



The Phyllis Schlafly Report



VOL. 3, NO. 4

Box 618, ALTON, ILLINOIS 62002

NOVEMBER 1969

Republican Women Oppose Trade With Communists

On September 26, some 300 Republican leaders from 35 states gathered in Washington at the invitation of Phyllis Schlafly. They unanimously passed the following important Resolution opposing trade with Communist countries. Lack of space prevented it being published in last month's Report. It is printed below with the urgent recommendation that you pass similar resolutions in your local and state organizations, both political and non-political.

Whereas, the Associated Press reported on September 15 that the United States has agreed with NATO countries to lower barriers on exports of strategic products to the Soviet bloc; and

Whereas, previously-banned items which the Soviet bloc will now be able to buy include "certain types of computers, rare metals and their alloys, chemical and petroleum equipment, a wide range of industrial, electrical and transport goods, and certain categories of electronic and precision instruments"; and

Whereas, those promoting trade with Communist governments are hoping to put over this new international agreement quietly without the knowledge of the American people, as evidenced by the way the dispatch came out of London not Washington, and by the fact that the story was omitted from many major U.S. newspapers; and

Whereas, President Nixon has made every possible conciliatory move to the Soviets in Vietnam and in Paris, and he told the United Nations that "the time has come for peace" and the U.S. is "prepared to withdraw all our forces" from South Vietnam; but Gromyko rudely rejected President Nixon's plea, sharply accused the U.S. of waging "aggressive war," and said that "the United States has been fighting the Vietnamese people" and that "its cause there is unjust"; and

Whereas, the Soviet bloc continues to send the sophisticated modern weapons and war supplies to North Vietnam and the Middle East which are prolonging the wars in those areas;

Resolved, that the several hundred Republican women leaders assembled in Washington on September 26, 1969 do hereby go in record in vigorous opposition to any exports of strategic products to Communist countries, and brand any trading with the Communists as a blood-money betrayal of the 40,000 American servicemen who have given their lives in Vietnam and of the half million Americans who are still fighting there.

Dr. Philip Crane Wins As "Conservative Republican"

Dr. Philip Crane, who campaigned as a "conservative Republican," won the GOP nomination for Congress in Illinois' 13th District in a special election on October 7. This District has been held by Republicans for more than 50 years, and Dr. Crane is expected to be elected in November.

Dr. Crane was described by the press as "the most conservative and most hawkish of the seven serious candidates." He recommended that the United States "stop all trade with Communist bloc nations, stop all aid to nations trading with the Communist bloc, and close the Panama Canal to ships trading with North Vietnam." He also suggested that we consider permitting the South Vietnamese to close the port of Haiphong "by destroying the harbor dredges and by sinking obstructions in the channel."

In an interview the day after the election, Dr. Crane said: "The public has had a belly full of the Great Society and its entire orientation. The establishment liberalism of the Democratic era is a bankrupt philosophy which has nearly bankrupted the country."

How did Dr. Crane win — when the politicians, the pundits, and the press all said it was impossible? He won, first, because he is an articulate and able candidate and, secondly, because he had the dedicated support of enthusiastic conservatives.

Typical of the Eagles who worked hard for Phil Crane was Jane Brown of Palatine, Illinois. Ill with leukemia, pretty much confined to her house, and with financial resources depleted from the burden of medical expenses, Jane Brown decided that Phil Crane must be elected to Congress.

Although she could only walk with crutches, she managed to visit every home in her precinct by going one block at a time. Her efforts paid off handsomely when Dr. Crane won by 2,000 votes. Weary, but happy, the day after the election, Jane wrote: "I hope you feel as good about it as I do. We have proven that a candidate can come right out and label himself 'CONSERVATIVE' and win."

We are proud of Jane Brown and the other Eagles who showed what can be done when they set an objective and work toward it — no matter what the odds and obstacles. We rejoice in the well-deserved victory of Dr. Philip Crane and wish for him a great future in the U.S. Congress.

A Father's Plea For

The following is a great speech made by the Honorable O. K. Armstrong, formerly a Republican Congressman from Missouri and now a writer for the Reader's Digest, before the State Convention of the American War Dads, Jefferson City, Missouri, August 23, 1969. We are proud that this distinguished American patriot has given permission to publish the text of his address in The Phyllis Schlafly Report. It is one of the finest statements we have seen on the Vietnam War.

My Fellow American War Dads, Ladies of the Auxiliary, and Friends:

I stand before you tonight, the father of a serviceman now in the Mekong Delta of Vietnam. It is not only because it is *our* son engaged in that tragic war, but in behalf of all service men there, who are sons, husbands, relatives of our fellow Americans, that I speak.

The time has come to demand an end to the killing and to end this war — to end it in the only way possible with what President Nixon has called "justice and honor." It is time to end it by attaining the announced objectives of our military action in that little country on the far side of the globe.

Those objectives are well known. They have been repeated by Presidents Eisenhower, Kennedy, and Johnson, and reaffirmed by President Nixon. They have had the overwhelming support of every Congress, and of the vast majority of American people, since our troops were committed to combat action years ago. They are:

To defend and preserve the freedom and self-government of the people of South Vietnam, against the aggression of the Communist regime of North Vietnam and its agents.

To this must be added another objective, as vital and compelling as the one just stated: We are in Vietnam to defend the interests of the United States of America, since history proves that Communist aggression feeds upon its own successes.

Let me waste no time to urge my fellow War Dads to appeal to the President to take all necessary steps to attain our objectives and fulfill our solemn pledges in Vietnam. In this, I am confident, we shall be joined by all other parents and relatives of Vietnam service personnel, and by veterans of all past wars in which our beloved country met the challenge of forces that would destroy human liberties and self-governments. We urge this program of action:

1. Demand a cease-fire to end the fighting and killing in Vietnam, setting a time limit for the enemy to agree to it.

2. Give notice that if the cease-fire is not agreed to within the specified time, sufficient military action will be taken to crush the aggression of the Ho Chi Minh regime.

3. If a cease-fire is not promptly attained: Close the port of Haiphong with a complete naval blockade on all war materiel for North Vietnam; resume bombing of military targets in North Vietnam without the present restrictions; permit no further sanctuaries for enemy military action in Laos and Cambodia.

I solemnly and earnestly urge that parents and other relatives of service men and women join my wife and me to demand in one mighty voice that our boys no longer be forced to fight an endless war, without hope of accomplishing the purpose for which our country sent them into battle. Let that mighty voice be swelled by the parents and relatives of the 38,000 young American men who have given their lives on the blood-soaked terrain of Viet-

nam and in the surrounding waters, and of the 240,000 others who are casualties of the war.

What are the restrictions under which our boys have fought — and are still fighting — in Vietnam? They were well summarized by the senior Senator from Missouri, the Hon. Stuart Symington, in a speech to the Senate on last January 10, in these words:

"Fighting against brave and well-led guerillas, the ground forces of the United States have been at grave disadvantage, one major reason being that the three countries which border South Vietnam have been declared sanctuaries; therefore our troops have never been able to counterattack. At the same time, ever since the United States, in effect, took over this war, our air power and sea power have been shackled, in a manner, and to a degree, never before known in major warfare."

Who dreamed up this infamous policy that shackles the arms and legs of our defenders of freedom in Vietnam? A hearing before a Senate committee two years ago brought out that 80 per cent of all the war materiel used to kill and wound our boys, and those of our brave allies, coming into Vietnam through the harbor of Haiphong, has been by ships of the Soviet Union. I personally have talked to naval aviators required to fly over that port and look down on Russian vessels loaded to the decks with every latest item of war to slaughter our sons — yet they could not retaliate. When by accident one day some shrapnel from an American bomb fell upon a Russian ship, our State Department issued an abject apology. Surely this reached the depths of international groveling! What a betrayal of the bravery our service men must show, when *they* meet the enemy equipped with arms from the Soviet Union!

And who will come forward and explain why our Air Force has been denied the blasting of military targets of North Vietnam that could have ended the war long ago? It is a simple fact that during the nine bombing pauses granted by our side before President Johnson announced the bombing restrictions on March 31, 1968, our enemies used each respite to build up their troops and replenish enormously the military strength. It is a simple fact also that since the further bombing restrictions announced last November 1, the Communist aggressors in North Vietnam have rebuilt their military facilities and are ready to carry on the war indefinitely. Already, in this August 1969, they have begun new offensives. In the last three weeks they have taken the lives of more than 600 young American men, young men who wanted, and deserved, to live, sacrificed to a shamefully mistaken policy that if we make concessions to the mortal enemies of human freedom they might be impressed by our generosity and ask for a just and honorable peace.

Admiral U. S. Grant Sharp, retired, who was commander in chief of the Pacific area from June 1964 to July 1968, has said: "There is no need for the United States to be bogged down as it is in a seemingly endless struggle in Vietnam. We could have won the war long ago. . . . All that we had to do to win was to use our existing air power — *properly*."

General William C. Westmoreland, who commanded the battle forces in Vietnam for three years, has repeatedly said that restrictions placed upon military action prevented attaining our objectives.

I believe the word of Admiral Sharp and General Westmoreland. I believe these experts, and all others who have borne the heat of warfare in Vietnam. I be-

For A Son In Vietnam

lieve them far ahead of any faith I have in the arm-chair tacticians in their sheltered academic, editorial, or political sanctuaries, who spout sheer nonsense as solutions for ending the war. Such as: "If we stop the bombing, it will prove our good faith, and the North Vietnamese will accommodate us." "If we pull our troops out of Vietnam, the other side will be impressed by our big-hearted concessions and give us better peace terms."

Anyone with a smattering of knowledge of Communist aims and methods knows that every concession made by the free world is taken as a sign of weakness, as a signal for our enemies to push along in their relentless, unchanging crusade to crush free governments under the juggernaut of Marxist terror and control.

What concessions, I ask you, have our enemies in Vietnam proposed to make? Their demands upon our side have never varied from their first ultimatum. On August 7 the spokesman for the North Vietnamese aggressors spelled them out once more: "The rapid and total withdrawal from South Vietnam of all American troops and those of other countries in the American camp without any condition whatsoever." In addition, he said, there must be a government for South Vietnam that will permit its control by North Vietnam.

It is now fair, and urgent, for American War Dads, for the parents and relatives of Vietnam service men, to ask: Who's making our policy on ending the Vietnam war? Surely the President would not listen to the same old group, or its heirs, who urged a government of coalition with the Communists for China, and also for the countries of eastern Europe; who shackled our military forces in Korea, who permitted the building of the Berlin wall, who insisted that Fidel Castro was only an agrarian reformer, who betrayed the Cuban freedom fighters at the Bay of Pigs and thus permitted the death of the Monroe Doctrine, and who now croak that we may as well agree to a coalition government for South Vietnam since we can't win the war anyhow.

Did our leaders learn nothing from the Korean war? That war has never ended, but we did get a cease-fire in July 1953, when President Eisenhower demanded that the enemy agree to it or suffer the military consequences — precisely as the Vietnam war could be ended. I sat in the House chamber, as did the then Senator Richard Nixon, and heard Douglas MacArthur, the general who was fired because he wanted to win that war, declare: "*There is no substitute for victory.*" He was right. Had we decisively defeated the aggressors in that war, the regime of Red China could have been overthrown, Communism would have been driven from Asia, and there would have been no Vietnam war that has cost the free world so much in blood and treasure.

Since when has "victory" been a dirty word? By victory in Vietnam, we American War Dads simply mean attaining our objectives. Anything wrong with that? If so, why did they send our boys into Vietnam in the first place?

Then why not, with a mighty voice all over our country, urge the President and Congress to get on with the task. Surely the President knows that we cannot "negotiate" with the Reds, since to them the idea of "negotiate" means to win at the "peace" table what they cannot win on the battlefield. Surely he knows, as we all should, that their one unchangeable purpose is to eliminate human freedoms and self-government all over the world, as they have done in China, in Czechoslovakia, in all eastern Europe, in North Korea, in North Vietnam — and be it

said to our everlasting shame, in Cuba.

Let's make no mistake about what confronts us in this August 1969: If we pull out of Vietnam without winning our objectives, and let that small country go down the drain to Communist control, it will give notice to the whole world that we no longer have the will nor the courage to help defend the liberties of peoples who cannot defend themselves; that we are willing to admit that the 38,000 sons who have given their lives in the conflict have died in vain.

My fellow patriots, you who love America and its glorious heritage of freedom, I say to you that we stand at the crossroads of history in Vietnam. If we lose there, we lose all around the world. If we permit the sacrifice of the people of South Vietnam after all our solemn pledges of support, then no country on earth will ever believe the word of the United States of America again. The Communist regime of North Vietnam already controls much of Laos, and would quickly take over the remainder, along with Cambodia. Thailand would be next in line to fall victim to Communist pressure and aggression. All other nations of Southeast Asia would be forced to make accommodations with Red China.

Those statesmen and "intellectuals" who come to us, Chamberlain-like, to advise that we can have "peace in our time" by compromise or by appeasement of the enemies of freedom, will be saying, "This sounds like the old domino theory!" It is no theory. It is a stark fact that the Reds of North Vietnam and of the Mao regime of China have their blueprints for conquest all ready. If put into execution, the Philippines, Malaysia, and Indonesia would desert the United States to make the best possible deal with the Reds. Japan would be forced to assume a neutrality for its own interests. The world-wide Communist conspiracy, which Marxist apologists declare does not exist, would be immeasurably strengthened, including the Mao-Castro agents of subversion in Latin America.

Finally, we ask: How much longer can we expect the morale of our sons in Vietnam to hold firm, when they are being led to believe, by some high in our government, that their mission is in vain, and when they see that our country has begun a surrender on the installment plan? Is it fair to ask them to die for a cause already lost? If not, let us assure them that we will support them in winning the cause for which they were asked to fight and die. Why not end the war with *that* sort of victory, and bring *all* our boys back home?

President Nixon has announced that the countries of Asia must carry more of their burden of defense, and there should be no more Vietnam wars. We American War Dads, I am confident, agree with that. But let us remind the President that the way to prevent wars in the future is to give notice, by a smashing victory for our objectives in Vietnam, that the United States will still give help to peoples who cannot adequately defend themselves, and that we do not intend to let free governments of, by, and for the people, perish from the earth.

Sworn Statement of Ownership

The Phyllis Schlafly Report is published monthly at Box 618, Alton, Illinois 62002.

Publisher: Phyllis Schlafly, Fairmount, Alton, Illinois 62002. Editor: Same. Owner: Same. Known bondholders, mortgagees, or other security holders: none.

Information on circulation not required as no advertising is carried.

Women Of The Year

The National Federation of Republican Women during 1968 conducted 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. In the September *Phyllis Schlafly Report*, we announced three State winners of interest to all Eagles: Lucille Young, Oklahoma Woman of the Year; Daisy McWhorter, Ohio Woman of the Year; and Phyllis Schlafly,

Illinois Woman of the Year. Here are three more wonderful Republicans elected Woman of the Year by their State Federations. All Eagles can take pride in this recognition of their devoted service to the cause of good government through the Republican Party and through the Federation of Republican Women. Each State Woman of the Year was awarded an engraved plaque as a memento of this happy event.



Mary Ising

Mary Ising was chosen Woman of the Year by the Wisconsin Federation of Republican Women. Mary is the well-loved and much admired Republican National Committeewoman for Wisconsin whose long years of service to the Republican Party eminently qualified her for this distinction. She was a Delegate to the Republican National Conventions of 1964 and 1968. She held an important role in six Republican Women's Spring Conferences. She has served the Republican Party on the county, district, state, and national levels, and formerly was first vice president of the Wisconsin Federation of Republican Women.

Mary's dedicated record of service is exceeded only by her courage and fortitude in fighting political battles in behalf of conservative principles and candidates. She was reelected National Committeewoman in 1968 in spite of a massive liberal effort to purge her from leadership.



Eva Jean Beltner

Eva Jean Beltner was chosen Woman of the Year by the Nebraska Federation of Republican Women. Her election as President of the Nebraska Federation was recognition of her longtime service to the Republican Party, as well as her leadership ability and administrative skill. On the state level, she has served on the State Central Committee, the State Executive Board, and the State Finance Committee. On the county level, she has been treasurer, co-chairman, and Chairman for 5 years of her County Central Committee.

Eva Jean is especially admired because of the remarkable way she has secured the involvement of local Republicans all over Nebraska. When she was County Chairman, she worked out a precinct program which was copied all over the state. Under her direction, the Central Committees, the federated women's clubs, the YRs, and the TARs all function as a harmonious and cooperative whole.



Olive Spann

Olive Spann was chosen Woman of the Year by the Alabama Federation of Republican Women. Olive is Vice Chairwoman for the Republican Party of Alabama and has been a delegate many times to the Alabama Republican State Conventions. She has been a member of the Board of Directors of the Alabama Federation of Republican Women since 1962, and its State Treasurer since 1965. Her service in all phases of work for the Republican Party ranges from holding offices in her local Republican Club to committee chairmanships for workshops of the National Federation of Republican Women and for the Republican Women's Spring Conference. In 1969 she was Alabama Chairman of Women for Nixon.

Olive's dedicated devotion to the conservative cause is outstanding. Among the many stars in her crown is her chairmanship of the Committee to Elect Bobbie Ames as Alabama National Committeewoman.

Calling All Eagles . . .

The November *Reader's Digest*, page 113, has a superb article by Senator Everett Dirksen promoting his anti-obscenity bill, S.1077. He finished this article the day before he went to the hospital for the last time. Please read it immediately and order reprints for wide distribution: 10 copies — 50c; 50 copies — \$2; 100 copies — \$3.50; 500 copies — \$12.50.

The October *Phyllis Schlafly Report* called "The Solution To Obscenity," which was the first national publication to boost S. 1077, has been a best seller and thousands of extra copies have been sold. Have you bought your extra copies?

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.