



The Phyllis Schlafly Report



VOL. 4, NO. 10

Box 618, ALTON, ILLINOIS 62002

MAY, 1971

Will Ping-Pong Propaganda Erase History?

There is a joke making the rounds in Moscow today that goes like this. When Stalin died, there was a clerical error at the Pearly Gates and he was admitted to Heaven without anyone realizing it. In due course, he met St. Peter and said, "Things are really pretty dull here, with everyone so happy and free. I would like to have a look at Hell to see if it might be more to my taste. St. Peter quickly granted this request and assigned an angel to take Stalin down for a tour of Hell. When Stalin arrived there, he found Hell was a rather exciting place -- parties, women, whiskey, and perpetual merriment. When they returned to St. Peter, Stalin said: "If it's all the same to you, I'd rather spend my time in Hell." St. Peter readily gave permission for Stalin to make the move, warning him, however, that there would be no chance to change his mind -- the decision would be final. Stalin agreed to the condition.

The angel escorted Stalin down below. This time, however, when they arrived, Hell looked like the way it really is, full of fire and brimstone, agony and pain. Stalin turned to the angel in astonishment and said, "But it wasn't like this when you brought me here before!"

The angel calmly replied as he departed, "Ah, Mr. Stalin, when you came before, you just had the guided tour."

The conclusions reached by the American table tennis players who went to Red China, and by most of the liberal publicists who wrote glowingly about them, are just as wrong as Stalin's guided tour of Hell. Even in this age of befuddled college students, it is hard to see how there could be any so ignorant as the members of the U.S. ping-pong team who praised Red China.

Some players said their visit shows that the Chinese Reds are a "very friendly people." One 18-year old member of the U.S. team said he would "prefer the Chinese system if it could be set up in America." Another U.S. ping-pong player said he could find no criticism of Red China; but he didn't hesitate to downgrade his own country.

As usual, the professors were more extreme than the teenagers. One 40-year old English teacher at an Eastern university, who wants to bring Chinese opera and ballet to America, said: "The single thing that struck me most is that Mao is Jesus Christ." He added that he sensed a "great psychic strength" among the Chinese. "It's a force to be reckoned with," he continued; "everyone comes together in this psychic discipline and unity." He failed to add that, if the Chinese don't voluntarily come together in "discipline and unity," they are killed or imprisoned.

Life Magazine portrayed the ping-pong tour as though it were as important as the invention of the steam engine, the flight of the Wright Brothers, the atomic fission at Chicago University, or some other event which marked a new era in history. Other liberal magazines were similarly extravagant in their reporting.

Those who think that a ping-pong game can turn murderers into gentlemen, or convert a Communist into a friend, show that they have learned nothing from the past and are unwilling to face the realities of the present. Ping-pong propaganda may be able to erase history from the memories of the ignorant and the naive, but such deliberate self-deception is dangerous for America.

It isn't the ping-pong game itself that is dangerous, it is the foolish way that Communist and liberal propagandists are using the ping-pong paddle as a wedge to promote diplomatic recognition of Red China and its admission to the United Nations. Non-recognition of Red China has been an established part of U.S. policy for 22 years through five different U.S. Presidents. The American people of both political parties are probably more solidly united against Red China than on any other foreign policy issue. The Senate and the House have gone on record dozens of times during the last 22 years with unanimous or near-unanimous votes against recognition of Red China and its admission to the U.N.

In the light of the current wave of ping-pong propaganda, it is well for us to examine the reasons why the United States should remain steadfast in its policy NOT to recognize Red China.

Uncivilized Barbarians

First, we oppose recognition of the Red Chinese bosses because they are unfit to belong to the family of nations or to be treated as equals in international intercourse. Civilized people don't dine with murderers and criminals, and that is what the Chinese Reds are.

The Red Chinese dictatorship has deliberately liquidated 20 million Chinese, violated the sacred institution of the family by forcing people into Red communes, persecuted all clergy and missionaries, committed savage aggression and genocide on the Tibetan race, seized territory from India, made the production and distribution of narcotics an organized Government monopoly netting billions in illicit profits, stolen millions of dollars of U.S. property, committed a sneak aggressive attack on Korea, and waged continuing aggression in Vietnam, Thailand and Laos.

Former Secretary of State Dean Acheson made a

very apt remark when he said, "The conduct of Red China must greatly improve before attaining the level of barbarism."

Like all Communist governments, the Chinese Reds use blackmail, counterfeiting, forgery, kidnapping, lying, mass murder, slavery, subversion, theft, religious persecution, and treaty-breaking as part of their official state policy. Like all Communist governments, their attitude toward treaties is succinctly summed up in Lenin's dictum: "Promises are like piecrusts -- made to be broken."

The argument is made by the liberals that "you can't ignore 750,000,000 people -- they exist!" Well, Richard Speck and James Earl Ray exist, too, but civilized people don't invite them to dinner. Former Philippine Ambassador Carlos Romulo once said that the admission of Red China to the U.N. would be like inviting Al Capone to join the Chicago police force.

The fact is that, if we recognize Red China, we would deliberately ignore 727,000,000 people. The total number of Communists in China is not more than 23,000,000. The remaining 727,000,000 Chinese are the slaves of the Red bosses and would feel betrayed and abandoned without hope if America were to grant their captors the dignity of diplomatic recognition.

The liberals argue that we should forgive and forget the fact that the United Nations officially branded Red China as an aggressor in Korea, just as we have forgiven and forgotten the attacks on America by Japan and Germany in World War II. But Japan and Germany threw out their war-starting governments before we welcomed them to the family of nations. Red China, on the other hand, has still the same criminal gang in control. This gang has not renounced treaty-breaking, no-warning wars, religious persecution, or any other of their uncivilized policies. Red China today is ruled by the same men who invaded South Korea and Tibet and killed thousands of American troops. We would break faith with our servicemen if we welcome their sneak attackers.

The liberals argue that, since we recognize the Soviet Union, why shouldn't we treat Red China the same way? The first answer to this is that two wrongs don't make a right. The second answer is that the Soviet Union remained weak and ineffective and no threat to our security during the period that four American Presidents (Wilson, Harding, Coolidge and Hoover) refused to recognize the Communist government. As soon as Franklin Roosevelt granted diplomatic recognition in 1933, Communism began to spread through the world because, in violation of all international morality and even of the executive agreement by which recognition was extended, the Soviet Union used its embassy as a center of espionage, subversion and propaganda.

The liberals argue in favor of Red China's recognition and admission to the U.N. because "it's better to be talking than fighting." Such a hoary cliché could only be repeated by one who never heard of the Pearl Harbor attack. The Japanese diplomats were politely talking with us in Washington, D.C. all during the months the surprise attack was planned -- and even while the bombs were falling on December 7, 1941.

The 450 Forgotten POWs

Second, our recognition of the Chinese Reds is morally wrong because they are still holding or refusing to account for 450 American POWs from the Korean War. We hear a great deal now about the plight of some 1,600 American servicemen who are POWs in Indo-China. The Vietnamese Communists won't even tell the families of our POWs if they are dead or alive,

although some have been held prisoner for as long as six years.

What about the 450 American POWs who have been imprisoned or unaccounted for ever since the Korean War? It has been nearly 20 years and they are truly the forgotten Americans. U.S. diplomats have met scores of times with the Chinese Reds in Geneva to negotiate for these 450 American prisoners. Not one of them was ever accounted for or released, although their continued imprisonment is in direct violation of the Korean armistice agreement.

The tragic tale of our Korean War POWs is spelled out in the House Foreign Affairs Committee Hearing on "Return of American Prisoners of War Who Have Not Been Accounted For By The Communists" held on May 27, 1957, and in House Resolution 292 unanimously passed by the House of Representatives on July 9, 1957.

The whole idea that diplomatic representatives of the United States should mingle socially with the Communist tyrants who have been holding American servicemen prisoners for 20 years is a shocking affront to every American who ever wore our country's uniform.

How can Hanoi believe we mean business in demanding the return of our Vietnam POWs when they see how so many Americans are hungering to fraternize, drink, trade, and play games with the captors of our Korean POWs?

Espionage Headquarters

Third, recognition of Red China is wrong because it would enable the Chinese Reds to engage in espionage and subversion inside the United States on a massive scale. We know they are already doing this furtively on our college campuses, and extensively throughout Latin America, Africa and Asia. Diplomatic recognition would give the Chinese Reds privileged sanctuaries in Washington, D.C. and in the United Nations in New York City to serve as headquarters for their spying and subversion.

FBI Chief J. Edgar Hoover said last year that the Chinese Reds are already working in the United States to procure "highly coveted technical data" and "to introduce deep-cover intelligence agents into this country." Mao has also lent support to the Black Panther Party and other revolutionary groups. Why should we give the Chinese Reds a privileged base from which to direct their operations?

Having the diplomatic immunity of their spy centers would make espionage so easy for the Red Chinese. They could use the unbroken seal of the diplomatic pouch to transmit orders to spies and couriers and to receive back their reports, microfilmed documents, and other materials. Colonel Oto Biheler, an attache of the Communist Czechoslovakian embassy in Washington, D.C., is a classic case of how this is done. He used the sealed diplomatic pouch to transmit to his Red bosses not only top-secret military and atomic information, but also jet propulsion materials, the secret electronic tubes used in proximity fuses, and geiger meters for detection of atomic materials.

Years of experience with the diplomatic missions of the Soviet Union and all Communist governments prove that this is the way Communists behave -- and Red China would certainly be no slacker in playing the game. For documentation, see the *Report of the Canadian Royal Commission* which investigated code clerk Igor Gouzenko's revelations, the *Report of the Australian Royal Commission* which investigated Embassy Secretary Vladimir Petrov's confession, and the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee Report called *Activities of United States Citizens Employed*

By The United Nations.

There has been no change in Communist tactics since these reports were published or since the House Committee on Un-American Activities issued a masterful report called *Patterns of Communist Espionage*. This document showed in detail how Communist embassies and U.N. delegations are headquarters for international Red spy rings. At the time the report was written, the Soviet Union had 442 adult Soviet citizens with official diplomatic cover in the United States who could be used for espionage. This is more than five times the number of United States citizens serving at the U.S. embassy in Moscow. Whereas the United States hires its servants in Moscow, Soviet diplomats import all their maids, chauffeurs, cooks, etc., and they are all part of the Soviet espionage apparatus.

Listening Posts

The liberals claim that our embassies in Communist countries have value as "listening posts." A mountain of historical evidence shows conclusively which side is doing the listening. Every servant, employee and interpreter working in U.S. embassies in Communist countries must be selected and registered by the Communist secret police. The U.S. embassy in Moscow employs some 90 MVD-registered employees. In most U.S. embassies in Communist countries, there are more Communist-certified employees than there are American personnel.

The embassy and the personal living quarters of Americans are bugged and their telephones tapped. One Western attache found eight microphones in his three-bedroom apartment. American diplomats discovered a microphone had been hidden for years only a few feet from where our Ambassador-to-Moscow Joseph E. Davies dictated his top-secret reports to Washington. The Reds planted another listening device inside the great U.S. seal. In the American legation in Budapest, a microphone was discovered in the fireplace of Cardinal Mindszenty's room connected to a wire recorder on the legation roof.

American diplomatic personnel are trailed by the Communist secret police when they leave their homes and offices. General Arthur Trudeau has testified that the secret police systematically weaves a web of bribes, blackmail, sex, alcohol and narcotics to entrap our diplomats abroad.

There is not a shred of evidence that the United States gains any useful information from our embassies in Communist countries. Every move the Communists make catches U.S. authorities off guard, such as the Soviet breaking of the nuclear test ban in 1961, Khrushchev's sending nuclear missiles into Cuba in 1962, and the invasion of Czechoslovakia in 1968.

The Racket Called "Trade"

Fourth, recognition of Red China would be a costly mistake for American taxpayers because it would encourage powerful financial interests in our country to press harder for trade with Red China, which indeed they are already doing. The granting of diplomatic recognition would open the door to the achievement of "East-West trade," a Communist objective for 15 years.

"Trade" is what they call it, but "racket" is a better word. Red China has no money to buy from an affluent America, and no prospect of getting enough money because of the inherent unproductiveness of the Communist economic system. So, what is really meant by "trade" with Red China?

"Trade" with Red China means handouts to a

Communist government financed by the U.S. taxpayer. Here is the way the racket works. The Red Chinese order U.S. materials, pay for them with money borrowed from the Export-Import Bank, the World Bank, the International Development Association, or the Asian Redevelopment Bank. These so-called loans are never repaid, and the long-suffering U.S. taxpayer pays the deficit. No wonder this racket is supported by powerful U.S. financial interests! They get paid in full! The U.S. taxpayers seldom find out how they are cheated because of the way the various international lending agencies -- the "middleman" in the deal -- are surrounded by liberal verbal gobbledygook and buried in the Federal budget.

When Lyndon Johnson was President, he increased the U.S. appropriation to the Export-Import Bank 50% from \$9 billion to \$13.5 billion. It just happened that the president of the Export-Import Bank, Harold F. Linder, was the largest single contributor to the Democrats in the 1964 campaign. He gave \$61,300 to Democratic candidates that year.

On April 6, 1971, the Senate voted to increase the lending authority of the Export-Import Bank from \$13.5 billion to \$20 billion. The Senate bill would also grant the request of the Nixon Administration that the Export-Import Bank be taken out from under the expenditure and lending limitations in the President's budget. Henry Kearns, president of the Bank, said that budgetary restrictions were greatly hampering its operations.

In President Nixon's State of the World Message of February 25, 1971, he asked Congress to "double" the "soft (low-interest) lending capacity" of the International Development Association, and to increase our contribution to the Asian Development Bank. The International Development Association is the device by which Americans are taxed in order to give foreigners no-interest or very-low-interest-bearing loans (euphemistically disguised as "soft" loans) which will never be repaid. These are the subterfuges by which U.S. financial interests will profit on the "trade" with Red China which is designed to accompany recognition.

New Nixon Policy

To the surprise and dismay of those who have studied history, the White House in 1971 embarked upon a series of steps to abandon our 22-year policy. The Kissinger-authored State of the World Message on February 25 said: "The United States is prepared to see the Peoples Republic of China play a constructive role in the family of nations.... We are prepared to establish a dialogue with Peking."

On April 14, President Nixon struck down many restrictions on travel, communications, trade and shipping with Red China, saying that he will soon authorize direct exports of nonstrategic items to Red China.

On April 26, a Presidential Commission headed by Henry Cabot Lodge recommended to the White House that Red China be admitted to the United Nations even though such action might be "awkward and discordant" to both the United States and the U.N. The May 10 *U.S. News & World Report* shows a picture of President Nixon accepting this report.

Initially, the press reported the Lodge statement as espousing the "two Chinas" policy, that is, give a seat to Red China but let the Republic of China on Taiwan (Formosa) continue in membership. It would appear, however, that the State Department is not only promoting the recognition of Red China and its admission to the U.N., but also the betrayal of our

longtime friend and ally, the Republic of China. On April 28, while Secretary William P. Rogers was telling a press conference in London how eager we are to exchange visitors with Red China, a State Department press officer named Charles Bray III announced in Washington that the legal status of the island of Taiwan was an "unsettled question" between rival governments. He issued a statement urging that Communist China and Nationalist China settle their dispute by peaceful means.

There is hardly any way to construe this inept remark except that the State Department wanted to insult the Republic of China. Yet the St. Louis Post-Dispatch Wire Service reported on May 5 that "Mr. Nixon stood by the U.S. contention that sovereignty over Taiwan was unsettled."

The only thing "unsettled" about the island of Taiwan is that Red China covets it and wants to capture it by force. Taiwan is truly a "bone in the throat" of Mao Tse-tung because it is an island of freedom and prosperity which stands in stunning contrast to the slavery and economic failure of the Red China regime on the mainland. Red Chinese guards patrol the coast of the mainland and shoot on sight anyone trying to escape. Yet thousands have risked death to swim their way out of the prison called Red China. In some months, more Chinese attempt to escape by swimming the dangerous channel to Hong Kong than all the East Germans who have ever attempted to scale or penetrate the Berlin Wall since it was erected! In spite of the efficiency of the Red Guards, Mao Tse-tung and his associates will never feel secure as long as Taiwan is free.

The Republic of China had been fighting Japanese aggression for years before Pearl Harbor. After the Japanese attack on the United States, Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek had the opportunity to make a separate peace with the Japanese. Realizing that the United States was fighting a long war on two fronts, he decided to keep fighting with us as a wartime ally. When World War II was over, President Franklin Roosevelt betrayed this loyal wartime ally by making a secret deal at Yalta to give the Soviet Union control of strategic Chinese territory: Outer Mongolia, Port Arthur, Dairen, the Chinese-Eastern Railroad, and the South-Manchurian Railroad.

Following Yalta, the pro-Chinese Communist crowd in the State Department tried to force Chiang into a coalition government with the Reds. When Chiang refused, the State Department cut off all aid to the Republic of China and forced it into a truce with the Communists which gave the Reds time to obtain arms and ammunition from the Soviet Union. Meanwhile, Under Secretary of the Treasury Harry Dexter White, who was a secret Soviet agent, caused the Republic of China's currency to deteriorate by stalling for four years and stopping a large loan which had been promised and approved. These activities brought about the takeover of China by the Red regime of Mao Tse-tung. The best history of this whole sorry story is *How The Far East Was Lost* by Dr. Anthony Kubek.

If U.S. national honor and our treaty commitments mean anything, we must never betray the prosperous, happy island of freedom, Taiwan, which is the present base of our faithful World War II ally, the Republic of China.

The liberals allege that Taiwan is just an offshore island which should belong to whomever owns mainland China. This is as ridiculous as the Nazi claim in World War II that England was an offshore island which really belonged to whomever controlled Europe.

Actually, England is much closer to the continent than Taiwan is to the mainland. Just as the United States recognized the legality of all the European governments-in-exile on the Island of Britain, and continues to recognize the governments-in-exile of the Republics of Latvia, Lithuania and Estonia (31 years after the Soviets seized them), so the United States must continue to recognize the Republic of China. It is larger in population than more than half of the 127 U.N. members.

"Inevitable" Recognition

Realizing the importance of maintaining sanctuaries for subversion inside the United States, the recognition of Red China and its admission to the United Nations have been major Communist objectives for the last two decades. These objectives are pushed relentlessly by the Communist press and by Communist fronts, and echoed by Communist sympathizers and dupes in many walks of life. Millionaire Cyrus Eaton used to finance a campus organization called The Undergraduate Committee for the Recognition of (Red) China. Before it died a natural death, chapters had blossomed on 50 college campuses, from Princeton to California University. Robert Kennedy made recognition of Red China a major part of his campaign with college students.

On October 16, 1960, the Communist newspaper, *The Worker*, launched a drive to convince the American people that the admission of Red China to the U.N. is "inevitable." This line was echoed by fellow-traveling commentators cooperating with the Red China lobby.

Since ping-pong propaganda has swept across our land, this line about "inevitability" has been trotted out again and is being pressed hard by the liberals. Recognition of Red China wasn't "inevitable" in 1960, and it isn't inevitable today -- unless American citizens swallow the falseness and the foolishness of the Henry Cabot Lodge-State Department-liberal line.

The United States has many weapons to prevent the admission of Red China to the U.N. -- if our Government only has the will to use them. (1) The U.S. has the absolute power, unilaterally, to block admission of Red China to the U.N. by the double veto. Not only can we veto Red China's admission, but we can veto any attempt to bypass our veto by the trick of calling Red China's admission a "procedural matter." (2) We have full power to block Red China by withholding some or all United States contributions which constitute 31 per cent of the U.N. budget. Nothing would stop the agitation for Red China by our so-called allies so fast as the simple declaration by our Government that, if Red China is admitted to the U.N., the United States will maintain its national honor by withdrawing from an organization which violates its own charter and rewards aggression.

Write President Nixon and your Senators and Congressmen and tell them you oppose recognition of and trade with Red China, using whichever of the arguments given above that most appeal to you. Write your newspapers, call your radio station, and use any of the channels of communication through which you can let your voice be heard.

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: 15 cents each; 8 copies \$1; 50 copies \$4.