



The Phyllis Schlafly Report



VOL. 7, NO. 5

Box 618, ALTON, ILLINOIS 62002

DECEMBER, 1973

Meditations on Morality

Morality In Schools

The recent horrible crime in Boston, when six youths poured gasoline over a 24-year-old woman and burned her to death, is proof again that many of our young people do not believe in the Ten Commandments and are not morally educated enough to live in civilized society.

The elimination of moral training from our public schools began with the movement known as "progressive education." This is a general term which has come to mean the educational theories which flowed from John Dewey and his disciples, and which resulted in the elimination of standards, values and discipline.

The Dewey theory was that there is no such thing as right and wrong, there are no absolutes, discipline must give way to permissiveness, and standards of conduct and achievement must be replaced by "life adjustment" education. This means that, no matter how disorderly the classroom, no matter how decadent the community morals or irreligious its atmosphere, the chief purpose of education is to accommodate the child to the group.

One of the easiest ways to demonstrate the fact that moral training has been stricken from education is to compare the old McGuffey readers, which our grandparents studied, with today's elementary school readers. The McGuffey stories taught the time-honored virtues such as love of God, patriotism, thrift, honesty, respect for elders, where there's a will there's a way, the golden rule, true courage, manliness, kindness to the less fortunate, obedience to parents, the value of prayer, the consequences of idleness and truancy, crime doesn't pay, and why virtue and love are worth more than material riches.

The old McGuffey readers taught morals, religious faith, and family love. Incidentally, McGuffey also taught an appreciation of literature, poetry and history.

Modern readers, on the other hand, are completely different. The characters merely run and play, they look up and look down, they hear the duck quack and the cat meow. Their lives are utterly devoid of the standards, the values, the morals, the inspiration, and the ideals of the McGuffey characters.

The last straw in the removal of moral training from our public schools was the U.S. Supreme Court: one decision forbade released time for religious instruction and another forbade all prayer, even a simple non-denominational grace before lunch.

The same U.S. Supreme Court which has guaranteed freedom of speech for Communists to teach in our schools and colleges, and freedom of speech for smut peddlers to distribute their obscenity, has denied freedom of speech to children to say a simple two-line prayer in school.

By the failure to teach the Ten Commandments, or to permit the daily acknowledgement of the Divine Creator whose moral laws should be obeyed, our public schools are cheating our young people even more than if they failed to teach them reading, writing or arithmetic. Many innocent victims of crime are paying the bitter consequences.

Crime In Schools

Just a few years ago, the principal problems on the college campuses and in the schools were demonstrations, sit-ins, and property destruction of the burn-down-the-ROTC-building variety. Today, the principal problem is violent crime: murder, rape, aggravated assault, armed robbery, burglary, and other non-ideological crime.

For example, in a three-week period in St. Louis this fall there has been a murder at each of two different city high schools, an exchange of gunfire outside a third, an armed robbery at a fourth; a beating of the principal at an elementary school, the molestation of an 8-year-old boy at another, and the beating of an honor student by a group of youths using a metal pipe.

Such crime and terror in the schools are a fairly recent innovation. As recently as eight years ago, the St. Louis school system did not employ a single security guard. Now, the School Board must cancel certain classes in order to greatly increase the number of additional security guards.

It's the same in many other big cities. In New York, the City Council recently received a report that crime and violence are up in the city's junior high and elementary schools. The city school system is described by some as a "jungle."

On college campuses, the plight of women students is especially acute. On some campuses, women are advised to carry a shrill whistle, and not to go out alone at night.

With all the money we've spent in this country on education, it seems that we've missed the most important subject. We expect our schools to teach reading, writing and arithmetic; but they have neglected the most important "R" of all: right or wrong. Somehow when religion and released time were

banned from the schools, the teaching of right or wrong was lost in the shuffle.

Moral education should be taught from the earliest grades. This includes the moral precepts of the Ten Commandments, especially thou shalt not steal and thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's goods, as well as other rules of good conduct such as honesty is the best policy. Our students should be taught that lying, stealing, cheating, and murder are both crimes and sins which cannot be excused by past economic, geographic or racial injustices, no matter how grievous.

The First Amendment merely forbids "an establishment of religion." It certainly does not forbid teaching the fundamentals of morality. Moral education is a basic necessity for civilized living. To abdicate this obligation is to resign our schools and our cities to the law of the jungle, and to allow ourselves to be terrorized by young savages who have never been taught the difference between right and wrong.

End Justify Means?

What moral rule is most violated by those in high places? Probably the answer to that question is the moral principle that the end does not justify the means.

The men involved in Watergate did not have any previous criminal records. Yet, they persuaded themselves that the reelection of President Nixon was so necessary that it justified the use of illegal means, such as burglary, bribery and perjury. Likewise, respectable heads of big corporations have confessed to using illegal means, namely, using corporate funds to make large cash gifts to CREEP, the Committee to Reelect the President.

Have American leaders always acted like moral illiterates and assumed that a good end justifies evil or illegal means? No, but there are many examples from recent history.

In 1960, the election of John Kennedy and Lyndon Johnson was deemed so important by their associates that they justified the notorious vote frauds in Chicago and Texas.

In 1945, President Roosevelt and General Eisenhower wanted to keep the friendship and good will of Soviet dictator Stalin. In order to achieve this alleged good objective, they ordered American troops to forcibly turn over to the Soviet secret police hundreds of thousands of anti-Communist refugees fleeing from Russia. The Keelhaul Papers tell the full story.

In August 1945, President Truman and Secretary of War Stimson approved dropping the atom bomb on the open cities of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, instead of on military targets. They rationalized that this slaughter of tens of thousands of civilians was necessary to achieve what they believed was a good objective, forcing Japan to surrender on our terms.

Dr. Henry Kissinger believed that the alleged good end of the SALT Agreement with the Soviet Union was so important that he willingly sacrificed U.S. superiority in missiles and submarines, and accepted a 3-to-2 inferiority. He even gave up the right of the American people to protect themselves with ABMs against incoming enemy missiles. Never in all history have so many millions of innocent people been so helplessly and hopelessly exposed to enemy attack as are the American people since the signing of the SALT Anti-Defense Treaty last year. The constitutional duty of our Government to "provide for the common defense" should not be exchanged for reliance on treaties.

Our prisoners of war in Vietnam have given us an

admirable example of how men, even under physical torture and psychological pressure can reject the rationalization that a good end justifies bad means. Even the good end of better food and better treatment did not persuade our heroic prisoners of war to indulge in the bad means of making propaganda broadcasts for Hanoi.

Our prisoners of war in Vietnam passed the test in morality which many high Government officials have failed.

Private Lives/Public Officials

Is a public official's private life his own personal business? Or is it the public's business? There seems to be an unwritten rule that no one ever mentions a public official's personal weaknesses or indiscretions. He may be an alcoholic or a philanderer, but this is never reported. There seems to be a strange double standard that it is socially and politically acceptable for a public official to overindulge in whiskey or women, but it is a grievous social and political blunder for anyone to tell the truth about his behavior.

This code of silence is a manifestation of the way men will cover up for each other because people in glass houses are reluctant to throw stones. Many public officials have the same weaknesses, and nobody has the courage to cast the first stone. Such an attitude deprives the voting public of information they have a right to know.

When the voters elect a candidate to office, the most important thing they want to know is: will he keep his campaign promises, or will he cynically dismiss them (in Presidential candidate Wendell Willkie's famous expression) as just "campaign oratory"?

What could be more germane in making a judgment about a candidate's moral character than to know whether or not he has broken his marriage vows? If a man has no regard for a solemn promise he made to love, honor and be faithful to his wife, how can we expect him to honor and be faithful to his campaign promises?

There is an old adage that a man is known by the company he keeps. If he is keeping company with call girls, that should be known. The Prime Minister of Britain recently forced several officials out of the Government for consorting with call girls, because public officials should observe a higher moral code than other men.

One of the most successful business executives in the country, Ross Perot, fires any employee who is cheating on his wife. Perot believes that he cannot trust a man to be loyal to the company if he isn't even faithful to his own wife.

It has often been said that there are three parties in Washington: the Republican, the Democratic, and the cocktail party, and that the third is the most numerous. In business, employers quickly spot the Monday absentees as chronic or incipient alcoholics. Why should public officials be privileged to drink on the job when other employees are not? The voting public has a right to a physical, financial and moral fitness report on its employees.

Does this mean that no man can have any private life immune from public scrutiny? No, it doesn't. It is very easy for any man to have all the privacy he wants. Just stay off the public payroll.

The President's Credibility

James Reston, a leading voice on the NEW YORK TIMES, has just quoted with approval a statement in the WALL STREET JOURNAL that President Richard Nixon's "misfortune is that his words are not widely

believed any more." So what else is new?

The only mystery is why it has taken such prestigious observers so long to discover what conservatives have known for four years, namely, that Nixon's words are not believable. The recent equivocations about the Watergate tapes are only peripheral evidences of the credibility problem which had already manifested itself on so many other issues of more immediate and vital concern to the American people.

On October 24, 1968, in a nationwide radio speech, candidate Richard Nixon solemnly promised to "restore our objective of clearcut military superiority." Last year, he repudiated his own words in the SALT Agreements by binding the United States to a 3-to-2 military inferiority in nuclear missiles and submarines. He even scrapped Lyndon Johnson's missile defense program, thereby leaving our cities defenseless.

In Nixon's 1968 campaign literature, he solemnly opposed price and wage controls as "an abdication of fiscal responsibility. Experience has indicated that they do not work, can never be administered equitably and are not compatible with a free economy." Yet, President Nixon has inflicted us with four Phases of price and wage controls.

Candidate Richard Nixon promised that he "would not agree to admitting [Red China] to the UN." Yet, President Nixon not only agreed to, but pushed, the entry of Red China into the United Nations, and failed to veto the ouster of the Republic of China.

Candidate Nixon promised "to reverse the irresponsible fiscal policies which produce [inflation]." Yet, he has not reversed, but increased, those irresponsible fiscal policies, giving us the largest peacetime deficits, more foreign giveaways, two devaluations of our dollar, and the highest interest rates in history.

On November 20, 1967, candidate Nixon said it "makes no sense to give credit to the Soviet Union." The 1968 Republican Platform on which Nixon was elected stated emphatically: "Only when Communist nations prove by actual deeds that they genuinely seek world peace and will live in harmony with the rest of the world, will we support expansion of East-West trade." The Soviets are not genuinely seeking world peace, either in Vietnam or in the Middle East; yet the Nixon Administration has been aggressively promoting trade financed by the American taxpayers. He has given hundreds of millions of dollars of U.S. taxpayers' money in subsidies and loans to provide the Soviet Union with American wheat, industrial plants and technology.

Lies about Watergate are dishonorable; but lies which cover up the deliberate deterioration of our defenses and our dollar affect the physical and financial security of every American citizen. It is not only President Nixon's misfortune that "his words are not widely believed any more." It is the country's misfortune, too.

Gifts To Public Officials

In the several pages of instructions which the Lord gave after he handed down the Ten Commandments, He included this admonition: "Thou shalt take no gift; for the gift blindeth the wise, and perverteth the words of the righteous."

It is in line with this ancient rule that society approves a woman accepting candy and flowers from a man who is not her husband, but is harshly suspicious of a woman who accepts diamonds and furs.

It is in line with this same rule against taking gifts that Article I of the U.S. Constitution forbids all

Government officials from accepting "any present . . . of any kind whatever" from any "foreign state." Our State Department has a warehouse in Washington, D.C. full of gifts which other governments have given to our foreign service employees, but which the Constitution does not permit them to keep.

Somehow, the theory has developed that, whereas the receiving of gifts compromises other people, it does not compromise the President of the United States. The double standard seems to be that minor officials can be corrupted with small gifts in the hundred-dollar price range, but the President cannot be corrupted by large gifts in the hundred thousand-dollar price range.

We've come a long way since President Herbert Hoover refused to accept even a presidential salary, and declined to permit his engineer son to go to work for an airline because the airline carried mail for the Government.

Nobody ever raised a moral question about the hundreds of thousands of dollars worth of livestock, farm machinery, and a putting green which President Dwight Eisenhower received for his Gettysburg farm. Nobody seemed to mind when the Government built an airport for President Lyndon Johnson near his Texas ranch, and let him have the immensely valuable, exclusive, all-networks television franchise in Austin, Texas. Questions of impropriety were not raised when Johnson took with him, as he left the White House, filing cabinets full of documents which he could value at a high price, then take a valuable income tax deduction for annual gifts to the Johnson Library.

Meanwhile, the General Services Administration has confirmed that more than \$2.2 million in public funds has been spent to improve President Nixon's personal homes at San Clemente and Key Biscayne, including such non-security items as a landscaping and watering system, a septic tank, a swimming pool heater, two golf carts, and a new heating system. There seems to be massive amnesia about Article II of the U.S. Constitution which states that the President's compensation "shall neither be increased nor diminished during the period for which he shall have been elected."

If it was wrong for a presidential aide to accept a vicuna coat or a deep freeze, or for an Internal Revenue agent to accept a ham, then why isn't it wrong for Presidents to accept expensive gifts?

Avoiding Income Taxes

The Spiro Agnew affair has caused shock waves among his friends who never guessed he could be guilty, and also among his enemies who think he was let off too easy.

Agnew is certainly not the first high government official to cheat on his income tax. Alben Barkley, Vice President of the United States from 1949 to 1953, was hundreds of thousands of dollars delinquent on his income taxes at the time of his death. The Government never prosecuted but quietly collected from his estate \$343,444.32 which he had failed to pay during his lifetime. As Senate Majority Leader, Barkley had steered through Congress many tax increases which the rest of us had to pay.

Some commentators have tried to make capital out of Agnew's cheating on his taxes while he was making speeches about law and order. So what's new about that type of hypocrisy? Under the Kennedy Administration, James Landis -- the chairman of a special presidential commission created to draw up a code of ethics for government employees -- failed to file any income tax returns at all for five years, although his income was more than \$60,000 each year.

He could hardly claim ignorance of the law because he had been Dean of the Harvard Law School. When finally caught, Dean Landis was merely sentenced to a 30-day rest in a luxurious suite in the finest hospital in New York.

Another notorious tax evader was the writer Edmund Wilson, to whom President Lyndon Johnson awarded the Presidential Medal of Freedom. One of Wilson's books was titled "The Cold War and The Income Tax," in which he boasted that he had refused to file any income tax returns for nine years.

President Nixon, with an annual income of more than \$200,000, paid an income tax of only \$792 in 1970 and only \$878 in 1971. Richard Nixon and Lyndon Johnson both used the same gimmick to avoid taxes. They had someone appraise their personal papers at a high value, and then they claimed a huge tax deduction for donating the papers to a library.

The question we all want answered is this: is it fair to ask the average American to pay high taxes when our leaders do not?

Three Courageous Heroes

For an antidote to the Watergate scandals, the illegal campaign contributions, and the acceptance of expensive, questionable gifts by highly-placed and highly-paid U.S. officials, we can look to a trio of super-heroes in Vienna and Moscow, to three men who have risked everything -- their lives, their freedom, and their careers -- in order to speak the truth about Communist tyranny.

The voice from Vienna, where he lives today, is the courageous clergyman, Joseph Cardinal Mindszenty. During World War II, he was imprisoned by the Nazis because he protested their outrageous treatment of the Jews and because he ordered all the Catholic churches and convents under his jurisdiction to shelter Jews trying to hide from the Gestapo. Later, when the Communists took over his native Hungary, he was arrested, tortured, and imprisoned for 23 years because he led the resistance to Communist control of the schools and churches.

Next we look to the Soviet scientist, Andrei Sakharov, who developed Russia's hydrogen bomb. Winner of many Soviet awards, Sakharov could have led a life of ease and prestige. Instead, he has literally taken his life in his hands by speaking out against Soviet repression. In an act of supreme heroism he even made public a desperate letter appealing to the U.S. Congress to deny most-favored-nation trading benefits to the Soviet Union until Soviet citizens are granted the right to emigrate. Contrary to Henry Kissinger's recent testimony to the Fulbright Committee, Sakharov wrote that the Jackson Amendment does not constitute interference in Socialist countries' internal affairs, but is simply a defense of international law "without which there cannot be mutual trust."

Then, in a sensational press conference in Moscow, Sakharov referred to the way the Soviets are importing Western commodities and technology, warning us: "By liberating us from problems we cannot solve ourselves, we could concentrate on accumulating strength. And as a result the whole world would be disarmed and facing our uncontrollable bureaucratic apparatus." Sakharov went on to say that detente on Soviet terms could lead to a disarmed world facing a Soviet Union "armed to the teeth" and dangerous.

What Sakharov warned us against is exactly a summary of what the United States is doing. Our shipments of wheat, corn and soybeans, of the largest truck factory and the most modern chemical plant --

most of it financed by the U.S. taxpayers -- are assisting the Soviets to solve their food and other economic problems, and thereby allowing them to concentrate their manpower and spend 40 percent of their Gross National Product on building weapons to control the world.

Sakharov warned strongly against the current favorite flight from reality called detente, saying that, "when the West in fact accepts our rules of the game in this process, such a detente would be dangerous." Sakharov even publicly mentioned the unmentionable in stating that mind-damaging drugs are being injected into some dissidents held in mental hospitals. There is growing evidence from many sources that the Soviets are imprisoning more and more dissidents in "special psychiatric hospitals" where they are given "medical punishment."

Third we look to the Nobel prize-winning writer, Alexander Solzhenitsyn. He could have used his exceptional literary talents to rake in the rewards of pleasing the Soviet bosses. Instead, he has used them to warn the West about the evils of Communism and especially of Soviet slave labor camps.

Cardinal Mindszenty was in the United States this fall for his first visit to our country in 25 years. It would be a good thing for America if those two other heroes, Sakharov and Solzhenitsyn, also come to America. Dr. Kissinger has been telling us that Communism is mellowing, and that Soviet leaders want friendly commercial and cultural relations. President Nixon can find out whether this is true or not by asking Brezhnev to permit Sakharov and Solzhenitsyn to visit the United States. This would be a good test of the new agreement Brezhnev signed recently when he was in our country.

Phyllis Schlafly is the co-author of three books on nuclear strategy, *The Gravediggers* (1964), *Strike From Space* (1965), and *The Betrayers* (1968), which accurately predicted that the Soviet Union had a program to overtake and surpass the U.S. in nuclear weapons. She has testified on national security before the Senate Foreign Relations and Armed Services Committees. She is now a commentator on *Spectrum* for CBS radio and television. Her 1972 series of interviews with military and nuclear experts was aired on 70 television and 50 radio stations. Her first book was *A Choice Not An Echo* (1964), and her latest book is a biography entitled *Mindszenty the Man* (1972). An honors graduate of Washington University and member of Phi Beta Kappa, she has a Master's Degree from Harvard University.

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.

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; 100 copies \$8.