

December 1979

THE ANTI-DEFENSE LOBBY: PART III COALITION FOR A NEW FOREIGN AND MILITARY POLICY

(Executive Summary)

The most comprehensive organizational manifestation of what some observers call the "anti-defense lobby" is probably the Coalition for a New Foreign and Military Policy, an apparatus that is national in scope and which styles itself as "an effort to develop a peaceful, non-interventionist and demilitarized U.S. foreign policy." The Coalition lists 43 organizations as members, and there are numerous others which cooperate with the Coalition in its "issue-oriented working groups which reach out to include organizations which are not members of the Coalition but which have an active interest in the issue." There are four of these instrumentalities (the Priorities Working Group, Human Rights Working Group, Disarmament Working Group, and Indochina Working Group); according to CNFMP literature, they "carry out much of the Coalition's work." The programs of the CNFMP are frankly geared to maximum influence on the legislative process: "The Coalition coordinates the national legislative strategy for the campaign for new national priorities."

Organizations which make up the membership of the CNFMP range from Americans for Democratic Action, the National Council of Churches, and several agencies of the United Methodist Church to such leftist operations as the American Friends Service Committee, Women Strike for Peace, and the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, along with the National Center to Slash Military Spending, the leadership of which includes identified members of the Communist Party, U.S.A., and the International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union, cited as having "long been controlled by identified members of the CPUSA." Rosters of Coalition Working Groups include, in addition to CNFMP member organizations like ADA, WSP, and AFSC, such other groups as Members of Congress for Peace Through Law; various subsidiaries of the "far-left" Institute for Policy Studies; New Directions;

the United Auto Workers; the National Student Association; the United Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers of America, expelled from the Congress of Industrial Organizations in 1949 on grounds of Communist domination; the United Nations Association; several major church organizations; the USLA Justice Committee, a front for the Trotskyite Communist Socialist Workers Party; and the National Lawyers Guild, once cited as the "foremost legal bulwark of the Communist Party, its front organizations, and controlled unions." The Center for International Policy and Center for National Security Studies, projects of the the leftist Fund for Peace, are also prominently identified with the Coalition.

The Coalition describes itself as "the peace movement, continued" and adds that "We ended the war. We can keep the peace." In fact, the CNFMP, like the "anti-defense lobby" within which it plays so important a part, has emerged, through a clear line of succession, from the anti-Vietnam war movement of the 1960s and early 1970s, a movement that was regarded by the Vietnamese Communists as "the 'Second Front' of the Vietnam war." The Coalition's immediate predecessor, the Ad Hoc Coalition for a New Foreign Policy, had originally been known as the Coalition to Stop Funding the War, characterized in 1975 by the newspaper of the Tom Hayden-Jane Fonda Indochina Peace Campaign as "the tactical leadership for the movement's developing Congressional pressure campaign." This "pressure campaign" emphasizes such issues as ending U.S. aid to regimes like those in South Africa and Chile while, at the same time, advocating "normalization of relations" with Vietnam and Cuba coupled with "reconstruction aid" for Indochina; withdrawal of American forces from South Korea; opposition to the B-1 bomber; passage of the so-called Transfer Amendment to convert military spending to "human needs" as part of a general program aimed at a drastic reordering of spending priorities combined with steady reduction in American military spending; and approval of the strategic arms limitation (SALT II) agreement.

This program requires a budget that, according to the most recent available estimate, runs into six figures; the projected budget for 1978 was \$143,680, of which \$28,000 was to be for the Coalition's field program. Contributions are solicited from the approximately 7,000 claimed "members of the network," with assistance also apparently received from other organizations. In running its field program, the Coalition has benefited from "a salary sharing relationship with local organizations." Additional benefit is derived from being able to appeal for funds by advertising that contributions for "public education and organizing work" may be "made payable to the" Budget Priorities Project of the tax-exempt Youth Project; earlier Coalition literature stated that checks could be "made payable to the United Methodist Church, Board of Church and Society."

COALITION FOR A NEW FOREIGN AND MILITARY POLICY

INTRODUCTION

The Coalition for a New Foreign and Military Policy (CNFMP) is probably, from an organizational standpoint, the most comprehensive effort mounted to date by those individuals and organizations active throughout the United States in propaganda and agitation campaigns against allegedly excessive defense spending and weapons development, a movement seen by some observers as an "anti-defense lobby" and by others as, in the words of a Coalition fact sheet dated November 9, 1978, "an effort to develop a peaceful, non-interventionist and demilitarized U.S. foreign policy." The Coalition claims that it "unites over 40 national religious, peace, labor and social action organizations" around this goal, according to a press release dated April 16, 1979, which source also emphasizes, as does much other Coalition material, a specifically legislative orientation: "The Coalition coordinates the national legislative strategy for the campaign for new national priorities."

ORIGINS

According to a CNFMP Action Alert dated May 26, 1976, the Coalition for a New Foreign and Military Policy was "[f]ormally launched on May 1 [1976] as a merger of the Coalition on National Priorities and Military Policy and the Ad Hoc Coalition for a New Foreign Policy," the aim being to "combine a close relationship with Capitol Hill with an extensive grassroots network of activists to create a highly effective force for change." The Ad Hoc Coalition had, in turn, been founded in late 1972 as the Coalition to Stop Funding the War, an appellation indicative of something which is far too little appreciated; namely, that the present-day "anti-defense lobby" has emerged, through a clear line of succession, from the anti-Vietnam war movement of the 1960s and early 1970s. Thus, it is hardly coincidental that the Coalition for a New Foreign and Military Policy, as shown by one of its basic promotional brochures, has described itself as "the peace movement, continued. Still going strong," adding that "We ended the war. We can keep the peace." As will be seen subsequently, organizations which today comprise the CNFMP also, to a significant extent, functioned as active components of the various national "anti-war" coalitions which operated, whatever the motivations of the less politically sophisticated among them, essentially to undermine American resolve in Vietnam while providing an almost incalculable propaganda and morale boost to the Communists in North Vietnam and in the Hanoi-controlled National Liberation Front of South Vietnam. First, however, it is perhaps best to discuss briefly the organizational composition of the Coalition as it is now constituted.

MEMBER ORGANIZATIONS

Vol. 1, No. 1 of Coalition Close-Up, dated Summer 1979, carries a list of 43 organizations which serve as members of the Coalition. These groups include several major American church organizations affiliated with the National Council of Churches, along with the NCC itself and some of the nation's more prominent activist peace groups. According to this source, "The following are members of the Coalition:"

American Friends Service Committee
 Americans for Democratic Action
 BEGIN
 Business Executives Move for New National Priorities
 Center for International Policy
 Chile Legislative Center
 Church of the Brethren, Washington Office
 Christian Church (Disciples of Christ) Department of Church
 in Society
 Clergy and Laity Concerned
 Council on Hemispheric Affairs
 Episcopal Peace Fellowship
 Friends Committee on National Legislation
 Friends of the Filipino People
 International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union
 Mennonite Central Committee, Peace Section, U.S.A.
 Movement for a Free Philippines
 National Assembly for Women Religious
 National Association of Social Workers
 National Center to Slash Military Spending
 National Council of Churches
 National Federation of Priests' Councils, U.S.A.
 National Gray Panthers
 National Office of Jesuit Social Ministries
 Network
 Northern Ohio Project on National Priorities
 SANE
 TAPOL
 Union of American Hebrew Congregations
 Unitarian Universalist Association
 United Church of Christ, Board for Homeland Ministries
 United Church of Christ, Office for Church in Society
 United Methodist Church, Board of Church and Society,
 Division of World Peace
 United Methodist Church, Board of Global Ministries,
 Women's Division
 United Presbyterian Church, U.S.A., Washington Office
 U.S. People's Committee on Iran
 War Resisters League
 Washington Office on Africa
 Washington Office on Latin America
 Women's International League for Peace and Freedom
 Women Strike for Peace
 World Federalists Association

World Peacemakers
 Young Women's Christian Association of the U.S.A.

The above list includes several organizations which have not appeared on earlier rosters; conversely, because of the tendency of "movement" groups to appear and disappear with some frequency, it does not include several which have been carried in earlier Coalition publications. The list cited immediately above, for example, includes five organizations -- the Council on Hemispheric Affairs, National Assembly for Women Religious, U.S. People's Committee on Iran, War Resisters League, and YWCA -- not named in Coalition material, such as the "peace movement, continued" brochure cited earlier, disseminated during 1978 and as recently as the first six months of 1979; the same brochure, on the other hand, included three organizations -- the Argentine Commission for Human Rights, FRIENDSHIPMENT, and Inter-University Committee to Stop Funding War and Militarism -- not carried in the summer 1979 list.

The earliest complete listing of CNFMP member organizations used in preparation of the present study appears in the Coalition's Action Alert for Winter/Spring 1977. For purposes of comparison, it is set forth in full at this point:

American Friends Service Committee
 Americans for Democratic Action
 Business Executive[s] Move for New National Priorities
 Campaign for a Democratic Foreign Policy
 Chile Legislative Center
 Church of the Brethren, Washington Office
 Christian Church (Disciples of Christ), Department of Church
 in Society
 Clergy and Laity Concerned
 Episcopal Peace Fellowship
 Friends Committee on National Legislation
 FRIENDSHIPMENT
 Friends of Indochina Organizing Committee
 Friends of the Filipino People
 Indochina Resource Center
 International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union
 Inter-University Committee to Stop Funding War and Militarism
 Jesuit Conference, Office of Social Ministries
 Mennonite Central Committee
 National Association of Social Workers
 National Council of Churches
 Network
 SANE
 Tapol
 Union of American Hebrew Congregations
 Unitarian Universalist Association
 United Church of Christ, Board for Homeland Ministries
 United Methodist Church, Board of Church and Society
 United Methodist Church, Board of Global Ministries,
 Women's Division

United Presbyterian Church, U.S.A., Washington Office
 Washington Office on Africa
 Washington Office on Latin America
 Women's International League for Peace and Freedom
 Women Strike for Peace

COALITION "WORKING GROUPS"

In addition to its member groups, the Coalition has attracted several other organizations as participants in what its November 9, 1978, fact sheet calls "issue-oriented working groups which reach out to include organizations which are not members of the Coalition but which have an active interest in the issue." Most available CNFMP literature refers to three such groups: the Priorities Working Group, Human Rights Working Group, and Disarmament Working Group. A recent brochure, however, also refers to a fourth: "Our Indochina Working group seeks reconciliation and diplomatic relations with countries in that war-ravaged region." According to the Coalition's Priorities Action Guide 1978, among other sources, these groups "carry out much of the Coalition's work." Available literature, including the Priorities Action Guide 1978 (which is the most recent obtainable edition, although an updated version is "in process," according to a Coalition staff employee), does not list those organizations which participate in the Priorities Working Group; and the same is true of the Indochina Working Group.

A presumably complete list of organizations affiliated with the Disarmament Working Group appeared in the CNFMP Disarmament Action Guide Winter 1977-78, an enumeration which included both DWG members which are also members of the Coalition and "Disarmament Working Group members who are not members of" the CNFMP. The first category included the following:

American Friends Service Committee
 Americans for Democratic Action
 Business Executives Move for New National Priorities
 Church of the Brethren, Washington Office
 Christian Church (Disciples of Christ) Department of Church
 in Society
 Friends Committee on National Legislation
 Inter-University Committee to Stop Funding War and Militarism
 Jesuit Conference, Office of Social Ministries
 Mennonite Central Committee
 National Council of Churches
 Network
 SANE
 Union of American Hebrew Congregations
 United Church of Christ, Office for Church and Society
 United Methodist Church, Board of Church and Society,
 Division of World Peace
 United Presbyterian Church, U.S.A., Washington Office
 Women's International League for Peace and Freedom

Women Strike for Peace
World Federalists Association/USA

"Disarmament Working Group members who are not members of the Coalition" were listed as follows:

American Ethical Union
Another Mother for Peace
Disarm Education Fund
Fellowship of Reconciliation
Institute for Policy Studies Militarism and Disarmament Project
Institute for World Order
New Directions
United Auto Workers
World Conference on Religion and Peace
World Without War Council

This source claimed a total DWG membership of "31 national labor, peace, religious, educational and political organizations committed to the goal of stopping the arms race." With publication of the Disarmament Action Guide 1979, the number had risen to "nearly 40 national religious, peace, labor and political organizations committed to the goal of promoting international security by halting and reversing the world's arms race and diverting those resources to meeting human needs." The 1979 version does not specify which of the Coalition's member organizations are also participants in the Disarmament Working Group, although it does, with respect to non-member groups, list the "following organizations [which] are not members of the Coalition, but participate" in this aspect of the Coalition's activities:

American Ethical Union
Council on Economic Priorities, Conversion Information Center
Churches' Center for Theology and Public Policy
Disarm Education Fund
Environmental Policy Center
Environmentalists for Full Employment
Exploratory Project for Economic Alternatives
Fellowship of Reconciliation
International Association of Machinists
Institute for Policy Studies, Militarism and Disarmament Project
Institute for World Order
Maryknoll Fathers, Office of Justice and Peace
Members of Congress for Peace Through Law
NARMIC*
New Directions
United Auto Workers
United Electrical Workers
United Nations Association/USA
World Conference on Religion and Peace
Young Women's Christian Association

*National Action/Research on the Military-Industrial Complex, a project of the tax-exempt American Friends Service Committee.

The Coalition's Human Rights Working Group also encompasses a wide range of organizations, many of them demonstrably leftist, around a multiplicity of human rights issues, especially, as shown by the CNFMP Covenants Action Guide, ratification of the United Nations Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and the UN Covenant on Economic, Social, and Cultural Rights. An undated Coalition document, "A DESCRIPTION OF THE HUMAN RIGHTS WORKING GROUP," avers that "Through the Working Group, over 60 national organizations plan strategy and implement common activities" around human rights issues and adds that membership "is open to any national organization that supports its legislative and educational goals and includes organizations which are not members of the Coalition as well as groups which for tax or charter purposes cannot formally join the Coalition." As with the Disarmament Working Group, the most recent available Covenants Action Guide does not specify which members of the CNFMP are also participants in the Human Rights Working Group, although it does include a roster of "Organizations that participate in the HRWG which are not members of the Coalition:"

The Action Center
 American Committee on Africa
 American Ethical Union
 Amnesty International, Washington Office
 Argentine Information Service Center
 Campaign to Stop Government Spying
 Center for Law and Social Policy
 Center for National Security Studies
 Center of Concern
 Church World Service
 Committee to Defend Political Prisoners in Iran
 CounterSpy
 Human Rights Education Project
 Institute for Policy Studies
 International Human Rights Program, Christian Church
 (Disciples of Christ)
 Liberty to the Captives
 Middle East Resource Center
 NARMIC
 National Lawyers Guild
 National Student Association
 New Directions
 North American Coalition for Human Rights in Korea
 North American Congress on Latin America
 Office of Social Justice and Peace, Maryknoll Fathers
 Office of Social Concerns, Maryknoll Sisters
 Palestine Human Rights Campaign
 Project on National Security and Civil Liberties (ACLU and
 CNSS)
 Sojourners
 Southeast Asia Resource Center
 Transnational Institute
 United Nations Association/USA
 USLA Justice Committee

One other organization is also listed, but in a somewhat different manner: "The United States Catholic Conference works with the HRWG on issues of mutual concern." The above-cited "DESCRIPTION OF THE HUMAN RIGHTS WORKING GROUP" carries the same listing of cooperating organizations with one addition, the "Latin American and Caribbean [sic] Office, Christian Church (Disciples of Christ)." This document, unlike the Covenants Action Guide,* lists the "HRWG Co-chairpeople" and the membership of the "HRWG Steering Committee," a total of nine people representing the National Lawyers Guild, which is a member of the HRWG, and the following Coalition member organizations: Clergy and Laity Concerned; Americans for Democratic Action; Washington Office, Church of the Brethren; United Church of Christ; American Friends Service Committee; Friends of the Filipino People; Washington Office on Africa; and Women Strike for Peace. In addition, there are listed, as "Co-chairpeople of the Coalition and ex-officio members of the HRWG Steering Committee," representatives of the Friends Committee on National Legislation and the Board of Global Ministries of the United Methodist Church.

SELECTED COALITION MEMBER ORGANIZATIONS AND AFFILIATES

In many cases, organizations which constitute the Coalition for a New Foreign and Military Policy are familiar and easily recognized. The character of Americans for Democratic Action, for example, is well known; since its inception in 1947, ADA has, under the leadership of such outspoken liberals as Joseph L. Rauh, Jr., and James Wechsler, been among the nation's preeminent

*Since preparation of this study, the Coalition has published a revised Covenants Action Guide and a complementary Human Rights Action Guide, both of which carry listings of groups "that participate in the HRWG which are not members of" the CNFMP. The roster carried in the revised Covenants Action Guide is the more complete of the two and, because of significant changes from the earlier list cited above, is set forth in full at this point: American Committee on Africa; American Ethical Union; Amnesty International, Washington Office; Bread for the World; Campaign for Political Rights; Center for Law and Social Policy; Center for National Security Studies; Center of Concern; Church World Service; Committee for Human Rights in Iran; Counterspy; EPICA; Friends of the Korean People; Haitian Refugee Concerns; Human Rights Internet; IMPACT; Institute for Policy Studies; International Association of Machinists and Aerospace Workers; International Lawyer's Committee for Human Rights; International League of Human Rights; Interreligious Task Force on U.S. Food Policy; Liberty to the Captives; Lutheran Council USA; Members of Congress for Peace Through Law; Middle East Resource Center; NARMIC; National Association of Women Religious; National Lawyers Guild; New Directions; North American Coalition for Human Rights in Korea; North American Congress on Latin America; Office of Social Justice and Peace, Maryknoll Fathers; Office of Social Concerns, Maryknoll Sisters; Palestine Human Rights Campaign; Sojourners; Southeast Asia Resource Center; Tabor House; Transnational Institute; United Auto Workers, International Division; United Nations Association/USA; Union of Democratic Thais; Young Women's Christian Association. Again, "The United States Catholic Conference" also "works with the HRWG on issues of mutual concern."

advocates of the economic and political liberalism that came to the fore during the years of the Great Depression and the New Deal administration of President Franklin Delano Roosevelt. Like many other groups which form what the CNFMP calls the "Coalition network," ADA has as one of its current priorities the achievement of U.S. Senate ratification of the strategic arms limitation (SALT II) agreements, an effort described by ADA National Director Leon Shull as "our single most important job now."

Similarly, the many religiously oriented groups affiliated with the Coalition are at least equally well known. The National Council of Churches is perhaps the most prominent self-proclaimed voice of American liberal Protestantism, and many of the church groups which work within the "Coalition network" also form active parts of the NCC's own network. Of particular current interest is the degree to which the NCC and CNFMP interlock with the recently-formed Religious Committee on SALT, which is among the plethora of organizations working actively for Senate ratification of the SALT II agreements. One of the organizations affiliated with the Coalition's Disarmament Working Group and Human Rights Working Group is the American Ethical Union, the Washington Office of which is also listed as a member of the Religious Committee in one of its promotional brochures, "Please Pass the S.A.L.T." Other Coalition-affiliated religious organizations so listed include, exactly as carried in the Religious Committee brochure, the Christian Church (Disciples of Christ), Dept. of Church in Society; Church of the Brethren; Friends Committee on National Legislation; National Assembly of Women Religious; National Council of Churches of Christ in the USA; National Federation of Priests' Councils; Network; Unitarian Universalist Association; United Church of Christ, Office for Church in Society; United Methodist Church, Global Ministries--Women's Division; United Presbyterian Church, USA; and US Catholic Conference.

In order to appreciate the far-flung nature of the NCC's concerns, it should be observed that the NCC is actively involved in affairs of the World Council of Churches, which is in turn deeply involved in providing support to so-called "liberation" movements in Africa and elsewhere. As documented in a comprehensive paper issued by the London-based Institute for the Study of Conflict (Conflict Studies No. 105, "World Council of Churches' Programme To Combat Racism," March 1979), the Central Committee of the WCC is on record as calling "upon the churches to move beyond charity, grants and traditional programming to relevant and sacrificial action leading to new relationships of dignity and justice among all men and to become agents for the radical reconstruction of society," such reconstruction being defined as "a transfer of economic resources to undergird the redistribution of political power and to make cultural self-determination meaningful." To implement this radical policy, the WCC has established a Special Fund to Combat Racism, the "basic underlying concept" of which is expressed as "that of a redistribution of power (economic, political, social, cultural, ecclesiastical)." The Institute study reflects that "the largest contributors" to the Special Fund "have been the Dutch Churches, followed by West

Germany, Sweden, the USA and Canada...." Organizations which have presumably met the WCC's criteria and which have received often substantial grants of money from the Special Fund include a number of terrorist groups, many of them Communist-backed, such as the Mozambique Liberation Front (FRELIMO), the Popular Movement for the Liberation of Angola (MPLA), the African Party for the Independence of Portuguese Guinea and the Cape Verde Islands (PAIGC), the South-West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), the African National Congress (ANC), and the so-called Patriotic Front in Rhodesia, made up of the Zimbabwe African People's Union (ZAPU) and Zimbabwe African National Union (ZANU).

As observed immediately above, these alleged "liberation" movements have often enjoyed Communist backing, a fact that has caused severe criticism of both the World Council of Churches and the National Council of Churches in some quarters. FRELIMO, for instance, is known to incline toward the Soviet point of view and has received aid for many years from the Soviet Union, Algeria, and Sweden through the Swedish Communist Party. Similarly, both the Soviet Union and Communist Cuba have rendered significant support to the PAIGC, a terrorist movement founded by an avowed Communist and organized specifically along Leninist principles; the Soviet Union's support has included the training of PAIGC guerrilla troops, while Cuba, as in so many other areas in Africa, has gone to the extent of committing military personnel. Soviet influence is also present in SWAPO, the ANC, and ZAPU. SWAPO saboteurs have reportedly received military training in the Soviet Union, as well as in Algeria and Egypt, while the ANC, which has coordinated terrorist activities with Joshua Nkomo's ZAPU, operates as an appendage of the South African Communist Party. It is significant that these three African terrorist organizations are all represented in the membership of the World Peace Council, well known as an international Communist front organization controlled by the Communist Party of the Soviet Union; current WPC members include both Sam Nujoma, founder of SWAPO, and Joshua Nkomo, founder and leader of ZAPU, although ZANU, the other half of the "Patriotic Front" in Rhodesia, is not thus represented, doubtless because of ZANU's adherence to what one of its leaders has called the application of "Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tse-tung Thought" to the "concrete conditions of Zimbabwe liberation."

It is also worthy of note that 1978 WCC grants also went to several leftist organizations active in the United States. These included the National Conference of Black Lawyers, which received \$12,500, and the Puerto Rican Solidarity Committee, which received \$5,000. The NCBL, the leader of which is also a member of the World Peace Council and "US Representative" for the International Association of Democratic Lawyers, another principal Soviet-controlled international Communist-front apparatus, has participated in activities of the National Lawyers Guild, cited many times as a Communist-front organization; and the PRSC, led by a former member of the Trotskyite Communist Socialist Workers Party, serves as a support group for the Castroite Communist Puerto Rican Socialist Party, the leader of which has openly declared that "We are Communists."

This aspect of NCC and WCC activity has been emphasized at some length both because it appears to be insufficiently appreciated and because the NCC and several of its member denominations are so significantly represented in the CNFMP and in its various Working Groups and other activities. It is not contended that the above information is necessarily representative of a consciously anti-American or pro-Communist bias on the part of the NCC or its leadership; it is sufficient to observe that a definite pattern does appear to exist and that such predisposition as that pattern appears to indicate ought to be taken into account as one attempts to assess the importance of the position enjoyed by the NCC and its affiliates within the Coalition, to say nothing of its possible impact on the formulation of Coalition policy.

In addition to organizations like ADA and the National Council of Churches which are regarded by many people as being generally of a liberal to left-liberal cast, there are within the "Coalition network" a number of other groups the origins and leadership of which are patently leftist in character. The Chile Legislative Center is a good example because the Center serves as the Washington office of a nationwide apparatus, the National Coordinating Committee in Solidarity with Chile, also known as the National Chile Center, which has as its national coordinator a member of the World Peace Council who has also served in a leadership capacity with the Young Workers Liberation League, the youth apparatus of the Communist Party, U.S.A. The National Coordinating Committee has been described as a front for the CPUSA in documented reports by Rep. John M. Ashbrook (R-Ohio), ranking minority member of the House Committee on Internal Security, in the Congressional Record for July 11, 1974, and Rep. Larry McDonald (D-Ga.) in the Congressional Record for February 6, 1975, and May 4, 1976.

It is noted that the National Chile Center and its affiliated Chile Legislative Center sponsored an advertisement published in the September 7, 1977, edition of the Washington Post as "An Open Letter to President Carter." The purported signers of the open letter included several supporters of the Coalition for a New Foreign and Military Policy, among them Larry Birns of the Council on Hemispheric Affairs, Dr. Herman Will of the Division of World Peace of the United Methodist Church, and Chauncey A. Alexander of the National Association of Social Workers. These three organizations are, as noted previously, members of the CNFMP. Alexander, the NASW's executive director, has endorsed the Coalition for "doing a most significant job of demonstrating that protecting 'national security' should mean addressing urgent human needs...and not merely spending more and more funds for exotic new weapons." A sponsor of the National Coordinating Committee's May 1976 National Legislative Conference on Chile, Alexander appeared before the House Committee on Un-American Activities on April 27, 1962, and refused to testify when asked whether he had been "a member of the Communist Party from 1939 until 1947" and when asked, "Are you a member of the Communist Party now?" The advertisement also listed several organizations and individuals as "Supporters," among them Olga Talamante, a

representative of the American Friends Service Committee on the steering committee of the CNFMP's Human Rights Working Group who, according to the July 15, 1979, issue of Information Digest, was once "arrested in Argentina with a group of Montoneros terrorists."

A similar situation exists with respect to two other CNFMP member groups. The International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union was described in the 1970 annual report of the House Committee on Internal Security as an organization "which has long been controlled by identified members of the CPUSA;" its president for a great many years was Harry R. Bridges, who was identified many times in sworn testimony as a member of the Communist Party. The National Center to Slash Military Spending is the outgrowth of the National Conference for a Drastic Cutback in Military Spending, held in Chicago, Illinois, in April 1975. Promotional material for the National Conference was written on the letterhead of the Chicago Peace Council, cited in the 1971 annual report of the House Committee as "completely controlled by members of the CPUSA," and signed by a "peace" activist who is also a prominent member of the Illinois State Committee of the Communist Party. The call to this conference was printed by the Prompt Press, described by the Subversive Activities Control Board as "a [Communist] Party publishing organization" and as "a printing establishment whose entire stock is owned by...a Party member...." The presence of the Prompt Press "bug," union label 209, on its literature has traditionally been regarded as a reliable indication that an organization is in fact a CPUSA front operation. The 1977-1980 membership list of the World Peace Council includes the name of Pauline Rosen, a well-known Communist Party "peace" activist identified only as "Coordinator, National Center to Slash the [sic] Military Spending," in addition to that of another National Center headquarters staff employee, Frances Bordofsky, identified in the WPC list as "Chairperson, Peace and Solidarity Department, Communist Party USA."*

*This list purports to be "a vast cross-section of organized public opinion throughout the world" representing "National peace organizations, movements and political parties from more than 130 countries of all continents" and "International and regional organizations and movements agreeing with [the WPC's] principles and aims." The list of members from the United States includes 40 individuals, at least one of them a member of the CPUSA's youth front, the Young Workers Liberation League; no fewer than 17 have been identified at various times as members of the CPUSA itself, among them such prominent figures as Dr. Herbert Aptheker, the well-known Marxist scholar who is probably the Party's principal theoretician, and Jack O'Dell, also known as Hunter Pitts O'Dell, who has served as a member of the Party's National Committee and who is identified in the WPC list as "Associate Editor, 'Freedomways' Magazine [a CPUSA quarterly]" and "International Affairs Director, 'People United to Save Humanity' (PUSH)." U.S. members also include representatives of organizations within the CNFMP "network," among them Luther H. Evans, "Former Chairperson, World Federalists;" Terry Provance, "Head of Disarmament Project, American Friends Service Committee (AFSC);" and Edith Villastrigo, "Legislative Representative, Women Strike for Peace."

Another Coalition member group is FRIENDSHIPMENT, described in the January 12, 1977, issue of the Congressional Record as "organized by Cora Weiss and other anti-Vietnam activists to raise money and supplies for the Vietnamese communist regime." According to this source,

Mrs. Weiss, who has traveled on a number of occasions to Hanoi, has been a highly active organizer and financial angel for the coalitions supporting the Vietnamese Communists. She is a leader of CALC [Clergy and Laity Concerned] and Women Strike for Peace; during 1976 she worked for the July 4 Coalition (J4C), set up by the Castroite communist Puerto Rican Socialist Party (PSP) and the Weather Underground's Prairie Fire Organizing Committee (PFOC) to organize anti-Bicentennial demonstrations in Philadelphia. Her husband, National Lawyers Guild member Peter Weiss, attempted to join a defense team for the Baader-Mainhof [sic] terrorists in West Germany; has been a leader of the American Committee on Africa, a support group for African Marxist terrorists for many years; and is a trustee of the Institute for Policy Studies (IPS).

The same source also reflects that contributions to FRIENDSHIPMENT "are routed through the Bach Mai Hospital Fund, a project of the Communist Party's youth group, the Young Workers Liberation League (YWLL)." During the Vietnam war, FRIENDSHIPMENT organizer Cora Weiss served as co-chairman, with self-identified non-Soviet Communist David Dellinger, of the Committee of Liaison with Families of Servicemen Detained in North Vietnam, an organization described by the House Committee on Internal Security, after careful investigation, as a "pro-communist" organization which, as a front for the Communist-dominated New Mobilization Committee to End the War in Vietnam, operated "at the specific bidding of the communists in Hanoi" as "a propaganda tool of the North Vietnamese Government, playing upon the hopes and anxieties of the wives of American prisoners of war for communist propaganda purposes."

The Institute for Policy Studies is well represented in the CNFMP and its Disarmament and Human Rights Working Groups, as noted previously. IPS, described in the 1971 annual report of the House Committee on Internal Security as "the far-left radical 'think tank' in Washington, D.C.," was discussed in detail in a previous Heritage Foundation study (Institution Analysis No. 2, "Institute for Policy Studies," May 1977) of the IPS program and "the obviously radical aims of the Institute's principal leadership." IPS and one of its chief subsidiaries, the Transnational Institute (TNI), are participants in the CNFMP Human Rights Working Group; one of TNI's principal leaders is also head of the British section of the Fourth International, a world-wide Trotskyite Communist apparatus which supports terrorist violence. Two participants in the CNFMP Disarmament Working Group are the IPS Militarism and Disarmament Project and the Exploratory Project

for Economic Alternatives. It is noteworthy that the Cato Institute, a libertarian organization, advertises a "major, on-going joint project with" IPS to "study the military, financial and political implications for a strictly non-interventionist United States foreign policy" with a view to holding "an international conference" during 1979. EPEA, another outgrowth of IPS led by Gar Alperovitz and Jeff Faux, has as its declared goal the achievement of "fundamental change in the way our economy is organized." EPEA has been deeply involved in another operation, Americans for a Working Economy, which views the American economic system as one of "corporate monopoly power" that "produces corporate profits, but increasingly destroys human lives."

Another group within the Disarmament Working Group is the United Electrical Workers, more properly known as the United Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers of America, an independent union expelled from the Congress of Industrial Organizations in 1949 on grounds of Communist domination. UE has been prominently represented in an extremely large number of CPUSA front movements throughout its history and still has within its leadership many individuals identified at various times as members of the Communist Party; one of these, Ernest de Maio, is today a member of the World Peace Council and United Nations representative for the World Federation of Trade Unions, another Soviet-controlled international Communist-front apparatus. Similarly, within the Human Rights Working Group one finds the National Lawyers Guild, described in a 1950 report of the House Committee on Un-American Activities as "the foremost legal bulwark of the Communist Party, its front organizations, and controlled unions." The Committee report further observed that "Through its affiliation with the International Association of Democratic Lawyers, an international Communist-front organization, the National Lawyers Guild has constituted itself an agent of a foreign principal hostile to the interests of the United States." The Guild remains affiliated with the IADL. As of its 1973 convention, the Guild declared that it was "attempting to support those organizing within the American working class since we believe it is only the workers who have the power to seize control of the means of production...." An authoritative report on the most recent Guild convention published in the May 4, 1979, Information Digest alleges that "Since the late 1960s when an influx of New Left activists swelled the NLG's ranks, the organization has been controlled by a leadership that has not deviated from the international political lines of Moscow, Havana and Hanoi." Interestingly, at a February 1978 NLG National Executive Board meeting, a so-called Democratic Caucus charged, in protesting the Guild's alleged support of the terrorist Palestine Liberation Organization, that "the Leadership has conducted Guild affairs as though we were a committed Marxist-Leninist entity" and denounced the "predisposition of the International Committee to identify the Guild with the position of the 'socialist' countries on every major international issue."

Three other Coalition-affiliated organizations are of particular interest at this point. One, the USLA Justice Committee

(US Committee for Justice to Latin American Political Prisoners), is well documented in public source accounts as a front for the Socialist Workers Party, largest Trotskyite Communist organization in the United States. USLA is run primarily by members of the SWP and its youth and training section, the Young Socialist Alliance, and has been described by a leading Venezuelan Trotskyite as an organization whose "effective work" has been "organized and promoted" by the Socialist Workers Party. The USLA Justice Committee is part of the CNFMP Human Rights Working Group, as is another avowedly radical group, the North American Congress on Latin America (NACLA), characterized by the House Committee on Internal Security as "an offshoot of SDS" and by itself as the "intelligence-gathering arm" of the New Left. NACLA's overall perspective is regarded as pro-Castro.

The Women's International League for Peace and Freedom and Women Strike for Peace are both members of the CNFMP and participants in its Disarmament Working Group. WILPF and WSP were active participants in the anti-Vietnam war agitation of the 1960s and early 1970s; and both WSP and the Cleveland, Ohio, affiliate of WILPF are among American organizations represented in the current membership of the World Peace Council. The 1961 report of the California Senate Fact-Finding Subcommittee on Un-American Activities observed that "Any organization of a liberal character that is interested in achieving results that are in coincidental conformity with the Communist line is a natural target for infiltration" by Communists and further stated, "So it has been with the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom." According to the Subcommittee's report, the "objectives of the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom thus being in conformity with the international Party line, some infiltration was inevitable." The Subcommittee was careful to point out that Communist infiltration of WILPF "on a national scale...has not been sufficiently acute to warrant characterizing the organization as a Communist front or Communist-dominated" but did conclude that "In California, and some other localities, however, the invasion has been far more serious." In fact, as shown by the California report and by a wealth of other documentary evidence, identified members of the Communist Party have been prominently involved in WILPF chapters in such major American cities as San Francisco, California, and Chicago, Illinois; and the Subcommittee report ventured so far as to conclude that WILPF "in California was heavily infiltrated and at one time perhaps dominated, by the Communist Party." A similar situation appears to apply with respect to Women Strike for Peace, characterized in 1967 by the House Committee on Un-American Activities as "an organization which, since it was first formed in the fall of 1961, has enjoyed the complete support of the Communist Party." The Committee also observed that its 1962 hearings on WSP "revealed that a large number of key officers in the New York, New Jersey, Connecticut section of this group were or had been members of the Communist Party."

One more group deserves special mention because of the degree of its involvement in the Coalition: the American Friends Service Committee. AFSC was among the most active organizers and supporters of the anti-Vietnam war movement and, according to a political science professor quoted in the June 9, 1979, issue of the New Republic, "went beyond the traditional conscientious objection to outright support of Hanoi," an allegation denied by the chairman of AFSC's board of directors in the July 7 & 14, 1979, issue of the same publication. The June 9 New Republic article states that at an April 1979 conference in Washington, D.C., on "The Search for Peace in the Middle East," AFSC "managed to present a facade of balance, but the tone of the conference was strongly sympathetic to the PLO (one evening featured a special reading of revolutionary poems by a Palestinian poet) and the workshops focused on ways of persuading the US to pressure Israel to make concessions to the Palestinians." As noted previously, AFSC is represented in the current membership of the Soviet-controlled World Peace Council, according to the WPC's own official list.

The January 12, 1977, edition of the Congressional Record carried extended excerpts from a 1972 AFSC pamphlet, "Nonviolence: Not First for Export," which declared that "Revolution then is needed first and foremost in the United States, thoroughgoing revolution, not a mild palliative. Specific and far-reaching changes are needed in American foreign policy, with equally specific and thoroughgoing changes in the U.S. domestic scene." AFSC's perspective may be seen clearly in the following paragraphs:

Any sensitive recollection of the imperialistic rise of the western nations during the past five centuries compels us to see the central role played by violence in their assumption of power over the people of Africa, Asia, and Latin America. This has been apparent not only in the military structures of control, but in the political, economic and cultural forms of coercion and domination. At the heart of western hegemony has been its ultimate power to overwhelm with physical force the colonized people who have thus been pushed against the wall by the keepers of repressive law and oppressive order. They have seen no recourse other than to take up the same arms which were used to exploit them. They have been taught by the West that force and violence are the ultimate arbiters of human destiny, and reluctantly they have been moved to action based on those suppositions.

Violence has become most apparent when the dispossessed have demanded the right to control their own land and destiny. In response to such insistent demands, every weapon in the western arsenal, from subversion and napalm to the threat of atomic destruction, has been used to maintain the unjust and oppressive power of the ruling forces. We can now see that violence

permeates the status quo as, for example, in South Africa.... The U.S. has allied itself economically with the violence of this status quo, and we ourselves are a part of it.

Based on such an analysis, the rhetoric of which will doubtless strike many readers as all too familiar, AFSC concluded that "It should surprise no one, therefore, that Third World forces have turned to counter-violence as a means of winning their freedom." The pamphlet also speaks of "the violence of the status quo in America," violence allegedly "compounded of slights and insults, of rampant injustice, of exploitation, of police brutality, of a thousand indignities from dawn to dusk and through the night." It is perhaps hardly surprising that AFSC should describe terrorism as a term used, presumably by the oppressive ruling classes, "to signify violent action" by "oppressed peoples in Asia, Africa, Latin America, or within the black ghettos of America, as they take up the weapons of violence in a desperate effort to wrest for themselves the freedom and justice denied them by the systems that presently control their lives." It hardly seems a condemnation of terrorist violence to contend that "Long before the first freedom fighter laid hold upon a gun, or club, long before the first brick was thrown in Watts or Newark, racist societies were already guilty of a ruthless reign of terror where freedom was suppressed and human dignity denied." It is the AFSC position that "before we deplore terrorism it is essential for us to recognize fully and clearly whose 'terrorism' came first, so that we can assess what is cause and what is effect." Thus, AFSC declares that "Instead of trying to devise nonviolent strategy and tactics for revolutionaries in other lands, we will bend every effort to defuse militarism in our own land and to secure the withdrawal of American economic investment in oppressive regimes in other parts of the world."

THE ANTI-VIETNAM WAR MOVEMENT

As noted previously, the Coalition for a New Foreign and Military Policy characterizes itself as "the peace movement, continued" and proclaims in its literature that "We ended the war" in Vietnam. Thus, if one is to gain a clear understanding of how the Coalition has evolved and just what the concerns of its member organizations and affiliates have been, it becomes necessary to appreciate the realities of the anti-Vietnam war movement which came to such national and international prominence during the 1960s and early 1970s. This is all the more essential because of a widespread tendency, especially among people regarded as opinion leaders in the news media and elsewhere in American life, to accept and to perpetuate the notion that this was merely a movement of the young and idealistic, led by activists whose sole, or at least primary, motivation was opposition to war as an instrument of national policy. Such a view, systematically reinforced as it has been by constant portrayal of even the more militant and disruptive elements of the "peace" movement as

pacifists in newspapers and on the evening news, may well be pleasant; but it is also at variance with the facts, particularly insofar as the principal leadership of the movement is concerned. The degree to which this is the case has been indicated in some detail in a separate study (Heritage Foundation Institution Analysis No. 11, "The Anti-Defense Lobby: Part II, 'The Peace Movement, Continued,'" September 1979); for purposes of clarity and continuity, however, the evidence treated therein should perhaps be summarized at this point.

During the years of increasing anti-Vietnam war protest, a period which began in earnest in 1965 and which reached its zenith in 1971, public opposition to the war achieved its most visible impact in a series of mass demonstrations and propaganda campaigns organized most effectively under the auspices of a succession of national coalitions. These were the National Coordinating Committee to End the War in Vietnam, formed in 1965; the November 8 Mobilization Committee, organized in September 1966; the Spring Mobilization Committee to End the War in Vietnam, organized in November 1966; the National Mobilization Committee to End the War in Vietnam, an outgrowth of a national conference held in Washington, D.C., during May 1967; the New Mobilization Committee to End the War in Vietnam, which succeeded National Mobe as the result of another conference held in Cleveland, Ohio, in July 1969; and two rival coalitions, the National Peace Action Coalition and Peoples Coalition for Peace and Justice, the latter being the successor to an intermediate apparatus known as the National Coalition Against War, Racism, and Repression.

All of these agglomerations were in fact the same basic coalition operating under different names. Called "umbrella" coalitions, these successive incarnations included a fairly wide variety of organizations, both Communist and non-Communist, among them the American Friends Service Committee, Clergy and Laymen Concerned About Vietnam (now known as Clergy and Laity Concerned), Episcopal Peace Fellowship, Fellowship of Reconciliation, Women Strike for Peace, Americans for Democratic Action, National Council of Churches, National Student Association, SANE, War Resisters League, Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, various agencies of the United Methodist Church, Union of American Hebrew Congregations, Unitarian Universalist Association, Institute for Policy Studies, United Electrical Workers, United Church of Christ, World Without War Council, and National Lawyers Guild, all of them currently part of the "network" of the Coalition for a New Foreign and Military Policy. Members -- and, in many cases, official representatives -- of some groups would appear on rosters of leaders and organizers at one juncture or another, with groups like Women Strike for Peace and the American Friends Service Committee represented at every stage of development. The true common denominator, however, was not the involvement of pacifists or religious types; rather, it was the unbroken thread of Communist participation and direction that endured throughout the course of the war. As the House Committee on Un-American Activities observed in its 1967 report, Communist Origin and Manipulation of Vietnam Week,

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

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

This assessment, based on a vast accumulation of evidence, was accurate as of 1967; and it remained accurate thereafter as the anti-Vietnam war movement grew in scope and militancy, always maintaining a close working relationship with such international Communist "peace" movements as the World Peace Council and with representatives of the government of North Vietnam and the National Liberation Front of South Vietnam. The Vietnamese Communists were most effusive in their expressions of appreciation for the support rendered them by what North Vietnamese Premier Pham Van Dong called their "friends in America," and key American movement leaders were equally effusive in their partisanship for the Vietnamese Communist side in the war. As the Young People's Socialist League put it in 1969, "Many in the leadership [of New Mobe] are more committed to an NLF victory than to peace," a sentiment echoed by one of the leaders of the YPSL, Josh Muravchic, who stated that "those people do not properly belong in the peace movement. They are not for peace. They are hawks on the other side." This denunciation from outside New Mobe's ranks should be considered in conjunction with the following statement made by one of New Mobe's co-chairmen, Professor Douglas Dowd of Cornell University, one of the movement's more important luminaries:

One of the tensions that we've had to work out within the National Mobilization [Committee] and consequently the New Mobilization [Committee] is that the people who are doing the organizing for this kind of thing, almost all of them, really feel that not only the war should end but if there had to be a side in that war I think most of us feel we would be on the other side [emphasis added].

Reference has already been made to the "unbroken thread of Communist participation and direction" which provided the real continuity in the "peace" movement during the Vietnam era. It is not without significance that credit for the first street demonstration against the war in Vietnam is claimed by a Communist group, Youth Against War and Fascism, rather than by an organization of a more orthodox pacifist sort. One of the primary reasons

for the success enjoyed by Communists and their collaborators within the anti-Vietnam war movement was that its basic organizational tenet was the doctrine of "nonexclusion," which meant that Communists were to be welcomed into the movement at every level on a basis of presumed equality with other types. The inevitable result, because of the uniquely disciplined sense of purpose with which Communists are by definition possessed, was that organizations like the Communist Party, U.S.A., the Socialist Workers Party, and their respective youth groups were able to dominate the national coalitions at every stage of their development. Evidence for this contention exists in a multiplicity of authoritative sources ranging from the hearings and studies of committees of Congress to the first-hand observations of several of the movement's key activists.

A good example is the National Coordinating Committee to End the War in Vietnam. An outgrowth of workshop sessions held during an August 1965 mobilization of pro-Communist strength known as the Assembly of Unrepresented People, the NCCEWV was described in the following terms by an Assembly organizer, Staughton Lynd: "Moving into the [leadership] vacuum, Communist Party members and sympathizers helped to create a National Coordinating Committee to End the War in Vietnam, with themselves in key roles at its national headquarters...." Lynd's background has long been conspicuous for adherence to fronts and causes of the CPUSA, a fact which lends particular interest to the assessment of another movement leader, Peter Camejo of the Young Socialist Alliance, youth organization of the Socialist Workers Party, with reference to the founding conference of the NCCEWV: "The CP carried the majority at that conference. The national coalition that came out of that conference -- the National Coordinating Committee -- never really had the character of a national antiwar coalition -- it was always run by the CP."

The tone of Camejo's statement is indicative of another aspect of anti-Vietnam war organizing: the unceasing rivalry that existed between the Moscow-controlled Communist Party, U.S.A., and the Trotskyite Socialist Workers Party. While sharing the common goal of undermining the United States position in Vietnam to facilitate the achievement of a Communist military victory, the CPUSA and SWP were under no illusions as to the historic differences between them. As a member of the CPUSA said in a report during 1970 to the New York Section Committee of the Young Workers Liberation League, official CPUSA youth front, the Communist Party recognized that "The Trotskyites (SWP, YSA variety) are the major ideological grouping that we must contend with in the peace movement." Similarly, in a 1969 convention resolution on the "peace" movement, the Socialist Workers Party explicitly acknowledged the CPUSA as the "the major long-term competitor of the revolutionary Marxists [of the SWP] for leadership of the working-class vanguard."

This constant struggle for power between the dominant Communist elements in the movement helped account for the demise of

the NCCEWV. As Lynd observed, the Trotskyite response to domination by CPUSA members and sympathizers was "a disciplined attempt at takeover at the NCCEWV's first national convention." These difficulties led to a conference in September 1966 which resulted in the formation of what was basically a successor apparatus, the November 8 Mobilization Committee. This gathering was purportedly the idea of a Cleveland, Ohio, "peace" group led by an individual whose background included prior membership in the Wisconsin State Committee of the CPUSA, as well as collaboration at a subsequent point with members of the SWP; according to Camejo, however, the initiative lay more precisely with the Trotskyite forces: "So what we did was initiate an antiwar conference in which antiwar forces could coalesce, bypassing the NCC." Among the approximately 150 delegates and observers were significant numbers of individuals with backgrounds of membership in the CPUSA, the SWP, and their youth groups, several of them key leaders in organizations and coalitions that formed the backbone of anti-Vietnam war organizing at the local and regional levels around the country.

This pattern continued at the conference which formed November 8 Mobe's successor coalition, the Spring Mobilization Committee to End the War in Vietnam. Again, according to Camejo, the initiative lay with the SWP and YSA, a claim which assumes some validity when it is realized that, at the minimum, approximately 65 percent of those registered for the gathering were members of either the SWP or the YSA, with both the CPUSA and its youth arm also enjoying significant representation. One of the principal bases of Communist strength in Spring Mobe was the Student Mobilization Committee to End the War in Vietnam, an organization originally formed at the instance of the CPUSA and later taken over, both nationally and locally, by the SWP and YSA. The increasingly obvious reality of the relationship between Communist and other power within the coalition led the House Committee to conclude in Communist Origin and Manipulation of Vietnam Week that "Communists are playing dominant roles in both the Student Mobilization Committee and the Spring Mobilization Committee."

Similarly, at the May 1967 conference which resulted in Spring Mobe's being reconstituted as the National Mobilization Committee to End the War in Vietnam, an enterprise the chief claim to fame to which was probably the riotous demonstrations coincident with the Democratic National Convention during August 1968 in Chicago, Illinois, more than 300 of the approximately 700 people registered were members of the Communist Party, the Socialist Workers Party, their youth groups, or Youth Against War and Fascism. Referring to the basic continuity of Communist and pro-Communist leadership in the coalition, the House Committee on Internal Security noted in its annual report for 1970 that, after this conference, "the composition of Mobe's leadership remained substantially the same as before." The same held true for the coalition as it became the New Mobilization Committee at a conference in Cleveland, Ohio, during July 1969. The host organization was a local coalition run by the Socialist Workers Party, and the program adopted was largely the direct result of skillful behind-

the-scenes manipulation by the SWP and its allies. The SWP's motivation in this effort was clearly expressed in the July 18, 1969, edition of the organization's official newspaper, The Militant, which declared that SWP and YSA representatives "sought to demonstrate that revolutionaries who regarded themselves as partisans of the Vietnamese liberation struggle" felt obligated "to build a broad mass movement" against the war "from the standpoint of aiding the Vietnamese revolution as well as from the standpoint of accelerating the radicalizing process in this country."

As with each previous stage, the pattern of Communist involvement in New Mobe was clear from the beginning. The coalition's leaders maintained continuous liaison with the World Peace Council, the North Vietnamese, and representatives of the National Liberation Front, while members of the CPUSA, SWP, and their youth fronts managed to occupy leading positions in New Mobe itself and, perhaps even more importantly, in the many local and regional operations in key cities and states across the country which were indispensable in getting the rank and file mobilized for the mass national demonstrations that were so gratefully received by the Communists in Hanoi and elsewhere. This pattern was such that, after detailed hearings, the House Committee could conclude in its 1970 annual report that New Mobe was "under communist domination." The committee further observed that "the Communist Party, Socialist Workers Party, Young Socialist Alliance, and Student Mobilization Committee played leading roles" in planning for New Mobe's schedule of demonstrations, known as the "Fall Offensive," in 1969 "and, to a large extent, have managed to dominate the New Mobilization Committee."

The continuing struggle for control between the CPUSA and SWP resulted in the breaking up of the coalition in 1970. One faction, the reflection of CPUSA strength within the movement, became the National Coalition Against War, Racism, and Repression, which, in 1971, became the Peoples Coalition for Peace and Justice; the other constituted itself the National Peace Action Coalition under virtually absolute control of the SWP. The House Committee on Internal Security conducted extensive investigations of these two coalitions during 1971 and reported that "the National Peace Action Coalition (NPAC) is tightly controlled by the Socialist Workers Party and that a generally predominant influence in the Peoples Coalition for Peace & Justice (PCPJ) has been exercised by the Communist Party, U.S.A." One of the most revelatory aspects of NPAC-PCPJ activity was the achievement of unity around a schedule of demonstrations in April 1971 at the specific instance of Xuan Thuy, chief North Vietnamese negotiator in Paris, who issued a strong appeal for unity of action against American "aggression" in Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia. These demonstrations were among the largest ever mounted by the major anti-Vietnam war coalitions and were also the last of their magnitude conducted in the United States despite attempts by their organizers to maintain the momentum achieved during their preparation. Typically, at a May 1971 gathering of the Soviet-controlled World Peace Council

in Hungary, according to an eyewitness report by an American woman who was both a member of the CPUSA and a prominent activist in Women Strike for Peace, the "warmest reception" the 30-member American delegation received "was from the Vietnamese delegates, who affirmed that the Spring Offensive had given a new thrust to the world forces opposed to U.S. imperialism and its naked aggression in Indochina."

It is, of course, recognized that it is not necessarily sufficient merely to point out the pattern of Communist involvement and domination that exists within such a movement as this; rather, one must also be aware of its significance -- or, to put it somewhat differently, of the motivations and ends that are being served. In this connection, it is important to realize that basic Communist policy, whether it be orthodox, Trotskyite, or other, presupposes the need for a front behind the enemy's lines, an apparatus which works to paralyze the enemy's will to resist the advance of the Communist armed force. This concept was well expressed in 1936 by Otto Kuusinen, a leading international Communist, when he expressed the need "to attack our class enemies in the rear" to aid in "transforming the imperialist war into a civil war against the bourgeoisie" and "preparing the masses in a Bolshevik way for the event of an imperialist war breaking out." Or, as expressed by North Vietnamese general Vo Nguyen Giap in an explication of what he called the "policy of Front," the goal is "neutralising all those which could be neutralised, dividing all those it was possible to divide in order to direct the spearhead at the chief enemy of the revolution, invading imperialism."

In pursuing this goal, the Communist Party recognized the need to build "opposition to U.S. imperialism and in solidarity with the national liberation movements" because of a basic belief "that victory for the Vietnamese people against U.S. imperialism will be a most powerful blow for peaceful coexistence [sic]." In like manner, despite supreme contempt for what their founder called the "professional fellow travelers, congenital stooges and moon-struck clergymen" who work with their Communist rivals in "peace" movements, the SWP worked most assiduously to cultivate these same types to aid in achieving a Communist military victory and American defeat in Vietnam. As expressed in a letter sent by a leading member of the United Secretariat of the Fourth International to the August 1971 convention of the Fourth International's American section, the SWP, Trotskyite-organized "peace" activity in the United States "contributed decisively to sap at the determination of American imperialism and to paralyse its forces" and "must continue in the U.S.A. as in the whole world to prevent American imperialism from making an orderly retreat, to insure that its defeat henceforth inevitable should be the worst possible."

Another benefit accruing to both the CPUSA and the SWP from their domination of these anti-Vietnam war coalitions was the gaining of new recruits. A Communist Party official wrote in the

January 1972 issue of Party Affairs, the CPUSA's confidential internal publication, of the Party's "participation in and leadership to the movement to end the war against Vietnam" and claimed that it "helped elevate the consciousness of many sections, especially youth, to the realization that these adventures are a part of an imperialist policy." The "enhanced anti-imperialist consciousness" thus created is of inestimable value in the Party's constant attempts to link "peace" issues to what the April 1971 issue of Party Affairs referred to as "the fight against political repression, racism and poverty" as "the basis for forging new alliances and broader united fronts." In the words of CPUSA general secretary Gus Hall, Party members must "work toward the crystallization of a broad people's alliance" that can "gather all the forces of rebellion into a coalition that will have the power to challenge the policies of the monopoly-military-industrial complex on all levels, on all fronts."

This aspect of Socialist Workers Party and Young Socialist Alliance policy was indicated in a draft resolution prepared for the 1971 national convention of the YSA. According to this document, "Mass mobilizations against the war" served as a "vehicle for...involving new people in activity against the war" and aided in "the politicization of the masses," characterized as the "first prerequisite of any revolution," the result being a successful effort by the Trotskyites at "drawing a whole generation of American youth into political consciousness and activity...." This was more precisely expressed in the 1969 SWP convention resolution on the "peace" movement, a document which openly declared that "The majority of new recruits to the Socialist Workers Party in the past few years have come directly out of the antiwar movement" and avowed that the "peace" movement "has been an important training ground for the new cadres of the" SWP. Recognizing that the Vietnam war "has been a major factor in generating a new wave of radicalization in the United States," the resolution stated that the "political struggles" within the movement "are part of the preparation for the struggles for the leadership of the general working-class radicalization...which will determine the future of the American socialist revolution" and added:

Our central tasks in the antiwar movement are to continue to build the mass antiwar demonstrations that are dealing hammer blows to American imperialism and to recruit from the growing numbers that have begun to move in a radical direction as a result.

Such was the reality, however unappreciated it may be today, of the movement in which so many of the organizations working within today's "anti-defense lobby," particularly within the Coalition for a New Foreign and Military Policy, played active roles. It is not claimed that each of these groups consciously shared the fundamental aims of the Communists and other partisans of Hanoi who provided the movement with its essential organizing expertise and policy direction; on the other hand, whatever the

concerns of the legitimate pacifists in the movement, the demonstrated pattern of Communist involvement and conscious adherence to the cause of Hanoi at its highest and most influential levels speaks for itself. It is hardly coincidental that an official of the National Liberation Front stated at a meeting of the World Peace Council in 1965 that the American "peace" movement represented "an effective support and great encouragement for" the Communist "struggle in South Vietnam." One perhaps recalls the previously-quoted sentiments of Professor Dowd in this connection, to which should be added the statement of another American anti-Vietnam war activist that "The anti-war movement is an integral part of the revolutionary movement in this country. We are not against the war just because of the killing and destruction, but we are for the Vietnamese." This was clearly recognized by the Vietnamese Communists, one of whom told an American member of the Venceremos Brigade in Cuba that "you go to the battlefield at the same time as we, and we are fighters on the same front."

As noted in the previous study, however, perhaps the best description of the "peace" movement in this country during the Vietnam war was the one quoted by CPUSA member and Women Strike for Peace activist Pauline Rosen in an interview in the May 21, 1970, edition of the CPUSA's Daily World in which, during a discussion of an international Communist-front conference attended by several American and Vietnamese figures, she reported that "There was great appreciation of the U.S. peace efforts at Stockholm, especially among the Vietnamese, who call our movement the 'Second Front' of the Vietnam war."

COALITION TO STOP FUNDING THE WAR

As the National Peace Action Coalition and Peoples Coalition for Peace and Justice declined with the gradual "winding down" of the war in Vietnam, the movement assumed new organizational forms. A useful summary of this development was published in the November 1, 1975, issue of Focal Point, founded as the publication of the Indochina Peace Campaign, a militantly pro-Hanoi operation run by Tom Hayden and Jane Fonda. According to this account,

The antiwar movement in all its aspects has been one of the most powerful social and political forces in American history. It played a central role in the destruction of the Johnson and Nixon presidencies, and in the course of the Watergate crisis emerged as the inheritor of the positive traditions of American politics.

The movement grew to maturity over a decade of genocidal war in Indochina, completely reversing American public opinion in the process. By May, 1975, antiwar activism was legitimate and increased public and Congressional control of foreign policy was considered common sense. Future Vietnam-type interventions entered the realm of the unthinkable.

With the signing of the Paris peace accord in January 1973, the "peace" movement was deprived of its organizing focus of immediate withdrawal of all American military personnel; the paramount need became "forcing the Administration to keep the peace and implement the Agreement" while the movement worked "to learn some lessons from its own past to become effective in the new period." That these "lessons" were needed was indicated by the admission that "Property destruction and violent confrontations with police were part of the movement's response to escalation in Indochina" in past years; now, however, there was a need to shift in the direction of greater respectability: "New attitudes and styles had to develop if the movement was to succeed in translating majority public opinion into effective political power."

To those of the Hayden-Fonda-IPC stripe, the development of these "New attitudes and styles" revolved around the "focal point theory," an idea that appears to have originated with the Vietnamese Communists. Far from forsaking its consistently pro-Hanoi bias, this element of the movement recognized that, in maintaining itself as a protest apparatus,

the strongest incentive came from understanding Indochina as the focal point of modern revolutionary conflict. With origins in both Vietnamese theory and the analysis of the Swedish antiwar movement, the focal point theory gave a more ideological framework for understanding the importance of antiwar activity [emphasis in original].

Another indication of the movement's partiality for Hanoi was the characterization of "the signing of the Paris Peace Agreement" as "a victory for both the Vietnamese and the American people." This seemingly offhand reference was solidly grounded in "the Vietnamese people, who introduced the sound idea of distinguishing between the U.S. government and the American people." As ACTION director Sam Brown observed in an interview in the December 1977 issue of Penthouse magazine, "the government of Vietnam understood very clearly the distinction between the American people and the U.S. government," an extremely useful device in Vietnamese and other Communist propaganda throughout the course of the war. Also, the movement viewed the "victory" of "the Vietnamese and the American people" as a "foregone" conclusion, the reason being that "The balance of forces in the world had shifted against imperialism." It is of the greatest import that this precise formulation has become a staple of Soviet propaganda in the continuing campaign to make detente "irreversible" as a weapon against the West.

The Focal Point article declared that a "national network of grass roots community groups doing antiwar education and a sophisticated Congressional pressure campaign were the two visible results of the movement's rebirth [emphasis added]." In this "rebirth," the "major organizational innovation was a new coalition, the United Campaign to End the War." This enterprise was "created at a unity conference held in Germantown, Ohio in late

October, 1973" at which some "200 people representing approximately 25 organizations" were in attendance; the conference "launched the United Campaign and embraced the Washington-based Coalition to Stop Funding the War as the tactical leadership for the movement's developing Congressional pressure campaign." The program adopted "was tightly focused on (1) cutting off aid to Thieu and Lon Nol; (2) opposing any further U.S. intervention in Indochina; and (3) forcing the Administration to implement the Paris Agreements." This program was strikingly similar to that outlined in literature of the Coalition to Stop Funding the War: "to prevent involvement of U.S. military forces in Indochina, to encourage a political settlement as outlined in the 1973 Paris Agreements, [and] to oppose continuing U.S. military and para-military aid to Vietnam, Cambodia, and Laos."

Organizers of this somewhat differently-oriented movement had high hopes for success. As the Focal Point article concluded,

The war is over, but the same cannot be said of the antiwar movement. By May 1975 its participants had felt their own power and caught a glimpse of the potential power of the American people. The movement will continue, under different names, with altered goals; but we are a permanent and ever more powerful feature on the political landscape of America.

As indicated above, the Coalition to Stop Funding the War was central to the movement's new thrust -- "the tactical leadership for the movement's developing Congressional pressure campaign." The available evidence indicates that the Coalition was formed at some point after the Christmas 1972 bombing of North Vietnam, principal groups in this endeavor reportedly being the American Friends Service Committee and the United Methodist Church. Co-chairmen of the CSFW, which characterized itself as "an effort by national religious, labor, social action, education, and peace organizations," were A. Dudley Ward of the Board of Church and Society of the Methodist Church and Edward F. Snyder of the Friends Committee on National Legislation. Members of the CSFW Administrative Committee included Ira Arlook, Indochina Peace Campaign; Josiah Beeman, United Presbyterian Church, U.S.A.; Tilford Dudley, United Church of Christ, Center for Social Action; Sanford Gottlieb, SANE; Sister Margaret Hohman, Network; and Larry Levin, Coalition Staff Director. The Coalition's Legislative Committee consisted of William Goodfellow, Indochina Resource Center; Fred Hofrichter, Disciples of Christ, Department of Church in Society; John Isaacs, Americans for Democratic Action; Rosalie Reichman, Women's International League for Peace and Freedom; Edward F. Snyder, FCNL; and Edith Villastrigo, Women Strike for Peace. Coalition literature also listed the following as staff personnel: Bob Edwards, Linda Goodacre, Diane Jones, Michael Jones, and Larry Levin. The same material declared that "Representatives of the following organizations are cooperating in the program:"

Action for World Community
 American Ethical Union
 American Federation of Teachers AFL-CIO
 American Friends Service Committee
 American Humanist Association
 Americans for Democratic Action
 Business Executives Move for New National Priorities
 Church of the Brethren
 Clergy and Laity Concerned
 Disciples of Christ, Department of Church in Society
 Episcopal Peace Fellowship
 Friends Committee on National Legislation
 Indochina Mobile Education Project
 Indochina Peace Campaign
 Indochina Resource Center
 Jesuit Conference, Office of Social Ministries
 Mennonite Central Committee, Peace Section
 National Council of Churches
 National Student Association
 Network
 Peace and Justice Committee, Leadership Conference of Women
 Religious
 Resource Center, United Methodist Office for the United Nations
 SANE
 Union of American Hebrew Congregations
 Unitarian Universalist Association
 United Church of Christ, Center for Social Action
 United Methodist Board of Global Ministries, Women's Division
 United Methodist Church, Board of Church and Society
 United Presbyterian Church, U.S.A.
 War Resisters League
 Women's International League for Peace and Freedom
 Women Strike for Peace
 World Federalists, U.S.A.

It is instructive to note that several of these organizations -- the Indochina Resource Center, AFSC, Indochina Mobile Education Project, Clergy and Laity Concerned, WSP, Episcopal Peace Fellowship, SANE, War Resisters League, and WILPF -- were listed as being among "OTHER ANTI-WAR GROUPS WE WORK WITH" in a summer 1973 document prepared by the Indochina Peace Campaign,* which document also boasted of the IPC's "INTERNATIONAL CONTACTS" in Stockholm, Oslo, Paris, London, Tokyo, and Hanoi.

According to a July 3, 1974, broadcast of the American Security Council "Washington Report of the Air," CSFW co-chairman A. Dudley Ward stated that "the Coalition's major objective is to sharply reduce or eliminate U.S. aid to the Saigon government, and he said it is achieving its aims through education and lobbying." Ward was further quoted as saying the Coalition "is being

*The other organizations so listed were Medical Aid to Indochina, Asia Information Group, Fellowship of Reconciliation, International Committee to Free South Vietnamese Political Prisoners, Union of Vietnamese in U.S.A., Vietnam Veterans Against the War, and Peoples Coalition for Peace and Justice.

financed by 'special gifts' from friends and supporters whom he would not otherwise identify." It is believed that significant amounts of such "special gifts" were forthcoming from, among others, the AFSC, the Methodist Church, and Stewart R. Mott, a principal backer of the Fund for Peace and its complex of related groups like the Center for Defense Information, In the Public Interest, and the CNFMP-affiliated Center for National Security Studies and Center for International Policy (see Heritage Foundation Institution Analysis No. 10, "The Anti-Defense Lobby: Part I, Center for Defense Information," April 1979).

One of the fruits of Coalition "education and lobbying" efforts was treated at length in the December 25, 1974, issue of the CSFW's publication, Legislative Update, which trumpeted that

The House of Representative took another measured stride toward ending American involvement in Indochina this month by quietly voting to sharply cut back US aid to the Lon Nol regime in Cambodia. By a startling voice vote, the House adopted the Conte-Aspin-Esch amendment placing a total ceiling of \$377 million on all forms of aid to Cambodia, including a \$200 million sub-ceiling on military aid. Like the war itself, the vote went relatively unnoticed in the press [emphasis in original].

In the February 14, 1975, issue of the same publication, the Coalition observed that "Phnom Penh may very well fall as a result of the lack of sufficient American 'aid,'" an eventuality that, from all indications to be gleaned from Coalition literature, did not trouble it overmuch; instead, the CSFW expended a good deal of time, money, and effort in trying to defeat "the Ford Administration's request for \$522 million in supplemental military aid for South Vietnam and Cambodia" during the 94th Congress.

The December 25, 1974, Legislative Update reflected the movement's belief that "The withdrawal of American troops from Vietnam was the result of intense and prolonged domestic opposition to direct American involvement" and declared that the "real significance" of the House vote on the Conte-Aspin-Esch proposal "is that it confirms a now clearly visible pattern of continued successful opposition to any form of American involvement. That pattern consists of a series of tangible legislative victories, each one building upon the other [emphasis in original]." Because of the crucial nature of this effort, and because the Coalition's own account says much about how the movement has operated and continues to operate in attempting to scale down American military activity, the following paragraphs from the CSFW newsletter merit quotation in full:

The legislative process in Washington is only a reflection of a deeper process going on all throughout the country. The elements of that process are a constant commitment to ending the war and an increasingly sophisticated and wide-ranging organizational effort. No

where [sic] has this been more apparent than on the recent Cambodian vote. The success of this amendment is almost exclusively due to the organizing and constituent pressure generated around the country. Before our national campaign began, the war in Cambodia was not even an issue in Washington. No Congressional leaders spoke about it, no newspapers editorialized about it, and its tragedy was often lost in the debate surrounding Vietnam.

But the response of people around the country was overwhelming. During the Congressional recess, dozens of campaigning Congresspeople were confronted in their districts with demands that they support a Cambodian amendment (even though sponsors had not been secured at the time!) Women Strike for Peace, long-time stalwarts of the anti-war movement, responded to an emergency Coalition mailgram by activating hundreds of constituents in the New York area alone just prior to the vote. The day before the vote, Coalition staffers and volunteers in Washington visited each Congressional office to deliver packets of information. Many of us were told of the unusually high volume of mail received in support of the amendment. Some Congressional offices reported receiving as many as twenty telephone calls a day from constituents concerned about Cambodia. The source as well as the volume of the mail indicates the depth of opposition to continued American funding of war and repression in Indochina: An effort that began with traditional peace activists has now developed into such unforeseen alliances as the conservative National Taxpayers' Union and the Americans for Democratic Action [emphasis and punctuation as in original].

To help maintain its momentum, the Coalition worked with the United Campaign for Peace in Indochina in staging a so-called Assembly to Save the Peace Agreement in Washington, D.C., on January 25-27, 1975. This activity was described in the following terms in the February 14, 1975, Legislative Update:

This fact [a reference to an Evans and Novak column which had cited the increasing importance of "constituent pressure" on the Congress of the United States in setting foreign policy] was dramatized in Washington during the weekend of January 25-27 -- the second anniversary of the signing of the Paris Agreement. Over three thousand people attended the ASSEMBLY TO SAVE THE PEACE AGREEMENT to renew their commitment to ending the war. Ten years later -- the old warmakers are gone, but the peace movement is still here. We forced the withdrawal of American troops from Vietnam. We forced an end to the bombing of Cambodia. And now we'll force the implementation of the Paris Agreement [emphasis in original].

Assembly literature reflects co-sponsorship by a number of groups, among them the following organizations with recent ties to the Coalition for a New Foreign and Military Policy and its various Working Groups: Americans for Democratic Action; American Friends Service Committee; Business Executives Move for New National Priorities; Clergy and Laity Concerned; Episcopal Peace Fellowship; Fellowship of Reconciliation; Friends Committee on National Legislation; Indochina Resource Center; Jesuit Conference Office of Social Ministries; National Lawyers Guild; SANE; Union of American Hebrew Congregations; United Methodist Church, Board of Church and Society; United Methodist Church, Women's Division; United Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A.; War Resisters League; Women's International League for Peace and Freedom; and Women Strike for Peace. Another co-sponsor was the "Joint Washington Office for Social Concerns representing the American Ethical Union, the American Humanist Association and the Unitarian-Universalist Association;" as noted earlier, both the AEU and the UUA have been listed as affiliates of the CNFMP.

The same material listed workshops on such topics as amnesty, "Direct Action Projects," Cambodia, and "Political Prisoners" as well as the showing of films, including "Introduction to the Enemy, new Fonda-Hayden film." Plenary sessions of the Assembly were to deal with such questions as "THE STRATEGY TO END THE WAR through pressure on Congress" and "THE NUTS & BOLTS OF ORGANIZING against the continuing war." "AMONG THE SPEAKERS" were Senators James Abourezk and George McGovern; Representatives Bella Abzug, Ron Dellums, and Elizabeth Holtzman; journalist I. F. Stone; "Indochina activists" Fred Branfman, Tom Hayden, Larry Levin, Don Luce, Ron Young, Holly Near, and Joan Baez; several religious and Vietnamese figures; and Daniel Ellsberg. Coordinator for the Assembly was AFSC activist John McAuliff, who also was conspicuous in his involvement in national pro-Hanoi "peace" coalitions of the sort discussed earlier. A highlight of this effort was a gathering on the steps of the U.S. Capitol on Monday, January 27, "Anniversary of the Peace Agreement," at which time there were to be "brief remarks from Representatives Ronald Dellums, Robert Drinan, and Tom Harkin" and "Songs by Pete Seeger," perhaps America's principal balladeer of protest and an identified member of the Communist Party, U.S.A.

AD HOC COALITION FOR A NEW FOREIGN POLICY

The successor to the CSFW was the Ad Hoc Coalition for a New Foreign Policy, which described itself at least until March 1976 as the "ad hoc [sic] Coalition for a New Foreign Policy, formerly the Coalition to Stop Funding the War." An extremely useful background study of the Ad Hoc Coalition published in the February 26, 1976, edition of the Congressional Record reported that the CNFP "emerged from the former" CSFW in June 1975; and an item in the November 1, 1975, issue of Focal Point characterized the new apparatus in the following terms:

The Ad Hoc Coalition for a New Foreign Policy was formed by the highly successful Coalition to Stop Funding the War to keep the pressure on Congress during this key transition period for U.S. foreign policy. With its network of 6,000 activists throughout the country, the Coalition is currently organizing constituent pressure on Congress to end the military assistance program and ban US [sic] economic aid to dictatorships....

The same publication averred that "a broad consensus exists for an end to US intervention in the Third World and the creation of a new foreign policy" and added that "In order to take advantage of this historic opportunity the Indochina Peace Campaign has initiated two new organizations." The first was the Friends of Indochina Organizing Committee, the "primary task" of which would "be to consolidate the work of the last ten years by building bonds of friendship and understanding between the Indochinese and American people." One of the bases of this effort was the "sense of strength and purpose" which the movement derived "from our solidarity with the peoples of Indochina." Or, as put elsewhere in the same article, "Those of us who participated in the Indochina Peace Campaign and the millions of other Americans who opposed the war all shared, to some degree, the struggle of the Indochinese people." A contribution of \$6.00 would bring interested people the FIOC's "monthly newsletter, published jointly with the Indochina Resource Center." Contributions could also be made on a tax-deductible basis if "made payable to Regional Young Adult Project."

The second IPC-created group was the Campaign for a Democratic Foreign Policy, described as an operation which "hopes to place further restrictions on US imperialism by helping to build a movement strong enough to end all US economic and military aid to dictatorships and to make substantial cuts in the military budget." A CDFP advertisement declared that "We are committed to extending Indochina's victory of independence throughout the Third World" and announced that "an At-large Member of CDFP" could, for dues of \$8.00, "receive a year's subscription to the CDFP national publication, special mailings, the Legislative Update of the ad hoc Coalition for a New Foreign Policy, and be kept informed of all CDFP activities" in his community. In pursuing the movement's then-stated priorities, as Focal Point expressed it, it was hoped "that each and every person who supported the Indochina Peace Campaign during the last three years" would "realize that they are, as the Vietnamese have said, 'part and parcel of the irresistible movement carrying the world forward.'"

As listed in the February 26, 1976, Congressional Record, "Co-chairpersons" of the Ad Hoc Coalition's Administrative Committee were Edward F. Snyder, Friends Committee on National Legislation, and Joyce Hamlin, United Methodist Board of Global Ministries, Women's Division. Other members included Ira Arlook, Campaign for a Democratic Foreign Policy; Carol Clifford, Friends

of Indochina Organizing Committee; Sanford Gottlieb, SANE; John Isaacs, Americans for Democratic Action; Don Luce, Clergy and Laity Concerned; and John McAuliff, American Friends Service Committee. The CNFP Legislative Committee consisted of Jacqui Chagnon, Vietnamese American Reconciliation Center; Carol Clifford, FIOC; John Isaacs, ADA; Gary Porter, Indochina Resource Center; Edward F. Snyder, FCNL; and Edith Villastrigo, Women Strike for Peace. Two people were listed as "Staff:" Jack Nicholl and Brewster Rhoads. Like its predecessor CSFW, the Ad Hoc Coalition stated that "Representatives of the following organizations are cooperating in the program:"

Action for World Community
 American Ethical Union
 American Friends Service Committee
 American Humanist Association
 Americans for Democratic Action
 Bach Mai Hospital Relief Fund
 Business Executives Move for New National Priorities
 Campaign for a Democratic Foreign Policy
 Church of the Brethren
 Clergy and Laity Concerned
 Disciples of Christ, Department of Church and Society
 Episcopal Peace Fellowship
 Friends Committee on National Legislation
 Friends of Indochina Organizing Committee
 Indochina Mobile Education Project
 Indochina Resource Center
 Jesuit Conference, Office of Social Ministries
 Mennonite Central Committee, Peace Section
 National Council of Churches
 National Student Association
 Network
 Peace and Justice Committee, Leadership Conference of Women
 Religious
 Resource Center, United Methodist Office for the United Nations
 SANE
 Union of American Hebrew Congregations
 Unitarian Universalist Association
 United Church of Christ, Center for Social Action
 United Methodist Board of Global Ministries, Women's Division
 United Methodist Church, Board of Church and Society
 United Presbyterian Church, U.S.A.
 Vietnamese American Reconciliation Center
 War Resisters League
 Women's International League for Peace and Freedom
 Women Strike for Peace
 World Federalists, U.S.A.

The Spring 1976 issue of the CNFP's Legislative Update carried a substantially similar listing of "cooperating organizations." Differences were the addition of Friendshipment and the absence of Action for World Community, the American Ethical Union, the American Humanist Association, the National Student

Association, and the Peace and Justice Committee of the Leadership Conference of Women Religious. This source, as did the November 1, 1975, Focal Point, also carried an intriguing reference to CNFP financing. To "support the work of the Coalition" in its attempts to, among other aims, "support legislation which reflects the lessons of the Indochina experience," one was urged to enclose one's "tax-deductible contribution...made out to the United Methodist Board of Church and Society [emphasis in original]."

Coalition propaganda stressed certain basic themes, among which perhaps the most fundamental was expressed in a leaflet which excoriated "Pentagon witnesses" who testify to "the increased Soviet 'threat.'" To oppose this presumably erroneous foreign policy perspective, according to the CNFP, "We must counter this influence by debunking the 'scare' tactic and challenging basic foreign policy objectives which force up the Pentagon budget." This meant that, for example, "No effort should be spared during their visits home in convincing members of Congress to vote for major 'transfers' of funding from military to domestic spending upon their return to Washington." Also, of course, pressure through constituent letter-writing was heavily emphasized, an example being the exhortation to the faithful in the March 6, 1976, Coalition Organizer's Update that "We must act now to ensure that the budget committees understand the degree of opposition to high military spending. Your letters should challenge basic foreign policy objectives which force up the Pentagon budget [emphasis in original]." Coalition literature included an "Activist handbook on how to lobby and do constituent organizing in context of new budget procedures" and a variety of other publications, including material from the Institute for Policy Studies, Members of Congress for Peace Through Law, and the Center for Defense Information.

In pursuing its program of activity, the Coalition was most attuned to what some would call "outreach." The Spring 1976 Legislative Update declared that

The three issues of new foreign policy, cuts in military spending and increased funding for domestic programs are inextricably linked. They form the basis for a broad movement which can unite many constituencies which have traditionally not worked together. In this potential unity is the historic opportunity for major change in the direction of American foreign policy.

At another point, the same publication stated that during the "last three years of the Indochina war, our active supporters consisted primarily of the traditional peace organizations and members of the student, religious, liberal and professional communities" and added that these constituencies have "continued, by and large," in this support "as the Coalition's program has broadened toward developing a new, non-interventionist foreign policy and cutting the military budget. They represent our organizing base." Now, however, it was necessary to "reach deep

into, and mobilize, new constituencies; for example, those most hurt by the current economic crisis." If such a path were followed, the result would be the building of "a broad-based campaign unifying our traditional constituency with those not previously involved in the peace movement." One of the most fertile fields for such cultivation, in the Coalition's view, was the labor movement, an indication being the action of "eight major unions, including three of the five most dependent on defense production," in calling on Congress "to hold the line on the military budget." These eight unions included the United Auto Workers, Amalgamated Clothing Workers, Textile Workers, United Steel Workers, United Mine Workers, Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees, and "International Longshoremen and Warehousemen's Union." Among "Additional unions that should be open to joining a local campaign" were the American Federation of Teachers, Building Trades Unions, Communications Workers of America, Hospital Workers Union - Local 1199, International Ladies Garment Workers Union, National Farmers Union, Service Employees International Union, Transport Workers Union, and United Farm Workers.

This effort at "outreach" was also to include "Work With Local and State Officials" and an attempt to "Join With Community and Public Interest Groups," the latter emphasis being grounded in the belief that such groups "know that only when we rid ourselves of the present interventionist foreign policy will Americans begin to focus on problems at home." The Coalition's listing of "those most likely to be interested" is instructive:

- Black and Minority Organizations
- Environmental and Consumer Groups
- Public Interest Research Groups
- PTA's, School Boards and Teachers Associations
- League of Women Voters
- NOW [National Organization for Women] Chapters
- Senior Citizen Clubs
- Food Cooperatives, Health and Day Care Centers
- Welfare Rights and Tenants Groups
- Chambers of Commerce
- Kiwanis, Lions and Rotary Clubs

In working with other organizations, the CNFP, according to an account published in the March 11, 1976, edition of the Congressional Record, was one of "21 U.S. organizations" which "participated in meetings at the Havana Libre, February 26 through March 1, 1976, with representatives of the MPLA [the Communist-backed Popular Movement for the Liberation of Angola, cited earlier]." Organizations from the United States that were involved also included, among others, the Venceremos Brigade; the Prairie Fire Organizing Committee, a support group for the terrorist Weather Underground Organization; the Castroite Puerto Rican Socialist Party; the American Committee on Africa; the Washington Office on Africa; the National Council of Churches; the American Friends Service Committee; the Women's International League for Peace and

Freedom; and the Workers World Party and its youth apparatus, Youth Against War and Fascism. Publications represented, according to this account, included, among others, the Communist Party quarterly Freedomways and the newspaper of the Nation of Islam, popularly known as the Black Muslims.

One of the Coalition's most significant undertakings was its participation in the national campaign against development of the B-1 bomber. A Coalition release dated March 31, 1976, sounded a note of the utmost urgency: "We must act this weekend if we are to counter the intense lobbying by Pentagon and corporate officials [emphasis in original]." Supporters were asked to "influence the outcome of the vote...by flooding congressional offices with thousands of telegrams and telephone calls before this Tuesday." But perhaps the most wide-ranging anti-B-1 enterprise to which the Coalition gave its support and expertise was the National Campaign to Stop the B-1 Bomber and the National Campaign's "Fiscal '77 National Conference to Stop the B-1 Bomber, Cut Military Spending, Meet Human Needs," organized jointly with the Coalition for a New Foreign Policy and held in Washington, D.C., on March 13-15, 1976. The CNFP Organizer's Update for March 6, 1976, proclaimed that "Fiscal '77 will attract organizers from throughout the country who have been working in their own communities to pressure Congress to stop the B-1 and cut the military budget [emphasis in original]."

The membership of the National Campaign to Stop the B-1 Bomber was indicated in a February 12, 1976, press release issued by the office of Senator William Proxmire (D-Wis.) which announced that "twenty-five labor, church and environmental organizations have formed a national coalition to knock out funding for the B-1 bomber this year!" According to the release, Senator Proxmire also stated that "this coalition...is the best organized public interest lobby in the defense arena since the anti-ABM forces of 1969 and 1970." The list, because of its close similarity to others cited in this study, is set forth below:

- Ad Hoc Coalition for a New Foreign Policy
- Americans for Democratic Action
- American Friends Service Committee
- Business Executives' Movement [sic] for New National Priorities
- Clergy and Laity Concerned
- Common Cause
- Council for a Liveable World
- Environmental Action
- Episcopal Peace Fellowship
- Federation of American Scientists
- Friends Committe [sic] on National Legislation
- Friends of the Earth
- Indochina Mobile Education Project
- International Longshoremens' and Warehousemens' Union [sic]
- Jesuit Conference, Office of Social Ministries
- Movement for Economic Justice
- National Taxpayers Union

NETWORK

Oil, Chemical, and Atomic Workers International Union

SANE

United Church of Christ, Center for Social Action

United Church of Christ, Board of Homeland Ministries

United Mineworkers of America

Women's International League for Peace and Freedom

World Ministries Commission, Church of the Brethren

World Federalists, USA

Prepared testimony submitted by the National Campaign to the House Committee on Armed Services on March 8, 1976, listed many of the same organizations and one more which did not appear on the February 12 list: the National Association of Social Workers.* This testimony was written specifically "to oppose the production of" the B-1 and "to insure that the U.S. government invest its limited resources in ways which will best meet the real requirements of genuine 'national security.'" It is noteworthy that, in attempting to argue this case, the National Campaign relied heavily on publications issued by such organizations as the Brookings Institution, Members of Congress for Peace Through Law, the Environmental Action Foundation, and the Center for Defense Information.

A basic packet of "'how-to' pressure your Congressperson information" and similar data disseminated by the National Campaign under date of February 1976 also reflected collaboration with environmental and other "public-interest" groups and, as in the case of the CNFP, solicited tax-deductible contributions to support its work:

The 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 (the people working full-time against the B-1 in D.C.). It was printed by Common Cause, at cost, for a savings of hundreds of dollars to the Campaign.

Still, we are running out of money (we'll be out by mid-March), and your tax-deductible help will sure be appreciated! (Make checks out to United Church of Christ, earmark for B-1 Campaign, send to 318 Mass. Ave. address.)

*A third list carried on a Campaign leaflet bearing a reprint of an article from the February 12, 1976, edition of the Washington Post also included the NASW along with four other groups not on the February 12 list: the Catholic Peace Fellowship, Fellowship of Reconciliation, Textile Workers Union of America, and War Resisters League.

The list of organizational co-sponsors for the Fiscal '77 gathering was, like so many others cited above, to a considerable degree like the list of organizations active in today's Coalition for a New Foreign and Military Policy. As published in a conference leaflet dated February 24, 1976, it included the following:

American Friends Service Committee
 Business Executives Move for New National Priorities
 Campaign for a Democratic Foreign Policy
 Church of the Brethren -- Washington Office
 Clergy and Laity Concerned
 Coalition on National Priorities and Military Policy
 Common Cause
 Episcopal Peace Fellowship
 Environmental Action
 Fellowship of Reconciliation
 Friends Committee on National Legislation
 International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union (ILWU)
 Jesuit Conference -- Office of Social Ministries
 Movement for Economic Justice
 National Association of Social Workers
 National Taxpayers Union
 Network
 SANE
 United Church of Christ -- U.S. Power and Priorities Team,
 BHM [Board of Home Ministries] and CSA [Center for Social
 Action]
 United Methodist Board of Global Ministries and Women's Division
 Women's International League for Peace and Freedom
 Women Strike for Peace

Conference workshops reflected the range of the movement's concerns. So-called "Issues Workshops" covered such topics as "The B-1 and the Environment," "Economic Conversion," "Military Arguments Against the B-1," "Military Spending and The Arms Race," "Military Spending and Full Employment," "Military Spending and Intelligence," "Military Spending and Social Needs," and "U.S. Military Spending & Global Human Needs," while "Organizing Workshops" involved sessions on "Local Pressure Campaign on Military Budget," "Direct Action," "Lobbying/Constituent Pressure," "National B-1 Bomber Campaign," and "Working with Media." The aim of the conference was, of course, chiefly legislative: the "unified Congressional pressure strategy" adopted by the National Campaign and the CNFP "to stop the B-1 Bomber and to substantially reduce military spending in the 1st Budget resolution."

Speakers involved a veritable cross-section of left-liberal activism. The February 24, 1976, brochure listed the following:

Eqbal Ahmad, Director, Transnational Institute/IPS
 Marion Anderson, Project Director, Public Interest Research
 Group in Michigan
 Tim Butz, Fifth Estate
 Bruce Cameron, ADA

Fritzi Cohen, Military Audit Project
 Mike Cole, Common Cause
 Diane Gabay, Environmental Action Foundation
 David Goodman, NARMIC/AFSC
 Sandy Gottlieb, SANE
 Kathie Harrington, AFSC/Press
 Bill Higgs, Staff Aide, Rep. Gus Hawkins
 Deborah Huntington, CALC
 Dave Johnson, Center for Defense Information
 Brennon Jones, Bread for the World
 Stefan Leader, Center for Defense Information
 John Looney, AFSC (Ohio)
 Don Luce, CALC
 John Marks, Center for National Security Studies
 Diane McMahon, National Council of Senior Citizens, Inc.
 Parren Mitchell, Rep. Maryland
 Jack Nicholl, Coalition for a New Foreign Policy
 Karen Nussbaum, CDFP (Mass.)
 Stefan Ostrach, NARMIC/AFSC
 Gail Pressberg, AFSC/Direct Action
 John Seiberling, Rep. Ohio
 Mark Shanahan, CDFP (Ohio)
 Ken Sherman, Organizer (Buffalo)
 Ed Snyder, Friends Committee on National Legislation
 Jeremy Stone, Federation of American Scientists
 Cynthia Wedel, President, World Council of Churches
 Joe Volk, AFSC (Ohio)

A five-page list of speakers distributed at the conference listed several additional individuals, among whom the following are of particular interest: Bill Broydrick, legislative assistant to Representative Les Aspin (D-Wis.); John Holum, "Chief Legislative Assistant" to Senator George McGovern (D-S.D.); Michael Klare, "Associate Staff Member" of the North American Congress on Latin America and fellow of the Transnational Institute of the Institute for Policy Studies; Mike Mann, "formerly with the Office of Rep. Michael Harrington" of Massachusetts and, at the time of the conference, Environmental Action's "full-time" anti-B-1 bomber lobbyist; Don Mansfield, administrative assistant to Representative John Seiberling (D-Ohio); Barry Schneider, "Staff Consultant to Military Affairs and Arms Control Committee of" MCPL; Pat Tobin, Washington representative, ILWU; and Roger Tresolini, "a legislative representative for the National Taxpayers Union...and volunteer organizer for the 'McGovern for President' campaign [emphasis in original]." It is further noted that one of the "Resources/Special Interest Meetings" scheduled for March 14 was listed as a "Peace Budget Workshop on the Local Level" to be conducted by one Sylvia Zisman, identified in a report on the conference in the March 23, 1976, edition of the Congressional Record as a representative of the National Center to Slash Military Spending, an operation of the Communist Party, U.S.A. Literature available included, in addition to material issued by the NCSMS, the World Peace Council's Stockholm Peace Appeal and a newsletter, Economic Notes, published by the Labor Research Association, one of the oldest extant auxiliaries of the CPUSA.

The ultimate success of the anti-B-1 effort was described from the movement's point of view in the Disarmament Action Guide Winter 1977-78:

The truth is that the campaign literally gave the B-1 decision to Carter by preventing the Ford Administration from committing the U.S. to a new round of B-1 procurement. At the insistence of B-1 opponents, Congress in June, 1976 delayed the final decision until the inauguration of the next President.

At about the same time, candidate Carter made his famous pledge to the Democratic Platform Committee: "The B-1 is an example of a proposed system which should not be funded and would be wasteful of taxpayers dollars." Nicholas Wade [in the July 31, 1977, Washington Post] characterizes Carter's statement as "perhaps the most important achievement of the network and the Coalition," and quotes a Senate staffer, "they got Carter to take a stand on the B-1 when he knew very little about it, and got him involved in a way that otherwise wouldn't have happened."

When the time came for Carter to decide, the B-1 issue had become a major credibility problem for the President who had promised never to tell a lie. Carter would have to break his campaign promise if he were to accept the nearly irresistible appeals of the military-industrial complex to produce the B-1.

Of course, the stopping of the B-1 was viewed merely as a way-station on the road to further weapons reduction. The need "for the future" would be "to wage a public opinion campaign and build political coalitions" which could "define a 'rational' weapons policy for the U.S. as not choosing the Cruise Missile over the B-1 but rather choosing arms reductions over the present irrational, overkill balance of terror." Significant tribute to the success of this campaign was contained in a letter over the names of "Sen. George McGovern" and "Sen. William Proxmire" as reprinted in the Disarmament Action Guide:

To the people who stopped the B-1 Bomber:

We heartily congratulate everyone in the B-1 Campaign for doing an astonishing job and winning a tremendous victory.

You played an indispensable role in the long fight, and we applaud your goals, skills and sheer determination. The one element that was present at every stage was citizen organizing, and it was the most important element of the victory.

Your profound achievement was to raise public opinion against the B-1. One measure of the success is that you overcame relentless efforts by military and economic interests who wanted to build the bomber. Another is that you refused to capitulate when the cause looked almost hopeless.

You deserve credit for an unprecedented victory. It has been an honor to cooperate with you, and we wish you good fortune in your future pursuits.

FROM CNFP TO THE COALITION FOR A NEW FOREIGN AND MILITARY POLICY

The first available account of the transformation of the Ad Hoc Coalition for a New Foreign Policy into today's Coalition for a New Foreign and Military Policy appears to have been published in the May 26, 1976, CNFMP Action Alert cited at the outset of this study. Because it provides so convenient a summary of the Coalition's program and aims at that point, this account is worth quoting in full (capitalization and emphasis appear exactly as in the original):

GREETINGS FROM THE EXPANDED COALITION!

This is the first action mailing of the newly-formed COALITION FOR A NEW FOREIGN AND MILITARY POLICY. Formally launched on May 1 as a merger of the Coalition on National Priorities and Military Policy and the Ad Hoc Coalition for a New Foreign Policy, the CNFMP will combine a close relationship with Capitol Hill with an extensive grassroots network of activists to create a highly effective force for change.

The COALITION'S initial educational and legislative program encompasses: reductions in the military budget; removal of US troops from Korea; support for bills or resolutions which best advance the prospects for arms control; normalization of relations with Indochina, including reconstruction aid; implementation of the human rights provisions in the foreign aid laws.

The success of the COALITION ultimately depends upon the active involvement of thousand [sic] of people educating and mobilizing their own communities around key foreign policy issues and legislation. We invite you to help build the COALITION's grassroots network by sending us the names of interested people and organizations and by giving us suggestions about how to improve our mailings and services to you. In addition, of course, we need your financial support to continue in these tight times. We thank you for your help!

COALITION LEADERSHIP AND FINANCES

The leadership of the Coalition for a New Foreign and Military Policy, like its organizational membership, reflects the essential continuity that has existed since the formation of the Coalition to Stop Funding the War. An undated leaflet attached to a "Dear Friend of the Coalition" letter dated February 1979 lists as "Officers of the Coalition" two "Co-chairs," Edward F. Snyder of the Friends Committee on National Legislation and Gretchen Eick of the United Church of Christ, and two "Co-vice Chairs," Bruce Cameron of Americans for Democratic Action and Nancy Ramsey of Women's International League for Peace and Freedom. Snyder and Eick were listed as CNFMP "Co-Chairs" in a Coalition Disarmament Working Group open letter to President Carter that was released on March 23, 1979; this document also carried the signatures of E. Raymond Wilson and Herbert Scoville, Jr., as "Co-Chairs" of the Disarmament Working Group. An earlier "Meet the Coalition" brochure, undated but outlining the Coalition's projected budget for 1978, listed as "Co-chairs" Edward Snyder of the FCNL and Joyce Hamlin of the Women's Division of the United Methodist Church; "Co Vice-Chairs" were Herman Will, Peace Division, United Methodist Church, and David Saperstein, Union of American Hebrew Congregations. This document also carried the names and organizational affiliations of two "Action Committee Co-chairs" and five "Other Administrative Committee Members." In the former category were Nancy Ramsey of WILPF and Jacqui Chagnon of Clergy and Laity Concerned; the latter included Jane Leiper of the National Council of Churches, Ruby Rhodes of the Church of the Brethren, Ron Young of the American Friends Service Committee, Bruce Cameron of ADA, and Edith Villastrigo of Women Strike for Peace.

An apparently fairly early but undated CNFMP brochure listed five people (Bob Brammer, Brad Karkkainen, Jack Nicholl, Brewster Rhoads, and Ann Taft, C.S.J.) as "Coalition staff" and declared that "the Coalition's top priority for expansion" was to be able to support organizers "in the field," a priority that has apparently been realized at least to some extent, as the Summer 1979 issue of Coalition Close-Up states that the CNFMP "now has an active field program, set up to strengthen our effectiveness and broaden the outreach of our network" and specifically names Mark Shanahan as "Coalition Field Director." The undated "Meet the Coalition" brochure listed seven individuals as "Coalition Staff" and provided certain identifying data which, in many cases, prove instructive. The list is as follows:

Bette Bono who joined us in November 1977 after organizing the Chicago area Campaign for the Transfer Amendment (CTA), coordinates our budget priorities/transfer work.

Bob Brammer, former director of the Washington office of the National Campaign to Stop the B-1 Bomber, joined us in July 1977 to coordinate our disarmament work.

Brad Karkkainen, who came to the Coalition in February 1977, coordinates the production and distribution of Coalition resources.

Brewster Rhoads, a former VISTA volunteer who has been with the Coalition since June 1974, coordinates our human rights work and our new field program.

Ann Taft, C.S.J., formerly a lobbyist with NETWORK, joined us in September 1976 to handle our administration and coordinate our Southern Africa work and special projects.

Steve Baskerville, a junior from American University, is our disarmament intern.

Bryan Frankel, a senior at American University, is our human rights intern.

The only Coalition Working Group for which a listing of individuals in leadership capacities was available as of this writing is the Human Rights Working Group. This roster, as given in an undated "DESCRIPTION OF THE HUMAN RIGHTS WORKING GROUP," includes the following:

HRWG Co-chairpeople:

Jacqui Chagnon (Clergy and Laity Concerned)
Bruce Cameron (Americans for Democratic Action)

HRWG Steering Committee:

Ruby Rhoads (Washington Office, Church of the Brethern [sic])
Gretchen Eick (United Church of Christ)
Olga Talamante (American Friends Service Committee)
Severina Rivera (Friends of the Filipino People)
Christine Root (Washington Office on Africa)
Paula Echeveria (Women's [sic] Strike for Peace)
Aviva Kempner (National Lawyers Guild)

Co-chairpeople of the Coalition and ex-officio members of the HRWG Steering Committee:

Edward Snyder (Executive Secretary, Friends Committee on National Legislation)
Joyce Hamlin (Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Board of Global Ministries, United Methodist Church)

Coalition staff working with the HRWG:

Brewster Rhoads (Co-director)
Bryan Frankel (Coalition intern)

The program of the Coalition for a New Foreign and Military Policy is an ambitious one that is avowedly geared to the accomplishment of specifically legislative goals. The February 1979 mailing cited earlier states that the CNFMP "field program is working to build strong regional coalitions in critical areas

across the country" and adds that "our Working Groups are carefully targeting crucial legislation to help you tie your work into a coordinated national strategy to maximize your impact on Washington." To implement this program of lobbying and other activity, the Coalition operates with a budget that, according to the most recent estimate reflected in available CNFMP literature, runs into six figures. As shown by the "Meet the Coalition" brochure, the budget for 1978 was projected as follows:

1978 Budget

Five staff members plus benefits.....	\$ 57,080
Office space across from the Capitol, phone, equipment and supplies.....	16,600
Printing and mailing Action Guides, Action Alerts and resources.....	42,000
Field program (field director, travel, conferences and local organizing).....	28,000
Total.....	\$143,680

To meet these needs, the Coalition must rely on contributions from its "network" of supporters. The same undated brochure which mentioned the priority to be given to "expansion in the field" also appealed to "You and the 7000 others who make up the Coalition network" to increase their support. It was claimed that "Over the past year, members of the network" had contributed "over \$20,000 with an average gift of \$22." This "level of support, however, was achieved through the generosity of only 20% or one-fifth of the network." It was projected that "If everyone who has not contributed before could give \$10 now, an additional \$56,000 would be available to expand our efforts." The brochure further indicated that contributions from individuals are supplemented by assistance from other organizations; for example, in discussing the desirability of field expansion, it stated that "Based on a salary sharing relationship with local organizations, a regional Coalition organizer can be fielded for \$4-6,000 for one year." Also, the brochure claimed, without further elaboration, that "Several substantial grants will become available to us if we can raise that \$56,000 now."

It is reasonable to presume that at least part of the money to be derived from these "substantial grants" was to be from tax-exempt sources. Like its predecessor Ad Hoc Coalition for a New Foreign Policy, the CNFMP asserted in its earlier material, such as the "expansion in the field" brochure cited immediately above, that contributors could "make checks payable to the United

Methodist Church, Board of Church and Society." Not all Coalition literature, it should be noted, has carried such a notification. The Winter/Spring 1977 Action Alert, for example, carried no such notation; and the February 1979 "Dear Friend of the Coalition" appeal stated merely that the contributor should "Please make checks payable to the Coalition for a New Foreign and Military Policy." More recent Coalition material does, however, include the added fillip of tax-deductibility for contributions, albeit through a different instrumentality. In the Summer 1979 Coalition Close-Up, with specific reference to so-called "public education and organizing work," the following language appears: "Tax deductible contributions can be made payable to the Youth Project - Budget Priorities Project [emphasis in original]." It is noted that the Youth Project, as a tax-exempt operation, "has supported a large number of radical community organizing groups; and its projects have involved such organizations on the far left as" the National Conference on Alternative State and Local Public Policies, a project of the Institute for Policy Studies, and the Georgia Power Project, "a Marxist 'public ownership' operation established in 1972 in Atlanta, Georgia, by the Institute for Southern Studies, a subsidiary of" the IPS (see Heritage Foundation Institution Analysis No. 9, "The New Left in Government: From Protest to Policy-Making," November 1978).

Another method by which the Coalition raises operating funds is illustrated by a mailing advertising "an evening with Jane Fonda and Tom Hayden on Wednesday, September 26 [1979] from 5:30 until 7:30 p.m. at 122 Maryland Avenue, NE to benefit the Coalition for a New Foreign and Military Policy." The mailing declares that the invitation was issued in the names of the following sixteen individuals: Tom Asher, Sally Benson, Bruce Cameron, Lenny Conway, David Cortright, Representative Ronald V. Dellums, Bill Goodfellow, Joyce Hamlin, Isabel Letelier, Ira M. Lowe, Bob McAlpine, Representative Parren J. Mitchell, Stewart Rawlings Mott, Peggy Shaker, William Winpisinger, and Anne Zill. Mott is, as previously noted, a principal backer of the Fund for Peace and its associated projects, several of which maintain offices at the 122 Maryland Avenue address; and Anne Zill has long been one of Mott's close aides and associates. A donation of \$20 was solicited, with those who could not attend being given the alternative of simply sending a contribution, checks to be made "payable to the" CNFMP, to which was added: "If you would like to contribute \$50. or more to support the Coalition's public education work on the arms race, you can make your contribution tax-deductible by making your check payable to the Youth Project - Budget Priorities Project [emphasis and punctuation as in original]."

The invitation carried the following endorsement of the CNFMP over the purported signatures of Hayden and Fonda: "The struggle for economic and social justice here at home cannot succeed unless we directly challenge the basic assumptions of U.S. foreign policy. The Coalition for a New Foreign and Military Policy is providing a critical link in making these connections." It will doubtless be recalled that the backgrounds of both Hayden

and Fonda, probably best-known at this point for their promotion of Hayden's political ambitions through the radical leftist Campaign for Economic Democracy, are replete with documented examples of support for the Communist side during the war in Vietnam. Both traveled to Hanoi during the war and voiced open support for North Vietnam and the National Liberation Front against the United States; and Hayden was reported to have stated, after returning to the United States, that "We are all Viet Cong," in addition to writing of his personal wish for "Good fortune!" and "Victory!" for the Vietnamese Communists in a June 4, 1968, letter to a North Vietnamese official. In line with her stated view of the Viet Cong as "the conscience of the world," Fonda has expressed her advocacy of Communism in a procession of public utterances. In November 1969, she reportedly told an audience at Michigan State University that "I would think that if you understood what communism was, you would hope, you would pray on your knees that we would someday become communist." And in December 1970, in a speech in Durham, North Carolina, at Duke University, she stated: "I am a socialist, I think that we should strive toward a socialist society -- all the way to communism."

COALITION ACTIVITIES AND PROGRAMS

As an education and lobbying apparatus, the Coalition for a New Foreign and Military Policy engages in a variety of activities, many of which have been cited above in discussions of the Coalition's predecessors. Fundamental to these efforts, of course, is the publication and dissemination of such printed matter as its Action Guides, Action Alerts, and the Coalition Close-Up, self-described as "our new network newsletter." In preparing these publications and its other "resources," the Coalition has frequently relied on data as compiled and analyzed by organizations like Members of Congress for Peace Through Law, the Center for Defense Information, and the Institute for Policy Studies. A list of "recently produced education resources on U.S. foreign and military policy" in the Summer 1979 issue of Coalition Close-Up includes films available from the American Committee on East-West Accord and the CDI and literature from such groups as Americans for SALT, the American Friends Service Committee's NARMIC, the Center for International Policy, the Religious Committee on SALT, SANE, and the Militarism and Disarmament Project of the Institute for Policy Studies.

The Coalition also issues voting records on what it regards as key issues of foreign and military policy before the Congress of the United States. The "1977 Voting Record" spoke of "promising new initiatives in many areas of U.S. foreign and military policy" put forward by President Carter during his first year in office but added that, as a whole, "the Administration's proposals certainly do not constitute the comprehensive non-interventionist and humanitarian foreign policy that the Coalition has worked for since the end of the Indochina war." Congress was excoriated for

"frequently" opposing "even the modest initiatives advanced by the Administration" and praised because "On issues of military spending and human rights...it was Congress that took leadership, and challenged a recalcitrant Administration." Issues stressed in this compilation included, among others, "normalization of relations with Vietnam and Cuba," "reconstruction aid to Indochina," "moves toward disarmament," "withdrawals of U.S. troops from Korea," "halting the B-1 bomber," and "Rep. Parren Mitchell's (D-MD) Transfer Amendment to cut \$6.5 billion from the military and transfer the savings to a variety of human needs programs." According to a summary printed at the beginning of the "1977 Voting Record," an attempt by "the Right-wing in Congress" to prohibit "all aid, including humanitarian aid," to Vietnam, Cambodia, Laos, Uganda, Mozambique, Angola, and Cuba was defeated in the House and Senate, credit being given to "The Administration -- with support from the Coalition" for securing "the removal of these statutory restrictions" which were viewed as "punitive measures disguised in the language of human rights to muddle the human rights issue and undercut Administration moves toward normalization of relations with Vietnam, Laos, and Cuba."

The voting record for 1977 was based on a tabulation of nine votes in the House and twelve in the Senate. The list of those with records of 100 percent support for the Coalition position in the House and Senate is an interesting one because so many of those who tended to vote along Coalition-approved lines have also been actively involved in Members of Congress for Peace Through Law (for purposes of comparison, 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). Among members of the Senate, seven were credited with voting for, being paired for, or having announced in favor of "the Coalition position." These seven were Senators Gravel (D-Alaska), Matsunaga (D-Hawaii), Clark and Culver (D-Iowa), Brooke (D-Mass.), Hatfield (R-Ore.), and McGovern (D-S.D.); eight others, among them Hart (D-Colo.), Sarbanes (D-Md.), Kennedy (D-Mass.), and Metzenbaum (D-Ohio), were credited with supporting "the Coalition position" in eight of the nine recorded instances, with Senators Church (D-Idaho) and Leahy (D-Vt.) credited with seven. In the House, 21 members were credited with support for "the Coalition position" on 11 of the 12 issues cited, while no fewer than 18 were listed as having supported the correct position on all 12: Representatives Stark, Waxman, and John Burton (D-Calif.); Schroeder (D-Colo.); Moffett (D-Conn.); Blouin (D-Iowa); Markey and Studds (D-Mass.); Kildee and Bonior (D-Mich.); Oberstar (D-Minn.); Maguire (D-N.J.); Chisholm, Holtzman, Rangel, Weiss, and Ottinger (D-N.Y.); and Kostmayer (D-Pa.).

The "1978 Voting Record" continued to reflect the Coalition's basic concern with such issues as restricting "aid to dictators," examples being the allegedly repressive governments of the Philippines and Chile, the "larger issue of the need for financing institutions to be accountable to human rights concerns," the Transfer Amendment, and opposition to the B-1 bomber and the

neutron bomb. The Coalition supported ratification of the Panama Canal Treaties and stated that "much" of its work later in the session "focused on fighting fierce Right Wing initiatives to lift Rhodesian sanctions, and to weaken the language barring international loans to South Africa." Losses cited included "an overall increase in the military budget for weapons procurement" and "the defeat of efforts to strike funds appropriated for Neutron Bomb components" while "votes to finally terminate funding for the B-1 Bomber" were characterized as "Our victories in both Houses" of Congress.

The 1978 record was based on nine votes in the House and, unlike that for 1977, only nine in the Senate. Only two Senators, Metzenbaum of Ohio and Hatfield of Oregon, supported "the Coalition position" on all nine occasions, while two (Clark of Iowa and Sarbanes of Maryland) were credited with the correct position on eight of the nine. In the House, 26 members were listed as supporting the Coalition view on eight of the nine questions, while 41 were carried as lending their support to all nine: Representatives Udall (D-Ariz.); Dellums, Stark, Edwards, Mineta, Beilenson, Roybal, and Phillip Burton (D-Calif.); Schroeder and Wirth (D-Colo.); Moffett (D-Conn.); Yates and Mikva (D-Ill.); Harkin and Bedell (D-Iowa); Mikulski and Mitchell (D-Md.); Drinan, Markey, Moakley, and Studts (D-Mass.); Kildee, Bonior, and Brodhead (D-Mich.); Oberstar (D-Minn.); Clay (D-Mo.); Maguire (D-N.J.); Rosenthal, Chisholm, Holtzman, Rangel, Garcia, Ottinger, and McHugh (D-N.Y.); Stokes and Vanik (D-Ohio); Edgar and Kostmayer (D-Pa.); Eckhardt (D-Tex.); and Kastenmeier and Cornell (D-Wis.).

These compilations are intended frankly for use as political leverage. In the words of the 1977 summary, "As you survey these votes, consider how you might use this information to exert stronger pressure on Congressional deliberations on the issues in 1978." Also, "The 1978 elections will provide many opportunities to win visibility and support for a new foreign policy and more humane budget priorities." The 1978 record was a touch more ambitious in tone, claiming that "the groundwork we have laid will help shape the debate of the 96th Congress" and reminding readers that "Most lawmakers will be looking anxiously toward the 1980 elections...."

The Coalition's program is outlined in its simplest form in the "Meet the Coalition" brochure, which declares that the CNFMP

- * Analyzes and articulates key issues in U.S. foreign policy and budget priorities, benefiting from the expertise of its member organizations and Working Group participants;

- * Coordinates and focuses the research, educational and lobbying efforts of national organizations on these issues;

* Produces and distributes educational resources, including Action Guides on human rights, disarmament and budget priorities;

* Alerts grassroots activists to pending legislation and organizes constituent pressure in support of key policy initiatives in Congress and the Executive Branch.

The "expertise" of the Coalition's "Working Group participants" is focused generally as outlined in brief form in the "peace movement, continued" leaflet:

Our National Priorities Working Group backs the transfer of funds from the dangerously bloated military budget to international and domestic programs meeting urgent human needs. Conversion legislation would create thousands of new jobs in a dynamic peacetime economy.

Our Disarmament Working Group supports arms limitations with the Soviet Union, troop withdrawals from outdated posts in South Korea, and an end to the American weapons trade.

Our Human Rights Working Group fights to halt U.S. aid to repressive regimes and backs majority rule and authentic self-determination in southern Africa.

Our Indochina Working Group seeks reconciliation and diplomatic relations with countries in that war-ravaged region.

In attempting to implement this program and achieve the desired impact on the deliberations of Congress, the Coalition has often worked closely with members of both the House and the Senate. A "Dear Colleague" letter dated February 15, 1977, for example, over the names of "George McGovern, U.S.S.," "Benjamin Rosenthal, M.C.," and "Pat Schroeder, M.C.," advertised the "second in our series of seminars to provide fresh perspectives on U.S.-Soviet relations and American foreign policy" on February 17, 1977, in the Rayburn House Office Building. The subject of the meeting was to be "The Future of Detente." The letter listed three scheduled speakers: Averell Harriman, former Ambassador to the Soviet Union; Walter Clemens, a professor at Brown University; and Richard J. Barnet, "Co-director of the Institute for Policy Studies" and "former Disarmament Advisor at the State Department." Members and staff were invited "to participate in this lively seminar which is being held with the support of the Coalition for a New Foreign and Military Policy." On February 9, as shown by a transcript inserted into the March 29, 1977, Congressional Record by Senator McGovern, Senators Mark Hatfield and George McGovern and Representatives Jonathan Bingham, Ron Dellums, Tom Harkin, Elizabeth Holtzman, George Miller, Toby Moffett, and Stephen Solarz had sponsored what Senator McGovern characterized as "a

discussion of outstanding issues between the United States and Vietnam." This gathering on "Resolving the Unfinished Business of the War" was also sponsored by three organizations: Friendship-ment, the National Council for Universal and Unconditional Amnesty, and the Coalition for a New Foreign and Military Policy.

A Coalition press release dated December 11, 1978, announced that "Senator Edward M. Kennedy, civil rights leader Coretta Scott King," and the CNFMP had issued a statement alleging that "the human rights agenda in both our foreign and domestic policies is far from fulfilled" and pointing to "the failure of the Senate to ratify the Genocide Convention and to establish a date for receiving testimony on the international Human Rights Covenants and the Convention to End All Forms of Racial Discrimination." The statement also "catalogued" such "major foreign and domestic concerns" before the country as "increased military spending, inadequate health care and housing, aid to repressive governments, and continuing discrimination for women and racial minorities" and called attention "to activities organized by local citizens across the nation in commemoration of Human Rights Week, the National Religious Call for Public Support of the U.N. Human Rights Covenants, and the December 11 Commemoration at the United Nations."

More recently, a press release dated January 22, 1979, announced a press conference scheduled for January 25 under Coalition auspices in the Rayburn House Office Building, the purpose being to "respond to the President's budget." Announced participants included Senator George McGovern; Representative Parren Mitchell; William Winpisinger of the International Association of Machinists; Mayor George Athanson of Hartford, Connecticut; and Nancy Ramsey, legislative director of the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom and "Coalition spokesperson," who condemned the President's budget as "shocking" because "the military gets a 3% real growth increase while day care centers, health research, jobs programs, social security benefits and our hard-pressed cities are sacrificed in the name of inflation." An account of the press conference distributed by the CNFMP under date of February 1979 reflects that Senator McGovern excoriated President Carter's "new foundation" for having as "its cornerstone" what he called "military waste." Representative Mitchell was quoted as stating that President Carter's cutbacks in social programs were "cruel and callous." Ramsey announced efforts by "members of our network in 30 cities across the country" to protest "this callous budget request" with "local press conferences, vigils, picket lines, rallies and town meetings," the hope being that "Congress will get the message that their constituents do not agree with President Carter's priorities."

In getting "the message" to Congress, the Coalition has achieved notable successes and sustained some equally notable losses. The "peace movement, continued" brochure includes a useful summary of "THE SCORE SO FAR:"

WINS

Human Rights Amendment 238-164 House
 B-1 Bomber Program Halt 234-182 House
 Chile Military Aid Halt 48-39 Senate
 Panama Canal Treaty 68-32 Senate

LOSSES

Transfer Amendment 102-306 House
 Neutron Bomb Program Halt 109-297 House
 Angola/Mozambique Human Aid 188-219 House

While conceding that its "lobbying and grass-roots campaigns" have "won many" and "lost some" important votes in the House and Senate, the Coalition alleges a positive side exists even with respect to the losses: "Measures which lost might never have come up for vote without Coalition backing." There are certainly several members of both bodies who have expressed themselves in most approving terms with regard to the Coalition's efforts. Representative Tom Harkin has been quoted as recognizing its "work, especially at the local level, in stimulating public concern and awareness of human rights legislation" as "very important" while Representative Helen Meyner (D-N.J.) has praised the Coalition as "a great help to me during my efforts to restrict the International Military Education and Training Program," adding that "The Coalition provides professional assistance and a moral, humanist perspective on foreign policy that is simply invaluable." Senator George McGovern has expressed his "Many thanks for...the excellent help the Coalition provided on the human rights amendment" and added his certainty that "it had a great deal to do with the acceptance of the amendment."

Senator James Abourezk has acknowledged specifically the "good work from you and so many others in the Human Rights Working Group," and Representative Parren Mitchell has acknowledged the effectiveness of Coalition organizing efforts in behalf of his transfer amendment, one of the Coalition's highest priorities.* Representative Herman Badillo (D-N.Y.) wrote of "how much I appreciate the very vital role the Coalition played" in passage of an amendment on human rights and multilateral banks and added that "My colleagues kept telling me how effective 'my' lobbyists were -- they were absolutely inundated by good people giving them good advice!" One of the most effusive of the encomia from members of Congress was provided by Representative Jonathan B. Bingham (D-N.Y.), who is quoted by the Coalition as writing:

*According to an article by Communist Party, U.S.A., Central Committee member Gil Green in the February 1978 Political Affairs, "The Priorities Working Group of the Coalition has helped formulate the new Parren Mitchell Transfer Amendment and is actively working to rally support for it." This amendment is also a high priority with the CPUSA; Green wrote that "no Communist, class conscious person or progressive, should need special prodding as to the importance of this fight and the need for active and leading participation in it."

Now that the uphill battle to partially lift the Vietnam trade embargo is nearly over, I want to offer my personal thanks to you...As you know, the odds of this particular bill becoming law were quite slim at the outset, particularly with the war so recently ended and a natural desire on the part of members and the public to put Vietnam out of their minds. The untiring efforts of the Coalition urging constituents to write their Congressmen on behalf of ending the embargo must be given much of the credit for our success.

On April 16, 1979, the Coalition for a New Foreign and Military Policy announced that "Thousands of people in over 40 cities throughout America are demonstrating their opposition to the current budget priorities of this country" with activities that "reflect the growing demand to transfer tax dollars from the military budget to meet the real human needs of this nation." In Congress, "The Transfer Amendment will be introduced later this month by Rep. Elizabeth Holtzman (D-NY) and Sen. George McGovern (D-SD)." The release further stated that "transfer referendums" have been passed "overwhelmingly" in Madison, Wisconsin, and San Francisco, California, as well as by city councils in St. Louis, Missouri, and East Orange, New Jersey. CNFMP "spokesperson" Erica Foldy characterized the "so-called conservative movement to cut taxes" as "really people getting rightfully angry about paying more and getting less" and added her denunciation of "the wasteful, bloated military budget that is robbing them, while it fuels inflation and the arms race."

As indicated previously, the emphasis on transfer amendments and economic conversion has been among the most consistent and recurring themes in Coalition propaganda. In the words of the Disarmament Action Guide Winter 1977-78, "Military spending steals resources that could be used to solve pressing problems such as poor housing, health care and transportation. Conversion means new priorities." To counteract what it has called the "inhuman priorities" of the President's budget, the Coalition continues to urge people to write their Senators and Representatives to "present in thoughtful and compelling terms, the case for disarmament and a reordering of national priorities." A "Dear Friends" letter dated April 1, 1979, includes a sample letter which reflects the basic Coalition viewpoint on spending priorities and which also illustrates the organization's tendency to derogate the traditional assessment of the Soviet Union as an actual threat to the security of the United States; this letter reads in pertinent part as follows:

Dear (Senator), (Representative),

I am deeply concerned about the high level of military spending proposed by President Carter and the Budget Committees. During a period of fiscal restraint, it is critical that we seriously examine our spending priorities and scrutinize carefully all aspects of our

budget -- including the military. I urge...your support of the (McGovern) (Mitchell) transfer amendment which calls for shifting funds from unnecessary military programs into other, more useful categories.

...the budget for strategic forces includes weapons which are both unnecessary and may actually endanger our national security. For example, "counterforce" weapons like the MX Missile make nuclear war more likely by lowering the nuclear threshold [sic] and by creating an incentive for one side to launch its missiles before they can be destroyed. In addition, mobile bases for the MX would make it very difficult for the Soviets to count how many U.S. missiles are deployed and therefore endanger future arms control agreements [sic].

U.S. policy-makers would do well to stop viewing each U.S. policy setback as a "gain" for the Soviet Union. What both the U.S. and the Soviet Union face is increasing nationalism and independence of Third World countries. And, it should be remembered that nothing the Soviet Union has done in thirty years has decreased U.S. power and prestige as much as the United States' long involvement in Vietnam --a result of trying to play policeman of the world and advancing U.S. interests by relying on militarism. Ultimately, our national security must depend on strength at home --on jobs, health and education rather than bombs, tanks and missiles.

THE COALITION, THE RIGHT, AND THE LEFT

Like so many other organizations which may generally be characterized as being on the left, the Coalition for a New Foreign and Military Policy appears much concerned with alleged "ultra-conservative" and "well-financed right-wing" opponents. Such groups as the American Security Council are singled out for special criticism and are used to appeal to fears of "resurgent right-wing militarism" that are apparently characteristic of Coalition supporters. An undated brochure speaks of the "pitched battle" that is "underway between resurgent right-wing militarism and the forces for peace and a humane foreign policy" and warns that the "right-wing has adopted our tactics -- grass roots mobilization and pressure on Congress and the Administration -- and is presently applying them with greater financial resources than we are able to muster." The brochure continues:

The American people do not want a return to the Cold War and big power sword rattling, but pressure from the right-wing is jeopardizing recent hard-won progress.

* Human Rights: The Coalition led the successful efforts to pass historic human rights legislation giving Congress the right to link foreign aid to the status of human rights in a country. But even with the new laws on the books, Congress has been reluctant to apply the laws because of right-wing pressure.

* Disarmament: The victory against the B-1 bomber was the first of its kind in American history. Yet this achievement risks being overwhelmed by a right-wing offensive in opposition to SALT and in favor of weapons systems like the Cruise Missile, M-X, and others which are even more dangerous than the B-1.

* Transfer: The promising new effort to increase funding for human services by reducing the cost of U.S. foreign policy, I.E., military spending, cannot withstand a new cold war hysteria.

* Indochina: The Coalition's success in pushing Congress to lift the Viet Nam Trade Embargo was nullified by President Ford's veto in 1976. Since then, Coalition efforts to encourage reconstruction aid and normalization have met increased resistance in Congress because of ultra-conservative forces.

Considering the obvious depth of this concern, it is perhaps hardly surprising that the CNFMP, in pursuing its goals and attempting to frustrate the efforts of its "well-financed right-wing" opposition, has allied itself with a number of groups of a clearly leftist cast. Many of these have already been discussed in sections of this study dealing with such subjects as the Coalition's predecessors and Working Groups. A more recent example appears in a basic Coalition leaflet extolling the virtues of "Economic Conversion." This leaflet, which also pushes for "the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks (SALT), Nuclear Non-proliferation Treaties and Foreign Military Sales restraints," carries the notation that it "is sponsored by" the United Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers of America, the International Association of Machinists and Aerospace Workers, the International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union, and the CNFMP. The Coalition has also participated in at least one major conference conducted by Ralph Nader's anti-nuclear energy apparatus, Critical Mass. According to a detailed report in the October 14, 1978, edition of the Congressional Record, the CNFMP was one of several groups which participated in the "Critical Mass 78" conference on October 6-8, 1978, in Washington, D.C., along with such other organizations as Friends of the Earth, the American Civil Liberties Union, the American Friends Service Committee, Congress Watch/Public Citizen, the Clamshell Alliance, the National Council of Churches, the Natural Resources Defense Council, the New American Movement, the Union of Concerned Scientists, the Center for National Security Studies, and the Campaign to Stop Government Spying. Featured speakers included, in addition to Nader, such

luminaries of the left as Tom Hayden; Morton Halperin of CNSS; and Russell Hemenway of the National Committee for an Effective Congress (see Heritage Foundation Institution Analysis No. 5, "National Committee for an Effective Congress," April 1978).

Another organization involved in the Critical Mass 78 conference was the Mobilization for Survival. According to an authoritative review published in the July 29, 1977, issue of Information Digest, the MFS, "operating from the headquarters of the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom" in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, "made its formal debut on April 23, 1977, at a Philadelphia conference" attended by "118 persons from 49 groups" such as, among others, the AFSC, Chicago Peace Council, North American Congress on Latin America, Women Strike for Peace, WILPF, and Coalition for a New Foreign and Military Policy. The evidence cited in this source indicates that the Mobilization was initiated with significant help from Sidney Peck and Sidney Lens -veteran "peace" activists whose backgrounds include, respectively, membership in the Wisconsin State Committee of the CPUSA and leadership in the Trotskyite Revolutionary Workers League - at the specific instance of a British representative of the Soviet-controlled World Peace Council and that Lens "drafted the original conference call after meeting with AFSC and other 'peace activists' last Thanksgiving in Boston." The address of the Chicago Mobilization for Survival is the same as that for the Chicago Peace Council, which is known to be wholly controlled by the Communist Party, U.S.A.

The Mobilization has drawn praise from CPUSA leader Gil Green, who has stated in the February 1979 Political Affairs that "The Mobilization recognizes the prime responsibility of U.S. imperialism for the nuclear arms race," although "some within it equate the responsibility of both 'superpowers.'" According to Green, the MFS "has given its full support to the transfer strategy and the Parren Mitchell Transfer Amendment." Further, "In the Mobilization's work for the Transfer Amendment there is a close tie-in with the efforts of the Priorities Work[ing] Group of the Coalition for a New Foreign and Military Policy and a pooling of resources." It is noteworthy that the Communist Party-controlled magazine New World Review has specifically called the attention of its readers to several organizations "involved...in the struggle for arms control, for cutting the U.S. military budget, [and] for banning the neutron bomb" and that these organizations include both the CNFMP and the Mobilization for Survival, along with the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship, one of the oldest extant fronts for the CPUSA; the AFSC; Clergy and Laity Concerned; Women Strike for Peace; the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom; and the U.S. Peace Council, American affiliate of the Moscow-controlled World Peace Council. The U.S. Peace Council is run by Michael Myerson, at one time secretary of the Peace Commission of the New York State Communist Party.

DISARMAMENT, NUCLEAR PROLIFERATION, AND SALT

In 1977, the Disarmament Working Group of the CNFMP circulated a "Disarmament Appeal to President Carter." This document cited a number of "global problems" such as "the spread of nuclear weapons, a burgeoning supply of plutonium, shortages of natural resources and energy, hunger [and] population pressures, the growing income gap between rich and poor nations, worldwide inflation, pollution and terrorism" and urged, rather than the use of military force, "a worldwide attack on our common problems; major arms reductions, leading in stages to general and complete disarmament; planning for the conversion of military facilities to civilian uses; and strengthened international peace-keeping institutions, associated with the United Nations." The signers called on the government to "undertake a continuing series of highly-publicized acts of restraint and to invite the Soviet Union to reciprocate them." The appeal was signed by some 85 "prominent Americans," among them people affiliated with organizations like the Fund for Peace, Center for Defense Information, numerous church groups affiliated with the CNFMP, and several members of Congress. An official response to this appeal was contained in an October 3, 1977, letter from the director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, Paul C. Warnke, to Herbert Scoville, Jr., and E. Raymond Wilson of the CNFMP. This "Dear Pete and Raymond" letter reads in part as follows:

The President has asked me to reply to your letter of August 2.... The two of you know, as well as any people I can think of, the difficulties faced by the President in carrying out his strong commitment to arms control. Therefore, both he and I were pleased by the evidence of broad and distinguished support for his commitment that the appeal provides.

...One of the important tasks ahead of us will be to promote public awareness of the issues and to foster public understanding of solutions to the complex problems involved. Active support from interested and concerned citizens such as you is essential if we are to succeed.

I believe that there are no more important decisions facing Americans, and people throughout the world, than those that affect the relative likelihood of nuclear war. The objective of preventing nuclear war is the controlling issue of our time. Faced with the seriousness of this reality, the support of the Coalition is welcome and gratifying.

On March 23, 1979, the Coalition announced that "Over fifty leaders of the religious, political, labor, and professional communities have urged President Carter to hasten the conclusion of a Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty with the Soviet Union." This appeal was contained in "a letter drafted and circulated by the Disarmament Working Group" of the CNFMP and emphasized that "a

Comprehensive Test Ban would complement the expected SALT II Treaty and would demonstrate American commitment to halt the qualitative side of the arms race." The Coalition release also included a list of those who had signed the appeal, among them the two "Co-Chairs" of the CNFMP, Edward Snyder and Gretchen Eick, and the "Co-Chairs" of its Disarmament Working Group, E. Raymond Wilson and Herbert Scoville. Other signers included individuals associated with several major religious organizations prominently identified with Coalition aims and activities; leaders of the American Friends Service Committee; individuals from the academic community; and the following people of particular interest in view of information in preceding sections of this study:

Robert L. Borosage
Director
Institute [for] Policy Studies

David A. Gold
Gordon Adams
Council on Economic Priorities

Richard Boardman
Clergy and Laity Concerned

William W. Winpisinger
President
International Association of Machinists

David Cortright
SANE

Michael Myerson
U.S. Peace Council

Rev. Robert Moore
National Secretary
Mobilization for Survival

Ethel Taylor
National Coordinator
Women Strike for Peace

Barton Hunter
Executive Secretary
Fellowship of Reconciliation

Thomas Whelan
New Directions

Henry Niles
Business Executives Move for New National Priorities

Jane Leiper
Washington Office
National Council of Churches

Melva Mueller
 Executive Director
 Women's International League for Peace and Freedom

Jerome Frank
 Federation of American Scientists

Patrick Tobin
 Washington Representative
 International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union

A centerpiece, however, if not the centerpiece of current Coalition activity is its ambitious program of organizing and lobbying activity designed to aid in achieving ratification of the SALT II agreement by the Senate of the United States. The Coalition's official position on SALT II is contained in a statement adopted in March 1979 and reprinted in the Summer 1979 Coalition Close-Up:

COALITION SALT II STATEMENT

The Coalition for a New Foreign and Military Policy welcomes the long-delayed conclusion of the second Strategic Arms Limitation Treaty (SALT II). Swift ratification of this Treaty will significantly enhance our nation's security by limiting the growth of strategic weaponry and lowering the risk of nuclear war.

We are pleased that SALT II establishes equal and comprehensive strategic delivery vehicle ceilings, which for the first time require the dismantling of already deployed weapons. We are also gratified that upper limits have been set for the first time on the number of missile warheads (MIRV's) that each country can have. However, we regret that these limits do not require early significant mutual reductions of strategic weapons.

We consider the restrictions in the Agreements on testing and deployment of new types of strategic weapons as important first steps toward controlling the very dangerous qualitative arms race. Yet we are concerned that in order to seek support for the SALT II agreement, many doors are still left open to eventual deployment of destabilizing and non-verifiable future weapons systems such as the MX Missile. In the long run, such concessions would be self-defeating because they would decrease our security by stimulating the costly and dangerous arms race. Thus we urge the Administration to make no firm commitments to procure such weapons in order to garner votes for the SALT Treaty.

We are pleased that the Treaty establishes useful measures not only to permit adequate verification of compliance but also to reduce uncertainties over the strategic threats both nations face.

In addition to supporting SALT II we call upon the Administration to enter immediately into SALT II negotiations based upon the Statement of Principles and aimed at substantial reductions and more extensive restrictions on new nuclear armaments. We believe that we must also take independent national steps to limit our weapons programs, since this is an important and necessary complementary approach to controlling the dangerous strategic arms race.

We believe that failure to ratify the SALT II Treaty would decrease our security, increase the risk of nuclear war, lead to even greater crises in military expenditures, and be a major setback to our goals of further controls on nuclear and conventional arms, including the early achievement of a Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty and the halt to the further spread of nuclear weapons throughout the world.

In this endeavor, as in its fight to obtain passage of economic conversion and transfer legislation, the Coalition for a New Foreign and Military Policy has gained the specific approbation of a number of organizations on the left, not the least of which is, again, the Communist Party. An article in the July 1979 issue of Political Affairs describes SALT II as "the most critical foreign policy test of the decade" and singles out such groups as Americans for SALT and the CNFMP for praise because of their program of "actively mobilizing for SALT II," seen as "only another step in the struggle to reverse the arms race, and not the last." It is instructive to note that the text of the "Draft Main Political Resolution" for the 22nd National Convention of the CPUSA, reprinted in the July 1979 Political Affairs, contains the following paragraph which, while it mentions no organization by name, nevertheless is strongly reminiscent of the multi-issue program of the CNFMP:

These developments, and the "guns, not butter" policies of the Carter Administration have placed the struggle for peace in the very center of all social and economic issues. The linkage of peace with wages, taxes, inflation, energy, unemployment, the dollar crisis, the refusal of monopoly to renew plants and equipment, the crisis of the cities, health care, education, etc., has made the fight for peace an explosive political issue.

A second instance appeared in the July 28, 1979, issue of World Magazine, a weekly supplement to the the CPUSA's Daily World and People's World, in which, in an article by CPUSA member

Karen Talbot, World Peace Council representative to the United Nations, it is stated that "There has never been a more urgent matter facing the people of the U.S. or the rest of the world than the ratification of the SALT II treaty." This article warns of the "multi-pronged offensive by the right" allegedly to scuttle the treaty and argues that "it is necessary to develop a multi-pronged fightback with SALT II ratification as the centerpiece and primary objective." Continuing, "Such a multi-faceted campaign is being conducted by the Coalition for a New Foreign and Military Policy. Their materials are excellent and should be widely distributed" along with "materials from Americans for SALT and The Committee on East-West Accord." Another article in the same source also recommends both the CNFMP and Americans for SALT, as well as the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom and the U.S. Peace Council, as sources of valuable information in pushing for ratification of the SALT II agreement.

CONCLUSION

As stated at the outset, the Coalition for a New Foreign and Military Policy is probably the most comprehensive effort mounted to date by the so-called "anti-defense lobby" in this country. Its 43 member organizations and the various other organizations within its Working Groups constitute a veritable cross-section of the movement as it exists today and range from religious groups to an assortment of outright leftist operations which are also active in campaigns to undermine the American intelligence community and the maintenance of an even nominally anti-Communist foreign policy. The Coalition, like its predecessors in the "peace" movement of the 1960s and early 1970s, is clearly based on the idea of "nonexclusion," welcoming into its ranks both pro-Communist and non-Communist organizations solely on the basis of their opposition to the sort of defense and foreign policies that have presumably characterized the United States government's efforts since the end of the Second World War and the inauguration of the Cold War. If this fact is borne in mind, it becomes obvious that the Coalition for a New Foreign and Military Policy may fairly be regarded as perhaps the most potent and significant single assault by the organized political left on American foreign and defense policy since the end of the Vietnam war and that, as such, it bears the closest scrutiny and the most careful watching.

William T. Poole
Policy Analyst

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

