



# The Phyllis Schlafly Report



VOL. 9, NO. 3, SECTION 1

Box 618, ALTON, ILLINOIS 62002

OCTOBER, 1975

## Inventory on President Ford

It is time to take an inventory on President Gerald Ford's first year in office.

In those matters where he acted on his own, President Ford's record is good. He successfully vetoed several wasteful spending bills. He refused to impose gasoline rationing or price and wage controls, despite intense pressure. He was not stampeded into bailing out New York City with federal funds.

However, in those matters where he followed the advice of his two chief appointees, Vice President Nelson Rockefeller and Secretary of State Henry Kissinger, President Ford has given us a steady succession of deficits at home and defeats abroad.

His Administration has fueled galloping inflation by giving us the largest peacetime deficit in history. That should hardly be a surprise, when Rockefeller's record as Governor of New York was to increase the cost of state government about 400 percent.

For the first time in our 200-year history, the United States lost a war. The fall of Southeast Asia was the direct result of the Paris Agreement, negotiated by Henry Kissinger, which let North Vietnam double its large standing army in South Vietnam, while requiring all U.S. land, sea and air forces to pull out. The falling dominoes in Asia and the crumbling alliances around the world are the direct result of letting the Communists crush our allies in Southeast Asia.

While President Ford cannot be blamed for the Paris Agreement, he has retained the architect of this disaster in near-total control of our foreign policy, military policy, and intelligence.

Mistakes of even more far-reaching consequences were made when President Ford permitted Secretary Kissinger to write the script for Ford's own shuttle diplomacy. His Vladivostok agreement with Brezhnev permits the Soviets to MIRV enough of their missiles to knock out our Minuteman missile force, while denying us the right to build missiles powerful enough to threaten the Soviet missile force.

President Ford's trip to Helsinki resulted in an agreement which Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn called "the funeral of Eastern Europe." This is because it legitimizes the Soviet invasion and occupation of ten satellite nations.

The Helsinki agreement is based on a premise which is directly contrary to the Captive Nations Law passed by Congress in 1959, which commits the United States to support a policy leading toward the independence of the nations under Communist tyranny. This law makes

it clear that this is not merely an altruistic verbal gesture, but that this policy "is vital to the national security of the United States."

By his calculated snub of Solzhenitsyn, President Ford made it dramatically clear that he has chosen to rely on Kissinger's phony detente instead of on American military power to defend us and our allies. Solzhenitsyn stated our problem clearly when he said: "No, it is not any difficulties of perception that the West is suffering, but a desire not to know, an emotional preference for the pleasant over the unpleasant."

### Giving Away the U.S. Canal

When I go to a doctor or a lawyer, I expect them to give me their best professional advice. If all they do is to find out what I think, and then tell me what they think I want to hear, I've wasted my money in paying fees to professional men trained with technical knowledge.

This fundamental premise is often forgotten when we hear reference to the concept of "civilian control of the military." The laws of our country make it the statutory duty of the Joint Chiefs of Staff to advise the President and Congress concerning the security of our nation. "Civilian control of the military" means that the President is free to accept or reject that advice, but it certainly does not mean that the President and Secretary of State should tell our military officers what "advice" to give.

This perversion of the process is exactly what has been going on behind the scenes as part of Henry Kissinger's determined effort to sign a new treaty with the dictator in Panama which will actually surrender the U.S. Canal. Secretary Kissinger used two meetings of the National Security Council and a personal directive from President Ford to force the Defense Department to support the new Kissinger treaty and thereby abandon the Joint Chiefs' honest advice that the U.S. control of our Canal is essential to our security.

Meanwhile, one of Kissinger's State Department officials has been writing letters to newspapers around the country, saying: "Although it is a commonly held belief that the Canal Zone is United States territory, we have never claimed sovereignty over the Canal Zone." The State Department either hasn't done its homework on the subject -- or it is trying to bury an important episode of American history down a George Orwell "Memory Hole."

In the controlling decision on the matter of ownership of the Panama Canal, the U.S. Supreme Court ruled: "This new republic (Panama) has by treaty granted to the United States rights, territorial and otherwise. . . . A treaty with it (Panama), ceding the Canal Zone, was duly ratified. . . . Congress has passed several acts based upon the title of the United States. . . . It is hypercritical to contend that the title of the United States is imperfect."

If Secretary Kissinger succeeds in putting over his new treaty with Panama, it will be the biggest giveaway in 30 years of extravagant foreign giveaways by U.S. officials.

### Israeli-Egyptian Peace

Before we commit ourselves to station American technicians to guard the shaky Sinai peace between the Israeli and Egyptian armies, we should have a clear picture of why we are involved.

Two years ago, the Israelis were perfectly able to secure their own borders without any help from us. Shortly after the Yom Kippur War began, Israeli tank commanders, by a brilliant maneuver, sliced through and behind the Egyptian army on the east side of the Suez Canal, and had it completely trapped and cut off from supplies.

Then Henry Kissinger entered from stage left and snatched defeat from the jaws of history. He ordered a truce and forced the Israelis to release the trapped Egyptians.

At that time, it was unclear to many people why Dr. Kissinger insisted on a course of action so highly disadvantageous to Israel. Now we know why -- because Brezhnev ordered him to. Admiral Elmo Zumwalt recently revealed what Henry Kissinger had concealed since October 1973.

According to Admiral Zumwalt, Brezhnev sent a "savage" ultimatum to President Nixon ordering him to pull back the Israeli forces or else Russian troops would rescue the Egyptians. "The United States had to back down in the face of a Soviet ultimatum," Zumwalt said, because the Russians had our ships outnumbered in the Mediterranean by 98 to 65, and they could have attacked U.S. carriers and other warships with airplanes flying in from four directions. Soviet planes had bases in Egypt, Syria, the Crimea, and Yugoslavia, while "we didn't have a single land base in the area."

Thus Henry Kissinger used the power and influence of the United States to pressure the Israelis to release the Egyptian army, as demanded by the Soviets, and the Israelis did.

"If Kissinger had given the American people an accurate report of the situation at that time," Admiral Zumwalt added, "it would have indicated that detente was working very poorly."

On Labor Day, George Meany again reminded us that, "in the era of detente, as defined and presided over by Secretary of State Henry Kissinger, we have witnessed an unmistakable shift in the world balance of power away from the United States and toward the Soviet Union."

The Israeli-Egyptian confrontation is a good example of how, because Brezhnev has more ships and missiles than we have, he can call the shots, dictate the terms, issue orders to Dr. Kissinger to force our friends to retreat, and then charge the financial cost to the U.S. taxpayers.

### U.S. Soybeans, Brazil and Japan

First question: What is the principal export product of Brazil? If your answer was coffee, you are wrong. All the geography books and encyclopedias are now obsolete. This year, coffee dropped to second place behind the giant Brazilian crop of soybeans.

Second question: How did Brazil happen to become such a formidable competitor of the United States in the soybean market which our country has dominated for years? The answer is that this is just one of the incidental costs of the Kissinger policy of detente with world Communism.

Back in 1972, President Nixon and Henry Kissinger made a much-publicized trip to visit Mao Tse-tung and Chou En-lai. As part of this opening to Red China, which was billed as one of the major accomplishments of the Nixon Administration, it was decided that we should sell Mao more than a million bushels of our soybeans.

There was just one problem. Our soybean crop was already contracted for. So, the Nixon-Kissinger Administration slapped a ceiling on exports, thereby sharply reducing soybean shipments to our best cash customer, Japan. Soybeans have been solid money-makers for the U.S. farmer for a long time.

The old adage of business success, "the customer is always right," gave way to the Kissinger policy that all other values must be subordinated to the goal of detente with the Communists -- even to the extent of cutting off a friendly customer who pays his bills in order to curry favor with an uncertain enemy who has practically nothing to sell and cannot pay cash. Our nation's image as a reliable trading partner became highly suspect.

Unable to grow enough food to feed their own people, the Japanese are virtually dependent on large imports of soybeans. This wonder crop, which has more protein than beef, more calcium than milk, and more lecithin than eggs, is a staple of the Japanese diet. The soybean cutoffs caused something of a food crisis in free Asia.

The Japanese are smart businessmen, and they resolved not to let themselves be caught short again. They made a deal with Brazil. Japanese money, machinery, and knowhow, and Brazilian acreage, fertile soil, and warm climate, forged a natural partnership.

By 1975, the deal paid off handsomely for both Brazil and Japan. But the American farmer has suffered a permanent business loss because Dr. Kissinger switched Japanese orders to Red China.

Dr. Kissinger has never had any business experience. His life has been divided between teaching and government. He does not appreciate the importance of keeping good cash customers. No Secretary of State who was a businessman would exchange prosperous Japan for bankrupt Red China.

### Ford's Legion Speech

Soviet leader Leonid Brezhnev must have gotten a big laugh about President Ford's speech to the American Legion in which he warned that, if Brezhnev doesn't hurry up and sign a SALT II arms agreement, the Ford Administration will request a \$3 billion increase in spending on strategic nuclear weapons.

We will actually be worse off if we sign a SALT II

Agreement than if we don't, because the terms agreed on at Vladivostok set the limits so high on missiles and MIRVs that the Soviets will be authorized to build all the nuclear weapons they need to carry out a first-strike against the United States. We will have no comparable capability because our missiles are only a small fraction as powerful as those of the Soviets.

President Ford's Legion speech chose to ignore the sensational evidence presented by our immediate past Secretary of Defense, Melvin Laird, and by our immediate past Chief of Naval Operations, Admiral Elmo Zumwalt, that the Soviets are blatantly and deliberately violating the SALT I Agreements. The Soviet violations include deploying SS-19 missiles, increasing missile silo dimensions by 50 percent instead of the allowed 15 percent, constructing new missile silos, and testing unauthorized radars.

The Soviets ignore our protests, deny the facts until confronted by proof from our satellite reconnaissance, or claim that whatever they are doing is allowed by loopholes in the SALT I Agreement.

The shift in the strategic balance from the United States to the Soviet Union since Henry Kissinger has been masterminding our policies is so dramatic and so ominous that many people other than Laird and Zumwalt have become alarmed.

A recent report by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy describes how the Soviet Union is overtaking the United States in the quality of its nuclear weapons, is ahead of the United States in quantity, payload and throw-weight, is developing a first-strike capability so total that it could destroy most of our missiles and deter use of the remaining ones, is conducting "a massive research and development effort" on new nuclear weapons, and is rapidly coming to the point that the Soviets may be able to "maximize their political advantage" (that is, to use nuclear blackmail to impose their will on the world).

The most interesting part about this report is that it was concurred in unanimously by a committee which includes liberal Senators Stuart Symington, Joseph Montoya, John Tunney and Clifford Case, as well as Chairman John Pastore.

Also coming in from the left side is the "Coalition for a Democratic Majority," led by Eugene Rostow and other prominent Democratic liberal intellectuals. They, too, are warning of the hoax of detente and of the threat posed by the growing Soviet military power.

These leaders who are at odds on most political and ideological issues speak with one voice on the overriding issue that must unite us all -- the survival of the United States. Their warnings cry out for Congress and the press to start a prompt and full investigation with the same diligence and perseverance expended last year on Watergate. Of all the investigations undertaken by Congress, none could be so important as finding out if our independence and freedom are threatened by Soviet cheating on SALT.

## Schlesinger's Bluff

Any law enforcement officer will confirm that you should never point a gun at a criminal unless you are prepared to use it. Bluffing with weapons, loaded or unloaded, is a risky business.

Yet this is precisely what Secretary of Defense James Schlesinger did when he called a breakfast meeting with reporters in July 1975 and allowed himself to be

quoted as saying that the United States could "conceivably" be the first to use strategic nuclear missiles against the Soviet Union.

The rationale for this saber rattling was explained as a desire to worry the Soviets about the "unpredictability" of American use of nuclear weapons. The real reason was probably a desire to reassure the millions of Americans who have been alarmed by reading the July 1975 *Reader's Digest* in which former Secretary of Defense Melvin Laird stated that the Soviets now "can outfire us in destructive (nuclear) power by two-to-one."

Secretary Schlesinger's policy of "speak loudly but carry a little stick" may mislead some Americans, but it won't fool the men in the Kremlin. They know that Schlesinger was only bluffing with empty threats on which he cannot deliver and will never try.

If Secretary Schlesinger should ever be so irresponsible as to push the button for a nuclear strike against the Soviet Union, it would be suicide for the United States. New satellite warning systems provide almost instantaneous notification of any missile launch.

If Schlesinger's missiles were heading toward Russia, Brezhnev and Company certainly are not going to sit quietly and wait for them to hit. The Kremlin will surely launch its own missiles capable of killing some 150 million Americans, and Schlesinger's missiles will hit only empty holes. The Soviets might even be tempted to preempt if they think that Schlesinger is irresponsible enough to threaten the use of our nuclear forces.

Secretary Schlesinger has said time and time again that the United States is *not* seeking a disarming capability against the Soviet Union, and that our missiles have neither the yield nor the accuracy for a first-strike. Unless you have the capability to disarm the other side, it makes no sense to strike first, and it would be suicide to launch a partial-disarming strike against a more powerful enemy force that would still have enough missiles remaining to wipe out our cities.

Schlesinger should retract his dangerous bluff, and instead issue the credible warning that, if the Soviets ever launch a first-strike against us, then we will launch a retaliatory strike immediately upon our receiving triple proof of their launch through our satellite warning system, our over-the-horizon radar, and our BMEWS radar.

Most Americans think that this is now our strategy, but there is plenty of evidence in statements by both Kissinger and Schlesinger to make the Soviets doubt our will to retaliate. It is important to make our policy clear well in advance of any war plans the Soviets might be tempted to make.

## Apollo-Soyuz

The ancient Roman emperors used circuses and games to divert the people from addressing themselves to the possibility of self-government. The last four American Presidents have given us manned space spectacles to divert Congress and the voters from asking pertinent questions about Soviet space weapons.

The national commitment of money and scientific skill to put a man on the moon was made by President Kennedy in 1961 on the argument that we were in a moon race with the Soviets. This false assumption was fed by such otherwise knowledgeable persons as Dr. Werner von Braun who, when asked what we would

find when we reached the moon, replied, "Russians."

It was clear to anyone who made an objective study of Soviet goals that the Russians were never racing to the moon, but were merely encouraging the United States to make the non-military moon expedition, while the Russians spent their money on space weapons to achieve military superiority. There was no military value in the trip, and nearly all the scientific value could be gained by unmanned space vehicles at a tiny fraction of the cost. Eight years and \$30 billion later, we had Neil Armstrong on the moon, and the Soviets had the lead over us in nuclear missiles.

This summer's Apollo-Soyuz space venture is the razzle-dazzle of detente. The Soviets supply the cosmonauts, and we supply the sophisticated equipment and technology. The Soviets wouldn't even let our reporters watch their launch.

There has to be something phony about detente when we are told it is a great step toward peace for Russian and American astronauts to shake hands in space, but may be a threat to world peace for President Ford to shake hands with Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn. There has to be something rotten in Geneva when Henry Kissinger pleads there with Gromyko to sign a SALT II arms agreement, while the evidence is mounting that the Soviets are violating both the letter and the spirit of SALT I.

It is a case of misplaced priorities when we spend billions on space travel whose principal value is television entertainment, with a little scientific spillover, at the same time that we are told we cannot afford the missiles, bombers, and submarines we need to match Soviet weapons.

Meanwhile, the Russian Bolshoi Ballet touring our country sees detente as a one-way street. On the same night that President Ford declined to attend George Meany's big dinner for Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn because Kissinger said this might offend the Soviets, the Bolshoi troupe successfully demanded that our National Anthem be omitted from their performance at the St. Louis Municipal Opera. For half a century, every performance at this famous open-air opera in Forest Park on city property has started with the Star Spangled Banner -- except, that is, when the Russians objected.

Fortunately, there was such a flap among local citizens that this piece of impudence was overruled the next day and the National Anthem was played for all remaining performances, even though the Russians complained that their anti-Anthem policy had been adhered to in all other cities they have visited this year.

### Trouble With Conservatives

Vice President Nelson Rockefeller recently made a foray into the Deep South prospecting for friends who might come in handy during the campaign of 1976. Nelson Rockefeller is a good example of a Number Two who is still trying harder, and he knew exactly the right sales talk to appeal to his conservative audience. He said "Hi, y'all," he was all smiles, and he waxed eloquent about his overpowering desire to cut out government waste, unbalanced budgets, and welfare cheating.

The friendly reception Rockefeller received is a good example of why conservatives are left waiting at the gate when political plums are passed out. Just as the favors of some women can be won by flattery and promises while smarter women hold out for a ring and marriage, so also some blocs of voters are pacified and

pigeon-holed by rhetoric that feeds their prejudices, while others hold out for tangible achievements. Conservatives are usually part of the former group, rather than the latter. They have a dismal record of being bought with words while the liberals walk off with the legislation and the appointments.

Politicians from both parties intuitively sense this weakness of conservatives. The closer we get to any election, the more candidates escalate their conservatism. By the end of 1975, Nelson Rockefeller and Gerald Ford will be outdoing each other to see which one can sound more like Barry Goldwater or George Wallace.

President Ford is already barnstorming around the country, preaching the conservative doctrines of fiscal prudence, military preparedness, and an end to federal intrusion in the affairs of corporations and individuals. All that sound and fury will signify nothing at all; once the election is past, the liberals will cash in on the rewards.

Many conservatives today are completely fooled by Secretary of Defense James Schlesinger's big talk designed to fabricate the illusion that he is the hardliner on defense in the present administration. The facts belie the words. Schlesinger's policies and actions are in no way different from his boss's, Henry Kissinger's, and the press recently uncovered the fact that Schlesinger is the author of a secret memorandum advising the President to take another \$5 billion out of strategic weapons.

During Rockefeller's trip through the South, Governor James Edwards of South Carolina made the most refreshingly realistic remark any conservative has uttered this year. He said: "I judge a man by his track record."

Now that is the way politicians ought to be judged. Everyone knows that, when professional football teams go recruiting for new players, they never make their selections on the basis of big talk. They look at their records: yardage gained, passes completed, tackles behind the line of scrimmage, and 40-yard speed.

If the voters would start putting the "track-record test" to politicians, we might get better performance instead of just phony promises.

**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.

### 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 bond-holders, 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.