



# The Phyllis Schlafly Report



VOL. 9, NO. 12, SECTION 1

BOX 618, ALTON, ILLINOIS 62002

July, 1976

## Differences Between Ford And Reagan

### The U.S. Canal at Panama

The matter of the U.S. Canal at Panama offers a clearcut difference between President Gerald Ford and challenger Ronald Reagan. Reagan has said emphatically that he will defend our Canal against any attempted takeover of our property. Period.

President Ford, on the other hand, has shown that his policy is not only to give away our Canal and the Canal Zone, but to do it under cover of denying that he is doing it.

In a news conference during his Texas Primary campaign this spring, President Ford declared: "I can simply say, and say it very emphatically, that the United States will *never* give up its defense rights to the Panama Canal and will *never* give up its operation rights as far as Panama is concerned."

But Congressman Gene Snyder (R.Ky.) released secret Congressional testimony in which Ambassador Ellsworth Bunker, Ford's chief Panama negotiator, was asked by Snyder if the object of the negotiations was to give up the Canal Zone to Panama. He replied: "To give up the Canal Zone after a period of time, that is correct."

Snyder then asked: "And the Canal over a longer period of time?" Bunker answered: "Over a longer period of time."

The Ford Administration has apparently made a calculated decision that the way to get the American people to acquiesce in Henry Kissinger's plan to sign a new treaty with Panama giving away the U.S. Canal is to threaten the American people with dire consequences as the alternative. After Ronald Reagan made the Canal giveaway proposal an issue in the Texas primary, Ron Nessen was assigned to make the White House reply. He conjured up the boogeyman of "violence and civil disturbances" in Panama and said that "riots and bloodshed would occur if we break off treaty negotiations."

Is Mr. Nessen expressing a lack of Administration faith in American military capability to defend our own property against an unelected pro-Communist dictator and his rock-throwing mob? That would be unthinkable. Or is Mr. Nessen expressing a lack of faith in the American will to defend our national interests after our humiliating retreat from South Vietnam? If so, he has misjudged the American people. The same people who were fed up with the no-win war in Vietnam are eager to defend the U.S. Canal with all necessary military action.

Mr. Nessen's scare talk followed a recent "background" interview given by a high Ford Administration official the gist of which was that, since Castro has 13,000 trained troops soon to return from their victory in Angola, and they might stir up trouble for us at the U.S. Canal in Panama, it therefore behooves the United States to hurry up and sign a new treaty with the Panamanian dictator giving away American rights to our Canal, in order to avoid having to defend it with military force.

Ron Nessen also said that relinquishing control of our Canal to Panama offers the best guarantee that it will continue to be "open to all." Such a statement is an insult to our intelligence. The U.S. Canal has been open to all for 62 years under the protection of the American Navy and Army, and there is no doubt that it will always be open so long as we are in control. But if Castro's friend, Omar Torrijos, were in control, there is no more assurance that it would be open to all than the Suez Canal was open to all under Nasser.

Ronald Reagan has rendered a service to our country by bringing the U.S. Canal giveaway out into the open so that the American people will know what their diplomats have been doing behind closed doors. Only a handful of Americans had been aware that Henry Kissinger went to Panama on Feb. 7, 1974 and signed a preliminary giveaway agreement. One would think that a move of such great importance would require the Administration to level with the American voters. But mention of the Canal giveaway proposal was conspicuous by its absence from President Ford's 1976 State of the Union Message to Congress.

### Constitution, Court, and Treaty

The next time Dr. Kissinger has a press conference, it would be appropriate to ask him: Just how, Dr. Kissinger, were you planning on circumventing Article IV, Section 3 of the U.S. Constitution which clearly states that only "Congress shall have the power to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States"? A treaty requires only Senate approval, but a surrender of U.S. territory, such as the U.S. Canal, requires both Senate and House approval.

If the United States will not defend our own U.S. Canal, a vital lifeline for Western Hemispheric defense and economic prosperity, the Soviets and their allies in Cuba and Mexico may be encouraged to conclude that we will not fight to defend Puerto Rico, the Virgin Is-

lands, Alaska, or even the parts of the United States claimed by Mexico.

In *Wilson v. Shaw* (204 U.S. 24, 33), the U.S. Supreme Court unanimously ruled on the ownership of the Canal Zone: "It is hypercritical to contend that the title of the United States is imperfect, and that the territory described does not belong to this nation."

The agreement that Henry Kissinger signed on February 7, 1974 and the proposed treaty negotiated by Ellsworth Bunker involve the surrender of more than \$6 billion which the American taxpayers have invested in the Canal and its improvements. Actually, the United States has paid for the Canal three times: first, by paying \$10 million to the government of Panama, plus a Panama Railroad annuity of \$250,000, later raised to \$2,328,200; second, by paying \$166,362,173 to all the owners of the land in the Canal Zone; and third, by paying \$25 million to Columbia (from which Panama had seceded) in order to vest title "entirely and absolutely" in the United States.

The existing treaty between the United States and Panama was signed in Washington, D.C. on May 18, 1903 and subsequently ratified by Panama on December 2, 1903 and by the U.S. Senate on February 23, 1904. Article III provides: "The Republic of Panama grants to the United States all the rights, power and authority within the zone mentioned and described in Article II of this agreement and within the limits of all auxiliary lands and waters mentioned and described in said Article II which the United States would possess and exercise if it were the sovereign of the territory within which said lands and waters are located to the entire exclusion of the exercise by the Republic of Panama of any such sovereign rights, power or authority."

In Article II, "the Republic of Panama grants to the United States *in perpetuity* the use, occupation and control" of the Canal Zone.

The difference is clear. Ronald Reagan believes in continuing to exercise our sovereignty, in accordance with the existing treaty, "to the entire exclusion of the exercise by the Republic of Panama of any such sovereign rights, power or authority."

When Gerald Ford was a Congressman, he agreed. But our foreign policy today is determined by Henry Kissinger, not by Gerald Ford, and the policy of the Ford Administration clearly is to give away our Canal. This would be the giant giveaway of all time.

## U.S. Military Defense

Admiral Elmo Zumwalt, former Chief of Naval Operations, wrote a memorandum on what he was personally told by Secretary of State Kissinger: "Kissinger feels the U.S. has passed its historic high point like so many earlier civilizations. He believes the U.S. is on the downhill and cannot be roused. ... He states that his job is to persuade the Russians to give us the best deal we can get, recognizing that the historical forces favor them. ... The American people have only themselves to blame because they lack the stamina to stay the course against the Russians, who are Sparta to our Athens."

The high position of Secretary of State, the most important position in the President's Cabinet, should not be held by a person who has this defeatist philosophy. Kissinger's actions amply confirm that he does believe what Admiral Zumwalt quoted him as saying.

In the SALT I Agreement, Kissinger (a) gave up our right to defend our cities and our allies with the great American-perfected anti-ballistic missile system (ABM), which could literally shoot Soviet missiles out of the skies, and was greatly superior to anything the Russians have, (b) allowed the Soviets a superiority of 1,618 intercontinental ballistic missiles (ICBMs) to our 1,054, (c) allowed the Russians 62 submarines for launching ballistic missiles (SLBMs) to our 44, (d) allowed the Russians 950 ballistic missile launchers on submarines to our 710, and (e) allowed the Russians a missile throw-weight advantage of at least four-to-one.

Kissinger negotiated the final terms of the SALT I Agreement without having a single technical expert at his side, while the Soviets had the chief of their missile program sitting with them in the negotiating room. As a result, according to Admiral Zumwalt, SALT I was tightly and expertly written to prevent *any* uses or development of our great ABM defensive weapon, but Kissinger was guilty of "dreadfully, technically sloppy, drafting" in regard to the offensive missile limits that the United States wanted.

At a time when the United States was widening its technological lead over the Soviets in all phases of ABM systems -- missiles, radars and computers -- and about to deploy its first Site Defense ABM system for prototype testing at Kwajalein, Kissinger stopped the initial testing of this fullscale system and consented to the Congressional bill to dismantle the single ABM installation in North Dakota permitted by the SALT Treaty. He thereby stripped all U.S. Minuteman ICBMs of any semblance of active defense.

In the meantime, the Soviets have been pressing hard on every front of ABM technology to overcome the U.S. lead, which was effectively frozen by the SALT Treaty. In the interim, they have developed a completely new advanced ABM system, including radar and missiles through the test phase and ready for operational deployment any time they choose to break the ABM Treaty.

As stated by the authoritative *Aviation Week & Space Technology* (Dec. 15, 1975): "When it suits their purpose, the Soviets will be in a position to deploy a new advanced ABM system that could blunt most of a U.S. retaliatory ICBM attack, while the U.S., by going even beyond the treaty provisions, will leave its entire Minuteman ICBM force naked to a Soviet strike."

## Can We Defend America?

The 1,054 intercontinental ballistic missiles and the 41 Polaris-type submarines that defend the United States today all represent the vision, the planning, and the technology of the years of the Eisenhower Administration. They were all ordered by President Eisenhower, although they kept coming through the pipelines for several years after he left the White House. Those weapons represented the level of security that President Eisenhower felt we needed to defend America against the Soviet Union twenty years ago. The defense policy of the Eisenhower Administration was well stated in his immortal words which have been inscribed on the keel of the aircraft carrier that bears his name: "Until war is eliminated from international relations, unpreparedness for it is well nigh as criminal as war itself."

It is criminal to be unprepared to defend our great country against the Soviet military machine. Dr. Kis-

singer and Presidents Nixon and Ford who gave him that power are responsible for keeping the United States in a weapons freeze since 1968 while the Soviets have raced ahead of us at a crash wartime rate.

Does America have the financial resources to stay ahead of the Russians? Of course we have. We are the great can-do nation that defeated two heavily-armed enemies on two fronts in World War II and sent a man to the moon. We can do anything we make up our minds to do. God has blessed our country with a Gross National Product twice that of the Soviet Union. With our double wealth and American ingenuity and resourcefulness, we could stay ahead of the Russians with a lot less effort than it took us to win World War II. However, the long lead times required for the building of weapons demands that we get started in 1976. If we do not reverse the Kissinger freeze on strategic weapons, we will have gone past the point of no return.

The issue is clear. Gerald Ford says that he intends to keep Henry Kissinger in power -- and that means Kissinger will make all foreign policy and defense policy decisions. Ronald Reagan would replace both Kissinger and his policies of substituting American military inferiority for the superiority we enjoyed prior to 1968.

## Kissinger In Africa

If there ever was a speech that seemed calculated to start a war, it was Henry Kissinger's speech in Zambia calling for the overthrow of the government of Rhodesia. Delivered the day after Tanzania threatened that "the war has started" for Rhodesia, Kissinger stated that the United States will confront Rhodesia with "our unrelenting opposition," that we will impose "mandatory economic sanctions against Rhodesia," and that the American taxpayers will give \$12.5 million to Communist Mozambique in order to promote an economic squeeze play against Rhodesia.

Kissinger also urged Congress to forbid the importation of chrome from Rhodesia. The big beneficiary of this act would be Russia which is the only other major source of chrome.

Both the Soviet Union and Cuba have white minority governments infinitely worse than Rhodesia. Russia and Cuba have Communist dictatorships, headed by white dictators Brezhnev and Castro, who deny more civil liberties than does Rhodesia. There is also less democracy and civil liberty in the countries attacking Rhodesia than in Rhodesia itself.

If Dr. Kissinger is sincere about aiding the overthrow of a white minority government, he should start with Cuba, only 90 miles away. Rhodesia has never invaded another country, whereas Cuba recently invaded and conquered the peaceful black country of Angola. There are plenty of Cuban Freedom Fighters available who would be glad for U.S. aid to liberate their native country from Castro's Communist dictatorship.

Likewise, if Dr. Kissinger is yearning to free people from white minority rule, he can start in Poland, Hungary, East Germany, Czechoslovakia, or any of the other Captive Nations that have so often proved their passionate desire for freedom and their willingness to fight, if necessary with their bare hands, to get rid of their white Communist dictators.

Dr. Kissinger's support of liberation movements in Africa is in stunning contrast to his policy toward Eastern Europe, as articulated by his deputy, Helmut Son-

nenfeldt, in a recent speech in London. Sonnenfeldt told a meeting of U.S. Ambassadors that it is our policy to make Eastern Europe an "organic" part of the Soviet Union.

The State Department has been trying to explain Sonnenfeldt's statement ever since it was made, but all subsequent statements only prove that the Kissinger policy is to oppose any and all efforts to win freedom or independence for Eastern Europe. This is craven appeasement of the Kremlin at the expense of the millions of Americans of Eastern European descent who cherish the hope that their homeland may someday be free again.

The overthrow of Rhodesia and South Africa is now openly threatened by Mozambique and Angola, which are fortified with arms shipments from the Soviet Union and by thousands of Cuban soldiers. Before Dr. Kissinger announces his support of pro-Communist invaders of anti-Communist nations friendly to the United States, he should first obtain Congressional approval for his radical change in American policy.

## Solzhenitsyn Interview

Alert and intelligent visitors can often better evaluate and describe a nation than the natives. The commentaries about America by the 19th century French visitor, Alexis de Toqueville, are still studied in our colleges. Likewise a perceptive modern visitor, Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn, has done a good job of describing what is wrong with United States' policy.

In a recent impressive television interview, Solzhenitsyn deplored the way the United States is financing its own destruction. "It is the importation of (American) technology which is saving the Soviets," he said, while at the same time the Soviets have so geared their system to building up a war-making capability that, "even if it were the unanimous opinion of all the members of the Politburo, they would be powerless not to cause war."

This view is corroborated by chilling warnings from the Pentagon that the Soviets consider a nuclear war "inevitable." General Daniel Graham, who recently retired as director of military intelligence, has warned that Soviet spending on military weapons now matches the percentage that Adolf Hitler was spending immediately prior to World War II.

Leonid Brezhnev, in his recent five-hour speech to the 25th Communist Party Congress, laid down the gauntlet of Soviet objectives. He said: "There is no room for neutrality and compromise in the struggle between the two ideologies. Here there is a need for constant political vigilance, active, efficient, and convincing propaganda, and timely rebuffs to enemy ideological subversions."

Apparently taunting President Ford and/or Secretary of State Henry Kissinger, Brezhnev continued: "Some bourgeois leaders affect surprise and raise a howl over the solidarity of Soviet Communists and the Soviet people with the struggle of other peoples for freedom and progress. This is either outright naivete, or more likely, deliberate mental befuddlement."

Ford and Kissinger may be "befuddled" about Soviet policies, but the American people see them clearly. Presidential candidates have discovered that as many as 70 percent of those responding to polls think that detente helps the Soviets and harms the United

States.

Although Solzhenitsyn understands the Soviet mind and behavior so well, he cannot understand "the speed of (American) capitulations" in the face of Soviet aggression. It does not make sense to him that the United States, "possessing freedom, does not value it enough to defend it."

When the television interviewer asked Solzhenitsyn if he did not fear returning to the era of the Cold War, Solzhenitsyn reminded him that "the West conceded nothing" to the Soviets during the Cold War; but under detente, the West has given up five countries and "all its world positions" of power. When the questioner conjured up the specter of the glib Bertrand Russell slogan, "Rather Red than dead," Solzhenitsyn replied, "Better to be dead than a scoundrel."

All the policy errors that Solzhenitsyn so perceptively pointed out can be laid directly at the feet of Henry Kissinger, who is so afraid of what Solzhenitsyn has to say that Kissinger would not even permit Solzhenitsyn to have a cup of coffee at the White House with President Ford.

## The "Can't Win" Syndrome

The eastern liberal-establishment Republicans have always pretended to pose as political pragmatists rather than as ideologues. While invariably supporting Presidential candidates who would continue big government deficits, they argue that their choice is determined by a magic formula guaranteed to appeal to party professionals: "The liberal candidate can win; the conservative cannot."

Thus in the primaries of 1952, the eastern liberals hammered with the slogan, "Bob Taft can't win," until they froze him out of the presidential nomination he had earned as Senate Republican leader. The liberals successfully argued that Taft was too closely tied to controversial legislation such as the Taft-Hartley Act and that a fresh face without such impedimenta, Dwight Eisenhower, was more electable.

In 1964 the eastern liberals again urged the Republican National Convention to nominate a candidate from outside Washington, either Nelson Rockefeller or William Scranton, predicting that conservative Senator Barry Goldwater couldn't win. In the November election, the eastern liberals made this a self-fulfilling prophecy by supporting a Washington politician, Lyndon Johnson.

In 1968 the eastern liberal Republicans, echoing the same refrain, said that Ronald Reagan couldn't win, while Richard Nixon was more electable because he was more liberal. That practical consideration was persuasive with enough conservative Delegates to the Republican National Convention to nominate Nixon.

In 1976 the shoe is on the other foot. On purely pragmatic political criteria, the western conservative Ronald Reagan is obviously more electable than Nelson Rockefeller's candidate, Gerald Ford.

Whereas President Ford is hopelessly hung with the triple albatross of Washington, Watergate, and Kissinger, those are all non-issues against Reagan. If one thing is clear from the 1976 primaries, it is that the American voters are systematically voting against Washington politicians (such as Ford), and for those who hail from the hinterland (such as Carter and Brown).

While the subject of Watergate has been quiescent

this spring, the Democrats will surely resurrect this obvious issue in the fall campaign. The ghost of Richard Nixon will forever hang over Ford because no explanations can erase the facts that Nixon made Ford President of the United States, and Ford saved Nixon from going to jail.

There is no way Ford can get out from under the burden of carrying the Kissinger policies on his back: the troublemaking hypocrisy of the recent African statements, the planned giveaway of the U.S. Canal in Panama, the obvious lopsidedness of detente with the Russians and allowing them to overtake our former lead in missiles and submarines, the Sonnenfeldt sell-out of eastern European hopes, and the senseless snub of Solzhenitsyn. As Congressman Ed Derwinski recently said: "The President is a captive of Henry K. The subordinate is controlling his chief."

Against the now-probable Democratic nominee, Jimmy Carter, Ford would have to write off the entire South, whereas Reagan would have a good chance. Finally, Reagan is clearly superior to Ford in articulating the issues, fielding questions from reporters and voters, and communicating via television.

The differences between Ford and Reagan are crucial to America, and should be carefully considered by the voters.

Those who do not remember 1964 should read:

### A Choice Not An Echo

by Phyllis Schlafly

- \* the famous book that put "choice not an echo" into our political language,
- \* the amazing best-seller that sold 3 million copies without a single ad,
- \* the authentic inside history of Republican National Conventions from 1936 through 1964,
- \* including Chapter 14 -- the first time the American people were ever told about the existence of the secret Bilderberger conferences. (*Personal to those who now own this valuable book: Turn to page 104 and add the name of Henry Kissinger to the list of those who attended that secret meeting.*)

**A Choice Not An Echo** has been out of print for years. We recently uncovered a few copies which are now available, while they last, at \$4.95 per single copy. We guarantee these copies to be the original 1964 paperback and not a reprint. Order at \$4.95 each from Pere Marquette Press, Box 495, Alton, Illinois 62002.

**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.