



# The Phyllis Schlafly Report



VOL. 6, NO. 2

Box 618, ALTON, ILLINOIS 62002

SEPTEMBER, 1972

## Conservatives Win Rules Fight In Miami

The only battle of the 1972 Republican National Convention in Miami was fought -- not from the platform before thousands of Delegates, Alternates and spectators, not on prime-time television before millions of viewers, not even between the hippies and police in the streets outside the Convention Hall. It was fought in the Convention Rules Committee before a few score Republicans who realized that at stake was control of the Republican National Convention of 1976.

Taking their cue from the leftist Democrats who many months before mapped their strategy to "McGovernize" the Democratic Party by rewriting the Convention Rules to favor their candidate, the Rockefeller Republicans and their allies had been working for Convention Rules changes for a long time. Senator Charles Percy told the *Chicago Tribune* that he had been "working for months with Senator Bob Taft and Congressman John B. Anderson of Rockford."

At first, the conservatives didn't realize they had a fight on their hands, and they dragged their feet in the face of rumblings about Rules. Conservatives are notorious for underestimating the liberals' resources and determination. The issue broke out into the open in April when a Federal District Court decided in favor of the contention of the liberal Ripon Society that the Republican formula, on which Republican Convention Delegate representation has long been based, was unconstitutional. The Ripon Society's legal play was soon followed by reports from two liberal committees advocating "reform" of Convention Rules: the Delegates and Organization Committee (known as the DO Committee), and the Ad Hoc Committee chaired by Congressman Tom Railsback.

The objective of the Rockefeller Republicans was to take over the Republican Party in general, and in particular the mechanics and membership of the next Republican National Convention in order to assure the nomination of a liberal in 1976 when President Nixon will be unable to succeed himself. Mississippi State Chairman, Clarke Reed, brought the issue into focus when he said that the liberals' proposals would make it impossible for Spiro Agnew to be nominated in 1976, adding, "It would be a Javits or a Percy."

### Reapportionment And Quotas

The liberals had three main tactics to achieve this goal: (1) to reapportion the Convention Delegates

from each state according to a new formula which would give the eastern liberal states a much larger proportion of the total Convention vote, (2) to set up a quota system, or *de facto* quota system, for youth and other minorities which would open up unlimited opportunities for Delegate challenges and enable the liberals to expel legitimately-elected Delegates (just as Mayor Daley's group -- which received nearly a million votes in an open primary -- was expelled from the Democratic National Convention in favor of Delegates who received no primary votes at all), and (3) to set up an "implementation committee" similar to the McGovern Committee which was a vital instrument in "McGovernizing" the Democratic Convention.

Any kind of quota system, or *de facto* quota system, is totally alien to the Republican philosophy of freedom of opportunity for everyone without discrimination, and likewise alien to the democratic right of each district and state to elect its own Delegates.

The formula for reapportionment of Convention Delegates pushed by the Rockefeller Republicans and their allies would have increased the Delegate strength of the northeastern liberal states by 12 percentage points taken away from southern, western and border states. Under the liberals' plan, 38 states would lose proportionately while the big gainers would be New York, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Massachusetts, etc.

After the Republican National Committee rejected the liberals' proposals, they took their case to the Rules Committee of the Republican National Convention. It is easy to see why the liberals thought they were going to win. They had planned their campaign for many months. They had placed their most articulate spokesmen on the Rules Committee, who positioned themselves in a diamond pattern and worked in tandem to support each other on parliamentary maneuvers. They had all the emotional language running in their favor -- they were working for "minorities," for "the Party of the Open Door," for "full participation," and for "equal opportunity."

### The Contrast In Famous Names

Most important, they had the liberal brass present to lead the fight and to give their arguments glamor, authority, respectability, and news value. They had three U.S. Senators: Mathias, Packwood, and Percy.

They had a former Cabinet official: Walter Hickel. They had a very articulate and effective Congressman: William Steiger. I was standing in a covey of liberals about midnight, watching the proceedings still going on, when one of their errand-boys rushed up and said: "We have four Governors outside the room ready to speak if we need them." The four were Governor Sargent of Massachusetts, Governor Miliken of Michigan, Governor Evans of Washington, and Governor Ray of Iowa. Congressman John Anderson, one of the House's most able speakers, also waited throughout the long evening hours as the Rules Committee deliberated.

The grassroots Republicans had no Governors standing by at midnight, no Senator, no Cabinet official, and only one Congressman (Quillen of Tennessee). Congressman Philip Crane had testified for the conservatives the week before at a Rules Committee hearing. But the conservative floor fight before the Rules Committee was led by two Delegates, Clarke Reed of Mississippi and Tom Staggs of Louisiana, who did not have the benefit of a famous name or high office.

The conservatives originally backed what was called the Tower-Kemp plan, named for Senator John Tower and Congressman Jack Kemp (the former star quarterback of the Buffalo Bills). This plan would have increased the number of Delegates in the 1976 Convention, but kept the same relative strengths between the geographic regions. The liberals fought long and hard for a substitute which would have taken voting strength away from southern and western states and given it disproportionately to New York and the other northeastern liberal states.

### The Two-To-One Victory

The conservatives countered with another substitute presented by the California Delegates. The decisive moment of the evening came when the Rules Committee adopted the California plan by a vote of 61 to 27. After the vote was announced, Senator Packwood left the room, and I heard him say as he passed me, "We are worse off now than we were before!"

In the short night hours, White House aide John Ehrlichman and former Party Chairman Ray Bliss made frantic efforts from the trailer near the Convention Hall to avert a floor fight which might mar the unity of the Convention, but liberals were adamant. Led by Congressman Steiger, the liberals made their grandstand play in a 60-minute debate on the Convention floor on Tuesday afternoon. The windup speaker for the conservative side was Governor Ronald Reagan.

The roll-call vote recorded a decisive grassroots Republican victory: 910 to 434. The formula adopted will increase the size of the 1976 Convention from the present 1,348 to approximately 2,197, while keeping the relative strengths of conservative and liberal states about the same as they are at present. Because the Delegate apportionment is based on a system of bonuses for the states which go Republican, it is theoretically possible that the 1976 Convention could have a maximum of 2,421 (if Nixon carries all 50 states and Republican candidates sweep Congressional and gubernatorial elections).

### The Stamina of Grassroots Republicans

The Rules Committee action was a significant current demonstration of the fact that grassroots Republicans are conservative, and do not want to be dominated or dictated to by the New York liberals. Even with all the odds of propaganda, publicity, and prominent people on the liberal side, Republican Delegates from all over the country had the courage and the patience to sit hour after hour and vote "no."

The opposition of grassroots Republicans to the New York kingmakers and the Rockefeller Republicans was a major theme of my 1964 book, *A Choice Not An Echo*, and the years since then have not bridged the gap between the New York liberals and the majority of the Republican Party. President Nixon selected Governor Nelson Rockefeller to make the nominating speech at the 1972 Convention, and the Delegates had no choice but to sit politely and listen. But any time Republicans have a fair chance to vote, as they did in the Rules Committee, the New York liberals are outvoted at least two to one. Grassroots Republicans will never knowingly accept a candidate of the New York liberal establishment.

Some politicians and pundits tried to describe the Rules Committee fight as a big-state little-state battle. It was not. California, the largest state of all, cast its 96 votes unanimously for the so-called small-state side. Illinois, another of the largest states, voted 50 to 8 for the so-called small-state side. The Rules Committee battle was purely and simply a struggle between grassroots Republicans (who are generally conservative), and the New York liberal Republicans and their allies.

Although the so-called big-state proposal would have benefited California and Illinois, nevertheless those states recognized that the long-term best interest of America and of the Republican Party lies with the south and west, and not with the northeastern liberal, Rockefeller-dominated states. The Convention roll call showed that New York gave all its 88 votes to the liberal proposal, Pennsylvania cast 58 of 60 votes, New Jersey gave 36 of 40 votes, Michigan gave 47 of 48 votes, and Ohio (where the Party has been run by Governor Jim Rhodes, Ray Bliss, and young Senator Bob Taft) gave 52 of 56 votes.

The liberal forces could not conceal their dismay. The Associated Press summed up the Convention on August 25 with these words of reluctant admiration for Republican conservatives:

"The Party that met here [in Miami] this week ended its sessions with the Ronald Reagans and Barry Goldwaters and John Towers in firm control of its direction, rather than the Nelson Rockefeller and Charles Percys, as before. . . . Though Nixon has used his presidency to move the nation's policies far to the left of traditional Republican views on welfare, Communist China and economic controls, he has made no similar impression on his Party. . . . If nothing else, however, the 1972 Convention showed that the conservative trend of the 1960s within the GOP -- which first became apparent with Goldwater's nomination in 1964 -- remains a major fact of life for future Republican presidential contenders to face."

However, the question that cries out for an answer is: Why didn't the conservative grassroots Republican Delegates use their muscle, their talents, and their two-to-one majority to influence the candidates and platform of the 1972 Convention?

# World Anti-Communist Conference In Mexico

Mexico City was the host August 23-27 for the Sixth Annual Conference of the World Anti-Communist League (WACL). Some 300 political, academic and civic leaders representing 43 nations, five continents, and every race, creed and color, met with only one common bond -- they recognized that world Communism is the enemy of freedom. The theme of the Conference was "Civilization and Progress, Yes; Communism, No." The first WACL conference was held in 1967 in Taipei. Succeeding conferences have been held in Bangkok, Seoul, Tokyo and Manila.

When the Honorary Chairman, Dr. Ku Cheng-kang of Taiwan, opened the Conference, he stated that WACL's purpose is "to find ways and means to awaken the people, to sharpen their vigilance against Communist intrigues, to strengthen anti-Communist unity, to check Communist infiltration and expansion, to help the enslaved peoples gain their freedom, and to accomplish our historical mission of victory over Communism."

Dr. Ku pointed out that the world today is witnessing four types of struggle against international Communism: "aggression vs. anti-aggression, slavery vs. anti-slavery, subversion vs. anti-subversion, and negotiation vs. confrontation." He called the admission of Red China to the UN, the Nixon visits to Peking and Moscow, and the Japanese overtures to Red China "expressions of appeasement and expediency on the part of wishful free-world dreamers. All these examples have amounted to spiritual disarmament of the free world."

Continuing, he stated that "the proposal to replace confrontation with negotiation, no matter how plausible the justification may appear, is in complete disregard of the basic contradictions between freedom and Communism, both in theory and in practice. . . . Confrontation between freedom and Communism is perpetual, and it defies solution through negotiation."

Dr. Ku concluded with the admonition: "We must oppose America's secret diplomatic dealings with the Chinese and Russian Communists, for such actions inevitably mean sacrifice of free-world interests, damage to the anti-Communist unity of the freedom camp, and serious injury to the fate of all peoples. . . . We must help the Republic of Vietnam crush the Communist scheme to create a 'coalition government.'"

## Recognizing the Atheism of Communism

Present at the WACL Conference were many members of the Parliaments of various countries, including England, Canada and Australia. The outgoing President of WACL, Senator Jose J. Roy, is President of the Philippine Senate and one of the most important political figures in the Philippines. In his final address to the WACL Conference, Senator Roy put his finger on the spiritual nature of the struggle, saying:

"The Communist is a man who does not possess any religion, God or conscience. He does not recognize the dignity of man, and he persecutes fellow human beings in order to gain everything for the state. The Communist does not think or work for the common good, but for the glory and power of those who guide the destiny of Communism. . . . Peaceful coexistence is a myth which can assure us only of a life full of peril and tribulation. In spite of the existing differences between Red China and the Soviet Union, the Communists have not changed their primary motive -- and that is the total conquest of the whole world."

The President of the U.S. affiliate of WACL, called the American Council for World Freedom, is General Thomas Lane, well known to readers of this *Report* as the author of *America On Trial* and *Cry Peace: The Kennedy Years*, as well as a widely syndicated columnist. He gave an excellent report on events in our country, and was appropriately recognized by WACL with a plaque for his distinguished service "in the cause of liberty and justice and against Communist aggression."

## The Folly of Cooperation with the Soviets

One of the scholarly speakers to address the WACL Conference was the delegate from France, Mme Suzanne Labin, who is also one of the world's authorities on Soviet propaganda. Her pamphlet called *The Technique of Soviet Propaganda* was published by the U.S. Senate Internal Security Subcommittee some ten years ago and has remained one of its most popular and important reports.

In her speech to WACL called "The Traps of the Triangular Policies: Moscow, Washington, Peking," Mme Labin analyzed the folly of the new U.S. policy of negotiation with the Soviet Union: "Never forget that the U.S. is very efficient in building a powerful economy and very clumsy in propaganda; while the U.S.S.R. is extraordinarily efficient in propaganda and very clumsy in building a powerful economy."

Mme Labin explained how the Soviets have profited so greatly from their recent agreements with the United States: "First, the Russians gained an exchange of technology with the U.S. Everyone knows that American technology is superior to the Soviets in all non-military fields. In particular, the Communists are still very backward in computers, which have become the backbone of modern industry, economy, weaponry and space conquest. For years, the Kremlin has exerted tremendous pressure to induce Washington to lift its ban on the exportation of computers to Communist countries. As it could not succeed, it has now circumvented the ban by acquiring, under the subterfuge of 'technological exchanges,' the American know-how to build computers. Moscow will reciprocate by teaching Americans how to breed sturgeon caviar in the Great Salt Lake.

"Secondly, the Soviets gained substantial cooperation from America in space and moon explorations. This means that America will provide the space ships and Russia the Communist astronauts. As the world position of Communism is based on propaganda rather than on achievements, this cooperation in space will give Brezhnev the opportunity to hide Russian space failures and to boast of half of future space exploits. . . .

"Thirdly, the Soviets gained a halt in the American deployment of anti-missile systems. In this field, the Soviets already have a lead, while the United States has barely begun to build a defense against Soviet offensive missiles. . . . Now, the U.S. will stop building a line of defense, and the U.S.S.R. will keep the one it has already built and enlarge it with buried launching pads invisible from the sky. There is no provision in the SALT Treaty for on-site inspection, and we know that the Communists are masters of deceit. The Soviets have already broken 140 out of the 140 treaties they have signed."

Mme Labin also drew on her expertise on Red China to explode some of the fallacies about U.S. overtures to Mao and Chou: "Another false assertion

concerns Red China. It is talked about as a great power, yet it is still 80% agrarian, underfed and underdeveloped. Even with its nuclear bombs, which make great booms on the ground but cannot fly away, Red China has not even a 20th part of Russia's strength."

In a brief windup talk near the end of the WACL Conference, Mme Labin complimented the distinguished delegates assembled in Mexico City and pointed out that "we do not meet for diversified unity, or some other vague generality, but are proud to rally under the anti-Communist banner." Inspiring the delegates to action, she said: "We are the voices of the silent majority. We are the avengers of betrayed justice."

### Dissecting The Nature Of Communism

The major speech by an American at the WACL Conference was given by Dr. Walter H. Judd, former U.S. Congressman and one of the world's top authorities on Communism and on China. Known as one of the most eloquent speakers in the United States, he is especially remembered by Republicans for having given the greatest Keynote Speech at a Republican National Convention in the last generation (at the 1960 Convention in Chicago).

Dr. Judd opened his speech at the WACL Conference by asking the question: "Why must we say NO to Communism? And must say YES to Civilization and Progress? Because there can be no humane civilization or enlightened progress under Communism. This conclusion is the inescapable result of theory, of logic, and, above all, of history."

Commenting on Communism's glowing promises, Dr. Judd said there is "one sure test" about its performance: "Which way does human traffic go on the border between a Communist and a free country? Are people escaping over the Berlin Wall from West to East—or from East to West? From Florida to Cuba—or from Cuba to Florida? From Hong Kong to Communist China—or the reverse? Fleeing from South Vietnamese defenders to join the North Vietnamese invaders—or desperately seeking to escape to the South?"

Dr. Judd said that "our most important task still is education regarding the true nature of Communism -- its philosophy, its goals, its basic strategy, and its skillfully deceptive tactics." He gave what he called the "most crucial reasons" for the failure of the free peoples to recognize the danger and evil of Communism:

"1. *Ignorance.* The 'scriptures' of Marx, Lenin, Stalin, Mao are tough to read and understand -- like medical books. But who wishes to risk his life to the care of a physician who has not given these books long and hard study?"

"2. *Wishful thinking.* Most people still stubbornly refuse to believe that Communists will act like Communists; that they unalterably intend to do exactly what they say they are going to do, namely, to revolutionize the world (called 'liberation') and then to communize it. . . .

"3. *Infiltration.* Frequently it comes to light that the Soviet Union has had, for example, 105 agents in its diplomatic mission in the United Kingdom -- or a hard-core unit in its embassy in Mexico, and in scores of other countries -- all of these so-called 'diplomats' working to undermine and overthrow the governments to which they are accredited. People are mildly shocked -- for a day or two. But most refuse to be really disturbed about the similar infiltration within their own country and their own government.

"4. *Pride.* After being deceived by this adversary -- as in Yalta -- it is too hard on human vanity for negotiators to admit they were fooled, to expose their naivete, and to come out openly and forthrightly against further yielding to Communism. It is easier to pretend, and hope, that just maybe the Communists will negotiate in good faith -- the next time!"

### What's Wrong With Peaceful Coexistence?

Continuing, Dr. Judd stated that "perhaps the most widespread and dangerous myth just now is that 'peaceful coexistence' means 'peace' as we use the word, i.e., each side letting the other alone to live in peace. But their doctrine and documents have always made clear the falsity of this notion." Using an analogy of the type which is a trademark of his speeches, Dr. Judd said:

"When you see one boxer in a prizefight embrace his opponent in a clinch, you do not misunderstand his purpose. His embrace is not to 'improve their relations;' it is to avoid being knocked out himself, in order, hopefully, to knock out the opponent in the next round."

Dr. Judd continued, saying: "The Communists have a bag of tricks which they have used with great success to weaken our will in the past and with which they hope to deceive us again." He identified these tricks as: "The first and easiest trick is to smile. That does not cost them anything and it has been singularly effective. . . . The second trick to soften us up is to offer trade. Lenin said, 'We can always count on the cupidity of the capitalist.' . . . A third is the prisoner-of-war trick -- the cruelest. To let out some prisoners of war does not cost the Communists anything. That is what they have been saving them for -- to use for bargaining purposes at the right time."

At the end of the WACL Conference, the several hundred delegates passed a *Joint Communique* stating that "The differences between Communism and freedom cannot be resolved by negotiation. The *Joint Communique* 'supports the struggle of the Captive Peoples for freedom,' and points out that there can be true peace in the world "only when Communist governments are overthrown" because Communists will never abandon their goal of world conquest.

The *Joint Communique* came out strongly against the traps of negotiation and summit conferences, saying: "Talk-talk-talk is one of the oldest tricks used by Communism for half a century and should deceive no one. Neutralism and pacifism are also part and parcel of the Communist strategy." The WACL Conference also passed some 25 Resolutions, one of which clearly recognizes that the free world depends for its survival on U.S. nuclear "supremacy."

Despite the obvious strength and cleverness of Communist deceit and power, this distinguished gathering of political leaders and scholars closed with optimism and agreed that the cause of freedom will ultimately be victorious over Communist slavery. It was a privilege to have been a delegate to the WACL Conference.

### 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.