



The Phyllis Schlafly Report



VOL. 3, NO. 2

Box 618, ALTON, ILLINOIS 62002

SEPTEMBER 1969

Political Fallout From The ABM Victory

"Rarely have so many ordinary citizens owed so much to so few."

This is the way newspaper columnist William S. White accurately described the final vote in the Senate on the anti-ballistic missile system, which turned out to be the most controversial, the most hard-fought, and the closest vote of recent years. The ABM was approved in the Senate because of what *The New York Times* described as a "Conservative Coalition."

Of all that has been written on the eyelash victory in the Senate on August 6 of President Nixon's proposal to build the ABM, perhaps the best appeared in the newsletter mailed to his constituents by Republican Congressman Richard L. Roudebush of Indiana. Writing under the headline "For The Want Of A Nail," here is what he said:

"Decisive events in history often turn on small detail, mere chance or the slimmest margin.

"Authorities tell us that the Old Confederacy at its high tide was thrown into the battle at Gettysburg because a few infantrymen nursing foot blisters went into town to requisition some shoes, and unwittingly started a skirmish that grew into the decisive encounter of the war.

"George Washington turned the tide of the Revolutionary War with a surprise attack at Trenton, catching the Hessians asleep in a maneuver that could not succeed, but did.

"Over the centuries it has been proven again and again that one man, or several men, with courage can make the difference in the rise or fall of empires.

"Such a decisive event may have occurred late in the afternoon of Wednesday, August 6, 1969.

"The United States Senate, after many weary days of debate, finally voted by the slim margin of one vote to construct and deploy an anti-missile defense system against Communist Russia and China.

"The worst that historians may write of that dramatic vote is that overly-cautious Senators voted billions of dollars for an unneeded and never used protection system for the United States.

"If the vote had been switched just one vote the other way, the worst historians may have written was that a mighty nation willing to spend billions on every conceivable project, including \$182 billion for foreign aid, simply forgot the basic priority of all — survival.

"The debate on the ABM issue was complex. Both sides quoted authorities, produced facts and figures, and summoned all their oratorical and emotional abilities.

"But, after all the dust had settled and the words had been spoken, two sinister facts remained: (1) Russia itself has been constructing its own defense system since 1958, and (2) there is a regime in power in the Kremlin that would not hesitate to destroy our nation or use nuclear blackmail to force a surrender.

"Perhaps the most specious argument used by the opponents of a Safeguard system for 200 million Americans was their objection to the cost.

"This is not to say the cost is not high, but those evoking this argument were those Senators who have over the years championed every liberal spending cause, regardless of the cost and sacrifice by the American taxpayer.

"For these liberal spenders to suggest economy in the matter of survival of this country, after spending this country into near bankruptcy, was a tragic irony of the ABM debate.

"Another argument of the opponents that fell on its face was that U. S. construction of a defense system would 'provoke' the Communists in Moscow.

"I don't know how you can provoke someone by taking the precaution of protecting yourself. And, if Russia has no intention of ever attacking this country, why should she worry if we build an ABM or not.

"Indeed, it may be that the holocaust of nuclear war was averted the day that the U. S. Senate voted by the barest majority to protect America's retaliatory power.

"To gamble the life of every American on the tender mercies of the Russian bear would be insanity."

\$3,000,000 Propaganda Fund

When it is obvious that the facts, the logic, the patriotism, and the Administration were all on the pro-ABM side, how is it possible that the opposition could muster up half of the United States Senators to vote against the ABM? Such shocking events as this don't "just happen." They are the result of a well-planned, well-coordinated, and well-financed campaign. How this happened leaked out in *The Shreveport Times* of July 20 which stated:

"A fund of \$3,000,000 was raised for anti-ABM propaganda. . . . The big question is: 'Who put up \$3,000,000 to kill what may be the only known possible defense for our nation against nuclear attack?' And the next question is: 'Why?'"

The Shreveport Times indicated that the existence of this huge propaganda fund is well known by reporters and commentators all over the east.

(Continued on Page 2)

(Continued from Page 1)

Others may not be privy to the precise amount of the anti-ABM propaganda fund, but it was perfectly apparent that the anti-ABM propagandists were spending money like it was going out of style. There was an endless succession of expensive fullpage anti-ABM ads in *The New York Times* and other metropolitan newspapers. Speaker after speaker appeared to denounce the ABM before hastily-called seminars and on television. "Spontaneous" anti-ABM grassroots organizations sprung up around Boston, Detroit and Chicago, apparently all flush with money for meetings and mailings.

The Teddy Kennedy anti-ABM book authored by Jerome Wiesner and Abram Chayes was launched with the most fantastically expensive advertising campaign in the history of the book-publishing industry. All over the country, ads for this book extended over two full pages in metropolitan newspapers. Anticipated receipts from book sales could not possibly cover the cost of such extravagant advertising.

Who paid for the anti-ABM propaganda would be an appropriate subject for a Congressional investigation. Such an investigation should include the part played by the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions, which has been publishing anti-ABM and pro-disarmament papers for several years.

The Role of Television

Television played a key role in propagandizing the American people against the ABM. Most TV newscasts and reports on the ABM were heavily loaded to give much more time to anti-ABM spokesmen rather than pro-ABM spokesmen.

Another way that the television newscasts hit the ABM effectively was to interview some speaker complaining about the cost of the ABM, and then switch immediately to a survey of poverty-stricken areas, so that the viewer was left with the impression that a vote for the ABM was a vote to let poor people starve.

On Sunday evening, July 13 — about three weeks before the ABM vote in the Senate — ABC-TV network aired on prime time a repeat performance of the clever propaganda movie *Dr. Strangelove*. In *Dr. Strangelove*, there is a disparaging reference to "Safeguard." At the time *Dr. Strangelove* was originally filmed, of course it was not known that the Nixon Administration would later choose the word "Safeguard" to describe its proposed anti-ballistic missile system. But the 1969 viewer of the movie could not help but connect the two and get a subliminal anti-ABM message.

The conclusion of *Dr. Strangelove* shows the whole world destroyed by nuclear explosions after the "Doomsday Machine" is activated. On July 29, about two weeks later, *The New York Times* and *The Washington Post* carried a fullpage ad under the headline: "Is A.M.B. The Doomsday Machine?" This ad alleged that the ABM, instead of protecting the United States, would cause "The Death of All Children." The obvious connection between the message of *Dr. Strangelove* and the message of this advertisement is hardly coincidence. It reveals the massive coordination and cleverness of the anti-ABM propaganda.

The day the ABM won in the Senate, the television newscasters made every effort to minimize the importance of the Nixon Administration victory. David Brinkley solemnly assured NBC listeners that whether the ABM passed or failed wasn't really important at all; what was important, he said, was that the Senators will now carefully scrutinize all military budgets in the future as they have never done in the past.

Late in the evening of August 6 and early in the morning of August 7, most of the newscasters on television and radio interviewed — not Senators Dirksen or Jackson, the leaders of the victorious ABM proponents — but Senators Mansfield and Kennedy, the losers.

The Acid Test For Senators

The vote on the ABM gives all Americans the black-and-white proof of which Senators believe in the defense of America against Communist aggression — and which Senators are for appeasement of the Communists. The decisive vote came on August 6 on the Smith Amendment. A vote *against* the Smith Amendment was equivalent to a vote *for* the ABM. The result was 51 to 50 in favor of the ABM and the roll call is reprinted here so you will have a handy reference for future months.

For the ABM — 51

Republicans-29

Allott (Colo.)	Baker (Tenn.)	Bellmon (Okla.)
Bennett (Utah)	Boggs (Del.)	Cotton (N.H.)
Curtis (Neb.)	Dirksen (Ill.)	Dole (Kan.)
Dominick (Colo.)	Fannin (Ariz.)	Fong (Hawaii)
Goldwater (Ariz.)	Griffin (Mich.)	Gurney (Fla.)
Hansen (Wyo.)	Hruska (Neb.)	Jordan (Idaho)
Miller (Iowa)	Mundt (S.D.)	Murphy (Calif.)
Packwood (Ore.)	Prouty (Vt.)	Scott (Pa.)
Stevens (Alaska)	Thurmond (S.C.)	Tower (Tex.)
Williams (Del.)	Young (N.D.)	

Democrats-21

Allen (Ala.)	Anderson (N.M.)	Bible (Nev.)
Byrd (Va.)	Byrd (W. Va.)	Dodd (Conn.)
Eastland (Miss.)	Ervin (N.C.)	Holland (Fla.)
Hollings (S.C.)	Jackson (Wash.)	Jordan (N.C.)
Long (La.)	McClellan (Ark.)	McGee (Wyo.)
Pastore (R.I.)	Russell (Ga.)	Sparkman (Ala.)
Spong (Va.)	Stennis (Miss.)	Talmadge (Ga.)

Against the ABM — 50

Republicans-14

Aiken (Vt.)	Brooke (Mass.)	Case (N.J.)
Cook (Ky.)	Cooper (Ky.)	Goodell (N.Y.)
Hatfield (Ore.)	Javits (N.Y.)	Mathias (Md.)
Pearson (Kan.)	Percy (Ill.)	Saxbe (Ohio)
Schweiker (Pa.)	Smith (Me.)	

Democrats-36

Bayh (Ind.)	Burdick (N.D.)	Cannon (Nev.)
Church (Idaho)	Cranston (Calif.)	Eagleton (Mo.)
Ellender (La.)	Fulbright (Ark.)	Gore (Tenn.)
Gravel (Alaska)	Harris (Okla.)	Hart (Mich.)
Hartke (Ind.)	Hughes (Iowa)	Inouye (Hawaii)
Kennedy (Mass.)	Magnuson (Wash.)	Mansfield (Mont.)
McCarthy (Minn.)	McGovern (S.D.)	McIntyre (N.H.)
Metcalf (Mont.)	Mondale (Minn.)	Montoya (N.M.)
Moss (Utah)	Muskie (Me.)	Nelson (Wis.)
Pell (R.I.)	Randolph (W. Va.)	Proxmire (Wis.)
Ribicoff (Conn.)	Symington (Mo.)	Tydings (Md.)
Williams (N.J.)	Yarborough (Tex.)	Young (Ohio)

Note: Vice President Agnew also voted for the ABM, hence the 51-50 vote.

This roll call proves that there are Senators in both parties who want to defend America against aggression, and there are Senators in both parties who would rather be Red than dead. The ABM could not have passed without the energetic leadership of certain patriotic Demo-

(Continued on Page 4)

The Hypocrisy Of The Military Budget Cutters

The prize for the biggest hypocrites in American politics today should go to those Senators who profess to worry so much about the cost of the ABM and other vital defense projects, but have *never, never* voted against or raised their voices against the fantastic \$171,235,000,000 our Government has given away in foreign aid.

In the current Federal budget, the Safeguard ABM is programmed to cost \$800,000,000. This same budget calls for \$800,000,000 in foreign aid to India on top of the \$6½ billion previously given. Have you heard one single anti-ABM Senator complain about the cost of aid to India? Which is more important: safeguarding your home and family against Communist aggression — or sending \$800,000,000 to the Socialist government of India which is showing its contempt for America by allowing Soviet planes to refuel in India while ferrying military supplies to Vietnam to kill American boys. If the liberals want to talk about costs, let us read to them the list of foreign giveaways they have all supported.

Foreign Aid: Fiscal Years 1946 Through June 1968

Afghanistan	\$ 344,900,000	Guyana	\$ 34,200,000	Paraguay	\$ 95,700,000
Albania	20,400,000	Haiti	101,500,000	Peru	449,200,000
Algeria	191,700,000	Honduras	91,200,000	Philippines	1,761,400,000
Argentina	409,400,000	Hungary	14,900,000	Poland	444,100,000
Australia	431,500,000	Iceland	67,900,000	Portugal	476,100,000
Austria	1,122,900,000	India	6,585,200,000	Rwanda	6,100,000
Belgium-Luxem	1,757,200,000	Indo-China	1,535,200,000	Saudi Arabia	217,900,000
Bolivia	476,200,000	Indonesia	686,400,000	Senegal	30,400,000
Botswana	17,300,000	Iran	1,848,400,000	Sierra Leone	35,200,000
Brazil	2,476,400,000	Iraq	98,800,000	Somali	68,200,000
Burundi	6,800,000	Ireland	99,400,000	Sou. Rhodesia	2,300,000
Burma	85,600,000	Israel	770,600,000	Spain	1,952,700,000
Cambodia	342,300,000	Italy	5,329,100,000	Sudan	128,600,000
Cameroon	28,400,000	Ivory Coast	29,700,000	Sweden	129,800,000
Canada	11,100,000	Jamaica	49,100,000	Swaziland	100,000
Gen. Africa Rep.	4,400,000	Japan	3,528,300,000	Syrian Arab Rep.	62,600,000
Ceylon	109,500,000	Jordan	622,700,000	Tanzania	55,800,000
Chad	7,400,000	Kenya	55,700,000	Thailand	1,063,900,000
Chile	1,221,600,000	Korea	6,986,800,000	Togo	13,200,000
China, Rep.	4,873,500,000	Kuwait	50,000,000	Trinidad-Tobago	51,600,000
Colombia	747,100,000	Laos	528,300,000	Tunisia	531,400,000
Congo (B)	2,000,000	Lebanon	84,100,000	Turkey	5,126,400,000
Congo (K)	393,500,000	Lesotho	2,100,000	Uganda	27,900,000
Costa Rica	142,300,000	Liberia	213,400,000	United Arab Rep.	925,400,000
Cuba	43,800,000	Libya	216,600,000	United Kingdom	7,394,000,000
Cyprus	20,300,000	Malagasy	12,500,000	USSR	186,400,000
Czechoslovakia	189,500,000	Malawi	14,100,000	Upper Volta	9,700,000
Dahomey	10,600,000	Malaysia	91,400,000	Uruguay	112,400,000
Denmark	877,300,000	Mali	21,400,000	Venezuela	318,400,000
Dominican Rep.	358,800,000	Malta	6,200,000	Vietnam	5,042,800,000
East Germany	800,000	Mauritania	3,400,000	Western Samoa	200,000
Ecuador	245,500,000	Mauritius	500,000	Yemen	43,900,000
El Salvador	99,400,000	Mexico	517,900,000	Yugoslavia	2,633,100,000
Ethiopia	323,300,000	Morocco	589,100,000	Zambia	16,200,000
Finland	39,400,000	Nepal	114,200,000	Bahamas	23,300,000
France	7,021,200,000	Netherlands	2,052,700,000	Brit. Honduras	4,700,000
Gabon	7,000,000	New Zealand	24,400,000	Surinam	10,100,000
Gambia	1,000,000	Nicaragua	129,500,000	West Indies	6,400,000
Ghana	204,200,000	Niger	13,000,000	Hong Kong	42,600,000
Germany & Berlin	3,668,700,000	Nigeria	204,100,000	Ryukyu Islands	364,700,000
Greece	3,605,100,000	Norway	1,132,400,000	Trust Ter. Pac.	147,200,000
Guatemala	220,300,000	Pakistan	3,126,500,000	CENTO - Pacific	53,000,000
Guinea	72,200,000	Panama	188,200,000	W/W Regional	12,742,100,000
				W/W Aid FY 1968	5,550,000,000

Total Net Disbursements to Foreign Nations. 1946 - 1968 \$118,432,000,000
 Total Net Interest Paid on What We Have Borrowed to Give Away, 1946 - 1968 52,803,000,000

GRAND TOTAL -- COST OF FOREIGN ASSISTANCE -- 1946 THROUGH 1968. \$171,235,000,000

Source: Foreign Operations Subcommittee on Appropriations, June 1968

Women Of The Year

The National Federation of Republican Women is conducting a contest for Women of the Year. Every federated club had the privilege of nominating a candidate, and then each State selected its State Woman of the Year. Below are three State winners of interest to all Eagles. Each one has worked actively for the election of *all* Republican candidates. These women have done all the hard, tiresome work of politics: selling tickets, raising funds, distributing literature door-to-door, circulating petitions, swelling crowds at rallies, and getting out the vote. Their service to the cause of good government through the Republican Party and the Federation of Republican Women is outstanding.



Lucille Young

Lucille Young was chosen Woman of the Year by the Oklahoma Federation of Republican Women. She was President of the Ponca City Republican Women's Club for two years, and Secretary of the Oklahoma Federation of Republican Women for four years. She has been on the Executive Board of the Oklahoma Federation since 1962 and is presently Sixth District Vice President. She is a member of the Kay County Republican Central Committee and the Kay County Executive Board. She is serving her second term as Sixth District committeewoman and her fourth term as precinct vice chairman.

Lucille was a Delegate-at-large from Oklahoma to the National Federation Convention in 1967. She is one of the leaders who have made sure that the Oklahoma Federation is in good hands.



Daisy McWhorter

Daisy McWhorter of Cleveland was chosen Woman of the Year by the Ohio Federation of Republican Women's Organizations. She is President of the Western Reserve Women's Republican Club of Shaker Heights, one of the most active Republican women's clubs in America. It has received many awards for its outstanding accomplishments. She is Vice President of the Ohio Federation of Republican Women's Organizations, and newly-appointed Ohio Coordinator of the Educational Advisory Committee of the National Federation of Republican Women.

Daisy was one of the leaders of the large Ohio delegation at the National Federal Convention in 1967. She is a longtime associate of Katharine Kennedy Brown, President of the Ohio Federation.



Phyllis Schlafly

Phyllis Schlafly was chosen Woman of the Year by the Illinois Federation of Republican Women. Phyllis has spent most of 1969 working for Senate approval of the ABM. Her lengthy testimony before the Senate Armed Services Committee consisted of a point-by-point refutation of the Teddy Kennedy anti-ABM book. She wrote numerous articles, resolutions, and letters in behalf of the ABM, and appeared on television or radio on this subject in more than 25 cities across the country. Her refutation of Senator Symington's fallacious arguments was published by many newspapers.

In 1968, Phyllis co-authored a book called *The Betrayers* which was of significant assistance in persuading uncommitted Americans to vote for Nixon in order to repair the damage done to America by McNamara.

(Continued from Page 2)

crats including Senators Henry Jackson of Washington and John Stennis of Mississippi. Senator Jackson's courage in the pro-ABM fight was indispensable to the victory.

The ABM vote shows that every single contender for the Democratic presidential nomination put himself on record in favor of leaving our country at the mercy of the Soviet Union. Senators Teddy Kennedy, Eugene McCarthy, Edmund Muskie, and

George McGovern all voted against the ABM. Hubert Humphrey couldn't vote, but he was on record against it. National Chairman Fred Harris and Majority Leader Mike Mansfield both voted against the ABM. As columnist William S. White stated so well:

"The ultimate meaning of this is all but incredible. It is that the Democratic Party cannot possibly offer in 1972 a presidential candidate committed to a policy of national strength unless it goes outside the entire present array of aspirants. The happiness

boys, the strength-through-weakness and the firm-in-hopefulness boys, have seized a whole political party."

The Phyllis Schlafly Report

Box 618, Alton, Illinois 62002

Published monthly by Phyllis Schlafly, Fairmount, Alton, Illinois 62002.

Second Class Postage Paid at Alton, Illinois.

Subscription Price: For donors to the Eagle Trust Fund — \$5 yearly (included in annual contribution). Extra copies available: 15c each; 8 copies \$1; 50 copies \$4.