Or both?
Believe me, my friends, this is only a slight indication of what might happen should Mexico succumb to the Communist *coup* now being arranged by President Luis Echeverria.

RETREAT IN THE WAR AGAINST DRUG ABUSE

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 29, 1976

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, in the late 1960's and early 1970's the Congress and the Johnson and Nixon administrations reacted to a popular alarm regarding the unparalleled and unanticipated introduction of heroin and other drugs into suburban middle-class America. This suburban phenomenon was accompanied by a sharp increase in the inner city. The heightened public awareness and demand on elected officials resulted in a fairly massive legislative and executive effort focusing on all aspects of the drug abuse problem: treatment, research, education, and law enforcement.

New laws were passed, new programs

created, moneys appropriated, and a generation of our beloved but undirected and adventuresome youth were "saved" from destruction—or so we thought. After some demonstrated success, we assumed that the war was won, the problem contained, and we began to relax, withdrawing our commitment and our vigilance and resources.

If we have learned anything at all since our major assault on drug abuse was curtailed a couple of years ago, it is this: The problem of drug abuse is resilient and potentially epidemic in all geographic areas and all socioeconomic groups, and that public retrenchment is an open invitation to sinister forces to intensify and expand illicit drug trafficking. We were almost lulled to sleep by glowing reports of greatly lowered incidences of drug abuse in our large urban centers and the effective disruption of the French-Turkey connection. We have been rudely reawakened by more recent reports which show that drug abuse rose in medium- and small-size communities as it receded in the larger ones, and that drug abuse is now rising sharply in the large urban areas where activity had been abated.

The Vice President in transmitting the Domestic Council Drug Abuse Task Force's White Paper on Drug Abuse on September 29, 1975, accurately described the situation when he said:

... the optimism about "winning the war on drugs" expressed so eloquently and confidently only a few years ago was premature.

We must reaffirm the commitment to combat drug abuse as a national priority.

The tragedy and irony of the current situation is that at a time of increased drug abuse, the National Institute on Drug Abuse is operating on a continuing resolution. This is unconscionable and inconsistent with the priority attention that must be given to this plague on our people.

It is very easy for us who are not in day-to-day touch with the personal and human miseries and dislocations of the drug abuse problem to view the problem with academic diffidence. For this reason, Mr. Speaker, I ask consent that the text of an article by Wista Moyler, appearing in the April 15 edition of Community News Service, Inc., be placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

This article is personalized testimony to the positive achievements being made by a drug addiction treatment program, the Addiction Rehabilitation Center—ARC—in my district. There are many other addicts stading in line wanting and needing the kinds of services provided by ARC. Because of inadequate Federal and local funding their needs are unmet; they remain at the mercy of the pushers and purveyors of drugs. All the while we allow funds to be cut, programs like ARC to be reduced and, in so doing, lose the moment of expedient action.

Let me put the ARC situation into the context of Federal drug abuse prevention policy. The program has just sustained a 10 percent cut due to a loss of some State funds which are funneled

through the New York City Office of Drug Abuse. Yet our national policy says that local programs, once established with Federal matching funds, should have the Federal match reduced in subsequent years and depend more heavily on local funding. This is absolute folly considering the fiscal troubles of most large cities. In fact, the Federal share should be larger than the present 60 percent.

The cost-beneficial nature of programs like ARC is easy to demonstrate. Last year, 227 ARC enrollers were employed and earned a total of \$909,000, on which they paid taxes. It is estimated that these same 227 individuals, without treatment and other intervention, would have spent \$17 million to support their addiction and would have stolen as much as \$67 million worth of goods to raise the income.

The Congress recently reauthorized drug abuse prevention programs, whose authorizations had expired, and on April 13 we passed the Second Supplemental budget appropriations, containing \$161,000,000 for drug abuse grants and contracts. House passed appropriations are less than 80 percent of authorizations. Mr. Speaker, I beg my colleagues to resolve now to match authorizations with 100 percent appropriations in fiscal year 1977 and to recognize and support this in committee deliberations, in concurrent resolutions on the fiscal year 1977 budget, and any House-Senate conferences on these matters.

I place in the RECORD at this point for the information of my colleagues an excellent article by Wista Moyler of the Community News Service on the current crisis of the Addiction Rehabilitation Center:

DRUG FREE ADDICTION PROGRAM BATTLES BIGGEST FOES: SHRINKING FUNDS AND APATHY
(By Wista Moyler)

APRIL 15.—The fifth floor window of the Addiction Rehabilitation Center (ARC) on 128th Street and Park Avenue overlooks roofing company, an Exxon gasoline station, an auto repair shop, two vacant lots strewn with debris and the elevated Penn Central railroad which splices the avenue, casting its steel shadow over the surrounding tenements and shops.

Angela, a 34-year-old ARC resident walks dispiritedly towards the ARC building. Charlene Jackson, public relations director for the residence, says that Angela, the mother of a 5-year-old paraplegic and a drug addict, typifies the drug addict or alcoholic with a multiplicity of problems that ARC attempts to "habilitate". "There is no such thing as "re-habilitation" because there was no habilitation in the first place," she argues. "We must perform the task that society failed to do."

Meivin is a 20-year-old North Carolinian who came to ARC with several arrest warrant against him in New York and North Carolina. Through the efforts of the ARC staff, the N.Y. warrants were dismissed but North Carolina is still seeking his extradition. Ms. Jackson says there is every indication that he might have to return to N.C. to serve a jail sentence.

"No one cares about the crises that individuals must face everyday, but if you have to deal with these problems every day, you just can't ignore them." Ms. Jackson explains.

Ignoring the problems of drug addicts, however, "is almost impossible for the ARC



& Foerster, Formerly, National Security Council Staff.

Harian Cleveland, Director, Program in International Affairs Aspen Institute for Humanistic Studies, Formerly, U.S. Ambassador to NATO.

Lynn E. Davis, Assistant Professor of Political Science, Columbia University.

Gaylord Freeman, Honorary Chairman of the Board, First National Bank of Chicago.

Richard N. Gardner, Henry L. Moses Professor of Law and International Organization, Columbia University, Formerly, Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for International Organization Affairs.

Richard L. Garwin, Thomas J. Watson Research Center, International Business Machines Corporation.

Paul Jennings, President, International Union of Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers.

Robert Kleiman, Editorial Board, New York Times.

Charles McC. Mathias, Jr., U.S. Senator for Maryland.

Paul W. McCracken, Edmund Ezra Day University Professor of Business Administration, University of Michigan, Formerly, Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisors.

Vice Admiral Gerald E. Miller, U.S. Navy (Ret.), Formerly, Commander of the Sixth Fleet.

Cyrus R. Vance, Vice Chairman, Partner, Simpson, Thacher & Bartlett, Formerly, Deputy Secretary of Defense.

Waldemar A. Nielsen, President, W. A. Nielsen and Company.

Frank Pace, Jr., President International Executive Service Corps, Formerly, Secretary of the Army; Chairman of the Board, General Dynamics.

General Bruce Palmer, Jr., U.S. Army (Ret.), Executive Director, Defense Manpower Commission, Formerly, Army Vice Chief of Staff.

Robert V. Roosa, Partner, Brown Brothers Harriman & Co., Formerly, Under Secretary of the Treasury.

Joseph M. Segel, Chairman, Presidential Airways, Board of Governors, UNA-USA.

Ivan Selin, Chairman of the Board, American Management Systems, Inc., Formerly, Acting Assistant Secretary of Defense for Systems Analysis.

Frank Stanton, Chairman of the American Red Cross, Formerly, Vice Chairman of the Board, Columbia Broadcasting System.

Paul C. Warnke, Partner, Clifford, Warnke, Glass, McIlwain & Finney, Formerly, Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Affairs.

Staff: Edward C. Luck, Project Director, Geraldine R. Caruana, Administrative Assistant.

that these foreign Communists are given preferential treatment and choice jobs in journalism, higher education, and government, at the expense of Mexicans who are as well, or even better qualified. I believe this demonstrates the determination of President Echeverria to push his country in directions determined by international communism.

The Times account of April 28 follows: MEXICO A HAVEN FOR LATIN EXILES AS RIGHTIST REGIMES TIGHTEN CURBS

(By Alan Riding)

MEXICO CITY, April 27.—“We knew Mexico's tradition on asylum and we remembered the way Mexico helped the Chileans,” recalled a Uruguayan doctor and Communist Party militant, now a political exile, “so I grabbed my wife and children and we headed for the embassy.”

The doctor sat around Mexico City's Hotel Versailles with other Uruguayan leftists who have recently fled the country. “We just don't know what is happening to our friends and relatives,” a woman historian said. “We were lucky to get out. The Mexican Embassy is now surrounded by soldiers and it's difficult to get in.”

With right-wing governments continuing to tighten their grip on the South American republics, Mexico is becoming perhaps the last safe haven and political center in Latin America for leftist exiles from the entire region.

Outside the Hotel Versailles, which has become the first home in Mexico for growing numbers of South American exiles, the distinctive Argentine accents of a mother and two children identified members of a group of refugees who had just arrived from Buenos Aires.

“MEXICO IS GENEROUS”

“Mexico is extraordinarily open and generous with political exiles,” said Dr. Ricardo Obregón Cano, former Governor of the Argentine province of Córdoba and now secretary general of a group called the Argentine Solidarity Committee. “No other country offers such personal and political security.”

Although Venezuela, Colombia and Costa Rica, the only three Latin American countries generally considered to be democratic, have received some exiles in recent years, they have reportedly done so reluctantly.

“The Venezuelan Embassy in Montevideo actually turned away a refugee who was then immediately arrested,” one Uruguayan exile recalled bitterly. “Colombia took five refugees against its will, while Costa Rica and Peru also closed their doors. But, at the last count, there were more than 100 exiles in the Mexican Embassy.”

Mexico's tradition of granting asylum to political exiles goes back to the late 1930's when thousands of republican refugees from the Spanish Civil War were welcomed here by the left-leaning President, Gen. Lázaro Cárdenas.

Even during the 1950's and 60's when more conservative regimes governed Mexico, leftist opponents of the repressive regimes Brazil, Guatemala, Nicaragua and Haiti as well as right wing exiles from the Cuban Government of Fidel Castro were granted asylum here.

But, under President Luis Echeverria Alvarez, this tradition has been transformed into an active instrument of foreign policy that enables the Government to contrast its new liberalism with the strident conservatism of many South American regimes.

As a result, during the last three years Mexico has not only opened the doors of its embassies to persecuted leftists, put pressure on other governments to allow them to fly into exile and tried to negotiate the release of political prisoners, but has also been will-

ing to sacrifice good relations with military regimes in order to protect their political opponents.

Mexico's warm welcome for refugees from Chile's military junta marked the beginning of this more aggressive policy in dealing with the problem of repression of leftists in several South American republics.

In part, this reflected the close friendship between President Echeverria and the late President Salvador Allende Gossens of Chile. The Mexican leader personally invited Dr. Allende's widow, Ortensia Bussi de Allende, to reside here and he later gave her a home in Mexico City.

TIES WITH CHILE BROKEN

But Mr. Echeverria also went out of his way to grant permanent or temporary asylum here to more than 3,000 Chilean leftists, including such prominent figures as former Foreign Minister Glodomiro Almeyda Medina and former Minister of Economy Pedro Vuskovic Bravo. And once the Mexican Embassy in Santiago was cleared of refugees, Mexico broke off diplomatic relations with the Chilean junta in November 1974.

The next wave of exiles came from Argentina, beginning in October 1974, after the Government of President Isabel Martinez de Peron swung to the right and a right-wing terrorist group, the Argentine Anti-Communist Alliance, began an offensive against leftists and even moderate opponents of the regime.

According to Dr. Obregón Cano, who now acts as a dental consultant as well as informal adviser to refugees, 450 to 500 Argentines, including two former university rectors, Rodolfo Puigros and Raul Leguizá, and former Interior Minister Esteban Bight, have taken up exile here since then. Most left Argentina after attempts or threats against their lives.

After the military coup against the Government of Mrs. Perón on March 24 this year, a new wave of exiles was expected to reach Mexico, but so far few have arrived. “The first thing the junta did was to surround all embassies, close the airports and even block all roads leading out of the country,” Dr. Obregón Cano said in an interview. “This time the junta doesn't want any leftists to escape.”

Like Argentina's new regime, the military-dominated Government of President Juan María Bordaberry in Uruguay does not recognize any of the country's own nationals as political refugees and therefore it refuses to grant them formal exile status.

Since the Uruguayan Army virtually took over the Government in June 1973, not only has the Tupamaro guerrilla movement been crushed but the Congress has also been closed, labor and student organizations have been outlawed and, according to exile sources, about 6,000 opponents of the regime have been imprisoned.

Last October, a new wave of repression against the Uruguayan left began, leading the London-based Amnesty International organization to denounce arbitrary arrests on a mass scale in Uruguay and the application of “institutionalized torture” against political prisoners there. Soon after, many who feared arrest began seeking asylum in the Mexican Embassy.

“The Uruguayan Government is furious with Mexico,” one exile said, showing a visitor an editorial from the pro-Government Montevideo newspaper La Mañana that carried the headline, “Mexico on the Dangerous Path Toward Communism.”

“It would like to expel the Mexican ambassador, but it doesn't want to draw too much attention,” the exile said.

In Mexico, though, the Uruguayan situation has already become something of a cause célèbre, at least among newspaper readers. Almost daily the newspapers here carry de-

ECHEVERRIA OPENS MEXICO TO ALL LATIN AMERICAN REDS.

HON. LARRY McDONALD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 4, 1976

Mr. McDONALD of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, the manner in which the President of Mexico, Luis Echeverria, is imposing on his country a collection of Communist who have been obliged to leave other parts of Latin American should be subject of general interest. I have mentioned it several times, and now we find confirmation in the New York Times—which, of course, leaves no doubt of its approval. It is worth noting



talled accounts of repression and torture in Uruguay alongside reports of Mexico's assistance to opponents of the Bordaberry Government.

As in the cases of Chilean and Argentine exiles before them, this publicity should help the Uruguayans find jobs as well as sympathy in Mexico. For example, government offices and state universities know immediately that it is official policy to help the Uruguayan exiles.

Yet, even apart from the anxiety they feel over the situation of relatives back home, the Uruguayans are finding their first weeks in Mexico less than easy. "We know that Mexico has its own serious unemployment problem," said one recent arrival from Montevideo who, like many of his colleagues, asked that his name not be published. "And we also know that many of the teaching and professional vacancies have been filled by Chileans and Argentines."

Until they find work, however, they are under no pressure to leave the modest comfort of the Hotel Versailles, where the Government has agreed to pay for their rooms and meals for an indefinite period. "Obviously we want to find work," one young exile said, "but the Government seems to understand the difficulties."

Exiles arriving from Argentina, on the other hand, have the advantage of finding an established exile organization, including not only the Solidarity Committee but also a cultural center known as Argentina House. "We don't concern ourselves about the political position of each exile," Dr. Obregon Cano said, "so long as they are political refugees. Most of us are Peronists, but we also help people from other parties."

JOURNALIST FINDS WORK QUICKLY

For example, thanks to assistance from established exiles, an Argentine journalist from Cordoba recently found a job and obtained immigrant status in Mexico within a month of his arrival here, even though he belonged to the former radical opposition party.

In contrast, 30 months after the coup against President Allende, the Chilean exile community is showing signs of disintegration, with traditional political differences now reflected in bitter divisions and infighting.

Part of Mexico's attraction for exiles is that, while it is as safe as many distant European countries, South Americans finding asylum here do not feel so out of touch with events back home.

"I'm so relieved I stayed here," said a former aide to President Allende who was also offered refuge in East Germany. "Here we're still in Latin America, people speak Spanish, it's more familiar, we don't feel so far from home. And, of course, the newspapers are full of news from Chile."

JOINT COMMITTEE SCHEDULING OF HEARINGS ON RADIOACTIVE WASTE MANAGEMENT

HON. MIKE McCORMACK

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 4, 1976

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Environment and Safety of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, I am pleased to announce that the subcommittee will conduct a series of public hearings on the management of radioactive wastes starting next Monday. The hearings will

be held at 10 a.m., on May 10, 11, and 12 in the public hearing room of the Joint Committee, S. 407, U.S. Capitol.

The management and handling of radioactive wastes, including wastes from our nuclear energy industry, is a subject of intense concern throughout the country. There is not the slightest doubt but that the technology can be developed for isolating, encapsulating, and storing our nuclear wastes deep in the ground in such a way that they present no threat whatsoever to the biosphere, the environment, or the population. Furthermore, it should be possible to do this so economically that the additional cost for nuclear electricity associated with permanent waste management would be insignificant.

The time has come for a full public discussion of the technical alternatives associated with waste management. The Energy Research and Development Administration, along with the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, the Environmental Protection Agency, and other agencies of the Government, have been studying this subject in detail for several years. ERDA is now prepared to make public its recommendations concerning these alternate technologies, and these hearings are scheduled to provide a platform for the ERDA to describe to the Congress and the public what the technical options are, what they might cost, and when they will be available.

The Joint Committee on Atomic Energy has full responsibility for oversight and legislation in the field of management of radioactive wastes. These hearings are designed to provide a "no holds barred", in-depth analysis of all aspects of this question so that the Joint Committee may provide whatever legislation is necessary to see that the implementation of programs for nuclear waste management is carried forward expeditiously.

Our goal is to establish a program under which all radioactive wastes are concentrated, encapsulated, and stored in a manner that will assure the full protection of the public, both now and in the future.

The subject of radioactive waste management is of great concern to all of us and I hope that my colleagues in the Congress will have the opportunity to either attend the hearings or familiarize themselves with the testimony generated from the hearings.

The tentative schedule follows:

Monday, May 10, 1976, 10 a.m.:

Richard Roberts, Assistant Administrator for Nuclear Energy, Energy Research and Development Administration.

John Bartlett, Pacific Northwest Laboratory.

James Liverman, Assistant Administrator for Environment and Safety, Energy Research and Development Administration.

Frank Baranowski, Director, Division of Nuclear Fuel Cycle and Production, Energy Research and Development Administration.

Tuesday, May 11, 1976, 10 a.m.:

John Frye and Robert Fosch, National Academy of Sciences, Committee on Radioactive Waste Management.

George DeBucananne, U.S. Geological Survey.

(Additional witnesses not yet identified.)
Wednesday, May 12, 1976, 10 a.m.:

Marcus Rowden, chairman, Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Kenneth Chapman, Director, Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards, Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Richard Roberts, Assistant Administrator for Nuclear Energy, Energy Research and Development Administration.

Roger Strelow, Assistant Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency.

CHEMICAL INDUSTRY LEADER FINDS LOAN GUARANTEES NECESSARY FOR CLEAN FUELS DEVELOPMENT

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 4, 1976

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, Thomas Milhaupt of the petrochemical energy group finds loan guarantees a necessity in the development of clean synthetic fuels. In testimony before the House Committee on Science and Technology, Mr. Milhaupt spoke as a representative of the many independent companies which comprise the petrochemical energy group. Each of the member companies is engaged in the production of refined products made from petroleum or natural gas.

By their very definition these companies are energy intensive, using petroleum and natural gas not only for fuels but for feedstocks. Mr. Milhaupt states:

... we are uniquely affected and vitally interested in legislation assuring adequate and economic supplies of these resources for the nation. And because we understand that H.R. 12112 is designed to encourage and explore the development and utilization of our domestic energy resources we believe that it is a step in the right direction and are pleased to appear in support of such initiatives.

Mr. Milhaupt's testimony stressed the importance of oil and gas hydrocarbons to their industry, including the liquid and gaseous synthetic fuels that can be derived from coal, urban waste, and other resources.

The petrochemical industry is particularly vulnerable to oil and natural gas shortages because no matter how strictly they conserve their energy efficient production there is no significant possibility for conservation when these resources are used as feedstocks to produce the refined products. For this reason the petrochemical industry and the jobs it creates are extremely susceptible to supply shortages.

Petrochemicals provide the basis for a multiplicity of products upon which all Americans depend. Seventy-eight percent of the Nation's rubber used for tires, coal conveyor belts, irrigation piping and other products are petrochemical based. Americans use 29 billion pounds of petrochemical based plastics each year. Sixty percent of the textiles produced in this country depend on petrochemicals; ammonia made from natural gas forms the base of our fertilizer industry. The auto-



THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

May 19, 1976

MEMORANDUM TO: JACK MARSH

FROM: RUSS ROURKE

Jack, Chuck Grassley returned my call this morning re the "letter to the President" on the situation in Mexico.

Grassley indicated that he had no further information on the subject over and above that which appeared in the various inserts in the Congressional Record. He was convinced that the same held true for the other co-signers of the letter. Obviously, he felt that the information contained in the letter, together with the statements contained in the Congressional Record inserts, was sufficient to warrant an inquiry by appropriate governmental officials.

Grassley thought that the letter itself was a joint effort by Phil Crane and Steve Symms.



due:
3/20
10:30A.

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

March 20, 1975

TO: Max Friedersdorf
Jack Marsh ✓

FROM: Rod Hills

May I please have your comments
by 10:30 a.m. this morning.



March 19, 1975


Dear Mr. Chairman:

The President has your letter of March 17, 1975 and has asked me to respond on his behalf.

We welcome the Committee's interest in the subject of H. Res. 313, and are pleased to have this opportunity to comment upon it. The circumstances surrounding the incarceration of American citizens in the Republic of Mexico is a matter of considerable concern to the President and one to which the Executive branch, through the Department of State, and other agencies, has devoted a great deal of time and effort. We note that considerable material on this subject has already been furnished to interested members of Congress and we are assured by representatives of the State Department that they will cooperate to the fullest extent possible in directing the efforts of the Executive branch to provide whatever additional materials are available and appropriate for transmission. By these efforts and through the hearing process, the facts you desire can be fully developed.

In view of the foregoing, it is the President's hope that H. Res. 313 will not be approved by the Committee.

Sincerely,



May 28 10:59 a. m.

Mr. Marsh:

~~_____~~

George Bush dropped off the attached.
He said it's not intended to be a response
because he doesn't know what your question
is.

Donna



28 May 1976

NOTE TO: DCI
FROM: A/NIO/LA

1. It is true that there have been widespread land seizures in Mexico, but there is no evidence to show that these are "officially tolerated." This is a demographic phenomenon caused by the rapidly increasing population. During Echevarria's tenure from 1970 through 1976, the population of Mexico increased from 14 million to 62 million -- most of them in rural areas.

2. While Echevarria is attempting to establish himself as a leader of the Third World, there is no evidence to show that he is Communist-inspired or advised.



A/NIO/LA

1.5(c)
1.6(d)(1)

*Suggested George Bush
advise "personally"*

plus -

*DM
5/28*



DECLASSIFIED • E.O. 12958 Sec. 3.6
With PORTIONS EXEMPTED
E.O. 12958 Sec. 1.5 (c)

MR 95-70, *30; CIA ltr 9/8/98
By Wt. NARA, Date 10/6/98

The open letter to President Ford from 30 U.S. Congressmen who denounced the "Cuban-Chilean" style threat to American security was extensively published about three weeks ago in the Mexico City press. Editorial comment in general criticized this intervention by the ~~collas~~ ^{collas} of the North in Mexican events.

It should be noted that as the letter states, while there is considerable violence, kidnapings and terrorism, an observer could conclude that Mexico is in serious straits. The conclusion in the letter that these events are taking Mexico toward the imposition of a Communist regime is simply not true. The recent growth of the Mexican population is exerting increasing significant social and economic pressures on the cities and on the rural areas. While persistent migration toward the cities is creating insoluble problems for the existing infrastructure, the number of landless and hungry peasants is also increasing. The government, which is well aware of the potential to violence as a result of this situation, is proposing radical new laws for urban settlement and a further redistribution of irrigated land. These two measures are among the most controversial in recent Mexican political history but are unlikely to stop the violence which is currently spreading in the new productive agricultural areas. The controversy and heat of debate generated by these proposed laws suggest that the government's job to reconcile the various interests concerned will not be an easy one. The Government of Mexico views the threats to

political stability and internal security with concern. However these laws can in no way be termed as Communist inspired. The Chileans mentioned in the letter to President Ford were ~~secretly~~ associated with President Allende of Chile and are currently living in Mexico City with the approval of the Mexican Government who granted them exile status. However in no way can they be considered advisors of President Echeverria. In summary, it should be noted that the Mexican political and economic situation still continues to be stable but the outlook over the next decade is serious and should be watched carefully by the U.S. Government

May 26, 1976

MEMORANDUM FOR: GEORGE BUSH

FROM: JACK MARSH

I would like to chat with you sometime about this article.

Many thanks.

JOM/dl

article from Washington Post, Sunday, May 16, 1976
"Mexico Strides Towards Communism"



MEXICO STRIDES TOWARDS COMMUNISM

Open letter to President Ford from thirty United States Congressmen of both parties denounces Cuban-Chilean style threat to American Security.

Reprinted from Congressional Record
May 6, 1976, Pages E2387-E2388

Washington, D.C., May 5, 1976.

Hon. Gerald R. Ford
President of the United States
The White House
Washington, D. C.

Dear Mr. President:

Surely you must agree that the development of a Cuban or Chilean "road to Socialism" in neighboring Mexico would pose a tremendous danger to the United States. However, it is not evident whether our Secretary of State, Dr. Henry Kissinger, has troubled to inform you of the situation existing in Mexico, and its grave implications for our national security.

Within the past year, long strides toward the imposition of a Communist regime have been taken by Mexican President Luis Echeverria, who appears to be making himself acceptable to Moscow and Havana.

Mexican newspapers and magazines are filled with accounts of insecurity, unrest, and violence resulting from a broadfront attack upon private property in all forms. Officially-tolerated land seizures are widespread. Compulsory textbook changes are intended to indoctrinate young Mexicans with Castroite propaganda. An amnesty has been proposed which would release hardened Communist cadres from prison and allow them to enter the government.

Mexico is in turmoil over these changes which are being imposed from above, and which are inspired by a large group of foreign Communists and Marxists who presently advise President Echeverria. They include such notorious Chileans as the former Foreign Minister, Clodomiro Almeida, the former Minister of Economics, Pedro Vuskovic, and the head of the far-left Socialist Party, Carlos Altamirano.

The popular Mexican magazine *Impacto*, describing these events, in its April 28 issue, says, "For several months, there have been mobilized 'brigades of parachutists', invaders of small farms, flying columns which are transported by truck, to fall upon rural properties.... Of course, they carry arms and are affiliated with organizations which count on the sympathy of the authorities." The picture is one of cynical terrorism against small property owners.

Material has been presented on the floor of the House and inserted into the RECORD (Congressional Record: April 14, pages H3359 and E2051; April 29, pages H3674 and E2230; and May 4, E2330) which documents many aspects of the situation; you will find that it has been a bi-partisan effort. My colleague Representative Steve Symms has emphasized the grave danger which would be posed by a hostile Marxist state across our virtually unguarded fifteen-hundred mile southern border.

Under the circumstances, we believe it is very important to determine whether or not the Department of State, under the direction of Dr. Henry Kissinger has seen fit to inform you of this problem. Certainly there has been no effort to inform us, or the public. Has Dr. Kissinger made known to President Echeverria the natural concern of the United States which his actions have caused? There is apparent indifference to their most serious problem.

Your timely attention to this matter will be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Don Young (R-Alaska)
Richard H. Ichord (D-Missouri)
George Hansen (R-Idaho)
John Ashbrook (R-Ohio)
Ron Paul (R-Texas)
Joe D. Waggoner, Jr. (D-Louisiana)
Goodloe Byron (D-Maryland)
Tim Lee Carter (R-Kentucky)
John B. Conlan (R-Arizona)
Mendel J. Davis (D-South Carolina)

Bob Bauman (R-Maryland)
Sam Devine (R-Ohio)
Gene Snyder (R-Kentucky)
William L. Dickinson (R-Alabama)
Albert W. Johnson (R-Pennsylvania)
Larry P. McDonald (D-Georgia)
Dan Daniel (D-Virginia)
Del Clawson (R-California)
Steve Symms (R-Idaho)
Trent Lott (R-Mississippi)

Marjorie S. Holt (R-Maryland)
Philip M. Crane (R-Illinois)
Robin Beard (R-Tennessee)
Bill Nichols (D-Alabama)
Chuck Grassley (R-Iowa)
Robert Lagomastro (R-California)
Bo Ginn (D-Georgia)
James M. Collins (R-Texas)
Floyd Spence (R-South Carolina)
John J. Flynt (D-Georgia)

Please clip and return this coupon.

YOU CAN HELP ALERT OTHER AMERICANS...

This ad sponsored by:
RADIO FREE AMERICAS
a daily Spanish-language radio program
produced by the American Security
Council for broadcast throughout the
Americas.

THE AMERICAN SECURITY COUNCIL IS A PRIVATE
NON-PROFIT RESEARCH AND EDUCATIONAL ASSOCIATION
DEALING SOLELY WITH ISSUES AFFECTING OUR
NATION'S SECURITY.

RADIO FREE AMERICAS
Suite 1000
1101 17th Street, N.W.
Washington, D. C. 20036

YES I want to help pay for more ads and otherwise alert people throughout the Americas to the Communist threat to all our freedoms.

I have enclosed my contribution of:

\$10 \$15 \$25 \$50 \$100 \$250 \$500 \$1000

Please make check payable to: **RADIO FREE AMERICAS**

Mr. Mrs.
 Miss Other

Address _____ (please print)

City _____ State _____ Zip _____

GERALD R. FORD LIBRARY

This form marks the file location of item number 2a
listed on the pink Withdrawal Sheet found at the front of this folder.

The open letter to President Ford from 30 U.S. Congressmen who denounced the "Cuban-Chilean" style threat to American security was extensively published about three weeks ago in the Mexico City press. Editorial comment in general criticized this intervention by the colossus of the North in Mexican events.

It should be noted that as the letter states, while there is considerable violence, kidnapings and terrorism, an observer could conclude that Mexico is in serious straits. The conclusion in the letter that these events are taking Mexico toward the imposition of a Communist regime is simply not true. The recent growth of the Mexican population is exerting increasing significant social and economic pressures on the cities and on the rural areas. While persistent migration toward the cities is creating insoluble problems for the existing infrastructure, the number of landless and hungry peasants is also increasing. The government, which is well aware of the potential to violence as a result of this situation, is proposing radical new laws for urban settlement and a further redistribution of irrigated land. These two measures are among the most controversial in recent Mexican political history but are unlikely to stop the violence which is currently spreading in the new productive agricultural areas. The controversy and heat of debate generated by these proposed laws suggest that the government's job to reconcile the various interests concerned will not be an easy one. The Government of Mexico views the threats to

political stability and internal security with concern. However these laws can in no way be termed as Communist inspired. The Chileans mentioned in the letter to President Ford were ~~some~~ associated with President Allende of Chile and are currently living in Mexico City with the approval of the Mexican Government who granted them exile status. However in no way can they be considered advisors of President Echeverria. In summary, it should be noted that the Mexican political and economic situation still continues to be stable but the outlook over the next decade is serious and should be watched carefully by the U.S. Government



JUN 4 1976

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

June 4, 1976

To: Jack Marsh

From: Bill Hyland

WGH

George Bush handed me the attached letter. Do you want me to staff it or do you want to handle it?

Bill -

Please handle

Jack

~~SECRET~~

THE DIRECTOR OF CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20505

June 1, 1976

The President
The White House
Washington, D.C. 20500

Dear Mr. President,

Jack Marsh called to my attention your concern about the attached advertisement which contains an open letter to you signed by several Members of Congress. The letter suggests that Mexico is in the process of having a Communist regime imposed on it.

The open letter was extensively published about four weeks ago in the Mexico City press. Editorial comment in general criticized this intervention by the colossus of the North in Mexican events.

It should be noted that as the letter states, while there is considerable violence, kidnappings and terrorism, an observer could conclude that Mexico is in serious straits. However, the conclusion in the letter that these events are taking Mexico toward the imposition of a Communist regime is simply not true.

The recent staggering growth of the Mexican population is exerting increasing significant social and economic pressures on the cities and on the rural areas. While persistent migration toward the cities is creating difficult problems for the existing infrastructure, the number of landless and hungry peasants is also increasing. The government, which is well aware of the potential to violence as a result of this situation, is proposing radical new laws for urban settlement and a further redistribution of irrigated land. These two measures are among the most controversial in recent Mexican political history but are unlikely to stop the violence which is currently spreading in the new productive agricultural areas.

DECLASSIFIED
E.O. 12356, Sec. 3.4.

MR 95-70; #32; CIA WHU 9/8/98

By Lt NARA, Date 10/4/98

~~SECRET~~

Classified by 435013
Exempt from general
declassification schedule of E.O. 11652
exemption schedule 5B (1), (2), (3)
Automatically declassified on
Date Impossible to Determine


~~SECRET~~

The controversy and heat of debate generated by these proposed laws suggest that the government's job to reconcile the various interests concerned will not be an easy one. The Government of Mexico views the threats to political stability and internal security with concern. However, these laws can in no way be termed as Communist inspired.

The Chileans mentioned in the letter were associated with President Allende of Chile and are currently living in Mexico City with the approval of the Mexican Government who granted them exile status. However, in no way can they be considered advisors of President Echeverria.

In summary, it should be noted that the Mexican political and economic situation still continues to be stable, but the outlook over the next decade is serious and should be watched carefully by the U.S. Government.

Respectfully,


George Bush

Enc.

~~SECRET~~

MEXICO STRIDES TOWARDS COMMUNISM

Open letter to President Ford from thirty United States Congressmen of both parties denounces Cuban-Chilean style threat to American Security.

Reprinted from Congressional Record
May 6, 1976, Pages E2387-E2388

Washington, D.C., May 5, 1976.

Hon. Gerald R. Ford
President of the United States
The White House
Washington, D. C.

Dear Mr. President:

Surely you must agree that the development of a Cuban or Chilean "road to Socialism" in neighboring Mexico would pose a tremendous danger to the United States. However, it is not evident whether our Secretary of State, Dr. Henry Kissinger, has troubled to inform you of the situation existing in Mexico, and its grave implications for our national security.

Within the past year, long strides toward the imposition of a Communist regime have been taken by Mexican President Luis Echeverria, who appears to be making himself acceptable to Moscow and Havana.

Mexican newspapers and magazines are filled with accounts of insecurity, unrest, and violence resulting from a broadfront attack upon private property in all forms. Officially-tolerated land seizures are widespread. Compulsory textbook changes are intended to indoctrinate young Mexicans with Castroite propaganda. An amnesty has been proposed which would release hardened Communist cadres from prison and allow them to enter the government.

Mexico is in turmoil over these changes which are being imposed from above, and which are inspired by a large group of foreign Communists and Marxists who presently advise President Echeverria. They include such notorious Chileans as the former Foreign Minister, Clodomiro Almeida, the former Minister of Economics, Pedro Vuskovic, and the head of the far-left Socialist Party, Carlos Altamirano.

The popular Mexican magazine *Impacto*, describing these events, in its April 28 issue, says, "For several months, there have been mobilized 'brigades of parachutists', invaders of small farms, flying columns which are transported by truck, to fall upon rural properties... Of course, they carry arms and are affiliated with organizations which count on the sympathy of the authorities." The picture is one of cynical terrorism against small property owners.

Material has been presented on the floor of the House and inserted into the RECORD (Congressional Record: April 14, pages H3359 and E2051; April 29, pages H3674 and E2230; and May 4, E2330) which documents many aspects of the situation; you will find that it has been a bi-partisan effort. My colleague Representative Steve Symms has emphasized the grave danger which would be posed by a hostile Marxist state across our virtually unguarded fifteen-hundred mile southern border.

Under the circumstances, we believe it is very important to determine whether or not the Department of State, under the direction of Dr. Henry Kissinger has seen fit to inform you of this problem. Certainly there has been no effort to inform us, or the public. Has Dr. Kissinger made known to President Echeverria the natural concern of the United States which his actions have caused? There is apparent indifference to their most serious problem.

Your timely attention to this matter will be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Don Young (R-Alaska)
Richard H. Ichord (D-Missouri)
George Hansen (R-Idaho)
John Ashbrook (R-Ohio)
Ron Paul (R-Texas)
Joe D. Waggoner, Jr. (D-Louisiana)
Goodloe Byron (D-Maryland)
Tim Lee Carter (R-Kentucky)
John B. Conlan (R-Arizona)
Mendel J. Davis (D-South Carolina)

Bob Bauman (R-Maryland)
Sam Devine (R-Ohio)
Gene Synder (R-Kentucky)
William L. Dickinson (R-Alabama)
Albert W. Johnson (R-Pennsylvania)
Larry P. McDonald (D-Georgia)
Dan Daniel (D-Virginia)
Del Clawson (R-California)
Steve Symms (R-Idaho)
Trent Lott (R-Mississippi)

Marjorie S. Holt (R-Maryland)
Philip M. Crane (R-Illinois)
Robin Beard (R-Tennessee)
Bill Nichols (D-Alabama)
Chuck Grassley (R-Iowa)
Robert Lagomarsino (R-California)
Bo Ginn (D-Georgia)
James M. Collins (R-Texas)
Floyd Spence (R-South Carolina)
John J. Flynt (D-Georgia)

Please clip and return this coupon.

**YOU CAN HELP
ALERT OTHER AMERICANS...**

This ad sponsored by:
RADIO FREE AMERICAS
a daily Spanish-language radio program
produced by the American Security
Council for broadcast throughout the
Americas.

THE AMERICAN SECURITY COUNCIL IS A PRIVATE
NON-PROFIT RESEARCH AND EDUCATIONAL ASSOCIATION
DEALING SOLELY WITH ISSUES AFFECTING OUR
NATION'S SECURITY.

RADIO FREE AMERICAS
Suite 1000
1101 17th Street, N.W.
Washington, D. C. 20036

YES! I want to help pay for more ads and otherwise alert people
throughout the Americas to the Communist threat to all our freedoms.

I have enclosed my contribution of:

\$10 \$15 \$25 \$50 \$100 \$250 \$500 \$1000

Please make check payable to: **RADIO FREE AMERICAS**

Mr. Mrs.
 Miss Other

Address _____ (Please print)

City _____ State _____

SEP 21 1976

September 20, 1976

MEMORANDUM FOR:

CATHIE DESIBOUR

FROM:

MAX FRIEDERSDORF

SUBJECT:

Request 141 - U.S./Mexico
Fisheries Agreement

Senator Tower believes it would be desirable to delay signing at this time, but recognizes urgency of the situation.

Agreement will hurt badly with shrimpers between Corpus Christi and Brownsville.

Tower recommends if the Agreement is signed, the President issue a strong statement on the positive aspects, indicate continuing efforts (if feasible) to assist the shrimp industry with more equitable arrangement in the future.

Tower said Texas shrimpers are upset by the prospective Agreement, as well as the policy of unlimited shrimp imports.

cc: Jack Marsh



THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

*Recommend
against signing*

*Called
9/21
[initials]*



SEP 20 1976

NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL

*See: ASAP
9/21-noon*

MEMO FOR: BILL SEIDMAN
JIM CANNON
~~JACK MARSH~~
MAX FRIEDERSDORF

FROM: CATHIE DESIBOUR

SUBJECT: NSC Congressional Clearance
Request # 141

Your ~~concurrence~~ ^{recommendation} is requested in the attached draft action package for the President along with any appropriate comments you may have. Please indicate your clearance by initialling in the space below.

We would appreciate receiving your response by ASAP & preferably no later than noon, Tuesday, Sept 21.
Thank you.

Cleared: Disagree

Date: _____
JM



MEMORANDUM

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

5082

CONFIDENTIAL/GDS

ACTION

MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT

FROM: BRENT SCOWCROFT

SUBJECT: Memorandum from Secretary Kissinger Regarding
US-Mexico Fisheries Agreement

The United States and Mexico have reached agreement, at the negotiating level, on a broad range of fisheries issues arising as a result of action by Mexico to extend jurisdiction over fishing up to 200 miles. The executive agreement resulting from these negotiations is now ready for signature. It does not require ratification by the Senate.

The Secretary's memorandum informs you that he thinks the agreement, as presently negotiated, is as good an agreement as we can get and that he has instructed Department of State officers to move forward toward signature. (After discussion with the NSC, however, State has agreed not to proceed to final signature until receiving your approval.) He recognizes that this agreement may have domestic political implications due to opposition by the Gulf shrimp-fishing industry, particularly that in Texas. The agreement would phase out US shrimp fishing in the Gulf of Mexico during the next 3 1/2 years. The Secretary points out that "with the passage of our 200-mile legislation, PL 94-265, this is precisely what the US would do (perhaps even less generously) with respect to foreign nations operating off our own coast in the same circumstances."

On August 3 a bill was introduced in the Senate, which, although dealing with a variety of issues relating to the shrimp industry, contains provisions directly aimed at embargoing Mexican shrimp imports. The bill was sponsored by Chiles and Stone of Florida; Bentsen and Tower of Texas; Long and Johnson of Louisiana; Allan and Sparkman of Alabama; and Thurmond and Hollings of South Carolina. Its introduction is related to the shrimping provisions of the US-Mexican agreement. Support for the bill appears to be limited.

CONFIDENTIAL/GDS

DAO, 1/17/66



Other aspects of the agreement negotiated with Mexico, however, are very favorable to us, particularly those affecting the US tuna industry. These provisions granting access for sport fishing off Mexico also are highly satisfactory. Even with regard to the shrimping interests, the Mexicans reversed a decision to immediately terminate access in order to allow time for US shrimp fishermen to adjust their fishing patterns.

The Mexicans, for their part, have not enforced against US boats their own 200-mile law (which went into effect on July 31) pending conclusion of an agreement with us. Agreement was reached at the negotiating level on August 6, and the Mexicans are now pressing for early signature. They advised us orally on September 10 that they wanted an answer from Secretary Kissinger - presumably a firm, early date for signature - before his departure for Africa. Thus, a further delay in signing this agreement could lead to seizures of US fishing vessels in traditional fishing waters now within the Mexican 200-mile limit. This would bring into force mandatory US legislative sanctions which would be expected to have serious implications for the broad range of our relations with Mexico.

The alternative to signing the agreement would be to seek to reopen the talks with Mexico. The Secretary does not believe Mexico will or can agree to substantial revisions in the provisions for shrimping, and reopening talks could jeopardize the other satisfactory terms of the agreement. The delay involved would also increase the possibilities of a vessel seizure or other confrontation with Mexico. He therefore recommends we proceed to signature of the agreement. I agree that from the foreign policy perspective the advantages of signing the agreement promptly heavily outweigh the disadvantages.

RECOMMENDATION:

That you approve signature of the fisheries agreement with Mexico.

Approve _____ Disapprove ✓

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON



November 15, 1976

MEMORANDUM FOR: JACK MARSH
FROM: CHARLES LEPPERT, JR. *CLP.*
SUBJECT: House Invitees to the Inauguration
of the President of Mexico -
November 28 to December 3, 1976

Rep. and Mrs. John J. Rhodes have accepted the President's invitation to attend the inauguration of the President of Mexico from November 28 to December 3. Rep. Rhodes must return to Los Angeles, California, on December 3 and needs to have his passport renewed. I told his secretary, Clara Posey, that the State Department would follow-up on all necessary arrangements.

Rep. Clem Zablocki (D-Wisc.) has also accepted the President's invitation to attend the inauguration of the President of Mexico from November 28 to December 3. I spoke with Rep. Zablocki as he was about to board a plane. Because he was in a hurry we did not discuss Mrs. Zablocki attending. I would assume that she would accompany the Congressman. Zablocki must return for a speech at the Citadel on December 4, 1976.

I recommend that the State Department follow up with the personal secretary to both Rhodes and Zablocki on their passports, shots, etc. and any specific returning travel arrangements.

cc: Max Friedersdorf
Pat Rowland
Tom Loeffler

