



The Phyllis Schlafly Report



VOL. I, NO. 1

Box 618, ALTON, ILLINOIS

AUGUST 1967

GIVEAWAY OF OUR PANAMA CANAL

Secret Treaties Imperil U. S. Rights

The Johnson Administration has secretly drafted a giveaway of U. S. rights and property that exceeds in harm to us the Roosevelt giveaways at Teheran and Yalta, and the Truman giveaways at Potsdam and Panmunjom. The new Johnson giveaway will be a military defeat for our country even worse than the Kennedy-McNamara defeat at the Bay of Pigs. The Johnson Administration is planning to give away the Panama Canal! This is the meaning of the three treaties with Panama presented to a closed session of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on June 29, 1967.

Woodrow Wilson used to say that the U. S. stands for "open covenants, openly arrived at." What a deception! The three new treaties with Panama are just the latest examples of *secret Democrat treaties, secretly arrived at.*

The plain fact is that the three new treaties, if ratified, will give U. S. sovereignty over the Panama Canal to Panama, will let Panama share with the United States in the running of the Canal, and will give Panama legal control over any new canal which might be built in Panama. The treaties will surrender U. S. control over a maritime thoroughfare which we built and which is essential to us militarily and commercially. Here are the main points of the principal treaty.

Main Points Of Treaty

(1) The treaty gives Panama sovereignty in a new "canal area", thereby abrogating the Hay-Bunau-Varilla Treaty of 1903 which guaranteed the U. S. *exclusive* sovereignty and control over the Canal and Canal Zone "in perpetuity".

(2) The treaty drastically reduces the size of the "canal area" and places it under the control of a 9-man board on which the U. S. would have a bare majority of one. Executive authority is put in the hands of a director general who might be American or Panamanian. This eliminates the present Panama Canal Company, a U. S. Government corporation.

(3) The treaty turns over to Panama all U. S. property in the present Canal Zone which is not included in the new "canal area". The unrecovered U. S. investment in the \$1.9 billion Canal and the \$3 billion Canal defense system would be written off.

(4) The treaty sharply increases annual payments to Panama from \$1,930,000 to about \$22,000,000 a year.

(5) The treaty gives control of defense, security, laws, police, and operation of the Canal to the new joint U. S. - Panama board.

A Red Target

The three new treaties will put

IN THIS ISSUE:

Panama Giveaway	1
McNamara Gap	3
Humor Dept.	3
Convention Skit	3
Club Action	3
Battle of Republican Women	4

the Canal at the mercy of the Panamanian radicals who already are attacking the treaties on the ground that they don't give away enough U. S. rights and treasure. The new treaties provide a standing invitation to a leftist regime in Panama to nationalize or expropriate the Canal completely, which the Red-infiltrated organizations in Panama are already demanding. Any Panama "guarantees" today may be as worthless as Nasser's "guarantees" about the Suez Canal.

Appeasement of the Panama radicals has always tremendously increased our problems. In 1936 the Roosevelt Administration gave away without compensation many of our rights in Panama. In World War II it cost us a high price to get back the defense bases we vitally needed. For the past 30 years, the more concessions the U. S. has given Panama, the more the anti-Americans and pro-Communists have increased their demands, often punctuated with violence and even riots.

The 1967 treaties will make the Panama Canal a target for intensified

Giveaway of Our Panama Canal

CONTINUED

subversion from Castro's Cuba. We have already seen several bloody samples of mob violence directed by Castroites and other Communist agitators. Many military and civilian authorities regard the new treaties as hopelessly inadequate for the protection of the Canal. The Canal could be overrun or destroyed before the U. S. could obtain permission from a Communist-infiltrated government of Panama to protect it.

There is absolutely no reason for Americans to have a guilty conscience about our treatment of Panama. General Robert E. Wood, one of the builders of the Canal and distinguished Republican leader, pointed out recently that "the U. S. has created all of the wealth that exists in Panama. American money and brains were responsible for building and operation of the Canal. Not even Panamanian labor went into building the Canal. . . . The Canal is vital to our defense. If we concede any of our rights there, we are finished."

Can we afford to relinquish the Panama Canal because a new sea-level canal, excavated by nuclear power, is nearing reality? The answer is no. According to a report of the Senate Commerce Committee, a decision cannot be made for another 3½ years, and construction of a new canal, if found practical, would require another 10 to 12 years. Even if nuclear construction is eventually found practical, it is prohibited by the Moscow Nuclear Test Ban Treaty negotiated by Averell Harriman and Khrushchev in 1963 and signed by President Kennedy. We could not use nuclear explosives to dig a new canal unless we secure the permission of the Soviet Union.

Congressional Action

When the new treaties were announced in June 1967, more than 100 Republican Congressmen quickly supported a House Concurrent Resolution by Representatives Durward G. Hall (R.-Mo.) and Richard L.

Roudebush (R.-Ind.) urging that "the United States maintain and protect its sovereign rights and jurisdiction over said Canal, and that the United States Government in no way forfeit, cede, negotiate, or transfer any of these sovereign rights or jurisdiction to any other sovereign nation or international organization."

Congressman Daniel J. Flood (D.-Pa.), long-time expert on Panama, warned: "The Panama Canal, as the key strategic point in the Western Hemisphere and the greatest single symbol of United States prestige, is marked for a takeover by Red revolutionary force."

The Chairman of the Panama Canal Subcommittee of the House Merchant Marine Committee, Congresswoman Leonor K. Sullivan (D.-Mo.), assailed the new Panama Canal treaty as a "giveaway" and warned that it "only opens the way to surrendering the Canal to the Republic of Panama." Mrs. Sullivan implied that treaty provisions are rigged to deceive the American people into thinking that we would receive a "fair payment" if Panama decides in the future to expropriate the Canal completely. In truth, she said Panama would pay for the Canal "out of higher tolls collected in most instances on shipping to and from the United States. We would be paying ourselves out of our own pockets for the privilege of having the Panama Canal taken away from us — and how we would pay!"

The Lesson Of Suez

Mrs. Sullivan said that we should have learned a lesson from the history of the Suez Canal since Egypt seized it in 1956. The Suez has been closed twice in the last 10 years, she said, as it is "subject to the whims of the Egyptian government." The costly consequences to the United States of Panamanian sovereignty over the Canal "would be vastly greater", she said. "Right now the

Panama Canal is the property of the United States — of the Government — and not subject to seizure by Panama. But under this treaty the Canal becomes the property of a non-American government authority and on the soil of Panama rather than under the American flag."

Senator Strom Thurmond (R.-S. C.) warned that if the Panama Canal is stripped of U. S. control, it becomes immediately vulnerable to seizure by Castro-trained revolutionaries. Such an overthrow, he said, could make Panama another Cuba, a second Soviet military base in the Western Hemisphere. He summed up the urgency in these words: "I think it is clear to every member of this body that the retention of undiluted United States sovereignty in the Canal Zone is as important to the security of this nation as winning the war in Vietnam."

The Johnson Administration is now lobbying strenuously and cleverly for ratification of the three Panama treaties. NOW is the time to let your Senator know how you want him to vote.

The "news management" department of the LBJ Administration had planned to keep the text of the treaties secret until after they were signed, and then rush ratification through the Senate before opposition was organized. Fortunately, this plan was foiled when the **Chicago Tribune** exclusively secured a copy of the Panama Canal Treaty and published it in full on July 15, 1967 — one of the greatest news scoops of the 20th century. Did your newspaper print the details of the Panama Canal Treaty?

HERE'S THE LATEST ON "THE McNAMARA GAP"

REPRINTED FROM

St. Louis Globe-Democrat

Tues., July 11, 1967

THE MAIL BAG

Cites Frightening U.S. Lag in Nuclear Weapons

To the Editor:

The American Security Council has just completed a special study prepared for the House Armed Services Committee called "The Changing

Strategic Military Balance U.S.A. vs. USSR."

ble strategic weapons." The charts show that by 1971 the Soviets will have a staggering nuclear superiority over America, and that 1967 is the crossover year when we relinquished nuclear superiority to the Soviets.

The high caliber of authorities who signed this report make it of supreme value. General Bernard A. Schriever, USAF (Ret.) is the Chairman, and the committee includes General Curtis E. LeMay, USAF (Ret.), Admiral Ben Morell, USN (Ret.), General Thomas S. Power, USAF (Ret.), General Albert C. Wedemeyer, USA (Ret.), Professor Stefan T. Possony, and Dr. Edward Teller.

I consider this report of the utmost significance to the survival of the United States. These facts have been known to me for several years; I wrote about them in detail in "Strike From Space." But this

is the first time that men of such military and scientific prominence have put their names to a document spelling out the terrible nuclear disarmament of our country that has already taken place.

It is interesting to me that all the statistics, documentation, and arguments used in this new report are in total harmony with the facts presented in "Strike From Space" (first edition 1965, second edition 1966).

France fell in 1940 and England suffered many defeats on land because they let Hitler reararm Germany with superior strategic land warfare weapons. By permitting the USSR to catch up with and then surpass the United States in strategic nuclear weapons, our Government is risking a far worse defeat in 1970 than France suffered in 1940.

PHYLLIS SCHLAFLY
Alton, Ill.



Strategic Military Balance U.S.A. vs. USSR."

It is a very scholarly report on our defense posture, but the sensational part is that it reveals the "megatonnage gap" between the United States and the USSR.

This report comes right out and charges that "the United States does not appear to have a superior position in deliver-

WHAT CAN ONE INDIVIDUAL DO?

- 1) Send \$1.50 to the American Security Council, 123 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Illinois 60606 and ask for the report on **The Changing Strategic Military Balance**. Read it and study it.
- 2) Take this Report to your newspaper editor and ask him for a news story, editorial, or feature story on this matter which concerns the survival of America. Ask him to return the Report to you.
- 3) Then take this Report to your minister and ask him to assume his responsibility to defend religion and freedom against atheistic Communist aggression by advising his congregation that we have the moral duty to defend our homes and churches from nuclear attack or nuclear blackmail.

NFRW CLUB ACTION

Ever since the NFRW Convention, delegates indignant about the irregularities and illegalities of the Convention and election have been expressing themselves in many effective ways — written and oral reports to their clubs, club resolutions, letters to Chairman Ray Bliss, Senator Everett Dirksen, Congressman Gerald Ford, and to their own Congressman. These reports, resolutions and letters are still pouring in. When clubs resume meeting in the fall, there will undoubtedly be more.

These documents speak with a loud clear voice that our women stand for honest elections and integrity in politics, and they will not tolerate or acquiesce in any betrayal of moral principles. It is good for all Republican officials to know that WE stand on principle.

CONVENTION SKIT

Some of the Ohio delegates to the NFRW Convention reported to their clubs in the form of a humorous skit called *Kapsule Kangaroo Konvention*. They have kindly consented to share their script with other clubs. It is hilarious — and a great vehicle for the talents of your members.

If you want to have fun with your politics — and really put your point across in a different way — send a self-addressed #10 envelope stamped with 10c postage to the Eagle Trust Fund, Box 618, Alton, Illinois 62002. Lots of fun guaranteed!

KEEP-YOUR-SENSE OF-HUMOR DEPARTMENT

On May 28, 1967, a long friendly interview with Gladys O'Donnell was published in the *Long Beach Press-Telegram*. Here are some direct quotations from her remarks:

"The extreme right today has overtones of Hitler's bigotry and intolerance."

"I'm all in favor of abortion and pills to cut the birth rate."

Mrs. O'Donnell said she is encouraged by the caliber of many of her Party's political figures — "Hatfield, Percy, Romney. They have successes in social fields. They are interested in youth." (No other Party figures were mentioned.)

☆☆☆☆☆

On June 30, 1967, Dorothy Elston held a press conference in Los Angeles and accused Phyllis Schlafly of "subversion" because she distributes anti-Communist literature from her home!


For hysteria and sheer silliness, this ranks with Mrs. Elston's charge on March 23, 1967 that Mrs. Schlafly was responsible for the cockroaches in the National Federation office.

ABOUT PAGE 4

Phyllis Schlafly's 16-year old son, John, came to Washington, D. C., May 4-6 to observe politics in action and to play the piano in the Schlafly Headquarters. A high school senior, he was later invited to write a page of verse for his school's literary magazine. The result appears on page 4 of this Report, unedited and unexpurgated, just as it was published in the School Magazine.

The **Phyllis Schlafly Report** is mailed to those who donate to the Eagle Trust Fund. (Subscriber \$5; Contributor \$10; Patron \$25 or more.) The year will be July 1 to July 1, and those who contribute during the year will be sent back issues. Extra copies available at 15c each. 8 copies \$1.00, 50 copies \$4.00.

The Battle of Republican Women



I know that I ought not to trouble you,
But there occurred in the N.F.R.W.
Such a terrible fight
O'er a shift to the right
That I must take great care not to muddle you.

A fear was expressed from on high
That Phyllis was going to try
To move up to the top;
Now, in order to stop
Her, the election they needed to buy.

"Republican, garden variety"
Was what Gladys dubbed self, with piety;
It soon became clear,
However, that here
Was one who'd give liberals satiety.

The ladies assembled divided
Though a banner proclaimed them "united";
With the Unity speeches,
Parliamentary breaches,
An ironic display was provided.

Credentials were giv'n without ground,
On true Schlafly delegates they frowned;
But O'Donnell supporters
Were quickly made voters,
Though that they never paid dues was found.

The committee needed the quality
Of credentials impartiality
As it barred from the floor
Schlafly delegates galore
On frivolous technicalities.

Though the Chairman approved the request
To put the machines to the test,
She broke her agreement
At the very last moment,
Which engendered suspicion, at best.

On the day of the voting there came
Big buses of ignorant dames;
Encourages by doles,
They were sent to the polls,
Then left, while the righteous cried "Shame!"

Though the tally made Gladys the victor,
It was a minority that picked her.
And now it remains
For the gals with the brains,
With Phyllis, to oust those who licked her.

John Schlafly