



The Phyllis Schlafly Report



VOL. 10, NO. 1, SECTION 1

BOX 618, ALTON, ILLINOIS 62002

August, 1976

Communism on the March

Cuba and The Monroe Doctrine

For a century and a half, the Monroe Doctrine was the most constant star in the firmament of our otherwise orbiting foreign policy. It means that the United States laid its power and prestige on the line to prevent any European government from "controlling" the "destiny" of any Western Hemisphere nation.

After Castro took over Cuba, however, Soviet Premier Khrushchev, whose earthy vocabulary included frequent references to burying non-Communists, taunted us by saying: "Now the remains of this [Monroe] Doctrine should best be buried, as every dead body is, so that it does not poison the air by its decay."

It is now clear that that was no idle boast. Russia has converted Cuba into a Soviet military base for Communist subversion and aggression all over the world.

Because an economy run by a Communist dictatorship is never as productive as a free economy, Castro's takeover of Cuba resulted in a desperate need for outside funds to shore up its economic system. In order to keep the Cuban economy from collapsing, the Soviet Union supplies this outside aid totalling a half billion dollars a year.

On CBS's hour-long interview with Fidel Castro, he admitted that he has "complete confidence" in the Soviets and in their "loyalty" to the Cuban Revolution. Castro said the Soviets have given Cuba a tremendous amount of aid including wheat, transportation, industrial and electric power equipment, fertilizers, and raw materials. He said that "aid by the Soviet Union has been decisive" and that, "if the Soviets had not helped us, we could not have made it through these critical years."

Unlike the United States, the Soviets exact their pound of flesh for their foreign aid. Today, some 7,000 Russians are effectively governing Cuba in the Stalinist pattern.

They train the secret police, run the military and the economy, dispatch troops to Angola, and direct Cuba's subversive and terrorist activities all over the Western Hemisphere, and even as far away as Austria and Iran. Cuban-trained terrorists are part of the Puerto Rican bomb-throwers, the Argentinian murder-kidnap-ransom brigade, and the guerrilla agitators in the Dominican Republic.

The previous year, Castro sent two brigades to Syria to fight against Israel, and other guerrillas to invade the Dominican Republic. Before that Castro sent guerrillas to make trouble in Bolivia, Chile, Venezuela,

and Guatemala. In 1972 Brezhnev awarded Castro the highest Soviet civilian decoration, the Order of Lenin, in recognition of Castro's "outstanding services in the struggle against imperialism," which means, of course, against America and other free governments.

More than 2,400 radicals from our country have visited Cuba to receive training for espionage and terrorist activity inside the United States.

Cuban Missile Crisis?

Dangerous as is Cuba as a base for subversion, espionage, and terrorism, its potential as a Soviet missile and submarine base is far greater. A Communist regime in Cuba enables Soviet missile-armed submarines, which Deputy Secretary William Clements said prowl along our coasts, to refuel in the Western Hemisphere and thereby save about a twelve-thousand-mile round trip to their home ports in the Black Sea.

When our U-2 reconnaissance plane discovered Khrushchev's missiles in Cuba in 1962, we were able to make him remove them from their launching pads because we then had the capability to deliver more than 40,000 megatons of nuclear striking power on the Soviet Union. Today, we can credibly threaten to deliver on Russia about 5,000 megatons.

What will our President do next year if our intelligence reports that Brezhnev has secretly installed his new SS-20 mobile nuclear missiles in Cuba aimed at vital American population targets? There is no threat that our President can hurl at Brezhnev that he cannot toss back at us, doubled in nuclear spades. Missiles fired from Cuba would reach our cities in about eight or nine minutes, as opposed to a 30-minute warning time for missiles launched from Russia.

Nor is there any credible threat that we can use to intimidate Fidel Castro. Recent evidence indicates that, even 13 years ago, he reacted to CIA unsuccessful attempts to assassinate him by encouraging and perhaps even sponsoring the tragically successful assassination of President Kennedy. Now Castro is flushed with victory after his Angolan conquest and ready to take on new challenges.

The big American mistake about Cuba was our abandonment of the Monroe Doctrine. We should revise that dying "body" before Brezhnev carries out Khrushchev's threat to bury it forever. To give diplomatic recognition to Castro would be to make the mistake of rewarding the chief enemy of the United States and freedom in the Western Hemisphere.

Danger From Mexico

"Don't worry, the Reds are still 90 miles away" was the sarcastic slogan of the 1960s designed to focus attention on the stupidity of our State Department, first, in supporting Fidel Castro's takeover of Cuba, second, in withdrawing air and sea support from the Cuban Freedom Fighters at the Bay of Pigs in 1961, and, third, in refusing to enforce the Monroe Doctrine when the Soviets installed offensive nuclear missiles in Cuba in 1962.

Thirty Congressmen recently sent a letter to President Ford which indicates that they believe the Reds are no longer as far away as 90 miles, but are on the verge of taking control of Mexico. If that ever happens, the Communists will have a virtually unguarded border along 1,500 miles of Texas, New Mexico, Arizona, and California.

The letter that the 30 Congressmen sent to the President pointed out the "long strides toward the imposition of a Communist regime" which have been taken by Mexican President Echeverria, including "a broadfront attack upon private property in all forms," "officially tolerated land seizures," "compulsory textbook changes intended to indoctrinate young Mexicans with a Castroite propaganda," and a proposed amnesty which "would release hardened Communist cadres from prison and allow them to enter the government."

Under this amnesty, the Communists who would move from prison to government jobs would be those who engineered the so-called "student revolt" in Mexico City in 1968 which resulted in the deaths of at least a thousand people.

President Echeverria has welcomed to Mexico the top Communist officials who fled from Chile after the suicide of Salvador Allende. Echeverria is often seen on public platforms with Allende's widow, Hortensia, who now lives in Mexico. Although Mexican law prohibits foreigners from owning Mexican property, Mrs. Allende has been permitted to buy a \$250,000 villa in Cuernavaca.

President Echeverria set up a "think tank" in Mexico for Chilean and other foreign Communists called the "Center of Economic Investigation and Teaching." Among the laws produced by this "think tank" is the new Law of Urban Reform, which the newspaper *El Occidental* of Guadalajara says was praised by Mrs. Allende as being "identical to one which her husband intended to impose in Chile."

President Echeverria is often quoted in Communist publications, such as *New Times*, as pledging "solidarity with the people of Chile waging a struggle against Fascism." "Fascism" is, of course, the Communist term for the present anti-Communist Chilean military government.

The letter to President Ford from the 30 Congressmen states that "Mexico is in turmoil over these changes ... which are inspired by a large group of foreign Communists and Marxists who presently advise President Echeverria. They include such notorious Chileans as the former Foreign Minister, Clodomira Almeida, the former Minister of Economics, Pedro Vuskovic, and the head of the far-left Socialist Party, Carlos Altamirano."

The 30 concerned Congressmen accurately point out that the establishment of a Castro-type or Allende-type Communist government in neighboring Mexico

would pose "a tremendous danger to the United States." It is an open question whether our State Department is giving our President any more accurate information than it did before Castro took over Cuba, or before Castro's soldiers invaded Angola and Mozambique.

Colonialism

Thirty-three years ago, thousands of American boys died to chase the Italians and Germans out of North Africa. Nobody thanked us for our blood, sweat and tears, and a pro-Communist dictator took over in Libya after we left.

Since World War II, our State Department has exerted its leadership to get most other European nations out of Africa, too. The prevailing propaganda winds helped to push the Belgians out of the Congo, the French out of Algeria, and the Portuguese out of Angola and Mozambique -- just as, in other parts of the world, the British were pushed out of India and the Dutch out of Indonesia.

Colonialism was the bete noire that must be eliminated at all cost, even though the resulting vacuum became an irresistible target for native dictators and international Communism. No voice defended the alleged ogre of European colonialism. The United Nations even sent a military expedition to overthrow the black government of Tshombe in Katanga because he was too friendly to Belgian interests.

Colonialism is a word that is always selectively defined. By definition, only Western nations can be guilty. When Communists conquer and control other nations, that is never labelled colonialism; it is called liberation.

No one seems to be bothered by the obvious double standard -- even though Western nations sent peaceful missionaries and teachers to their colonies, built hospitals and schools, waterworks and sewers, and substantially raised the local standard of living, while the Communist emissaries to their colonies are always armed troops, and commissars to stamp out freedom.

The double standard has never been more apparent than it is today in Angola, the richest prize of central Africa. Now that a combination of Soviet Communist weapons and Cuban Communist troops has conquered Angola, where are all those people who urged the Portuguese to get out in the name of native democracy?

If it was our patriotic duty to drive the Italians and Germans out of Africa, why isn't it our duty to drive out the Cuban and Russian Communists?

It is difficult to avoid the conclusion that there may be only one consistent premise on which our policy toward colonial powers and captive nations can be reconciled. If the rulers are Communist, our government supports them. If the rulers are anti-Communist, our Government works diligently and effectively to replace them.

In Leonid Brezhnev's recent speech to the 25th Congress, he admitted there are only 15,694,000 Communist Party members in all of Russia. Solzhenitsyn tells us that 80 percent of the people in the U.S.S.R. are our secret allies and hate their Communist Party rulers.

Our leaders make the mistake of toasting the few Red jailers and ignoring their hundreds of millions of captives.

Communist Threat In Italy

The recent Italian elections showed how perilously close Italy is to a Communist coalition government or financial bankruptcy, or both. As John Connally said, "The Mediterranean was the cradle of civilization. It is not beyond reason that it could also become its grave."

The Italian Communist Party is trying to present the image that it is a national party, independent of the Soviet Union. Its leaders are very sophisticated, even charming. Actually, the Italian Communist Party maintains iron discipline and tolerates no meaningful dissent. Its present leader has repeatedly stressed the party's "unbreakable ties of solidarity with the Soviet Union."

The official Italian Communist Party position on membership in NATO is ambiguous. The Communist newspaper has declared that Italy should not accept NATO "as it is" because it is "the instrument of American manipulation of Europe."

Even if Moscow agents do not stage-manage every action of the Italian Communist Party, it is clear that its basic goals and programs do not include defense efforts or cooperation with NATO. The overriding purpose that gave birth to NATO and has nurtured it for three decades is the defense of the Western democracies against potential aggression from the Soviet Union and Warsaw Pact governments. There is no way that any Communist Party will ever assist in that objective.

Unfortunately, the political power of the Communist Party is only one prong of a three-pronged danger. From without, the Italians see the ominous presence of the Soviet Navy in the Mediterranean, usually kept at about 50 ships, and easily able to expand in time of crisis to 95 ships, as it did during the October 1973 war.

The third prong is the defeatist attitude of many pro-Western Italians. Having witnessed the collapse of U.S. commitment to South Vietnam, they now fear a similar retreat in Western Europe in the face of Soviet imperialism.

Italy is the home port of the American Sixth Fleet. Italy hosts a network of American bases and NATO facilities, and is at the center of NATO political and military planning and operations. Italy is also a charter member of the NATO Nuclear Planning Group in which the most sensitive issues of nuclear defense are discussed. Italy's tremendous importance to the security of the Western world can hardly be overestimated.

If the Communists are able to control or even dominate the Italian government, this would mean the neutralization of Italy and the closing of key NATO and U.S. bases, resulting in the collapse of NATO's southern flank. Turkey and Greece could hardly resist pressures from the Soviet Union, and the Mediterranean would soon become a Soviet lake. It is likely that whoever controls Italy will control the Mediterranean.

If Italy votes in a Communist government, then the Italian Communists would participate in NATO land, sea, and air plans and maneuvers for the defense of Europe from Communists invasion. There is no provision in NATO's charter to freeze out a member from sensitive deliberations. Communist control of Italy would be a severe blow to the security and independence of the entire Western world. The risks to the West in permitting the Communist Party to come to

power in Italy are simply too great to be tolerated.

In a recent address given at the Center for Strategic and International Studies at Georgetown University, former Ambassador to Italy Clare Boothe Luce focused clearly on the interrelationship between Italy, the Soviet Union, and U.S. foreign policy. "There would be no Italian Communist problem," she said, "if there were no Soviet Union determined to achieve hegemony over the Middle East and the oil that is the lifeblood of Europe's economy, determined to make the Mediterranean a Russian lake, determined to collapse NATO ... There would be no Italian Communist problem if the Italian people did not feel that the United States has no policy today that promises them any hope that they will not, in the end, be relentlessly drawn into the orbit of Moscow."

Another American who recognized the great danger to the West of a Communist takeover of Italy is John Connally. A few months prior to the election on June 20-21, 1976, he formed the Citizens Alliance for Mediterranean Freedom to urge the 25 million Italian-Americans to write and persuade their Italian relatives and friends to vote against the Communists.

John Connally is a former Governor of Texas who will always be remembered for being shot by one of the bullets aimed at President John Kennedy in Dallas on November 22, 1963. In making it his citizen's mission to help the Italian anti-Communists, it was fortunate that Connally is not Italian, not Roman Catholic, apparently has no relatives in Italy, and has no official position in the U.S. Government. His advice to the Italian people could not be attacked as biased by nationality or religion or politics.

It is impossible to assess the impact that his efforts had on the Italian election, but the fact is that the Communists did not receive a majority. John Connally should be praised for recognizing a major threat to our country and devoting his energies and funds to the cause of saving Italy from Communist control.

Quemoy

The old adage that coming events cast their shadows before them explains the announcement by the Ford Administration that the United States is pulling its military advisers out of the Nationalist Chinese islands of Quemoy and Matsu. This move is undoubtedly planned by our State Department as the forerunner of withdrawal of recognition from Taiwan after the November presidential election, in abject appeasement of the Chinese Reds.

Quemoy is immensely important to Taiwan and to the free world, not only militarily, but as a symbol of man's determination to be free. It is a fantastic military, financial, and psychological achievement that Taiwan has held this little island for 20 years in the very jaws of the Communist colossus.

In the days of the late, lamented Cold War, the United States did not surrender any real estate to the Communists. The years of detente, however, have been marked by retreat all over the world. If Gerald Ford is reelected, the first few months of his second term will be busy ones, indeed, as Henry Kissinger proceeds with all the acts of appeasement he has postponed so as not to alienate the votes Ford needs for nomination and election. This includes the abandonment of Taiwan, the new giveaway treaty with Panama, and the "normalization" of relations with Castro and

with the Angola he conquered.

The risks people will take in order to escape from Red China are shown by the number of young people who continue to try to make the long and dangerous swim from the Mainland to Hong Kong. Most of these refugees are from 17 to 30 years old -- and that is no wonder, since they must swim through shark-infested waters and past heavily-armed Red patrol boats.

The swim from Red China to Hong Kong is almost as long as the English Channel, but is much more difficult. The swimmers are not accompanied by a boat with a guide to navigate and dispense food. I asked one of these freedom swimmers what percentage is successful. She said one out of a hundred.

It is quite a commentary on the Mao regime that these boys and girls choose a course of action in which they have 99 chances out of 100 of being shot by Red Guards, blown up by mines, eaten by sharks, or drowned from exhaustion.

Many of the lucky few who arrive in Hong Kong are hunted down by British helicopters and patrol boats, and then turned over to the Chinese Communists. The tragic fate awaiting these refugees after their return to Mainland China is too horrible to describe. The repatriation of these refugees is one of the prices that Red China extorts from the British for the privilege of occupying Hong Kong island.

Lessons of Cambodia

The bits and pieces of news that have percolated out of Cambodia since that country went behind the bamboo curtain last year are so horrible that it is almost as though we are hearing reports about a race of sub-human monsters on another planet. The human cost of Communism in that little country of 8,000,000 people is staggering. Estimates range from 250,000 to 600,000 deaths since the Khmer Rouge came to power in April 1975 and drove the entire population of Phnom Penh out into the countryside. Those too sick or weak to walk fast enough were left on the ground to die.

The bloodbath in Cambodia clearly exceeds the most extreme predictions made prior to the fall of southeast Asia. Cambodia now has no money, no markets, no telephones or telegraph, no shops, no private property, and no paid labor. Cambodia has banned the practice of religion and suspended marriage.

The people work like slaves from dawn to dusk under the tight military control of about 70,000 Khmer Rouge soldiers. Although there are relatively few of this new ruling class, the people do not challenge their power because of the savage threats to kill an entire village if one Red soldier is harmed.

The daily food ration is a cup of rice. Salt, sugar, meat, and fish are all rationed. The people scavenge for roots and edible insects, or try to trap fish with wicker baskets.

The most frequent mistake of Americans in trying to anticipate what other governments will do is to make assumptions of what we think is rational, based on our scale of values. The trouble is, many other governments simply do not have our scale of values with its great reverence for life, liberty, and private property.

The lesson of Cambodia during the last year should cause us to reevaluate our assessment of the Soviet Union. The new relationship which Dr. Henry Kissinger has engineered between the United States and the Soviet Union is based on the assumption that

the Soviets' desire to raise their standard of living through access to American methods of production and distribution will cause them to respond positively to our initiatives of grain, trade, technology, and long term credits.

As Cambodia makes clear, however, the principal objective of a Communist regime is not a higher standard of living, but total control over the minds and actions of every human being. It matters not how many lives are sacrificed in the process.

A realistic review of Soviet behavior indicates that the men in the Kremlin are not motivated by any desire to give an automobile, a house, or a color television to every Russian family. The Kremlin bosses want total control regardless of the cost in human life. The British expert Robert Conquest estimates that the Soviet Communists have deliberately killed at least 30 million of their own people, and Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn, with more first-hand sources, estimates 66 million. In the last ten years, the Soviet Union has diverted up to 40 percent of its Gross National Product into military weapons instead of improvements in the standard of living.

Since such a callous attitude toward human life and consumer wants is incomprehensible to most Americans, it would behoove us not to measure our own security in terms of what actions we think are rational for the Soviets to take, but rather on what they **can** do.

Thus, when we calculate the level of military weapons we need for U.S. security, we should make sure that we have enough to defend our country against Soviet weapons capability -- rather than relying on assumptions about whether it is rational for the Soviets to start a war in which millions of their own people would die.



Have you read?

Ambush at Vladivostok

by Phyllis Schlafly & Chester Ward

Rear Adm., USN (Ret.)

\$2 from Pere Marquette Press, Box 495, Alton, Il. 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.