

League of Women Voters: the vanguard for Brave New World politics

by Kathleen Klenetsky

The name "League of Women Voters" conjures up images of upper-middle-class ladies getting together over afternoon tea for discussions of civics. But since its inception, this supposedly nonpartisan organization has functioned as a "ladies' auxiliary" to the Council on Foreign Relations (CFR), the Trilateral Commission, and other elite institutions, helping to drum up support for the Eastern Establishment's policy agenda. Its funding comes from AT&T, IBM, Warner Communications, the Aspen Institute, W. R. Grace, and the Ford and Rockefeller Foundations. Its leaders are consistently drawn from the upper echelons of the Establishment.

The League doesn't limit itself to "studying" issues. As a national board member recently emphasized, "We're not interested in just producing reports. We want to change public policy and shape public opinion."

A disarmament lobby

Over its 63-year history, the League has actively lobbied for the following policies:

- **Appeasement:** The League has always promoted "disarmament" schemes; it recently jumped on board the nuclear-freeze movement.

- **World government:** In the post-war period, the League played a pivotal role in marshaling public support for the United Nations, the IMF, and other bodies designed as a world government in embryo.

- **Genocide:** The League has consistently boosted environmentalism and population control. It recently threw its efforts behind the campaign to institutionalize the Carter-Mondale administration's *Global 2000 Report* and has spearheaded efforts to slash U.S. energy consumption and living standards.

- **Sabotaging the Constitution:** The League has been a key force in the conspiracy to destroy U.S. political institutions. It was instrumental in establishing the Federal Election Commission; promoting the Carter-Mondale administration's national vote-fraud scheme, the Universal Voter Registration bill; and battling to abolish the Electoral College.

And the League has fought to keep the political scene clear of potent opposition to its policies. During the 1984 presidential elections, the League's nonpartisan pose was exposed as a fraud when it excluded Democratic presidential candidate Lyndon H. LaRouche from the current primary debates, shocking even the cynics of the press corps.

The League justified its decision by claiming that LaRouche is not a "significant" candidate—even though his campaign has raised \$1.5 million, qualified for federal matching funds, and paid for several half-hour national television spots.

The League would have mounted any argument to keep LaRouche out of the debates, knowing he would use them to expose to the American population the utter folly of the League's policies. This is particularly true in the area of national security. LaRouche's pre-eminent campaign theme is the need for the United States to launch an emergency defense mobilization, centered on the rapid development of directed-energy-beam systems, to counter the Soviet threat.

It was the League which, in 1982, inaugurated a far-reaching program on national security, which drew on the expertise of people like Gordon Adams of the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, a bitter opponent of strengthening U.S. defense capabilities.

In December 1983, the League issued a statement endorsing the nuclear freeze and a comprehensive test ban treaty, and opposing the development of space-weapons technology and the deployment of anti-satellite weapons. The League is now preparing a large-scale campaign to "educate" the public on these policies.

Anglo-Saxon racists

The League of Women Voters didn't become corrupt—it was born that way, sired by the Anglo-American elite and midwived by the British Fabian Society. Established in 1920, the League came out of a feminist movement imbued with an Anglo-Saxon racist outlook and dominated by raving cultists. The League's spiritual godmother, Elizabeth Cady Stanton, for example, was an avowed theosophist with an avid lifelong

interest in phrenology and spiritualism. Bankrolled by Mrs. Borden Harriman, Mrs. Oliver Hazard Perry Belmont, and the Vanderbilts, the League adopted an agenda topped by conservation, birth control, and immigration restriction, in order to radically cut the numbers of “racially inferior” Americans. The League is as committed today to this neo-Malthusian outlook as it was in its infancy.

According to Laureen Andrews, head of the international relations division at the group’s national headquarters, the League strongly supports the genocidal policies of the Brandt Commission and Global 2000. Andrews stated that the *Global 2000 Report*—which advocated eliminating 2 billion people by the year 2000—“came at a pivotal time. We definitely encourage our members to look at the *Global 2000 Report* and national headquarters sent out summaries of the report to our state leaders.”

The national League, said Andrews, “emphasizes [Global 2000] as a good vehicle for learning about these issues, which we ourselves have been emphasizing since the early 1970s.” Andrews proudly noted that the national League had co-founded the Global Tomorrow Coalition, which, she said, is “dedicated to promoting the concerns of Global 2000” and “doing all the footwork” to make sure they “are systematized in U.S. policy.”

Indeed, in its 1982-84 “Impact on Issues,” the League states that its members support “U.S. efforts to assist other nations in their population planning programs.”

The League had been one of the first “civic organizations” to jump on the population-control bandwagon. In 1972, it issued a publication entitled “More: The Interfaces Between Population, Economic Growth and the Environment,” which argued that global population growth must be radically curbed. Parading as another “objective” League study, the report declared: “The economic growth of the future will have to be different from the past. The time for population stabilization will surely come.” It also attacked “the old assumption that children are good for the nation,” and maintained that “a no-growth, steady-state society may be the only answer.”

Agitation against nuclear energy

This neo-Malthusianism permeates the League’s positions on energy and the environment: that the United States “must make a significant and progressive reduction in its energy growth.”

The League eagerly lent support to the Carter administration’s campaign to slash energy consumption. Under a grant from the Department of Energy (the League’s former national president, Ruth Clusen, was then employed as assistant secretary of energy for conservation), the League initiated a nationwide “grass-roots” program with topics ranging from “How to Insulate Your Home” to “Problems of Nuclear Waste Storage.” Sources for the program included Amory Lovins’s “Soft Energy Paths.”

Thus, it is not surprising to find the League leading local

fighters against nuclear-power plant construction and the like. The League works closely with such groups as the Environmental Defense Fund and Friends of the Earth. In April 1983, for instance, the League joined with the National Association of Solar Contractors to sue President Reagan to release \$21.85 million for the Solar Energy and Conservation Bank.

How the League came to run the debates

By virtue of its sponsorship of the presidential debates, the League of Women Voters has become a major arbiter of the presidential election. It achieved this position through the active intercession of the Aspen Institute, the Twentieth Century Fund, and the Federal Election Commission.

Ever since the Kennedy-Nixon debates in 1960, the League had been pressing for institutionalized presidential debates, but was faced with the problem of federal regulations requiring “equal time” for TV appearances of candidates running for the same office.

This problem was remedied with the help of the Aspen Institute’s Douglass Cater. First, Cater wrote a report for the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) recommending that it re-interpret the Communications Act of 1934 so that presidential debates could be televised as “on-the-spot coverage of bona-fide news events,” without the danger of “minor” candidates suing the networks for equal time. He further recommended that the debates be sponsored by a “non-profit, nonpartisan citizen group.” This “Aspen ruling” was adopted by the FCC, and the League went on to sponsor the 1976 debates.

Second, in 1979, Cater headed a Twentieth Century Fund task force on presidential debates, which urged that the League of Women Voters be designated as the sponsor of the 1980 debates, and author of the criteria under which candidates would be allowed to participate. Third, shortly thereafter, Cater turned up on the public advisory committee which helped the League run the debates.

For its part, the FEC rewrote its regulations so that “non-partisan” groups like the League could accept donations from unions and corporations to fund the debates.

The biggest underwriters for the 1980 League-sponsored debates included the Atlantic Richfield Foundation and the Radio Corporation of America (RCA). The chairman of Atlantic Richfield (Arco) is Robert O. Anderson, a leading member of the Aspen Institute. The chairman of RCA is Thornton Bradshaw, a crony of Anderson, director of Arco, and vice-chairman of the Aspen Institute (see *EIR*, Feb. 28).

Bradshaw’s RCA, in turn, owns the National Broadcasting Company (NBC), which has recently run two prime-time television broadcasts smearing Democratic presidential candidate Lyndon LaRouche. In 1980, the League’s presidential debates project director was Lee Hanna, an executive at NBC. This year, Hanna is serving on the League’s public advisory committee.

So much for the League’s nonpartisanship.