



# The Phyllis Schlafly Report

VOL. 22, NO. 3, SECTION 1

BOX 618, ALTON, ILLINOIS 62002

OCTOBER, 1988

## Liberals Make Americans Uncomfortable

A couple of days before the 1964 presidential election, a full-page advertisement appeared in metropolitan newspapers paid for by the then well-known New York night club owner, Billy Rose. The big headline read, "I'm comfortable with LBJ," and the text played on the theme that Rose felt America would be in safe hands with Lyndon Johnson, but was scared of what candidate Barry Goldwater might do.

Rose encapsulated what millions of voters apparently thought. Most Americans want to feel "comfortable" about their President. They do feel "comfortable" with Ronald Reagan and that projection was a major reason why he won his television debates against Jimmy Carter.

The more we see of George Bush on the evening news, the more comfortable we feel about entrusting the Presidency to him. There are no surprises in his background; his life has been an open book for years, and his wife and five children are tremendous political assets.

The more we see of Michael Dukakis on television, the more his image, his voice, and his arrogant manner grate on us like a fingernail on a blackboard. More important, as the details of his record as Governor of Massachusetts become nationally known, Americans are feeling more and more uncomfortable about entrusting the Presidency to the man who calls himself "a liberal Democrat" and "a card-carrying member" of the American Civil Liberties Union.

Until the Duke came into our national consciousness, many Americans had never taken a hard look at what a doctrinaire liberal really stands for. Other Democrats have usually been able to muffle their liberalism with warm fuzzies.

In that cloistered little world of liberal elitism in Massachusetts, Dukakis apparently never felt any need to fussy up his liberalism. He didn't seem to realize that what plays in the Kennedy environs simply doesn't play in Peoria.

As a typical liberal, Dukakis is soft on criminals at the expense of law-abiding citizens and victims. He opposes the death penalty for anyone, including cop killers and drug kingpins. Worse still, he was the leading advocate of Massachusetts' unique system of giving unsupervised weekend passes to convicted murderers who had been sentenced to life-without-parole. The liberal mindset is that every criminal can be rehabilitated, that all convicted criminals should eventually be released from prison, and that their innocent

victims are simply acceptable losses in a liberal social program to benefit criminals. (The true story of this incredible Dukakis furlough program — and its victims — is documented in Robert James Bidinotto's article entitled "Getting Away With Murder" in the July 1988 *Reader's Digest* and in the video entitled "Justice on Furlough," available for \$21.95 from Fairmount Productions, Box 495, Alton, IL 62002, (618) 465-1166 or 462-8314.)

Governor Dukakis's veto of a law that would have required public school teachers to lead the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag every morning was the action of a typical liberal who shrinks from flag-waving symbolism. He liked the law even less after it was overwhelmingly passed over his veto, and he never enforced it.

Whereas George Bush's "read my lips" is a reliable campaign promise, Dukakis is a liberal who believes in being liberal with other people's money, and believes that the elite are more competent to spend our money than we are. Dukakis fought the Massachusetts tax cut called Proposition 2-1/2 and he raised taxes repeatedly.

Dukakis is the most vociferous pro-abortion and pro-abortion-funding candidate ever to run for the Presidency. As a Massachusetts state legislator, he introduced a bill (at the request of radical pro-abortion agitator Bill Baird) to legalize abortion in 1970, even before *Roe v. Wade*. As Governor, he vetoed a bill in 1977 that would have cut off state funding of abortions.

Dukakis's own campaign position paper documents his endorsement of so-called "gay rights laws" at both the state and federal level. "I will fight for federal legislation," he says, "to add a prohibition against discrimination based on sexual orientation to the existing protections of the 1964 Civil Rights Act."

Other bills introduced by Dukakis at the behest of Bill Baird included a bill "to repeal the law punishing blasphemy," a bill "to repeal the law prohibiting the crime against nature," a bill "to repeal the laws punishing unnatural and lascivious acts with another person," and a bill "to repeal the law prohibiting fornication."

Although Dukakis proudly asserted at the Democratic Convention that this election isn't about ideology, it's about competence, the polls show that the American public think George Bush is more competent. But this election is really

about which candidate the American people feel more "comfortable" with, and an increasing number of voters feel downright uncomfortable with Dukakis because he is a synthesis of Walter Mondale on taxes, Ted Kennedy on crime, Tip O'Neill on spending, Geraldine Ferraro on abortion, and George McGovern on foreign policy. How can Americans possibly feel comfortable with a liberal who believes in releasing murderers who have been sentenced to life-without-parole?

### **Fact and Fiction About the Pledge**

The Pledge of Allegiance is the surprise issue of the 1988 presidential campaign. But more noteworthy even than the intensity of the extravagant rhetoric is the persistent falsification of the facts by liberals circling the wagons to defend Michael Dukakis.

National news media, including the CBS-TV Evening News, have stated repeatedly that the now-controversial Massachusetts law *required students* to pledge allegiance to the flag, and they assert that this would be unconstitutional under a 1943 U.S. Supreme Court decision. That is simply not true.

What happened was that in 1977 the Massachusetts legislature passed a one-sentence amendment stating: "Each teacher at the commencement of the first class of each day in all grades in all public schools shall lead the class in a group recitation of the 'Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag.' "

That's all. The Massachusetts bill did not require the students to do anything at all, and it did not impose any penalties on anyone.

Expressing his displeasure with this bill, Governor Michael Dukakis solicited an advisory opinion from the Massachusetts Supreme Court. Five of the judges (three of whom had been appointed by Dukakis) wrote that the bill was unconstitutional, but they admitted that the U.S. Supreme Court has never ruled on this issue. The other two judges wrote that the Massachusetts law meets every constitutional standard.

Dukakis then vetoed the bill. The Massachusetts legislature responded by overriding his veto by overwhelming margins: 201 to 27 in the House and 24 to 7 in the Senate. Following the House override, the legislators rose and sang God Bless America.

This 1977 law is still on the books. Dukakis never enforced it, and it has never been challenged.

Dukakis and his liberal friends, both in his campaign and in the media, are now crying around that criticisms of his actions are "negative campaigning," "McCarthyism," "garbage," and "attacking my patriotism." Dukakis doth protest too much, methinks. A candidate's official actions in public office are *the* most pertinent matters to discuss in any campaign. George Bush didn't question Dukakis's patriotism or motives. With precise accuracy, Bush just pointed to the record and questioned Dukakis's judgment in taking a specific action as Governor of Massachusetts.

Dukakis, however, did make a dishonorable attack on George Bush by accusing him of being "not fit" to be President because he would have signed an "unconstitutional" bill. *That* is an example of "negative" campaigning and rhetorical "garbage."

The Massachusetts law is *not* unconstitutional, and five state judges giving an advisory opinion cannot make it so. That's only their opinion and, fortunately, neither candidate Bush nor President Bush need accept their gratuitous advice.

The U.S. Supreme Court case cited by Dukakis's friends, the 1943 case of *West Virginia v. Barnette*, held that it was unconstitutional to compel a Jehovah's Witness child to salute the flag under penalty of expulsion from the public schools followed by prosecution for truancy. The Massachusetts law is very different; it merely requires *teachers to lead* the Pledge of Allegiance, but does not impose any penalties and does not require students to do anything.

That is a constitutional difference. The teachers are taxpayer-paid employees, and the state has the right to impose conditions of employment on them.

The U.S. Supreme Court doesn't give "advisory opinions" and it is always hazardous to predict what the Court will do when confronted with a new fact situation. But there is ample reason to believe that the high Court would uphold the Massachusetts law if it had the chance.

In a 1979 case, the U.S. Supreme Court upheld a New York law forbidding the employment of teachers who are eligible for citizenship but refuse to seek naturalization. In 1964, the high Court refused to review a 1957 New York court decision that it is constitutional to require teachers to lead the pledge so long as there is no penalty for students who refuse to recite it.

Dukakis voluntarily chose to veto the 1977 Pledge of Allegiance bill, and now he is hiding behind judicial robes that have no force of law and whose advice he didn't have to solicit or take. Once the law was passed over his veto, he had the obligation to enforce it, which he did not do.

### **The Radical Antics of the ACLU**

When presidential candidate Michael Dukakis labelled himself a "card-carrying member of the ACLU," he performed a long-overdue and stunningly significant service to the American people. With that one comment, he thrust onto newspaper front pages and TV network screens the name and ideology of a powerful, wealthy, influential organization that has operated for decades in the shadows of our government.

We are grateful to Dukakis for bringing the American Civil Liberties Union into the limelight so we can look at its leftwing policies and its tactics of implementing them by litigating some 6,000 cases a year. They are radical elitists who work to change laws and public policies outside of the democratic legislative process.

The ACLU is the foremost defender of child pornography, which is defined as pictures and materials showing or describing sex acts involving children. The ACLU uses its

legal expertise to try to cloak the peddlers of child pornography in the First Amendment, while exposing the private parts of child victims to every obscenity devised by sadistic criminals.

It's no wonder that donations to finance such litigation come easily from profit-making porn peddlers such as *Playboy*. The smut industry can afford to hire expensive lawyers.

The ACLU tries to cut itself a piece of righteous turf to stand on by sanctimoniously saying that it only defends the publication and sale of child pornography but does not defend the direct personal abuse of children. Don't believe it. The ACLU's Connecticut chapter is on record as having opposed efforts to cure child molesters of their evil practices.

The maximum security prison at Somers, Connecticut in 1974 developed a program in which pictures of naked children from pornographic magazines were shown to convicted child molesters at the same time that they received a very low intensity shock from electrodes strapped onto their thighs.

The program was voluntary, and the prisoners admitted that the shocks didn't hurt. In spite of the low intensity, the shocks produced enough unpleasantness to give the pedophiles an aversion to naked children. According to the psychologist who administered this treatment, the shock "knocks the hell out of their sexual fantasies." In other words, the treatment cured their addiction.

After 12 weeks of this quick and inexpensive therapy, 9 out of 15 offenders were paroled. In a follow-up 11 months later, none of those treated had been rearrested for any crime, though all had previously been repeat offenders. This was a remarkable record for child-molesters, a type of criminal very difficult to reform.

The ACLU, however, called the Somers program a form of government thought-control, went on record opposing it, and then successfully sued the Connecticut Correctional Institution to stop its use of electric shock to reform sex criminals. (This is described in the book *Behavior Mod and the Managed Society* by R. L. Geiser, Beacon Press, 1976, pages 48-50.)

The ACLU is the litigating vehicle of the liberals who are soft on criminals and heartless about victims. The ACLU opposes prison terms for all but "the most serious offenses, such as murder and treason."

The ACLU even wants prisoners, regardless of their offense, to enjoy the right to vote. It's no coincidence that Massachusetts is one of the few states where prisoners have been given the right to vote.

The ACLU policies call for decriminalizing all deviant sexual behavior. The ACLU wants to legalize male and female prostitution and remove all state regulation so that prostitutes can move in on any neighborhood.

ACLU policies call for granting marriage licenses to homosexuals along with the same privileges that traditionally accrue to husbands and wives. Those privileges include joint

income tax returns, spousal medical and retirement benefits, child custody and adoption rights, and participation in the Big Brother and foster parents programs.

The ACLU is now in court trying to deny tax-exemption to the Catholic Church because of its opposition to abortion. At the same time, the ACLU supports the right of children to have abortions without the knowledge or consent of their parents.

The ACLU wants all drugs legalized, no matter how exotic or damaging. It even wants to deny public school officials the right to search student lockers for drugs.

Since Michael Dukakis cannot deny the radical record of the ACLU, his response is to get Burt Lancaster to make TV spots saying that he, too, is "a card-carrying member of the ACLU." That won't help Dukakis; it will just keep the spotlight on the ACLU.

### The 50th Anniversary of Munich

"Peace for our time" was the promise made by British Prime Minister Neville Chamberlain when he signed the Munich Agreement with Hitler on September 30, 1938. On that fateful day 50 years ago, the West agreed to give Hitler one-fifth of Czechoslovakia in return for his signature on a piece of paper and his statement that this was "the last territorial claim I have to make in Europe."

Eleven months later, Nazi troops invaded Poland and World War II had begun. The lesson of Munich is that peace cannot be bought with treaties, appeasement, weakness, or a renunciation of violence.

Each act of Western appeasement during the 1930s tended to convince Hitler that the West would not fight. As it turned out, that was a false conclusion; but it took 50 million deaths to prove that it was false.

The Munich peace-at-any-price syndrome rested on the notion that civilized mores could be maintained so long as military violence was avoided. If the aggressor grabbed his booty in a bloodless maneuver, then Western sensibilities would not be disturbed.

However, letting it be known that a great nation shrinks from any use of force leads to dangerous miscalculations by the enemy. Hitler was encouraged, indeed led, to believe that Western Europe would wash its hands of the fate of Central Europe and that America would not become involved.

Munich was very popular with the liberals when it happened. The Gallup Poll reported 59 percent approval. President Franklin Roosevelt cabled his congratulations. Walter Lippmann, that oracle of establishment rectitude, praised it. Gertrude Stein said Hitler should be given the Nobel Peace Prize.

After the awesomeness of World War II sunk into the American consciousness, "Munich" became a word-symbol as "bad" as "Pearl Harbor." Munich became synonymous with appeasement of an international criminal, retreat from reality, and a spinelessness that was definitely un-American.

Unfortunately, most current history textbooks don't

bother to teach the historical lessons of Munich. If today's young people do not learn the lesson of Munich, they may be doomed to repeat its mistakes.

The military defense of a nation is the basic ingredient of its commercial prosperity. The road to peace has never been through unilateral disarmament, appeasement, or negotiation from weakness, but is instead through military strength and a national will to survive in freedom and independence.

In the twilight of the Reagan Administration, we appear to be entering a period when our relations with the Soviets are circumscribed by treaties, trade, and television. Our national honor and our national security demand that we elect a President who will focus on the power and the potential of the Soviets' military arsenal rather than on their paper promises of peace and purchases. Our national survival depends on having a President who believes America must continue to be free, independent, and defended against all enemies, regardless of cost.

### Same Day Voter Registration Invites Fraud

One of the unrealistic notions that have surfaced in this volatile election year is Senator Alan Cranston's proposal for same-day voter registration. It would make our elections a farce because they would be dominated by illegal votes cast by unidentified persons instructed how to vote by political bosses.

Under same-day voter registration, political bosses would gather up uninformed, apathetic persons who would not otherwise bother to vote, instruct them how to vote, and bus them to Polling Place A, where they would vote after merely showing their driver's licenses. The bus would then take them to Polling Place B where, after being provided with phony identification, they would all vote again.

Such systematic cheating could be repeated again and again, so long as phony identification could be provided. The occasional election frauds we have had in the past would be replaced by massive cheating. Every close election would leave the victor with the stigma of having won a corrupt election and would severely erode faith in the democratic process.

Same-day voter registration would be as unfair to citizens who cast an honest vote as if banks were to cash checks by unidentified persons who showed up at a teller's window and asked for "same-day new-account cash."

A decent respect for keeping the bank solvent, and also for protecting other depositors, demands that no one can cash a check until he is positively identified and verification made that money exists in the account on which the check is drawn. A decent respect for having honest elections and being fair to other voters demands that no one can vote except those who are properly identified and entitled to vote, and that no one "robs the bank" by voting twice.

Such identification is impossible if same-day registration is allowed. As a practical matter, officials in the polling places would be compelled to hand a ballot to any unknown and

unidentified person who shows up with a piece of paper in his hand.

There would be no way whatsoever to identify the person or to verify the piece of paper. There would be no way to prevent fraudulent votes from being cast and counted.

Same-day voter registration not only invites fraud but would make it virtually impossible to catch anyone at it. There is nothing democratic about making it easy for dishonest people to vote two or three times in different polling places, thereby reducing the value of the vote of honest people.

Doing away with the one-month interval between the close of registration and election day would prevent election officials from canvassing neighborhoods, posting voter lists, and taking other steps to verify the identify and residence of prospective voters. It would deprive candidates of their right to have voter registration lists so they can know who are the voters in their district.

You have to be kidding if you think people wouldn't cheat in an election if they get the chance. In Illinois, we have had bitter experience with long years of "tombstone voting" and "ghost voting" by those long dead or moved away.

Again, you have to be kidding if you think politicians would be deterred by the threat of prosecution. Election frauds are the most unprosecuted crimes in America and nobody's afraid of going to prison for stuffing the ballot box. There is no indication that Congress is willing to appropriate the hundreds of millions of dollars that would be required to police the polls and prosecute the crimes that would be committed.

There would be no way to stop aliens from voting, since they have driver's licenses and other forms of ID. Forging false identifications would become a bigger business than it already is.

Same-day voter registration would be the death knell for honest elections and should be decisively defeated by those who care about the integrity of self-government.

---

Phyllis Schlafly is the author of five books on defense and foreign policy: *Kissinger on the Couch* (1975) and *Ambush at Vladivostok* (1976) covering the Kissinger years, *The Gravediggers* (1964), *Strike From Space* (1965), and *The Betrayers* (1968) covering the McNamara years. She was a member of Ronald Reagan's 1980 Defense Policy Advisory Group and a member of the National Security Subcommittee of the 1984 Republican Platform Committee. President Reagan appointed her a member of the Commission on the Bicentennial of the United States Constitution.

### 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. Postmaster: Address Corrections should be sent to the Phyllis Schlafly Report, Box 618, Alton, Illinois 62002.

Subscription Price: \$15 per year. Extra copies available: 50 cents each; 4 copies \$1; 30 copies \$5; 100 copies \$10.