



# The Phyllis Schlafly Report

VOL. 19, NO. 10, SECTION 1

BOX 618, ALTON, ILLINOIS 62002

MAY, 1986

## Who Shapes U.S. Foreign Policy?

### Rambo and That "Other War"

When the Soviets called a news conference in Moscow to denounce some American movies, I figured I should find out for myself what caused the Russians' petulant paranoia. Then, I discovered that U.S. movie critics were equally scathing in their denunciations of those same movies.

The Soviets coined a new word, "warnography," to describe what they called the movies' "anti-Soviet hysteria." The U.S. critics must have thumbed their thesauruses to come up with every adjective of contempt from "boring" to "stupid."

But the customers are rushing to see them, and the movie entrepreneur who has so mightily offended those critics with easy access to the media must be laughing all the way to the bank. "Rambo" sold 425,605 \$80 video cassettes the day it went on the market.

The target of this new hate/love phenomenon is Sylvester Stallone, whose three movies, "First Blood," "Rambo: First Blood Part II," and "Rocky IV," are record-smashing successes. Since the plot is that the hero, Rambo or Rocky, defeats the Russians, the Soviets and the liberals are as upset as they are about Ronald Reagan's "Star Wars."

The critics tried to tell us that the "good" movies about Communists were "Reds," which glamorized the Communist John Reed (honored by the Russians by burial in Moscow), and "Daniel," an attempt to rehabilitate the reputations of Julius and Ethel Rosenberg (who were executed as spies for the U.S.S.R.). But both were box-office turkeys.

Rambo expresses the collective outrage of Americans that we let a two-bit, backward country in Southeast Asia defeat us. Rambo speaks even fewer lines in his movies than Gary Cooper did in his, but when Rambo was asked to go back to Vietnam, he said it all in one memorable line, "Sir, do we get to win this time?"

Rambo expresses the collective outrage of the American people at the way our nation has allowed our POWs and MIAs to languish for 15 years more or less, caged up like animals, tortured by sadistic captors.

Rambo expresses the collective outrage of our

Vietnam veterans at the way they were treated by the liberals, by the media, and by brainwashed U.S. citizens who spit on them and called them "baby-killers" when they returned home from a tour of duty they did not seek, but accepted only because their country ordered them to go. Rambo blurts out what the Vietnam veteran wants -- "for our country to love us as much as we love it."

The media and the liberals bitterly blasted Ronald Reagan a few years ago for daring to say that our Vietnam veterans were "noble." But Rambo has turned the tide. What has devastated the liberals is not just that Rambo proves that Vietnam veterans are noble, but that audiences are enthusiastically cheering Rambo as he kills the vicious Russians and rescues our POWs still concealed in Vietnam.

Not only men respond enthusiastically to Stallone's irrepressible machismo. Sociologists might think that a Stallone movie is a "man's" movie, but the girls are also shouting "go Rambo" and "go Rocky." Despite a decade of women's lib propaganda that women prefer "sensitive, Phil Donahue-type" men, Rambo/Rocky is an authentic hero to women, too.

All the movies the Soviets are upset about are not blood and guts. "White Nights," with great dancing by Baryshnikov and Gregory Hines, shows the Soviet suppression of freedom of artistic expression. It also shows how the favored few in the U.S.S.R. live the life of the wealthy, while the rest of the people exist like peons.

Rambo is not fighting only the Communists. In "First Blood," Rambo understood only that "somebody wouldn't let us win." When he returned to Vietnam to rescue POWs in "Rambo: First Blood Part II," he discovered that there is "another war going on."

Indeed there is. It was that "other" enemy in the media and the Administrations in power during the Vietnam War which dealt our country a humiliating defeat, and then savaged the valiant men who answered the call to "duty, honor, country" but had no part in the policy decisions.

The movies show that Rambo probably could have beaten the Communists in Vietnam all by himself. But it's too late for that, now.

What has the Soviets and the liberals in paranoid panic is that Rambo/Rocky's fantastic success may win that "other war." Helped by the technology of VCRs in 27 million American homes, Rambo/Rocky is teaching Americans that, when it comes to dealing with evil men, there is no substitute for victory.

### **Our Problem State Department**

When U.S. Ambassador to France Evan Galbraith ended his tour of duty in Paris in 1985, the French Foreign Ministry publicly protested what it called the "unacceptable character" of his outspoken comments.

Galbraith had stirred the ire of the Socialist Mitterrand by criticizing the Communist Party officials he had in his government. Galbraith said America found it easier to deal with the French *after* the Communist officials left the government.

Galbraith made some other controversial comments which are even more important to Americans. He called for major reforms in the U.S. Foreign Service, including the appointment of Reagan supporters to all major U.S. embassies and senior positions in the State Department. He said this is necessary to correct the Foreign Service's built-in "liberal Democrat" bias.

It is refreshing that a senior U.S. diplomat has finally spoken out about one of the scandals of the U.S. Government: the fact that the State Department functions as a law unto itself and ignores American election results. Galbraith said bluntly, "The facts are that most of the people in the Foreign Service vote Democrat."

Ronald Reagan was reelected President in the biggest landslide in modern times. The American people gave him a mandate to carry out his policies, domestic and foreign. That mandate cannot be carried out by people who voted for Walter Mondale. That's the crux of the problem with the State Department.

Policies are really made by the thousands of middle-echelon bureaucrats who give advice, determine what information is sent to their superiors, draft the "working" papers, prepare the "options," "interpret" the regulations, and summarize the "intelligence." The Federal bureaucrats in the State Department and the Foreign Service have the arrogant attitude that Reagan is just an interlude to be endured.

Democratic Administrations never permitted Civil Service or Foreign Service to impede their political objectives. Presidents Roosevelt, Truman, Kennedy and Johnson ruthlessly got rid of Republican holdovers -- Civil Service to the contrary notwithstanding -- and used every possible tactic to put liberal Democrats on the payroll and keep them there.

President Franklin Roosevelt used "emergency" powers to fire hundreds of civil service employees, put a freeze on all new hirings, and then hired new workers through the employment office of the Democratic National Committee. When President Harry Truman wanted to load his friends in the Pendergast machine onto the Federal payroll, he just closed some Federal offices and reopened them in Kansas City.

President John F. Kennedy abolished the entire Federal agency then dispensing foreign aid, thus elimi-

nating the Eisenhower appointees. Kennedy then created a new foreign aid agency under a new name, and hired a new staff of all Kennedy supporters.

Dwight Eisenhower was elected President on the 1952 Republican Party Platform pledge that "We shall eliminate from the State Department and from every Federal office, all, wherever they may be found, who share responsibility for the needless predicaments and perils in which we find ourselves." Unfortunately, that promise was never kept.

Only a handful of top jobs were changed; the State Department which had lost China and announced that South Korea was outside the U.S. "defense perimeter," remained virtually intact. The few Republicans who did receive high appointments were told they could not even hire a secretary of their own choosing, but had to continue with Truman Administration holdovers.

Fidel Castro was the bitter harvest of this failure to clean out the State Department. U.S. Ambassador Earl E. T. Smith sent back accurate reports that Castro was a Communist, but they came into the hands of a Truman holdover named William Wieland who pigeon-holed them and never passed them up to his superiors.

The Nixon and Ford Administrations did nothing to rock the boat of Kennedy-Johnson holdovers in the State Department. The Nixon-Ford foreign policy was managed by Henry Kissinger anyway, whose policies were indistinguishable from the Johnson Administration's.

In calling for President Reagan to appoint "his own men" to all major overseas embassies and to key positions in the State Department, Ambassador Galbraith has challenged the entrenched elite of the State Department's Imperial Bureaucracy. He has called for the State Department to follow U.S. election returns -- a reasonable request in a democracy.

### **The Foreign Policy Gap**

Who is the keeper of the flame? Who can enunciate, interpret and implement U.S. foreign policy? Under the U.S. Constitution, the President has this responsibility and it's clear where Ronald Reagan stands. His heart is with the freedom fighters everywhere in the world. He has consistently said that we have a moral obligation to support anti-Communist resistance movements fighting for freedom.

But the State Department doesn't seem to get the message. There is a yawning gap between rhetoric and reality. Of the eight pro-Western, anti-Communist resistance movements now operating inside Communist countries with a chance to win, State is supporting only the one in Nicaragua, and even that is reluctant.

Take Afghanistan. The State Department opposed U.S. aid to the freedom fighters and continues the Most Favored Nation trade status for the Soviet-installed regime there. Although Congress voted for humanitarian aid, State engages in footdragging to avoid releasing the money.

Take Angola. Congress has shown bipartisan support for aid to the anti-Communist forces called UNI-

TA, and repealed the Clark Amendment which previously forbade it. However, Secretary of State Shultz wrote a "for your eyes only" letter to House Republican Minority Leader Robert Michel opposing aid to UNITA.

Take Mozambique. The State Department is asking Congress to appropriate \$27 million to prop up the shaky Soviet-installed regime of Mozambique which has deliberately evacuated and starved thousands of its own people. State encourages U.S. corporations to invest in Mozambique, as well as in Angola.

Take Nicaragua, Reagan's most important foreign policy issue. The State Department is conspicuously unenthusiastic about the military aid that Reagan wants to send, insisting that U.S. policy is purely "diplomatic." State sides with the Communists in excluding the freedom fighters from negotiations about Nicaragua.

Take Eastern Europe. The State Department has given Most Favored Nation trading status to Hungary and Romania under the fiction that they are more "independent" of Moscow than Poland, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, and East Germany. State opposes enforcing the Tariff Act of 1930 which prohibits importing goods produced by slave labor.

The State Department supports the subsidizing of bank loans to the Warsaw Pact countries through the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the World Bank. State encouraged huge new commercial bank loans to East Germany which, in turn, loaned millions to the Sandinistas in Nicaragua. State advocates the admission of Poland to the IMF.

Take the United Nations. The State Department opposes reducing the number of Soviet bloc personnel at the UN in New York and limiting their movements, despite overwhelming evidence that espionage is their principal mission.

Take the Soviet Union. The State Department sends a letter each year on November 7, the anniversary of the Bolshevik Revolution, congratulating the Soviet people. We don't hear a peep out of the State Department on Captive Nations Day, when American law requires our President to proclaim our hope that the countries under Communism may one day achieve freedom.

The disgraceful return to the U.S.S.R. of the Ukrainian sailor, Miroslav Medvid, who twice jumped ship when it was docked in New Orleans, was, unfortunately, a typical example of the State Department's continuing accommodation of the Soviets.

### **Bay of Pigs Anniversary**

The month of April should have been the occasion for a torrent of television, newspaper and magazine commemorations of the 25th anniversary of the Bay of Pigs. But somehow, the media didn't find this occasion newsworthy.

For a demonstration of how the media commemorate an anniversary when they want to teach us a lesson, just recall the weeks of editorials, analysis articles, and TV newscasts, specials, and docudramas dramatizing the last anniversary of the Hiroshima bomb.

The Bay of Pigs has very important lessons for all Americans. In April 1961, a brave band of 1,400 Cuban Freedom Fighters -- encouraged, financed and armed by the United States, and promised the sea and air support essential to their success -- landed on Cuban beaches at the Bay of Pigs.

Fidel Castro apparently had advance warning of the invasion and quickly closed in on the brave men. Without the promised American air and sea backup, nearly all the Freedom Fighters were killed or captured.

One person who did not forget the significance of this event was former-Ambassador now-Professor Jeane Kirkpatrick. She lectured during April on what the world would have been like if the Bay of Pigs had succeeded instead of failed.

Pre-Castro Cuba had the highest per capita income and one of the best constitutions in Latin America. Life in Castro's Cuba today is very different; it is marked by political repression, economic privation, and a denial of human rights.

Castro closed Catholic and private schools, co-opted the unions, expropriated private property, replaced the courts with block committees for surveillance and revolutionary tribunals, and abolished the free press. No wonder one out of nine Cubans fled their homeland.

The failure of the Bay of Pigs was not only a human rights and economic disaster for Cuba. It was and is a clear and present danger to U.S. security. The price we have paid in increased defense is truly so monumental that it dwarfs into insignificance any cost we might have paid to have assured the success of those Cuban Freedom Fighters.

Within months after the Bay of Pigs debacle, Nikita Khrushchev started his plans to install offensive nuclear missiles in Cuba. That led to the nuclear face-off between the United States and the U.S.S.R. in October 1962, the closest our nation ever came to annihilation.

The militarization of Cuba and its exporting of revolution have been dramatic. Two-thirds of the Communist troops in the Third World are Cuban. They are stationed in Angola, Mozambique, Ethiopia, Algeria, the Congo, Ghana, Iraq, South Yemen, Mali, Syria, Libya, Nicaragua, and several other countries. Of course, Cubans WERE in Grenada.

Five times as many Cuban troops are in Africa today as were in the entire pre-Castro Cuban army. If the Bay of Pigs invasion had succeeded, those Cuban men would today be working at civilian jobs in Cuba, living with their families.

Castro's Cuba trains and supports guerrillas and terrorists all over Latin America and the Third World. Some 20,000 students have graduated from Castro's training camps and provided the leadership for the Communist forces in Nicaragua and El Salvador.

The costs of failing to help the Cuban Freedom Fighters in 1961 have been tremendous. They range all the way from the cost of facing down the Cuban

Missile Crisis of 1962, to the bloodshed all over Latin America during the last decade, to the costs of protecting our shipping coming through the Caribbean sea lanes and of protecting our space and military communications systems from being monitored by KGB agents stationed in Cuba.

Will we learn the lesson of the Bay of Pigs? Or, will we be like those who, failing to learn the lessons of history, are doomed to repeat its mistakes? Mrs. Kirkpatrick has been warning in her speeches that "power is cumulative." We simply cannot afford a second Communist regime in the Western Hemisphere.

The fate of the Freedom Fighters in Nicaragua, known as the Contras, is hanging in the balance. They are risking their lives, fortunes, families, and sacred honor for the cause of freedom against Communist control of their native country.

The Contras cannot win without U.S. aid. If we turn a deaf ear to their call, and thereby allow a second Communist regime in Central America to consolidate its armed power, every man, woman and child in the United States will pay a horrendous price.

### Changes At The Kremlin?

Since Mikhail Gorbachev became "first among equals" in Communist Russia, the news media have bombarded us with interviews and analyses speculating on how different he is from his predecessors and what changes in Soviet policies we might expect.

The best comment was written many years ago by a former U.S. Secretary of Defense and former Congressman, Melvin Laird, in his book *A House Divided*. He bluntly explained the facts of life in dealing with the Soviets: "Communism cannot change; and to believe in the possibility of change is a madness almost as far from the true ordering of reason as the ideology itself. Communism, while it exists, must remain what it is."

Laird's choice of the term "madness" was not a piece of hyperbole. Laird was a soft-spoken man who had 15 years of practical experience on the House Defense Appropriations Subcommittee, with wide access to classified as well as unclassified information on Communist strategy, tactics and objectives.

Laird is only one of hundreds of experts who have concluded that Communism cannot change and still remain Communism. Among those who believed this are all the dictators of the U.S.S.R.: Lenin, Stalin, Khrushchev, Brezhnev, Andropov, Chernenko, Gorbachev and the Politburo's long line of chief theoreticians.

Khrushchev probably put it most authoritatively in the fewest words in a speech to the Academy of Social Sciences and the Institute of Marxism-Leninism: "The Communist party of the Soviet Union has been, is, and ever will be loyal to the doctrine of Marxism-Leninism, to proletarian internationalism and friendship among the peoples. It will always fight for world peace, for the victory of Communism, as the great Lenin taught us."

This Khrushchev quotation is from the speech

which President John F. Kennedy characterized as a "Red blueprint for eventual world domination."

Laird's book explained why Communism cannot change. "The hard fact is that Communism will always remain true to its core because it has no choice. If the basic tenets of Communism were altered or even modified, the whole Communist Empire would collapse.

"Remove any part of this foundation and chaos would result. ...Without the dialectic of historical necessity promising the inevitability of Communist victory, the heart would go out of the overburdened peoples; the thirst for human rights would become unquenchable. Without the ruthless doctrine of ends and means, the Communist rulers could not pursue the strategy which brings them victories. Without the maintenance of atheism, they could not enforce the sacrifices which maintain their own power in the deified state."

Not only do all Communist leaders and theoreticians agree with Melvin Laird that Communism cannot change, but so do all objective and knowledgeable Western authorities who apply realistic analysis to the Communist system. It was most pointedly summed up by Robert Strausz-Hupe, William R. Kintner, and Stefan T. Possony in their classic book *A Forward Strategy for America*: "The goals of the enemy are as fixed as his methods are flexible."

Even most of the Soviet personnel are the same as they were when the Laird and Strausz-Hupe books were published in 1962 and 1961, respectively. In October 1962, Foreign Minister Andrei Gromyko and Ambassador Anatoly Dobrynin sat in President John F. Kennedy's office and told him the lie that the Soviets had no strategic nuclear missiles in Cuba. Kennedy had the U-2 photographs of the Soviet missiles in his desk drawer while they were talking.

On the afternoon Gerald Ford took office as President in 1974, he greeted diplomats from some 57 countries. He was quoted as marveling about the then-12-year ambassadorship of Dobrynin in Washington. "He seems to go on and on," Ford said.

Dobrynin was still in Washington when Jimmy Carter became President, and also when Ronald Reagan became President. Only in 1986 did Dobrynin leave his Ambassador's post in America and return to Moscow to join that other old Communist war-horse, Gromyko, where they will continue to direct Soviet policy toward the United States.

Yes, it is madness to believe that the Communists can change -- a madness as irrational as the Communist ideology itself. Communist goals and doctrine are the same as they have always been.

### The Phyllis Schlafly Report

Box 618, Alton, Illinois 62002  
ISSN0556-0152

Published monthly by The Eagle Trust Fund, Box 618, Alton, Illinois 62002.

Second Class Postage Paid at Alton, Illinois.

Subscription Price: \$10 per year. Extra copies available: 50 cents each; 4 copies \$1; 30 copies \$5; 100 copies \$10.