



The Phyllis Schlafly Report



VOL. 8, NO. 12, SECTION 1

Box 618, ALTON, ILLINOIS 62002

JULY, 1975

The First Task of a Presidential Candidate

This is the time of year when aspiring politicians of all parties are jockeying for position, for primaries, and for personnel commitments, which will carry them to victory in the presidential campaign of 1976. Among the many available candidates, no obvious leader has yet emerged.

The collapse of American prestige, the decline of our dollar, and the shrinking military power of the United States in the face of the greater and ever-growing Soviet military arsenal, all combine to make the overriding issue the survival of the United States as a free and independent nation.

No candidate can cope with this problem and lead America to peace and security unless he makes a clean break with the Henry Kissinger policies and sets forth a plan to rebuild U.S. strength. The first presidential candidate of stature who grabs this issue and runs with the ball will have on his side truth, common sense, the logic of unfolding events, and ultimately the majority of American voters.

Only a year ago, *Time* magazine labeled Dr. Kissinger "the world's indispensable man," *Newsweek* endowed him with the flying attributes of Superman, and the Gallup Poll told us he was the most admired American. Now, even his most ardent supporters concede that his foreign policies are collapsing all over the world. *The New York Times* notes that a few months ago, Kissinger seemed like a King Canute, able to order back the waves of history; but today Henry is like the little Dutch boy trying to stem the rising tide by sticking his finger in the dike.

Kissinger did not originate the disastrous policies of nuclear disarmament in the face of the Soviets' drive for nuclear superiority; these policies were started by Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara in 1962. But Kissinger has continued those same policies, keeping America in a missile freeze since 1969 while the Soviets added 1,000 ICBMs to their arsenal.

Starting with the notorious wheat deal, the United States got the short end of every Kissinger negotiation from Moscow to Peking, from Cairo to the Panama Canal. The Soviets have consistently forced, persuaded, or outmaneuvered Kissinger to lead from his weakness into their strength. The best recent summary of what's wrong with Kissinger's delusion of detente is an article by former Secretary of Defense Melvin Laird called "Is This Detente?" on page 54 of the *July Reader's Digest*.

The Soviets are openly violating the SALT I Agreement (e.g., by conducting ABM radar tests forbidden by the treaty) while Kissinger obsequiously pleads with

them to sign a SALT II Agreement even *more* favorable to the Kremlin. The Soviets demand more and more U.S. agricultural goods, industrial plants, and our latest technology, while Kissinger harangues Congress for not granting credits and trade favors speedily enough.

Return the Nobel Peace Prize!

Kissinger should return the Nobel Peace Prize which he received for negotiating an agreement that permitted 150,000 North Vietnamese troops to remain in South Vietnam while requiring all U.S. troops to leave. The predictable result was humiliation for the United States, disaster for South Vietnam and Cambodia, and the falling dominoes of our once-loyal allies in the Pacific.

Our longtime allies in Western Europe have been divided, weakened, and alienated. Portugal and Italy are on the verge of a Communist takeover; Britain and Italy are on the verge of an economic collapse; Greece and Turkey are both asking us to remove our bases.

In the Middle East, Israelis know that Kissinger forced them to give up their military victory when it was within their grasp, and they don't believe it is safe any longer to depend on the United States to defend them. The Arabs know they can use their oil weapon against the West because they now have the shelter of the Soviet superior nuclear umbrella.

In the post-Watergate era, when candor and credibility are essential, Kissinger's record of prevarication on subjects ranging from the SALT Agreements of 1972 to wiretapping is unworthy of a Secretary of State and Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs.

It is time for all Americans who care about the survival of our country to say: We won't back any candidate for President in 1976 unless he (1) makes a clean break with the Kissinger-McNamara foreign policies, nuclear policies, and intelligence policies, and (2) spells out a specific program for the rebuilding of U.S. military power so that America can survive in the face of the Soviet missile force. Furthermore, such a presidential candidate must convince us that his commitment is binding and irrevocable, because we will not again permit ourselves to be led down the primrose path with deceitful promises such as Richard Nixon made in October, 1968 "to restore our clearcut military superiority."

If no candidate makes meaningful and satisfactory commitments on this overriding issue, then those concerned about America's survival should bypass the presidential race and work instead for Senators and Congressmen who *do* make such binding commitments.

"Safeguard" in SALT

Strategic arms limitation talks have resumed in Geneva to work out a SALT II Agreement to be signed at the next summit meeting with the Soviets this fall. Before we go any further, it is important for the American people to understand how we were fooled by the SALT I Agreements of 1972.

Dr. Henry Kissinger sold the SALT I Agreement to Congress with assurances that he had achieved the most critical U.S. objective -- that is, stopping the Soviets from replacing their existing light missiles with additional heavy missiles capable of destroying our Minuteman missiles in their silos.

At his White House briefing on June 15, 1972, Dr. Kissinger made this flat statement: The SALT I Agreement contains "the safeguard that no missile larger than the heaviest light missile that now exists can be substituted."

If there is such a safeguard in the SALT I Agreement, then the Soviets are in open and notorious violation because they are now replacing their light SS-11s with their new heavy SS-17s and SS-19s. Both these new Soviet ICBMs have three to five times the throw-weight of the SS-11, which was the heaviest light missile existing at the time the SALT I Agreement was signed.

But we have heard nothing from Secretary Kissinger about the Soviets' violating the SALT I Agreement. Even though the Soviets are openly substituting missiles that are three to five times more powerful, and hence heavier and larger, Dr. Kissinger acts as if nothing has happened to disturb our broad new relationship of detente with the Soviets.

However, Kissinger is correct in not accusing the Soviets of violating the SALT I Agreement because (contrary to his 1972 statement) there is no such "safeguard" against substitution of heavy missiles for light missiles either in the SALT I Agreement or in any of its subsequent documents. The SALT I Agreement specifically permits modernization and replacement of missiles and launchers, and the Soviets expressly refused to agree to a definition of a heavy missile.

The proof of this vital defect in the SALT I Agreement is that our own SALT Delegation labored and brought forth a document labeled "Noteworthy Unilateral Statements" which includes this sentence of frustration and pleading: "The U.S. Delegation regrets that the Soviet Delegation has not been willing to agree on a common definition of a heavy missile."

Fortunately, the 1972 Agreement itself provides a way to escape from the straitjacket of SALT. Article VIII, Section 3 grants the Soviet Union and the United States "the right to withdraw from this Interim Agreement if it decides that extraordinary events related to the subject matter of this Interim Agreement have jeopardized its supreme interests."

The giant Soviet 30 billion ruble program to substitute their recently-tested heavy missiles is most certainly jeopardizing our "supreme interests" in the survival of the United States as a free nation. We should withdraw from the SALT Agreement immediately, and cease and desist from negotiations leading into a new SALT trap.

Policy Toward Castro

The way I read the election returns of November 1972, George McGovern was decisively defeated. He carried only one out of 50 states. It is a puzzlement, therefore, why McGovern seems to be making U.S. pol-

icy toward Castro.

Last fall, President Ford appointed William D. Rogers as Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs. Mr. Rogers served on candidate McGovern's 1972 Latin Task Force, which recommended that we "reorder Cuban relations, and specifically . . . lift the trade embargo (on) Cuba." This spring, Senator McGovern visited Havana, returning with the recommendation that we normalize relationships with Cuba.

What Castro wants is for the Organization of American States to lift its diplomatic and trade embargo against Cuba. His strategy is to persuade the OAS to amend the Rio treaty at its July 15 meeting to eliminate the rule requiring a two-thirds majority to reinstate Cuba to good standing.

If that procedural change is made, Castro believes the OAS embargo will then be terminated, the United States will end its own embargo, and Cuba will be able to get direct shipments of U.S. goods on credit, just like the Soviet and Eastern European Communists.

The Ford-Kissinger policy is to allow the OAS to lift its embargo as though this were inevitable, but not our fault, while making noises to indicate U.S. reluctance to end our own embargo. This policy is designed to avoid ruffling the American public, but it will not prevent Castro from achieving his goals. The fact is that this scenario is not inevitable, and if it does happen, it will be the fault of the Ford-Kissinger-McGovern policy of passive pro-Castroism.

There are numerous reasons why Cuba is not worthy of normal relations with the United States and with the OAS. Castro has acknowledged that he fosters revolution wherever he can. "Have we aided revolutionaries as much as we have been able to?" he asked himself. "Yes, we have. Has the influence of the Cuban Revolution been felt in the revolutions of other countries? Yes." He added later: "I would say that armed struggle is necessary. Arms are necessary to carry out revolution. Otherwise, you cannot effect social change."

Paul F. Wallner, an analyst with the Defense Intelligence Agency, recently told the House Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs that estimates of those who want to leave Cuba, "could go into the hundreds of thousands, really." He told of inhuman prison camps which were off limits to all human rights groups. He noted that "the Church is still persecuted and held down very strongly," and said that "no organized opposition" to the government is permitted.

The United States could and should exert the leadership necessary in the Organization of American States to continue the embargo against Castro -- at least until Cuba settles the claims for American property it has confiscated, expels all Soviet military and intelligence agents now stationed in Cuba, stops fostering revolution in other Latin American countries, and permits the Red Cross or the United Nations to visit Cuban prison camps.

Panama Canal Giveaway

Congresswoman Leonor K. Sullivan has written a letter to Secretary of State Henry Kissinger warning of a possible "Communist takeover" of the Panama Canal. She called for a breakoff in the present State Department treaty negotiations with Panama because Panama "is moving closer and closer to the Communist government in Cuba."

Mrs. Sullivan is the chairman of the House Merchant Marine Committee, which handles legislation pertain-

ing to the Panama Canal. She is one of the most respected members of Congress, with a 20-year record of distinguished service. She is not an alarmist or a sensationalist, but a conscientious legislator whose committee rank and particular expertise on this subject have caused her to speak out in behalf of American security and property.

In February 1974, Henry Kissinger made a quickie flying trip to Panama and signed a preliminary agreement pledging that the United States will surrender sovereignty over the U.S. Canal Zone. The U.S. taxpayers have a more than \$6 billion investment in the U.S. Canal Zone, and Secretary Kissinger has no authority whatsoever to give it away.

In a recent speech, the distinguished Cuban scholar Mario Lazo pointed out the source of the drive to steal the Panama Canal from the United States: "For over 60 years Panama has lived off the canal. But since Nasser got away with seizing the Suez Canal in 1955, Panamanian politicians have dreamed of nothing else than taking over the Panama Canal. They have continually vilified the United States and incited their population against it.

"Some Americans, self-styled 'liberals' and assorted appeasers, have applauded these tactics, arguing that in the 'new world order' unilateral control of the canal is obsolete. But rights of the United States to the Panama Canal were bought and paid for. The U.S. has no obligation to renounce or modify those rights in favor of politicians anywhere, or of the appeasement-minded at home."

In her letter to Secretary Kissinger, Mrs. Sullivan expressed the "serious misgivings" of the majority of Congressmen over "the possible loss of U.S. sovereignty and jurisdiction over the Canal and the Canal Zone." "Behind this concern," she said, "is the fear that the United States presence in the Canal Zone will be substantially reduced, or eliminated altogether and replaced by a Communist presence. In short, the last thing that we want is our control over the Canal replaced by Communist control of the Canal."

Mrs. Sullivan's letter to Secretary Kissinger concluded: "I must say that the linkage of two events -- the renewal of ties between Panama and Cuba and the continuing treaty negotiations between the United States and Panama -- certainly exacerbates Congressional fear of a Communist takeover of the Canal."

Certain State Department diplomats have been working for years to appease the Panamanian radicals by giving away the U.S. Canal Zone. Their giveaway treaty will soon be submitted to the Congress for ratification. It certainly can and should be rejected.

Portugal

One of the time-tested strategies for winning any battle -- military, political, or athletic -- is the doctrine of diversion. The quarterback fakes a pass to the right, and then throws to the left.

The classic expression of this doctrine in military terms, sometimes attributed to a Chinese named Sun-Tzu, is: "Make a noise in the East, but strike in the West."

Among the many times that the Communists have used this ploy was the Berlin Blockade in 1948. While we strained for 17 months to fly in food and fuel, the Reds captured China.

The strategy of diversion still works. While we were absorbed with the fall of Vietnam, and emotionally involved with flying out the orphans, the Communists

were quietly consolidating their control of Portugal.

Senator James Buckley calls this "the most profound crisis since the end of World War II," and adds that, "if Portugal is lost to the West, our Middle Eastern policies and goals become irrelevant, as we will be stripped of the power to implement them." Portugal was the only European nation that permitted our planes to refuel on their way to take essential military aid to Israel in the 1973 war.

A quick look at the map proves the vital importance of Portugal and her islands, the Madeiras and the Azores. If a Moscow-dominated Portugal remains in NATO, the Kremlin will soon have a seat in the secret councils of the Free World. If Portugal withdraws, the Soviets will have achieved one of their primary goals, the breakup of NATO. There are already rumblings that Portugal may be the springboard to another Communist coup in neighboring Spain.

The man who engineered the coup in Portugal a year ago was certainly not a Communist. General Antonio de Spínola wanted his country to be democratic. But he made a fatal mistake. Today, General Spínola is in exile in Brazil, a sadder and a wiser man, now saying that, if he had it to do all over again, he certainly would *not* bring Communists into the government.

It is a pity that Spínola was so ignorant of the fate of all Communist coalition governments. What happened in Portugal was simply a replay of the takeover of Poland, Hungary, Rumania, and Czechoslovakia.

There is no question about the role of the Portuguese Communist Party in the present situation. It has always been totally subservient to the Kremlin, and even gave 100 percent support to the 1968 Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia. The Portuguese CP leader, Alvaro Cunhal, has spent much of the past 20 years in Prague, where he worked with the KGB and other Kremlin agents.

If the Communists succeed in taking over Portugal, the Soviet Navy will acquire bases which will control the approaches to the Mediterranean. Soviet submarines patrolling American coasts will double their on-station time because they will not have to return to Russian bases.

The Soviet Union, well aware of the stakes in Portugal, is sending at least \$10 million per month in weapons and other aid to the Portuguese Communist Party. The Soviets are counting on the American people being too preoccupied with Vietnam, Henry Kissinger being too busy with shuttle diplomacy, and the CIA being too neutralized by investigations, to do anything about it.

Phu Quoc Refugees

When the French were defeated at Dien Bien Phu and the Geneva Agreement of 1954 cut Vietnam in half, one million Roman Catholics in North Vietnam fled to freedom in South Vietnam. Among them was Tran Thi Nam, a woman then 87 years young in her desire for freedom and the right to practice her religion. She and her two sons settled in Phu Quoc, an island 50 miles off the coast of South Vietnam, where they lived peacefully as farmers for 21 years.

When the Communists overran South Vietnam in May this year, Tran Thi Nam, now 109 years old, and her family of 14 members covering four generations, set out to sea in a 20-foot boat searching for freedom somewhere in the Pacific Ocean. They were picked up by a U.S. merchant ship, taken to Guam, and arrived at Camp Pendleton, California, in June 1975.

Left behind on the island of Phu Quoc are an estimated 42,000 South Vietnamese refugees, including about 17 clergymen, 300 nuns, 1,000 American-Vietnamese orphans, and a number of South Vietnamese officials.

When Hanoi consolidates its control over Phu Quoc, most of the island's residents will be marked for liquidation because they either committed the "crime" of having escaped from North Vietnam 21 years ago, or the alternate "crime" of having fled to Phu Quoc when South Vietnam began to crumble this spring.

Like Tran Thi Nam, these refugees are hoping someone will answer their desperate pleas for help. Several countries have indicated a willingness to accept them, including South Korea, Taiwan, Chile, Brazil, and Canada.

However, there is no country that can be a St. Christopher and carry them across the water except Americans. One private steamship line has already picked up a few brave refugees from fishing boats out past the 12-mile limit, and expects to rescue others the same way.

The question awaiting President Ford's decision is whether or not to permit our Navy to assist this emergency humanitarian rescue operation and give freedom to those who have already risked so much to gain it. He has received requests for prompt action from Senator Jesse Helms and from 31 Congressmen.

The specter of two past mistakes hangs over this decision. During World War II, U.S. officials acquiesced in the forcible repatriation of two million refugees trying to escape from Communist Russia. And in 1956, U.S. officials turned a deaf ear to the dramatic appeals of the Hungarian Freedom Fighters trying to resist the Soviet invaders. Radio Budapest's last broadcast cried out: "People of the civilized world, in the name of liberty and solidarity, we are asking you to help. . . . The light vanishes. The shadows grow darker hour by hour."

The light did vanish in Hungary, and the shadows are lengthening over Phu Quoc today.

Pitfalls of Personal Diplomacy

The psychological change that takes place in most men when they move into positions of great power is a phenomenon that has been commented on by philosophers through the ages. Shakespeare declaimed: "Upon what meat does this our Caesar feed, that he is grown so great?" Lord Acton's famous aphorism is: "Power tends to corrupt."

When Gerald Ford moved into the White House, he was Mr. Middle America, a humble man without any pretensions. Yet, a recent *New York Times* dispatch quotes several White House aides as saying that the President sets great store by personal diplomacy and believes he can do much in direct contacts with foreign leaders.

This is the precise self-delusion on the part of American Presidents that has caused more foreign policy mistakes than any other. Back in 1942, President Franklin Roosevelt told Winston Churchill: "I think I can personally handle Stalin better than either your Foreign Office or my State Department."

And in 1943, before the sellout conferences of Teheran and Yalta, President Roosevelt told Ambassador William Bullitt: "I have just a hunch that Stalin doesn't want anything but security for his country, and I think that if I give him everything I possibly can and ask nothing from him in return, noblesse oblige, he won't try to

annex anything and will work for world democracy and peace."

The fact is that Stalin had *no* impulses of honorable conduct, and he *did* annex everything he could. President Roosevelt held all the cards of mobilized U.S. military superiority, plus a monopoly of the atom bomb.

In addition, he was a consummate politician, an eloquent speaker, and a persuasive personality. Yet, the wily Stalin outsmarted him because Roosevelt was a prisoner of his own self-delusion about his imagined expertise in personal diplomacy.

When President Ford goes to the international bargaining table, he lacks all the chips that Roosevelt had. Because of the strategic missile freeze that Henry Kissinger has imposed on our country during the last six and a half years, President Ford must deal from a position of military inferiority.

How, therefore, could President Ford and his staff have such an inflated vision of their own abilities as to think that he can succeed where Roosevelt failed? Only because of the make-believe world that Henry Kissinger has fabricated for him.

The same *New York Times* story quotes another aide of Ford as saying, "He is a pragmatist who approaches foreign policy on a problem-by-problem basis. He doesn't have any structured world view."

That is true. The trouble is, U.S. foreign policy is being made by Henry Kissinger and he does, indeed, have a structured view of the world. His "new world order" is a world in which the Soviets are the number-one military power, while we try to preserve the illusion of detente by bribing them with the industrial and agricultural goodies of the American free enterprise system that the hopelessly inefficient Socialist system is unable to produce.

The trouble with Kissinger's structured world view is that, as the Soviets grow stronger on subsidies from us, the United States will soon no longer be master of our own destiny. We must reverse our national grand strategy immediately.

For additional information on what's wrong with the Kissinger policies, read these earlier issues of the *Phyllis Schlafly Report*:

April: "Our Allies Got The Message -- But Did We?"

June: "The Lesson of Vietnam"

March: "Panama, Vietnam and the CIA"

See also the book *Kissinger on the Couch* by Phyllis Schlafly and Admiral Ward (Pere Marquette Press, Alton, Ill., \$12.95).

Phyllis Schlafly is the co-author of four books on nuclear strategy: *The Gravediggers* (1964), *Strike From Space* (1965), *The Betrayers* (1968), and *Kissinger on the Couch* (1975). She has testified on national security before the Senate Foreign Relations and Armed Services Committees. Her 1972 series of interviews with military and nuclear experts was aired on 70 television and 50 radio stations. An honors graduate of Washington University and member of Phi Beta Kappa, she has a Master's Degree from Harvard University.

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.