

World Federalists direct nuclear freeze in Congress

by D. Stephen Pepper

"We are absolutely opposed to any weapons in space and we are against anything nuclear." With these words Representative Edward Markey (D-Mass.), congressional sponsor of the nuclear freeze resolution and a leading ideologue of the movement, responded to intensive questioning by *EIR* and others at the press conference held by the nuclear freeze movement in Washington, D.C. on March 8. Markey went on to admit that the nuclear freeze would "rather leave intact the present situation [i.e., the doctrine of mutually assured destruction—MAD] than raise the possibility of defensive weapons."

The nuclear freeze movement as a whole is indeed designed to preserve the MAD doctrine. That is why the freeze advocates are increasingly and publicly obsessed with discrediting the feasibility of defensive systems, particularly the development of energy beam weapons that can knock out ballistic missiles. *EIR* founder Lyndon LaRouche and presidential adviser Edward Teller have been the two principal advocates of the development of such systems. Both have been strenuously attacked by the freeze advocates and their controllers. At the same press conference, Randall Forsberg, a national leader of the freeze movement, ranted that for 20 years Teller has proposed that technology can bring peace, "and he's been wrong every time."

Sandy Persons gives orders

Directly controlling this operation is the World Federalist movement. The Washington-based leader of the World Federalists, Sandy Persons, took personal charge of the effort during the vote by the House Foreign Affairs committee on the freeze. Persons, seated in the gallery, announced the amendment to the basic resolution, which was then intro-

duced by Rep. Jim Leach (R.-Iowa). The Leach resolution is a resurrection of the so-called McCloy-Zorin agreement, named after John J. McCloy and Valentin Zorin, respectively U.S. and Soviet disarmament negotiators in 1961. The proposal, which specified total disarmament by stages, was one of the first anti-technology agreements proposed under the guise of disarmament. It also calls for such measures as the abolition of national armed services and their replacement by a global police force, administered by the United Nations. Therefore, it was never considered for ratification by the superpowers at the time. But it has been a beloved project of the World Federalist movement ever since. The Senate's chief "freeze" advocate, presidential aspirant Alan Cranston of California, is a longstanding World Federalist and, like other World Federalists, a dedicated Malthusian and opponent of broad-scale industrial progress.

According to one of Leach's aides, "there was an eleventh-hour lobbying campaign by the World Federalists on this thing [the McCloy-Zorin proposal]. It has been a crusade of theirs for years." As for Leach himself, "his goals are identical with those of McNamara and Vance," according to the aide. "Space-based weapons are Leach's main concern," he continued. "Watch out for attempts to develop particle beam weapons." These remarks were in reference to the Feb. 28 press conference held by Robert McNamara and Cyrus Vance, in which the two declared war on U.S. security by calling for a \$136 billion cut over five years in U.S. defense spending, and even more importantly, the elimination of any R&D money for beam weapons.

The Leach amendment is thus revealed to be a part of the World Federalist orchestration of the campaign against beam weapons. A close collaborator of the World Federalists, Rob-



Stuart Lewis/NSIPS

Americans' fear of war is being perverted into an assault on nuclear energy in general and high-energy anti-missile defense in particular.

ert Bowman, has launched a campaign explicitly aimed at the antiballistic defense program proposed by LaRouche and Teller. Bowman, the president of the recently formed Institute for Space and Security Studies, issued a leaflet entitled "Preliminary Analysis of High Frontier Proposal," in which he explicitly attacked the entire concept of defensive weapons. These concepts, he argues, are so dangerous that even before his institute completed a study of them, it is necessary to denounce claims made on their behalf as "blatant misinformation—"none of these claims are true." Bowman will address the executive board of the World Federalists at their next meeting.

After the McCloy-Zorin amendment was sneaked into the freeze resolution as part of the preamble, freeze coordinators commented that if congressmen understood implications of the preamble, it could cause a backlash. Several Capitol Hill sources have commented that conservatives actually like the freeze resolution because it has things like on-site inspection.

The fact that some conservatives are supporting such initiatives has Wickersham, Persons, and Bowman laughing the hardest. The administration, too, has allowed its guns to be spiked. Although the President has announced his desire for a militarily strong United States, his administration has yet to demonstrate that it is prepared to take the requisite steps of initiating a crash beam-weapons defense program and announcing it to the world.

In the environment of budget pressures, the freeze proponents expect the administration to reshape military policy around conventional buildup and the so-called "projection of power," the fancy term for a world police force. Unbeknownst to the conservatives, this is precisely World Feder-

alist policy. The recent announcement by Fed Chairman Paul Volcker that the record budget deficit will cause interest rates to rise is the context in which the administration is supposed to make further concessions to the World Federalist faction to preserve the semblance of a military buildup.

The only hope for a turnaround in the U.S. strategic situation has been introduced by the LaRouche faction of the Democratic Party, the National Democratic Policy Committee (NDPC), which has brought to the public at large the military, scientific, and industrial reasons why development of space-based anti-ballistic beam weapons is the only way to secure peace. The intensity of this campaign and its effects on Congress caught the freeze movement off guard. At the press conference mentioned above, Markey and Leach were unable to formulate any intelligent response to the potential of beam weapons. One NDPCer from Tuskegee Institute threw Leach into babbling double talk after the student pressed him to admit that the freeze utterly failed to limit the danger of war from existing weapons. It was under such grilling that Markey admitted his endorsement of MAD.

Over 20 NDPC activists, representing half a dozen states, visited congressmen in a two day lobbying effort to introduce the beam weapons campaign as the "higher peace movement" in Congress. Two contrasting experiences of the New Jersey NDPC lobbyists reflect the attitudes of the congressmen. Rep. Robert Roe (D-N.J.) was genuinely taken aback when he met with his NDPC constituents, who demonstrated to him the anti-technology aspects of the nuclear freeze movement. Although he became excited about the possibilities of ABM defense, he was still planning to vote for the freeze, simply because he wished to show he was concerned about the danger of nuclear war. On the other hand, Rep. Bernard Dwyer (D-N.J.) abruptly terminated the meeting when his constituents identified the depopulation policies advocated by Vance and McNamara. Such attacks, he claimed, were "character assassination."

The most striking expression of the NDPC mobilization's effect is the fact that the National League of Cities meeting in Washington during these past days did not pass a pro-freeze resolution, despite the overwhelming preponderance of Democrats there. The NDPC lobbyists were so effective that the freezers became convinced that a resolution would be discredited even if it passed. Even though it is likely that the freeze resolution will pass the House, the momentum has shifted. With each visit from NDPC delegations from across the country, the conviction is growing within the NDPC that it is not enough to pressure Congress, it is necessary to change it. For example, in Wichita, Kansas, NDPC-endorsed candidate for City Commissioner Sheri Preston held a press conference before the office of pro-freeze congressman Dan Glickman calling on him to vote against the freeze and the IMF bailout, "otherwise we will replace you." The latest word from Glickman's office is that he is undecided on the freeze issue. The congressman knows his constituents are watching.