

November 1978

THE NEW LEFT IN GOVERNMENT: FROM PROTEST TO POLICY-MAKING

(Executive Summary)

During the 1960s and early 1970s, the American people witnessed the growth and decline of a movement known as the New Left. Those who gave impetus to the New Left were often the offspring of Old Left activists, including members of the Communist Party, U.S.A., one of the principal Old Left Communist organizations. While there were major differences between the two broad movements, particularly as to ideological and organizational discipline, they also managed to coalesce around the great radical organizing causes of the period, including especially the Vietnam war; and, though often wracked by sectarian and tactical disputes, they were alike in their common rejection of traditional American society and institutions and in their general preference for radical Marxist (and, in many cases, Marxist-Leninist) alternatives. In organizing the massive anti-Vietnam war protests of the 1960s and early 1970s, moreover, activists from both the Old and New Left shared, as a general proposition, a marked preference for an American defeat and Communist victory in Southeast Asia.

Perhaps the best-known New Leftists of the 1960s were the "Chicago Seven," who were tried for conspiring to foment violence in the streets of Chicago, Illinois, during the August 1968 Democratic National Convention. Some of them have moved on to less radical pursuits; Rennie Davis is an insurance broker, while Jerry Rubin is busily promoting his new "Human Potential" movement. Others, however, have remained active radicals, although no longer outside the system they formerly opposed in the streets. Instead,

they are, in several instances, pursuing their goals from within the political and governmental processes. Tom Hayden, for example, is associated with California Governor Jerry Brown and has been invited to meet with President Carter in the White House, in addition to being actively involved in his Campaign for Economic Democracy, a movement with close ties to the far-left Institute for Policy Studies. Others of the Chicago Seven have been given positions in the government at the national level. Lee Weiner is a consultant to ACTION, and John Froines is director of the Office of Toxic Substances, which is part of the Occupational Safety and Health Administration. It is with this aspect of the New Left -- the transformation of movement activists from outsiders into insiders within the policy-making process on a scale perhaps unprecedented in our history, at least since the era of the New Deal -- that the present study is concerned. Among those considered are the following:

- * Sam Brown, Director, ACTION
- * Mary King, Deputy Director, ACTION
- * John Lewis, Associate Director, ACTION
- * Ilona Hancock, Regional Director, ACTION
- * Marge Tabankin, Deputy Associate Director, ACTION
- * Peter Bourne, former Special Assistant to the President
- * Bella Abzug, Co-Chair, National Advisory Committee for Women
- * Hendrick Hertzberg, White House speechwriter
- * W. Anthony Lake, Director, State Department Policy Planning Staff
- * David Aaron, Deputy Assistant to the President, National Security Council
- * Robert Pastor, National Security Council staff
- * Stoney Cooks and Brady Tyson, U.S. Mission to the United Nations
- * Andrew Young, U.S. Representative to the United Nations

Many of these New Left-era activists, along with others mentioned, have been associated with the Institute for Policy Studies, an organization whose leadership includes several admitted or otherwise known Communists and other revolutionaries. The pattern of affiliation with IPS, like the pattern of activity in pro-Hanoi segments of the "peace" movement of the 1960s, forms a noticeable common thread running through the various sections of the present study and, in view of the ties maintained by IPS and its subsidiaries with a wide variety of radical individuals and movements, both foreign and domestic, is of the greatest significance.

It is not the contention of this study that every government official with a New Left background is necessarily pro-Communist; in each case cited, the relevant data are enumerated and patterns of activity developed, and the information speaks for itself.

THE NEW LEFT IN GOVERNMENT: FROM PROTEST TO POLICY-MAKING

INTRODUCTION: OLD vs. NEW LEFT

To many Americans, and especially to those conversant with the more exotic forms of political protest in the United States, one of the preeminent developments of the 1960s was the growth of a phenomenon which came to be known as the "New Left." The distinction between the New Left and the traditional "Old Left" often seems a difficult one, involving what appear to be arcane sectarian differences and protracted disputes over tactical approaches to mass protest. However, though there were very real differences between them, it cannot be too strongly emphasized that they were able to cooperate to a significant degree in united front efforts built around specific issues. Many of the people who were responsible for the birth and growth of the New Left were themselves the offspring of Old Left radicals, including long-time members of the Communist Party, U.S.A., a fact which helps explain why both the Old Left and the New Left were reflective of a common rejection of traditional American society and institutions coupled with an often frenzied desire to overturn them in favor of a radical Marxist -- and, in many cases, even a Marxist-Leninist -- alternative.

Briefly, the Old Left is embodied in such organizations as the Communist Party of the United States of America (CPUSA), which adheres to the line and direction of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, and the Socialist Workers Party (SWP), the largest and oldest exemplar of Trotskyite Communist doctrine in the United States. Both of these primary Communist groups on the Old Left are part of larger international movements. The devotion of the CPUSA to the orthodox Communism of the CPSU is undisguised, as even a casual perusal of basic CPUSA publications can attest, while the SWP is a constituent part of the Fourth International, a world-wide Trotskyite Communist apparatus some sections of which are known to engage in terrorist violence.

It is significant that, even though the CPUSA and SWP are historic enemies on matters of fundamental dogma, a fact which stems from the great rift in the world Communist movement created by the formal break between Josef Stalin and Leon Trotsky, both organizations managed to work together in creating and directing the most effective segments of the domestic anti-Vietnam war movement of the 1960s. As extensive research and investigation by both the House Committee on Internal Security and the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee demonstrated, virtually every major anti-Vietnam war coalition, including those which initiated and carried out the massive protests in Washington, D.C., in 1967, 1969, 1970, and 1971, was either dominated or controlled by functionaries and concealed members of either the CPUSA or the SWP, very often working together toward their common goal of bringing about an American defeat and Communist victory in Southeast Asia. Other

While the leadership of the New Left, like that of the Old Left, was generally Marxist in outlook, it does not necessarily follow that everyone who was caught up in radical causes of the 1960s agreed in every particular with the leadership of the various organizations involved. Nevertheless, the patterns of association are there and are certainly valid as indicators of a person's basic orientation on the issues which often had revolutionary implications for American society.

Also, the present study does not purport to show the extent to which elements of the environmentalist or "public interest" advocacy movements have been absorbed into policy-making positions in government. There are those who tend to view these movements as being synonymous with the radical left in America; such a view is at best imprecise. It is true that certain elements of the New Left have tended to gravitate toward the more radical fringes of environmentalism, particularly toward civil disobedience-oriented anti-nuclear energy groups like the Clamshell Alliance; but it would be inaccurate to tax all adherents of the environmentalist movement with attachment to such avowedly radical enterprises, though it seems fair to contend that substantial numbers of them do adhere to what is often called a "no-growth" mentality in this area.

Communist groups, many of them created by former members of the CPUSA and SWP, also worked in this effort. To the extent that these other groups, including such avowedly Maoist organizations as the Progressive Labor Party and such other dissident Communist entities as the Workers World Party, are reflective of an openly Communist perspective on revolutionary change in our society, they should be considered inheritors of the Old Left tradition.

It is also true, of course, that the traditional left in America includes various democratic socialist groupings; but it is essential to observe that, especially in some of the more blatantly Communist-led operations mounted by the anti-Vietnam war movement, the socialists, particularly members and leaders of the Socialist Party, frequently refused to participate precisely because of the obvious desire on the part of Communist activists to bring about the ultimate victory of Communist aggression. It is a historic truism that to coalesce with Communists is not to work for the achievement of legitimate social or political ends; rather, it is, however unwittingly, to aid them in advancing the revolutionary cause of proletarian dictatorship as enshrined in the repressive system of the Soviet Union and similar states.

For purposes of convenience, then, and bearing in mind the democratic socialist distinction, one may assume that the Old Left is that portion of the radical spectrum that is characterized generally by adherence to traditional Marxism-Leninism. It is, by and large, specifically Communist in the popularly-understood sense and, while plagued by sectarian divisions and seemingly interminable tactical and personal disputes, has shown itself to be dedicated to the advancement of a coherent body of Marxist-Leninist doctrine. Further, the various organizations which comprise the Old Left are characterized by a remarkable degree of internal discipline. It is axiomatic, for example, that a rank-and-file member of either the CPUSA or the SWP must, as a condition of party membership, accept without question the dictates of those whose function it is to set party policy. Dissent is, as a practical matter, hardly tenable unless one is willing to run serious risk of disciplinary action, including expulsion.

Within the New Left of the 1960s, however, the situation was radically different. Ideological homogeneity was by no means the rule; and organizational discipline was generally by no means as strict, although it was certainly far from nonexistent. In general, the New Left may accurately be said to have been an outgrowth of the burgeoning student protests of the 1960s, protests which centered to a great extent around the Vietnam war and a multiplicity of issues which the New Left regarded as inseparably related to it, including alleged complicity

of certain university institutions with the so-called military-industrial complex -- or, as the New Left liked to style it, the "war machine." The New Left saw American universities, corporations, and other great institutions as integral parts of one vast system of oppression and dedicated itself to the destruction of that system by any means necessary, including mass protest, forcible disruption, and, eventually as in the case of the Weather Underground and similar groups, terrorist violence.

It is important to note at this juncture that adherence to overt terrorist violence should not necessarily be charged to the New Left as a whole. Students for a Democratic Society was, until the splintering of the organization in 1969, an avowedly radical organization which engaged in disruptive protest activity, the 1968 SDS occupation of Columbia University being perhaps the best-known example. In 1969, however, SDS became so riddled with factionalism that it simply fell apart as rival groups vied for final control. The result was the demise of the organization as it had originally been conceived and the emergence of the so-called Weatherman faction, named for a passage in a popular Bob Dylan song of the time. This group became what is currently known as the Weather Underground Organization (WUO), made up of hard-core advocates and practitioners of terrorist bombings and other violence.

Other groups which came to prominence during the period of New Left growth also, like SDS, became increasingly militant. Organizations like the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee and the Black Panther Party assumed increasingly racist postures as such leaders as Stokely Carmichael of SNCC and Eldridge Cleaver of the BPP toured the United States and various foreign countries espousing the rhetoric of "black power" and support for such guerrilla movements as the Viet Cong. With regard to SNCC, it is instructive to note that as the organization's leadership became increasingly enamored with the rhetoric of violence, its support among certain white activists, many of whom had been among the group's founders, correspondingly diminished until SNCC became purely and simply a black revolutionary organization. It is also instructive to note that, as with the BPP, SNCC's white supporters were to a significant degree products of the Old Left and included people long associated with the CPUSA and with the CPUSA's extensive network of front organizations.

A similar situation arose among organizations active in the anti-Vietnam war agitation. Vietnam Veterans Against the War, for example, included movement activists who later progressed to involvement with such Maoist groups as the Venceremos Organization and such avowedly terrorist operations as the Symbionese Liberation Army, while some of those associated with the May Day

demonstrations in Washington, D.C., in 1971 were known to be planning for violence rather than for peaceful mass protest. The point is that the positions of a great many movement types during the period of New Left prominence tended to harden rather than to become more moderate.

Perhaps the epitome of mass violence in the New Left era of the 1960s was reached during the August 1968 demonstrations at the Democratic National Convention and during the October 1969 SDS "Days of Rage," both of which actions were executed in the streets of Chicago, Illinois. The August 1969 demonstrations were organized and carried out under the aegis of the National Mobilization Committee to End the War in Vietnam, the nation's principal Communist-oriented anti-Vietnam war organizing focus at that point, and an allied movement known as the Youth International Party, popularly called the "Yippies." There can be no doubt that the purpose of this action was to provoke violent confrontation with the police, viewed by many of the demonstrators as the quintessential embodiment of America's political repressiveness; unfortunately, there can also be no doubt that the organizers of the demonstrations succeeded, although many competent observers remain convinced that the popular media-encouraged notion of the demonstrations as a "police riot" is at best an oversimplification and at worst a gross distortion of reality. While these riotous demonstrations involved a virtual cross-section of people from both the Old and New Left, the October 1969 "Days of Rage" were a purely SDS operation intended specifically as an exercise in violent protest. Again, those who organized for violence were resoundingly successful.

To reiterate an important point, one should not necessarily impute to all members of the New Left a common ideology or a uniform belief in mass or selective violence. Unlike Old Left groupings, those of the New Left were often, by comparison, woefully lacking in discipline and ideological consistency. Indeed, Clark Kissinger, an early leader in Students for a Democratic Society, was quoted in 1965 as saying, in trying to distinguish between the two movements, that "The old Marxist Left was intensely ideological. They could rattle off the cause of any war as capitalism, imperialism, fight for markets: one, two, three. We are characterized primarily by skepticism. Not having all the answers, we don't pretend we do emphasis in original." Having made this point, however, one should not make the mistake of thinking that the New Left was devoid of Communist influence or perspective. For example, while such New Left theoreticians as Kissinger tended in the earlier years to disavow the sort of identification with particular foreign Communist powers that has always been a hallmark of the CPUSA, it is clear that the movement as a whole tended toward extravagant admiration for the specifically Communist revolutionary model of

Fidel Castro. As Staughton Lynd and Tom Hayden wrote in the magazine Studies on the Left, "We refuse to be anti-Communist," a sentiment that should be read in conjunction with the assessment by an eminent liberal, Irving Howe, that the New Left demonstrated "an unconsidered enmity toward something vaguely called the establishment, an equally unreflective belief in the 'decline of the West,' a crude, unqualified anti-Americanism, drawn from every source."

It should also be reiterated that, despite divergent views on the morality or tactical utility of violence, those who adhered to the New Left view were, like their brethren of the Old Left, characterized by a common rejection of traditional American usages and norms, a rejection which most citizens of the United States recognized as based on a distorted view of reality. The New Left was often seemingly anarchist to a great extent. It represented what has been popularly termed the "counterculture," a phenomenon in which rejection of the norm became in itself the norm and in which blatant sexual promiscuity and the increasingly widespread utilization of drugs went hand in hand with what was all too often a slavish idealization of Communist-led "national liberation" guerrilla movements like the Viet Cong. It says much about the make-up of the New Left, and particularly about the "crude, unqualified anti-Americanism" to which Irving Howe adverted, that Professor Douglas Dowd of Cornell University, a prominent figure in the anti-Vietnam war movement of the 1960s, could be quoted as having said "that the people who do the organizing for this kind of thing, almost all of them, really feel that not only the war should end but that if there had to be a side in that war I think most of us feel we would be on the other side."

It is probably correct to assume that the New Left, at least as an attempt at mass radicalization, was born in 1962 with the "Port Huron Statement" which, drafted by Tom Hayden, was the basic ideological manifesto of SDS. The New Left came into its own, so to speak, with the radical "Free Speech Movement" demonstrations on the campus of the University of California at Berkeley in 1964. As previously indicated, New Left organizing centered in large measure around the Vietnam war as the 1960s progressed, although, as we have also seen, much of the primary impetus and organizational expertise for the major anti-Vietnam war coalitions was supplied by seasoned veterans of the Old Left. The National Conference for New Politics, which organized a well-attended convention in Chicago, Illinois, over Labor Day weekend in 1967, represented a serious attempt to unify activists from both the Old and New Left around radical anti-Vietnam war political candidates, although, as with the national anti-Vietnam war coalitions, the degree to which the effort was successful was probably attributable to the organizational expertise of activists from the Old Left, in this case functionaries and concealed

members of the Communist Party, U.S.A. A large number of Old and New Leftists also became actively involved in the presidential candidacy of Senator Eugene McCarthy (D-Minn) in 1968.

The New Left was in fact a phenomenon of the radical activism of the 1960s and relied, in the last analysis, primarily on student and other discontent with the Vietnam war and related questions for its chief organizing focus. It is certainly true that New Left-type protest activity went into decline as United States involvement in Southeast Asia lessened; and it appears equally true, at least at this juncture, that there has not arisen another issue with sufficient emotional appeal to rekindle the sort of fundamental revolutionary rejection of American society that was basic to the New Left period of the 1960s, although the more militant elements of the anti-nuclear energy movement have clearly been trying to move in this direction.

THE NEW LEFT: WHERE ARE THEY NOW?

In view of the foregoing summary, and bearing in mind the extreme seriousness with which so many members of the New Left held their essentially anti-American and, to a great extent, pro-Communist views, it becomes appropriate to ask oneself where the New Left is today as the 1970s draw to a close. It is, for example, ten years since the August 1968 demonstrations at the Democratic National Convention, after which the so-called Chicago Seven were indicted for conspiracy to foment violence. Perhaps no group of radicals epitomized the revolutionary fervor of the 1960s as did the "Chicago Seven:" David Dellinger, Jerry Rubin, Abbie Hoffman, Rennie Davis, Tom Hayden, John Froines, and Lee Weiner. The entire movement became involved in defending these activists (who, according to Rubin, writing in the Chicago Sun-Times for March 8, 1976, were all "guilty as hell") and in using the Chicago conspiracy trial as a vehicle for condemnation of the United States as the embodiment of repression and reaction, but it may well be that most people are unaware of what has happened to the defendants and others of their stripe in the intervening years.

Dellinger is currently engaged in editing Seven Days, a radical magazine, and in working with the Mobilization for Survival, a movement initiated at the instance of the World Peace Council, an apparatus controlled by the Soviet Union. Self-described as a non-Soviet Communist, he has repeatedly traveled to Communist Cuba and remains an unabashed radical. Rubin, on the other hand, while still hardly anyone's idea of the typical middle-class American, appears to have changed more than Dellinger. Formerly outspokenly anti-American and given to some of the movement's most bizarre costuming, Rubin reportedly now lives in New York City with his girl-friend in a \$685-a-month apartment and, in conjunction with her, is planning to incorporate himself to produce a "Human Potential Festival." He has even been quoted

as saying that he "used to fear money" but now has "a more practical attitude." Hoffman has supposedly undergone plastic surgery to disguise his appearance and still remains a fugitive from arrest as a result of having jumped bail in New York City after being charged with selling cocaine to undercover policemen. He was recently the object of a "Bring Abbie Home" concert in New York, a function at which Dellinger, Rubin, Davis, and Froines were present, although Hoffman apparently was not. Davis has married and lives with his wife and daughter in a rented home in Denver, Colorado. With the end of the Vietnam war, during which he was a particularly outspoken partisan of Hanoi, Davis reportedly felt that "this chapter was closed" and turned to wondering "what I would do next." After a period of three years as an adherent of guru Maharaj Ji, he is currently a John Hancock insurance broker.

But it is when one comes to Hayden, Froines, and Weiner that one is perhaps most surprised. Hayden, now married to actress Jane Fonda, who loudly proclaimed her preference for Communism and Hanoi during the Vietnam war, remains one of America's most radical and articulate activists. Deeply engaged in his Campaign for Economic Democracy, a movement with close ties to the extremely radical Institute for Policy Studies, Hayden has been received in the White House by President Carter, who has been quoted as telling him, "I'm proud of you...you've made important contributions to our country." During the Vietnam war, Hayden journeyed to Hanoi and returned to the United States to say that "We are all Viet Cong." Whether such an utterance is properly to be regarded as one of Hayden's "important contributions to our country" is, of course, problematical. It is noted, however, that Hayden's visit to the White House, which occurred while he was in Washington as one of the 26 delegates appointed by California Governor Jerry Brown to represent him at a Conference on Balanced National Growth and Economic Development held in January 1978, was arranged by Dr. Peter Bourne, at the time an official adviser to President Carter on questions of drug abuse.

Froines and Weiner have also, like Hayden, moved into the governmental establishment. Weiner was the least known of the defendants in the Chicago conspiracy trial. Ultimately acquitted along with his co-defendants, Weiner subsequently lost his teaching position at Rutgers University after having allegedly stated, at a 1972 birthday party for Black Panther Bobby Seale, that he was "starting a new Communist party in New Jersey." In 1976, he worked for the presidential campaign of Jimmy Carter, later acquiring a position as a consultant for ACTION at the rate of \$130 per day. Froines remained more visibly active in the movement than did Weiner. When the National Mobilization Committee to End the War in Vietnam became the New Mobilization Committee to End the War in Vietnam as a result of a Communist-dominated conference held in mid-1969, Froines wound up as a member of the New Mobe steering committee. He remained active with

this apparatus, officially cited by the House Committee on Internal Security as being under Communist domination, through a series of successive changes and reorganizations until it became the Peoples Coalition for Peace and Justice, one of the prime organizers of the violence-marked demonstrations in Washington, D.C., during April and May of 1971. In its annual report for 1971, the House Committee characterized the PCPJ as being under the "generally predominant influence" of the Communist Party, U.S.A. During a rally at the U.S. Department of Justice building during the 1971 demonstrations, John Froines, according to eyewitnesses, stated, "I have not come to the Justice Department to surrender. I have come here to tear down the Government." In 1972, Froines was a PCPJ delegate to the World Assembly for Peace, a Soviet-controlled gathering in Versailles, France, and also served as a sponsor of the National United Committee to Free Angela Davis, cited by the House Committee as part of the "official defense apparatus" created by the Party around the case of one of its top leaders who was then on trial in California. After later efforts at campaigning for Senator George McGovern (D-S.D.) and lobbying against congressional funds for the Vietnam war, Froines now enjoys a position within the Carter administration as director of the Occupational Safety and Health Administration's Office of Toxic Substances at a salary of some \$36,000 per annum.

Hayden, Froines, and Weiner are of special interest because they represent what many observers see as an alarming trend: the transformation of former New Left and other basically extremist activists from outsiders to insiders in the political and governmental processes. It is, of course, well known that administrations have tended to recruit from certain particular areas of the national life. Those who make and implement our foreign policy, for example, generally have come from such organizations as the Council on Foreign Relations or the Foreign Policy Association; from such institutions of learning as Harvard University; and from such tax-exempt power centers as the great foundations, the Brookings Institution, and the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. A common complaint among New Left and other left types has been that they have been relegated to outsider status and thereby effectively deprived of the opportunity to influence at first hand the formation of public policy. Now, however, with the advent of the Carter administration, the situation has been dramatically reversed. Instead of being on the outside looking in, representatives of the American left are now solidly ensconced within the policy-making process, perhaps for the first time on such a scale since the period of the New Deal and the administration of Franklin D. Roosevelt. This influx of political leftists has been notable in several areas, but it has probably been nowhere quite as pronounced as at ACTION under the leadership of Sam Brown.

SAM BROWN, DIRECTOR, ACTION

Samuel Winfred (Sam) Brown, Jr., is the very embodiment of the notion of the New Left activist turned establishment figure. Educated at such institutions as the University of Redlands, Rutgers University, and Harvard Divinity School, Brown served in 1968, according to his official biography, as "national volunteer coordinator of Eugene McCarthy's campaign for president, supervising the 'children's crusade' in New Hampshire." Later in the same year, he worked as statewide citizens coordinator for the successful campaign of Harold Hughes for the United States Senate in Iowa. In December 1968, Brown served as a consultant to the Peace Corps in India and Nepal, after which he spent six months as a fellow of the Institute of Politics of the John F. Kennedy School of Government at Harvard University.

In 1972, Brown worked in the abortive campaign of Senator Fred Harris (D-Okla.) for the Democratic presidential nomination, following which effort he became a prime organizer of the successful campaign to bar the winter Olympics from Colorado. This effort, a major example of successful environmental activism, was shrewdly couched in terms of the Olympics being a waste of the Colorado taxpayer's dollars. In 1974, Brown ran successfully for the office of state treasurer of Colorado, and he was later believed to be seriously considering a race for the office of mayor of Denver when his term as state treasurer expired. Instead, when President Carter assumed power early in 1977, he appointed Brown director of ACTION, the federal agency which includes some 236,000 volunteers serving in such programs as VISTA and the Peace Corps. ACTION's budget has been estimated at approximately \$182,000,000.

Brown's other ties include membership on the board of the Fair Campaign Practices Committee, the Brookings Institution Study on the Presidency, and the Robert F. Kennedy Memorial Foundation; and he was also, again according to his official biography, "a founding board member of the Council on Economic Priorities, an economic reserach organization." It is, however, for his anti-Vietnam war organizing activities that he is best known, although his biography merely observes that "Brown founded, coordinated and led the Vietnam Moratorium in Washington, D.C. in 1969," a summary that hardly does justice to the realities of anti-Vietnam war movement activity during this period.

The focus of Sam Brown's anti-Vietnam war activities was the Vietnam Moratorium Committee, an organization which played a major role in organizing mass demonstrations against United States involvement in Vietnam during October and November of 1969. Specifically, the VMC staged a demonstration in Washington, D.C., on October 15, 1969, and gave all-out support to the massive demonstration in Washington on November 15, 1969, under the auspices of the New Mobilization Committee to End the War in

Vietnam (New Mobe, as it was popularly known). The extent to which these two organizations were interlocked is often overlooked, but it provides valuable insight into anti-Vietnam war movement organizing.

The VMC enjoyed official representation on the steering committee of New Mobe from the latter's inception in July 1969 at the National Anti-War Conference in Cleveland, Ohio. Sworn testimony before the House Committee on Internal Security revealed that the National Anti-War Conference, in which the VMC actively participated, had actually been called largely at the instance of the Socialist Workers Party, which enjoyed operational control of a substantial percentage of the machinery of the anti-Vietnam war movement across the United States. The New Mobe, founded at this conference as the official successor to earlier coalitions, to which Communist support was also crucial, was an umbrella apparatus which sought to bring groups into its ranks on the basis of "non-exclusion," a term which meant simply that Communists were to be welcomed at all levels. The uncontradicted record shows that New Mobe's founding conference was secretly manipulated by members and supporters of the SWP, working in concert with other advocates of a Communist victory in Vietnam. In this connection, it is noted that Martin Abend, a television commentator in New York, stated to his listeners in 1969 that Sam Brown admitted he was in favor of a Viet Cong victory in Vietnam -- a position, as previously indicated in the quotation attributed to Douglas Dowd, held by most of the really important activists in the movement.

The VMC, which shared its office space with New Mobe, collaborated very closely with New Mobe on the October 15 demonstration, which was characterized by heavy Communist participation at every juncture. Subsequently, the Daily World, official newspaper of the Communist Party, reported in its October 22, 1969, edition that Brown, coordinator for the VMC, had announced VMC's complete, nation-wide support for the New Mobe demonstration in Washington on November 15. It should be noted that in its annual report for 1970, after a careful and thorough investigation, the House Committee on Internal Security formally concluded that New Mobe was under "communist domination." As previously indicated, New Mobe formally endorsed the VMC's October 15 demonstration, while the VMC played an active part in assuring the success of New Mobe's massive outpouring on November 15. It is also indicative of the true nature of these demonstrations, despite the generally favorable coverage the VMC received in most media accounts, that New York area participation in VMC's October 15 effort was coordinated by a regional coalition known as the Fifth Avenue Vietnam Peace Parade Committee, also cited as "dominated by communists" in the House Committee's 1970 annual report.

Such was the nature of the movement to which Brown lent his energies. It is perhaps small wonder that in 1976, while serving as a member of the Democratic Party Platform Committee, Brown was at odds with some of the Carter people over the issue of amnesty for those who had resisted the draft during the Vietnam war. Nor is it surprising that Brown avows a strong bias against the American intelligence community. As far back as 1967, when he was attending Harvard Divinity School, Brown ran for president of the National Student Association on a platform which included denunciation of involvement in the NSA by the Central Intelligence Agency; and in a lengthy interview published in the December 1977 issue of Penthouse magazine, he stated, "I take second place to no one in my hatred of the intelligence agencies." What may be surprising, at least to some observers, is that, according to the same interview, Brown was offered the directorship of ACTION a bare three hours after President Carter's inauguration. As Brown described it, he had first been called by Mr. Carter in Colorado about a week before the inauguration, so that

It wasn't an accident that he/Max Cleland, President Carter's choice to head the Veterans Administration/ and I were the first people into the White House on inauguration day. After Carter walked down Pennsylvania Avenue, he called us into the Oval Office.

As for whether he might feel somewhat awkward in such an "establishment" position after a career as one of the nation's better-known radical activists, Brown stated:

I never felt that much "outside." I felt that people in the streets in the sixties were working on the same problem as I am now. It has something to do with the way government should be when it's at its best -- it ought to include some sense of justice and equity. The civil-rights and anti-war demonstrators were trying to do what I try to do now; the difference is that now the government pays me for it instead of chasing me through the streets because of it. It doesn't feel at all uncomfortable.

(The reference to being chased through the streets may be an allusion to Brown's having been in Chicago during the violent demonstrations at the Democratic National Convention in August 1968. According to his own statement as quoted in the Penthouse interview, he was "in the middle of Michigan Avenue during the 1968 Democratic convention" in the company of a movement luminary named Carl Oglesby, a prominent anti-Vietnam war activist and leader in Students for a Democratic Society who has reportedly described himself as a Communist -denying, however, specific membership in the Communist Party, U.S.A.).

Brown clearly does not feel that his commitment to the Carter administration in any way connotes a diminution of his commitment to what is usually called "the movement." On the contrary, as shown by the Penthouse interview, he has been thinking about extending the activities of the Peace Corps into Communist Vietnam. Interestingly, Brown observed during the discussion that his "sense of the Vietnamese, from conversations during the war, is that the government of Vietnam understood very clearly the distinction between the American people and the U.S. government," which is certainly true: it was one of the most pronounced themes of Communist propaganda during the Vietnam war that there was a vital distinction to be made between the American people and their imperialist government. This possibility with regard to Vietnam is indicative of Brown's view of the so-called Third World generally:

I don't see ourselves in a Cold War context -- "us" against "them." Questions in the Third World have very little, it seems to me, to do with political ideology. They have to do with basic human needs. There are a lot of revolutionary governments in the world today that welcome the Peace Corps but don't like the United States very much.

If such a perspective sounds reminiscent of Andrew Young, President Carter's choice as United States Ambassador to the United Nations, it is probably more than mere coincidence. During his Penthouse interview, Brown was asked specifically how he feels about Young, and his response was as follows:

I've been spending a lot of time with Andy, and we've been on two trips abroad together. He's in a very strong position: he is the administration's foreign policy. By the time this appears in print, I may have egg on my face, but I think that Andy Young really expresses Carter's views. Most of the people who criticize him just don't want to believe him. /Emphasis in original./

Brown's assessment of President Carter provided intriguing indicators of possible things to come:

I think Carter's incredibly smart, one of the smartest men I've ever met. I think he is a much more progressive kind of guy than he is given credit for being. His energy speech was, I think, very understated but a very radical speech. It's redistributive with respect to tax impact. He said that the government, not the oil companies, ought to control energy policy. He talked about disclosure and about the way in which the oil companies make their money. Once there is disclosure, there will be divestiture. Equally important, I think, Carter is a terrific guy to work for, because he gives you a mandate and says, Go with it.

Bearing in mind the two immediately preceding quotations, it may be of particular interest to note the following exchange taken from the same interview:

Penthouse: Tom Hayden, whom you've said you admire a great deal, wrote in Rolling Stone that while it was too early "to predict their fates" -- speaking of Carter's younger appointees, such as you and Andrew Young -- "the most likely judgment is that they are a cadre of insiders who now are moderate enough to be acceptable and independent enough to be creative and critical, and who in a decade will be the next set of top policy makers." Would you agree with that assessment?

Brown: I think that's probably true. I'd like to think so. I thought about it before I came. Moreover, I talked to the president about it.

That Sam Brown is a long way from giving up his extremely radical perspective is indicated by his continuing affiliation with the National Conference on Alternative State and Local Public Policies, an apparatus established and operated by the Institute for Policy Studies, a far-left Washington "think tank" which numbers among its principal leaders and associates a variety of leftists, including identified Communists and other revolutionaries. (For a detailed examination of the origins, leadership, and activities of IPS, see Heritage Foundation Institution Analysis No. 2, "Institute for Policy Studies," May 1977.) Brown's ties to the NCASLPP include service on the organization's coordinating committee and active involvement in task forces and other programs, including a three-day national conference held during July 1978 in St. Paul, Minnesota, and described by David Broder in the July 17, 1978, edition of the Washington Post as the "fourth annual reunion" of some "650 veterans of the peace and civil rights movements and the radical politics of the 1960s." At the organization's 1975 conference, Brown, according to the authoritative weekly Human Events, "urged radical state officials to press for regulations limiting the size of bank holdings and assets, putting state funds only in banks which agree to make loans 'to particularly socially desirable goals,' and setting up 'public enterprises,' using taxpayers' funds as capital to drive private enterprise out of certain, selected areas."

It is perhaps significant that the national director of the NCASLPP is Lee Webb, at one time national secretary of Students for a Democratic Society. Webb, who was extremely active in SDS, also worked in 1968 with such movement leaders as Rennie Davis and Tom Hayden in organizing the demonstrations conducted by the Communist-dominated National Mobilization Committee during the

Democratic National Convention in Chicago, after which he became Washington, D.C., "bureau chief" for the Guardian, a well-known Communist newsweekly. In addition to Webb, NCASLPP has two other staff people in its Washington office: Ann Wise and Barbara Bick. Bick was also active in Communist-oriented "peace" movements during the Vietnam war and was identified as a member of the Communist Party in sworn testimony before the House Committee on Un-American Activities in 1951.

The NCASLPP has described itself as a "new network...established to strengthen the programmatic work of the left." To this end, presumably, the organization conducted a second annual conference in Austin, Texas, in June 1976, at which Brown reportedly stated that if President Carter "turns out to be as conservative as some people fear, our work becomes still more important because the only people out to change things in the long run are in this room." Such a statement says much about Brown's basic motivations and reflects a clearly elitist conception of what is needed in effecting basic change in our society.

In view of Brown's active adherence to the policies and programs of the NCASLPP, it is pertinent to cite two items from Webb's statement of the group's intentions. The first reflects a desire "To open up contacts with local government and political officials in Europe, particularly England, Sweden, Italy, Portugal, and some Eastern European countries...." The second advances the idea of "contacts of American local public officials with Cuba, particularly concentrating on structure and function of local government." Webb stated that "Jim Rowen, Assistant to the Mayor of Madison, Wisconsin, and son-in-law of George McGovern, received an initial inquiry from the Cubans about the National Conference and an expression (of interest) in a possible delegation." This preoccupation with Communist Cuba is of particular interest when it is recalled that Brown has a special concern for what is often called the Third World. Also, according to syndicated columnist Patrick Buchanan, Brown once addressed a Secretary's Open Forum at the U.S. Department of State on the subject of "workplace democracy;" which he described as "a concept ill-developed in American society. It is another of the places where we stand to learn from Jamaica, from Tanzania, from Cuba, from Yugoslavia...."

The most notorious incident involving Brown, however, was probably his participation in a public rally in New York City on September 25, 1977, during which, in the words of a reporter for the New York Times, "Vietnam's new delegation to the United Nations was greeted by thousands of its American friends and supporters, many of whom had opposed the United States involvement in Indochina." Presiding at this function in honor of the official representatives of the Communist government of Vietnam was

"peace" movement activist Cora Weiss, a woman with a record of subservience to the Communists in Hanoi that is virtually unmatched in the United States. Among the estimated 2,500 people who attended the gathering were self-admitted Communist David Dellinger, former U.S. Attorney General Ramsey Clark, and radical folk singer and movement guru Pete Seeger, long ago identified in sworn testimony as a member of the Communist Party. Present also was Sam Brown, head of ACTION, who reportedly stated that "we ought to aid the Vietnamese in their reconstruction" and that he was "deeply moved." According to the Times reporter's account, Brown also said that "It's difficult to describe my feelings -- what can you say when the kinds of things that 15 years of your life were wrapped up in are suddenly before you?"

One might ask, "What indeed?" One of the Vietnamese representatives was quoted as saying, as part of an attack on the United States, that "From such a long distance the American imperialists send half a million troops to wage a bloody colonial war," adding that, despite this, "no enmity exists between the Vietnamese and American people." (At this point, one might recall Brown's statement that the Vietnamese government "understood very clearly the distinction between the American people and the U.S. government.") The same speaker, to "heavy applause," also asked, "How can we accept that those who dropped 50 million tons of bombs on Vietnam not contribute to the healing of war wounds?" Then he declaimed, to a standing ovation, "Long live the friendship between the Vietnamese and the American people!"

Press accounts of this gathering occasioned considerable negative comment, especially among members of the House and Senate of the United States who questioned Brown's fitness for a position of public trust in such circumstances. But the most telling commentary was perhaps that of Eric Sevareid:

Most of those in the New York theatre were not celebrating peace. They were celebrating the triumph of communist totalitarianism, which is what they had always been working for in the guise of a peace movement.

MARY KING, DEPUTY DIRECTOR, ACTION

It appears that Brown's radical views are shared by others at the upper levels of ACTION. Deputy Director Mary King stated during her confirmation hearings before the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, "I find myself completely in compatibility with Mr. Brown. I think our beliefs and values are congruent and that we will work very effectively together." Reportedly quite close to President Carter and to Mrs. Carter, Mary King served from

1963 to 1965, according to her official biography, as assistant director of communications for the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee; it was during this same period (specifically, from 1963 through 1966) that John Lewis, currently Director of Domestic Programs for ACTION, served as SNCC's national chairman. According to a staff study placed into the record of 1967 hearings before the House Committee on Un-American Activities, the "Primary initiators in the founding of SNCC were" two women, Ella Baker and Anne Braden. Both were involved extensively in both SNCC and the Southern Conference Educational Fund, an organization with which SNCC collaborated frequently and which was known throughout that period as an adjunct of the Communist Party. Mrs. Braden was herself identified under oath as a member of the CPUSA and, with her husband Carl Braden, likewise identified as a Party member, was among SCEF's principal moving forces.

PETER BOURNE, SPECIAL ASSISTANT TO THE PRESIDENT

Mary King is, as previously noted, married to Peter Bourne, a psychiatrist who recently resigned as an adviser to President Carter on drug abuse questions because of allegations of improper activities involving the writing of a prescription for a potent and frequently abused drug in the name of a fictitious person, a criminal offense. As shown by an official list of local coordinators printed and disseminated by Vietnam Veterans Against the War, Bourne was at one time an Atlanta, Georgia, coordinator for VVAW, an overtly pro-Communist and pro-Hanoi organization that was eventually taken over by the Maoist Revolutionary Union. It is further noted that VVAW was among the most active components of the Communist-dominated Peoples Coalition for Peace and Justice during the organizing of the so-called May Day demonstrations of 1971, reference to which was made earlier in connection with John Froines, director of OSHA's Office of Toxic Substances.

Bourne has also served as a member of the board of directors of the Institute for Southern Studies, formed in March 1970 as a subsidiary of the extremely radical Institute for Policy Studies. A non-profit, tax-exempt organization, ISS has described itself as "a social change organization engaged in research and educational programs that analyze and clarify alternatives for the political economy of the South and the Nation." More specifically, the Institute, with a staff characterized as "young, black and white, men and women who were active participants in the struggles of the sixties," believes that "Corporate behavior assumes aspects of colonial domination in the South" and that "Multi-national firms view the region's unorganized work force and poorly protected resources as ripe for exploitation...." To help counter this situation, the Institute, among other activities,

is systematically collecting, evaluating, and disseminating data on the operations of over 400 corporations in the South. The information gets wide use, from local black strikers to Ralph Nader's Law Center. In addition, we are linking corporate reform groups outside the region to local struggles, and helping local struggles, and helping local projects develop alternative modes of economic survival.

JOHN LEWIS, ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR, ACTION

ACTION Domestic Programs Director John Lewis was characterized by Anthony Bouscaren and Daniel Lyons, in their comprehensive volume Left of Liberal (New York: Twin Circle Publishing Co., 1969), as a "Marxist revolutionary" who "before turning over the chairmanship of SNCC to Stokely Carmichael helped author that organization's infamous call for draft evasion." SNCC was one of the most active black revolutionary groups of the 1960s. Begun as an interracial organization, as indicated previously, SNCC became increasingly militant under the leadership of men like Lewis, Carmichael, and H. "Rap" Brown. As the decade progressed, SNCC allied itself with the Movement for Puerto Rican Independence, cited by the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee as one of "the three leading pro-Communist organizations of Puerto Rico." According to the House Committee on Un-American Activities, SNCC also "aligned itself with the Havana-based Latin American Solidarity Organization (LASO), a Castro-led network of guerrilla fighters whose primary aim is to export revolution in Latin America and among the Negro population in America."

Several of Lewis's other radical affiliations are also of special interest. He has served as a "Vice Chairman" for the "Southern Region" of the National Committee Against Repressive Legislation and as a member of the "Southern Region Committee" of NCARL's predecessor, the National Committee to Abolish the House Un-American Activities Committee. This apparatus, originally set up in 1960 "to lead and direct the Communist Party's 'Operation Abolition' campaign" against the House Committee, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, has operated from its inception as a front for the CPUSA. In 1966, when the Attorney General of the United States moved to require the W.E.B. DuBois Clubs of America to register with the government as a Communist-front organization under the terms of the Internal Security Act of 1950, several movement leaders mounted a defense of the DCA against the government. Among them was John Lewis of SNCC, along with such people as David Dellinger, Dagmar Wilson of the heavily Communist-infiltrated Women Strike for Peace, Clark Kissinger of SDS, Elizabeth Sutherland, director of SNCC's New York office and supporter of the Communist-front Fair Play for Cuba Committee, and Rev. James Bevel, a prominent leader in the Southern Christian Leadership

Conference and activist in the pro-Hanoi "peace" movement of the 1960s. Lewis also served as a sponsor of the GI Civil Liberties Defense Committee, cited by the House Committee on Internal Security as being under the control of the Socialist Workers Party, and, in 1973, was among sponsors for the founding conference of the National Alliance Against Racist and Political Repression, which was characterized as follows by the House Committee in its December 1973 report, Revolutionary Target: The American Penal System:

Based on the evidence presented in the hearings and briefly summarized above, the committee concludes that the National Alliance Against Racist and Political Repression is completely controlled by the Communist Party, U S A, and represents one of the most ambitious attempts ever mounted by the party to establish a "defense" apparatus for the purpose of duping the unwary into supporting CPUSA aims under the guise of appearing to support humanitarian or reform objectives.

ILONA HANCOCK, DIRECTOR, REGION 9, ACTION

Another ACTION official with a solidly radical background is Ilona (Loni) Hancock, sworn in on February 9, 1978, as director of the agency's western Region 9. A member of the Berkeley, California, City Council since 1971, she indicated that she would continue her membership during her service with ACTION. Reportedly chosen because "we wanted somebody who has a commitment to social change," in the words of an unnamed ACTION official, Hancock has been quoted in press accounts as seeing her federal position as a "continuation of her involvement in community and activist politics here over nearly a decade and a half, beginning with the Free Speech Movement and first anti-war demonstrations in the 1960s...." A member of the American Civil Liberties Union and the National Organization for Women, Hancock has also been affiliated with Women for Peace; the Community for New Politics, an overtly Marxist California political movement; and the Friends Committee on National Legislation. In 1968, she worked in the unsuccessful campaign of pro-Hanoi Marxist Robert Scheer for Congress (the Community for New Politics grew out of the Scheer campaign); and in 1973, she reportedly signed a petition in defense of the French section of the Trotskyite Communist Fourth International, a project in which she was joined by such luminaries as screenwriter Dalton Trumbo, who has been identified as a member of the Communist Party. In 1971, she was, according to an official list disseminated by the organization, among the endorsers of the "United Women's Contingent for April 24th," a subsidiary of the National Peace Action Coalition, an organization

which was, in the words of the House Committee on Internal Security's annual report for 1971, "tightly controlled by the Socialist Workers Party."

Along with ACTION director Sam Brown, Ilona Hancock is an active member of the IPS-created National Conference on Alternative State and Local Public Policies, serving as a member of the organization's steering committee. In July 1977, for example, she attended the third national conference of the NCASLPP, held in Denver, Colorado, where she participated in workshops on such topics as "Feminist Issues: Legislative Strategies at the State & Local Level" and "How to Work as a Progressive Minority in a Legislative Body." Among others who attended this same gathering were Sam Brown; Esther Peterson, Special Assistant to the President of the United States for Consumer Affairs; Leonel Castillo, currently Director of the United States Immigration and Naturalization Service; Tom Hayden of the Campaign for Economic Democracy, a radical Marxist movement based in California; and numerous state and local public officials, including District of Columbia City Council member Marion Barry, currently running for mayor of the District as the nominee of the Democratic Party. According to an article in a recent issue of the authoritative Information Digest, Ilona Hancock also attended the fourth national NCASLPP conference, held in St. Paul, Minnesota, in August 1978, and participated in a workshop on "Community Organizing: Basis for a New Political Strategy?" Like other NCASLPP gatherings, this conference was characterized by the presence of a large number of elected and appointed government officials from the national, state, and local levels, along with such leading movement radicals as the ubiquitous Tom Hayden. Among attendees from government agencies, in addition to Hancock, were Sam Brown of ACTION; Msgr. Geno Baroni, Assistant Secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development; Ellen Feingold, Director of the Office of Civil Rights, U.S. Department of Transportation; Karen Paget, another regional director (Area 8) for ACTION; and Tina Hobson, Director of the Office of Consumer Affairs, U.S. Department of Energy. Hancock also served on the planning committee for the Third Annual California Conference on Alternative State and Local Public Policy, which was held during February 1978.

Since Hancock views her work with ACTION as essentially a "continuation" of her earlier efforts, it is useful to refer briefly to her career on the Berkeley City Council, where she pushed such causes as public ownership of Pacific Gas and Electric, a favorite radical target; sensitivity training for the police; and nonenforcement of laws against the use, cultivation, and possession of marijuana. An article in the April 22, 1978, issue of Human Events reflects that

"Three newly elected radical coalition city councilmen," the piece /in the May 4, 1971, Oakland Tribune/ began, "refused to stand and recite the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag as they took their seats for the first time this morning." Guess who was one of them? The Tribune went on: "Councilman D'army Bailey, speaking for Ira Simmons and Ilona Hancock, said, 'We cannot in good conscience' recite the 'pledge as long as the United States is not 'one nation, indivisible, under God, with liberty and justice for all.'

"To the cheers of the packed council chambers, Bailey said, 'We do not believe a patriotic ceremony should be a regular order of council business' as long as 'racial discrimination, rat-infested housing, joblessness and police brutality exist in this country.' Bailey suggested the council's rules committee study the possibility of eliminating the Pledge of Allegiance from all future council meetings."

The same article adds that

Ms. Hancock indicated no remorse or real change of heart about this particular act. Those were "desperate" times, she said. Asked if she still felt as passionately today about the things that prompted her 1971 actions, she replied: "I feel as strongly as ever."

She added, however, that she did have a much more "positive" attitude about the country today because so many of the positions she took in the '60s and '70s -- such as her stand on the war -- "became mainstream positions."

MARGE TABANKIN, DEPUTY ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR, ACTION

Under Sam Brown's directorship, there have been several positions taken by ACTION personnel that have occasioned considerable controversy. The announcement at one point by Associate Director John Lewis that a three-day conference could not be held in Atlanta, Georgia, because of that state's failure to ratify the Equal Rights Amendment is a not-untypical example, as is the revelation, contained in a letter written by Sam Brown to Representative Harold Volkmer (D-Mo.) in May 1978, that ACTION spent some \$45,000 during 1977 on abortion-related costs incurred by Peace Corps volunteers. But there is probably no other single division of ACTION that has become embroiled in more controversy since the advent of Brown and his team than VISTA (Volunteers in Service to America), which is currently led by a prominent movement activist named Marge Tabankin.

In July 1978, for example, VISTA official Lynn Miller sent a letter to former Peace Corps and VISTA volunteers soliciting their support for the upcoming "Longest Walk" demonstration in Washington, D.C., under the auspices of the American Indian Movement. Her letter was written on official stationery and mailed in a franked government envelope; it also carried Miller's office telephone number for contact purposes. Miller denied that any of this activity was conducted during office hours, although it developed that the project assignment sheet carried the names and office numbers of several other ACTION employees in addition to Miller herself. Because of a serious question as to the propriety of using federal funds to support lobbying activities by special interest groups, Brown announced that he would investigate to determine whether official government postage had been used illegally.

This incident assumes considerable interest when one realizes the true nature of the American Indian Movement as revealed in hearings and reports published during 1976 and 1977 by the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee. As noted by the Subcommittee in its annual report for the fiscal year ending February 28, 1977, the evidence developed during the Subcommittee's hearings, "supported by extensive documentation, established" certain basic facts about AIM, among them that, despite sympathetic coverage of AIM activities in the media, it is "a frankly revolutionary organization which is committed to violence, calls for the arming of American Indians, has cached explosives and illegally purchased arms, plans kidnappings, and whose opponents have been eliminated in the manner of the Mafia." Further, some of the organization's "leaders and associates have visited Castro's Cuba and/or openly consider themselves Marxist-Leninist."

Tabakin's background is as committedly radical—as that of any other New Left figure cited in this study. Immediately prior to becoming head of VISTA, she served as director of the Youth Project, which is discussed below. A graduate of the University of Wisconsin at Madison, where she served as president of the student body and was also a prominent anti-Vietnam war activist, she spent four months at Saul Alinsky's Industrial Areas Foundation in Chicago, Illinois, studying community organizing, after which she taught school for a year before being elected president of the National Student Association, which had become increasingly involved in blatantly pro-Hanoi "peace" activity, including promotion of the "People's Peace Treaty," a central focus of anti-Vietnam war organizing during 1971 on the part of NSA and the Communist-run NPAC and PCPJ. As stated in the 1971 annual report of the House Committee on Internal Security, this "so-called treaty, which involved negotiations with representatives of the communist North Vietnamese Government, fully support/ed/ the communist position on Vietnam" and was actually drafted by the North Vietnamese.

Tabankin's "peace" activity during 1971 included sponsoring an advertisement placed in the New York Times by the National Peace Action Coalition and the Peoples Coalition for Peace and Justice, cited by the House Committee on Internal Security as being, respectively, "tightly controlled by the Socialist Workers Party" and under the "generally predominant influence" of the Communist Party, U.S.A. In 1972, she represented NSA at the World Peace Assembly, a Moscow-controlled gathering held in France as part of the decades-old international Communist "peace" offensive waged by the Soviet Union against the United States. Subsequently, during May 1972, she participated in a visit to Communist North Vietnam under the auspices of the PCPJ, after which she joined her three colleagues on the visit in a "war crimes" press conference, saying, "It's no longer bridges, railroads and military targets that are being attacked, but 90-year-old men and civilians who cannot run fast enough to bombshelters." Such contentions were, of course, precisely in tune with North Vietnamese and Viet Cong efforts to discredit the American military in the eyes of the world at large and, most especially, among American civilians at home. The following extract from official minutes of a June 1972 meeting of the PCPJ Coordinating Committee is most revealing:

From the evidence that was seen by the group of four people (Paul Mayer, Margy Tabankin, Bill Zimmerman, Bob Lecky) that were in North Vietnam from May 20-27, it is obvious that many of the areas we are bombing are neither military nor near military targets. This evidence is particularly noxious in view of our recent claims that we can pinpoint our bombing raids to within a few feet of the targets specified. However, the attitude of determination of the Vietnamese is summed up in a statement by a Vietnamese youth, "I only want to live to grow up and fight in the army and avenge my country and family." The Vietnamese feel that this is a very significant phase in the war; that the U S Administration is trying to bomb the Vietnamese to the Paris talks (assuming they will come with a pleading attitude) before the elections.

After returning from Hanoi, Tabankin worked in the Indo-china Peace Campaign with Tom Hayden and Jane Fonda, both of whom were among the nation's foremost and most vocal partisans of the Communist cause in Vietnam. Hayden's statement that "We are all Viet Cong" has already been quoted. One of the more notorious statements attributed to Fonda occurred during a speech which she delivered in November 1969 at Michigan State University: "I would think that if you understood what communism was, you would hope, you would pray on your knees that we would someday become communist." She also referred to the Vietcong as "the conscience of the world." In December 1970, while speaking in Durham, North Carolina, at Duke University, Fonda declared, "I

am a socialist, I think that we should strive toward a socialist society -- all the way to communism." With this information in mind, it is particularly instructive to note that, speaking in a 1977 interview, Tabankin reportedly stated that she had been recommended for her position with ACTION by some "mutual friends," including Lee Webb of IPS and NCASLPP; Heather Booth, head of the Midwest Academy (discussed below) and wife of Paul Booth, a founder of SDS; and Tom Hayden and Jane Fonda.

ACTION AND "COMMUNITY ORGANIZING"

That VISTA, to say nothing of ACTION in general, should have become an object of controversy, especially in Congress, should not be at all surprising if one is aware of the avowed predilections of the agency's leadership. As observed by Joseph Nocera in an extensive article, "Sam Brown and the Peace Corps: All Talk, No ACTION," in the September 1978 issue of Washington Monthly:

From the beginning Brown spoke in the language of the left -- he would "put ACTION on the cutting edge of social and economic change," he would "find the places where you have some latitude and try to create some models" -- and from the beginning most of Washington bought it. If he infuriated the right with his statements -- and he did, especially in Congress -- that was a feather in his cap; he must be doing something right to get those folks mad at him. Within the first few months, many of the heavies of the left came to ACTION to visit Brown. Tom Hayden came by. David Harris. Phillip Berrigan. Ralph Nader. It was as if he had to prove to these people that he could be a part of the federal government and not sell out; their approval would mean that his credentials were still intact.

With specific reference to VISTA, Brown was asked during his Penthouse interview whether "The rich, the corporations, Republicans in general, may still regard a highly publicized VISTA program and your volunteers as a threat," to which he responded, "I assume they will, and they ought to; if they don't, then I'm not doing my job," adding that VISTA "ought not to be just a bunch of low-paid social workers. It ought to be people helping to get themselves together to build new institutions /emphasis in original/." During the same interview, Brown emphasized community organizing, a favorite priority among 1960s radicals that is clearly central to the present ACTION leadership's conception of what the agency is supposed to be doing to effect basic change in American institutions:

But in this job I spend my time calling on that same network of community organizers that has been there right along. When I want to talk to somebody about prisons, I call David Harris or Phil Berrigan, because they're the people I know best who've spent time in jail. So I'm going to San Bruno, Calif., next week, where we have a program in the city jail, and I'm going with Dave Harris and Sheriff Richard Hongisto of San Francisco County. Hongisto is clearly the most interesting law-enforcement officer in the country /he was among those who participated in a "Criminal Justice" workshop at the February 1977 California Conference on Alternative Public Policy, for which Tom Hayden was a principal organizer/, and Harris spent a couple of years in jail as a draft resister.

When I talk to people about community programs, I want to talk to the people from ACORN and Fair Share and Mass Advocacy -- all the community groups that I've known over a period of years. VISTA volunteers -- there are 5,000 of them out there -- ought to be assigned, and are being assigned, to genuine community groups. VISTA is a whole series of little programs that grow out of the community, or that do when it's at its best. So it's really not too difficult, if you make the effort to stay in touch with local people.

Under the Brown-Tabankin leadership, VISTA's perspective on community organizing is clearly confrontational. Tabankin has been quoted in public press accounts as saying that "VISTA should be organizing people to act upon their rights as citizens and work towards more equitable distribution of income and opportunities," while Brown was quoted by a magazine for former Peace Corps and VISTA volunteers as having stated that his "predecessor said he turned VISTA into motherhood and apple pie. Well, that's not my intent. Right now we have VISTA lawyers pushing paper for the community. My view is that they ought to be filing cases against the community." Thus, it is hardly accidental that there have been proposals from within ACTION that volunteers be allowed to participate in voter registration campaigns and labor organizing; that VISTA funds went to a New Orleans organization which subsequently had to be warned that it would lose its funding unless it ceased endorsing local political candidates; or that someone as demonstrably a part of the radical political fringe as former Chicago Seven defendant Lee Weiner could be hired at \$130 per day as a consultant to ACTION for "developing community-based programs, policy and planning."

ACTION AND THE NATIONAL CENTER FOR URBAN ETHNIC AFFAIRS

In pursuit of more aggressive community organizing, it was revealed early in 1978 that ACTION had made no fewer than three contracts with the National Center for Urban Ethnic Affairs, founded in 1970 by Msgr. Geno Baroni, who serves now as Assistant Secretary of Housing and Urban Development in the Carter administration. Baroni, as noted earlier, has been a participant in activities of the IPS-created National Conference on Alternative State and Local Public Policies. His background also includes active involvement in the Southern Christian Leadership Conference and Martin Luther King's 1963 March on Washington, as well as participation in the 1970 national congress of the National Student Association, which at that time had assumed a pro-Hanoi point of view as shown by, among other things, its involvement in promoting so-called "Vietnam Moratorium" demonstrations and, somewhat later, the "People's Peace Treaty." It should be noted that Baroni's fellow participants in the August 1970 NSA congress included such Old and New Left activists as Lee Webb of the Institute for Policy Studies; Rev. Jesse Jackson, prominent participant in activities of the Communist-dominated New Mobilization Committee, PCPJ, and NPAC and endorser of the "People's Peace Treaty;" Rennie Davis, one of the nation's preeminent supporters of the Communist cause in Vietnam; Paul Booth, a founder of SDS; and Charles R. Garry, attorney for the Black Panther Party and identified member of the Communist Party, U.S.A.

One of ACTION's contracts with NCUEA involved some \$50,000 for the production of "program assistance manuals" for the Older American Volunteer Programs (OAVP), for which, as part of his official responsibilities, one Gerson Green serves as an expert consultant. Green also has served since August 1977 as an expert consultant in the office of ACTION Deputy Director Mary King -- and as Baroni's successor as head of NCUEA, which is what has led to allegations of serious conflict of interest in the letting of ACTION funds to the National Center. Green, who serves as president of NCUEA's National Neighborhood Institute project and as a member of NCUEA's management committee, in addition to being a paid consultant to ACTION and OAVP, signed the contract for the manuals in behalf of the National Center and was also reportedly listed as the one who negotiated it for them. Another contract involved \$5,000 to NCUEA for a study of why poor "ethnics" who work for low or moderate wages instead of receiving welfare are not participating in the sorts of volunteer projects maintained by NCUEA and ACTION, and a third involved a \$491,000 VISTA grant to NCUEA for the wages of 75 organizers who were selected by NCUEA for work in "low income communities." It has been alleged that the general counsel of ACTION informed Brown that Green represented NCUEA on two occasions, at a minimum, with respect to "matters concerning the grant before the agency" and that, though the precise extent to which Green may

have been personally involved in developing the grant application for the National Center is unclear, "one of the two people responsible for it at the organization was subject to his supervision."

As indicated above, these contracts have occasioned considerable controversy because of possible conflict of interest. However, it appears that only one of these has been canceled. On December 30, 1977, Sam Brown wrote to Representative Larry McDonald (D-Ga.) that the first contract was being terminated because of "an appearance of conflict of interest." Dr. McDonald summarized the situation with regard to ACTION and NCUEA in the February 8, 1978, edition of the Congressional Record:

Three ACTION contracts have been given to the National Center for Urban Ethnic Affairs (NCUEA), now headed by Baroni's successor, Gerson Green. Green, in addition, is a consultant to ACTION. In one of the NCUEA contracts, Green was not only ACTION's expert consultant, but also signed the contract on behalf of the NCUEA. In December, on the same day he received a letter from me inquiring into these grants, ACTION Director Brown ordered this contract canceled for "apparent" conflict of interest. The other contracts stand.

ACTION AND THE MIDWEST ACADEMY

Two other organizations with which ACTION has been financially involved are the Midwest Academy, which received a master grant of \$432,235 from VISTA, and the Youth Project, which was scheduled to receive a grant of \$500,000 from ACTION. These organizations have close ties to a variety of groups that have grown out of the radical activism of the 1960s, as well as to such ACTION officials as Marge Tabankin, who has lectured at the Midwest Academy and who was listed by the Youth Project in 1977 as serving on that organization's board of directors, having been its executive director prior to her appointment to ACTION.

According to the April 22, 1978, issue of Human Events, the Midwest Academy "trains and supervises 'volunteers' for VISTA and other ACTION agencies." The director of the Academy is Heather Booth, wife of SDS founder Paul Booth and former activist in the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee and other movements and causes related to labor, womens' rights, and tenants' rights issues. According to the Human Events article, Heather Booth has stated that her institution does "a lot more than teach confrontation to our organizers. Confrontation is only a tactic," her position being that "if confrontation becomes necessary,

then there's a right way to do it." She has also been quoted in press accounts and in the Congressional Record as saying that it is time for "people to organize to address visionary, long-range questions, issues of national policy, the actual redistribution of wealth." The Midwest Academy has concerned itself with issues dear to the hearts of the radical left in the United States, including affirmation action, abortion, and the Equal Rights Amendment, and has worked with such organizations as the National Organization for Women and the American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees, one of the nation's more radically oriented labor unions. It has also worked closely with the New American Movement, an organization formally organized in 1972 to promote what it calls a "socialist revolution" to "end imperialist intervention throughout the world;" the National Conference on Alternative State and Local Public Policies; and activists from the National Coordinating Committee for Trade Union Action and Democracy, cited in 1971 by the House Committee on Internal Security as "a major attempt by the CPUSA to re-establish itself in the trade union field."

ACTION AND THE YOUTH PROJECT

In 1976, tuition and travel expenses for organizers from so-called "workplace organizing" and other radical movements who attended the Midwest Academy were met by the Youth Project, with which ACTION's Marge Tabankin has had particularly close ties. A non-profit, tax-exempt institution, the Youth Project has supported a large number of radical community organizing groups; and its projects have involved such organizations on the far left as the New American Movement, the NCASLPP, and the Georgia Power Project, a Marxist "public ownership" operation established in 1972 in Atlanta, Georgia, by the Institute for Southern Studies, a subsidiary of the Institute for Policy Studies. Members of the Georgia Power Project have reportedly worked in collaboration with members of the Maoist October League (now known as the Communist Party, Marxist-Leninist); and two speakers at a 1973 GPP-sponsored conference are alleged to have indicated that such tactics as sabotage and the use of dynamite might be acceptable against strip mining operations run by utility-owned coal companies.

In addition to dispensing its largesse to the ACTION-funded Midwest Academy, the Youth Project has provided funding to such other radical operations as the People's Bicentennial Commission and the Public Education Project on the Intelligence Community, a group established by the Organizing Committee for a Fifth Estate, thought by many to have been at least an indirect cause of the death by assassination of CIA agent Richard Welch in Athens, Greece. It has also disbursed significant sums of money to a number of radical community organizing operations, among them the Association of Community Organizations for Reform Now, branches of which in Louisiana and Arkansas have received VISTA funds for the training of community organizing volunteers. The following summary of ACORN activity, taken from a presentation

by Representative McDonald in the February 8, 1978, Congressional Record, is most instructive in view of the organization's ties to both the Youth Project and ACTION:

Association of Community Organizations for Reform NOW (ACORN), active in some eleven South, Southwest and Midwest states. Membership is through family membership in affiliated community organizations. ACORN's staff of paid professional organizers are active with the NCASLPP project. ACORN has had the benefit of summer legal interns from the National Lawyers Guild (NLG) /cited many times as an adjunct of the Communist Party, U.S.A./ and cooperates with the Midwest Academy and NAM /New American Movement/ to the extent of sending NAM listings of job openings for paid organizers on ACORN's staff.

ACORN organizers emphasize that ACORN does not merely coordinate community groups in 11 states around health care, urban renewal and utility rate issues, but also works to get its candidates elected or appointed to local regulatory and advisory boards and commissions. ACORN has participated in the NCASLPP conferences and is viewed as one of the most successful anti-capitalist community prototypes.

Such information adds a certain piquancy to a realization that the Youth Project operates as a tax-exempt institution. It also makes it of special interest that the Youth Project has been the recipient of support from such foundations as the Field Foundation, the Samuel Rubin Foundation, and the Stern Fund, all of which have been major sources of money for the Institute for Policy Studies; the Sierra Club; several established church agencies; and such individuals as W. H. Ferry, Stewart Mott, and Mott's sister, Maryanne Mott Meynet, who have also helped finance the operations of the National Committee for an Effective Congress, the subject of an earlier Heritage Foundation study (Institution Analysis No. 5, "National Committee for an Effective Congress," April, 1978).

With the foregoing sampling of the available data on ACTION and its present leadership in mind, it is perhaps small wonder that the agency has become the center of such heated controversy, as well as the subject of a formal investigation by the staff of the House Committee on Appropriations. The man who initiated this investigation, House Minority Whip Robert Michel (R-ILL) would seem to have had more than sufficient justification for alleging, as reported in the February 17, 1978, edition of the Washington Post, that Sam Brown is "seeking to transform ACTION into a tax-supported sanctuary for radical activists...."

BELLA ABZUG, CO-CHAIR, NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR WOMEN

Of those movement activists who have been appointed to government positions in recent years, one of the most aggressively leftist is Bella S. Abzug, former member of the U.S. House of Representatives from New York City. Unlike some of those considered in this study, Abzug has ties to both Old and New Left activists and organizations but is an almost classic product of the Old Left whose record of affiliation with organizations and projects characterized by official government agencies as fronts for the Communist Party spans at least 38 years. During her service in the House from New York City's 20th Congressional District, she was conspicuous among those members who demonstrated a particularly vehement animus toward the American intelligence community while maintaining ties to organizations and causes on the far left of the political spectrum, a record which was entirely in keeping with the pattern of prior years and which, despite its obvious character, has clearly been anything but a bar to advancement under the present administration.

In 1977, Bella Abzug served, by presidential appointment, as Presiding Officer for the National Commission on the Observance of International Women's Year and for the Commission's National Women's Conference in Houston, Texas. Subsequently, when the National Commission ceased to exist with the expiration of its mandate on March 31, 1978, and was replaced by the National Advisory Committee for Women under the terms of an Executive Order issued by President Carter, she became "Co-Chair" of the NACW, also by presidential appointment. Her biography as carried in The Spirit of Houston: The First National Women's Conference, published by the National Commission as its "Official Report to the President, the Congress and the People of the United States" in March 1978, reads as follows:

Bella S. Abzug, of New York, New York; author of Public Law 94-167, which designated the National Commission as sponsor of the National Women's Conference; member of Congress, 1971-1976; attorney, lecturer, author; convener and former chair, National Women's Political Caucus; Congressional Adviser to U.S. Delegation to U.N. World Conference on IWY in Mexico City, July 1975; former member advisory board, National Organization for Women, Americans for Democratic Action; member, B'nai B'rith, Hadassah, American Civil Liberties Union, Women's Forum; 1976, Democratic Party platform committee; named third most influential member of Congress by her colleagues and one of 10 most important women leaders in a U.S. News and World Report poll in 1976; Honorary degrees, Hunter College, Manhattanville College, Hobart College.

According to a detailed article published in the December 11, 1976, issue of Human Events,

In early 1940, the Hunter College Bulletin reported that Bella Savitsky, now Ms. Abzug, was strongly isolationist during the Hitler-Stalin pact. But she apparently changed her mind when the Nazis invaded Soviet Russia. Ms. Savitsky's pro-Communist allegiance was so conspicuous that the New York Post of March 18, 1941, wrote:

"Among those who have generally followed the Communist Party line in her college activities is Bella Savitsky...."

It is noted that, among those professionally concerned with these issues, such a change of views on neutrality vis-a-vis Nazi Germany after the Hitler-Stalin pact has always been regarded as one of the principal indicia of pro-Soviet leanings.

The same source reflects that from 1944 to 1953, Bella Abzug was a supporter of the American Labor Party, a Communist-controlled political apparatus first officially cited as a Party front in 1944; her affiliation with the ALP lasted for some ten years subsequent to its identification as an adjunct of the CPUSA. She also became a member of the National Lawyers Guild, cited many times as a CPUSA legal front organization, and served in 1948 as a member of the Guild's delegation to the Third Congress of the International Association of Democratic Lawyers in Prague, Czechoslovakia, six months after the Communist takeover of that country. The IADL has been well-known since its inception as part of a network of international Communist-front organizations controlled by the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. As the Human Events article further observes, at "about the same time, she was active in a group called the Citizens Committee of the Upper /West/ Side," designated by the Attorney General of the United States in 1947 as a subversive organization that was among the affiliates and committees of the CPUSA, and was a "frequent speaker at meetings of the Civil Rights Congress," identified as a CPUSA operation by the Attorney General, the House Committee on Un-American Activities, the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, and the Subversive Activities Control Board.

In 1951 and 1953, respectively, Abzug was listed as a signer of an open Letter for, and as a sponsor of, the National Women's Appeal for the Rights of Foreign Born Americans, characterized by the House Committee on Un-American Activities as one of the "nationwide affiliates" of the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born, the nation's oldest extant Communist-front organization. More recently, she has been a financial supporter of Jewish Currents, a monthly magazine described by the House Committee on Internal Security as "CPUSA-controlled," and the recipient of the 1976 annual Tom Paine Award from the National Emergency Civil Liberties Committee, cited by two congressional

committees as a front for the Communist Party. In 1975, Abzug was a speaker, along with fellow members of Congress John Conyers (D-Mich) and Herman Badillo (D-N.Y.), at a Capitol Hill rally conducted by Youth United for Jobs, a group run by Maria Ramos, a member of the Communist Party and of the CPUSA's official youth front, the Young Workers Liberation League. During the same year, she was also among members of Congress invited to the National Conference for a Drastic Cutback in Military Spending, held in Chicago, Illinois. The promotional letter for this enterprise was written on the letterhead of the Chicago Peace Council, cited by the House Committee on Internal Security as being "completely controlled by members of the CPUSA," and was signed by well-known Chicago "peace" activist Sylvia Kushner, a member of the Illinois State Committee of the Communist Party. Checks for the conference were to be made "payable to" the Chicago Peace Council, in which Kushner has long been the principal functionary.

Bella Abzug has been particularly concerned over the years with "peace" activity, and in this area, as in others already cited, she has exhibited a pronounced leftist bias. Her biography in the Congressional Directory stated that she was an "initiator of Women Strike for Peace," characterized in 1967 by the House Committee on Un-American Activities as "an organization which, since it was first formed in the fall of 1961, has enjoyed the complete support of the Communist Party." As the Committee observed, its 1962 hearings on the organization "revealed that a large number of key officers in the New York, New Jersey, Connecticut section of this group were or had been members of the Communist Party." According to a document placed into the record of these hearings, Bella Abzug served as "Chairman pro tem." of the legislative "Work Committee" for the "METROPOLITAN N.Y., NEW JERSEY, CONN." region of the organization.

During the height of the anti-Vietnam war agitation, Abzug was actively involved with projects supported, interestingly enough in view of her long record of association with fronts and causes of the CPUSA, by both the CPUSA and the SWP, as well as by other radical groups. In 1970, for example, she endorsed the Emergency National Conference Against the Cambodia-Laos-Vietnam War, described by the House Committee on Internal Security as a gathering whose "real motivating force was the Socialist Workers Party." In 1971, she endorsed the "People's Peace Treaty" and spoke at gatherings sponsored by the New York Peace Action Coalition and the Student Mobilization Committee, both of them controlled by the SWP, and by the Fifth Avenue Vietnam Peace Parade Committee, a New York coalition cited in the 1970 annual report of the House Committee as "dominated by communists." She was also listed as a speaker for a 1971 demonstration under the auspices of the United Women's Contingent, a subsidiary of

the SWP-controlled National Peace Action Coalition, and for a New York City demonstration organized by the CPUSA-dominated Peoples Coalition for Peace and Justice. In addition, according to the Human Events article, she reportedly told a convention of the New Democratic Coalition, a left-liberal group, that she opposed extending "U.S. sanctuary to anti-Communists in the event of a Red victory in Vietnam. Such people, she said, deserve the 'punishment that awaits them.'"

Considering Bella Abzug's record of activity over so many years, one is hardly surprised that, in 1970, she was formally disavowed by the New York Socialist Party because of her "general unwillingness to be outspokenly critical of Communist actions threatening peace and freedom in the world." Of equal interest, perhaps, is the following passage from a report to a meeting of the CPUSA National Committee by Party General Secretary Gus Hall, as reprinted in the April 3, 1971, edition of the Daily World, official CPUSA newspaper:

The last elections also opened up new patterns of electoral struggle. An indication of this is the fact that some Movement candidates were successful in their election bids. They are a new breed of public officials.

All one has to do is to visit the offices of two such people in Congress -- the offices of Congressman Ronald Dellums of California and Congresswoman Bella Abzug of New York -- to see that there is something new. Their offices are Movement offices. They are offices of struggle. There is a new relationship between these elected public officials and the movements from which they came. What is needed is an extension of this concept of electing Movement activists into public office -- activists from the Black liberation and peace movements, from the Rank-and-File movements of labor, from the struggles of women, of youth. There is no question that this is adding a new quality to the concept of independent political action.

HENDRICK HERTZBERG, SPEECHWRITER, THE WHITE HOUSE

Throughout this study, much attention has been paid to the anti-Vietnam war movement as a prime example of leftist -- and, in many cases, actively pro-Communist -- activity. This is because, despite the impression conveyed in media coverage at the time, the most effective organizing forces in the movement were consciously pro-Hanoi. The statement to this effect by Professor

Douglas Dowd has already been cited; and the hearings and reports of congressional committees, both House and Senate, are replete with documented confirmation of it. As the House Committee on Un-American Activities observed in a 1967 report on the Communist Origin and Manipulation of Vietnam Week, as a general proposition,

genuine pacifist elements and organizations in this country are relatively small and weak. Alone, they have never succeeded in staging a major demonstration. While the sincerity of these groups in agitating for peace in Vietnam and elsewhere is not to be questioned, it is clear that they have played, and are playing, a minor role in Vietnam Week and in other anti-Vietnam-war demonstrations that have taken place in this country in recent years.

Every major, large-scale demonstration against the war in Vietnam which has taken place in this country has had all-out Communist support. They have, in fact, achieved the status of "large-scale" and "major" mainly because of the effort put into them by Communist elements.

It is of the greatest significance that the organization which claims credit for conducting the first public demonstration against the Vietnam war was not a pacifist one; rather it was a small group known as Youth Against War and Fascism, youth apparatus of the dissident Communist Workers World Party. Also, the major anti-Vietnam war coalitions were effectively dominated or controlled by members of the Communist Party, U.S.A., and the Socialist Workers Party; and the activities of both received the warm approbation of international Communist leaders. The degree to which these movements served the propaganda needs of the international Communist movement is indicated by the fact that unity between the CPUSA-dominated PCPJ and the SWP-controlled NPAC for the April 1971 demonstrations was achieved only when a direct appeal was made by Xuan Thuy, the chief Vietnamese negotiator in Paris, and that Vietnamese Communist representatives at a 1970 Communist "peace" conference in Stockholm, Sweden, hailed the American anti-Vietnam war movement, according to CPUSA "peace" movement activist Pauline Rosen, as the "'Second Front' of the Vietnam war." There has never been a better description of the anti-Vietnam war movement.

In a similar vein, the reason for the SWP's involvement in the movement was clearly stated in a letter sent to the 1971-national convention of the SWP by Pierre Frank, a member of the International Executive Committee of the Trotskyite Fourth International. Writing in behalf of the United Secretariat of the FI, he stated:

First of all I express to you the attention and the passion with which the international Trotskyist

movement in its entirety follows the action against the Vietnam war waged in the U.S.A. and in which you, the S.W.P., play such an important role. It is this mass mobilization increasingly large and increasingly firm to "Bring the GIs home now" which, after the heroic resistance of the Vietnamese people, contributed decisively to sap at the determination of American imperialism and to paralyze /sic/ its forces. This anti-war activity must not stop for one minute, even if the victory of the Vietnamese revolution seems imminent. It must continue in the U.S.A. as in the whole world to prevent American imperialism from making an orderly retreat, to insure that its defeat henceforth inevitable should be the worst possible.

Among the radical pacifist groups active in anti-Vietnam war agitation, the War Resisters League was among the most prominent. WRL was officially represented, for example, on the steering committee of the PCPJ, as well as in activities of the Stockholm Conference on Vietnam, an international Communist "peace" front operated by the Soviet-controlled World Peace Council. Though radical pacifist rather than Communist, WRL has shown a marked willingness to coalesce with Communists in movements built around such issues as Vietnam.

With this qualifying information in mind, it is noted that Hendrick Hertzberg, a White House speechwriter since February 1977 at a reported salary of \$32,500 per annum, has been actively affiliated with the War Resisters League's magazine WIN, both as a member of its editorial board and as a contributor of articles to its pages. An avowed believer in socialism and son of an active member of the Socialist Party, Hertzberg wrote two articles for WIN that are of particular interest and which have been extensively quoted by, among others, syndicated columnist John D. Lofton, Jr.

In the first, Hertzberg stated his case for "unilateral nuclear disarmament," arguing that "it would be undeniably 'better' for the United States alone to be destroyed /in a nuclear war/ than for the Soviet Union, Europe and much of the rest of the world to be destroyed as well." Such unilateral nuclear disarmament would allegedly result in "a dramatic improvement in the world's moral and political climate."

In the second, he argued the case for the Communist victory in Vietnam, writing that "I welcome this victory" because "as a pacifist I take some comfort in the fact that the Communist victory was not a military but a moral victory." At another point, he wrote, "I welcome their victory because it was the only way

to end the war's suffering," although he did add that "as a democrat I take no joy in it." Describing the Communists as "the good guys in the Vietnamese war," Hertzberg contended that "Most people will be far better off than they were under Saigon.... Malevolent repression will give way to a more benevolent totalitarianism." As Lofton caustically observes, "One wonders how the estimated 300,000 South Vietnamese who are being brainwashed in Communist 're-education schools' would react to this statement." Hertzberg, enlarging on his "benevolent totalitarianism" theme, referred to the allegedly repressive policies of the South Vietnamese government toward the press, adding that under Communist rule, "there will be no further need for censorship, because the press will merely be a part of the state and party apparatus." In a final extract cited by Lofton, Hertzberg summed up what many would see as, at best, his naive view of the realities of Vietnam:

Labeling the American effort to prevent the Communists from capturing South Vietnam "meaningless savagery" that "sickened and shamed us," Hertzberg concludes:

"The society the Communists will construct in Vietnam will not be a free society, as I understand the term. But the outcome of the struggle, both there and here in the United States, was a victory for something honorable in the human spirit."

DEPARTMENT OF STATE AND NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL

Probably at least in part because of the anti-Vietnam war climate generated by Old and New Left activism in the 1960s and early 1970s, there has been some influx of people with New Left credentials into the Department of State and the staff of the National Security Council. While hardly on a scale to rival that found at ACTION, it has caused concern in some quarters because of the nature of the organizations with which certain of these officials have been affiliated. These organizations, which may fairly be said to represent concerns advanced to one degree or another by the New Left, are the Center for International Policy, the North American Congress on Latin America, and the Institute for Policy Studies.

The Center for International Policy is a project of the Fund for Peace, a left-oriented organization which has received significant funding from tax-exempt foundations which have also provided financial support to IPS and its various subsidiary projects. One of the prominent financial backers of the Fund for Peace has been Stewart Mott, also a supporter of such groups as Members of Congress for Peace Through Law (See Heritage Foundation

Institution Analysis No. 1, "Members of Congress for Peace Through Law," April 1977) and the National Committee for an Effective Congress. One of the Fund's trustees has been Mrs. Louise R. Berman, identified in Congressional hearings and reports during the 1940s and 1950s as a contact for agents of the Soviet NKVD and GRU. Among the Fund's projects, in addition to the CIP, is the Center for National Security Studies, with which Morton Halperin has been intimately involved. Significant numbers of CNSS staff personnel have reportedly been drawn from IPS and the National Lawyers Guild.

The advisory board of the Center for International Policy as listed in September 1976 included Stewart Mott; such prominent figures in the foreign policy field as Carl Marcy, Harlan Cleveland, and Charles W. Yost; and the late Orlando Letelier, an IPS fellow and co-director of the IPS subsidiary known as the Transnational Institute. Letelier, as was revealed after his assassination, was receiving approximately \$1,000 per month from the Cuban secret police (DGI), which is controlled by the Soviet KGB. CIP's consultants have included Richard Barnet, a founder of IPS; William G. Miller, former staff director of the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence (the "Church Committee"); and two upper-level officials currently serving, respectively, with the State Department and the staff of the National Security Council: W. Anthony Lake and David L. Aaron.

Lake is director of the State Department's Policy Planning Staff, of which one Richard Feinberg is also a member. Feinberg was mentioned in an August 25, 1976, letter from Elizabeth Farnsworth of the North American Congress on Latin America to Orlando Letelier of IPS in which Farnsworth discussed an upcoming NACLA report which she was co-authoring with Feinberg, at that time an employee of the Treasury Department. Farnsworth admonished Letelier: "Do not tell anyone else that he is working on the project, please. It wouldn't help his work at Treasury (obviously)." The North American Congress on Latin America, described by the House Committee on Internal Security as "an offshoot of SDS," is an overtly pro-Castro organization which has characterized itself as the "intelligence-gathering arm" of the New Left.

Lake served as head of the "State, Defense and Intelligence Cluster" in the Carter transition staff in 1976. The November 24, 1976, edition of the Washington Post carried a complete list of transition staff members and described Lake's background as follows:

Anthony Lake, 37, Connecticut, leader, liaison to State Department, Agency for International Development and U.S. mission to the United Nations. Carter campaign policy planning staff; formerly on

National Security Council staff; former executive director of International Voluntary Services.

He is also part of what Robert L. Schuettinger, in an article in the Summer 1977 issue of Policy Review, termed "The New Foreign Policy Network." He worked in the presidential campaigns of Senators Edmund Muskie and George McGovern and, as Schuettinger wrote, "while he was at the NSC...was in close contact with the group of liberal Senate aides who were in the process of turning our foreign policy around." He served in Vietnam and returned to the NSC staff, leaving in protest after the bombing of Cambodia. He has also worked at the Council on Foreign Relations and the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.

Lake has been credited in several press accounts with being deeply involved in the Carter administration's policies in Africa, especially as those policies affect the crisis in Rhodesia. Syndicated columnist Paul Scott has written that

Working closely with Richard Moose, Jr., Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs, and Charles W. Maynes, Assistant Secretary of State for International Organizations, and W. Anthony Lake, chief of State Departments /sic/ Policy Planning Staff, /Andrew/ Young has convinced President Carter and Secretary /of State Cyrus/ Vance that Cuban aid to guerrillas in southern Africa is no threat to the Administration's present policy for the region.

An interesting assessment of the impact enjoyed by Moose and Lake, along with David Aaron of the NSC, comes from another syndicated columnist, William Safire:

In Africa, U.S. policy and operations are conceived and carried out by David Aaron, now number-two man at the National Security Council, and formerly Fritz Mondale's man at the Senate Intelligence Committee, working with Richard Moose, a disciple of Sen. William Fulbright at the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, long a leading exponent of U.S. withdrawal from Southeast Asia.

Both Aaron and Moose have life-long commitments to disengagement, withdrawal, accommodation. Both have recently been presidential envoys to the Horn of Africa, and both will report back to Carter views from eyes that narrow at the prospect of actively confronting Soviet probes.

Anthony Lake, who stormed out of the NSC in 1970 over the Cambodia incursion (strange how little we hear about the bloodbath in Cambodia now), also has a hand in the reluctance of this government to support the internal settlement in Rhodesia. Tony Lake ghosted Henry Kissinger's 60,000-word policy statement in 1970; he ghosts most of Cy Vance's speeches today, and peopled the Carter administration with most of the "new-boy network."

Like his mentor Anthony Lake, Moose is a former Foreign Service officer and member of the National Security Council staff who resigned from his NSC staff position to protest the Vietnam war. Instead of moving to the CFR or Carnegie Endowment, however, Moose went to the Ford Foundation, later rejoining the NSC under Henry Kissinger -- and resigning again because of objections to U.S. policy in Vietnam. Moose was also a prominent member of Lake's "State, Defense and Intelligence Cluster," described by Schuettinger as "probably the most influential of all Carter transition teams."

David L. Aaron also served as a member of Lake's portion of the Carter transition team. He is now on the NSC staff as Deputy Assistant to the President and, according to the 1978-79 edition of the U.S. Government Manual, is also listed as Deputy Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs on the White House staff. Like Anthony Lake, Aaron has been a consultant to the Center for International Policy; he also served on the staff of the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence, along with two other current members of the NSC staff, Gregory Treverton and Karl Frederick Inderfurth. Aaron has been credited with engineering the appointment of Richard Moose as Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs to replace William Schaufele, Jr., who was widely attacked by the left for allegedly supporting anti-Communist civilian and military figures in Chile against the pro-Communist government of Salvador Allende.

Another member of the NSC staff is Robert Pastor, whose principal radical ties appear to be with the Transnational Institute of the Institute for Policy Studies, the former co-director of which was Orlando Letelier. Letelier, after his assassination, was replaced by Tariq Ali, a principal TNI activist who is also head of the British section of the Trotskyite Communist Fourth International, the International Marxist Group, an organization which has reportedly provided essential support for urban terrorists of the Irish Trotskyite Saor Eire. Pastor's ties to IPS are, of course, far from unique among recent administration appointees. The NCASLPP ties of Sam Brown, Marge Tabankin, and Ilona Hancock

have already been cited, as has Peter Bourne's affiliation with IPS's Institute for Southern Studies; and Under Secretary of Commerce Sidney Harman was listed by IPS in 1975 as one of its trustees, while Mark L. Schneider, Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Human Rights, is reportedly active with IPS and close to the family of Orlando Letelier.

Pastor has been a guest speaker for TNI's Latin American Round Table during the 1975-1977 period and a member of IPS/TNI's "Ad Hoc Working Group on Latin America," which was organized under Letelier's supervision. According to a brochure issued by LART, it "is a monthly forum sponsored by the Institute for Policy Studies to follow current developments in Latin America and the Caribbean and to aid in the formulation of an alternative United States policy toward Latin America." The same source further describes LART as "part of the" IPS "Latin American Program." The "Ad Hoc Working Group" produced a report, "The Southern Connection: Recommendations for a New Approach to Inter-American Relations," which included conclusions with respect to the Panama Canal that paralleled those of the Linowitz Commission, for which Pastor had served as executive director. Several members of the IPS/TNI "Ad Hoc" group had backgrounds which involved service with the Linowitz Commission, especially as consultants.

In view of the foregoing, it is particularly instructive to note that Pastor's position on the NSC staff is that of a Latin American specialist and that, in June 1977, according to press accounts, he was responsible for asking the Central Intelligence Agency to develop an "alternative plan" to bring down the anti-Communist regime in Chile.

STONEY COOKS, U.S. MISSION TO THE UNITED NATIONS

Aside from those at ACTION, perhaps the most intriguing group of New Left-era radicals in government is at the U.S. Mission to the United Nations under Ambassador Andrew Young. In addition to Young himself, of course, they include Young's executive assistant, Stoney Cooks, and Rev. Brady Tyson, Young's Latin American specialist and deputy leader of the U.S. delegation to the Human Rights Commission in Geneva, Switzerland.

Cooks developed his relationship with Young while both were staff employees of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference and later as Young's administrative assistant when Young was elected to Congress from Georgia in 1972. When the 10th World Youth Festival, a Soviet-controlled international mobilization of pro-Communist strength, was held in East Berlin in 1973, Cooks was a U.S. sponsor along with such movement figures as Angela Davis of the CPUSA; various other members of the CPUSA and the

Young Workers Liberation League, its official youth front; actors Ossie Davis and Ruby Dee; and Rev. Ben Chavis of the "Wilmington 10." The "U.S. Preparatory Committee for the 10th World Festival of Youth and Students" operated from YWLL headquarters, and its literature was printed by a company described by the Attorney General of the United States as "reliably known to be owned by the Communist Party."

According to a formerly "TOP SECRET" FBI report entitled Foreign Influence -- Weather Underground Organization (WUO), dated August 20, 1976, Stoney Cooks was among 41 Americans who traveled to Bratislava, Czechoslovakia, for a September 6-13, 1967, meeting with representatives of the Communist North Vietnamese government and the Viet Cong. This gathering, in which representatives of SDS and other radical groups participated, was described by an SDS participant as "The first large meeting between Americans of the anti-war movement and delegations from the DRV /Democratic Republic of Vietnam/ and the NLF /National Liberation Front of South Vietnam/...." According to an article in the January-February 1968 issue of Dissent by another participant, the meeting had been initiated by the North Vietnamese, and the Americans "were expected not only to oppose the war in Vietnam but also to favor, on balance, an NLF victory." The Bratislava session also served another important purpose; according to the FBI report, it was part of "a series of events which had a cumulative effect on the growing presence of Weathermen as revolutionary Marxist-Leninists who had made a commitment to armed struggle in behalf of the international communist movement."

BRADY TYSON, U.S. MISSION TO THE UNITED NATIONS

Brady Tyson achieved considerable notoriety in March 1977 when he expressed America's "profoundest regret" for its alleged role "in the subversion of the previous democratically elected Chilean government /of Marxist Salvador Allende/ that was overthrown by the coup of Sept. 11, 1973." This gaffe resulted in disavowal by the Department of State, which observed that even the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence had not concluded there was evidence to support such a proposition, and a statement by President Carter that Tyson's language had been "inappropriate." (Carter, however, had said during the 1976 campaign that the Ford administration "overthrew an elected government and helped to establish a military dictatorship" in Chile, according to the March 19, 1977, issue of Human Events, which also carried the statements attributed to Tyson.)

Like others mentioned above, Tyson has been affiliated with the Institute for Policy Studies. An IPS publication, Beginning the Second Decade, 1963-1973, carried a list of those who had

served at various times as IPS "Lecturers-on-Occasion," among them "Brady Tyson, North American Congress on Latin America." Tyson was in fact a founding member of NACLA, whose basic ideological statement of May 1967 asked for support from those "who not only favor revolutionary change in Latin America but also take a revolutionary position toward their own society." Many NACLA publications bear the union label of the Prompt Press, described by the U.S. Attorney General as "owned by the Communist Party."

Prior to helping found NACLA, Tyson had worked with Andrew Young in the SCLC. He had also taught in Brazil, but was expelled in April 1966 after alleging that the Brazilian government was a "front" for U.S. foreign policy; the official reason given for his expulsion was that he had "offended the dignity of the country" and "disturbed the social and political order." More recently, he has been affiliated with the U.S. Committee for Justice to Latin America Political Prisoners (USLA), a group run largely by members of the Socialist Workers Party and the SWP's youth apparatus, the Young Socialist Alliance. USLA operates as a U.S. support group for such Latin American terrorists as the Peruvian Trotskyite Hugo Blanco, who has admitted responsibility for the murder of three policemen in a terrorist raid in Peru during 1962. A leading Venezuelan Trotskyite has described USLA as an organization whose "effective work" has been "organized and promoted" by the Socialist Workers Party.

Tyson also appeared at a two-day, pro-Castro Congressional Conference on U.S.-Cuba Relations held in 1972, according to Human Events, "in one of the U.S. Senate office buildings under the auspices of" Senator Edward M. Kennedy (D-Mass). The same source reflects that Tyson was one "of the more militant, pro-Cuban panelists" at the conference, which was coordinated by Michael Myerson, publicly identified as secretary of the Peace Commission of the New York State Communist Party.

In view of Brady Tyson's demonstrated preference for radical leftist approaches to Latin American affairs, it should be noted that syndicated columnists Rowland Evans and Robert Novak, in a column published in the September 6, 1978, edition of the Washington Post, observed that "Before Carter took office, a prediction was made by Brady Tyson, now with the U.S. Mission to the United Nations, that human rights would be used to support revolutionary forces in the hemisphere." Interestingly, according to Evans and Novak, "An identical prediction was made privately last year by Robert Pastor of the National Security Council staff."

ANDREW YOUNG, U.S. REPRESENTATIVE TO THE UNITED NATIONS

Of all government officials covered in the present study, Andrew Young is easily the most controversial. Confirmed as U.S. Representative to the United Nations and to the UN Security Council on January 26, 1977, by an 89 to 3 vote of the U.S. Senate, Young has reportedly been praised by President Carter as the "finest elected official" and "best man" he has ever known; the President has also been quoted as calling him a "national treasure" and "Third World hero." In his present position, Young holds the official rank of Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary; his background and public statements have been examined in meticulous detail by Representative John M. Ashbrook (R-Ohio) in the August 16, 1978, edition of the Congressional Record and by Carl Gershman, executive director of Social Democrats, U.S.A., in a definitive article, "The World According to Andrew Young," in the August 1978 issue of Commentary.

Immediately prior to becoming U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations, Young had served as a member of the House of Representatives from the Fifth Congressional District in Atlanta, Georgia. He was first elected to the House in 1972 and was reelected in 1974 and 1976. While in the House, he was a regional vice president and executive committee member of the Democratic Study Group, treasurer and executive committee member of the Congressional Black Caucus, and member of the Environmental Study Conference. He was also an endorser of, and recipient of support from, the National Committee for an Effective Congress. His biography in the Congressional Directory reflects his involvement in the National Council of Churches; Southern Christian Leadership Conference, for which he was executive director, a position to which he was appointed by Rev. Martin Luther King, Jr.; World Council of Churches; National Urban Coalition; Common Cause; and Martin Luther King, Jr., Center for Social Change. Young is an ordained minister in the United Church of Christ.

Andrew Young's activities over the last several years have also encompassed organizations and causes of a distinctly far-left nature, however, and have tended to reflect his intense involvement in the civil rights movement of the 1950s and 1960s, as well as a seeming inability to recognize the reality of world Communism. Gershman cites an interviewer's comment on "how often" Young interprets "world events through" his "civil rights experience," to which Young responded that "It's true. I mean, it's all I got. Everybody is determined by his own experience." For several reasons, "some in the civil-rights movement began to identify anti-Communism with opposition to racial progress and to view Communism as a sincere ally of the black freedom struggle." As a result, according to Gershman, "Young in his civil-rights

days may have been influenced by this misperception of the role of Communism." Thus, in an interview with CBS newsman Dan Rather, Young could state that "communism has never been a threat to me." Instead, "Racism has always been a threat -- and that has been the enemy of all of my life and, everything I know about life."

Young has described four U.S. Presidents -- Kennedy, Johnson, Nixon, and Ford -- as racists and has branded the British and Swedish people; respectively, as having "almost invented racism" and as "terrible racists." During an April 1970 television program on the Black Panther Party, a militantly racist and violence-oriented organization with important Communist connections, Young was asked whether he would "support the destruction of Western civilization if you were convinced that the rest of the world would thereby be liberated," his answer being, "I probably would." The following statement taken from the same interview is indicative of Young's anti-Western bias:

Western technology and western militarism has so interfered with the right of -- the possibility of, say, democracy in Latin America, or real freedom in Africa and Asia, that it may take the destruction -- and this of course is /Black/ Panther /Party/ ideology -- that it may take the destruction of western civilization to allow the rest of the world to really emerge as a free and brotherly society, and if the white west is incapable of brotherhood with colored peoples, then this small body of colored peoples, black people within the white west, may be the revolutionary vanguard that God has ordained to destroy the whole thing.

Whether or not Andrew Young "is the administration's foreign policy" as Sam Brown has contended, it is undeniable that he has had a significant impact on American foreign policy, particularly as it relates to Africa. Thus, it becomes of more than casual interest that Young has enjoyed a close friendship with Robert Mangaliso Sobukwe, the founder of the Pan Africanist Congress of South Africa, an outlawed terrorist organization which was described in 1974 by the House Committee on Internal Security as Maoist in orientation. In 1963, the PAC, according to the House Committee report, "claimed sponsorship of the Poqo guerrilla terrorists in South Africa." Further, Young was involved in producing "The African-American Manifesto on Southern Africa" in September 1976 and was among those who gave their support to the following language:

We totally support the liberation of Southern Africa from white minority rule by means of armed

struggle, where necessary, and affirm the right of the African liberation movements to seek necessary assistance from whatever sources available to achieve self-determination and majority rule.

In his interview with Rather, Young argued that "There's a sense in which the Cubans bring a certain stability and order -- to Angola, for instance, and I think that the enemy -- all over the world, I think, is chaos." He contended that "we could negotiate very successfully withdrawal of Cuban troops from southern Africa," although "the Cuban presence" in Angola was justified by "the South African presence" and by the fact that Castro's troops "were in Angola at the invitation of" the MPLA, the Communist-oriented terrorist movement that emerged as the controlling power in the country. According to Young, another reason the "Cubans went to Angola" was that "we were not there with a rational movement first." Such an attitude seems to be illustrative of the "misperception of the role of Communism" mentioned by Gershman; it is certainly consistent with his public statement that the American people are "paranoid about a few Communists" in Africa. The April 13, 1977, edition of the Washington Star carried Young's view, characterized by President Carter's Deputy Press Secretary as "not in disagreement with that of the President," that

The only thing I'm thinking is, don't get paranoid about a few Communists -- even a few thousand Communists. Americans shouldn't be afraid of Communists -- they just shouldn't. It offends me, really.

The pattern of Young's Communist-front and other radical affiliations indicates that he, at least, is anything but "paranoid about a few Communists." During his involvement with SCLC in the early 1960s, he studied at Highlander Folk School, described in 1954 by a former Communist Party organizer as "A school operated ... ostensibly as an independent labor school, but actually working in close cooperation with the Communist Party." In 1968, Young was a principal leader of the SCLC's Poor People's March on Washington, one of the organizers of which was Grace Mora Newman, an activist from New York City. When Newman ran for Congress later in 1968 as a candidate of the Freedom and Peace Party, cited by the House Committee on Internal Security as "a CPUSA front organization," the sponsors of her campaign included "Andrew Young, SCLC." Newman was identified in sworn testimony before the House Committee in 1971 as a member of the Communist Party, the Party's Claremont Club in the Bronx, and its Bronx County Committee; she is now chairman of the national CPUSA Puerto Rican Commission.

In 1971, Young appeared at an annual stockholders meeting of the Gulf Oil Corporation to speak in behalf of a motion put forth by the Gulf Boycott Coalition, a group working to aid pro-Communist guerrillas in Angola by inducing Gulf to end its involvement in Angola and southern Africa, thereby putting economic pressure on Portugal. Young proposed four people as members of an enlarged Gulf board of directors: himself; Amilcar Cabral, an African Marxist revolutionary and leader of a Soviet-controlled terrorist movement which now controls Guinea-Bissau; Agostinho Neto, a Marxist-Leninist theoretician and founder of the Communist MPLA in Angola; and Angela Davis, a member of the Central Committee of the Communist Party, U.S.A.

Young was one of a group of SCLC representatives invited to attend high-level meetings of the Communist-run National Mobilization Committee and New Mobilization Committee in 1968 and 1969; in 1973, he was reportedly a supporter of activities mounted by the SWP-controlled National Peace Action Coalition and the CPUSA-dominated Peoples Coalition for Peace and Justice. The personnel from these movements also interlocked extensively with a New Left political effort, the National Conference for New Politics, which held a national New Politics Convention during the Labor Day weekend of 1967 in Chicago, Illinois. NCNP's convention tabloid, New Politics News, listed "Andrew J. Young, Southern Christian Leadership Conference," as a member of the Convention Steering Committee. As shown by the sworn testimony of a knowledgeable former FBI informant before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee in 1970, the CPUSA "was instrumental from the very beginning in developing the NCNP Convention" and considered it "one of the party's great successes in the past 10 years...." The accuracy of this assessment is indicated by a statement in a confidential summary circulated in August 1967 by a government agency which observed, citing specific examples, that the Communist Party had "already made plans to place some of its members in key positions within the National Conference for New Politics."

In February 1975, Young sponsored the Second National Conference in Solidarity with Chile, organized by the National Coordinating Center in Solidarity with Chile, a major front for the Communist Party, U.S.A. Conference literature was printed by a CPUSA printing firm; and the NCCSC's Chicago affiliate operated from the offices of the Chicago Peace Council under the direction of Illinois CPUSA member Sylvia Kushner. In November 1975, the Institute for Policy Studies released an IPS/Trans-national Institute study, The Problem of the Federal Budget, which argued the case for, among other things, greater government intervention in the economy and a sharply diminished American national defense posture. The tone of this effort fully justified the

language used by the House Committee on Internal Security when, in its annual report for 1971, it described IPS as a "far-left radical 'think tank.'" The February 20, 1975, letter commissioning the study had been sent to IPS by Representative John Conyers (D-Mich.) and was signed by Conyers and 47 other members of the House, including "Andrew Young (Ga)."

Young has been a sponsor of the Political Rights Defense Fund, as shown by a June 15, 1976, PRDF letterhead. PRDF is one of the principal front organizations of the Socialist Workers Party and was formed, according to one of its 1973 mailings, "as an adjunct of the Committee for Democratic Election Laws," another SWP front group. PRDF activity is a basic part of the SWP's attempt to destroy all government domestic security capability, a campaign currently being waged by a number of Communist and allied radical groups. The national secretary of the organization and all but one of its national staff members as listed on the June 1976 letterhead are functionaries of the SWP.

According to the April 30, 1977, edition of the CPUSA's Daily World, Young was one of "184 nationally prominent Senators, Members of Congress, labor, civil rights and religious leaders" serving as cosponsors of a May 15, 1977, luncheon for Representative Conyers, prominent among congressional supporters of such activities as a January 1978 Washington, D.C., meeting under the aegis of the Soviet-controlled World Peace Council. The luncheon was to be chaired by identified CPUSA member Anne Braden under the auspices of the National Coalition to Fight Inflation and Unemployment, a recently-formed Communist front characterized by the Party's theoretical magazine, Political Affairs, as an organization in the creation of which the CPUSA "played an important part."

More recently, on June 11, 1978, a "Cultural Celebration of Paul Robeson's 80th Birthday" was held in New York City. As advertised in the Daily World, participants included Georgia State Senator Julian Bond and Paul Robeson, Jr., among others. Young reportedly served as host at a reception in connection with this program, held as a benefit for the Paul Robeson Archives, a tax-exempt project set up by Paul Robeson, Jr., identified in sworn testimony before the House Committee on Un-American Activities in 1960 as a member of the Communist Party. Paul Robeson, Sr., was identified as a member of the Communist Party in sworn testimony before both the House Committee and the Subversive Activities Control Board and has been described by Andrew Young as "the hero of my youth."

Young's record of radical activity lends added interest to his statement in the December 17, 1976, edition of the New York

Times that "I'm going to be actively working within the State Department, the Congress, the Executive for my own concerns." This conception of his role as a diplomat was echoed more recently in an interview with the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation which was carried in the Washington Post for July 19, 1978:

I'm certainly not, you know, what people's traditional notion of a diplomat happens to be. But I don't represent a country like that. I became a diplomat and was appointed to this position because I was politically active in a human rights movement, and in an anti-war movement, and because I fought for the things that I believe in, and -- did not fight to be a diplomat.

Whether I'm a diplomat or not, I am going to continue to fight in any way I know short of violence for the things that I believe in. And I really don't care what people think about it. The only thing that's important is that they think.

Complementing this concept is Young's relationship with President Carter. Young believes that "there's some advantage in my preserving my freedom. It gives /the President/ also the freedom to repudiate me, not to be responsible for what I say, or to agree with me." This relative autonomy "is something I talked with him about before I accepted the job, and I hope it works." As Young expressed it in an interview published in the June 1977 issue of Playboy magazine, "My relationship with him has always been one of mutual trust. I mean, I didn't clear anything with him during the campaign and I've cleared almost nothing with him since then." He added: "I really get very few guidelines from Washington."

Much has been written about Young's propensity toward controversial utterance, but he claims that President Carter told him to "stick with" him because it "seems like you and I are the only ones who want to talk foreign policy with the American people. And I think we just have to keep it up." Young's rationale was succinctly expressed in the Playboy interview: "President Carter and I talk openly in public because that's what people have been looking for in Government: freshness and candor." In the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation interview, he stated:

One of the interesting things about everything that's happened so far is that I get very little argument, or challenge, on the validity of what I really say. I get questions about whether a diplomat should say it, or I get questions about, you know, other people getting mad and the political impact of my making certain statements, but usually I have taken into consideration most of those things before I say something.

It is again noted that this interview appeared in the Washington Post on July 19, 1978; five days earlier, the Washington Star carried pertinent portions of an interview Young had given the French Socialist newspaper Le Matin in which he had been questioned about his reaction to the "show" trials of Shcharansky and Ginzburg in the Soviet Union. Young's response was most illuminating:

A: Oh, it's certainly a challenge, a gesture of independence on their part. But that will not prevent them from pursuing the SALT negotiations. And then, one doesn't know what can happen to the dissidents. After all, in our prisons too there are hundreds, perhaps even thousands of people whom I would call political prisoners. Ten years ago I myself was tried in Atlanta for having organized a protest movement. And, three years later, I was a Georgia representative. It's true that things do not change that quickly in the Soviet Union, but they do change.

Q: But one cannot compare the two systems...

A: I do not agree that these systems should be considered as opposing each other. Take the United States for example: the society of today has nothing in common with the pre-Roosevelt one. In the years 1930-40 the trade union movement launched a radical revolution in American life, a revolution without which we certainly couldn't produce nine million automobiles a year today. In the 1950s there was a revolution of civil and racial rights, today it is women who are participating more and more in our economy. And this constant evolution is the rule everywhere. I think the current Soviet dissidents could well be the salvation of the Soviet Union. They are a natural development of Soviet society, but the leadership has not yet realized it.

(In the Playboy interview, Young had said, "I don't think the Soviet government is, in fact, very concerned about its dissidents." Rather, "Of far more importance are its satellite countries in eastern Europe" and, instead of President Carter's "statements on human rights...such things as increases in the budgets of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty.")

In the Le Matin interview, Young also contended that recent massacres of white missionaries in Rhodesia "can only have come from the Smith camp." Such a statement is entirely consistent with the ingrained bias on African affairs -- and, indeed, on

"Third World" affairs generally -- alluded to earlier, as is the fact, cited in a July 19, 1978, Evans and Novak column, that in May 1977 in Mozambique, "a Marxist regime with 100,000 citizens in forced-labor camps," Young allegedly stated, "East and West alike look to this nation with new hope and with new courage." In a similar vein, as Evans and Novak observed, "While welcoming communist Vietnam into the United Nations by praising its 'struggle for independence,' he ignored repression and genocide in the new Indochina."

It was reported that Secretary of State Cyrus Vance's reaction to Young's political prisoner statements was unprintable, and President Carter was supposed to have called Young to express his personal displeasure. White House Press Secretary Powell indicated that future statements by Young on similarly touchy issues may well have to be cleared in advance, and several members of the House and Senate were moved to advocate Young's dismissal. Young issued a clarifying statement in which he said he is in "full accord" with administration statements condemning the Shcharansky-Ginzburg trials and denied that he had meant to "equate the status of political freedom in the United States with that in the Soviet Union." According to Evans and Novak, however, "it is fair to expect more of the same, although slightly softer," an argument buttressed by their revelation that "the very day after the President's rebuke" Young "reiterated to the International Herald Tribune the essence of his Le Matin interview."

Reaction from the Soviet Union, on the other hand, was positive. The official Soviet news agency, Tass, described Young's statements as "noteworthy" because they "come from a member of the Cabinet and therefore signify an official admission that political persecution is widespread in the United States." In like manner, Young's definition of political prisoners as "blacks in civil rights movements" and "anti-war people" has been picked up by Tass and broadcast by Radio Moscow: "The American authorities, using a wide choice of antidemocratic laws, put into prison fighters for civil rights, against racism, dissidents."

Young's motivation for making statements which incur domestic disapproval and Soviet approval is difficult to fathom, although the influence of his civil rights movement experience, as cited by Gershman and by Young himself, would seem to provide at least a partial explanation. There is also the possibility of his simply being subject to bad advice, an issue raised recently by several observers, including syndicated columnist Paul Scott, who revealed on August 7, 1978, that Young enjoys a "close relationship with Stanley Levison, a New York lawyer and long time adviser of both Young and the late Dr. Martin Luther King." Levison was identified

in a confidential January 3, 1962, FBI memorandum as a "member of the Communist Party, USA," an allegation that was taken seriously by high officials of the Kennedy administration who were concerned about possible Communist influence on King and his SCLC. Considering Young's pronouncements with respect to Africa in particular, it is perhaps of the greatest significance that, as Scott has noted, "U.N. sources reveal that Levison advises Young on Africa and a number of controversial statements he has made on Soviet armed Cuban and East European troops in the region."

It is clear that Young sees himself as part of a new style of foreign policy. As he told his Playboy interviewer, "in the early months, there were still basically two administrations -- the new people who came in with President Carter and the old people who'd been around for a while, the bureaucrats." The "old" bureaucrats, according to Young, "haven't yet quite understood what we're doing," at first thinking that "some of the things the President was saying were slip-ups." Now, however, "they know it was deliberate on his part and that this is a policy style he is encouraging as part of his Administration."

The problem stems from the fact that Young's "policy style" appears to reflect a belief that, in Gershman's words, "the East-West conflict between totalitarianism and democracy has come to an end, and that race is the main dividing line in the world today." In Gershman's view, Young's basic attitudes, including his obvious anti-anti-Communism, "bespeak a political perspective that" has much "in common with the New Politics movement of the past decade" and that has led to an "apparent lack of commitment to political freedom" and an "ability to turn a blind eye to oppression if it is carried out by African and other Third World regimes in the name of a progressive ideology...." The ultimate result, if Gershman is correct, has been that "in his eagerness to demonstrate his solidarity with the new Marxist-Leninist elite of black Africa, Young finds himself today for the most part on the side not of the oppressed but of the oppressors."

William T. Poole
Policy Analyst

The foregoing analysis is one in a series published by The Heritage Foundation. This publication is intended as a background analysis of an important organization which affects public policy. Any views expressed are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect those of The Heritage Foundation. Any comments should be addressed to the Director of Research at The Heritage Foundation, 513 C Street, N.E., Washington, D.C. 20002.

