



# The Phyllis Schlafly Report



VOL. 7, NO. 12, SECTION 1

Box 618, ALTON, ILLINOIS 62002

JULY, 1974

## The Fraud Called Detente

The biggest fraud of the 1970s is not the fake autobiography of Howard Hughes. It is our so-called detente with the Soviet Union. To obtain detente, Henry Kissinger agreed to allow the Soviets a 3-to-2 lead in nuclear missiles and submarines. Then, he gave the Soviets a billion dollars of our wheat on credit and at bargain prices. Finally, he approved spending hundreds of millions of U.S. tax dollars to finance truck and fertilizer factories in Russia.

And how have the Soviets responded? They have supplied weapons for new Communist invasions in Southeast Asia. The Soviets armed and encouraged the Arabs to attack the Israelis. Then the Soviets openly called on the Arabs to use their "oil weapon" against us and our allies. Now the Soviets have developed four new types of super missiles.

The more concessions we give the Soviets, the more weapons they build and the more wars they start. Kissinger's detente is really a policy of paying blackmail.

### Computers

Computers are an American invention, and we have stayed far ahead of the rest of the world in their development and production. Our second, third and fourth generation computers are the envy of the Communist countries. A computer is not just a calculating machine. A computer is an entire system, often costing millions or even tens of millions of dollars.

The leading U.S. manufacturer of computers advertises with the theme: Think of the computer as mental energy -- the power to get things done. And it does. Computers have become essential to the operation of many industries and especially to all vehicles that travel into outer space.

Remember the case of the aborted moon mission of Apollo 13? When something went wrong and our spacecraft could not land on the moon, it took the NASA computer 84 minutes to determine the correct trajectory for the return to earth. But it would have taken the 220 people in the NASA Planning and Analysis Division about 47 centuries to compute the solution manually.

This kind of computer is absolutely essential to space vehicles and to nuclear weapons. And this is the kind of computer we are now giving to the Soviet Union, with 90 percent of the cost provided by American loans.

Until recently, the Government restricted the export of U.S. computers. Now, most export control restrictions have been cancelled in the name of detente and the spirit of the Moscow, Yalta, and San Clemente meetings bet-

ween Nixon and Brezhnev.

Does it make sense for the United States to continue this massive distribution to the buildup of an ever-more-sophisticated and deadly Soviet war machine? A computer which the Soviets may claim to buy in order to assist in crop planning can also be used to compute trajectories for intercontinental ballistic missiles with MIRV warheads. It is primarily the acquisition of this U.S. computer technology which has enabled the Soviets to speed up their development of MIRVs two years faster than we had anticipated.

The sale of even more sophisticated U.S. computers is now being negotiated. Control Data Corporation has announced a deal with the Soviets for the development of an even more advanced computer and communications network estimated to cost \$500 million.

Precision machines for manufacturing ball bearings are also being shipped to the Soviet Union. Although bought ostensibly for peaceful purposes, they have a direct military application. The Soviets are concentrating on buying the very types which we use for the guidance of ballistic missiles.

Our country imposed jail and death sentences on those who turned our atomic secrets over to the Soviets. It doesn't make sense to reward with Export-Import Bank funds those who turn our computer and ball-bearing secrets over to the Soviet war machine.

### Secret Deals In 1972

The investigations into the Republican campaign tricks in 1972 have uncovered much hanky-panky such as illegal corporate gifts, spying inside the Democratic headquarters, and huge cash donations from people wanting favors such as Robert Vesco, Howard Hughes, and the Associated Milk Producers. Yet, the investigators have overlooked the biggest trick used to guarantee a Nixon landslide.

It was the 1972 person-to-person diplomacy -- in Moscow with Brezhnev, and in Paris with North Vietnam's Le Duc Tho (the latter winning the Nobel Peace Prize for Kissinger and Tho) -- which convinced the voters that they should not swap the Nixon-Kissinger team in the middle of the stream.

We are now learning more about the price we are paying for these talks. First came the 1972 giant Russian wheat deal which cost our taxpayers nearly a billion dollars in export subsidies and loans, and cost the American consumers about \$3 billion in higher food prices

Now we are building a truck plant in the Soviet Union

on the Kama River which will be the largest in the world. It will have an ultimate capacity of 250,000 diesel engines and 150,000 trucks. It is being financed by loans and guarantees from the Export-Import Bank, which means out of the pockets of the American taxpayers.

Sixty-five U.S. corporations are far advanced on their contracts to build and equip this gigantic factory headed by Swindler Dressler, C-E Cast Equipment, Holocraft & Company, and Ingersoll-Rand. So pleased are the Soviets, they have recently asked General Motors to build another huge truck factory for them in Siberia. Chase Manhattan Bank has put out a trade guide on the Kama River plant called "The Billion Dollar Beginning." Other deals are in the works, including fertilizer and chemical plants and computers.

The amazing part of this deal is that our country is desperately short of trucks. Trucks often must be ordered a year in advance to get deliveries on time. It takes months to replace the vehicles when they break down. A General Motors spokesman, Francis Cronin, recently said: "No one has been able to build facilities fast enough to keep up with the demand." Other leading truck manufacturers such as Mack Truck, International Harvester, White Motors, and Detroit Diesel also say they cannot supply the current American need for trucks. Suppliers of truck parts and diesel engines are faced with the same problem as truck manufacturers: the inability to keep pace with the phenomenal demand.

Was the 1972 Nixon election victory worth skyrocketing the cost of our bread and meat, and worth giving the Soviets a gigantic truck factory at a time when we do not have enough trucks to serve American business and farming? Congress should investigate not only the secret Watergate tapes, but also the secret White House commitments made in Moscow and Paris to insure victory in the 1972 presidential election.

### Summit Conferences

The crowning glory of detente is presumed to be the Summit Conferences and the agreements which are produced in the good fellowship of the champagne and caviar circuit. The most successful Summit Conferences with the Communists, however, are the ones at which no agreements whatsoever are signed. The Free World is the gainer anytime our President or Secretary of State can return from a Summit Conference without surrendering any free territory, or agreeing to pay billions for some Communist project, or promising to give more U.S. agricultural or industrial commodities to the Soviet Union.

The first two summit conferences in recorded history were held with the devil on the pinnacle of the temple and on the top of a high mountain. It is too bad that, in the summit conferences between the United States and the Soviet Union, our representatives did not have the courage to say, "Begone, Satan, thou shalt not tempt the West." Entire countries were surrendered to the Communists at the summit conferences of Teheran, Yalta, Potsdam, and Geneva.

In the various U.S.-Soviet conferences of the last two years, our representatives agreed to ship the Soviets vast quantities of our wheat and other grains, plus entire industrial plants to manufacture trucks, fertilizers and chemicals.

In the SALT Summit in 1972, we surrendered our right to defend our cities against hostile nuclear missiles, whether they are launched from the Soviet Union or Red China or accidentally.

The agreement which ended hostilities in the recent

Israeli-Arab war has cost us plenty. We agreed to sweep out the mines and reopen the Suez Canal at the expense of the American taxpayers, a costly project which will not benefit America or Israel, but will tremendously benefit the Soviets, saving their ships a 6000-mile journey around the tip of Africa.

Our agreement to pay the costs of cleaning up the Suez Canal came in the face of an insulting and contemptuous broadcast on Radio Moscow which called on the Arabs to continue their oil embargo against the United States and to continue using their "oil weapon" against the West.

Secretary Kissinger's brief flying visit to Panama was also very expensive. His few hours there may end up costing us the \$5 billion Panama Canal because he signed an agreement promising ultimately to give up the Canal.

If we face reality rather than succumb to the illusions of detente, we must admit that the U.S. comes out on the short end of every agreement with the Communists.

### The Willy Brandt Case

All those who naively thought that Communist espionage went out of style when the new era of detente came in must have been badly shaken by the sensational case of West German Chancellor Willy Brandt. His abrupt resignation in the spring of 1974 confirmed the embarrassing fact that he had been very closely associated with two Communist spies. His top aide, Gunter Guillaume, has been a Communist spy since 1956, and has been so close to Willy Brandt that the Chancellor took him as a companion on his vacation last summer.

Brandt admitted on television that he "allowed secret papers to come into the hands of the agent Guillaume during my holiday in Norway." Among those papers was a confidential letter from President Nixon to Brandt outlining U.S. plans regarding NATO.

No sooner had Brandt resigned in the wake of these startling revelations than a second Brandt spy scandal surfaced. A Communist woman agent, Susanne Sievers, had been assigned by the Party to work her wiles on Brandt. The West German newspapers have reported that the West German Government ultimately paid her \$163,000 in return for her promise *not* to publish her memoirs. She had already entitled them "And Then There Was A Girl."

U.S. State Department officials reacted by describing the Brandt affair as "very surprising." If our Government officials are surprised, then they have learned nothing from the many acts of Communist espionage previously committed against Western countries.

Spy scientists Klaus Fuchs and Bruno Pontecorvo and the Rosenbergs stole the secrets of our atom bomb. Soviet spies Gordon Lonsdale, Harry Houghton, Ethel Gee, and Peter and Helen Kroger stole the secrets of our Polaris submarine.

Colonel Israel Beer, trusted aide to Prime Minister Ben Gurion of Israel, betrayed his country's secrets to Moscow. John Vassal, the secretary to the First Lord of the British Admiralty, transmitted secrets to Russia for seven years. Colonel Stig Wennerstrom, military attache to the Swedish embassy in Washington, sent Swedish and U.S. secrets to Russia for years.

It is ridiculous to think that the Communists would plant top spies in other governments, but not do likewise in our country. Yet, in the United States, the Subversive Activities Control Board has been abolished. Our most knowledgeable security officer, Otto Otepka, has been removed from the State Department. The House Internal Security Committee and the FBI are constantly

being harassed and restricted in their efforts to protect us. There is a continuing propaganda effort carried on which is designed to destroy their usefulness.

Instead of being surprised at Communist espionage, our Government should realize that spying is a standard Soviet tactic. The successful spying on Willy Brandt should encourage our Government to strengthen, instead of weakening, our internal security. The important question may be, what secrets are currently being sent to Russia by well-placed Communist spies in Washington?

### Simas Kudirka

The Simas Kudirka case is a dramatic illustration that terrorist tactics did not disappear with the death of Stalin, but are still a part of the policies and practices of the Soviet Union on which detente has not made the slightest dent.

On November 23, 1970, a Lithuanian seaman named Simas Kudirka leaped from the deck of a Soviet fishing trawler to the U.S. Coast Guard ship called the *Vigilant*, and asked political asylum. The two ships were anchored side by side in American territorial waters off Martha's Vineyard, Massachusetts.

The Russians demanded that the U.S. Coast Guard return Kudirka. The Coast Guard officers instead allowed crew members of the Soviet ship to board the *Vigilant*, search it until they found and captured Kudirka, beat him unconscious, and carry him back to the Soviet ship. He was subsequently sent to a Soviet prison. He is now serving a ten-year prison sentence in a slave labor camp in the Ural Mountains.

The behavior of the Coast Guard officers who rejected Kudirka's desperate plea for political asylum, and who allowed this brutal act of Soviet tyranny to take place on an American ship, was universally condemned.

New documentary evidence, however, indicates that the victim of this human tragedy was not just a Lithuanian sailor, but was and is an American citizen whose mother was born in Brooklyn, New York.

Because he was born out of wedlock, Kudirka acquired at birth the American citizenship of his mother by reason of Section 205 of the Nationality Act of 1940. This fact has been confirmed by senior officials of the U.S. Naturalization Service. Although this 1940 law was subsequently repealed by the McCarran Act of 1952, Kudirka did not lose his citizenship because our laws do not operate retroactively.

Since our Government has never recognized the Soviet invasion of Lithuania, and still maintains diplomatic relations with the Lithuanian Government-in-exile, the Soviets cannot establish that Kudirka is a Russian citizen or that he has "dual citizenship" with Russia.

### Kudirka's Mother

Kudirka's mother was born in Brooklyn and is, therefore, an American citizen. She would like to return to the United States. In the spring of 1974 after she began trying to make contact with the U.S. Embassy in Moscow in order to secure her American passport, she began to be harassed and followed by the Soviet police. On April 28, she was stopped by five members of the Soviet secret police when she tried to board a train for Moscow from Lithuania.

Her case was then championed by a courageous Soviet biologist named Sergei Kovalov. He called a press conference in Moscow and revealed how the U.S. Embassy is constantly guarded by the Soviet secret police who, when it suits them, prevent even American citizens from entering.

It came as a shock to many people to discover that the

U.S. Embassy in Moscow is, in effect, in a state of siege, and that even American citizens may enter only with the permission and under the surveillance of the Soviet secret police. This is in violation of the Consular Treaty which supposedly guarantees free access to the U.S. Embassy in Moscow.

In May 1974, the U.S. Embassy in Moscow issued an American passport to the 67-year-old widowed mother of Simas Kudirka. This constituted confirmation by the U.S. State Department of her American citizenship. The question now is, will the Soviet Government give her an exit visa and permit her to leave the country? The Soviets have said nothing yet, but she has been placed on the "hardship list." Other cases on the "hardship list" have been known to wait as long as 30 years. At her age, a 30-year wait would be too long.

The case of Simas Kudirka's mother should be a good conversation piece for Congressmen to bring up when they are visited by Russian trade delegations, who come from Moscow to lobby on Capitol Hill for Soviet trade benefits. When they ask for U.S. credits to finance Soviet purchases, our Congressmen should ask when the Soviets will permit American citizens to leave Russia.

If the Soviets refuse to respect the right of a U.S. citizen to leave the Soviet Union, then we are only deceiving ourselves if we imagine that they will make meaningful concessions in other areas, such as weapons and space.

The disgraceful treatment which Simas Kudirka received from the U.S. officers who turned him back to the Soviet Union makes it our moral obligation to help his mother now. Secretary of State Kissinger's frequent intimate conversations with Soviet Ambassador Dobrynin present a splendid opportunity for Kissinger to request that Kudirka's mother be permitted to return to America.

### Alexander Dolgun

Simas Kudirka and his mother are not the only American citizens who have been held against their will inside the Soviet Union. Alexander Solzhenitsyn, in his new book, *The Gulag Archipelago*, told about Alexander Dolgun who was an American citizen and employee of the U.S. Embassy in Moscow. One day on December 13, 1948, he went out to lunch and never came back.

He was seized on the streets of Moscow by the Soviet secret police, and disappeared for eight years into the world of prisons, torture chambers, solitary confinement, and slave labor camps. He was not allowed to sleep until he confessed to fabricated crimes. He was kept an entire year in solitary confinement. Solzhenitsyn's book gives an eloquent description of the way Dolgun was savagely beaten at the Sukhanovka prison by the No. 2 man in the secret police.

Dolgun was released from prison in 1956, but forbidden to make contact with any Americans. Finally, in 1971, he was able to get a message to his sister who lived in Vienna. She went to the American Ambassador there, and he was able to get Dolgun out of Russia in about six months. Dolgun's mother and father were also seized by the Soviets. His mother became insane under torture and died in prison; his father survived prison and died in Moscow.

There must be more reporters per square mile in Washington, D.C. than in any city in the world. How was it possible for the kidnapping of Alexander Dolgun to be suppressed by the State Department and undiscovered by our press for 25 years, including two years after he returned to live in Washington? It is mighty strange that we have to get our news about the actions of American citi-

zens from a Russian author who has never even been to our country.

### Relations With Castro

The same people who push detente with the Soviet Union are also working to secure U.S. recognition of Castro. Their plans have had a temporary setback because of a mysterious murder near Miami. Although it has gone almost unnoticed by the regular news media, the Spanish-language press in the United States has been buzzing with comment.

On the Thursday before Easter, a 70-year-old businessman and civic leader named Jose de la Torriente was shot as he sat with his wife watching television in their home in Coral Gables, Florida. The bullet came through the window, and the killer escaped under cover of darkness. The killer never entered the house, there was no attempt at robbery, and it was obviously a well-planned murder by professionals.

Torriente was widely known as a staunch anti-Communist. His enemies were Castro and the Communist Party. The Cubans in Florida are convinced that this was a political execution ordered by Fidel Castro and carried out by his agents in the United States. Recent declarations by Raul Castro have boasted that there are Castro infiltrators among Cuban refugees in Miami, and he praised them for the work they are doing there. The Cuban press in Florida is conjecturing that Torriente was the first victim of a plan by Fidel and Raul Castro against leaders of the anti-Communist Cubans in order to terrorize and intimidate them.

Torriente became a prime target because he had been speaking out forthrightly against any proposed agreement between the United States and Castro which would, in diplomatic jargon, normalize relations. Shortly before his death, Torriente sent a message to President Nixon warning that such an agreement "would betray the principles under which the United States has traditionally aided people fighting for their independence," and would simply "assure Castro's permanence and relieve the Soviet Union of the financial burden of maintaining Castro's government."

The big money involved is why there is suddenly an effort by certain groups to get the United States to reestablish relations with Castro. Since Castro ruined Cuba's economic system, the Soviet Union has had to subsidize him in order to maintain this vital Soviet submarine base in the Western Hemisphere. Castro is in hock to Brezhnev to the tune of several billion dollars, and Brezhnev would like to shift this financial burden onto the backs of the American taxpayers.

If the United States would open diplomatic ties with Castro, Cuba would become eligible for U.S. foreign aid and Export-Import Bank loans. The State Department has already taken the first step by issuing export licenses allowing Argentine subsidiaries of General Motors, Ford and Chrysler to sell Cuba several million dollars worth of cars and trucks, thus bypassing the current U.S. embargo on trade with Cuba.

Getting courageous spokesmen such as Torriente out of the way is one way to silence the opposition to recognizing Castro. We hope Castro's terroristic tactics will be counterproductive and that Torriente's murder will stiffen our backbone to keep Castro in a diplomatic deep-freeze. Let him continue to drain Brezhnev's pocket-book. The American taxpayers are already carrying too many freeloaders on their backs without adding Castro.

### Kissinger At Salzburg

When Oliver Cromwell had his portrait painted, he instructed the artist, "Paint me as I am, wart and all." Television is a medium which does exactly that. It presents an unretouched picture with all the warts and wrinkles. Television does even more. It is also a window which looks into the soul behind the face and voice, as no other medium can.

It is almost impossible for anyone to conceal from the TV camera emotion, evasion, hate, guilt, lying, or nervousness. There are a few actors and con artists who can cheat the tube, but not many.

Thus, Richard Nixon lost the presidency in 1960 on the night of the first Nixon-Kennedy debate when television revealed that Kennedy had superior confidence in his capacity for leadership. Edmund Muskie kicked away his hope to be President the day he lost control of his emotions in a snowstorm in New Hampshire with the TV cameras mercilessly grinding away.

Thomas Eagleton was dropped as a vice presidential candidate after that Sunday when he faced the press on television and the public saw the beads of nervous perspiration on his forehead.

To this list we must now add the architect of detente, Henry Kissinger. The television closeups of his temper tantrum in Salzburg revealed him as emotionally unstrung, his voice quavering and tears in his eyes. This was a side of Kissinger that few people knew, although it was probably suspected by some reporters.

It is cause for concern that this man who trembled in public is the same one who ordered a strategic alert of our nuclear forces on October 25. He subsequently promised to explain what Soviet action could possibly have justified that emergency alert, but he has never explained it to this day. We still don't know whether the alert was caused by a real Soviet threat, or merely by another occasion of Kissinger's emotional distress.

The straw that appears to have precipitated Kissinger's outburst in Salzburg was a hostile personal question by a reporter at a press conference a week earlier. If Kissinger's Salzburg behavior was an authentic reaction to a keenly-felt personal injury, then the television closeups revealed him as too unstable to have his finger on our nuclear trigger.

If Kissinger's behavior was not genuine, then it must have been a dramatic act to arouse sympathy among the press and Congress, to win votes of confidence from both, and thereby to avoid cross-examination on crucial issues. There is no reason why he, alone of all public figures, should be immune to close questioning. As Harry Truman was fond of saying, if you can't stand the heat, get out of the kitchen.

In either event, it is time to get on which the business of questioning Dr. Kissinger. After we resolve the question of whether he did or did not order the 17 wiretaps on the press and on his own staff, then let's move on to asking the life-or-death question of why he ordered the strategic alert last October. Then we may know the real truth about detente and its relationship to the policy of paying blackmail to the Communists.

#### 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.