The Heritage Foundation

Institution Analysis

No. 10 | The Heritage Foundation • 513 C Street • N.E. • Washington, D.C. • 20002 • (202) 546-4400

April 1979

THE ANTI-DEFENSE LOBBY: PART I
CENTER FOR DEFENSE INFORMATION

(Executive Summary)

Of the many organizations currently active in the United States and which are regarded by some observers as the "anti-defense lobby," one of the most prominent is the Center for Defense Information. CDI, led by retired Rear Admiral Gene R. LaRocque, who has served as the organization's director since its founding in 1972, is an important part of the apparatus of the Fund for Peace, a left-oriented tax-exempt instrumentality with headquarters in Washington, D.C., near the U.S. Capitol in a facility purchased in 1974 by General Motors heir Stewart R. Mott, a major financial backer of an assortment of leftist projects and groups. Organizations within the Fund complex which interlock closely with CDI include the Center for National Security Studies, one of the nation's principal anti-intelligence community operations and an organization whose personnel show a pattern of interrelationship with the far-left Institute for Policy Studies; the Center for International Policy, some of whose principal activists have also had close ties to IPS; In the Public Interest, a project designed to "counteract the onslaught of right-wing broadcasting" with information gathered by CDI, CNSS, and CIP and made available through the efforts of a large group of "peace" movement activists, members of Congress, and others; and the Fund itself, the former president of which has been identified with activities of the World Peace Council, a Soviet-controlled international Communist front organization.

CDI's program reflects LaRocque's view that the "military has become far too pervasive and powerful," and basic CDI literature stresses the theme that it is necessary "to ensure that the military in this country does not overreach civilian control." Primarily

through its regular newsletter, the Defense Monitor, the Center publicizes the results of its research and analysis on such defense questions as development of the B-1 bomber, the value of the cruise missile, development of nuclear weapons, the size of the Pentagon budget, and the value of U.S. military installations in the Indian Ocean and the Philippines -- all from a negative standpoint. At the same time, CDI material has downplayed the question of Soviet versus U.S. naval strength and has argued against anti-Communism as "the dominant theme of U.S. foreign policy for thirty years." The Center is among those groups currently arguing strongly for a U.S.-Soviet strategic arms limitation (SALT) agreement, a basic point being that such an agreement's "most significant result" could be "the slowing of new nuclear weapons developments in both the United States and the Soviet Union." As part of its anti-nuclear weapons emphasis, CDI conducted the First Nuclear War Conference in Washington, D.C., during December 1978 in conjunction with IPS.

The Center claims that some significant successes have resulted from its work. A March 1978 CDI letter stated that "CDI analyses played a key role in cancellation of the B-1 bomber, nuclear strike cruiser, and additional heavy attack aircraft carriers" and that "We influenced the slow-down in development of the new land-based mobile ICBM (MX)...and the reduction of the U.S. arms sales overseas." In CDI's view, "None of these reduces the security of our nation one iota," a view that is apparently shared by such political leaders as U.S. Senators Mark Hatfield and Adlai E. Stevenson III, who have said that "we need this independent, privately funded source of information on military matters." CDI material is regularly distributed to members of Congress and to appropriate offices in the executive branch of government, and CDI personnel have appeared regularly to "lecture at Military War Colleges and at the State Department Foreign Service Institute." Two members of the CDI Board of Advisors, Paul Newman and Harold Willens, "served on the United States delegation to the recently concluded United Nations Special Session on Disarmament," which was also addressed by CDI Director LaRocque.

Operating on a budget estimated at approximately $300,000, CDI solicits contributions from "concerned citizens," among whom have reportedly been Paul Newman and Stewart Mott. A major source of funds, however, has been a group of tax-exempt foundations, principally in New York City, including especially such institutions as the Field Foundation and the Compton Foundation. Foundation support for the Fund for Peace and its projects, including CDI, since 1972 has amounted to a minimum of $2,299,495; the largest grantor has apparently been the Field Foundation ($1,073,800), with Compton the second-largest ($816,695). The largest grantor to CDI, insofar as the available information indicates, has been the Field Foundation with a minimum total of $530,000. Field has also granted operating funds to such groups as the Lawyers Military Defense Committee, which has worked closely with the National Lawyers Guild, and the Bill of Rights Foundation, the latter grants being to support the Political Rights Defense Fund, an adjunct of the Trotskyite Communist Socialist Workers Party to which Mott has also given support.

At present, the Fund for Peace complex is bringing into being a new project which interlocks with CDI and other Fund projects: the Campaign for Peace and Campaign for Peace Media Center. Supposedly scheduled to become operational in late April or early to mid-May 1979, the Media Center has developed from a June 5, 1978, meeting convened by Mott and former U.S. Attorney General Ramsey Clark in Washington, D. C., to discuss "An International Campaign for Peace." Draft material currently being circulated indicates that the "central theme of the Center" is to be "The Dangers of the Arms Race" and that its program is designed to achieve maximum media impact around such issues as "Military Spending, SALT, Foreign Arms Sales, Budget Priorities, Detente, Nuclear Technology, Economic Conversion and the Test Ban." The CFP's proposed budget for 1979 has been projected at $106,400, it being expected that the budget will increase to $117,410 during 1980. Minutes of a November 16, 1978, meeting of the CFP Executive Committee state that Mott has pledged "$50,000 a year for two years, providing there was a 2 to 1 match for each of his dollars." He has also stated, however, that "he would contribute the first $50,000 without a match so the Media Service Center could begin." CFP's Board of Directors includes several people with ties to other parts of the Fund for Peace complex and includes at least two prominent "peace" activists currently listed as members of the Soviet-controlled World Peace Council.

CENTER FOR DEFENSE INFORMATION

INTRODUCTION

There are active in the United States today a number of organizations which are viewed by some observers as forming, in the aggregate, the "anti-defense lobby." Of these, one of the most prominent is the Center for Defense Information (CDI), self-described in its promotional literature as "a project of The Fund for Peace," a left-oriented operation which maintains offices at 122 Maryland Avenue, N.E., Washington, D.C., in a building purchased in August 1974 for some $375,000 by General Motors heir Stewart Rawlings Mott to house the Fund for Peace and several avowed Fund projects. This arrangement was discussed by Stephen Isaacs in a detailed article published in the August 10, 1975, edition of the Washington Post:

> Mott said he paid $375,000 for the house last August. He rents 80 per cent of it to the Fund for Peace and some of its member organizations, and uses the other 20 per cent for two of his own Washington employees and for space for himself when he is here "five or six days a month."
>
> Mortgage payments and upkeep on the house run $43,000 a year, and the tenants pay $35,000 of that, Mott said. But that $35,000 is more than made up by the $50,000 he gives them. He is chairman of the executive committee of the Fund for Peace.
>
> Mott's tenants are organizations consisting mostly of former government officials who have become disaffected "oppositionists."
>
> They are the Fund for Peace's Center for National Security Studies, a left-wing think tank set up to investigate the use of intelligence and national security claims to justify the growth of government power, which is headed by Robert Borosage; the Center for Defense Information, set up to scrutinize the Department of Defense, headed by retired Rear Adm. Gene R. LaRocque; the Twentieth Century Fund's National Security Study, headed by Morton Halperin, the one-time aide to Henry A. Kissinger who has sued Kissinger for tapping his telephones; a media project, In the Public Interest, which prepares material for newspapers and radio stations, and the Institute for International Policy, set up to publish a foreign affairs newsletter edited by Carl Marcy, who was top assistant on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee when it was headed by then-Sen. J. W. Fulbirght /sic/.

The Center for Defense Information regards its location as being of key significance, since it is "at the hub of Washington's legislative life, adjacent to the U.S. Senate office buildings and only 2 blocks from the Capitol itself. The White House and most major government offices are minutes away, and easily reached from the Center's headquarters."

ORIGIN AND PURPOSE

The Center was formed in 1972 with help from Mott and from the Fund for Peace, cited by John Pierson in the April 24, 1972, issue of the Wall Street Journal as "kicking in enough money to get things started." According to Representative Les Aspin (D-Wis.) in remarks inserted into the May 1, 1972, edition of the Congressional Record announcing CDI's formation, "The Center for Defense Information has been organized in order to gather and disseminate information about military programs, American strategy, and alternatives to the Pentagon's position." Such a statement would not necessarily seem to connote a specifically anti-military predilection on the part of CDI, although a passage in the Pierson article quoting retired Rear Admiral Gene LaRocque, who has served as CDI's director since the organization's inception, is less neutral in tone than Aspin's characterization:

> "The military has become far too pervasive and powerful," continues Adm. LaRocque. "Defense tells State it wants a port for ships in Greece and State arranges it. That's so sailors can be near their families. But hell, sailors ought to be serving the nation, not the other way around."
>
> Specifically, the admiral and his crew plan to challenge "basic assumptions" underlying current defense thinking. For example, does the U.S. really need to defend other countries to defend itself? "I'd like to see what share of the defense budget goes to defending the 50 states," he says. "Maybe 25%?"

More recent CDI literature explicitly raises the spectre of a military establishment grown so powerful that it threatens to subvert traditional civilian control. A letter circulated in March 1978, for example, speaks darkly of the need "to ensure that the military in this country does not overreach civilian control" and warns that "continued unchecked investment in military force poses a threat--the threat that excessive concern for security will overwhelm those very democratic values the military is designed to preserve and protect." This theme is carried through at greater length in CDI's basic promotional brochure, which asks the question "Who will Watch the Watchmen?" and proceeds to set forth what is apparently the organization's operating rationale, which is worth quoting in full as an indication of whatever bias may properly be charged to CDI and its staff:

Throughout this century, democratic societies have been challenged by the twin evils of authoritarianism and militarism.

In response, even the most liberal democracies have themselves resorted to standing military establishments of unparalleled size and destructive power.

America has entrusted its military with great authority, power, responsibility, and treasure. To its credit and the safety of our democratic institutions, the American military honors the concept of civilian control.

Nevertheless, the need for continuous investment in military forces poses a threat--the threat that excessive concern for security will overwhelm the democratic values our military forces are designed to preserve and protect.

This threat was recognized even by our founding fathers, who addressed the question in The Federalist Papers. More recently, the threat has been described in terms of the "garrison state."

Whether in ancient Roman terms, in the words of the Founding Fathers, or in contemporary political analysis, the problem is the same: how do we insure that the military and the interests which coalesce around it do not outrun the institutions intended to direct and control them?

Only continuing watchfulness can guard against unwarranted military influence. This was the objective in creating The Center for Defense Information in 1972, and it remains a vital task for all Americans.

THE QUESTION OF OBJECTIVITY

As a "non-profit, non-partisan, public interest organization," the Center avows its dedication to "making available continuing, objective information and analyses of our national defense--information which is free of the special interest of any government, military, political or industrial organization." Such a statement is reminiscent of LaRocque's statement, as quoted by Pierson in the 1972 Wall Street Journal article, that he was "going out of his way to fend off 'peaceniks who are anti-military and people who've left the military in anger.'" Whether CDI has avoided involvement with "peaceniks who are anti-military" is perhaps open to argument; certainly, as will be seen subsequently, CDI and its associated groups

within the Mott-backed complex have maintained close working relationships with, for example, the far-left Institute for Policy Studies. And, as observed by Pierson, the reality of such an enterprise is that "objectivity may be an impossible goal," a sentiment echoed in LaRocque's statement that "Any group that tries to challenge the military power is going to be of a liberal bent," to which he added, "We've got to accept that. We're not going to get any money from the Barry Goldwaters, and I don't think I want any." Along the same lines, it is perhaps noteworthy that, according to Pierson, LaRocque "has already been dubbed the Ralph Nader of the military," an analogy used by LaRocque himself in expressing his desire for long-term effectiveness: "We don't want to be a flash in the pan....It took Ralph Nader six years of just hard slogging to get established. I think it will take us just as long."

PROGRAM

After better than "six years of...slogging," CDI has an extensive and varied program of activity, all of it geared to the Center's avowed policy which, it is claimed, "supports a strong defense but opposes excessive expenditures or forces. It holds that strong social, economic, and political structures contribute equally to national security and are essential to the strength and viability of our country." The Center's program, as outlined in CDI promotional material, includes:

* the CDI Library, "a growing, specialized collection of basic data and analyses essential to the work of our analysts and available to researchers in the Washington area."

* The Defense Monitor, CDI's newsletter, "published 10 times a year, with each issue devoted to a specific defense issue." According to a CDI promotional letter dated November 15, 1978, "we send out over 8,000 copies of the Defense Monitor each month at a cost of $25,000 annually," and there are no "subscription or service charges" assessed. CDI's basic brochure, issued prior to the November 1978 letter but subsequent to the election of President Carter in 1976, specifies that the Monitor "is sent to over 7,000 individuals and organizations--500 to the media, including 25 magazines, 115 newspapers, and to most major wire services." The newsletter has been "quoted or referenced in news features and editorials across the nation," while "Military War Colleges regularly reproduce Monitor material, as does the Pentagon, which provides copies to the Admirals and Generals stationed in the Washington, D.C. area." Further, it is claimed that more than "500

copies...are received by Congressional offices, including those of 85 Senators and 200 Representatives at their request. The Monitor is regularly reprinted in The Congressional Record."

* "Special Studies" consisting of "Occasional papers, monographs, and analyses...originated by the Center or developed in response to special requests," some of them "generated by members of Congress, government agencies, independent organizations, and individuals." In addition, CDI analysts "frequently write" articles for "wide-circulation publications, both magazines and newspapers."

* a series of books "started in 1976...with continued output on at least an annual basis." CDI reports that "Current issues in U.S. Defense Policy, the first of this series, is already being used as a standard text in many college courses."

* the "Center's Reference Service," characterized as less "immediately visible than publications, although equally important since clients are heavily concentrated among decision makers and opinion leaders," which provides "defense information in response to individual requests." CDI claims that inquiries "come from England, India, Germany, Australia, France, Denmark and Sweden, and other countries" as well as from "Members of Congress, congressional offices and committee staffs, the press, governmental offices, other organizations, independent researchers and scholars, students, and private individuals."

* radio programs "for rebroadcast by local stations across the country" and television appearances "which contribute to the continuing expansion of the Center's audiences." In addition, "Assistance and coordination have also been supplied for the production of T.V. documentaries concerning defense issues." More recently, this aspect of the Center's activities has been expanded by the release of a CDI film, War Without Winners, characterized in the February 1979 issue of the Defense Monitor as an exploration of "the danger of nuclear war in today's world." The film examines such issues as "the power of nuclear weapons, expected deaths from nuclear war, how nuclear war would start, the size of U.S. and Soviet nuclear arsenals, who is ahead in the nuclear arms race, the spread of nuclear weapons, and the consequences of SALT treaties." Directed by "Academy Award winning film maker" Haskell Wexler, the film was produced by CDI Board of Advisors member Harold Willens and "was made in cooperation with the Members of Congress for Peace Through Law Education Fund."

* various "Conferences, Seminars, Meetings, Speeches, and Lectures" which, as "another major aspect" of the Center's work, "range from participation by single staff members to broader staff participation in convocations and conferences extending over several days." CDI emphasizes that "Center members regularly lecture at Military War Colleges and at the State Department Foreign Service Institute." The other side of the coin is that "the Center itself is frequently the site of conferences, and seminars. Participants range from established experts to student groups and visiting classes."

* "Special Courses for career groups" as part of what the Center calls its "educational activities," an example being "a national security seminar in conjunction with the University of Maryland for congressional legislative aides." A similar effort consists of CDI "Intern & Fellow Programs in conjunction with most major universities and colleges" which "are conducted on continuous basis at the Center."

* "appearances of Center personnel, by request," to provide expert testimony "before congressional committees, and executive bodies such as the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, and the Department of State." Given the repeated emphasis on the influencing of the legislative and executive branches of government that appears in CDI publications, it is hardly surprising that the Center characterizes this as "Probably the most significant of all" aspects of its work and regards it as "indicative" of its "growing recognition."

STAFF

CDI's leadership -- both with respect to key personnel and with regard to their basic point of view on defense matters -- has remained relatively constant over the years. In 1972, for example, according to Pierson, There were some "37 consultants," including

> Dr. William Corson, a retired Marine lieutenant colonel and author of "The Betrayal," a highly critical study of U.S. counter insurgency in Vietnam; Leslie Gelb, compiler of the Pentagon Papers; Morton Halperin, who quit Henry Kissinger's White House staff over policy matters, and Dr. Ralph Littauer of Cornell, co-editor of another critical book, "The Air War in Indochina."

In assessing the potential for objectivity present in the roster of CDI consultants and staff, Pierson observed that "most of the people who are joining the staff of the center or signing up as consultants are dedicated Pentagon budget cutters and well-known doves."

As previously noted, retired Rear Admiral Gene R. LaRocque has been CDI's director since the organization's inception. The most recent (March 1979) issue of the Defense Monitor lists the following CDI staff personnel:

Director:
Rear Admiral Gene R. LaRocque
U.S. Navy (Ret.)

Deputy Director:
Brig. Gen. B. K. Gorwitz
U.S. Army (Ret.)

Assistant Director:
Dr. Johanna S. R. Mendelson

Research Director:
David T. Johnson

Senior Staff:
William J. Flannery
James J. Treires, Economist
Arthur L. Kanegis
Dr. Thomas H. Karas
Evelyn S. LaBriola
Elsie May Abi El Mona
Patricia Eisler

Research Interns:
Matthew M. Aid (Beloit)
Nicholas S. Fish (Harvard)
Peter K. Skinner (Stanford)

In addition to LaRocque, several other CDI staff members have been with the organization for extended periods of service. Gorwitz, for example, has been listed as deputy director at least since publication of the May 1975 issue of the Defense Monitor, while Mendelson has been carried as assistant director since June 1978. Johnson was first listed as research director in the issue dated March 21, 1974; issues from September 1976 through April-May 1978, however, listed him simply as a member of the "Senior Staff," the research director designation being resumed with the June 1978 Monitor. Similarly, Dr. Robert M. Whitaker (Col. U.S. Air Force - Ret.) served as staff director for CDI for the better part of two years, as shown in issues of the Monitor from September 1976 through April-May 1978; prior to that time, he had been listed as a member of the staff since the issue dated July 1975. Perusal of a nearly-complete set of the Defense Monitor (beginning with Vol 1, No. 2, June 7, 1972) yields the following compilation of CDI staff personnel, which is believed to be as nearly complete a listing as is possible at this point (the date beside each name represents the earliest available issue of the Monitor in which the individual's name is carried in a particular staff capacity):

	First Listed:
Director:	
Rear Admiral Gene R. LaRocque U.S. Navy (Ret.)	June 7, 1972
Assistant Director:	
Lindsay Mattison	June 7, 1972
Donald May	June 7, 1972
Dr. Johanna S. R. Mendelson	June 1978
Associate Director:	
Lindsay Mattison	September 8, 1972
Lt. Col. Edward A. Miller USAF (Ret.)	September 8, 1972
Co-Director:	
Lindsay Mattison	January 30, 1974
Deputy Director:	
Brig. Gen. B. K. Gorwitz U.S. Army (Ret.)	May 1975
Staff Director:	
Dr. Robert M. Whitaker (Col. U.S. Air Force - Ret.)	September 1976
Research Director:	
Howard C. Reese	December 12, 1973
David T. Johnson	March 21, 1974
Director of Public Information:	
Dean Rudoy	January 30, 1974
Staff	
Sally Anderson	June 7, 1972
Robert Berman	June 7, 1972
David Johnson	June 7, 1972
William Ronsaville	June 7, 1972
Dean Rudoy	June 7, 1972
Judith Weiss	June 7, 1972
John Nugent	September 8, 1972
Josephine Fredericks	May 15, 1973
Jane Doyle	September 1, 1973
Larry Yuspeh	December 12, 1973
Constance Matthews	December 12, 1973
William Rust	December 12, 1973
Bill Gulledge	March 21, 1974
Robert Guttman	March 21, 1974
Dennis Brezina	April 1974
Barry R. Schneider	August 1974
Dr. Stefan H. Leader	August 1974
Rosalia Britt	August 1974
Susan-Jane Stack	August 1974

Staff (cont.)	First Listed (cont.)
Bruce Stoddard	August 1974
Daniel Frankel	August 1974
William Mako	August 1974
Thomas Weber	October 1974
James Schear	October 1974
Evelyn S. LaBriola	December 1974
Doron Bar-Levav	January 1975
Richard Goldschmidt	January 1975
Bruce Butterworth	May 1975
Jim Slack	May 1975
John Gile	May 1975
Elizabeth Campbell	May 1975
Elaine Richardson	May 1975
James Willis	July 1975
Michael O. Fallon	July 1975
Dr. Dennis F. Verhoff	July 1975
Col. Robert M. Whitaker	July 1975
Sheila D. Moore	July 1975
Monoranjan Bezboruah	July 1975
Phil Stanford	November 1975
David B. Duboff	December 1975
William J. Flannery	May 1976
Senior Staff	
David T. Johnson	September 1976
Dr. Stefan H. Leader	September 1976
William J. Flannery	September 1976
Nancy B. Jones	September 1976
Evelyn S. LaBriola	September 1976
Dr. Jeffrey D. Porro	September 1976
Cheryl L. Rosen	September 1976
Dr. John F. Tarpey (Capt. USN-Ret.)	September 1976
James J. Treires	February 1977
Arthur L. Kanegis	July 1977
Elsie May Abi El Mona	August 1977
Dr. Jo Husbands	September-October 1977
Johanna S. R. Mendelson	April-May 1978
Dr. Thomas H. Karas	August 1978
Patricia Eisler	September-October 1978
Special Representative to the UN	
Sidney R. Katz	February 1978
Consultants	
Dean Rudoy	May 1974
Phil Stanford	May 1975
David McKillop	January 1978
Sidney R. Katz	September-October 1978

INTERNS

A review of the same issues of the Defense Monitor indicates that the Center's "Intern & Fellow Programs" have been quite active ones. The following individuals have been listed at various times either as "Junior Fellows" or as research interns, as noted:

Junior Fellows	First Listed
Mark Licht	February 1977
Stan Kaplan	July 1977
Center Interns	
Jeffrey A. Barr	September 1, 1973
Carmine F. Cardamone	September 1, 1973
Theresa D. Lewis	September 1, 1973
Thomas B. Mason	September 1, 1973
Interns	
Janet Harris	July 1975
David Duboff	July 1975
Jeff Schwab	July 1975
Randy Compton	July 1975
James Firth (Colby College)	February 1976
Paul N. Stockton (Dartmouth College)	February 1976
Michael Mariotte (Antioch College)	May 1976
Research Interns	
Marilyn L. Booth (Harvard)	September 1976
David L. Phillips (Trinity)	September 1976
James Firth (Colby)	September 1976
Cornelia J. Ravenal (Harvard)	September 1976
Paul N. Stockton (Dartmouth)	September 1976
Michael Ottenberg (Ripon College)	December 1976
Charles C. Allen (Dartmouth)	January 1977
Thomas Gleason (Denison)	January 1977
Guy Thomas (Fairhaven College)	February 1977
Sally Buckman (Wellesley College)	July 1977
Jenny Sternbach (Univ. of Penn.)	July 1977
Mark Sugg (St. John's College)	July 1977
Amy Timmer (Mich. State Univ.)	July 1977
James Cohen (Hampshire College)	September-October 1977
Toby Seggerman (Stanford Univ.)	September-October 1977
Pamela Strateman (Cornell Univ.)	February 1978
Jim Tierney (Allegheny)	February 1978
Susan Helper (Oberlin College)	June 1978
Lee Glickenhaus (Oberlin College)	June 1978
Dmitri Steinberg (UCLA)	June 1978
John Kunreuther (Haverford College)	June 1978
Larry Friedman (Columbia Univ.)	November 1978
Ellen McCollister (Cornell Univ.)	November 1978
Matthew M. Aid (Beloit)	February 1979
Nicholas S. Fish (Harvard)	February 1979
Peter F. Skinner (Stanford)	February 1979

Of the interns, Duboff appears to have been the only one to be listed subsequently as a full member of the CDI staff; and at least a few members of the staff have in turn moved on to employment with the United States Congress. According to the 1978 edition of the authoritative Congressional Staff Directory, for example, Larry M. Yuspeh was able to secure a position as "Financial Analyst" with the Senate Select Committee on Small Business, while Bruce R. Butterworth was listed as a professional staff employee of the Subcommittee on Government Activities and Transportation of the House Committee on Government Operations. Another past CDI staff employee, Barry R. Schneider, has more recently served as a staff consultant on arms control and military affairs to the influential Members of Congress for Peace Through Law and as a consultant on human rights for the MCPL Education Fund (see Heritage Foundation Institution Analysis No. 1, "Members of Congress for Peace Through Law and Members of Congress for Peace Through Law Education Fund," April 1977).

BOARD OF ADVISORS

The CDI Board of Advisors represents a fairly broad range of involvement from business and the professions, including retired military personnel. As shown in the March 1979 issue of the Defense Monitor, the current list is as follows (identifying data is also taken verbatim from the Monitor listing):

* Doris Z. Bato -- Cos Cob, Connecticut
* Arthur D. Berliss, Jr. -- Captain USNR (Ret.); former Vice-President, Allen-Hollander Company
* Benjamin V. Cohen -- Former Advisor to President Franklin D. Roosevelt
* James R. Compton -- President J. R. Compton Development Company; Board of Trustees, Experiment in International Living
* Colonel James Donovan, USMC (Ret.) -- Author; former publisher, Journal of the Armed Forces
* Charles H. Dyson -- Chairman of the Board, Dyson-Kissner Corporation
* Seth M. Glickenhaus -- Investment Broker
* James D. Head -- President, Strategy Development Company
* Stewart Mott -- Philanthropist

* Paul Newman -- Motion Pictures

* Jubal Parten -- Oil Producer & Cattle Rancher, Madison, Texas

* Lawrence S. Phillips -- President, Phillips-Van Heusen Corporation

* Randolph S. Rasin -- President, The Rasin Corporation, Chicago

* Dr. Earl C. Ravenal -- Former Director, Asian Division (Systems Analysis), Office of Secretary of Defense

* John Rockwood -- Publisher, Chicago, Illinois

* Jonathan F. P. Rose -- Builder/Environmental Planner

* Albert M. Rosenhaus -- Vice President, J. B. Williams Company

* Robert P. Schauss -- Metallurgical Engineer; International Consultant for Industrial Development

* Alfred P. Slaner -- Former President, Kayser-Roth Corp.

* Dr. Herbert Scoville, Jr. -- Former Deputy Director, Central Intelligence Agency

* Philip A. Straus -- Partner, Neuberger and Berman, Members, New York Stock Exchange

* Susan W. Weyerhaeuser -- New York, New York

* Harold Willens -- Chairman of the Board, Factory Equipment Corporation

* Abraham Wilson -- Attorney, Partner, Kadel, Wilson and Potts, New York, N.Y.

Others who have served as members of the advisory board in past years, as listed in available issues of the Defense Monitor, include:

* Morris B. Abram, Jr. -- Pembroke College, Oxford, England; founder and former President of Student Vote and Harvard Independent

* Marriner S. Eccles -- Former Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board

* G. Sterling Grumman -- G. S. Grumman & Associates, Inc., Members New York Stock Exchange

* Harry Huge -- Partner, Arnold and Porter; Chairman, Board of Trustees, UMWA Welfare & Retirement Fund

* Dr. Jeremy J. Stone -- Director, Federation of American Scientists

* Paul Warnke -- Former Assistant Secretary of Defense, International Security Affairs

INTERLOCKING RELATIONSHIPS

The membership of CDI's advisory board represents an interlocking relationship with several other groups which are of more than passing interest. Stone's organization, for example, has been identified with activities of the Coalition for a New Foreign and Military Policy, probably the most all-inclusive of the so-called "anti-defense lobby" efforts; and it is regularly featured in Coalition publications as a recommended resource organization. The FAS has also been active in such undertakings as the campaign against the anti-ballistic missile (ABM); the National Campaign to Stop the B-1 Bomber; and the Campaign to Stop Government Spying, now known as the Campaign for Political Rights, a coalition which includes, in addition to various political and church groups, such organizations as the National Lawyers Guild, National Emergency Civil Liberties Committee, National Committee Against Repressive Legislation, and National Alliance Against Racist and Political Repression, all of which have been officially identified as fronts for the Communist Party, U.S.A., along with Morton Halperin's Center for National Security Studies, another project of the Fund for Peace. The September 1978 issue of the F.A.S. Public Interest Report lists Halperin as a member of the FAS National Council and Scoville as one of the organization's sponsors.

Scoville is not the only CDI advisor to have had experience in government. Newman has recently participated in United Nations deliberations on disarmament as part of the American delegation appointed by President Carter; and Warnke, who until very recently had served as President Carter's chief arms negotiator as head of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, is now busily engaged in promoting public support for the President's strategic arms limitation (SALT) agreement.

Willens, in addition to his affiliation with CDI, has been listed as a member of the Board of Trustees of the Fund for Peace and as a principal leader in the anti-Vietnam war Business Executives Move for Vietnam Peace and in BEM's Businessmen's Educational Fund, all of which have been among significant beneficiaries of Mott's financial largesse. With respect to the Businessmen's Educational Fund, it is noted that on April 29, 1972, there was played over Radio Hanci a tape, identified as a regular broadcast of the BEF, in turn identified as the public relations arm of BEM. In this broadcast, one Randy Floyd, claiming to be an ex-Marine pilot, denounced U.S. bombing of North

Vietnam, called for a set date for withd-awal of all United States forces from Vietnam, and accused U.S. military forces of war crimes against the Vietnamese people. The program was billed as BEF's "In the Public Interest," the same name used by a broadcast series sponsored more recently by the Fund for Peace and identified in a 1973 Fund mailing as having been "created two years ago to answer the need for balance on radio." BEM is currently known as Business Executives Move for New National Priorities and is a constituent member of the Coalition for a New Foreign and Military Policy.

Mott's other involvements have been many and varied. A major contributor to the support of CDI (in 1975, he was reported to have "given $60,000 to the center over the past three years"), Mott has also donated, often heavily, to such organizations as the Businessmen's Educational Fund and Members of Congress for Peace Through Law, as well as to the Fund for Peace itself. From 1970 through 1974, Mott reportedly gave $63,953 to the liberal National Committee for an Effective Congress (see Heritage Foundation Institution Analysis No. 5, "National Committee for an Effective Congress," April 1978) and $283,747 to the Fund for Peace. Mott and his sister, Maryanne Mott Meynet, have also been among contributors to the Youth Project, a leftist apparatus whose executive director from 1972 to 1977 was Margery Tabankin, well-known anti-Vietnam war activist who traveled to Communist North Vietnam in 1972 and who is now serving as Deputy Associate Director of ACTION in the Carter administration under Sam Brown. (see Heritage Foundation Institution Analysis No. 9, "The New Left in Government: From Protest to Policy-Making," November 1978). In 1971, Mott endorsed the so-called "People's Peace Treaty," drafted in Hanoi and characterized by the House Committee on Internal Security as "fully support/ing/ the communist position on Vietnam." He participated in a February 1977 benefit for the Political Rights Defense Fund, an adjunct of the Trotskyite Communist Socialist Workers Party, along with such other celebrities as actor Edward Asner, feminist Kate Millet, and former U.S. Attorney General Ramsey Clark, and currently serves as a member of the National Council of the National Emergency Civil Liberties Committee, cited by both the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee and the House Committee on Un-American Activities as a front for the Communist Party, U.S.A.

Ravenal's background also includes more than his service with the Office of the Secretary of Defense; it involves an extended connection with activities of the Institute for Policy Studies, one of the nation's principal purveyers of extreme leftist theory and activism (see Heritage Foundation Institution Analysis No. 2, "Institute for Policy Studies," May 1977). An official IPS history, Beginning the Second Decade, 1963-1973, listed Ravenal as being among some 56 Associate Fellows who had been part of the "Past IPS Faculty;" and a major study, The Problem of the Federal Budget, published in November 1975, reflected his participation in the Study Group on the

Federal Budget, a project of the Institute for Policy Studies and the Transnational Institute, a principal IPS subsidiary the leadership of which includes the head of the British section of the Fourth International, a world-wide Trotskyite Communist apparatus with a documented record of support for terrorist violence. Ravenal has also contributed to the most recent IPS budget study, a volume on The Federal Budget and Social Reconstruction: The People and the State published in 1978. This latest study describes him as "a fellow at the Institute for Policy Studies" who "has written a number of books and articles on American foreign and military policy, and teaches International Relations at Georgetown and Johns Hopkins Universities."

INTERLOCKS WITH FUND FOR PEACE

Of the 24 individuals currently serving as members of the CDI Board of Advisors, no fewer than 12 (Bato, Berliss, Compton, Donovan, Dyson, Ravenal, Rosenhaus, Schauss, Scoville, Slaner, Straus, and Wilson) were also listed as members in the August 1974 issue of the Defense Monitor, the earliest issue to carry such a listing. Prior to August 1974, the Monitor simply listed current CDI staff employees and, above the usual identification of CDI as "a project of the Fund for Peace," enumerated the Fund's Board of Trustees, which, as of the May 1974 issue, was as follows:

Morris Abram, Jr.
Arthur D. Berliss, Jr.
Louise R. Berman
Cyril E. Black
Julian Bond
Dr. William G. Bowen
Sen. Edward W. Brooke
Joel I. Brooke
Ellsworth T. Carrington
James E. Cheek
Joseph S. Clark
Barry Commoner
James R. Compton
Randolph P. Compton
Andrew W. Cordier
Norman Cousins
Royal H. Durst
Dr. Helen Edey
Richard A. Falk
Richard N. Gardner
Robert W. Gilmore
G. Sterling Grumman
Myres S. McDougal
Joseph E. McDowell
Sen. H.M. Metzenbaum
Stewart R. Mott
Davidson Nicol
Nicholas Nyary
Earl D. Osborn
A.H. Parker
Mrs. Maurice Pate
Lawrence Phillips
Stanley K. Platt
Robert V. Roosa
Albert M. Rosenhaus
Matthew B. Rosenhaus
Henry E. Schultz
Alfred P. Slaner
Young M. Smith, Jr.
Josephine B. Spencer
H. Peter Stern
Mark Talisman
Dr. Kenneth W. Thompson
Audrey Topping

Charles Guggenheim
Rev. Theodore Hesburgh
Harry B. Hollins
Harry Huge
Mrs. Thomas E. Irvine
Adm. Gene La Rocque
Arthur Larson
Walter J. Leonard
Joseph P. Lyford
Ira D. Wallach
Philip M. Warburg
Jerome B. Weisner
Harold Willens
Franklin H. Williams
Abraham Wilson
Charles W. Yost
Mrs. Arthur N. Young

Of the above, 11 have been identified in CDI literature as members of the CDI Board of Advisors: Abram, Berliss, James R. Compton, Grumman, Huge, Mott, Phillips, Albert M. Rosenhaus, Slaner, Willens, and Wilson; LaRocque, as previously noted, has been the Center's director continuously since 1972. A list of the officers and board members of the Fund circulated in 1975 cited Nyary as president, Wilson as vice president and counsel, and Mott as one of two co-chairmen of the Fund's Executive Committee. Because of the significant interlock existing between CDI and the Fund for Peace, it is noteworthy that Nyary, as president of the Fund, served as a member of the American delegation to a September 23-26, 1976, World Conference to End the Arms Race, for Disarmament and Detente, organized by the Continuing Liaison Council of the World Congress of Peace Forces and held in Helsinki, Finland. The president of the Continuing Liaison Council is also secretary-general of the World Peace Council, and the Helsinki conference was a major WPC undertaking during 1976. The WPC has long been recognized as the principal international Communist front organization, a fact which lends added significance to involvement in its activities by a key leader in the CDI-affiliated Fund for Peace. As shown by a July 1978 report prepared by the Central Intelligence Agency at the request of Representative John M. Ashbrook (R-Ohio), the World Peace Council, "with its headquarters in Helsinki, is the most important Soviet front organization" and "supports disarmament on Soviet terms (without international inspection) along with various subsidiary campaigns backing Soviet policy on the Middle East, Cyprus, Chile, South Africa and other regional problems." As the same report demonstrates, ultimate control of WPC policy actually lies with a representative of the International Department of the Soviet Communist Party, which even "stands firmly over the KGB /Soviet Secret Police/ for clandestine political activities. In these matters the KGB may act only on direction of the ID."*

---

*Another 1974 member of the Fund's Board of Trustees is also of particular interest. According to a January 1959 report of the House Committee on Un-American Activities on Patterns of Communist Espionage, Louise Bransten Berman /nee Rosenberg/ "has several times been identified with Soviet espionage operations in this country."

INTERLOCKS WITH CENTER FOR NATIONAL SECURITY STUDIES

In view of the interlocking relationship which exists between CDI and the Fund for Peace, it is hardly surprising to find a similar situation with respect to CDI and other projects of the Fund such as the Center for National Security Studies, the Center for International Policy, and In the Public Interest. In 1976, for example, Mott was listed by CNSS as a member of the organization's Advisory Committee, along with Richard J. Barnet and Peter Weiss of the far-left Institute for Policy Studies. Another principal IPS activist, Robert Borosage, was listed as the group's director, a position now held by veteran anti-intelligence community activist Morton Halperin. CNSS today stands pre-eminent among those organizations which are carrying on the systematic campaign of litigation and other activities designed to weaken the U.S. government's intelligence organizations; and it is of some significance that the organization has, throughout its career, maintained close working relations with key IPS people.

INTERLOCKS WITH CENTER FOR INTERNATIONAL POLICY

The Center for International Policy describes itself as "a non-profit education and research organization that examines the relationship of U.S. foreign policy to the status of human rights and needs -- political, economic, and social -- in the third world." A CIP document quoted in the January 26, 1977, edition of the Congressional Record cites the group's concern with "Intervention in the domestic affairs of Chile, military and economic support of dictatorships in Greece, Korea, Brazil and elsewhere, and an effort to involve the U.S. in Angola," all of them situations, as stated by Representative Larry McDonald (D-Ga.), in which "the United States supported indigenous non-Communist groups in resisting Soviet-planned and financed aggression by Communists."

CIP's official publication is International Policy Report, which also carries a listing of the group's staff and advisory board. The editor of this publication of CIP "associate" Susan Weber, who has also served as business manager for The Elements, self-described as a publication of "the Transnational Institute, a program of the Insitute for Policy Studies." Among those who have been members of the CIP Board of Advisors was, until his assassination, Orlando Letelier, former official in the pro-Communist government of Salvador Allende in Chile. Letelier is known to have been receiving funds on a monthly basis from the DGI, the Cuban secret police apparatus controlled by the Soviet KGB, and was a prominent leader in the Institute for Policy Studies and the IPS Transnational Institute. The May 1978 issue of International Policy Report listed the following CDI-connected individuals as members of the CIP Board of Advisors: Benjamin V. Cohen, Stewart R. Mott, Susan Weyerhaeuser, and Abraham Wilson. The complete

list, which includes former high-ranking government personnel and several individuals with ties to the Fund for Peace, is as follows, with identifying data taken verbatim from the Report:

* Thomas R. Asher, lawyer, Washington, D.C.

* William Attwood, president and publisher, Newsday; former U.S. ambassador

* Peggy Billings, Women's Division, Board of Global Ministries, United Methodist Church

* Joel I. Brooke, retired partner, Elmo Roper & Associates

* Benjamin V. Cohen, advisor to President Franklin D. Roosevelt

* Jerome Cohen, director of East Asia Legal Studies, Harvard Law School

* Adrian W. Dewind, former legislative counsel, U.S. Treasury

* Richard A. Falk, professor of international law and practice, Princeton University

* Donald M. Fraser, Member of Congress

* Arthur J. Goldberg, former Supreme Court justice and ambassador to the U.N.

* Philip C. Jessup, former U.S. member of the International Court of Justice; former U.S. ambassador

* Philip Johnson, president, Council for Religion and International Affairs

* Leon H. Keyserling, former chairman, Economic Advisory Council

* Wassily Leontief, economist, Nobel laureate, and professor, New York University

* Sally Lilienthal, sculptor, San Francisco

* Stewart R. Mott, trustee, The Fund for Peace

* Edward Snyder, executive secretary, Friends Committee on National Legislation

* Susan Weyerhaeuser, trustee, The Fund for Peace

* Abraham Wilson, partner, Kadel, Wilson & Potts

* Charles W. Yost, senior fellow, Aspen Institute; former U.S. representative to the U.N.

INTERLOCKS WITH IN THE PUBLIC INTEREST

In the Public Interest, which has been described by former Senator Walter Mondale (D-Minn.) as "an invaluable service," has characterized itself in the following language, according to an undated IPI brochure: "To counteract the onslaught of right-wing broadcasting, the Fund for Peace, through IPI, has developed a strong, effective voice to inform the American public." To IPI, the "opposition" consists of such organizations as the John Birch Society, Liberty Lobby, America's Future, former California governor Ronald Reagan, and the American Security Council, cited as "a strong military-industrial complex backer." The same source reflects that

> IPI provides accurate, up-to-date, often exclusive information and analysis on current events at no charge to newspapers and radio stations throughout the fifty states.
>
> Information is gathered by the investigative scholarship of the three research centers of The Fund for Peace --
>
> The Center for Defense Information,
> The Center for National Security Studies,
> The Institute for International Policy /now known as the Center for International Policy/
>
> -- as well as the studies of its university fellows, the results of its seminars and conferences, and a wide range of other sources.

In "reaching 8,000,000 people with alternate points of view as an educational service of the Fund for Peace," IPI bills itself as "not a single voice but many voices," including such CDI-affiliated individuals as LaRocque, Paul Newman, and Herbert Scoville. Other "voices" have included prominent anti-Vietnam war activists like Fred Branfman, William Sloane Coffin, and Don Luce; former U.S. Attorney General Ramsey Clark; economist John Kenneth Galbraith; environmental activist Joe Browder; consumer movement panjandrum Ralph Nader; IPS activists Richard Barnet and Robert Borosage; and numerous members of the U.S. Congress, among them Representatives Les Aspin (D-Wis.), Yvonne Burke and Ron Dellums (D-Calif.), James Symington (D-Mo.), and Charles Whalen (D-Ohio) and Senators Frank Church (D-Idaho), Dick Clark (D-Iowa), Joseph S. Clark (D-Pa.), Alan Cranston (D-Calif.), John Culver (D-Iowa), Sam Ervin (D-N.C.), J. William Fulbright (D-Ark.), Fred Harris (D-Okla.), Floyd Haskell (D-Colo.), Edward Kennedy (D-Mass.), Eugene McCarthy (D-Minn.), George McGovern (D-S.D.), Charles Mathias (R-Md.), Lee Metcalf (D-Mont.), Walter Mondale (D-Minn.), Edmund Muskie (D-Maine), Charles Percy (R-Ill.), William Proxmire (D-Wis.), and Richard Schweiker (R-Pa.).

The undated IPI brochure also listed the members of the organization's Board of Advisors, which has included several individuals with ties to CDI. The complete list, with identifying information, is as follows:

* Arthur Arundel, President, Arundel Communications; President, WAVA (Arlington)

* Richard Barnet, Co-director, Institute for Policy Studies

* Robert Borosage, Director, Center for National Security Studies

* Joel Brooke, retired Partner, Elmo Roper Assoc.

* Joseph S. Clark, Vice President, American Academy of Political and Social Science; former U.S. Senator from Pennsylvania

* Randolph P. Compton, Chairman, The Fund for Peace

* Maxwell Dane, retired Chairman Executive Committee, Doyle, Dane, Bernbach, Inc.

* Morris Dees, Chief Trial Counsel, Southern Poverty Law Center

* Royal H. Durst, Partner, The Durst Organization

* Richard A. Falk, Professor of International Law and Practice, Princeton University

* Rev. Richard Fernandez, Director of Public Education, Global Issues, Institute for World Order

* G. Sterling Grumman, President, G.S. Grumman & Assoc., Inc.

* Russell D. Hemenway, National Director, National Committee for an Effective Congress

* Nicholas Johnson, Chairperson, National Citizens Committee for Broadcasting

* Edward Lamb, Lawyer; Chairman, Lamb Communications, Inc.

* Gene R. LaRocque, Rear Admiral U.S.N. (ret.); Director, Center for Defense Information

* Carl Marcy, Attorney; Former Chief of Staff, Senate Foreign Relations Committee

* Eugene McCarthy, former U.S. Senator fr m Minnesota

* Edward A. Miller, Colonel, U.S.A.F. (ret.); staff member for Senator Gary Hart

* Stewart Mott, philanthropist

* Jeremy Rifkin, Chairman, People's Bicentennial Commission

* William Schneider, Associate Professor of Government, Harvard University

* Philip Stern, author and philanthropist

* Ira Wallach, Chairman, Gottesman & Co., Inc.

* Abraham Wilson, Lawyer, Kadel, Wilson & Potts

* James Wynbrandt, Executive Editor, Progressive Radio Network

As with other Fund for Peace projects described in preceding sections of this study, the interlocking relationship between In the Public Interest and the Center for Defense Information is readily apparent from a simple comparison of the organizations' respective advisory boards. In addition to CDI Director LaRocque, the advisory board of IPI has included Grumman, Mott, and Abraham Wilson, all of whom have been among members of CDI's own Board of Advisors; and Col. Edward A. Miller, in addition to working for Senator Gary Hart (D-Colo.), has served in the past as Associate Director of CDI.

FINANCES

The Center for Defense Information operates on a budget which has been estimated as being approximately $300,000. The organization's basic promotional brochure states that the "Center for Defense Information is a project of The Fund for Peace" and that "The Fund has no endowment; all of its projects depend wholly upon the interest and support of concerned citizens." Such "concerned citizens" have reportedly included both Paul Newman and Stewart Mott; and CDI also solicits contributions through the direct-mail mechanism, an inducement being the 501(c)(3) tax-exempt status of CDI's parent Fund for Peace. A CDI solicitation letter dated November 15, 1978, and signed by LaRocque as director states that "Contributions to the Center for Defense Information are tax-deductible. They should be made payable to the Fund for Peace."

Another major source of funds for the Center and other Fund projects has been a group of tax-exempt charitable foundations, principally in New York City. These foundations generally enjoy a common

denominator that is of no small interest: officers or directors who have also served as members of the advisory boards of CDI or IPI, or else as trustees of the Fund for Peace. The trustees of the Danforth Foundation, for example, which is based in St. Louis, Missouri, include James R. Compton, a trustee of the Fund for Peace and a member of the CDI Advisory Board, and Charles Guggenheim, also a trustee of the Fund for Peace. Similarly, Morris B. Abram, who has been listed as a member of the CDI Advisory Board and of the Board of Trustees of the Fund for Peace, is president of the Field Foundation in New York, while Philip M. Stern, a member of the IPI Board of Advisors, is also president of the New York-based Stern Fund. Also, Robert W. Gilmore, who has served as a trustee of the FFP, is president of the Mertz-Gilmore Foundation of New York; and yet another Fund trustee, Dr. Helen Edey, is a director of New York City's Scherman Foundation. Finally, the directors of the Compton Foundation, another New York-based institution, include Fund for Peace trustee Kenneth W. Thompson, while the foundation's officers include CDI advisor and FFP trustee James Compton and IPI advisor and Fund for Peace Board of Trustees Chairman Randolph Compton.

Listings of major grants to the Fund for Peace and its various projects, including the Center for Defense Information, as published in annual editions of the Foundation Center's authoritative Foundation Grants Index, are set forth below and include, where specified, the dates on which the grants were authorized and the purposes for which they were made by the granting institution:

* $330,000 from the Danforth Foundation, St. Louis, Missouri, 1972, to the Fund for Peace "for fellowship program for international peace and world order studies."

* $75,000 from the Field Foundation, New York, New York, 1972, to the Fund for Peace "for support of Center for Defense Information."

* $75,000 from the Field Foundation, 1973, to the Fund for Peace, Center for Defense Information, "To support research and public education on the economic and social consequences of American military policy."

* $5,000 from the Abelard Foundation, New York, New York, June 10, 1974, to the Fund for Peace "For Project on an Open Society" to "stimulate research and creative scholarship in development of warless system of international relations and to impart such knowledge to the public."

* $75,000 from the Field Foundation, January 1974, to the Fund for Peace "For research, public infcrmation, and other work of its Project for an Open Society."

* $20,000 from the Field Foundation, January 1974, to the Fund for Peace "For work in Project for an Open Society involving monitoring and reporting publicly on Federal Law Enforcement Assistance Administration and related matters."

* $119,475 from the Compton Foundation, New York, New York, 1974, to the Fund for Peace "For general purposes."

* $53,625 from the Compton Foundation, 1974, to the Fund for Peace "For Warburg Fellows."

* $20,000 from the Compton Foundation, 1974, to the Fund for Peace "For general support and public interest purposes."

* $20,000 from the Compton Foundation, 1974, to the Fund for Peace "For Foreign Affairs Center."

* $20,000 from the Compton Foundation, 1975, to the Fund for Peace "For general purposes."

* $5,494 from the Compton Foundation, 1974, to the Fund for Peace "For convocation."

* $5,000 from the Compton Foundation, 1974, to the Fund for Peace "For public interest purposes."

* $125,000 from the Field Foundation, February 1975, to the Fund for Peace "For general support of Center for National Security Studies, DC, which is engaged in research and public information activities concerning growth of state power in the name of national security."

* $75,000 from the Field Foundation, June 1974, to the Fund for Peace "To support its Center for Defense Information in DC, which undertakes research and public education on economic and social consequences of American military policies."

* $15,000 from the Stern Fund, New York, New York, 1974, to the Fund for Peace "For Center for National Security Studies in its efforts to encourage more openness in government and restraint on military and political adventures."

* $15,000 from the Stern Fund, June 1, 1974, to the Fund for Peace "To establish Center for National Security Studies to question the ominous growth of state power which has developed under the banner of 'national security.'"

* $91,000 from the Compton Foundation, December 10, 1975, to the Fund for Peace.

* $20,000 from the Compton Foundation, December 31, 1975, to the Fund for Peace.

* $20,000 from the Compton Foundation, March 26, 1976, to the Fund for Peace "For general purposes."

* $19,276 from the Compton Foundation, April 7, 1976, to the Fund for Peace.

* $75,000 from the Field Foundation, May 1976, to the Fund for Peace, Center for Defense Information, "For research and public education on economic and social consequences of American military policies and their effects on liberty."

* $10,000 from the Field Foundation, May 1976, to the Fund for Peace, Center for National Security Studies, "For work to monitor and report publicly on federal Law Enforcement Assistance Administration and related matters."

* $125,000 from the Field Foundation, November 1975, to the Fund for Peace "For general support of its Center for National Security Studies, DC, which is engaged in research and public information on growth of state power in the name of national security."

* $75,000 from the Field Foundation, September 1975, to the Fund for Peace "For research and public information at Center for Defense Information, DC, on economic and social consequences of American military policies and their effect on liberty."

* $20,000 from the Field Foundation, November 1975, to the Fund for Peace "For work at Center for National Security Studies, DC, involving monitoring and reporting publicly on federal Law Enforcement Assistance Administration and related matters."

* $15,000 from the Field Foundation, September 1975, to the Fund for Peace for the same stated purpose.

* $7,800 from the Field Foundation, September 1975, to the Fund for Peace "For research and writing at Center for National Security Studies, DC, on blacks and the military."

* $20,000 from the Stern Fund, March 1976, to the Fund for Peace, Center for National Security Studies, "For study of U.S. trade union and government intervention in French and Italian unions after World War II up to the present."

* $76,500 from the Compton Foundation, 1976, to the Fund for Peace "To stimulate research and creative scholarship in development of warless system of international relations and to impart such knowledge to the public."

* $26,405 from the Compton Foundation, 1976, to the Fund for Peace "For joint study, American University Field Staff in Hanover, NH, and Institute for the Study of World Politics, N¥C."

* $25,782 from the Compton Foundation, July 1, 1976, to the Fund for Peace.

* $15,469 from the Compton Foundation, September 24, 1976, to the Fund for Peace "For general support."

* $133,000 from the Field Foundation, November 1976, to the Fund for Peace "To support Center for National Security Studies, DC, which is engaged in research and public information on growth of state power in name of national security."

* $75,000 from the Field Foundation, March 1977, to the Fund for Peace "For Center for Defense Information in DC which undertakes research and public education on economic and social consequences of American military policies and their effects on liberty."

* $17,000 from the Scherman Foundation, New York, New York, 1976, to the Fund for Peace.

* $150,000 from the Compton Foundation, September 14, 1977, to the Fund for Peace, Institute for the Study of World Peace, "For general support and for fellowship program."

* $61,169 from the Compton Foundation, November 17, 1977, to the Fund for Peace "For general support."

* $25,000 from the Compton Foundation, September 14, 1977, to the Fund for Peace "For Institute for the Study of World Politics program with American Universities Field Staff."

* $15,000 from the Compton Foundation, March 28, 1978, to the Fund for Peace "For Center for International Policy."

* $12,500 from the Compton Foundation, March 28, 1978, to the Fund for Peace "For Center for National Security Studies."

* $10,000 from the Compton Foundation, March 28, 1978, to the Fund for Peace "For fellowship program in Public Interest Radio Program."

* $5,000 from the Compton Foundation, March 28, 1978, to the Fund for Peace "For Center for Defense Information."

* $7,000 from the Mertz-Gilmore Foundation, New York, New York, 1977, to the Fund for Peace.

* $80,000 from the Field Foundation, 1978, to the Fund for Peace, Center for Defense Information, "For research and public information on economic and social consequences of American military policies."

* $13,000 from the Field Foundation, 1978, to the Fund for Peace, Center for National Security Studies, "For research on race relations in United States military since Vietnam War and the impact of that war on black veterans."

Thus, as may readily be seen from a simple tabulation of the above figures, the aggregate of foundation support for the Fund for Peace and its apparatus has, since 1972, amounted to a minimum of $2,299,495, the largest single grantor apparently being the Field Foundation with a total of $1,073,800 and the second-largest being the Compton Foundation with a total of at least $816,695. Of those grants made for specifically-designated Fund projects, $511,300 went to the Center for National Security Studies, and $535,000 went to the Center for Defense Information. As with overall grants made to the Fund complex, the largest grantor to CDI, with total grants of $530,000, has been the Field Foundation, which has also been the major grantor ($448,800) to CNSS.

Like the interlocking affiliations of CDI and Fund for Peace personnel, certain other patterns evident among the grants made by these foundations are of particular interest. Compton, Scherman, and Mertz-Gilmore have contributed, at times heavily, to several especially activist environmental groups (see Heritage Foundation Institution Analysis No. 4, "The Environmental Complex," November 1977), among them the Natural Resources Defense Council, Sierra Club Foundation, and Environmental Defense Fund. In other areas, Mertz-Gilmore has provided funds for the MCPL Education Fund, while Scherman, Field, and Stern have granted significant funding to the left-oriented Youth Project. Both Stern and Field have been major grantors to the Institute for Policy Studies; and Stern has supported the Peoples Bicentennial Commission and the San Francisco-based Prison Law Collective, grants to the latter being for research conducted by a writer who has been identified as a member of the Communist Party, U.S.A. Field has made an extended series of grants to the American Civil Liberties Union Foundation, at least one of them being for the Lawyers Military Defense Committee, a group which has enjoyed a close working relationship with the National Lawyers Guild, and has made at least two major grants to the Bill of Rights Foundation to support the Socialist Workers Party-controlled Political Rights Defense Fund.

SELECTED MAJOR ISSUES AND ACTIVITIES

The range of Center for Defense Information activity has already been demonstrated, as has the Center's fundamental point of view in approaching national defense and defense-related issues. Certain specific examples may be especially illustrative, however, and may serve further to indicate the Center's perspective and, in some cases, the degree of acceptance and "respectability" which the organization has come to enjoy in some influential quarters.

CDI's basic method of attacking certain defense issues is, of course, by publicizing its research and analysis in the pages of the Defense Monitor and other publications. Center publications have dealt with virtually every major defense and weaponry controversy that has arisen since the organization's creation in 1972, including the question of United States versus Soviet naval power, the size of the Pentagon budget, the value of United States military installations in the Philippines and the Indian Ocean, the cruise missile, U.S. sales of military goods to other countries, the B-1 bomber, and issues related to nuclear weapons and disarmament. In some cases, the organization has been able to claim a degree of success, a point illustrated by a passage taken from a CDI "Dear Concerned Citizen" letter circulated in March 1978:

> Is our message heeded? Absolutely. CDI analyses played a key role in cancellation of the B-1 bomber, nuclear strike cruiser, and additional heavy attack aircraft carriers. We influenced the slow-down in development of the new land-based mobile ICBM (MX)...and the reduction of the U.S. arms sales overseas. None of these reduces the security of our nation one iota.
>
> In the words of senators Mark Hatfield and Adlai E. Stevenson, III, "we need this independent, privately funded source of information on military matters."

CDI information was of particular influence in the campaign against the B-1 bomber. The detailed testimony in opposition to the B-1 given to the House Committee on Armed Services in March 1976 by a representative of the National Campaign to Stop the B-1 Bomber, for example, relied extensively on such authorities as CDI and MCPL; and CDI's fact sheet on "Life Cycle Costs of the B-1 System" was used as a section of the basic information packet prepared for the Fiscal '77 National Conference to Stop the B-1 Bomber, Cut Military Spending, Meet Human Needs, held in Washington, D.C., during March 1976 under the auspices of such co-sponsoring organizations as the National Campaign to Stop the B-1 Bomber, Americans for Democratic Action, Environmental Action, SANE, Women Strike for Peace, the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, Clergy and Laymen Concerned, Common Cause, and the National Taxpayers

Union. It is worthy of note that a February 1976 letter fro : the National Campaign to Stop the B-1 Bomber stated that this conference information

> Packet was prepared by Diane Gabay of Environmental Action Foundation, Michael Mann of Environmental Action, Roger Tresolini of the National Taxpayers Union, and Bob Brammer of the National Campaign to Stop the B-1 Bomber....It was reprinted by Common Cause, at cost, for a savings of hundreds of dollars to the Campaign.

It is also noteworthy that the Center, which is regarded as one of the primary sources of information supporting arguments for significantly reduced defense spending, was the organization which computed and disseminated information on the projected costs of the B-1 bomber program, an action which has been credited with major impact in bringing about extended public debate on the value of the B-1.

CDI Director LaRocque has also written and spoken widely on issues of concern to CDI and other groups which share its perspective. In 1975, for example, Senator Frank Church inserted into the Congressional Record an article by LaRocque which had appeared in the December 18, 1974, edition of the Los Angeles Times and which argued that, while it is, "of course, in the best interest of the United States to maintain a strong national defense," this does not mean that it is necessary or desirable to maintain U.S. military forces in South Korea. In the concluding paragraph of his article, LaRocque stated that "Far from contributing to our defense posture, the presence of U.S. troops and weaponry in South Korea is as counterproductive as it is wasteful." This view is, as is readily apparent, at wide variance with those of a number of well-regarded, competent military authorities who have expressed themselves on the subject, former Major General John Singlaub being but one example.

Similarly, the April 12, 1976, edition of the Congressional Record carried an article written by LaRocque at the specific request of Senator Mark Hatfield as a rejoinder to an earlier piece by former U.S. Secretary of Defense James Schlesinger in Fortune. Schlesinger had, in Hatfield's words, "decried what he perceives as a 'failure of will' on the part of the United States and her allies, a failure manifested in an apparent reluctance to continue a massive arms buildup." To this, LaRocque replied that "legitimate defense needs must be met, but we are not the world's policeman. More weapons and more nuclear overkill do not equal greater national security." Directing his attention to the "lack of will" argument, LaRocque said:

> The critical question facing the United States is not a "lack of will" as Schlesinger likes to point out, but why must we continue to waste our funds on weapons that are not needed or contribute in only marginal ways to our defense. Must we continue to spend billions on massive weapons programs such as the B-1 Bomber, the strike cruiser, or the cruise missile, which do not add to our national defense, while our cities rot and our health-care standards remain below that of most of the Western European nations?

This line of argument is that of many so-called "anti-defense" groups which lobby for what is known as "conversion" or "peace conversion." What this means, simply put, is that government spending and productive capacity currently devoted to military needs should be diverted to non-military needs. The December 1978 issue of the Defense Monitor is a good example of this approach. Titled "Prosperity in a Demilitarized U.S. Economy: A Program for Conversion," it argued the case for reduced military spending and stated that "The pursuit of maximum military power over three decades has gradually eroded our primary source of strength, the civilian economy." The conclusions reached by the article's author, CDI economist James J. Treires, are instructive:

> *Federal spending for armaments, welfare, education, and employment and training redistribute income but do not directly increase the supply of consumer goods and services.
>
> *Healthy economic growth can be restored by shifting emphasis back to U.S. consumer goods industries. Only a policy oriented toward civilian needs can bring full employment and a better standard of living /emphasis in original/.
>
> *If the economic assistance now routinely provided to military goods producers were channeled to non-military manufacturers, the return on the public investment would be much greater and national strength would be increased.
>
> *Prospects for world peace will be greatly enhanced by policies which enable U.S. civilian goods manufacturers to compete on even terms in world markets. Efficient factories, not massive armaments, made the United States the Number One power; only a strong civilian economy can maintain that status.

As part of its emphasis on reducing government expenditures for military needs, CDI has been heavily involved in a variety of activities, including a May 1974 Training Conference on Challenging the Military Budget, for which the Center served as one of several "Cooperating Organizations," as did such other groups as the American

Friends Service Committee, Clergy and Laity Concerned, the Federation of American Scientists, SANE, Women Strike for Peace, the Division of Church and Society of the National Council of Churches, the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, and the Fund for Peace Project for an Open Society. The program included a presentation on U.S. naval forces by Admiral LaRocque; another on "Strategic Weapons: Bigger Bang, More Bucks," by Morton Halperin; and "'Guns or Butter?', SANE slide show narrated by Paul Newman."

More recently, according to the August 1978 issue of the Defense Monitor "Paul Newman and Harold Willens, both members of the Board of Advisors of the Center for Defense Information, served on the United States delegation to the recently concluded United Nations Special Session on Disarmament." Both were involved apparently because "they share an urgent concern about the increasing possibility of nuclear war." Among those who addressed the Special Session, which was given considerable attention by the apparatus of the Soviet-controlled World Peace Council with which Fund for Peace president Nicholas Nyary has been affiliated, was CDI Director LaRocque, whose June 13, 1978, remarks were carried in the July 1978 Defense Monitor. In his speech, LaRocque averred that "my country has generally taken the lead in the nuclear arms race" and claimed that there is "no military utility in the use of nuclear weapons by the superpowers against non-nuclear countries," adding that "This Special Session should urge all nations to stop producing fissionable material, stop making nuclear weapons, and stop testing nuclear weapons." After recommending that "we should begin reducing the huge strategic nuclear arsenals of the United States and the Soviet Union by dismantling over a 5-year period all land-based intercontinental missiles (ICBMs)," LaRocque concluded by saying:

> The governments of the United States and the Soviet Union have carelessly let their relations deteriorate to an alarming extent. Political leaders must take control of events and not permit the military or technology to control them. The non-nuclear countries can act as the burr under the saddle to push the nuclear powers in the direction of reason. If we are to survive on this planet, the arms race must be slowed, stopped, and reversed. The time to start is now.

CDI AND THE SOVIET THREAT

In his remarks, as in Center publications from time to time, there was reference to the Soviet Union as a potential danger to world peace. However, it appears that the Center's view of the Soviet Union's role in the arms race is, at best, less harsh than its view of that of the United States. In this connection, it is noted that the June 29, 1978, edition of the Daily World, official newspaper of the Communist Party, U.S.A., carried LaRocque's alleged

statement that the Carter administration "is guilty of more than benign neglect in the area of disarmament. It is as if Carter is almost starting cold war number two." In a similar vein, according to the July 1, 1976, Daily World, in responding to a statement by Soviet leader Leonid Brezhnev in which Brezhnev had accused the administration of President Gerald Ford of "delaying completion of the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks (SALT) in Geneva," LaRocque supposedly said, when asked whether he agreed with Brezhnev's charge, "I certainly do, I think we've seen Ronald Reagan make this an issue and Ford's response is to add another $1 billion to the military budget and four ships to the navy without any rhyme or reason whatsoever." At the same time, it should be noted that CDI has called attention to Soviet arms sales to the so-called "Third World," although this warning is qualified by the assertion that the "United States should not overreact to Soviet arms exports."

In general, it seems fair to observe that CDI is not impressed with conventional arguments which play up the Soviet threat. It is interesting that a section on "Staff Notes" in the June 7, 1972, Defense Monitor referred to CDI staff member Sally Anderson's former work as "economic analyses of Soviet capabilities and the 'threat' at the US Central Intelligence Agency, Stanford Research Institute and RAND." Also, the September 1975 issue of the Monitor, devoted to an examination of "The Lessons of Vietnam: Toward a Post-Vietnam Foreign Policy," included the following exceptionally significant passage:

> Anti-communism has been the dominant theme of U.S. foreign policy for thirty years. The U.S. got involved in Indochina "to stop the spread of Communism." There are real differences in values and practices and the U.S. must, as it has, maintain sufficient strength to deter the Soviet Union. But too often in the third world we have been indiscriminate and negative in our anti-communism and have seen the competition too much in military terms.
>
> It is a truism that today the communist world is no longer monolithic and that the U.S. is now following a policy of detente with both the Soviet Union and China. But it would be difficult to underestimate the continuing inclination to interpret world events in terms of the struggle between the "Free World" and the "Communists." Recent events in Portugal, Italy, Greece, Turkey, and Korea are too easily interpreted in terms of the continuing U.S.-Communist antagonism. For example, a New York Times editorial in July holds the Soviet Union responsible for internal political developments in Portugal: "The United States and its NATO allies need to make it clear to Moscow that the Soviet Union will be held responsible if Portugal's

Communists continue on their present path." The simplification inherent in such a statement is not much different than the simplification that dominated U.S. policy in Southeast Asia for many years: aggression from the north was the cause of conflict and Moscow or Peking controlled events.

The U.S. encouraged the overthrow of the government of Chile because, as Secretary Kissinger has been quoted, "I don't see why we need to stand by and watch a country go Communist due to the irresponsibility of its own people." Uninformed rhetoric about countries "going Communist" is still much too common where more careful and less ideological analysis is required.

In the absence of anti-communism as the touchstone, it is difficult to determine what broad principles motivate U.S. foreign policy. Secretary Kissinger senses this when he states that "while the cold war structure of international relations has come apart, a new stable international order has yet to be formed." The catchword of "stability" is an inadequate goal, as Secretary Kissinger has occasionally admitted: "our concept of world order must have deeper purposes than stability."

Too often the U.S. continues to instinctively align itself with the status quo and against social change, siding with the forces of "stability." Lacking a vision of goals beyond stability, U.S. containment policies have seldom transcended a reflexive global anti-communism. Vietnam should have taught the lesson that compulsive resistance to change in the third world can be very damaging to our interests.

CDI AND SALT

As indicated previously, the Center for Defense Information supports strategic arms limitation (SALT) agreements and has published a fairly considerable body of material in support of such a treaty between the United States and the Soviet Union. The "Disarmament Action Guide 1979," published by the Coalition for a New Foreign and Military Policy, includes CDI among recommended "Organizations & Resources," while the Religious Committee on SALT cites CDI in its "SALT II BIBLIOGRAPHY," specifying that

> Several issues of the Center's regular monthly newsletter, The Defense Monitor, are pertinent to the SALT discussion: "The Arms Race: Is Paranoia

Necessary for Security?" (March 1978); "NATO and the Neutron Bomb" (June 1978); and "Hard Running: The US Has Not Dropped Out of the Nuclear Arms Race" (September/October 1978).

Another issue of the Monitor that is of special interest appeared in July 1977. Titled "SALT: A Race Against The Arms Race," it developed a case for a SALT agreement in detail, arguing that the "most significant result" of such an agreement "could be the slowing of new nuclear weapons developments in both the United States and the Soviet Union" and further contending that "The impact of a new treaty on Soviet forces would be greater in the short-run than on U.S. forces" with the Soviets "required to reduce delivery vehicles immediately." Consistently with so much other CDI material, this article emphasizes the effect of SALT on the problem of nuclear weaponry:

> * American and Soviet confidence in the arms control process needs to be reinforced if the danger of nuclear war is to be reduced. An agreement that reduces Vladivostok ceilings by ten per cent and imposes some qualitative limits on new weapons, while less than ideal, is far better than no agreement at all. Such a SALT agreement could reduce the growth of U.S. and Soviet arsenals and prevent as many as 7,000 new nuclear weapons from being added to U.S. and Soviet forces by 1985.

CDI, NUCLEAR WAR, AND THE INSTITUTE FOR POLICY STUDIES

It is clear from the foregoing summary of certain CDI activities that an overriding theme of Center material is the threat of nuclear war and atomic weapons in general. In pursuing this line, LaRocque, according to Drew Middleton in the September 11, 1974, edition of the New York Times, "told a Congressional committee that many /American nuclear weapons overseas/ are loosely guarded, and that it would be relatively easy for terrorists to seize one and escape with it by helicopter." Similarly, according to the December 4, 1974, edition of the Washington Post, LaRocque testified before a committee that nuclear weapons had been brought into Japan by American ships on a routine basis, a "revelation" which "touched off a furor in Japan where the government had for years maintained that nuclear weapons were not permitted." More recently, CDI has issued its film, War Without Winners, to which this study has already adverted.

An aspect of CDI's anti-nuclear program that is of particular interest, however, is the First Nuclear War Conference held in Washington, D.C., on December 7, 1978. An article in the November 27,

1978, edition of the Washington Post stated that "Attendance is by invitation only, except for members of the news media," and that the "Hosts for the conference are retired Navy Adm. Gene R. LaRocque, director of the Center for Defense Information, and Richard J. Barnet, senior fellow of the Institute for Policy Studies." The March 1979 Defense Monitor carries what it calls "excerpts from the statements made by the major participants in the Conference," including, in addition to Barnet and LaRocque,

* Ruth Adams, editor, Bulletin of Atomic Scientists
* Dr. Richard Falk, professor, Princeton University
* Dr. Jerome Frank, psychiatrist, Johns Hopkins University
* Dr. George Kistiakowsky, former Presidential Science Advisor
* Harrison Salisbury, former editor, New York Times
* Dr. George Rathjens, professor, Massachusetts Institute of Technology; former Defense Department official
* Rear Admiral George Miller, former director, Navy Strategic Offensive and Defensive Systems
* Lt. General Arthur Collins, former Deputy Commander-in-Chief of U.S. Army in Europe
* Admiral John T. Hayward, former president, Naval War College
* Lt. General Robert Gard, president, National Defense University
* Paul Newman, motion pictures; U.S. Delegate to United Nations Special Session on Disarmament
* Dr. Henry Kendall, professor, MIT; president, Union of Concerned Scientists
* Dr. Robert Conard, senior scientist, Brookhaven National Laboratory
* Bardyl Tirana, director, Defense Civil Preparedness Agency
* Dr. Bernard Feld, professor, MIT; Editor-in-Chief, Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists
* Senator John Culver, member, Senate Armed Services Committee
* Dr. Herbert Scoville, former Deputy Director, Central Intelligence Agency

Among what the Monitor calls "Questioners from /the/ audience" were such activists as cartoonist Jules Feiffer, Rev. William Sloane Coffin, and radical journalist I.F. Stone who, according to an account by Walter Pincus in the December 8, 1978, Washington Post, "charged that the conference may be used as an opening wedge in a new civil defense program," a reaction apparently triggered by Kendall's presentation on the probable devastation to be expected in any United States-Soviet nuclear exchange. Despite Stone's assessment, however, the text of Kendall's remarks makes it clear that he believes "that on the large scale appeal to civil defense is an appeal to an illusion, and because of the scale of the consequences, a very dangerous illusion."

Among the military speakers, Rear Admiral Miller stated that "Soviet nuclear weapons imperil the existence of the United States, and the root of the problem is our strategy." He also advocated the movement of "all U.S.-based nuclear weapons, those Soviet aim-points, as we call them, to sea in ships and submarines." Admiral Hayward, on the other hand, while conceding that the Soviets "would be prepared to use tactical nuclear weapons when and where it was in their interests," expressed the opinion that "the least probable attack is a complete surprise attack from the Soviet Union on the continental U.S."

Senator Culver's remarks were far more emotional in tone as he excoriated the "most monumental, dangerous illusion of our time -- indeed of all time...that any nation can win an all-out nuclear war" and spoke of "a number of concomitant illusions along with the insane dream of winning a nuclear war," among them the concept of a 'limited' nuclear war." In Culver's judgement, "we have made the central equation too complicated" and "have lost the elementary sense of horror and anguish that is needed to make us see the truth" that "after a nuclear war, even the rubble contains the seeds of death." A like note of emotional urgency was struck by CDI advisory board member Newman, who stated:

> It is still absolutely amazing to me that people can gather together in this room and approach and attack an absolutely irrational subject in such a rational way. When you stop and think about it, we are simply talking about, if it escalates to the point that a lot of people think it will, that it is not controllable, and if you can't limit a nuclear war, that this little, rather lonely, fragile planet is on its way out of the ball park, and I am surprised that there aren't people who are angrier.

CAMPAIGN FOR PEACE

One final aspect of CDI-interlocked Fund for Peace activity is of particular interest in view of the developing controversy over the SALT agreement: the creation of the Campaign for Peace and the Campaign for Peace Media Center. The list of "Organizations & Resources" published by the Coalition for a New Foreign and Military Policy in its "Disarmament Action Guide 1979" includes the following reference:

> Campaign for Peace Media Center, 122 Maryland Ave., N E, Washington, D.C. When this organization begins operation in mid-February,* it will provide cooperative

---

* As of this writing, according to a CFP staff employee, the organization is not scheduled to become fully operational for "another month or month-and-a-half," which would presumably push it back to some time in late April or early to mid-May.

services and training in media skills for national and local organizations working for an end to the arms race.

A background document on the Campaign for Peace currently circulating in draft form reflects that the organization "is a cooperative effort by leaders of a broad range of national organizations concerned about arms control and disarmament and the urgent need to bring this issue to the attention of the American people." The document further reveals that

> On June 5, 1978, Ramsey Clark and Stewart Mott convened a meeting in Washington, D.C. to discuss, "An International Campaign for Peace." This campaign was initially conceived as an effort: 1) to more effectively persuade the public of the possibility of peace; and 2) to affect government action to achieve it. Attending were representatives of the major peace organizations in the United States.

Participants in the June 5 meeting discussed the "proper mechanism for coordinating, energizing and supporting private efforts to achieve peace" and identified four key issues: "1) control of the technology of violence; 2) human, social and economic needs; 3) human rights; and 4) world law." The original intention was "a series of international and U.S. regional conferences" that would culminate in "a Pacem in Terris Conference in the United States in the fall of 1980 that would focus attention on these issues during the 1980 Presidential and Congressional campaigns." As a result of several later meetings of a "Continuation Committee," however, it was realized that

> 1) with the exception of Amnesty International, the participating peace organizations were nationally oriented and did not view international conferences /as/ priority items on their agendas; 2) the original issues focus of the International Campaign for Peace were too broad. Because the arms race and disarmament emerged as primary concerns of the participants, discussion focused on a major new initiative to reverse the present drift toward resurgent militarism: how best to heighten public awareness to the dangers of the arms race as well as the economic costs of the military budget, and the relationship between the arms race and such related issues as hunger, human rights and population.

Rather than simply create "yet another peace organization," it was decided that what was needed "was a way to strengthen and enhance the work of already existing organizations by publicizing their message" in an "intensive campaign to educate Americans that we are

simultaneously the victims and purveyers of a highly sophisticated technology of violence." The result was that "A Media Service Center, designed to provide cooperative services and training in media skills for national and local organizations working on arms control issues," was brought into being.

Minutes of a November 16, 1978, meeting of the Campaign for Peace Executive Committee indicate that one of the items of business during the meeting was the following: "The Executive Committee approved the 'Background' description of the Campaign for Peace." The same minutes indicate that it was decided, at Stewart Mott's suggestion, not to enlarge the membership of the CFP Board of Directors, at that time 23 with an allowable upper limit of 40. According to another draft document which deals with the structure of the CFP, the membership of the Board of Directors at the time was as follows:

Joel Brooke, Fund for Peace
Fritzi Cohen, Military Audit Project
Dave Cortwright, SANE
Sandy Gottlieb, New Directions
Bob Maslow, In the Public Interest
Lindsay Mattison, Center for Development Policy
Frank Millspaugh
Stewart Mott
Terry Provance, American Friends Service Committee*
Nancy Ramsey, Women's International League for Peace and Freedom
Brewster Rhoads
Bob Schwartz, DISARM
Ed Snyder, Friends Committee on National Legislation
Edith Villastrigo, Women Strike for Peace*
Jack Sangster, Fund for New Priorities in America
David McKillop, Meridian House
Norman Hunt, World Federalists
Peggy Shaker, Campaign to Stop Government Spying
Mort Halperin, Center for National Security Studies
Bob Borosage, Institute for Policy Studies
Jean Mattison, American Committee on East-West Accord
Alex Knopp
Ramsey Clark

The cross-fertilization existing between CFP and the Fund for Peace complex is obvious from even a casual comparison of the above list with those in preceding sections of this study. As always, Mott appears to be the most readily observable common denominator, so that it is of interest that he also serves as a member of the executive committee, according to the same draft document, which lists Brooke, Ramsey, Snyder, Rhoads, Cortright, Mattison, and Provance as Mott's fellow executive committee members. As of the time the draft document was prepared (apparently in late November 1978), groups listed

---

* It is noted that, according to its official "List of Members 1977-1980," both Provance and Villastrigo are members of the Soviet-controlled World Peace Council.

as "Cooperating Organizations" included In the Public Interest, SANE, the Fund for Peace, and Women Strike for Peace. Members of the CFP Advisory Council, "which would include (representatives of) organizations who work with the project," had not as yet been named, the council being still "in formation."

Designed as "a separate, tax-deductible organization (501c3) of the Internal Revenue Code," the CFP has projected a "Proposed Budget" for January 1 through December 31, 1979, of $106,400, broken down as follows:

Total Staff	$62,100
Outside research, conference assistance and all other services	15,000
Postage and telephone	4,500
Office equipment and supplies	5,000
Travel	5,000
Office rental	6,000
Printing and duplicating	4,800
Legal and accounting	4,000
Total	$106,400

Projected budget figures for January 1 through December 31, 1980, are, as would be expected, higher in virtually every category for a projected total of $117,410. As has so often been the case with Fund for Peace projects, including, it has been reported, the Center for Defense Information, Stewart Mott appears to be the donor who has made the founding of the CFP possible. As stated in the minutes of the November 16, 1978, CFP Executive Committee meeting:

> Stewart Mott elaborated on his pledge to the Campaign for Peace of $50,000 a year for two years, providing there was a 2 to 1 match for each of his dollars. He stated he would contribute the first $50,000 without a match so the Media Service Center could begin.

According to a November 28, 1978, draft document setting forth the projected program of the CFP Media Service Center, the "central theme of the Center" is expressed as "The Dangers of the Arms Race." This overall theme "will include a media focus on the following topics: Military Spending, SALT, Foreign Arms Sales, Budget Priorities, Detente, Nuclear Technology, Economic Conversion and the Test Ban." To implement the organization's "central theme," the following four-part "basic outline of activities" is envisioned:

I. Public education via the news media
- Distribution of news releases, as well as background briefs and research studies prepared by cooperating organizations to editorial page editors, columnists and reporters who cover disarmament and related issues. The Center will

originate its own news releases when appropriate.

- Use of nationally recognized spokespersons to present immediate response to relevant news events as well as to misleading statements by opposition leaders.

- Scheduling of news conferences and background briefings to communicate arms race issues to the media.

- Scheduling spokespersons, on a regular basis, on local and network TV and radio talk and interview shows.

- Assistance in the distribution of media materials available from cooperating organizations.

II. Training organizations (local and national) in communications skills

- Development of basic training resources and the sponsorship of media workshops to assist organizations at the regional and local level in the use of the media.

- Organizing spokespersons to initiate and/or sign letters to the editor and guest editorials, at both the national and local level.

III. Improve existing communications efforts

- Expansion and coordination of existing radio networks such as In the Public Interest, SANE and Pacifica.

- Evaluate budget and content of ACDA /Arms Control and Disarmament Agency/ public education program.

IV. Public Education via non-news media

- Commission a study to test for and develop more effective means of communicating arms race issues to the American public.

- Preparation of advertisements for radio, newspaper, magazine and billboard use based on recommendations of study. Include contracting to public relations and advertising agencies for this purpose.

It is further assumed that within "these activities, there are numerous publicity opportunities" to be mined by the Center, some of them being "an annual awards ceremony for journalists, and imaginative media events around issues like: a nuclear victim body count, the MX missle /sic/, military taxes, and arms shipments overseas."

CONCLUSION

Because of the extensive pattern of interlocking relationships clearly evident among the various organizations within the Fund for Peace complex, it has been necessary to discuss most of them in some detail so that the reader may better appreciate the full extent of the broad program of which the Center for Defense Information is so integral and important a part. Just as one cannot properly appreciate an organization apart from the broader movement within which it operates, one certainly cannot fully understand the Center for Defense Information and its aims without at first gaining at least a basic understanding of the nature and extent of the operations of the Fund for Peace and its growing apparatus.

It is apparent from the available information, by no means all of which has been summarized in the preceding sections of this study, that the Center for Defense Information is a key part of a well-organized, well-financed, and effectively-staffed apparatus designed to effect the most fundamental change in the national defense policies of the United States government. CDI propaganda, written by professionals in various aspects of military and weapons policy, has been consistently well-produced and pitched to the appropriate policy-making audiences on Capitol Hill and elsewhere in government, achieving a considerable degree of acceptance among certain key leaders concerned with the shaping and implementation of the nation's national defense and defense-related policies. Though perhaps not as well-known as other organizations which comprise what some observers call the "anti-defense lobby," the Center for Defense Information has shown itself to be one of the most skillful and -- particularly with the creation of the CDI- and FFP-related Campaign for Peace and its ambitious media-oriented program to exploit the "Dangers of the Arms Race" -- must be regarded as a continuing force of major import as SALT and other defense controversies occupy what will probably be a growing share of national public-policy concern.

William T. Poole
Policy Analyst