



# The Phyllis Schlafly Report

VOL. 24, NO. 9, SECTION 1

BOX 618, ALTON, ILLINOIS 62002

APRIL 1991

## Lessons of the Gulf War

This is the first time most Americans have ever seen our nation win a war. Now we can shake off our self-image as a defeated nation, characterized by that embarrassing picture of the helicopter lifting its last load of refugees out of Saigon. Let's peek under the national feeling of exhilaration and identify some lessons of lasting value.

1. The dramatic success of our Patriot anti-missile in zapping the Iraqi Scud proves the value and necessity of anti-missile defenses. We saw the clear proof on our television screens.

For the last 25 years, the liberals have been talking, conniving and voting against anti-missile defenses. Just last year, the liberals in Congress slashed SDI funding in half. Their arguments ricocheted back and forth, inconsistent and often incoherent. They said, "It won't work, it's too costly, it's provocative and will upset arms negotiations with the Russians, even if it does work it's a bad idea, and it's better to rely on Mutual Assured Destruction."

Now we know it does work, it's feasible, it's cost-effective, and it saves lives. American technology has demonstrated the near-impossible feat of hitting a bullet in flight with another bullet in flight. The Patriot isn't the full-blown SDI which President Reagan called for in his famous 1983 speech. But Patriot is an anti-missile, it uses SDI technology, and its anti-missile capabilities wouldn't have been available in the Gulf War without the technology developed through SDI funding.

At least 15 other nations are expected to have ballistic missiles by the year 2000, so why can't American civilians have the same protection against missile attacks that we provided to Saudi Arabia and to Israel? Congress should go full-speed ahead with SDI now that it has proven itself in the Middle East.

2. The Gulf War has fully validated the farsighted defense policies of Ronald Reagan. It proved that American defense capabilities should be based on the most sophisticated technology that money can buy plus a professional, all-volunteer fighting force.

3. The Gulf War proved that the way to minimize casualties is to confront the enemy with overwhelming force — and to escalate fast, not slowly (as we did in Vietnam). The reason we had such a small number of casualties was that Saddam Hussein's troops (including the vaunted republican guard

didn't put up much of a fight. They mostly surrendered or deserted; and so our troops never had to engage in hand-to-hand combat or aerial dogfights as our soldiers did with the Germans and the Japanese in World War II.

Overwhelming superiority, overkill, redundancy — those are all positive factors when it comes to winning battles. They do not mean we waste unnecessary resources; they mean we shed less blood because the enemy gives up sooner.

In 1956 when the Butcher of Budapest sent merely-superior numbers of troops and tanks into Hungary, the fighting was bloody until a beaten nation capitulated. In 1968, however, when the Soviets sent 650,000 troops with their full complement of artillery into Prague against an ill-equipped Czech army of only 175,000, there was no bloodshed; just a clean surrender.

4. The Gulf War proved that, if we get into a war, the President should let the military win it, which is what George Bush did. We can be grateful that George Bush didn't imitate Lyndon Johnson, who kept a map in the White House where he selected and approved every target our bombers were allowed to hit.

5. The Gulf War proved that we should never rely on missile treaties because, even with all our high tech, spies in the sky, and "national means of verification," we found only 35 of Saddam's 200 mobile Scud missile sites. If we couldn't find most of them in Iraq, we surely can't find Soviet mobile missiles in the vast areas of Russia and Siberia.

6. Finally, the Gulf War reconfirmed the fact that Mikhail Gorbachev is not our friend. He tried to help his pal Saddam Hussein with the hoary Communist ploy of calling for a cease-fire when the bad guys were on the run and needed a pause to regroup.

Fortunately, George Bush didn't fall for it because he understood the lesson of previous wars that "there is no substitute for victory."

### The New World Order

At least President Bush didn't parrot Woodrow Wilson's promise that we were fighting a foreign war "to make the world safe for democracy." Americans understand the word "democracy," and it's clear that "democracy" is not what our Gulf War or George Bush's foreign policy is all about.

Instead, President Bush packaged his foreign policy as an

effort to establish a "New World Order." Although he has used this phrase repeatedly in his speeches to the American people and to Congress beginning on September 11, 1990, either by design or inadvertence he has failed to define this new goal.

We are left to speculate on what he means by a New World Order. One option is that America will now undertake the role and responsibility of serving as the world's policeman; after all, keeping order by arresting the bad guys is the chief function of the police. The magnitude of such a role is awesome. Shall we next send our troops to repel the Soviets from invading Lithuania and Latvia? Or to protect the next protesters in Tiananmen Square? Of course not. Perhaps we will be the world's policeman merely to protect existing boundaries. That policy would make it OK for dictators to savage people within their own borders (such as Gorbachev repressing freedom in Lithuania and Latvia).

Or, does the New World Order mean that we will maintain a costly NATO-level of U.S. troops stationed in the Middle East for the next 40 years? The Administration has already announced that most of our troops won't be coming home right away.

A second possible definition of New World Order is that the United Nations will henceforth exercise decisionmaking power over U.S. foreign policy. Indeed, President Bush sought warmaking approval by the United Nations before he went to Congress, and his lawyers stoutly maintain that he didn't need Congressional approval at all.

In his September 11, 1990 speech to Congress, Bush said, "We are now in sight of a United Nations that performs as envisioned by its founders." During her tenure as Ambassador to the U.N., Jeane Kirkpatrick conclusively exposed the hostility of the United Nations toward American policy and interests.

Most Americans were pleased that the U.N. had become an irrelevancy in world events. Most Americans are very uncomfortable with Bush's resurrection of this anti-American outfit. Does the New World Order mean that the propaganda will begin anew to try to convince Americans to accept the United Nations as our world government?

A third possible definition of New World Order was suggested a few weeks ago by Abe Rosenthal of the *New York Times*, namely, "a convergence of goals and interests between the United States and the Soviet Union working as a team through the U.N. Security Council." Since the Third-World-dominated General Assembly of the United Nations could be as fractious and frustrating for President Bush as the liberal Democratic-dominated Congress, it would be so much more efficient for the two superpowers to just get together on the Hot Line and make all the important international decisions.

Rosenthal's use of the word "convergence" is ominously reminiscent of the use of that word by Lyndon Johnson's National Security Adviser, McGeorge Bundy, who was famous for his theory that the U.S. and the U.S.S.R. would "converge," and by John F. Kennedy's State Department policy planning chairman, Walt W. Rostow, who was famous for his plea for "an end to nationhood."

On February 26, Gorbachev told the Byelorussian Academy of Sciences: "My dear Party comrades, I am a Communist, and I adhere to the socialist idea. And I shall remain so until

the end of my days." Yet, President Bush is openly supportive of Gorbachev and has called for giving him billions of dollars of U.S. tax-funded credits.

Bush and the other Western heads of state have closed their eyes to the way Gorbachev has abandoned perestroika and all hope for a free market economy. He is trying to browbeat the nation into functioning under the heavy-handed, failed socialist bureaucracies.

Gorbachev took personal control of the KGB on March 5 and made it the vehicle to force compliance with his totalitarian one-man rule. Whatever remained of glasnost was liquidated when Gorbachev clamped down on the Baltic states and denied Boris Yeltsin the opportunity to speak on television prior to the March 17 referendum.

President Bush, his National Security Adviser Brent Scowcroft, and his financial advisers cherish "stability," and so are apparently willing to line up with the repressive Soviet regime of Gorbachev rather than with the hundreds of thousands of Soviet citizens who have been demonstrating against him.

Does the New World Order mean ruling the world in cooperation with big-power dictatorships rather than allowing the uncertainties and unpredictability of freedom and decentralization?

### **U.N. Treaty On Rights Of The Child**

The proposed United Nations Convention (Treaty) on the Rights of the Child is a good example of why Americans should vigorously oppose any efforts to build the U.N. into an organization with real authority. If this Treaty were proposed as new federal legislation, it would be unacceptable to the American people because it gives the Federal Government such a broad grant of power over our children and schools, and it would be unconstitutional because of vagueness.

The U.N. Convention on the Child is based on the concept that a child's rights originate with the U.N. Treaty itself or with the government, in contrast to the U.S. Constitution which spells out rights which individual Americans can assert against government. This U.N. Treaty, which assumes that government is the source of the listed "rights," can only diminish the status of existing American rights.

The Treaty purports to give the child the right to express his own views freely in all matters, to receive information of all kinds through media of the child's choice, to freedom of religion, to be protected from interference with his correspondence, to have access to information from national and international sources in the media, to use his own language, and to have the right to "rest and leisure."

Does this mean that the government will help the child to enforce these rights against his parents? Does this mean that the child can decline to do his homework and household chores because they interfere with his "right" to rest and leisure?

Does this mean that a child has the right to use his native language in school and cannot be required to speak English? Does it mean that a child can demand the right to television in order to receive media reports from national and international sources?

Does this mean that a child can assert his right to say what he wants to his parents at the dinner table? Does this mean that

the government will assist the child to select a different church from the one his parents attend?

What will it mean to enforce the provision that makes "primary education compulsory and available free to all"? Will this provision make it compulsory to give subsidies to private or religious schools, *or* will it ban private and religious schools?

The U.N. Treaty prescribes school curriculum with a specificity that Americans would never permit Congress to do. It calls for teaching children "the principles enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations"; respect for "the national values of . . . the country from which he or she may originate, and for civilizations different from his or her own" (a controversial curricular approach known as "global education" and "multiculturalism"); "equality of sexes" (a concept which is subject to controversial interpretations in the United States); and "the development of respect for the natural environment" (certainly one of the most controversial issues in the United States, particularly in the 1990 U.S. elections).

The U.N. Treaty imposes on the government the obligation to "strive to ensure," to "render appropriate assistance," and to "take all appropriate measures" to the "maximum extent of their available resources" so that children may enjoy certain economic benefits. Does this Treaty require our government to impose new taxes to carry out these obligations?

The U.N. Treaty requires us to "ensure the development of institutions, facilities and services for the care of children." The Treaty even obligates the government to ensure "standards" for child care institutions, services and facilities (something which even the current liberal Congress voted down).

What does the U.N. Treaty mean when it requires universal legal standards for the care and protection of children against neglect, exploitation, and abuse? Will the United Nations decide that it is "neglect" *not* to establish government daycare centers, *or* that it is "neglect" to put children in daycare centers where they are exposed to more illnesses?

The U.N. Convention on the Rights of the Child is vague and contradictory on the fundamental issue of whether or not an unborn child is accorded any rights. Article 6 states that every child has a "right to life," but Article 16 purports to establish the child's right to "privacy," the operative word used by the Supreme Court to create the right to abortion.

Of course, all these grandiose U.N. Treaty goals would not be complete without the establishment of a new international bureaucracy and mechanism of control headed by a committee of ten "experts." There is no assurance that any American will be on this committee of experts, not even any assurance that there will be even one "expert" friendly to American institutions and traditions.

### **Bush's Gift To Gorbachev**

We laughed last year when Congressman Richard Gephardt (D-MO) called for U.S. foreign aid to bail Mikhail Gorbachev out of his economic problems and consolidate his control. But the Gephardt folly is now a George Bush project. President Bush announced, without any by-your-leave from Congress or the American people, that he will send \$1 billion in U.S. aid to the Soviet Union. Critics are calling it the "Red Bear S&L bailout."

"Sellout" would be a better word because it makes the

American taxpayers pay the costs of keeping Gorbachev in control of a nation desperately striving to be free from dictatorship. Unlike the Marshall Plan, which helped European countries remain free from Communism in the aftermath of World War II, the Bush bailout will help Gorbachev maintain centralized Communist control openly enforced by the KGB.

The initial \$1 billion goes to the Soviets mostly in U.S. agricultural products ranging from grain to cheese, paid for with credits guaranteed by the U.S. taxpayers. It's called a "loan," but if it were an honest commercial loan, the Soviets could have borrowed from big U.S. banks; it's only the taxpayer guarantee that makes the deal go through.

Bush said that our massive food aid will be supplemented by pharmaceutical, technical and economic assistance, as well as a "special association" with the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank. It has been widely reported that the Soviet subsidy will be up to \$3 billion in government-guaranteed farm credits, restored access to U.S. Export-Import Bank loans, equal tariff treatment on Soviet imports, and possible investment insurance.

This Bush handout to Gorbachev is not just a temporary deal to help the Soviet Union through a bad winter. The new Bush initiative will probably evolve into a permanent foreign entitlement program.

Administration spokesmen are calling this aid "humanitarian," but nobody is fooled by the euphemism. In any pre-Christmas listing of the "100 neediest cases," Gorbachev wouldn't rate a mention. The Soviet Union isn't needy and had a rather good harvest in 1990. Empty shelves and hungry Muscovites are the result of the appallingly inefficient Communist bureaucracy and of the fact that the Captive Nations within the U.S.S.R. are using food as their tool for freedom.

President Bush granted the Soviets a six-month waiver of the Jackson-Vanik Amendment, which since 1974 prevented U.S. credits to the Soviet Union unless the U.S.S.R. adopts a liberalized emigration policy. While some Soviet Jews and ethnic Germans have been allowed to emigrate in the last year, the Soviet Union has declined to make emigration a legal right, which is what Jackson-Vanik requires.

Thus, Bush's gift to Gorbachev abandoned a key American policy: the linking of trade status to a respect for fundamental human rights. This policy was one of the principal levers that helped move the Captive Nations of Eastern Europe toward liberation, and Bush's gift relieves any pressure on the Soviet Union to give its people the right to emigrate.

Bush's gift delays fundamental reform in the Soviet Union. It strengthens central authority in Moscow at the expense of democratic forces in the Soviet republics. It helps to finance Gorbachev's continued centralization policies for which he has made the KGB the instrument of control.

Why don't we demand that Gorbachev pay for the U.S. food from his large hoard of gold? Or with the oil he has available for export? Or with the money he could save by canceling the modernization of his intercontinental nuclear missiles? Or, if we really need to buy Gorbachev's toleration of our military action in the Middle East, why don't we make the Japanese pay for the food, since they are the chief beneficiaries?

The Bush gift to Gorbachev is a foreign policy decision to

spend American taxpayers' money to perpetuate "stable" KGB-enforced, centralized bureaucratic Communism in the U.S.S.R. instead of encouraging a free-market economy and liberation for the Captive Peoples inside the U.S.S.R. (such as Lithuania).

But that's not all. Bush's gift to Gorbachev shows that his Administration is arranging for the large business and agricultural corporations to put their risk of doing business with the Soviet Union on the backs of the U.S. taxpayers.

### Is Gorbachev Good For America?

It is rather obvious that the financial and media establishment in the United States has decided that the political survival of Mikhail Gorbachev is more in our national interest than the freedom of Lithuania or the other Captive Nations. After all, *Time* Magazine proclaimed him the Man of the Decade.

The world famous physicist, Dr. Edward Teller, in a speech in Washington, D.C. last year, warned that Gorbachev "is a good Communist who is trying to make Communism respectable." "Gorbachev is the most intelligent leader the Soviets ever had," Dr. Teller conceded. "He is certainly good for the Soviet Union because he is trying to stop the most horrible malpractice of the Soviet system."

But whether Gorbachev is good for America, Dr. Teller said, "is a very different question." Is making Communism respectable a desirable goal? Teller explained that Communism is diametrically opposed to America and all it stands for. He praised the framers of the American Constitution for understanding clearly that, in a healthy society, "everybody should have the right and obligation to think for himself; and *that* is the antithesis of Communism, of Socialism, and of planning by government." Teller described the Soviet system as obsessed with central planning of the economy. That's what makes Communism "the antithesis of American freedom."

Glasnost has given the Russians much more freedom to speak than they used to have, "but then there used to be no freedom of speech and now there is some." Gorbachev has released a few political prisoners and permitted some persons to leave the country. He has allowed some freedom to satellite countries. How eager the captive peoples are to escape the chains of Communism is shown by the several elections they have had so far: the Communists received only about ten percent of the vote.

Are the Soviets less of a military threat than they were before the Berlin Wall came down? They have cut back somewhat on their spending for conventional weapons but, Teller warned, they have "increased spending on strategic attack weapons. Their rockets are more dangerous than ever."

The threat from rockets — short-range, middle-range, long-range — has been accelerated. "Now 15 or 20 governments have these dangerous instruments and, by the turn of the century, the number may be 30, 40, or 50." Teller pointed out that these rockets "need not be associated with nuclear weapons to be very dangerous. They are sufficiently dangerous if they are associated with gas or bacteriological weapons."

Teller gave enthusiastic support to the American Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI) because it will be a defense against "any rocket attack of any type — nuclear, bacteriological, high explosives, chemical or whatever."

### Conservatism Is Alive and Innovative

Some reporters have been gleefully predicting a coming conservative crack-up because, with the liberation of Eastern Europe, conservatives have allegedly lost Communism and national defense as their major issues. The liberals are just looking for pie in the sky. It's not conservatives who have an identity crisis, but liberals. Liberalism is a proven failure, and government as an institution to solve our problems and spend our money has no credibility any more.

Conservatives are ready to accept the challenge to promote an American perestroika — that is, a restructuring away from the liberal notion that more government spending and bureaucracies can solve our problems, into a renewed faith that money can be more efficiently and productively spent by the people who earn it. The lessons from the collapse of socialism all over the world reaffirm the American ideology that only individual freedom can produce extraordinary results (i.e., prosperity) from ordinary people.

Unfortunately, for the first time since World War II the Federal politicians are now spending 25 percent of our Gross National Product. State and local government spending is also at record levels. The several recent income tax "reforms" have only made the code more complex as the politicians, bureaucrats and lobbyists have become more extravagant in their demands and more adept at gaining a greater and greater share of our national income.

Conservatives should press ahead to demand a reduction of taxes and a cutback of government at all levels. Won't tax cuts hurt our national defense? No, we should spend our military budget on modern technology (including SDI), not on the continued maintenance of hundreds of thousands of troops overseas (the most expensive part of our defense budget).

Conservatives should make sure that our foreign policy is based on American interests and that we let foreign countries handle their own domestic concerns, *not* try to buy allies or seek an American Empire to succeed the Soviet Empire.

Conservatives should devote their best efforts to solving the biggest problem in America today: the failure of the public school system. Conservatives should demand the privatization of education as the only way to reform our stagnant education monopoly. This is a fundamental issue of freedom and diversity, of saving the underclass, and of international competitiveness.

Another major conservative objective should be to reform Congress to become a citizen-legislature instead of a Washington bureaucracy with lifetime tenure, high salaries, and exorbitant pensions. We should restrict the terms members may serve, limit the length of sessions, require Congressional redistricting to follow local geographic boundaries, and force a Congressional election before any pay raise can go into effect.

### The Phyllis Schlafly Report

Box 618, Alton, Illinois 62002  
ISSN0556-0152

Published monthly by The Eagle Trust Fund, Box 618, Alton, Illinois 62002. Second Class Postage Paid at Alton, Illinois. Postmaster: Address Corrections should be sent to the Phyllis Schlafly Report, Box 618, Alton, Illinois 62002.

Subscription Price: \$15 per year. Extra copies available: 50 cents each; 4 copies \$1; 30 copies \$5; 100 copies \$10.