



The Phyllis Schlafly Report



VOL. 11, NO. 12 SECTION 1

BOX 618, ALTON, ILLINOIS 62002

JULY, 1978

Liberal Double Standards

Liberals have a special code of commandments from which they never deviate. Right? To echo the Gilbert and Sullivan refrain about the Admiral who never used the Big Bad D, what, never? No, never. What, never? Well, hardly ever.

1. "Thou shalt not deny a passport or visa to any individual because of his political activities." Under the freedom to travel rule, the State Department has permitted Wilfred Burchett, who led the third-degree interrogation of U.S. prisoners in Korea, to enter the United States and lecture at 18 leading universities including Harvard, Yale, Columbia, Michigan, Oregon, Iowa, and the University of California Law School. This lecture tour was after Burchett lost a libel suit in Australia which he brought after publication of sworn charges that he was a Soviet KGB agent.

Meanwhile the State Department has refused to issue a visa to the anti-Communist pilot, Lt. Colonel Fan Yuan-yen, who flew a MIG-19 fighter plane from Red China to Taiwan. He is an outspoken critic of the repressive Red regime on Mainland China and would present eloquent eye-witness testimony about how miserable life is there.

Likewise, Soviet Lieutenant Viktor Belenko, who flew a MIG-25 from Siberia to Japan and is now in the United States, is apparently restricted from traveling about our country to give interviews about life in the Soviet Union.

2. "Thou shalt not engage in wiretapping or bugging. If the FBI, CIA or other U.S. intelligence agencies engage in such acts, the individual agents must be punished like criminals and the evidence destroyed, no matter how incriminating."

But when the Soviet Embassy engages in electronic eavesdropping on all long-distance telephone calls in and out of Washington, D.C., there is no Administration demand that such outrageous snooping be stopped and no editorial outcry from the liberal columnists; just a sweep-it-under-the-rug acquiescence of this outrageous invasion of American privacy and acquisition of U.S. confidential information.

3. "Thou shalt not blacklist any entertainer because of his or her ideological activities. We must bury forever the so-called Red witch hunts of the 1940s and 1950s." So when Vanessa Redgrave engaged in anti-Israel, pro-Palestinian Liberation Organization (PLO) political activities, 20th Century Fox sanctimoniously

declined to blacklist her from employment, saying: "We totally reject, and will not be blackmailed into supporting, any policy of refusing to employ any person because of their political beliefs."

Ms. Redgrave's right to engage in anti-Zionist propaganda without employment sanctions was also championed by Bud Sandford, executive secretary of the AFL-CIO American Federation of Television and Radio Artists (AFTRA) who wrote Fox: "This union applauds your position that no person should be denied employment because of their political views."

Liberal spokesmen, however, have not accorded the same rights to Anita Bryant who spoke out against the Miami homosexual ordinance. She was denounced by AFTRA's sister union, Actors Equity Council, and she has been blacklisted and frozen out of her formerly profitable television and concert bookings.

5. "Thou shalt not censor school textbooks to eliminate words and concepts offensive to Bible-believing parents." The liberal community heaped scorn, ridicule and even criminal prosecution on West Virginia parents who wanted obscenities removed from school textbooks.

However, the Textbook Project Staff of the Office of Research of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights is sending questionnaires to textbook publishers demanding the elimination of words and pictures that a small pressure group has labeled "sexist" because they show men and women in traditional roles. Academic freedom goes out the window as the HEW and Justice Department militants, with all the clout of Federal funds behind them, impose on schools and textbook publishers their new brand of unisex orthodoxy.

The liberals are never inconsistent? Well, hardly ever.

Dictators' Insults

Is there no limit to the insults that foreign dictators can get by with hurling at Americans?

Within hours after the U.S. Senate ratified the Panama Treaty giving our Canal to dictator Torrijos, he arrogantly boasted that, if the vote had gone the other way, "We would have started a struggle for liberation, and by tomorrow the Canal would not have been in operation." That's the gratitude we get for giving him our \$7 billion Canal plus promising to pay him nearly \$3 billion to take it.

The White House had argued that the treaty should be approved so that we would win the good will of Latin Americans. Now we find that the only people who really like the treaty are Torrijos and the Communist Party of Panama, and they respond with insults instead of thanks.

The preceding weekend, another foreign dictator administered a different kind of insult. President Nicolae Ceausescu of Romania was travelling across the United States on a state visit seeking American trade and credits.

On April 15 he was the guest of honor at a dinner given at the Plimssoll Club by the leading businessmen of New Orleans. When the president of the International Trade Mart opened the dinner by calling on a clergyman to give the invocation, Ceausescu and his retinue of 35 Romanians marched together out of the dining room. After the prayer was finished, they all came back to eat their dinner.

Ceausescu thus chose to flaunt his atheism by insulting his hosts, their hospitality, and their custom of saying grace before meals. He gave a dramatic reminder of the fact that Communism is the arch-enemy of all religion.

Ceausescu proved anew that Communists will not modify their militant atheism even for the sake of the economic deals they hope to sign with American businessmen or for the social courtesy that is the obligation of every guest.

When the Bolshoi Ballet toured the United States in 1975, one of the conditions the Russians imposed was that the Star Spangled Banner could not be played at any performances. This Moscow-imposed policy was adhered to in Washington, New York, New Orleans, Houston, Los Angeles, and San Francisco.

When the Bolshoi reached St. Louis, the dancers performed at the open-air Municipal Opera in Forest Park where, for half a century, every performance has started with the Star Spangled Banner. On the Bolshoi's opening night, the National Anthem was omitted because the Russians demanded it.

Fortunately there was such a flap among St. Louisans and in the press that a compromise was worked out. Both the U.S. and the Soviet National Anthems were played at all subsequent performances.

The American Bar Association Committee on Communist Tactics, Strategy and Objectives issued a report in 1958 correctly identifying "humiliation" as a major Communist tactic. The Communists try to humiliate us personally, ideologically, militarily, and politically in order to badger us into accommodating ourselves to their objectives.

Communists do not negotiate in order to arrive at a workable compromise midway between opposing views. They negotiate with the tactics of humiliation and harassment in order to expedite their escalating demands.

Any Communists who cannot be courteous when Americans pray or sing their National Anthem should be invited to leave our country and never come back. The U.S. House of Representatives should take care of Panama's insults by declining to pass the implementing legislation which is necessary to complete the surrender of our Canal to the drug-peddling, war-threatening Torrijos.

UN Defector Shevchenko

The most interesting fact about Arkady N. Shevchenko who defected from the United Nations to the United States in April is not Russian embarrassment caused by the loss of their high-ranking official. It is not even that he is seeking American freedom at the cost of giving up his prestigious \$76,000-a-year job in New York City.

The most interesting aspect about Shevchenko is that he is the eleventh consecutive Communist to hold the second most important position in the UN Secretariat. His predecessors starting in 1945 were Arkady Sobolev, Constantin E. Zinchenko, Ilya S. Tchernychev, Dragoslav Protitch, Anatoly Dobrynin, Georgy Petrovitch Arkadev, Eugeny Kiselev, Vladimir P. Suslov, Alexi Efmovitch Nesternko, and Leonid N. Kutakov.

All were Communists and only one was not Russian, Dragoslav Protitch, a Yugoslav, who was permitted to hold the position for a brief time during the period of Tito's total subservience to Moscow.

How did it happen that, although the United States hosts the UN and has always paid the largest share of UN costs, the Kremlin has had a monopoly on the UN position which is Number Two in rank and which many people believe is the most important because the Secretary General has so many time-consuming ceremonial duties?

This Soviet monopoly over the post of Under Secretary General for Political and Security Council Affairs is the result of a secret agreement made between Molotov and the U.S. Secretary of State Edward Stettinius (when Alger Hiss was one of his advisers) in London in 1945. This was revealed in the book written by the second UN Secretary General, Trygve Lie, called *In the Cause of Peace*.

That wasn't the only secret agreement with the Soviets made by our State Department during the months when it was selling the United Nations to the American people as the last best hope for peace. Another secret agreement was made at Yalta between President Franklin Roosevelt (where Alger Hiss was one of his advisers) and Joseph Stalin to give the Soviet Union three votes in the UN General Assembly while every other nation has only one.

The Department of Political and Security Council Affairs, which Shevchenko had headed for nearly five years at the time of his defection, has control over all UN military, political, nuclear, and disarmament questions. Soviet tenure in this sensitive post was particularly valuable in giving the Kremlin access to our military plans during the Korean War.

The highest-ranking Russian ever to defect to the West, Shevchenko undoubtedly has a wide and deep knowledge of Soviet military, political and economic activities. He could probably give us more secret strategic information in a week's testimony than all our CIA intelligence agents could uncover in several years.

Shevchenko's first-hand testimony could rank with the immensely valuable intelligence provided to the United States in 1961 and 1962 by Colonel Oleg Penkovskiy, the Soviet missile expert, scientific committee chairman and intelligence officer. After sending us vital military secrets which enabled President Kennedy to stand up to the Russians during the Cuban Missile Crisis, Penkovskiy was caught by the Soviets in November 1962 and executed six months later.

Shevchenko would be a sensational star witness and should be summoned by a Congressional committee. He provides a splendid new reason for the House to hurry up and pass the bill sponsored by Congressmen John Ashbrook (R., O.) and Larry McDonald (D., Ga.) to reactivate the House Internal Security Committee.

Treaty Watchdog Committees

While the rigged trial of Yuri F. Orlov was making a farce of the Helsinki Agreement, elsewhere U.S. negotiators were blithely pursuing still another U.S.-USSR treaty. Yet there is no reason to think that the forthcoming SALT II Treaty will be honored any more than the Helsinki accord.

Yuri F. Orlov is the prominent Soviet physicist who was arrested, kept incommunicado for 15 months, subjected to a staged trial before a clique of government agitators, and then sentenced to seven years in prison plus five years exile in Siberia.

Orlov was convicted of "anti-Soviet agitation." What he did was to organize Helsinki Watchdog Committees in five Soviet cities to monitor and publicize Soviet violations of the human rights provisions of the Agreement signed in Helsinki in August 1975 by 35 nations, including the Soviet Union and the United States.

In the Helsinki Agreement, the Soviets pledged these inspiring words: "The participating states will respect

human rights and fundamental freedoms, including the freedom of thought, conscience, religion or belief, for all without distinction as to race, sex, language or religion."

Orlov's real crime was that he was more successful than anyone else in getting the freedom-loving peoples inside Russia to work together as a coalition. His strong personality brought together such disparate groups as Jews who want to emigrate, Christians who want freedom to worship, Georgians who want to secede, Russians who want to stay and reform the system, and artists and writers who want the freedom to pursue their art or comment on what is happening.

The casual observer of the Orlov case might think that the Soviets were stupid to rig the trial so brazenly, to deny him all semblance of fair procedure, to have the KGB harass Orlov's wife and strip her clothes off, to pack the courtroom with government agents shouting for a harsher sentence, or to have five cars of KGB agents chase journalists bumper-to-bumper through Moscow traffic.

But the Soviets do not fear that such acts will damage them in world opinion, inhibit the cooperation of President Carter, or impede negotiations on SALT II. The State Department promptly announced as much. The gullible American diplomats who did not let the 1968 Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia stand in the way of SALT I will hardly let Orlov's conviction stand in the way of SALT II.

Orlov's arrest and imprisonment, however, will teach an important lesson in police-state discipline to Soviet citizens and reduce dissent to practically nothing. The Orlov lesson for Russians is, keep your mouth shut or get ready to go to Siberia.

But in our still-free America, the Orlov lesson should be different. Standing in front of the same courthouse in Moscow two years ago, Orlov told an American visitor: "If you are not careful, what is happening in there will be happening in your country 20 years from now. ... We are not fighting for ourselves, but to save you. It is too late for us."

In America we have no need for a Helsinki Watchdog Committee because we have the protection of something better than the Helsinki promises. It's called the American Bill of Rights.

But we do have an overriding need for a SALT Watchdog Committee which is independent of the Carter Administration just as outside auditors are independent of company accountants. The purpose of a SALT Watchdog Committee would be to monitor and publicize Soviet violations of SALT I, and to expose the dangers to Americans from the loopholes and the trickery of SALT II.

An American SALT Watchdog Committee would require citizens as brave and determined as Orlov, because its members would incur the bitter enmity of the Carter Administration and others who have a vested interest in the myth of detente and the deceptive treaties it hatches.

Red China's Commencement Pitch

For the first time, Red China has allowed its highest diplomat in the United States, Han Hsu, to make a public speech. The occasion was the graduation ceremonies at Illinois College in Jacksonville, Illinois. Whereas most commencement speakers use their platform to give words of wisdom to eager graduates, Han Hsu used it to demand that the United States abandon Taiwan and allow Red China to take it over.

Han warned ominously that Mainland China won't be friends with America unless we withdraw from Taiwan and allow the Communists to "liberate" Taiwan. "When and how," he said, "is entirely China's internal affair, an internal affair which brooks no foreign interference whatsoever."

After throwing down this gauntlet, Han went on to paint his vision of the future. He predicted that, by the end of the century, China will become a powerful Socialist country with the help of other industrialized nations.

If prizes were given for crass arrogance, Han Hsu would

win in a walk. Here is a guest in our country using a college commencement as a platform (1) to announce the intent to invade a peaceful neighbor, (2) to demand that the U.S. abandon a longtime and faithful ally, and (3) to predict that free, industrialized America will help Red China to become a powerful Socialist country.

Unfortunately, Ambassador Han has some reason to believe that the Carter Administration looks with favor on such policies. At the same time that Han was delivering his ultimatum and predictions, Zbigniew Brzezinski, President Carter's National Security Adviser, was visiting Mainland China with the avowed purpose of warming up a friendship between the two countries.

The timing of Brzezinski's trip was particularly unfortunate. His itinerary took him to Red China the very same weekend that ceremonies were taking place in Taiwan for the inauguration of the new President, Chiang Ching-kuo. Brzezinski made stops in Japan and South Korea on the way to and from Red China, but pointedly bypassed Taiwan.

Reviewing the tone of Ambassador Han's speech, it is probable that the dictators of Mainland China served notice on the Carter Administration that, if any U.S. official dared to make a courtesy stop at Taiwan on the way to Mainland China, then Red China officials wouldn't deign to talk with the Americans about extending aid and trade to the Red Chinese regime.

The whole idea of trying to make friends with Red China on such insulting terms so that they will be gracious enough to accept our aid and trade is one more example of our topsyturvy policies of humiliating our friends in order to toady to our enemies. They make no sense morally or commercially.

Red China was responsible for the deaths of thousands of American servicemen in the Korean and Vietnam wars, and openly threatens further aggression. Taiwan (the Republic of China) has remained faithful to the United States, even during World War II when Japan offered a tempting separate peace under which it would pull its million invaders out of China and use them against the United States.

Commercially, Taiwan is a prosperous cash customer that pays its bills. Its booming economy is highly attractive to U.S. private investments. With 17 million people, Taiwan's foreign trade far exceeds that of Red China with 900 million people. Red China lacks products to sell and lacks cash to buy from us, so any "trade" must be subsidized by American taxpayers.

Proof of the poverty and tyranny on Mainland China is that every year hundreds of young men and women attempt the long, dangerous swim to Hong Kong. Despite hundred-to-one odds of conquering the distance and eluding Red gunners and man-eating sharks, the best and the brightest, those who enjoy the cream of whatever Red China has to offer, jump at the opportunity to escape to freedom.

Human Rights In Cuba

Now that the passions of spring campus demonstrations have subsided, some of the students who spent last semester protesting their universities' investments in corporations doing business in South Africa should look at human rights violations closer to home. The recent testimony of the first American political prisoner released from Cuban jails provides quite a startling picture of a Western Hemisphere Gulag.

Frank Emmick, a 63-year-old American businessman imprisoned in Cuba for 14 years until his release in January, has given an eyewitness account of heroic physical and spiritual endurance in the face of prolonged brutality. Unfortunately, few seem to be interested in his story.

During the 1950s and early 1960s, Emmick engaged in the innocuous business of freezing and exporting frog legs from Cuba to the United States. When this country broke off diplomatic relations with Cuba in 1961, he suspended production. Then his troubles began.

Emmick was harassed and arrested several times and asked what he knew of the coming "invasion." Although he had no knowledge of any invasion, his home was entered at midnight by five Cuban militiamen who beat him savagely and threw him into the ocean for dead. After he survived that ordeal, he was forbidden to leave Cuba.

Two and a half years later, Emmick was thrown into a Cuban dungeon on the trumped-up charge of being the chief of the CIA in Cuba. After months of typical Communist-style interrogations, occasionally witnessed by Russians or Czechs, Emmick was tried in 1964 and sentenced to 30 years in prison.

Emmick's descriptions of life in a Communist prison for political prisoners rival Alexander Solzhenitsyn's in horror and sadism. Emmick was savagely beaten, kept in solitary confinement in a completely darkened refrigerated room, then packed in a dungeon with 650 other prisoners with practically no sanitary facilities and no room to lie down to sleep.

"Prisoners were jammed like sardines, forced to sleep on an old, poorly cemented floor full of earthen pot holes, rats, vermin, etc., with little ventilation and where the sun, moon, and stars could never be seen," Emmick said. "Captives fought for a measly inch of space to rest our bodies."

Emmick said that there were about 5,000 prisoners in that compound. All those who left went straight to the firing squad. There were 20 to 25 executions a week and as many as 27 in one night. "Among us there were no common prisoners, only political prisoners -- men in all walks of life from peasants to priests whose only crime was their revulsion of Communism."

In addition to everything else, Emmick suffered two heart attacks during his imprisonment, and at one point a guard bayoneted him in the side simply because he was the only American prisoner in the fortress. He credits his survival to his faith and to the courage of his convictions.

Emmick was released this year, he said, because "I think (Castro) probably didn't want me to die on his hands."

How many political prisoners are suffering like this in Communist Cuba? Emmick estimates that ten years ago there were 100,000, and that at the present time the figure is about 40,000 political prisoners.

Castro's barbaric treatment of an innocent U.S. citizen is a worthy focus for the energies of American student protestors, and also of the Carter Administration's campaign for human rights. Emmick says that at least four other American political prisoners remain in Cuba in circumstances similar to his own.

Will campus agitators and Carter Administration orators call for human rights in Cuba? Or will they continue their practice of selective moral accusation?

The Tragedy Of Cambodia

After a recent speech I made in San Francisco, an angry man accosted me and said, "I hold you responsible, as a member of the media, for the blackout of news about the tragedy of Cambodia." I protested that I had written several columns on the bloodbath following the Khmer Rouge takeover, but he was not mollified. "The silence of the press on this subject is the most outrageous and immoral double standard of our time," he added.

While not all the media are equally to blame for giving Cambodia the silent treatment, mea culpas are called for from most of us. Few examples in all history can match the systematic, sadistic murder of more than 1 million out of Cambodia's 7 million inhabitants. The whole idea of talking about "human rights" in South Africa, Rhodesia, or Chile approaches the ridiculous when discussed by anyone who is silent about Cambodia.

Some spokesmen are naturally downplaying the Cambodian bloodbath because of their reluctance to be reminded of

their own erroneous predictions. When the fate of Cambodia hung in the balance in 1975, liberal columnists cried out: "The present Cambodian government is corrupt. It doesn't really matter if the Communists take over. Cut off U.S. aid and that will stop the killing."

Joseph Kraft wrote, "Does it really matter whether Cambodia goes Communist? Not very much." Tom Wicker in *The New York Times* wrote that "there is not much moral choice" between the Cambodian government and the Khmer Rouge Communists. Bella Abzug said we should "let the Cambodians find their own political solution."

Senator George McGovern predicted that the Cambodian people would be "better off" working out their problems in their own way. Senator Mike Mansfield said it was in the "best interests" of Cambodians to stop American aid. Senator Alan Cranston warned that more U.S. aid would "only prolong the agony of Cambodia."

After U.S. aid stopped, the agony really moved into high gear. The Khmer Rouge first followed the favorite Communist tactic of murdering the leadership class: the entire army officer corps and their families, most of the administrative officials of the former Cambodian government and their families, the teachers, the Buddhist and Moslem priesthood, and almost anyone with an education.

But the Khmer Rouge murdered the proletariat, too. They emptied the cities and forced the people, no matter how feeble or ill, to march out to the countryside. Hundreds of thousands perished on the way. The Khmer Rouge brigade was a human "neutron bomb": it killed the people while leaving the buildings intact.

The head of the Khmer Rouge, Pol Pot, revealed in a 1977 speech that his patron and mentor was Mao Tse-tung. He said his army had the "wholehearted, unconditional and all-around support and assistance of Chairman Mao Tse-tung, Comrade Chou En-lai, the Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party, the Chinese government, and the (Chinese) people, who are our comrades-in-arms."

Hua Kuo-feng, the present Chinese Communist Party chairman, later confirmed Chinese aid to the Khmer Rouge: "Our two parties, two countries, and two peoples have forged a profound revolutionary friendship and militant unity in their protracted struggles. This friendship and this unity are based on Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism."

So the Khmer Rouge, brutal, illiterate peasants that they are, did not perpetrate one of the most horrible mass murders in history simply to release nihilistic urges. Nor did they do it alone. Using Communist revolutionary ideology and the material assistance of their Red Chinese friends, they have provided a classic example of what total Communist control means.

Phyllis Schlafly is the co-author of five books on defense and foreign policy: *Kissinger on the Couch* (1975) and *Ambush at Vladivostok* (1976) covering the Kissinger years, and *The Gravediggers* (1964), *Strike From Space* (1965), and *The Betrayers* (1968) covering the McNamara years. Her first book, *A Choice Not An Echo* (1964), sold three million copies without a single advertisement. Her other books are *Safe Not Sorry* (1967), *Mindszenty the Man* (1972), and *The Power of the Positive Woman* (1977).

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.