THE NEW AMERICAN
Vol. 2, No. 22 August 11, 1986

Manion Judgeship Approved

On a final vote of 50 to 49, the Senate on July 23rd approved the appointment of former Indiana legislator Daniel A. Manion as a Federal appellate judge for the Seventh Circuit hearing cases from Illinois, Indiana, and Wisconsin. The appointment was confirmed conditionally on June 26th, giving Senators opposed to Manion's appointment time to marshall opposition. The attempt failed, however, despite severe criticism from the more liberal Senators, who were disturbed by Mr. Manion's conservative views as well as by the association of his late father, Clarence Manion, with The John Birch Society. (The father was a founding member of the conservative group.) Among Daniel Manion's supporters in the Senate were Dan Quayle (R-IN) and Strom Thurmond (R-SC). Among his more outspoken detractors was Edward M. Kennedy (D-MA).

Rehnquist Vote Imminent

The Senate Judiciary Committee has scheduled an August 14th vote on the confirmation of President Reagan's nominee for Chief Justice, William H. Rehnquist. Although approval of Rehnquist is anticipated, Democrats on the Committee are expected to issue a challenge based upon the nominee's history of conservatism in legal matters. However, the American Bar Association's Standing Committee on the Federal Judiciary has voted unanimously to rate Rehnquist as "well qualified" for the position.

Passing of W. Averell

Harriman W. Averell Harriman, Union Pacific Railroad heir, adviser to four Presidents, and former Governor of New York, died July 26th at the age of 94.

A 1913 Yale graduate, Harriman entered the family business, becoming chairman of Union Pacific from 1932 to 1942. He founded the international banking firm of W. A. Harriman & Company in 1919 (which became Brown Brothers Harriman in 1931). Harriman -- a member of the Council on Foreign Relations since 1923 -- pioneered Western business ventures in the Soviet Union, lending money to fledgling dictator Lenin in exchange for manganese concessions.

Having met personally with Soviet leaders Lenin, Trotsky, Stalin, Khruschev, Brezhnev and Andropov, Harriman served in various diplomatic posts over seven decades, helping to formulate many critical East-West agreements. Among them: the Lend-Lease agreement in 1942, the Yalta agreement in 1945, a coalition government agreement for Rumania in 1945, a coalition government agreement for Laos in 1962, a nuclear test-ban treaty with Soviet Russia in 1963, and the Vietnam War Talks in Paris from 1968 to 1969.

Sir Wilfrid Kent Hughes of the Australian Parliament once commented on Harriman's negotiating efforts: "Averell Harriman ... has the chance to go down in history as the Churchill or the Chamberlain of Southeast Asia. When I was in Bangkok, he seemed to have decided on the latter, umbrella and all."

The Drought in Dixie

The drought in the American South has already become the worst one in the United

(c) 2000 American Opinion Publishing, Inc. -- www.thenewamerican.com

States since "Dust Bowl" conditions devastated the Great Plains in the 1930s. Farmers have been the hardest hit by the present drought, which has continued unabated since March. Drought-related losses to crops and livestock are expected to reach $2 billion. Particularly affected is the nation's poultry production, nearly 40 percent of which is in the South. Frank Purdue of Purdue Farms has predicted a possible price increase due to shortages of chicken feed, decreased laying by hens, and increased consumer demand through fast food outlets selling chicken nuggets. Beef prices, however, have temporarily dropped as farmers low on feed take their cattle to slaughter earlier than usual. Farmers in areas not stricken, such as Massachusetts, New York, Ohio, and Texas, have been donating hay to feed Southern livestock. Transportation of the hay has been provided in some cases by National Guard aircraft manned by volunteers and by truckers returning south after making northern deliveries. Little relief is in sight and thousands of farmers may lose their farms.

Joint Venture Against Drugs

On July 19th, U.S. pilots flying Black Hawk helicopters airlifted Bolivian strike forces in the first of several planned drug raids to be conducted jointly by the two nations. The U.S. logistic support of the anti-drug operation was prompted by increasing concern over cocaine use in this country and by Bolivia's position as the second largest source of cocaine sold in the United States. Hampered by the remote locations of the jungle processing laboratories and tip-offs to drug manufacturers from paid informants within the Bolivian government, the extent of the operation's success so far has been limited to the discovery and seizure of abandoned laboratories with little equipment and no drugs or personnel left behind. Nevertheless, officials of both countries believe that the joint operation will stop cocaine production in the region.

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

Communist Split Myth

General Douglas MacArthur once said: "You cannot oppose Communism in one part of the world and expect to appease it in another. It is the global struggle." Unfortunately, his cautious words have not been heeded by the Reagan Administration's policy regarding China.

In every manner and form the Chinese Communist Party still professes Marxism-Leninism. It continues to badmouth the United States, as evidenced recently by the UN Security Council when the Chinese delegate voted to condemn the United States over its raid against Libya.

During a speech in Houston, the Chinese Ambassador to the United States, Mr. Han Hsu, made insulting remarks against President Reagan's April 15th decision to attack Kadafy's Libya, describing it as an "act of terrorism." He venomously accused both the U.S. and Israel of being responsible for state terrorism in the world today. Such conduct by a foreign ambassador on American soil is not only repugnant, but an abuse of his diplomatic privileges in our country.

If Ambassador Han's caustic remarks had been made during Mao Tse-tung's time, they would have been ignored as mere propaganda; but, since Communist China is now officially designated by our State Department as a "friendly" power, one would expect the Reagan Administration to demand an explanation. But we did nothing. It is business as usual. The Administration continues to push hard with its proposal to provide Communist China with $550 million in avionics to modernize its airforce. Sino-American rapprochement continues apace in the military field.

The proposed sale of strategic military electronics is just one more example of the "scissors strategy" described by highly-placed KGB defector Anatoly Golitsin in his book ***New Lies For Old***. Golitsin explained that the much publicized Sino-Soviet split is nothing more than

(c) 2000 American Opinion Publishing, Inc. -- www.thenewamerican.com

a strategic deception. The intended victim -- in this case the United States -- is cut in half (destroyed) after first being deluded into building up one of the two Communist regimes as a supposed buffer against the other. Aiding Communist China at the expense of Taiwan is like turning Israel over to the Arabs. Moreover, no concessions by the U.S. can possibly make the Chinese Communists renounce their intention to use force against Taiwan.

Playing the so-called "China Card" against the Soviet Union has been the strategy of our past three U.S. presidents. Their hopes that "some Communists may help check other Communists" is foolhardy. "A foolish consistency," said Ralph Waldo Emerson, "is the hobgoblin of small minds." Peking officials have repeatedly said they will not be a pawn of any superpower. The Chinese are not going to serve as cannon fodder for any western capitalist. I do not think we should go on a Chinese-sponsored Polar Bear hunt. If Teng Hsiao-ping or the Chinese want to fight the Soviets -- let's watch it on television.

DR. ANTHONY KUBEK
Jackson Heights, New York

P.S. Your May 19th issue of THE NEW AMERICAN was in my view the best so far. James Drummey is doing an outstanding job of research and writing.

Communist Genocide

Everytime the Reagan people prepare to offer aid, trade or other moral support for any Communist country we Should ask them, "If you urged ratification of the Genocide Treaty, and have stated your opposition to that crime, why do you violate the spirit of that agreement by offering to help these genocidalists?"

I think linking up U.S. support of Communism with the Genocide Convention, and showing how contradictory with international law such aid and trade is (now that the Senate has ratified the Treaty), would be most telling and effective.

EDWARD HAMM, Jr.
Paterson, New Jersey

Slave Goods at Wal-Mart?

While shopping at a Wal-Mart in Lafayette, Louisiana recently, your article "Bentonville's Billionaire" in the February 3rd issue came to mind.

The article was about Sam Walton, the owner of Wal-mart, Sam's Wholesale Club, and several other chain stores. The article told what a wonderful person Mr. Walton was and how proud and thankful the small town of Bentonville, Arkansas was to have him as a resident.

What the article neglected to mention was that Wal-Mart sells several items that are made in Red China.

JORGE A. AND RAMONA A. MASPONS
New Orleans, Louisiana

Respect For Life

Your June 30th article on the Supreme Court abortion ruling was excellent. Very few Americans are familiar with the opinions written by the justices. To her credit, Justice O'Connor stated recently that current abortion law is on a collision course with medical technology. I submit two cases in point.

Readers of THE NEW AMERICAN may be interested to learn that the smallest baby known to survive was born to a Minnesota couple in St. Luke's Hospital, Fargo, North Dakota on July 29, 1985. The little boy was born at about 23 weeks gestation, weighed 12 ounces, and was

(c) 2000 American Opinion Publishing, Inc. -- www.thenewamerican.com

classified technically as a "fetus." He is alive and thriving today.

On June 16th, on a local live television show, Mrs. Judie Brown, a prominent leader in the pro-life movement went head to head with Thomas Webber, leader of Planned Parenthood in St. Paul. The most interesting fact to come to light during the interview was: Hospitals and abortion clinics dispose of human fetal tissue in the sanitary sewer systems just as other products enter the sewage systems. This fact was confirmed by Webber on the show.

NANCY GEHL
Bloomington, Minnesota

Tough Stuff

Your magazine is the most hard hitting editorial I believe I've ever read.

Your article on abortion in China in the June 16th issue brought me to tears as on June 15th my baby boy was born into an American world, and I thank God that America was the country he was brought into. Your articles on minimum wage and on welfare are also worth noting.

Please keep up the great work as my own subscription will be in the mail in the very near future.

LARRY WOOLF
Norfolk, Virginia

Tariffs and the South

There seems to be some disagreement between two articles in your April 21st issue. Chamberlain argues correctly that tariffs, especially protective tariffs, are detrimental to the economy. Lockman, apparently in agreement with Ellis and Kurowski whose book he reviews, argues in favor of tariffs as a primary source of revenue for the U.S. government. He even favors protective tariffs.

Lockman surely favors taxing imported oil heavily to subsidize domestic oil producers. U.S. industry and military run on oil. They certainly should not rely on foreign supplies. Let's have autarky for everything that the U.S. government considers essential -- especially chrome, platinum, and other strategic metals for which there are few or no domestic sources.

Certainly not all the Founding Fathers favored protective tariffs. John Taylor of Carolina and many other leading Southern statesmen and agriculturalists realized that tariffs made the farmer a serf of -- and the agricultural Southern States colonies of -- the Northern bankers and industrialists.

To rely on Hamilton's arguments in ***The Federalist Papers*** is to rely on the representative of the bankers and industrialists. Hamilton, the author of the federal deficit, was part of what The John Birch Society would Call the *Insiders*.

Another fallacy of Lockman is that tariffs on imports are paid by foreigners. Tariffs on imports are no more paid by foreigners than sales taxes are paid by retailers. If the objective is to get foreigners to support the U.S. government, an impost on exports would be much more effective.

Tariffs may be an acceptable source of revenue for government -- as long as the tariff is uniform without favor to product or country and is no more than about five percent. Once a tariff becomes protective in nature, it subsidizes inefficiency, incompetence, and the politically powerful. It injures the economy in the ways Chamberlain points out -- and worse.

The Southern colonies have but one hope of retaining their lost liberties: free trade and low taxes. That hope is to follow the example of the Founding Fathers, who seceded from

(c) 2000 American Opinion Publishing, Inc. -- www.thenewamerican.com

England. The time has come for a free and independent confederation of free and independent Southern States.

THOMAS C. ALLEN
Franklinton, North Carolina

Who's Counting Anyway?

For the record, the reference to the Federalist #38 on page 60 of your June 16, 1986 issue appears to be incorrect. I found the Madison quote at the end of Federalist paper #37.

By the way, I love the new magazine!

HARLAN M. BREWER
Renton, Washington

Thanks for pointing out the error. It won't happen again.

Collector's Items

A special thanks for the good articles on education, especially the information in "Home Schools Flourish" (October 7, 1985). I didn't need the information right then, but my husband keeps all the back issues. When I needed that article it was easy to find, thanks to the department listing at the front of each magazine. I like the fact the magazine is so well organized!

D. LYNN FORD
Cedar City, Utah

FRONT PAGE **Has Reagan Renounced SALT II?**

Or is he disarming the U.S. and making it vulnerable to a first strike?

The day after President Reagan announced he would end his observance of the terms of the Strategic Arms Limitation Treaty (SALT) II, the ***Wall Street Journal*** (May 29, 1986) ran an editorial entitled "The Death of SALT II." This decision, said the ***Journal***, "reflects a major change in U.S. arms control policy. No longer will U.S. military planning be constrained by the SALT process."

To which the proper rejoinder is, "Not so fast!"

First, SALT II never legally *existed*. President Carter signed the treaty in 1979, but the Senate failed to ratify it. Nevertheless, Mr. Carter informally abided by the treaty's limitations *anyway*. And although Mr. Reagan has announced that we would no longer be bound by these limitations, we have yet to exceed them.

Second, even if the treaty had been ratified, it would have expired at the end of 1985 -- almost five months prior to Mr. Reagan's announcement.

Third, Mr. Reagan's announcement not to stay within the limits of SALT II *in the future* was made after he decided to sacrifice two more Poseidon submarines with 320 nuclear warheads in order to stay within the limits of SALT II.

Fourth, the Reagan Administration has said it would review its decision not to follow SALT II if the Soviet Union changed its arms control policies. What specific changes would have to take place have not been stated, but the U.S. has been discussing arms control issues -- including our position on SALT II -- with the Soviets in Geneva. The talks on Mr. Reagan's SALT II position opened on July 22nd. In agreeing with the Soviet Union's request for this special session, the Reagan Administration said that we have agreed to it "as a sign of our desire

(c) 2000 American Opinion Publishing, Inc. -- www.thenewamerican.com

that the Soviet Union join us in establishing an interim framework of truly mutual restraint."

Fifth, the U.S. strategic arms proposal, made last November, calls for a 50 percent reduction in arms. Mr. Reagan's announcement on SALT II has not changed the policy of the Administration of negotiating arms reductions of this magnitude with the Soviets.

It is, in fact, almost certain that Mr. Reagan's renunciation of SALT II has much more to do with throwing his familiar rhetorical bone to conservatives than actually reversing his long-standing policy of unilateral "build-down." Unprecedented criticism from his own people (Senators Malcolm Wallop, Jesse Helms, James McClure, Dan Quayle and Steven Symms, and Representatives Jack Kemp and Jim Courter), protesting his decision to sacrifice two more Poseidon submarines obviously forced his hand. However, there is every reason to believe that skepticism as to his sincerity is warranted.

The most obvious sour note, of course, is that the promised "major change" has been put off until near the end of this year when the U.S. equips the 131st B-52 bomber for cruise missiles, thus putting us over our SALT allotment. Mr. Reagan is saying that at that time he will not destroy other missiles or bombers as we are "supposed" to and have done in the past.

Scrapping More Poseidons

Another sour note is that we may dismantle still more Poseidons. As ***Newsweek*** reported in its June 23rd issue:

> Presidential arms-control advisor Paul Nitze indicated that the United States might rhetorically defy the treaty, but still meet its limits by scrapping a Poseidon submarine when the 131st B-52 bomber armed with cruise missiles is deployed this fall.

Meanwhile, our fleet has already suffered the loss of three Poseidons under the Reagan Administration, including the two Mr. Reagan decided to dismantle earlier this year. Contrary to the President's remarks about these vessels not being "worth" retaining, it should be understood that their destruction not only diminishes our national security but is ludicrous in the extreme.

We taxpayers have invested over $3 billion in each still perfectly serviceable Poseidon submarine targeted for destruction by the Reagan State Department. Hundreds of millions more dollars are required for dismantling procedures set up by SALT for the sole purpose of insuring Soviet verification. The Environmental Protection Agency also makes it very expensive to dispose of perfectly good nuclear submarines. Nevertheless, at the same time Mr. Reagan is eloquently pleading for increased funding for defense plus a balanced budget, he has already dismantled three operational Poseidons with the possibility of more to follow.

Although this makes no sense financially, it is even more incomprehensible as regards actual weaponry. These Poseidon submarines now being readied for destruction carry the Trident I Sea Launched Ballistic Missile (SLBM). Although this is our newest and most advanced submarine launched missile, it is greatly inferior to modern Soviet SLBMs. This is because, in compliance with Soviet wishes, the Reagan Administration has not gone ahead with developing the Trident II SLBM, which would be comparable in range and accuracy with the Soviets'. Originally, this Trident II missile was to be deployed in the new Trident submarines; but, instead, the Tridents now coming on line are armed with the *same* small Trident I SLBMs carried in the Poseidons slated for destruction. Yet the President could say in all seriousness, "Had I been persuaded that retaining these two Poseidon submarines would have contributed significantly and cost-effectively to the national security, I would have directed that they not be dismantled but be overhauled and retained" (The ***Wall Street Journal***, May 29, 1986).

But there is more to this outrage. Congress recently slated about $21 billion to fund the

(c) 2000 American Opinion Publishing, Inc. -- www.thenewamerican.com

planned deployment of 100 MX land-based intercontinental ballistic missiles. Because land-based missiles are perceived as being "non-survivable," a great debate ensued over which basing mode would best afford protection from a first strike by the Soviet Union. Submarine-borne missiles, however, are perceived as being more "survivable" than land-based missiles, since they are harder to find. What sense can be made out of deploying 100 relatively less survivable land-based missiles at staggering cost while scrapping 48 highly survivable Poseidon missiles?

It should not be supposed that Mr. Reagan's incongruities began with the Poseidons. For his full five-and-one-half years in office he has illegally abided by the terms of the lopsided SALT II Treaty, inherited from Mr. Carter, which the Senate labeled "against the national interest" and refused to ratify. Even if it had been ratified, it would have, as already indicated, expired last December. It is difficult to believe that the President is the same man who in 1980 said, "The Soviets only see weakness in a President [Carter] who clings to the unilateral observance of the fatally flawed SALT II Treaty." He, himself, in spite of his strong campaign rhetoric calling for increased defense, has consistently used his power as Commander-in-Chief to weaken our military capability vis-à-vis the Soviets. The great irony is that while the liberal media have continually lambasted his administration for pursuing a massive military buildup, the President has, in fact, extensively cut back the level of U.S. arms. While the public also perceives this President as strengthening our defense and approves of it, he has, in fact, cut our deliverable level of nuclear megatonnage by about one third.

"Building down" our defenses

First to go were eight Polaris submarines. These were destroyed by cutting up their missile launchers and pouring concrete into the missile bays. This meant a loss of 160 SLBMs and over $125 million in dismantling costs. These funds, drawn from vital Navy operations and maintenance budgets, could have been used instead for improving military capability. The Polaris submarines themselves, instead of being sunk at sea, could have been retained as attack or torpedo submarines (as could the Poseidons), of which the U.S. has only half as many as the Soviets.

Next to go were 54 Titan ICBMs, followed by at least 80 B-52 bombers. The President then cancelled deployment of 100 stockpiled Minuteman III ICBMs in direct violation of a congressional mandate. He reduced the range of the new MX ICBM to conform with Soviet wishes. He spent millions of tax dollars to put identifying devices on bombers carrying cruise missiles so that the Soviets could observe and count them.

These steps, all illegal because the Senate had never ratified SALT II, were taken by the President on the flimsiest of pretexts, such as "going an extra mile," convincing the Soviets of our "good faith," or giving the Soviets time to "join the U.S. in an interim framework of truly mutual restraint." When Secretary of the Navy John Lehman publicly denounced these actions as being illegal and inconsistent with Republican beliefs, he was reprimanded and overruled by the State Department. Meanwhile, of course, the Soviets laughed all the way to their missile silos. According to a recent analysis by the Defense Intelligence Agency, "The Red Army's rocket forces last year were able to report to the Kremlin that they had finally achieved their goal of targeting all soft and hard military and industrial targets in the U.S. and Western Europe that would be attacked in the event of war. This has been the long standing goal of the Soviet leadership" (The ***Wall Street Journal***, April 23, 1986).

A Secret Agreement

This is also the inevitable result of a little-known action taken by Mr. Reagan in late

(c) 2000 American Opinion Publishing, Inc. -- www.thenewamerican.com

1981, his first year in office. At that time the Reagan State Department reached an unauthorized secret Executive Agreement with the Soviet Union concerning arms control. On the face of it, this was clearly illegal, for the Arms Control and Disarmament Act prohibits any President from binding the U.S. to any such agreement solely on his own authority.

Ignoring this law apparently meant nothing to Mr. Reagan, who seemed intent upon continuing the process begun by the Nixon/Kissinger SALT I; i.e., widening the strategic lead granted the Soviets in that document. For this secret Executive Agreement greatly altered the provisions and limits of SALT II for the benefit of the Soviets, relieving them of the obligation to cut back and authorizing them instead to increase their strategic nuclear forces far beyond those of the U.S. This, too, was against U.S. law, for the Jackson Amendment to SALT I specifically prohibits any arms control agreement that would make the U.S. less than equal with the Soviet Union. In addition, although the Case Act requires the President to report promptly all Executive Agreements to Congress, this was not done. Several years passed before this secret Agreement was ferreted out by Senators Steve Symms and the late John East, who wrote the President in 1984:

> We believe that this Agreement formalizes United States acquiescence in a profound shift in the strategic balance of power in favor of the Soviet Union.
> According to the Senators, the Agreement allows the Soviets to
> cancel the 2,250 ceiling on total delivery vehicles and possibly also the individual ceilings on ICBM and SLBM launchers as well as bombers with long range cruise missiles. Through these cancellations, the Soviet Union is already almost 1000 strategic nuclear delivery vehicles and well over 1000 warheads ahead of the U.S.
> [Letter of protest to the President, July 2, 1984]

In light of this information, the President's renunciation of SALT II because of "Soviet violations" (although they have been legion) sounds like a charade. The Soviets quickly joined the game by stating that the Kremlin "won't adhere to SALT II the moment the U.S. exceeds its limits" (The ***Wall Street Journal***, June 3, 1986). While nothing but lies and deception are to be expected from the Soviets, it is quite another thing when the President distorts the truth.

Strategic Defense

If the President's actions in regard to strategic offense have lacked coherence, his approach to strategic defense has been equally bewildering. By far the most important proposal he has made since coming to office is his Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI). The concept of a shield of anti-ballistic missiles (ABMs) that would make nuclear weapons obsolete and kill no one is eminently sensible and right. Yet here, too, the real picture is far from the understanding given the public by Mr. Reagan. Most people believe Mr. Reagan is doing everything possible to make "Star Wars" a reality but is being thwarted by some sort of "mutual accord" with the Soviets (the ABM Treaty), lack of technology, and long lead time.

As for technology, the truth is that we could have had a space-based defense shield *in the 1960s*, when "a strong Department of Defense scientific and technical team of over five thousand, utilizing technology then available, concluded that such a system could be operational within six years" (***We Must Defend America***, by Lieutenant General Daniel O. Graham). Twenty years later (1982), a private group (High Frontier) directed by General Graham, using primarily the same relatively simple technology, concluded the same thing; only with lower cost, greater ease, and less time. The President could have ordered work to begin, and by 1988 we would have had a 96 percent assurance of safety for all targets of Soviet long-range missiles. By comparison, in 1956 President Eisenhower ordered the first nuclear submarine built despite serious

(c) 2000 American Opinion Publishing, Inc. -- www.thenewamerican.com

technological unknowns and opposition from most of the U.S. Navy; the first Polaris put out to sea less than four years later. President Kennedy ordered a manned landing on the moon -- a project to boggle the mind with enormous technological uncertainties; seven years later it was a reality. Yet Mr. Reagan has allowed all our SDI resources to be devoted to research to answer the question of whether defenses against ballistic missiles are possible!

The President has additionally misled the public by proposing only a *space*-based defense, which had led to the belief that there could be no other kind. But a *land*-based system could be started immediately with off-the-shelf technology. In June, 1984, the Army proved this conclusively when it destroyed a Minuteman with an interceptor missile launched 4,000 miles away. Today the Army has developed an even more accurate interceptor, which, together with our existing radar system, could provide a near complete missile defense system in less than five years. If this system were restricted to only 100 missiles, it would be in full accord with the ABM Treaty.

For, under the terms of the ABM Treaty, both the U.S. and the Soviet Union are allowed to deploy as many as 100 interceptor missiles at designated launch sites. Our site is at Grand Forks in northern North Dakota. From there, an interceptor missile could protect an enormous area -- virtually all of North America. The treaty limit of 100 missiles would protect against everything except an all-out, massive nuclear attack; by breaking the limits and adding more missiles, protection would be nearly total. Yet nothing at all has been done to implement this sensible approach to safeguarding millions of lives.

The reason seems to lie in the fact that the President does not "choose" to protect this country even in ways permitted by the ABM Treaty. Last November, Senator Malcolm Wallop and Representative Jack Kemp asked the President for clarification of this bizarre policy:

> Whereas your administration has said previously that the treaty prevents us from doing a variety of things to protect ourselves against ballistic missiles, Secretary Shultz has now made clear that we refrain from doing those things not because the treaty forbids us, but because we choose not to do them .... As we see it, this unilateral approach of self-denial *beyond the terms* of the treaty is wholly incompatible with the strategic direction you have indicated for our country .... Why are we imposing unilateral self-restraints required neither by treaty or technology? (Letter to the President, The ***Wall Street Journal***, November 14, 1985)

The President claims his purpose is "to restore the integrity of the ABM Treaty." This means, of course, that the Soviets have violated it; but that if we don't -- in fact, if we don't do anything at all to protect ourselves -- the Soviets might take heart about our intentions and follow suit.

Meanwhile the Soviets, not surprisingly, have shown they are diametrically opposed to this rejection of strategic defense. They refer to the idea contemptuously as "bourgeois naiveté" and over the past decade have spent more on defense than we have on strategic offense. Far from denying themselves defensive missiles, they have deployed the only ABM system in the world -- the land-based one near Moscow, capable of protecting a major part of the Soviet Union. A massive building program associated with strategic defense, including space laser and particle beam weapons, is underway, regardless of treaty limits. As usual, the ABM Treaty means nothing to the Soviets; merely another "pie crust to be broken."

What does Mr. Reagan hope to gain by his restraint? Any real decision as to how to deal with these problems has been put off until the 1990s, even as anti-missile equipment continues to roll off Soviet production lines. When one considers that by 1988 our relative position in

(c) 2000 American Opinion Publishing, Inc. -- www.thenewamerican.com

counterforce weapons is projected to be worse than it was in 1980, it is clear that an anti-ballistic missile defense is the only possibility we now have of negating Soviet strategic superiority.

Words vs. Actions

As Senator Wallop and Representative Kemp explain, Mr. Reagan's oft-stated noble goal of "protecting, rather than avenging, lives," is precisely opposite to what Mr. Reagan calls "the integrity of the ABM Treaty" when that integrity "presumes the defenselessness of the American people. We question whether it is reasonable to pursue such wholly contradictory ends at the same time, or whether it is possible to pursue them simultaneously without discrediting both" (Letter to the President, November, 1985).

Precisely. It is generally agreed that one of the most disturbing aspects of the entire defense picture is the great disparity between the President's words and his actions. His phenomenal ability as a communicator has lulled the American people into a false sense of security. At the same time the President is prolonging our defenselessness against nuclear weapons, he describes defense as "the very core" of his strategic policy. At the same time he is decreasing our offensive ability and increasing the Soviets', he tells us "we must rebuild our defense and secure our freedom so that once again America will be second to none in the world." Norman Podhoretz' (editor of ***Commentary***) apt phrasing comes to mind: "Wouldn't it be wonderful if Ronald Reagan were President?"

But how to make Reagan be Reagan? A number of Senators have challenged him head-on, to no avail. The Congress has passed laws designed to prevent any President from implementing policies inimical to the survival of this country; the President has broken them. We must assume the President knows exactly what he is doing and has a reason for his actions; but to attempt to unravel that reason leads us into the dark realm of conjecture. All we can know for certain are the facts of the record.

And that record, as we have seen, is grim: absurd compliance with an unratified treaty, destruction of costly weapons while asking for increased defense funding, a secret agreement for Soviet military superiority, disregard for United States laws, choosing to leave the American people defenseless as a matter of policy, and, above all, duplicity. None of this suggests that the President is sincere about abandoning SALT II restrictions at the end of this year. It is far more likely that "pressure" from allies, the Soviet Union, and the disarmers in Congress and his own administration will "force" Mr. Reagan to continue policies that seem headed toward making the American people vulnerable to nuclear blackmail.

-- JANE H. INGRAHAM

WASHINGTON
Capitol Update

The human rights hypocrites are ignoring HR 97

In early 1985 Representative Philip M. Crane (R-IL) introduced HR 97. This bill would amend the Trade Act of 1974 and the Export-Import Act of 1945 to prohibit all extensions of credit guarantees, investment guarantees, or grants by any agency of the United States government to any Communist country. Unlike the bills that would prevent investment in South Africa, HR 97 simply states that the United States government would not be permitted to extend guarantees or grants to totalitarian regimes. While the local and national media have devoted hundreds of hours and thousands of column inches to covering the issue of sanctions against South Africa, Representative Crane's bill has been largely ignored.

(c) 2000 American Opinion Publishing, Inc. -- www.thenewamerican.com

The Old Double Standard

The hypocrites are everywhere. In Congress they call for laws to impose all sorts of economic sanctions on South Africa because of that nation's racial policies yet fail to call for similar measures against Communist dictatorships such as the Soviet Union -- a regime that has murdered thousands of innocent Afghanis since it invaded their nation in December of 1979. In the churches and temples, the hypocrites in their crisp robes and high collars piously denounce South Africa in the name of God, while they ignore the plight of Jews, Christians, and Moslems persecuted by Communist authorities in Red China, Ethiopia, Cuba, and Romania.

On college campuses, the hypocrites are those professors, students and administrators who plead for their institutions to divest themselves of their interest in companies with South African operations or who erect mock shantytowns on campus greens to depict the plight of South Africa's unfortunates, but who do not ask for disinvestment from companies trading with Communists.

When the Hungarian government sought to leave the Communist Warsaw Pact alliance in 1956, Soviet tanks rolled into Budapest, mercilessly crushing any hope of independence for that nation. In 1968, Czechoslovakia was invaded on the orders of the Soviet dictators to prevent that government from dismantling the most oppressive aspects of its dictatorship. In 1975, the Soviet dictators signed the Helsinki Accords, agreeing among other things to "respect human rights and fundamental freedoms, including the freedom of thought, conscience, religion or belief for all...." The Soviets also promised to allow freedom of movement for their subjects at home and in Eastern Europe, to respect the civil liberties of dissidents, and to permit free exchange of information between their inhabitants and the non-Communist world. Today, Yury Orlov, a founder of a Russian group set up to monitor the dictators' adherence to the accord, has been lingering in a Soviet prison for eight years. As of July 1985, 51 of the 100 members of Mr. Orlov's organization were in prison, concentration camps, "psychiatric" hospitals, or forced internal exile.

Perhaps Senators Mark Andrews (R-ND), Alan Cranston (D-CA), Christopher Dodd (D-CT), Robert Dole (R-KS), Ernest Hollings (D-SC), and Dan Quayle (R-IN) would care to explain to their constituents why they voted on July 11, 1985 to impose economic sanctions on South Africa, yet voted *against* a measure that would have extended the sanctions to nations that violated the Helsinki Act (i.e., Communist dictatorships) and a similar measure that would have included such notorious violators of human rights as the Soviet Union, Cuba, Libya, Syria, Iran, Poland, Afghanistan, Mozambique, Angola, Ethiopia, and East Germany.

Dictatorships like Hungary, Poland, Romania, and Yugoslavia have received direct loans from the United States' taxpayer-funded Export-Import Bank and Commodity Credit Corporation. The dictatorships of Red China and Angola receive Export-Import Bank loans. The Export Administration Act of 1985, prohibiting the Export-Import Bank from financing trade with the Soviet Union, did not prevent four major American banks from lending the Soviet dictators $400 million at very low interest rates to buy American and Canadian wheat. The United States government contributes 20 percent of the funding of the International Monetary Fund (IMF), thereby indirectly assisting Vietnam, Ethiopia, Red China and other totalitarian governments that have received millions of dollars from the IMF.

How You Can Promote HR 97

A large number of letters supporting HR 97 have been received by Congressmen. Writing again to a Congressman who has already stated his opposition to HR 97, or who has refused to take a firm stand in favor of the bill, would be futile.

(c) 2000 American Opinion Publishing, Inc. -- www.thenewamerican.com

Hundreds of call-in talk shows around the country are discussing the issue of sanctions against South Africa. Why not call one of these show every time sanctions against South Africa are discussed and suggest that the topic be expanded to include human rights abuses in Communist dictatorships -- *and then mention HR 97?* The simple question, "If Representative John Doe claims to support human rights throughout the world regardless of politics, then why is he supporting sanctions only against South Africa and doing nothing to stop taxpayers' dollars from going to Communist dictatorships?" would prod many listeners to inquire of their Representative as to his lack of principles and his odious double-standard.

Well-written letters to the editors of the local newspapers could describe HR 97 and indicate whether the local Representative has taken any stand on the bill. One of the few pleasures in life is putting the human rights hypocrites on the defensive. Try it; perhaps all some of them need is a little education.

Callers to talk shows should clearly indicate the purpose of HR 97. Talk show hosts in need of information on HR 97 and human rights violations in Communist nations should be referred to THE NEW AMERICAN'S Research Department.

-- EVANS-RAYMOND PIERRE

NATION
The AIDS Plague

The more we learn about the epidemic, the worse it gets

> *[A]ny community that loses a substantial percentage of its young adults in a single epidemic finds it hard to maintain itself materially and spiritually.*
>
> -- William H. O'Neill
> ***Plagues and Peoples***

Five years ago, physicians in California and New York reported the beginnings of an epidemic that today we know as AIDS, the Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome. At that time, some three dozen homosexual men were diagnosed with either a rare form of skin cancer known as Kaposi's sarcoma or with an equally rare strain of pneumonia called Pneumocystis carinii pneumonia or with both. Thirteen patients had already died.

Over the next weeks and months, more cases were reported. On August 28, 1981, the Centers for Disease Control in Atlanta reported an additional 70 cases, bringing the total number of patients to 108. Of that number 95 claimed to be homosexual or bisexual, six were heterosexual, and the sexual preferences of the remaining half dozen remained unknown. By this time, 40 percent of the patients had died.

In the years following, more than 22,000 cases have been reported in the United States, of which over half have died. At the same time, medical science has made tremendous gains in its understanding of the disease: The syndrome was given a name, the virus believed to be the cause was identified, and tests to detect the presence of AIDS antibodies in the blood were produced. And, in only five years, well over 10,000 articles have been published in medical and scientific journals (not to mention thousands of newspaper and magazine articles). Yet, AIDS remains an invariably fatal disease, and even the most optimistic scientists do not predict a vaccine or cure before the end of the decade.

This summer a series of three conferences were held in the United States and Europe,

(c) 2000 American Opinion Publishing, Inc. -- www.thenewamerican.com

providing a "State of the Epidemic" evaluation five years into what one author has dubbed "The Plague Years." on June 4th, the U.S. Public Health Service gathered 85 of the leading experts on AIDS for a three-day conference at the Coolfont Conference Center in Berkeley Springs, West Virginia. Several weeks later, AIDS experts from around the world met in Paris for the Second International Conference on AIDS (June 23-28). And, last month, the National Institutes of Health convened a three-day conference in Washington, DC, to evaluate the impact of AIDS-antibody testing of blood donors on public health (July 7-9).

What follows is an overview of the findings presented at these conferences. Put simply, the more we learn about AIDS, the worse it gets.

Bad News for Humanity

The total number of AIDS cases world-wide may be as high as 100,000, according to Dr. Halfdan Mahler, director general of the World Health Organization (WHO). Another five million to ten million people are thought to be infected with the AIDS virus and are capable of transmitting the virus to others, he told the Paris Conference.

"If the rest of the world catches up with the United States," Dr. James Curran, head of the AIDS task force of the Centers for Disease Control, reported to the 2,500 scientists at the conference, "by 1991, 300,000 people will have caught AIDS. Every country will have it. AIDS is an international problem of great magnitude."

Curran based his projection on the findings of the Coolfont Conference held earlier in June. That conference estimated that the cumulative number of AIDS cases will total more than 270,000 by 1991. "During 1991 alone," the Coolfont report states, "more than 145,000 cases of AIDS will require medical care and over 54,000 AIDS patients are predicted to die, bringing the cumulative number of deaths due to AIDS to over 179,000."

However, these statistics, staggering as they are, may underestimate, the report continued, "by at least 20 percent the serious morbidity and mortality attributable to AIDS, because of under-reporting and under-ascertainment of cases." Some experts believe that the total number of AIDS cases at any one time may be underestimated by as much as 50 percent.

Also addressing the Paris Conference was Dr. Donald S. Burke, chief of the viral disease department at the Walter Reed Army Institute of Research in Washington, who reported on a Pentagon study of more than 300,000 military recruits tested for the AIDS antibody between October 1, 1985 and March 31, 1986. The study found an AIDS infection rate among recruits significantly higher than that of the overall population (15 per 10,000 recruits as opposed to 4 per 10,000 in the general population).

The study "suggests a lot of hidden AIDS virus infection," Dr. Burke told the ***New York Times***. Based on the average age of military recruits, researchers believe that many Americans are being infected with the AIDS virus in their late teens and early 20s. The findings "make us think more seriously of heterosexual spread to account for the infections among the group," Dr. Burke said.

But the United States is not alone when it comes to AIDS. In Europe, "the virus has spread very rapidly among drug abusers in European capitals," according to Dr. Jean-Baptiste Brunet of the Hospital Claude Bernard in Paris.

In France, for example, six in 10,000 people in the general population are infected with the virus (compared to four in 10,000 in the U.S.). Fifty-one percent of intravenous drug abusers in France are infected, as are 15 percent of the country's male homosexuals.

Yet, the AIDS infection rate is by far highest in Africa. Over six percent of the population of Africa is infected with the virus, and the disease, which was once believed to be confined to

(c) 2000 American Opinion Publishing, Inc. -- www.thenewamerican.com

isolated areas in central and eastern Africa, has now spread "almost everywhere," Dr. Bela M. Kapita of Zaire told the Paris Conference. In some parts of Africa, the infection rate could run as high as 18 to 23 percent.

Unlike in the United States, AIDS in Africa is by and large a heterosexual disease, with men and women equally affected. Dr. Kapita said that female prostitutes constitute the greatest threat for transmission. In Kenya, for example, 60 percent of prostitutes are infected and in Rwanda the infection rate among female prostitutes runs nearly 90 percent.

"The disease is showing clear signs of spreading in areas where it never existed before and growing in areas where it already existed," noted Jonathan Mann, director of the World Health Organization's AIDS program. "Prevention should be the top priority. It cannot await a vaccine or treatment."

Scientists attending the Paris conference were troubled by reports of increasing heterosexual transmission outside of Africa as well. In June, at the Coolfont Conference, experts cautioned that while "[c]urrent information [is] insufficient to predict the future incidence of ... infection in heterosexual populations ... increases in heterosexual transmission are likely." The report also warned that promiscuous heterosexuals faced a higher risk of AIDS virus infection.

Several studies were presented in Paris documenting both the increase in heterosexual transmission and the likelihood of female-to-male and male-to-female transmission. Dr. Warren B. Johnson of Cornell Medical College presented a study on AIDS in Haiti demonstrating that heterosexual intercourse is now the predominant route of the spread of AIDS there. In 1983, the pattern of AIDS in Haiti largely mirrored that in the U.S., with 71 percent of the cases coming from the so-called high-risk groups (homosexual and bisexual men and IV drug abusers). However, now those groups account for only 11 percent of the cases, with 72 percent of the cases among heterosexuals who claim they do not practice any of the high-risk behaviors.

The study demonstrates "how rapidly and dramatically the AIDS virus can spread in a promiscuous heterosexual population," Dr. Peter Piot, an AIDS expert with the Institute of Tropical Medicine in Belgium, told the conference. In an interview with the ***New York Times***, Dr. Johnson warned that heterosexual intercourse could become the predominant means of AIDS transmission in the U.S. just as it has in Haiti.

Blood Supply Still Tainted

On June 20th, the Centers for Disease Control reported the first instance of AIDS virus transmission from a person whose blood tested negative for the AIDS antibody at the time of blood donation. In this case, the donor was a 31-year-old male homosexual who had sex with a 22-year-old man on May 15th, 1985. The donor claimed that his only other homosexual encounter occurred in 1974 and denied using intravenous drugs. He donated blood in April and August and was found to be seronegative (no AIDS antibodies detected). In November, he donated again, but this time his blood tested positive. The contaminated August blood had been transfused into two patients, both of whom subsequently tested positive for the AIDS virus.

Three weeks later, the National Institutes of Health sponsored a conference to examine the reliability of antibody testing and its impact on public health. The conference found that, while the blood supply is safer now than it was four years ago, some infected blood still escapes detection. And, in the absence of better tests, scientists offer little hope of improvement.

According to Lincoln E. Moses, professor of statistics at Stanford University School of Medicine, "approximately 120 infectious units [of blood] per year in the country" escape detection by the antibody tests. Moses based his estimate on the premise that one out of every 1,000 units of donated blood are contaminated by the AIDS virus. "It appears that one in 100 of

(c) 2000 American Opinion Publishing, Inc. -- www.thenewamerican.com

these may not be screened away," he said.

On the average, products from a blood donation are transfused into 1.5 patients. Therefore, "based on the information we received at this meeting, the chance of contracting AIDS from a blood transfusion is substantially less than one in 10,000," concluded Dr. Richard H. Aster, president of the Blood Center of Southeastern Wisconsin. "By comparison, the chances of dying from general anesthesia are one in 10,000 or perhaps higher."

However, some experts caution that the threat of getting AIDS from a blood transfusion is not on the verge of extinction. Myron E. Essex of the Harvard School of Public Health warned during the Paris Conference that, as the AIDS epidemic shifts from the current high-risk groups into other groups, their blood may develop different markers not covered by the test presently in use. And, of course, in the final analysis, for the one in 10,000 people who do contract AIDS from a transfusion, statistics provide little consolation.

-- KIRK KIDWELL

NATION
Turner Turns Leftward

Ted Turner started out at the top. After his millionaire father committed suicide in 1963, young Ted -- not yet thirty years old -- found himself president and chief executive officer of the various Atlanta-based Turner enterprises. In 1976 he pioneered the use of satellites to transmit his WTBS to all parts of the nation. That independent UHF station quickly became the nation's most widely available cable outlet. Then in 1980, he again led the way in the television world when he started TV's first round-the-clock news coverage via his Cable News Network.

Turner's early years in television fueled great hope for many Americans who were justifiably critical of the major networks. They cheered as the hard-driving Atlantan castigated the TV and film industries for "doing real harm to traditional values." He labeled NBC, ABC and CBS "anti-religion, anti-business, and anti-family."

In 1980, the rising TV promoter was awarded the Freedom Foundation's "Private Enterprise Exemplar Medal." It seemed as though the real alternative needed to counteract TV's devastating impact had been found. But championing traditional values and hurling criticisms at his competition is all part of the past for Turner. Television's great innovator has turned left -- hard left.

Can't Beat 'Em; Join 'Em

In the spring of 1985, Turner launched a well-publicized bid to grab control of CBS. The effort proved to be a total failure. We don't know whether mixing with TV's "big boys" had anything to do with his ideological shift, but the beaten Turner promptly announced the formation of the Better World Society, a "global television programming" outfit designed to publicize concerns about the environment, the arms race and population control. Its leftist slant was telegraphed by the presence on its board of former President Jimmy Carter, Audubon Society luminary Russell Peterson, Worldwatch Institute's Lester Brown, and UN undersecretary Yashshi Akashi. The Better Worlders were later joined on their board by longtime Soviet propagandist Georgi Arbatov.

Not content with merely one outlet for his changed views, Turner threw his support to "The Friendship Force" led by Rosalynn Carter and Soviet apologist Armand Hammer. The "Force" hopes to achieve world peace through citizen exchange programs involving forty Communist and non-Communist nations. Then the Turner name showed up on the Global Tomorrow Coalition, and the Turner pro-abortion views led to his affiliation with the Population

(c) 2000 American Opinion Publishing, Inc. -- www.thenewamerican.com

Institute.

Leftists Welcome New Friend

As can be expected, leftists have welcomed Turner's friendship in many ways. In May 1986, he was guest of honor at a United Nations luncheon attended by UN ambassadors and other high officials. Calling the UN "the most important thing we have on this planet," he said that people must think about the world instead of their own countries. How foolish it must now seem to Turner for an American to revere our nation's Declaration of Independence and Constitution; how obstructive for Afghan freedom fighters, Angola's UNITA and Mozambique's FRELIMO to fight and die for freedom in their nations.

The UN crowd must have delighted when their new ally told a futurist conference in Colorado earlier this year that Third World debt was caused by America and that the U.S. is "the greatest problem in the world."

Ever the sports enthusiast, the owner of Atlanta's baseball and basketball teams has been welcomed by the Kremlin to promote his Moscow-based Goodwill Games. While in the Soviet capital, he exulted at a press conference: "Like Jesus, I've made my peace with the Soviets. They're not my enemies. We're all brothers .... I found their leaders very reasonable." Communists and world government promoters everywhere have a new friend in Ted Turner.

-- JOHN F. MCMANUS

This commentary is also syndicated by
The John Birch Society Features.

For 75 years, the U.S.-built inter-oceanic canal that spans 51 miles across the isthmus at Panama was clearly in the hands of the United States. The canal was built by the United States under a 1903 treaty that granted us the right to build, operate, and own such a canal. For the first 65 years after the original Panama Canal Treaty, U.S. ownership of the canal remained unthreatened. But in 1968 General Omar Torrijos overthrew the newly installed government of Arnulfo Arias. Following his coup, Torrijos pushed for Panamanian control of the Canal and the Canal Zone. The wishes of the Marxist Torrijos were largely fulfilled in 1977, when President James Earl Carter signed the Panama Canal Treaty. The following year, the treaty was ratified by the U.S. Senate.

Leading opponents of the 1977 Treaty, Senators Robert Dole (R-KS) and Jesse Helms (R-NC), questioned the integrity of the Torrijos regime then in power. The "Panamanian Connection" had been identified as one of the most important drug trafficking channels in the hemisphere. As far back as 1971 Torrijos' brother, Hugo, had been secretly indicted by a U.S. Grand Jury for drug smuggling. As Intelligence Chief of the National Guard, then-Colonel Manuel Antonio Noriega was also believed to be involved; however, in February 1978, reports from the U.S. Intelligence Committee hinted that officials did not want to "alienate" Noriega by linking him with drug trafficking. Treaty proponents down-played the significance of the drug connection, arguing that it was only the treaty itself that should be considered. The treaty proponents prevailed; but, even though the status of our Canal has been altered by the treaty, the character of Panama's leaders has not.

(c) 2000 American Opinion Publishing, Inc. -- www.thenewamerican.com

On June 22nd of this year, Senator Helms named Noriega, now a general and the military leader of Panama, as the "head of the biggest drug trafficking operation in the Western Hemisphere." As the nation's commander, Noriega is the dominant authority, while civilian President Eric Arturo DelValle remains a nominal political figure. The following day, the ***New York Times*** credited Helms as "the first American public official to affirm on the record published reports about what has been described as General Noriega's connection to drug traffic and other illegal activities."

"Other illegal activities" include gun-running, money-laundering, the sale of U.S. technology to Cuba and Soviet-bloc countries, and the murder of Dr. Hugo Spadafora, a leading critic of Noriega's Panamanian Army who was found stuffed in a U.S. mailbag just outside Panama in Costa Rica last September. General Noriega has barricaded himself against the barrage of authoritative reports linking him with the growing list of misdeeds; the government-controlled press has defended the military strongman, calling the attacks against him part of a conspiracy by opposing political leaders. Sources in Panama also point to the popular opinion that the attacks come now as part of a Reagan Administration movement to oust the General. Reports dating back to the 70s identify Noriega as a double agent and a seller of restricted U.S. technology to Cuba, as well as a broker of intelligence information to both the U.S. and Cuba. A lengthy ***New York Times*** article (June 12, 1986) quoted one former American Ambassador to Panama: "As far as they [station chiefs] were concerned, the stuff they were getting was far more interesting than what the Cubans were getting from Noriega on us." CIA intelligence sources have also credited Noriega with the procurement of important information on the Nicaraguan Sandinistas. According to the ***Times*** article, U.S. Administrations present and past have turned their heads to the indictments against General Noreiga because of his value as an intelligence source and the leeway he has allowed U.S. operations in Panama.

The Ideal Stepping-stone

With the rise in insurgencies in Central America, Panama has become an increasingly important platform for U.S. military activity. Through its operating arms in the Army, Navy, and Air Force, the U.S. National Security Agency has successfully managed to boost its intelligence-gathering efforts in Panama since the beginning of this decade. The United States' monitoring capabilities have grown so that we are now able to audit all of Central America and most of South America from our Panamanian-based installations. Panama's close proximity to Nicaragua, for instance, has made it the ideal stepping-stone for U.S. entry into that divided country.

The geographic advantages of Panama are enhanced by the presence of the U.S.-built canal that is slated to become wholly controlled by the government of Panama before the year 2000. Neutrality and free access to the Canal are supposed to be protected by the 1977 Treaty, but such provisions are threatened by the shaky political climate.

Sources within Panama have relayed reports that Noriega has divested himself of his interest in illegal activities and that the strongman understands well the perilous position in which he would find himself if any hard evidence could be documented against him. His control seems sure at the present, but party opposition leaders are eager to pounce.

-- MELANIE S. SHIFFERT

WORLD

Revolution and Betrayal

(c) 2000 American Opinion Publishing, Inc. -- www.thenewamerican.com

The accelerating onslaught against South Africa

This report is the first of a two-part series, adapted with permission from the **McAlvany Intelligence Advisor** *for July 1986. The second part will profile the African National Congress.*

The "winds of change" are blowing rapidly throughout southern Africa. In South Africa, apartheid has been largely dismantled:

1) influx control has been abolished;
2) the pass laws are gone;
3) the mixed marriage laws have been repealed;
4) property rights have been granted to Blacks;
5) public accommodations have been integrated;
6) South African citizenship rights have been granted to Blacks;
7) equal pay for equal work has become a reality;
8) a tri-cameral government with chambers for Coloreds, Indians and Whites will soon give way to a quadra-cameral government with a chamber for Blacks; and the government has accepted political participation (*not domination*) and power sharing with Blacks.

But still the governments, the media and the liberals throughout the West declare these changes to be "cosmetic," or "too little, too late," and demand a total capitulation of the government to the African National Congress (ANC) and some nebulous concept called "black majority rule." South African leaders could totally abolish apartheid tomorrow and the West would not believe it; they could make Zulu Chief Mangosuthu Buthelezi the state President the next day and the West would reject him as an "Uncle Tom" or a "white puppet," just as they did pro-western black Zimbabwean Prime Minister Able Muzorewa in 1979.

The West has a "death wish": it will be satisfied with nothing less than a black, ANC, Marxist government in Pretoria, to complement the black Marxist dictatorships the West supports in Mozambique, Zimbabwe, Angola, Zambia, Tanzania, Uganda, etc. As the saying goes, "whom the gods will destroy, they first make mad."

Update

On July 22nd, after this report was written, President Reagan addressed the nation on the subjects of South Africa and apartheid. He urged the South African government to move toward "political peace" by:

- setting "a timetable for elimination of apartheid laws";
- releasing "all political prisoners," including Nelson Mandela;
- removing a ban on "black political movements"; and
- beginning a dialogue with the government's opponents on "constructing a political system that rests on the consent of the governed...."

Mr. Reagan also asked the U.S. Congress and Western leaders not to impose "punitive sanctions." (The President had already imposed some sanctions against South Africa by Executive Order last September 9th, supposedly to block the tougher sanctions now being considered by the Congress.)

The day after the President's address, Secretary of State George Shultz indicated that the United States might impose sanctions in two months if South Africa does not move to open negotiations on ending apartheid by that time. And on July 24th, Mr. Reagan said, regarding the possibility of additional sanctions: "We haven't closed any doors."

(c) 2000 American Opinion Publishing, Inc. -- www.thenewamerican.com

-- THE EDITOR

Meanwhile, the Soviet buildup in southern Africa, preparatory to the final onslaught against South Africa, is continuing to accelerate. With over 140,000 Soviet-bloc troops in Angola, Zimbabwe, and Mozambique (including Russian, Cuban, East German, North Korean, Libyan, Bulgarian, PLO, and Angolan MPLA), and massive arms deliveries to 21 sub-Saharan African states, the U.S. Department of Defense believes that the military balance of power in Africa has shifted in the Soviets' favor. The Defense Department's annual report, ***Soviet Military Power -- 1986***, documents the Soviet delivery of billions of dollars of Mi24/HIND and Mi-17/H helicopter gunships, MIG-23s, MIG23/FLOGGERS, SA-13 SAMs (surface to air missiles), T-55 tanks, multiple rocket launchers, and a host of other weapons to its surrogates throughout sub-Saharan Africa. About 65,000 Soviet, Cuban, and other East-bloc troops with billions in Soviet weapons are currently massing in southeastern Angola for an attack against the pro-Western guerrilla forces of Jonas Savimbi. The first skirmishes in this Soviet offensive have been fought over the past 30 days. If UNITA should fall, Soviet tanks could rumble through Namibia, Botswana, Zambia and Zaire within the next 18-24 months.

If South Africa falls to the Soviets (through a combination of external military pressure, sanctions from the West, and internal revolution), the entire global balance of power will shift dramatically to the Soviets, with the West in grave danger within three to five years thereafter.

The State of Emergency

In April, May and early June, the momentum of the revolution really began to accelerate. The killing of moderate Blacks in the townships by radical ANC and United Democratic Front (UDF) revolutionaries reached 554 in that period and was rising rapidly; a million Blacks had taken to the streets on May Day; and a major insurrection, including the burning of the Union Buildings in Pretoria, was planned for June 16th, the 10th anniversary of the Soweto riots. On June 12th, with law and order breaking down badly in the black townships, the South African government intervened and declared a state of national emergency. The military (which is 20 percent black) and the police (which are 50 percent black) moved into the black townships and arrested and jailed 2,000-2,500 ANC/UDF radicals. The violence has not ceased; there are still about four Blacks per day dying, mostly moderates who are being necklaced. (See page 25.) However, pro-government Blacks (many of them Zulus), called vigilantes, have begun to retaliate against the radical Blacks.

The Zulus are the toughest, most courageous, and least intimidated of all the black tribal groups in southern Africa. If turned loose on the revolutionaries, many of whom are from the rival Xhosa tribe, the Zulus could probably end the revolution in short order.

The action of the South African government took a lot of courage. They had to choose between sanctions from their "friends" in the West (led by the U.S.) and the revolution. They chose sanctions, and they will probably get them from the U.S. and much of Western Europe in the coming months. Probably the most important benefit from the state of emergency, besides the restoration of law and order, has been the muzzling of the left-wing press in South Africa (including the U.S. press and television reporters). The greatest ally the Communist revolution in South Africa has is the press, which distorts and falsities about 95 percent of the reporting on events in South Africa, is pro-ANC and pro-revolution, and has had a great deal to do with popularizing the radical leaders of the revolution (Tutu, Winnie Mandela, etc.).

Also of great importance, for now, at least, the momentum of the revolution has been broken. Many of the revolutionaries are jailed (criminal charges have been filed against 780 at this writing), and many of the revolution leaders have gone into hiding. Tremendous pressure is

(c) 2000 American Opinion Publishing, Inc. -- www.thenewamerican.com

now being exerted by the Reagan Administration, the State Department, the world media, the United Nations, the liberal opposition, and many of South Africa's appeasement-oriented business leaders to lift the state of emergency and release the jailed revolutionary leaders. If the government gives in to this pressure and lifts the state of emergency, it will eventually fall and a Marxist regime will become inevitable.

It is important to understand that the state of emergency has *not stopped the revolution* -- it has merely placed a lid on it for the period that the restrictions remain in force. It has given the government the appearance of strength and of being in control, and that is very important psychologically to both the moderate Blacks and the Whites. Active steps need to be taken by the government in the meantime to dismantle and neutralize the revolution while continuing with the racial reforms that are now in process. In the meantime, if it gives in to intimidation from the West or from its own liberals, and lifts the state of emergency, the revolution will regain its momentum and will triumph.

The Global Propaganda War

One of the elements of the Soviet grand strategy for world domination is to launch a globally orchestrated media campaign against a targeted government or its leader, portraying the target as a violator of human rights, corrupt, racist, perpetrator of election fraud, and not worthy of U.S. or Western support. Recent years have seen such global media campaigns against the Thieu government in Vietnam, the Shah in Iran, Somoza in Nicaragua, Marcos in the Philippines -- and today against South Africa.

The media always makes the national liberation group, which is trying to overthrow the targeted government, appear to be benign, righteous liberators, fighting for the rights of the oppressed, the abused, and the downtrodden. The media buzzword is to call these revolutionaries "dissidents." Khomeini, the Sandinistas, and the African National Congress have all been portrayed in this light. Never (or seldom) are the Communist or Soviet connections of the liberation group cited by the press; these are played down or totally ignored.

In the case of South Africa, the incredible necklacing atrocities of the ANC/UDF revolutionaries, by which over 600 Blacks have been brutally tortured and burned to death with burning tires around their necks, are *totally ignored.* Soviet flags flying at funerals in black townships around South Africa are *totally ignored.* Legitimate moderate black leaders and their sentiments in favor of ongoing reforms and against disinvestment are *totally ignored.* The numerous and genuine racial reforms that are taking place are *totally ignored.*

The Soviets are masters at individual and mass brainwashing. They have thousands of KGB operatives scattered throughout the press and television of the Western world working with and manipulating the liberals in the media (who comprise the vast majority of media personnel). The Soviets fully understand Hitler's admonition, "Tell a lie, tell it often enough and the people will believe it." They are directing today a highly successful, sophisticated propaganda/psychological warfare campaign against South Africa. Just as with the Shah, Somoza, Marcos, Thieu, and Batista, the West is being brainwashed into betraying and selling out one more strategic ally.

The Sanctions Are Coming

The momentum for sanctions against South Africa is growing almost geometrically. On June 18th, a bill (HR 4868) calling for near total sanctions against South Africa, introduced by one of the Congress' most far-left representatives, Ron Dellums (D-CA), passed by voice vote. An identical bill (S 2570) has been introduced by the very liberal Senators Ted Kennedy (D-MA), Lowell Weicker (R-CT), and Alan Cranston (D-CA) in the Senate. Richard Lugar

(c) 2000 American Opinion Publishing, Inc. -- www.thenewamerican.com

(R-IN), the Chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, has promised to act, and Nancy Kassebaum (R-KS) is spearheading the effort. The House-passed sanctions bill cuts off virtually all U.S. trade and investments with South Africa. Specific provisions include:

A. No U.S. person may directly or through another person make or hold any investment in South Africa. This provision includes loans to South African companies, beneficial ownership or control of a share or interest in such a business enterprise, or of a bond or other debt instrument of a South African company.

B. No article produced or grown in South Africa may be imported into the U.S., except certain strategic minerals that the President deems essential to national security -- provided no substitutes are available. (Presumably, if the U.S. can buy it from the Soviet Union, we won't buy it from South Africa).

C. No U.S. goods, technology, or information can be exported to South Africa.

D. South African Airways would be denied landing rights in the United States.

The four former homelands and now independent Republics of Transkei, Bophuthatswana, Ciskei and Venda are included in these sanctions provisions. The U.S. government has refused to recognize these new countries because they were given independence by the "hated apartheid regime," whereas we instantly recognize African and other Third World dictatorships that have come to power via bloody revolutions and that are far less viable economically. The double standard and selective morality of the U.S. and the other Western powers know no bounds.

Senate liberals and moderates are lining up to push through the Kennedy-Dellums bill or some slightly watered-down version; in all likelihood, a sanctions bill will reach President Reagan's desk sometime this fall. The State Department wants sanctions and is helping to "program" the Congress for the same, but not before it can wring more concessions out of the South African government. For several years State has been trying to pressure the South African government into concessions and piecemeal surrender to the ANC as their price for holding back sanctions. It should be remembered that it was President Reagan (not the Congress) who enacted sanctions against South Africa via executive order, in a strategy supposedly designed to head off even tougher congressional sanctions.

The insanity that rules the United States and much of the West today in the stampede for sanctions is grim testimony to the success of the Soviets and the Soviet-orchestrated Western media in manipulating Western public opinion and goading governments into an action that is so destructive of their own national interests. The Soviets have slaughtered a million and a half men, women and children in Afghanistan in recent years, and there is no uproar in the Western press, no calls for sanctions, no thought of halting Soviet Aeroflot flights to the United States. Black African dictators have slaughtered millions of Blacks in sub-Saharan Africa since 1970, and the western press and leaders ignore it. Are we so blind or decadent in the U.S. and the West that we can no longer tell the difference between good and evil? Are we so brainwashed by evil men that we believe that evil is good, and that good is evil?

Ian Smith, the former Prime Minister of Rhodesia, recently had the following to say about his 14 years of combatting sanctions:

The first 10 years of sanctions proved to be a most stimulating tonic for Rhodesia -- we had a growth rate in our economy which was double what it would have been under normal circumstances. We developed a strong, wide base to our economy, which

(c) 2000 American Opinion Publishing, Inc. -- www.thenewamerican.com

would not have taken place under normal circumstances, and expanded industry, both primary and secondary, into new fields, which many people believed to be impossible. There is no doubt in my mind that sanctions against South Africa could be the very stimulant which that country needs today.

Rhodesia would probably still be a free, non-Communist multi-racial country if not for the duplicity and betrayal by the U.S. State Department and British Foreign Office -- and especially the efforts of Henry Kissinger. Immediately after the Communists came to power, the U.S. and the Western powers lifted the sanctions; but today Communist Zimbabwe is an economic basketcase (i.e., a free Rhodesia, under sanctions, did better economically than Communist Zimbabwe with no sanctions and $375 million in Reagan aid).

South Africa has seen the Rhodesian "sanctions-busting" model up close and has for years been working out "alternative channels" to trade. South Africa is already self-sufficient in food, minerals, arms (since the U.S./UN-backed arms embargo instituted in the early '70s, she has built the ninth largest arms industry in the world), energy, etc. When Rhodesia couldn't import toothpaste, nails, shoes, home appliances, etc., she set up industries to make everything from A to Z at home. South Africa will do likewise.

The primary victims of sanctions will be the million or so Blacks from neighboring states who work in South Africa and who will be sent home to make jobs for South African Blacks. Thousands of South African Blacks will also lose jobs, at the onset of sanctions.

In conclusion, South Africa is probably the best situated country in the world to withstand and possibly even prosper under sanctions. Major adjustments would have to be made, and certainly some businesses would be hurt and some jobs lost. Many South African businessmen are paranoid about sanctions and would prefer government appeasement of the West and even negotiations with the ANC. But, overall, the benefits of sanctions will make South Africa lean and tough and could tend to pull the South African people together against a common enemy, the leader of the sanctions movement -- *the United States*.

-- DONALD S. MCALVANY

The author is the editor of the **McAlvany Intelligence Advisor**, *coeditor of the* **African Intelligence Digest**, *and Chairman of the Council on Southern Africa. For more detailed information on the subject of this article, including a report entitled* **South Africa: Will She Survive?**, *send $5.00 to:* McAlvany Intelligence Advisor, *Suite 430, 2696 South Colorado Blvd., Denver Colorado 80222.*

VIEWPOINT/ Reed Irvine

Who's Censoring Whom?

American journalists are withholding information about South Africa

American journalists have complained loudly about the restrictions on what they can report from South Africa under the state of emergency State President P. W. Botha declared on June 12th. They say this prevents them from informing the American people about what is going

(c) 2000 American Opinion Publishing, Inc. -- www.thenewamerican.com

on in that country. But even while they are complaining about the restrictions on the flow of information imposed by the South African government, our journalists themselves are refusing to tell the American people some important and even sensational news from that country.

In announcing the national state of emergency, President Botha emphasized that the action was being taken because the government had learned of plans being made by radical elements which, he said, posed a real danger for all population groups in the country. He disclosed that in the period from March 1st to June 5th a total of 284 blacks had been killed by black radicals. He said that 172 of these had been killed by the "barbaric so-called necklace method."

This is lynching by fire. The victim's hands are either hacked off or bound, sometimes with barbed wire. An automobile tire filled with gasoline is hung around the victim's neck and another around the legs. The gasoline is ignited. The hot black smoke from the tire destroys the lining of the victim's throat and lungs. The melting rubber penetrates the flesh. It may take up to twenty minutes for the victim to die an agonizing death. The lynch mob laughs and jeers, while this is going on.

What are the crimes that are being punished by this barbarism? According to ***Newsweek***, one of the few publications in this country that has described the practice, one of the victims was an old woman who sold funeral insurance. That was considered to be cooperating with the authorities, and she was sentenced to death. Another had given a Christmas party, when the "comrades" had forbidden such celebrations.

If, in a three-month period, there had been 172 lynchings of blacks in the United States by any method, this would have been the biggest news story of the century. Long before the total reached such heights, the TV coverage and the newspaper and magazine stories would have generated such intense public outrage that the Federal government would have been moved to take whatever steps were necessary to halt the killings. If that required a state of national emergency, we would have a state of national emergency. If the lynchings were carried out by the "necklace" method -- by burning the victim alive -- a single case would have been enough to arouse the country.

How many American viewers of TV news or assiduous readers of our newspapers are aware of the fact that during a three-month period an average of two such lynchings occurred each day in South Africa? These haven't been shown on our television. When President Botha said that there had been 172 such lynchings since last March, our news media didn't even report the figure, much less mention that this was one of the reasons given for declaring the national state of emergency.

Typical of the importance that our human-rights-oriented media have attached to these lynchings is a report in the ***Washington Post*** on June 26th headlined, "South Africa Warns Journalists To 'Toe the Line' on Coverage." It was devoted to the restrictions imposed on the media by the South African government, except for the last paragraph, which said, "A black man was stabbed to death by a mob in Soweto while another man's burned body was found in a rural part of the Transvaal."

The same spirit of self-censorship has kept our media from reporting that Mrs. Nelson Mandela has encouraged lynching by fire. On April 13th, according to an AFP dispatch, she said, "Together, hand in hand with our boxes of matches and necklaces we shall liberate this country." That wasn't mentioned in the adulatory program on Mrs. Mandela aired by PBS, nor when she was recently given an honorary degree by the John Jay College of Criminal Justice in New York City.

(c) 2000 American Opinion Publishing, Inc. -- www.thenewamerican.com

The author is chairman of the board of Accuracy in Media, a Washington-based news-monitoring organization.

The affect of the hidden agenda on our Armed Forces

***Brigadier General Andrew J. Gatsis, U.S. Army (Ret.)**, entered the U.S. Army in 1939 as a private. He earned his commission after graduating from West Point. During his 36 years as a professional combat infantryman, he became one of the most decorated officers ever to serve in our nation's armed forces. An intense student of military strategy and tactics, he completed courses and taught at practically all of the nation's military schools. Today, he serves as a member of the Council of The John Birch Society under whose auspices he delivers many lectures nationwide.*

The late Lyndon Johnson once stated during his presidency: "Those who test our courage will find it strong and those who seek our friendship will find it honorable." As the echoes of these words have faded, so has the resolve of the United States to confront and repulse its enemies paled, degenerating into a merciless betrayal of our true allies.

U.S. foreign policy clearly enshrines the abandonment of anti-Communist countries friendly to the United States, ostensibly on the grounds that they are "repressive militant right-wing dictatorships." Such philippics were used against Fulgencio Batista of Cuba, Chiang Kai-shek of China, Nguyen Van Thieu of South Vietnam, the Shah of Iran, Anastasio Somoza of Nicaragua, Ferdinand Marcos of the Philippines, and Ian Smith of Rhodesia. Today, the countries that were ruled by these so-called dictators are now Communist-controlled -- with the exception of Iran and the Philippines, both of which are nevertheless ardently anti-American and ripe for Red domination. And now the controlling authorities of these new regimes not only oppress their own people -- far more ruthlessly than their predecessors -- but they wish to oppress us as well.

The few loyal allies that America has left -- such as South Africa, South Korea, and Taiwan -- are also being abandoned. The big mistake made by the unfortunate victims of U.S. treachery was that they trusted us. In the early seventies when I, as a senior military officer, visited the Taiwanese government in an official capacity, the senior Chinese officials refused to believe me when I advised them that the U.S. government was planning to abandon Taiwan and recognize Communist China. They remained unconvinced even when they were told that I had been designated as the plans officer to draw up the schedule for pulling U.S. army troops out of their country. In spite of their disbelief that the United States would do anything so dastardly, U.S. troop redeployment out of Taiwan was effected a year later.

Though aware of the Communist goal of world domination, the average U.S. citizen refuses to believe that the Reds are only a peripheral enemy and that the real threat comes from a Western power structure made up of governmental officials and their non-governmental confederates who secretly espouse the same objectives as the openly avowed Communists. These underhanded activists, whom we shall call the Insiders, promote one-world government through

(c) 2000 American Opinion Publishing, Inc. -- www.thenewamerican.com

a gradual, transition from freedom to International Socialism.

This is their hidden agenda for the United States:

(1) Destroy American nationalism.

(2) Neutralize United States intelligence agencies.

(3) Bankrupt America.

(4) Promote a sense of guilt and shame among the people and urge the relinquishment of national sovereignty and the international redistribution of America's wealth as atonement for our country's "sins."

(5) Convince the American people that all friendly allies who oppose socialism are violators of human rights and should be toppled in the name of "democracy."

(6) Weaken the nation's defenses and disarm the United States.

Because the American way of life involves some yielding up of freedom to ensure an orderly society, the United States must have institutional means for forcibly preserving peace. American Citizens can enjoy their liberty only when they are certain that criminals will be punished and invaders repelled. This framework of security, whose construction is the fundamental purpose of government, is provided primarily by the military. Effectively accomplishing the *sixth point* of the *hidden agenda* -- by reducing the combat effectiveness of the Armed Forces -- is the most important of all measures to America's enemies, for it removes the prop that ensures the private citizen his liberties. A weak military invites compromise and creates a vulnerability to coercive diplomacy.

The attack on the defenses of our nation is part of an integral plan for transforming the status of the U.S. from an independent republic to an interdependent element in a world socialist system; and it targets hard-core values, assaulting discipline, esprit de corps, strategy, doctrine, codes of ethics, command structure, military control and combat readiness in equipment and personnel. The attack has been implemented as follows:

Indoctrinating the Officers

In the late forties, the stage was set to begin brainwashing American military officers to "think liberal" and to promote international socialism. The war colleges that produce future generals began to reorient the thinking of professional military men from fighting to intellectualism. Shortly after 1947, the Air War College announced that the traditional relative isolation of military officers from domestic and international policy matters would be discarded and that the basic approach to academic solutions in the curriculum would revolve around the United Nations and the avoidance of traditionalism. The instruction focused increasingly on compromise, appeasement, and the downgrading of U.S. national interests to a position of secondary importance in relation to world affairs.

As a student in the Air War College in 1963-64, I personally experienced the transformation of the curriculum. I estimate that 90 percent of the guest lecturers (and we had one every day) were extremely liberal and embraced the principles of world government. Some of the main ones -- Henry Kissinger, Zbigniew Brzezinski, Averell Harriman, Norman Cousins, George Ball, Dean Rusk, Elspeth Rostow, and Supreme Court Justice William J. Brennan, Jr. -- remain active on today's scene. All but a very few came from the liberal establishment.

They were Harvard professors, members of left-wing think tanks, liberal journalists, ambassadors, government officials holding high positions in the Kennedy Administration, and the like. The rare conservatives (perhaps ten, among hundreds of speakers) could hardly have been left off the program, for they were mainly high-ranking military men like General Curtis LeMay, who was the Chief of the Air Force at that time. After all, some military philosophy had

(c) 2000 American Opinion Publishing, Inc. -- www.thenewamerican.com

to be worked into a college designed to train future generals to fight and win wars.

I still remember Dr. Brzezinski's lecture on the subject of world Communism. His main, theme was the transformation of the role of the U.S. from independence to interdependence. I was completely shocked when he told us that, as military officers, we should first redefine what it means to win.

When I complained to the authorities of the college about the extremely unbalanced liberal curriculum and requested more conservative instruction and guest speakers, I was told that I was out of date and that it was too late to change the guest speakers program. Earlier in the school year, I asked Averell Harriman, then a roving ambassador for the Kennedy Administration, to tell the students why our government was undermining President Ngo Dinh Diem, the President of South Vietnam. Harriman went into a rage, told me to sit down, and denied that the U.S. government was working against Diem. Needless to say, I was thoroughly reprimanded by the senior Army faculty member for confronting Ambassador Harriman with this question. A short time later, Diem was assassinated.

The service academies where career professional military and naval officers are trained have experienced this same "liberalization." President Carter brought Army General Andrew Goodpaster, a member of the Council on Foreign Relations, out of retirement and made him West Point's superintendent with the express purpose of liberalizing the U.S. Military Academy.

During his tenure, Goodpaster promoted individualism within the system, placing the desires of self over the unit; removed the merit system, thereby eliminating competition among cadets; lowered the physical standards of the academy to accommodate large groups of women in the cadet corps; changed the rules of the honor system to provide greater tolerance for violators; and greatly civilianized the academic faculty with outside personnel who know nothing of the spirit and the traditions of the academy or the interrelationship between the academic program and the military profession.

There are now at West Point women tactical officers supervising cadets, most of whom, upon graduation, will become combat arms officers. One can imagine how much a woman supervisor, with no combat experience, inspires these young cadets, whose mission will be to fight one day. When I asked an old combat sergeant assigned to duty at West Point during his 17th year of service why he had decided to quit, he said: "Sir, I am fed up with these high-ranking prissy military officers who are bent on sissifying the army." Such "sissification" can play havoc with male-to-male bonding and unit cohesion -- vital elements for preventing the disintegration of units in combat.

One example of brainwashing through the academic department occurred in November 1981, when the Reverend William Sloane Coffin, Jr. lectured cadets at the United States Military Academy. His themes were "Nuclear Situational Ethics," "Strategic Nuclear Pacifism," and "American Unilateral Disarmament," surprising subjects at the primary training school for America's future professional soldiers. But he won good will and the blessings of State Department foreign Service officer Gene Preston, then on professorial duty at West Point, who commented: "I wish Coffin had borne down even harder on the mission of total defeat that the Lord promises for a self-deceiving people."

Coffin, the avid booster of pacifist elements that have given aid and comfort to enemies killing and imprisoning U.S. military men, now found himself an honored guest of the military establishment.

This was quite a change! During the period from 1961-67, he was jailed several times for illegal demonstrations. His long career in pacifism includes leading roles with the National

(c) 2000 American Opinion Publishing, Inc. -- www.thenewamerican.com

Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy and similar leftist groups. In 1978 he called the Pentagon the "Jim Jones" of America's society; and, during the Iranian hostage crisis, he labeled the united States "the guilty party." Did West Point care about Coffin's record? Were the authorities of the academy concerned over his denunciations of the military? Obviously not. One cadet told him after his speech: "Sir, as we would be among the first to get ourselves blown up if the U.S. begins to use tactical nuclear weapons, you are talking to a group of peaceniks." An unbelievable pronouncement from a professional trained to defend America!

First Earth Battalion

As an example of how confident our enemies are in transforming military thinking and in dismantling America's combat capability, consider that they have created an army unit in the form of a think tank of more than 200 individuals, who are developing "alternative futures" for military service. The unit is officially designated as the First Earth Battalion.

Lieutenant Colonel Channon, the pioneer of this battalion -- better known as the natural (not national) guard -- says that "its essence is not physical but spiritual. It's a way for the army to open itself to new ways of being." The army financed Channon's production of a multi-media program about this battalion, which was shown to the First Classmen of the U.S. Military Academy. The concept, Channon said, has "infected the highest ranks of the military." He and his colleagues inform their fellow officers of alternative concepts through TV tapes, workshops, and a "soft tactics" manual

According to the manual, the primary allegiance of the First Earth Battalion is not to the United States but to the world. Its members are engaged in the ethical evolution of force: They seek mastery as they move up the ethical hierarchy, from force of arms to force of heart. This new breed of soldiers, or "warrior monks," would be schooled in various non-destructive methods of control. Under the guise of peace, the traditional tactics of combat would be retooled, and the human dimension of the military would be emphasized.

The Battalion's basic doctrine claims that "a major shift in the criterion for victory has already begun. Since the advent of worldwide television coverage, the judgments for success in battle have changed. *Victory will now accrue to the force that executes an action most consistent with evolving world values.* Destroying your opponent and his property will, in the long run, equal defeat." (Emphasis ours.)

In short, the military spirit of the soldier is smothered in an atmosphere of pacifism that saps his will to fight. When projected openly by military authorities, this defeatist philosophy psychologically conditions the American citizenry to call for unilateral disarmament in the name of "peace."

Civilians Control Operations

One of the greatest deficiencies in our defense system is that civilian planners have assumed control of our military doctrines, strategy, and tactics since World War II. Detailed control is in the hands of so-called defense intellectuals, who have sabotaged our military operations and discredited the professionalism of our Armed Forces.

Civilian control over military operations has promoted consistent failure. The Iranian rescue mission is an excellent example. The authority of the ground commander to determine whether or not to abort the mission was critical to success. One does not have to have detailed knowledge of that operation to realize that, if the President himself gave the order to abort the mission, the military commander closest to the action had no say in the decision and was completely subordinated to the Civilian planners in Washington.

This is not a one-time happenstance. Remember the Cuban Bay of Pigs, the *Pueblo*, and

(c) 2000 American Opinion Publishing, Inc. -- www.thenewamerican.com

the Marine disaster in Lebanon? These operations were also Controlled by civilians from the White House and the State Department. The Bay of Pigs operation, aborted when U.S. air support was withheld at the last minute, was a complete disaster. Washington's failure to direct the American commander of the *Pueblo* to fight, as it was his duty to do, resulted in the capture of the crew by North Korean gun boats. And the Lebanon tragedy could have been avoided had the military commander not been obliged to risk the security of his troops by pursuing a political rather than a military objective.

Dangerously ineffective doctrines based on objectives short of victory, a preoccupation with defensive concepts, and strategic inferiority weaken our ability to protect America. Worst of all, professional military men trained to plan and execute military campaigns are replaced by charlatans. Their naïveté and arrogance -- their accommodation and subterfuge -- take many fatal forms. In Vietnam, those forms included the "body-count," used as a criterion for success; the Hamlet Evaluation System (an administrative pencil exercise), used to determine whether or not an enemy area was pacified by rating 18 factors pertaining to education, health, welfare, economic development, and security; and the on-again, off-again bombing in the North, which permitted the enemy to recover during the interludes.

No Longer Bound by the Code

The principles of war represent a list of how a military unit "ought to fight." Translating these principles into action gives victory when the soldier's motivation is "total commitment against the enemy." No matter how sophisticated the weapons, no matter how brilliant the strategy, the soldier must have a non-compromising mentality. Anything less encourages defeat. This precept calls for the highest standards of conduct in combat and applies to all arenas of military operations.

The Code of Conduct for prisoners of war (POWs) is one of these arenas. A strong code promotes male-to-male bonding, loyalty to cause, and a camaraderie that stirs maximum resistance against the foe. Prior to 1955, the Code dictated that the captured prisoner give only his name, rank, service number, and date of birth to the enemy. The standards were set high in order to obtain the best possible performance. Although not all men could comply with such demanding rules in the literal sense, everyone could abide by them in spirit. Furthermore, the Code provided a defense against a nervous collapse before the eyes of fellow prisoners. The Code helped the POWs keep their self-respect and dignity intact, unified them, and increased their chances of survival. Any violation of the Code was dealt with by a military court-martial.

After the Korean War, in coordination with the agenda to disarm America, another step was taken to dilute America's military image by lessening the requirements demanded of the POW. The word "bound" was replaced by "required" and the world "only" was deleted in the portion of the Code that read: "I am bound to give only name, rank, service number, and date of birth." Additionally, the Code was no longer made legally binding.

To supplement these rule changes, Department of Defense policy, at the end of the Vietnam hostilities, was not to press charges or prosecute returning POWs for anything they may have done while in captivity, even if they had broken faith with fellow prisoners or betrayed their country. The psychological effect produced by certain disloyal Americans, who publicly depicted the U.S. soldier in Vietnam as a criminal, was to create a no-prosecution policy for violators of the Code. Such undermining encouraged some of the captives to cooperate without pangs of conscience and reinforced the enemy propaganda effort against us. Modifying the Code is just another phase of the overall effort to weaken America's Armed Forces.

Substituting Defeat for Victory

(c) 2000 American Opinion Publishing, Inc. -- www.thenewamerican.com

The main objective of the hidden agenda for U.S. defense is to habituate the American citizenry to defeat. This theme is advanced by a propaganda drive through the major news media that victory is not worth the price. It parallels the Communist language that peace requires the prior destruction of the very idea of military victory and perpetuates the myth that Communist advances are irreversible.

Two policies reinforce this precept and assure that U.S. military victory is not within the grasp of reality:

(1) the reduction of U.S. Armed Forces' strength and its transfer to the other side, and

(2) the restriction of military strategy and doctrine to defensive concepts and limited objectives.

One must understand the real meaning of military superiority to understand how U.S. military strength is diminished. Military superiority does not mean that we must have the numerical advantage in weaponry and people, nor does it necessarily mean that we must have the best in quality for all weapon systems, although sufficiency in both are necessary. Superiority is obtained through flexibility -- which means having a greater *variety* of modernized weapons, fighting elements, and support capabilities than the adversary.

Perpetuating this misconception of military superiority, anti-military pundits convey to the American people that, in lacking the manpower and capability to finance a huge military machine larger than that of the Soviet Union, the U.S. can never gain military ascendancy over the Kremlin. This truism predicated on a false definition of real military superiority has three objectives:

(1) to discourage the average American citizen from supporting any effort to build military strength,

(2) to point out the futility of trying to surpass the Soviets in military capability, and

(3) to encourage unilateral disarmament in the name of fiscal responsibility.

Those who pursue the hidden agenda for neutralizing America's combat readiness do so by developing military requirements to fit the budget rather than by providing a budget to satisfy the military requirements. Missions and requirements should be based on the opponent's capabilities, not on a dollar figure.

Flexible Armed Forces are well within the bounds of a reasonable defense budget that is insufficient for financing large forces. Flexibility can offset numbers; and, combined with the great advantages of American technology, the U.S. can easily dominate its external enemies. Dominance, however, presupposes the termination of all aid to the Communists and a reversal of the "build-down" of our Armed Forces.

In addition to thwarting the modernization of our military hardware and the adequate training of personnel, the Insiders seek to prohibit military professionals from developing and employing winning strategies. They restrict them within the parameters of defensive doctrine and neutralize their efforts at offensive operations by confining them to limited (shallow) objective attacks.

No matter how good a unit is, it loses if it fights by the wrong principles. It is a well-known military maxim that the best defense is a good offense. Military doctrine, shaped by the realities of battle throughout the ages, dictates that clear-cut military victories can be gained only by continual offensive actions. Defensive operations are an *interim* measure and are conducted only until an offensive capability can be attained. The sole purpose for a defensive strategy is to develop favorable conditions for launching an attack. No war has been won using defensive tactics alone.

(c) 2000 American Opinion Publishing, Inc. -- www.thenewamerican.com

An example that clearly demonstrates the validity of this principle is the War Between the States. Although the South won many battles, almost all were fought for the *defensive* objective of repelling the advancing Northern Armies.

During World War II, the United States was compelled to fight defensively in the initial stages of the war but had to go on the offense -- invading Germany and taking the islands in the Pacific -- before victory could be obtained.

One of Napoleon's distinguished soldiers and scholars, General Baron Antoine de Jomini, an authority on the principles of war, said, "The best thing for an Army standing on the defensive is to know *how* to take the offensive at a proper time and *to take it.*" (Emphasis ours.)

The Soviets follow this principle to the letter, as evidenced by their success throughout the world in conducting offensive insurgency operations. On the other hand, the United States has been losing consistently since World War II by using defensive counterinsurgency operations deliberately imposed upon the Armed Forces by the Insiders.

The overriding principle of war is the "objective." To win, the objective must be either to destroy the enemy or to break his will to resist. The key elements needed to accomplish either end are the seizure of objectives deep in the opponent's rear and the cutting of his supply lines.

After World War II, the U.S. Armed Forces were compelled to abandon this doctrine. They were pressed to replace deep objectives with shallow ones, which always allowed the enemy to escape and precluded his defeat. Since then U.S. units have suffered a series of military failures -- the Korean War, Vietnam, Cambodia. It is notable that America never lost a war so long as we had a Department of War and has never won one since it became the Department of Defense. More than just the name of the department was changed -- there was a fundamental change in philosophy as well. (See page 60.)

Victory was turned into stalemate in the Korean War because American commanders were ordered to abandon their original objectives and revert to defensive operations after U.S. forces had broken the back of the Chinese Communist Army in "Operation Killer," putting them in full retreat.

The Vietnam War was the perfect lever for continuing the transformation of America's military doctrine into a non-violent one. The Armed Forces were directed to reinforce failure rather than success, and they continued to fight a defensive action in the South after years of such fruitless tactics. Not once was any notable attempt made to change the strategy and redirect the weight of our power at the enemy's heartland, his warmaking potential, and his willingness to fight.

The U.S. Army was told by government officials that, since the military phraseology "search and destroy" sounded too horrible to the American public and the world, all references to such maneuvers would have to be expressed in the more docile term "search and clear." Such terminology was hardly a catalyst for motivating the fighting spirit of the American soldier.

Thus, the lost cause was of our own making: We were forced by our own government to violate all standard military doctrine and to fight the war in the most inefficient and costly way possible. The net result of this ludicrous concept of operations was an attrition rate that produced a defeatist attitude among Americans and created the perfect climate for the abandonment of our allies to the Communists under the infamous slogan, "Peace With Honor."

I well remember the cries of "immoral war" and the detrimental restrictions placed upon our tactics. We could not bomb within a restricted radius of Hanoi, even though the enemy anti-aircraft defenses located in that area were shooting our planes down every day. Occupied civilian villages could not be attacked, even though they contained enemy battalions shooting

(c) 2000 American Opinion Publishing, Inc. -- www.thenewamerican.com

and killing American soldiers. Plans to bomb and break the dykes in North Vietnam, flooding the rice paddies and destroying the food supply, were ruled out as being "too barbaric."

A classic example of the sabotage of U.S.-South Vietnamese military operations was the incursion into Cambodia on April 30, 1970. The real purpose of that operation was to serve the political objective of pulling U.S. forces out of South Vietnam. Failure against the enemy in Cambodia would signal another American defeat and brand the United States as an aggressor. The excuse given for this cross-over was that the North Vietnamese had to be routed out of their sanctuaries.

As a military advisor and the first American officer to move into Cambodia with the South Vietnamese Army, I was disturbed by the great number of restrictions placed upon our ability to close in On the enemy and destroy him. The Rules of Engagement, written in Washington, assured that the incursion would be a fruitless one, militarily. At the outset there was a 30-mile limit of advance placed upon all friendly units and a requirement to withdraw from Cambodia within 60 days (June 30, 1970). Military commanders were left with few options and little flexibility to maneuver their troops.

The initial attack was successful. We were able to defeat the first enemy elements contacted and to capture a great number of weapons, but we were unable to pursue the defeated units because they had retreated beyond the 30-mile limit.

Guidelines for use of firepower prevented the infliction of maximum damage upon the fleeing North Vietnamese and Communist Khmer Rouge forces. Such prohibitions hampered the intelligence-gathering operations of unit commanders. The result was that friendly troops were Continually wasting billions of ammunition rounds by firing into areas in which there was no intelligence to confirm an enemy presence, a procedure known as "reconnaissance by fire." There were even such extremes as making air strikes with 500- and 750-pound bombs against a lone sniper hidden in the jungles. It was like killing ants with a hammer. While these fruitless operations were conducted, the main enemy force withdrew deeper into Cambodia and reconstituted its forces safely beyond the 30-mile limit, knowing that they had only to remain in their sanctuaries and avoid the hamstrung U.S.-South Vietnamese forces for 60 days.

The Warrior Spirit

Another form of building down U.S. military might is the effort to weaken the warrior spirit of our military personnel. Current professional soldiery smacks of master's degrees and Ph.D.s. As a rule, senior rank officers cannot get promoted to general unless they hold a graduate degree. Many generals and admirals are becoming soft-headed liberal intellectuals. In the War Colleges they are indoctrinated with such themes as "What does it mean to win?" and "Theories of compromise." An atmosphere of weakness also pervades our service academies as manifested by civilian professors, liberal philosophies, and the women's liberation movement.

The spirit of the warrior is being replaced by a sense of false compassion for our enemy and the promotion of individualism over teamwork. Equal rights and understanding are overshadowing discipline and obedience. It is discipline that is required when a unit fights to the death -- not compassion. The fighting man must be committed to team loyalty, not to individual rights. Professional military journals advance this new approach by praising the unqualified. For example, at the height of the feminist movement the ***Armed Forces Journal*** described inexperienced feminist Antonia Handler Chayes, Deputy Secretary of the Air Force during the Carter Administration, as follows: "She emerges from behind the stereotypical facades of title and gender as a superbly talented metamorphosis of executive humanity with the hide of a rhino and the grace of a swan."

(c) 2000 American Opinion Publishing, Inc. -- www.thenewamerican.com

Leadership is gradually being replaced by management. You can lose a war for lack of management, but you cannot win one without leadership. The greatest demands on commanders today are equal rights and balancing the books -- not leadership. Management runs out of answers when your comrades lie wounded around you, when each moment is suffused by terror, when nothing is definitely known any longer, and when all that is left is the leader's ability and his will to unite his men. You cannot manage men to their death. It is leadership that spurs the combat soldier to follow his commander through hell.

The Insiders who are responsible for the hidden agenda purposely defuse the intangible spirit that the combat leader must demonstrate to make men fight to win. In the thick of battle soldiers do not fight for patriotism, motherhood, or apple pie. They fight for each other. It is male-to-male bonding that creates pride and the spirit of winning. The combat leader's job is winning by any means, not statistics, not market trends.

We hear much rhetoric today from President Reagan on the need for a strong defense. From documented information and personal experience, I have drawn for the reader a real mental picture of the threat to America's combat potential. An objective thinker will conclude that President Reagan is a master at saying what he knows the average American citizen wants to hear about defense while allowing actions that promote the hidden agenda -- an agenda that erodes the ability of America's Armed Forces to fight.

Around 500 BC Sun Tzu, a great Chinese author and general, said in his book ***The Art of War***, "Know the enemy and the battle is half won. Know yourself and the battle is yours." One of the problems in America is that we know neither.

If we knew the enemy, we would believe Soviet doctrine, which clearly enunciates their intent to communize the world, merging our own country into their system. If we knew ourselves, we would heed the words of Cicero, who once warned Rome just before her collapse, "Beware of the traitor within the gates."

WORTH REPEATING

South Africa

We communist party members are the most advanced revolutionaries in modern history....

-- Nelson Mandela

As in Cuba, the general uprising must be sparked off by organized and well prepared guerrilla operations during the course of which the masses of the people will be drawn in and armed.

-- Nelson Mandela

The people of South Africa, led by the Southern African Communist Party, will destroy capitalist society and build in its place socialism .... The transition from capitalism to socialism and the liberation of the working class from the yoke cannot be affected by slow changes or by reforms as reactionaries and liberals often advise, but by revolution. One must therefore be a revolutionary and not a reformist.

-- Nelson Mandela

[W]ith our boxes of matches and our necklaces, we shall liberate this country.

-- Winnie Mandela

(c) 2000 American Opinion Publishing, Inc. -- www.thenewamerican.com

The most common method of terror is the so-called necklace. In this barbaric way of reprisal, a tire is filled with kerosene and gasoline, and placed around the neck of an alleged collaborator and ignited. The victim may be a black policeman, a teacher, a soldier, a civil servant -- it makes no difference, the atrocity is designed to terrorize blacks into ending all racial cooperation and to polarize South Africa as a prelude to a final climactic struggle for power.

* * *

But let me outline what we believe are necessary components of progress toward political peace.

First, a timetable for elimination of apartheid laws should be set.

Second, all political prisoners should be released.

Third, Nelson Mandela should be released to participate in the country's political process.

Fourth, black political movements should be unbanned.

Fifth, both the Government and its opponents should begin a dialogue about constructing a political system that rests on the consent of the governed....

Sixth, if post-apartheid South Africa is to remain the economic locomotive of southern Africa, its strong and developed economy must not be crippled. And therefore, I urge the Congress and the countries of Western Europe to resist the emotional clamor for punitive sanctions.

-- Ronald Reagan

(Both remarks were made by the President as part of his July 22nd nationally televised address on South Africa and apartheid.)

Your President is the pits as far as blacks are concerned.

* * *

I am quite angry. I think the West, for my part, can go to hell.

-- Bishop Desmond M. Tutu

(The Bishop and Nobel Peace Prize recipient was responding to Mr. Reagan's July 22nd address.)

The Goetz Case

To completely exonerate such an individual [Bernhard Goetz] would allow citizens to set their own standards for the permissible use of force. It would also allow a legally competent defendant suffering from delusions to kill or perform acts of violence with impunity, contrary to fundamental principles of justice and criminal law.

-- Sol Wachtler (NY State's Chief Judge)

I was vindicated a long time ago -- some people just haven't noticed it.

-- Bernhard Goetz

Foreign Relations

The nation which indulges towards another an habitual hatred, or an habitual fondness, is in some degree a slave. It is a slave to its animosity or to its affection, either of which is sufficient to lead it astray from its duty and its interest.

* * *

It is our true policy to steer clear of permanent alliances with any portion of the foreign

(c) 2000 American Opinion Publishing, Inc. -- www.thenewamerican.com

world.

-- George Washington
(From his Farewell Address.)

LETTERS OF THE REPUBLIC
Joan of Arc Returns

I, Martha Adams By *Pauline Glen Winslow*, Baen Publishing Enterprises, 1986, $3.95, 447 pages, paperback.

Two years ago a novel was published by St. Martin's Press that postulated an unnervingly plausible scenario -- the surrender of the United States government following a nuclear first strike by the Soviet Union. The action was set in the immediate future, during the administration of a pacifist liberal president who had come to power following the assassinations of Ronald Reagan and George Bush. According to the story, he had *reversed* the military policies of his predecessor, dismantling the defensive capabilities of our country to such an extent that capitulation appears to be the only sensible response to the attack.

Fortunately for freedom-loving Americans, the wife of a government contractor killed in the bomb blasts learns of the existence of a top-secret super weapon covertly built and installed on the orders of the wily Reagan. With the help of a noble Mossad agent and her own teenage son, the heroine completes a transcontinental trek across Soviet-occupied America and from the doomsday weapon's firing capsule delivers an ultimatum to the enemy: Withdraw all personnel from the United States or face the annihilation of Russia.

Increasing Urgency

Recently released in paperback, ***I, Martha Adams*** makes a compelling case for its central supposition that American leadership lacks the will to win and that in the advent of a Soviet takeover the majority of our de-principled countrymen would be willing collaborators. Pauline Glen Winslow completed the book in 1982, with the intention of sounding an alarm about the ominous trends in American politics and morality, and paying tribute to a President who had positioned himself as the champion of our personal and national revitalization.

The message of ***I, Martha Adams*** is even more urgent today than it was two- much less four-years ago. However, its shortcomings are also more glaring. When Winslow completed her novel, President Reagan was not yet halfway through his first term. Stubborn optimists remained oblivious to the warning signs in the President's political career and felt confident that his pronouncements about rebuilding America's defenses were more than empty rhetoric. The President's recent decision to scuttle two Poseidon submarines should make Winslow wince at the stroking she gave our *disarmingly* eloquent commander-in-chief.

Winslow's fawning depiction of a Mossad agent and her assignment to Israeli scientists of the credit for the creation of the doomsday device also seem gratuitous in light of recent revelations about Israeli spying in the United States -- and our ongoing military and technological assistance to the beleaguered Jewish state. Likewise, her total acceptance of the mythic split between the Soviet Union and Red China, which figures prominently in the plotline, demonstrates that even an author who sets out to chide her countrymen for their naïveté is not immune to bouts of gullibility.

Fiction or Fact?

It bears mentioning, too, that many of the changes Winslow describes as taking place in a newly Sovietized America are already proposed or under way in the United States today, such as

(c) 2000 American Opinion Publishing, Inc. -- www.thenewamerican.com

the issuance of national identity cards, restrictions upon citizen travel, the substitution of our currency, and the fortification of the White House. To suggest, as Winslow does, that American leaders are weak and stupid, and that they may be caught unawares by a Soviet strike, is to let them off easy.

Then there are the nonpolitical defects of the book: the ridiculous dialogue of its male characters, the flatness of character typical of polemical novels (cf., ***1984***), the concentration on meaningless details that double the length of the volume without adding one line of substance (a high-fiber approach favored by teachers of creative writing, in an unconscious admission that their -- and their progenies' -- powers of observation are more trustworthy than their analytical abilities).

Nevertheless, ***I, Martha Adams*** does have the fast-paced readability of a potboiler, and the author does set forth unflinchingly several unpleasant facts that the average American would prefer to ignore, such as:

1. American businessmen help to provide the means to perpetuate Soviet oppression;
2. The United Nations was designed for no other purpose than to destroy the sovereignty of the United States;
3. The Soviets make a practice of establishing their own resistance groups to guarantee that they can control the opposition; and
4. The Soviets may very well look upon the fighting in Afghanistan as a form of maneuvers to prepare its troops for combat in the mountain ranges of the United States.

But, most important of all, Winslow drives home the point that one person, man or woman, can make a difference, that resistance begins with the individual. If the United States had not one army of two million but 240 million armies of one, there would be no possibility of defeat, and no word in our language for surrender.

-- F. R. DUPLANTIER

CULTURAL CURRENTS You've Come A Long Way, Molly

Molly Marine has stood guard at the busy intersection of Elk Place and Canal Street in New Orleans for nearly 43 years. She was the first statue of a service woman in uniform erected in the United States. Sculpted by a French Quarter artist, Enrique Alvarez, she was dedicated in 1943 on November 10th, the birthday of the U.S. Marine Corps.

Standing staunchly at her post, Molly has seen good times and bad times for men and women in uniform. Cast in marble chips and granite instead of bronze, because of wartime restrictions, the statue became shabby and dirty-looking over the years. In 1966, a local committee decided that a monument should be erected that would represent women who had served in all branches of the service, and they proposed to put the new monument on Molly's beach-head.

Molly Stood Her Ground

But, with the aid of her many friends, Molly stood her ground. Among them was Lieutenant Colonel Linus N. Hardy, USMC (Ret.), who had sworn in South Louisiana's first women Marines in 1943. A city councilman pointed out that "Molly had priority and should keep her place." Frank Zito, former State Commandant of the Louisiana Marine Corps League, promised that Molly would be bronzed and placed on a new pedestal. Molly was there first (as all good Marines are) and there she stayed.

(c) 2000 American Opinion Publishing, Inc. -- www.thenewamerican.com

The local committee did an about-face and a refurbished Molly was the only statue dedicated exclusively to women Marines, past and present.

On February 13, 1986, women Marines celebrated their 43rd anniversary as permanent status Marines. This writer was one of those sworn in by then-Captain Linus Hardy, and my first military experience was a captain's mast for arriving at the Officers' Candidate School at Mount Holyoke College in Massachusetts beyond the report-in date. Orders were received on March 13, 1943, the date to report in.

That wasn't the only snafu. Uniforms did not arrive for several weeks and bedraggled civilian clothes had to do until the uniforms came in. It was a proud bunch that first wore the green uniform and the jaunty green hat with the bright red ribbon on Easter Sunday, 1943. "In my Easter bonnet with the red ribbon on it," we sang.

When the members of that first class became cadets (after one month), Eleanor Roosevelt was the guest speaker. At the conclusion of training, the class paraded in review before Madame Chiang Kai-shek.

After being commissioned, the new officers were sent to Hunter College in New York, then the site of the women Marines recruit training depot (which was later moved to Camp Lejeune), to Camp Lejeune and Cherry Point in North Carolina, to Washington DC, to the West Coast, and to recruiting stations throughout the United States.

They were so proud of being just Marines -- no nickname like WAVE or WAC or SPAR. All had signed up for the duration, which turned out to be 3½ years for most of the first class. The majority of the women Marines were separated from the service at the end of World War II, although a few remained in the Reserves. At that time, a pregnancy made it mandatory that one leave the service. Molly would be happy to see the snappy uniforms designed for pregnant women today! And now there is no such designation as "women" Marines -- there are just "Marines."

Well, there have been a lot of changes made, Molly. There were good times and bad times for us, too, and time does not dim those memories. There were the wounded Marines coming back from Guadalcanal whom we met at our first duty station, and later Iwo Jima, Tarawa and all the other sites of fierce battles in the Pacific. There were deaths of those close to us, too, and homesickness and anxiety, but there were also memories of dancing a birthday dance with General Holland M. (Howling Mad) Smith, of organizing a party in honor of Admiral Chester Nimitz, of watching the Raider Battalion's General Edson drink champagne from a lady's shoe on the day peace was declared with Japan while Marine Bob Crosby's band marched up and down the streets of Camp Catlin, of watching the 24th Regiment of the Fourth Marine Division's regimental parade in Maui the day they got the news that they were being sent home.

All these memories came flooding back when the colors were advanced on Armed Forces Day. After the luncheon, I went over to an attractive woman Marine sergeant and said, "I just wanted to say 'hello' to a 1986 Marine. I was in the first class of women Marines."

"Oh," she said, "That's really cool. Were you really a Marinette?" So much for trying to bridge the gap. I didn't even tell her that Marinettes weren't really Marines but were an auxiliary to the Marine Corps -- during World War I!

Molly would understand.

-- PEGGY MENGIS

The author is a veteran free lance writer and photographer.

(c) 2000 American Opinion Publishing, Inc. -- www.thenewamerican.com

Sometimes it takes a great shock to remind us what our priorities should be. We may take offense at the suggestion that our ambitions, our lusts, and our greed are more important to us than the health and safety and happiness of our loved ones, but how often do we find ourselves acting as though they are? Sometimes the shock occurs in time for us to rearrange our priorities. Sometimes it comes too late, and we can only regret our foolishness.

Garry Marshall's ***Nothing in Common***, from Tri-Star Pictures, concerns just such a shock. After 34 years of marriage, Lorraine Basner (Eva Marie Saint) leaves her husband Max (Jackie Gleason) because she can no longer tolerate his oppressive silence. Over the course of three decades he has treated her at best as a roommate, at worst as a handservant. Their marriage is barren, devoid of affection and intimacy. Aside from their son David, they have nothing in common anymore.

Max is devastated by his wife's departure, and too proud to admit it. He would like nothing better than for her to return, but he is unwilling -- perhaps unable -- to protest his love. The shock has come too late for Max and Lorraine, and the blame belongs to both of them. Max has indeed treated his wife shamefully, but she in turn has put up with it. Thirty-four years is a long time to wait before lodging a serious complaint.

The shock has come just in time for David Basner (Tom Hanks), the clever young adman always ready with a line -- for a client, for a girl. He lives a life of constant change, moving blithely from one presentation or seduction to the next, putting together a reel of 60-second commercials and 90-minute relationships as he goes. In his preoccupation with the surfeit of choices in his smorgasbord life, he has denied himself the opportunity to get to know his parents as people and deprived them of the one thing they still have in common, their son. The shock of their separation reminds him that he is neglecting his responsibility to his parents; the discovery that his father will require life-threatening surgery gives added urgency to his renewed interest in their lives.

The shock also gives him pause to reflect on the shape of his own life, to recognize that he has nothing in common with the sleeping partners he picks out like actresses at a cattle call and that the childhood sweetheart with whom he can identify may not be available forever.

Nothing in Common is an adult movie in the true sense of the term. It offers a mature treatment of a subject of extreme importance to adults in a country racked by divorce. It does not resort to nudity, coarse language, or superficial sociological dialogue. It presents the breakup of a marriage as an unmitigated tragedy, not as a grand opportunity for the exploration of narcissism (as is the case with such shallow contemporary films as ***An Unmarried Woman***). It resolutely rejects the irresponsible and amoral lifestyle celebrated in so much of modern culture, and it encourages us to do likewise, by giving us an honest picture of it. ***Nothing in Common*** is an adult movie with a PG rating, a fine cast of characters, a skillful director, and an important story to tell.

-- F.R. DUPLANTIER

CULTURAL CURRENTS **The Great One at His Best**

(c) 2000 American Opinion Publishing, Inc. -- www.thenewamerican.com

Jackie Gleason turns in a stellar performance, and how sweet it is!

There are few things more pitiful than a master artist continuing to practice his craft when his genius has abandoned him, and few more heartening than the sight of a floundering paragon suddenly reemerging at the top of his form. Though inferior scripts may have been largely to blame, it cannot be denied that the recent performances of Jackie Gleason have been disappointing. His outings in ***The Toy***, the HBO videotape drama ***Mr. Halpern and Mr. Johnson*** (a career lowpoint for Gleason *and* Laurence Olivier, both cast against type), and ***Smokey and the Bandit*** made many of his lifelong fans wonder why he had bothered to forsake the fairway. This was the work of a second-rate character actor. What had happened to the Gleason of ***Requiem for a Heavyweight***, ***The Hustler***, and ***Soldier in the Rain*** -- the uncommon comedian with the remarkable knack for creating complex dramatic characters out of ordinary people?

Nothing in Common

Gleason stalwarts will be pleased to learn that the Great One's latest role [see page 39] has nothing in common with the sops thrown to him in recent years. In Max Basher the has-been salesman whose wife leaves him after 34 years of marriage, Gleason once again has material worthy of his talent. What Arthur Miller failed to achieve with three ham-handed hours of Willy Loman (whose death is not lamented by weary theater-goers but longed for), Jackie Gleason accomplishes in one five-minute scene, capturing with brilliant economy all the pathos of a salesman on the skids.

With the same unerring skill he displayed week after week on ***The Honeymooners***, Gleason also tackles the subject of American marital relations; here the effect is anything but comic. Max Basner is Ralph Kramden without the climactic apologies -- and the unflappable wife who demanded them. He is married not to Alice but to Lorraine, who meekly suffers through 34 years of his bluster and thoughtlessness ("You're going to the moon, Lorraine! .... Okay, Max, I'll pack my things."). Although Ralph Kramden was never quite satisfied with himself, he and Alice always accepted each other for what they were and found fulfillment in their union. Max and Lorraine Basner are another story: Each blames the other for his/her dissatisfaction.

Something in Common

Gleason is at his best when he portrays ordinary men wrestling with fairly common problems. His characters are not the angst-ridden elites of foreign films and teen exploitation pictures. They are average Joes struggling to make a buck, longing for respect, and wondering what happened to the romance that briefly blossomed in their young adulthood. They make mistakes -- over and over again -- and, if they're lucky, they learn from them. Max Basner may not have learned enough from his mistakes to save his marriage, but he has learned enough to salvage his flagging relationship with his only son (played by Tom Hanks with a tragicomic flair that complements Gleason's own).

It appears to have been providential that Gleason made his television debut in ***The Life of Riley***, for an obsession with the good life -- seemingly just out of reach -- has typified his most successful roles, from Kramden to Basner. Ralph has become the archetype of the American Dreamer, the little guy with big ideas, the entrepreneur with no capital, the lottery-addicted working man convinced that some day his number will come up. Each of Gleason's characters -- from the most broadly comic to the most subtly dramatic -- is a variation on this theme. Each finds himself playing the lead in a Horatio Alger story that veers off course. Each is an American Tantalus, reaching for success that is forever elusive.

(c) 2000 American Opinion Publishing, Inc. -- www.thenewamerican.com

In many ways, Jackie Gleason is the incarnation Of the American Dream. Growing up in a Brooklyn tenement, he survived the disappearance of his father and the deaths of his mother and his older brother. At 19, he was on his own, with nothing to fall back on but an eighth grade education and a familiarity with pool halls. He broke into the nightclub circuit in Newark, New Jersey and was on his way. Ralph Kramden was the man he should have been, given his beginnings. Instead, he became everything that Ralph and all the Kramdens of America long to be.

In recent years he has seemed to be losing his talent, and it is richly ironic that he should make a triumphant comeback by playing a character facing this same crisis. In ***Nothing in Common***, nothing obscures the greatness of the Great One. Gleason is in control again, doing what he does best, and demonstrating to his anxious following that he has not lost his touch. How sweet it is!

-- F.R. DUPLANTIER

STRICTLY BUSINESS **Red Traders and Ugly Sisters**

Local politicians expedite aid and trade with Communist China

A few months ago, two press releases describing a new "sister state relationship" crossed my desk. The first, issued from the Governor's Office of the State of Connecticut, read in part as follows:

> Governor William A. O'Neill and Governor Li Changan of Shandong Province, People's Republic of China, today signed a historic "Agreement on Friendship Relationship" in ceremonies at the State Capitol in Hartford.
>
> According to the agreement, "both sides will make efforts to promote and expand cooperative relationships between Shandong Province and the State of Connecticut in fields of economics, trade, and technology so as to improve the mutual understanding between the two peoples and to develop a friendly relationship over a long period of time."

The second release, from a chemical company in Newington, Connecticut specializing in high performance sealants and adhesives, proclaimed: "Just two days after the announcement of a sister state relationship between the State of Connecticut and Shandong Province in the People's Republic of China, Shandong Governor Li Changan and Loctite Corporation officials announced that Loctite will pursue a joint venture agreement with a Shandong enterprise."

The "sister state relationship" strategy is the latest wave of fallout from Richard Nixon's 1972 visit and Jimmy Carter's 1979 recognition of Communist China. When all of these "sister states" are viewed on a national basis, this trend is alarming. According to Governor O'Neill, "Connecticut is one of 23 states with a sister state agreement with the People's Republic of China."

Gary H. Miller, Director of the International Department at the Connecticut Department of Economic Development, explains the program: "There are about 26 provinces in China. This includes Outer Mongolia, and Tibet, and of course, they also count Taiwan." Shandong, Connecticut's new sister state, is portrayed as a rich diversified province with over 73 million residents.

According to Miller, patience and personal contact are the key when dealing with oriental cultures. "You need that face-to-face contact, and a solid long-term relationship to succeed. You

(c) 2000 American Opinion Publishing, Inc. -- www.thenewamerican.com

can expect to get an agreement that you have a deal very quickly [with the Red Chinese], but it takes a long time to consummate it, and to work out the details."

When Miller made his first official state trip to China in 1980, everything was centrally controlled. Today, he maintains, decision making is more decentralized. High priority goods, such as aircraft engines and airport construction deals, are still handled at the central level in Peking; but authorities have turned over many buying decisions for lower priority goods to officials at the provincial level. This is where the sister state relationship comes in.

"I have a counterpart in Shandong," Miller observes. "Our office here in Hartford acts as a clearinghouse for Connecticut-based businesses who want to cut deals with the Chinese. My Chinese contact feeds us a list of approved projects that they are prepared to deal on. Some of these favor us, some favor them; they run the whole gamut.

"I send a Telex to my counterpart in China offering a particular product or service and, within a few hours, he wires me back. If it is a successful marriage, our office then puts the Connecticut corporation in touch with their office in Shandong."

How It Helps Red China

Sister state status will sharply increase the total amount of trade with the Communists and add legitimacy to the Peking regime. Deals that were impossible only a few months ago are being made all across the country. As a result of these deals, we tend to receive straw hats, Chinese culture, and cheap textiles for high-tech machinery, computers, and other industrial equipment the Red Chinese need to bolster the economic power and military might of their regime.

Figures from the Commerce Department put total U.S.-China trade during 1985 at $8.1 billion. They exported $4.2 billion to the U.S., while American firms exported $3.9 billion to Red China. Because of the recent proliferation of sister state relationships, trade this year is sure to top last year's level and should expand still further in coming years.

It is apparent that Nixon opened a Pandora's box with his 1972 visit. Whatever their motives, American businessmen are helping to support the oppression in Communist China.

According to a Senate Internal Security Subcommittee study published in 1971, entitled ***The Human Cost of Communism in China***, the Chinese Communists have killed between 34 and 64 million of their fellow Chinese. The bones of these victims cry out for justice and, despite our knowledge of this Communist brutality, we in the West act as though it never took place. It is, instead, business as usual.

-- MARK D. ISAACS

U.S.-China Sister States

Ohio	**Hubei**
Maryland	**Anhui**
Kansas	**Henan**
New Jersey	**Zhejiang**
Illinois	**Liaoning**
Washington	**Sichuan**
Wisconsin	**Heilongjiang**
Minnesota	**Shanxi**
Iowa	**Hebei**
Michigan	**Sichuan**

(c) 2000 American Opinion Publishing, Inc. -- www.thenewamerican.com

Colorado ..... Hunan
Massachusetts ..... Guangdong
New York ..... Jiangsu
Oregon ..... Fujian
Alaska ..... Heilongjiang
Hawaii ..... Guangdong
Oklahoma ..... Gansu
Utah ..... Jiangxi
Kentucky ..... Jiangxi
Alabama ..... Hubei
Idaho ..... Shanxi
Florida ..... Guilin
Connecticut ..... Shandong

This review of major financial newsletters is not intended by THE NEW AMERICAN as personal financial advice.

Alexander Paris observes in the June 26th issue of the ***Alexander Paris Report*** that the foundation is still in place for higher growth and a significantly longer recovery. "Inflation will be steadily accelerating for the rest of 1986 and 1987. Excluding periodic rallies, we've seen the best news on interest rates," he says. (Box 471, Barrington IL 60010, $95)

Michael Jenkins states in the July 2nd issue of ***Stock Cycles Forecast*** that the current bull market began August 12, 1982 and from the standpoint of the famous four-year cycle there should be a sharp drop in the stock market from mid-July into mid-August. "We should expect at least another year of advancing prices and hopefully another three years," he says. (160 Broadway East Building, 7th Floor, New York NY 10038, $175)

R. E. McMaster in the July 10th issue of the ***Reaper*** says it may be time to consider gold as a viable investment alternative. "My work is projecting monetary inflation to begin at latest by late 1987. Gold should skyrocket, hitting $5,040 an ounce possibly by 1990. A combination of monetary disruptions, social unrest, and military activity should trigger a panic into gold." (Box 39026, Phoenix AZ 85069, $195)

Hans Black observes in the latest issue of ***Interinvest Review and Outlook*** that another upleg, taking the Dow above 2000 and possibly to the 2200 level, may occur during the third quarter. "It has been our view that this market still must go through a period of increased speculation and even euphoria prior to a more significant reaction either later this year or in early 1987." (Box 1585, Boston MA 02104, $125)

William Ulrich in the July issue of ***Capital Gains*** states: "Our analysts predict that a major banking crisis, including a national bank holiday, will occur within the next 36 months." A bank holiday would cause stock and bond prices to tumble and precious metals to soar. (700 Shelard Plaza North, Minneapolis MN 55426, $78)

Clayton Makepeace in the July issue of ***Personal Wealth Bulletin*** expects gold to move up to and past the $360 level late this year and to the $1,000-$1,500 level within the next two to five years. A short-term rally in the dollar will be the last chance, for the next five years, to get

(c) 2000 American Opinion Publishing, Inc. -- www.thenewamerican.com

out of the dollar and into hard assets, he says. (4425 W. Napoleon Avenue, Metairie LA 70001, $78)

Aier in the July 7th issue of ***Research Reports***, published by the American Institute for Economic Research, states: Private demand for gold will probably increase when the gold price begins to trend upward. "We have no way of predicting when such a trend will commence, but in the long run it would appear to be assured by the continued rapid increases in paper claims." (Great Barrington MA 01230, $48)

Ian McAvity notes in the July 9th issue of ***Deliberations***: "The economy is now seen to be much weaker than had been expected." The stock market has been loaded with risks for months. With two big down days everyone wants to know whether the bear has arrived. It's still too early to get too short, he warns. (Box 182, Adelaide Street Station, Toronto, Ontario, Canada, M5C 2J1, $125)

James Sibbet states in the latest issue of ***Let's Talk Silver & Gold***: "It's the beginning of a business recession. Maybe the stock market is beginning to realize this now." This is bullish for the precious metals, as he believes the Fed will choose inflation this time instead of depression. (1091 East Woodbury Road, Pasadena CA 91104, $200)

Tony Henfrey reports in the July 10th issue of ***Gold Letter*** that critical support levels to watch are gold $340, silver $4.90, platinum $420. Should these support levels be violated, "take advantage of the likely selloff and go short." (Box 9137, Allentown PA 18105, $185)

Mary Anne and Pamela Aden in their July 10th issue of the ***Aden Analysis*** say: "At this point, our various studies combined with the ongoing surge in money supply, the fact that the oil price drop has essentially already filtered through the inflation figures, the bull market in metals' confirmations and the likelihood of a renewed dollar decline among other factors, are all important signs indicating that inflation and metals' prices should begin to rise at least moderately, in the second half of 1986." (4425 West Napoleon Avenue, Metairie LA 70001, $250)

Tom Holt in the July 11th issue of the ***Holt Executive Advisory*** expects the stock market to crack by election day, and his advice is to get out of all stocks without delay. The only exception is a few North American golds, which can be held. "OPEC's latest failure to agree on output quotas means that we'll see single-digit crude prices before long. It underscores the economic fact that the developing deflation cannot be artificially stopped." (290 Post Road West, Westport CT 06880, $60)

Donald Rowe in the July 14th issue of the ***Wall Street Digest*** says of the stock market: "The institutions are holding 10% cash with the Dow at new highs. That means any correction will be short and should be used as a buying opportunity." On the bond market: "Bond prices will rise as interest rates fall." On gold and silver: "We still anticipate a steep drop in gold prices." (101 Carnegie Center, Princeton NJ 08540, $150)

Kennedy Gammage notes in the July 10th issue of the ***Richland Report*** that his advice given on July 2nd still holds: "Now is not the time for investors to undertake new positions -- too likely to find yourselves buying in at a top." He thinks the current selling wave contains still more in terms of downside prices. (Box 222, La Jolla CA 92038, $177)

C. V. Myers in the July 11th issue of ***Myers' Finance & Energy*** sees no danger of inflation because "the banks won't create more money because they can't." The danger ahead is deflation and the Fed won't be able to stop it. We are approaching the limit to debt, he says. (North 7307 Division, Suite 204, Spokane WA 99208, $200)

-- W. A. "JOHN" JOHNSON

(c) 2000 American Opinion Publishing, Inc. -- www.thenewamerican.com

CORRECTION, PLEASE!
Red China Myths

A trip to Red China is the latest fad. Travel bureaus offer a variety of options to "see for yourself" how the Communist giant has mellowed. Even more, growing numbers of trade and cultural delegations -- glowingly sanctioned by the U.S. government -- have led thousands into Peking and other parts of the formerly sealed nation.

The recasting of Red China's image actually appears to be a strict assignment for most journalists. Encouraged by Ronald Reagan's adoption of the Nixon-Carter China policy -- as stunning a reversal of the President's campaign oratory as his piling up of massive deficits -- a vast array of opinion molders jumps at any bit of "evidence" showing that Communist China is our friend, has rejected Marxism, stands at sword's point with the Soviet Union, and has relaxed its oppressive rule. These same individuals remain determined to discount real evidence showing how far from the truth they have wandered.

Happily, not everyone runs with the herd. Columnist Stephen Chapman has recently reviewed a two-volume collection of revelations about Red China issued by the congressional Joint Economic Committee. Its 1,164 pages, said Chapman, "document the communist government's failures in eradicating poverty, cast doubt on the significance of China's recent economic reforms and add new crimes to the regime's unenviable human rights record."

Has China rejected Marxism? Chapman cites University of Michigan scholar Robert Dernberger's findings that the government has vowed to keep most resources in the hands of nationalized enterprises, to control most prices, and to allocate capital, labor and raw materials according to state goals, not consumer desires.

Has government oppression been relaxed? The refreshing Mr. Chapman quotes John Aird, a former official of the U.S. Census Bureau's Center for International Research: "People who get pregnant without permission are lectured, harassed, publicly humiliated, fined, deprived of contract land, denied food, water and electricity, and 'mobilized' to have abortions." As recently as 1983, says Aird, the government "ordered that all couples with two or more children be sterilized, all women with one child have IUDs inserted, and all unauthorized pregnancies be aborted."

Beyond what Stephen Chapman reported, any journalist who wanted to do so could have provided additional much-needed realism about Red China's new image. **Is the Peking regime our nation's friend?** Its ambassador to the U.S. labeled our bombing of Libya "state terrorism" and used the same occasion to condemn us for having "supported Somoza and opposed the people in Central America." At the UN, Red China voted with the USSR and others to denounce us for the Libyan raid. And an official statement from Peking recently claimed that "the source of the world's ills is the fierce contention of the two superpowers." In other words, the United States is as guilty as the Soviet Union for the world's turmoil.

Is the split between Red China and the USSR legitimate? In December 1984, officials of the two nations met in Peking to sign a pact committing the Soviets to assist in modernizing several dozen industrial plants; in July 1985, more Chinese and Soviet officials met in Moscow to formalize a $14 billion trade agreement; and, in March 1986, representatives of the two nations were back in Peking to ink a pact calling for the exchange of engineers and technicians.

Yes, there are many myths about Communist China. Yet, our nation is planning joint military exercises with Red China's armies; Congress has allowed the sale of sophisticated military hardware to Peking's air force; 250 American corporations now have offices in China

(c) 2000 American Opinion Publishing, Inc. -- www.thenewamerican.com

and have invested $1.4 billion there; and President Reagan reextended Most Favored Nation trade status to the government in Peking. Clearly, our nation's leaders prefer myths to realities.

-- JOHN F. MCMANUS

This commentary is also syndicated by
The John Birch Society Features.

ITEM: *A* **New York Times** *editorial for July 13th quoted from the Attorney General's Commission on Pornography: "The manner of presentation and distribution of most standard pornography confirms the view that at bottom the predominant use of such material is as a masturbatory aid." The* **Times** *did not dispute the commission's finding, but consider their interpretation: "[T]he conclusion and perspective are probably right. Most pornography is harmless."*

CORRECTION: We have to give the ***Times*** credit: When they resort to a nonsequitur, it's a lollapaloosa. To the commission's conclusion that pornography is primarily an aid to masturbation, the ***New York Times*** attaches the implied premise that masturbation is harmless. Given that the primary use of pornography is as an aid to masturbation, *if* masturbation were indeed harmless, it would follow that pornography too is harmless, for the most part. The reasoning is sound, but the unstated premise is bogus.

For masturbation is anything but harmless, and the consequences of the practice are not to be reckoned in the proverbial hairy palms and pimples. Like any method of satisfying basic drives, or any ritualistic pastime, masturbation can become habit-forming. Its effects can be calculated in narcissism, the expectation of immediate gratification and the inability to defer satisfaction, the weakening of the heterosexual impulse, and the reduction of the sex act to a mere mechanical process. Masturbation is a denial of the procreative function of the sexual organs. It is a practice that cheapens life and debases the individual who indulges in it.

-- F.R.D.

EDUCATION ROTC Makes Strong Comeback

Not too many years ago, patriotic students who had chosen to serve their country through involvement in the Reserve Officers Training Corps (ROTC) found the going pretty rough. Enrollment plummeted from 109,000 in 1970 to 61,000 in 1973.

ROTC buildings were picketed, stoned, and even fire-bombed. Some schools dropped their ROTC programs, while others moved the programs off campus or at least made them less conspicuous on campus. Not wishing to be spat upon or subjected to the taunts and derision of professors and classmates, cadets at many schools refrained from wearing uniforms on campus whenever possible. It was an atmosphere hardly conducive to high morale.

Morale on an Upswing

Morale, however, is no problem today. The colleges and universities may still harbor sizable contingents of the "surrender lobby," but the atmosphere is far from the "state of siege"

(c) 2000 American Opinion Publishing, Inc. -- www.thenewamerican.com

tension of a decade and a half ago.

Pentagon press officer Lieutenant Pete Wyro told THE NEW AMERICAN that ROTC enrollment and morale have been on an upward spiral for the past decade. More than 111,000 students are enrolled in senior ROTC programs at the college level, and more than 227,000 high school students participate in junior ROTC. College ROTC is presently comprised of 530 detachments: 314 Army units, 152 Air Force units, and 64 Navy and Marine units. At the high school level, there are 1,375 units divided among the various services; and, according to Lieutenant Wyro, the Defense Department is processing requests from high schools for an additional 20 Army units, 103 Navy units, 117 Air Force units, and 13 Marine units.

Captain L.A. Lantzer, U.S.N., who heads the Navy ROTC at the University of Southern California, says: "From our standpoint, things look very positive and encouraging. Being in the military is no longer unglamorous and to be looked down on." New recruits, he says, are very enthusiastic and highly qualified. "My incoming ROTC freshmen have SAT scores about 150 points higher than the average incoming students," Lantzer told THE NEW AMERICAN in a recent interview. He is "very pleased" with the resurgence of patriotism that has even been felt on the campuses. "Of course, ***Top Gun*** [a current summer movie box office hit about Navy fighter pilots] has been a great recruiting tool," he says, and is further evidence of the revival of a favorable image for the military.

Los Angeles Navy recruiter Jose Rodriguez echoes these sentiments. Overall, he says, "The quality of the applicant [for ROTC] is better than ever ... and these young men are proud to be a part of this country, proud of their heritage, and proud to serve."

ROTC scholarships pay for all tuition, laboratory fees, and books; but, according to Armed Forces personnel, this financial incentive is not the primary motivation. "I think that [financial assistance] is a minor consideration," says Captain Lantzer. "The overwhelming majority are seriously interested in serving in the military." Of the more than 111,000 ROTC recruits in all branches of the armed services, less than one third (29,500) are on scholarships.

Students desiring to enter the college ROTC scholarship program usually submit applications during the second semester of their junior year in high school. By that time, they should have completed mathematics studies up through pre-calculus, advanced English, chemistry, biology, and physics. School grades, Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT) scores, sports activities, attitudes, and involvement in the community are all factors that are taken into consideration for ROTC scholarship selection.

How important is ROTC to our nation's armed forces? Lieutenant Wyro says "ROTC graduates this year number about 12,000, which is around 80 percent of the new officers. The military academies simply are not capable of providing officers in the numbers required" to supply all of our defense needs.

Peaceniks Target ROTC

There are those, however, who care little about "national defense needs" and view ROTC training as a nefarious scheme to indoctrinate and transform students into militaristic automatons. Particularly at the high-school level, disarmament groups have organized to challenge school involvement in the ROTC and have demanded equal time for their organizations to recruit and teach on campus. One of the bitter ironies here is that it is these same "anti-nuke" forces that have been pushing pacifism and disarmament indoctrination at students in the form of compulsory "nuclear age" classes. While there are a couple of hundred thousand students taking part *voluntarily* in high school ROTC, there are *millions* of students who are being subjected to the propaganda of *mandatory* "peace" or "nuclear age" programs.

(c) 2000 American Opinion Publishing, Inc. -- www.thenewamerican.com

This anti-military movement is nothing new. The ROTC program, established by the National Defense Act of 1916, first came under vigorous attack in the mid-1920s when a number of influential liberal educators, John Dewey among them, formed the Committee of Militarism in Education. They were successful in getting a number of universities to drop ROTC altogether. During the Vietnam War era, pacifist and anti-military propagandists succeeded again in banishing military training from some additional campuses.

There has been something of a "turning of the tables" now, however, with regard to some educational institutions. A number of universities that expelled ROTC in the '60s and '70s apparently would like to reinstate the program, now that the climate is more hospitable to such training. The Department of Defense, however, has wisely rejected the applications of many of these "fair weather patriots." Other craven school officials who are cowering before the bombast of the strident anti-military crowd should be forewarned that, if they fail to stand by their country now, they too will be rejected if, in some future time, they wish to be reinstated in the ROTC program.

-- WILLIAM F. JASPER

SCIENCE The Ultimate Snow Job

The "nuclear winter" theory is pure science fiction

The so-called "nuclear winter" theory is one of the most recent scare tactics dreamed up by those who would disarm America. In an effort to convince the public that there are too many nuclear weapons in the world and that any nuclear exchange would mean the annihilation of the human race, Carl Sagan and several of his lieutenants concocted the widely publicized theory.

In November 1983, the TTAPS study (an acronym formed by the last name initials of the authors) was released and became an immediate media favorite. Soon it became clear to millions that, even if you survived the initial explosions and radiation, you would perish in the dark, merciless cold of a nuclear winter.

Obviously, no cause could be so important to warrant risking these consequences. The only solution would be to eliminate nuclear weapons *at any cost* -- even if this meant living in a Communist world. Of course, that was exactly the attitude the contrivers of this travesty of science had hoped to convey. And, it has also been used as the basis for U.S. foreign policy for decades.

It is common knowledge that a nuclear war would be horrible, and it is not the intention of this article to say otherwise. Rather, it is our intention to expose the falsehoods being spread by the nuclear winterists. Many scientists are hesitant to criticize the nuclear winter theory because they fear that they will be labeled by the media and others as favoring nuclear war. This has helped lead to the illusion that the whole of the scientific community endorses the theory.

What Is a "Nuclear Winter"?

The basic point of the nuclear winter theory as dreamed up by the TTAPS authors is that, after a nuclear war, the firestorms created by burning cities would hurl vast quantities of soot and smoke into the atmosphere. These clouds would gradually spread, the winterists claim, blocking out the sun and causing a major drop in temperature. Sagan prophesied that the temperature would be well below zero, sufficient to kill "virtually all livestock and farm animals." In the September 30, 1984 issue of ***Parade***, the Sunday supplement, one of Sagan's best vehicles for disseminating misinformation, he says: "[I]t is clear that if the lights are turned out and the

(c) 2000 American Opinion Publishing, Inc. -- www.thenewamerican.com

temperatures plunge -- for months, if not years -- our global civilization and the human species will be profoundly imperiled." Fortunately for the human species, the nuclear winter theory was gravely flawed.

More than a year before Sagan's pronouncements, in the spring of 1983, the winterists arranged to have a meeting of scientists in Cambridge, Massachusetts to review and consequently lend credence to the nuclear winter theory. The plan backfired somewhat when some of the scientists present expressed doubts and criticisms. Soviet climate physicist Vladimir Aleksandrov stated: "This is foolishness. You can't apply such models to a perturbed state of the atmosphere. You're playing with toys."

Russell Seitz of Harvard has been studying the history of nuclear winter theory extensively. He found that even the left-leaning scientists present at the meeting did not accept the theory. "The science is terrible," he was told by Victor Weiskopf of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. "But perhaps the psychology is good."

Despite the many doubts in the scientific community, the mass media jumped onto the nuclear winter band-wagon with both feet. Nationwide talk shows regularly hosted various winterists, providing them with the perfect forum to spread their horror stories to the public about a post-nuclear war world. Their solution to avoid total obliteration of life on Earth? Freeze nuclear weapons production and ultimately disarm our country. Obviously, the "trustworthy" Soviets would do likewise, and soon we would all be living in a nuclear-free Carl Sagan Utopia.

A vast array of anti-nuclear organizations also latched onto the nuclear winter theory. They found that they had an effective way of influencing public opinion with the new "threat" of a nuclear winter. The theory effectively changed the entire nuclear debate, making disarmament seem more viable to many people.

Flaky Assumptions?

Under any kind of scrutiny, the TTAPS study was clearly deficient. One of the major premises on which the authors based their conclusions is that the dust and soot would be efficiently transported into the upper atmosphere and spread evenly over the face of the Earth. Then, this blanket of clouds would blot out the sun, causing the surface of the earth to cool off and a subsequent deep freeze to take place. The winterists do not take into account the fact that massive rainstorms would be created by the explosions and large atmospheric temperature differences. These rainstorms would wash much of the soot out of the air before it reached the upper atmosphere. This factor alone greatly discredits any purported results.

The oceans, which cover about 70 percent of the Earth's surface, are also an incredible stabilizing influence on the atmosphere. Even if the air is cooled, the oceans would act like a giant heat source, continually warming the air. In fact, the top several meters of the oceans have the same heat capacity as the entire atmosphere.

One of the more bizarre conclusions arrived at by TTAPS was that, in the immediate vicinity of a nuclear blast, a "quick freeze" would occur. The heavy localized cloud of soot would essentially totally block out the sun, they claim; and, in the nuclear blast zone, "it would be too dark to see, even at noon...." History has proved this wrong. Neither Hiroshima nor Nagasaki experienced any intense darkness or chilling freeze after the nuclear explosions there.

But today's weapons are far more powerful than those original bombs, so perhaps a better comparison would be Mt. St. Helens. During the eruption in 1980, the energy released by the volcano equalled a 2,400 megaton explosion, which was equal to roughly one quarter of the Earth's total nuclear weapons stockpile. Obviously, no one area would ever be subjected to that kind of a nuclear explosion; nevertheless, no "quick freeze" or impenetrable darkness prevailed

(c) 2000 American Opinion Publishing, Inc. -- www.thenewamerican.com

over the mountain.

Another consideration is that the targeting of the weapons would greatly affect any climatic changes. If a nuclear bomb hit a city, the burning city would spew much more soot and smoke into the atmosphere than if the bomb exploded in the countryside, simply because there would be more material in the city to burn. The nuclear winterists based many of their results on the assumption that most nuclear weapons are aimed at cities and not military targets. Contrary to this assumption, it is believed that Soviet policy is mainly to target military sites. These targets would generate much less smoke if attacked.

Over the Threshold

Carl Sagan and his lieutenants calculated a nuclear winter "threshold": the point at which they allege a nuclear war would trigger a nuclear winter. This point, they decided, would be a 100 megaton exchange.

Not true! Dr. Petr Beckmann, in the January 1984 issue of his monthly newsletter ***Access to Energy***, reports that this "threshold" has been far surpassed in recent centuries. "[T]he Mt. St. Helens eruption on the first day alone (18 May 1980) equalled 24 Sagan Thresholds; the Krakatoa eruption (of 27 August 1883) equalled 240 Sagan Thresholds, and the Mt. Tambora eruption of 1815 some 2,400 Sagan Thresholds." At no point was any nuclear winter experienced. Dr. Beckmann added:

> When Mt. Tambora erupted in 1815 at a (conservative) 2,400 Sagan Thresholds, it ejected some 25 *cubic miles* of debris into the atmosphere; ash was encountered at sea for as long as four years afterward, and [quoting from "The Year Without a Summer" by H. and E. Stommel in ***Scientific American***, June 1979.] "climatologists rank the eruption as the greatest producer of atmospheric dust between 1600 and the present. The dust circled the earth in the high atmosphere for several years, reflecting sunlight back into space and thereby reducing the amount of it reaching the ground."
>
> Did the average global temperature drop in 1816 after this 2.4 kilosagan catastrophe? Yes: by almost an entire degree Centigrade. In Hartford, Conn., the summer was so cold that the temperature never went above a bone-chilling (plus) 82°F.

New Studies

In January 1985, a new study was released which conceded that, while a nuclear winter was indeed a possibility, the original projections of a months-long deep freeze were unrealistic. This new study was performed by California's Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory and Colorado's National Center for Atmospheric Research. The original conclusions of the TTAPS study were deemed excusable because the newer study used more advanced computer simulation methods.

The most recent nuclear winter study was released in June of this year. The latest results further lessen the impact of a nuclear winter. The chart shows the anticipated temperature drops for three different scenarios and compares these results to the original conclusions of the TTAPS study. Many old-time nuclear winterists are now giving up the whole idea, but some are still holding firm to the Sagan Threshold, saying that both superpowers should reduce their arms to a level below the threshold. Dr. Starley L. Thompson and Dr. Stephen H. Schneider, scientists at the National Center for Atmospheric Research, wrote in the Summer 1986 issue of ***Foreign Affairs***: "[S]imulations using geographically realistic models produced such a wide range of consequences for any given war scenario that it became clear that the elegant and strategically

(c) 2000 American Opinion Publishing, Inc. -- www.thenewamerican.com

compelling idea of a threshold was an artifact of a simplified model .... Hence, it is questionable to predicate any strategic policy options on the existence of a nuclear winter threshold, even a 'fuzzy' one." The report went on to say that "the global apocalyptic conclusions in the initial nuclear winter hypothesis can now be relegated to a vanishingly low level of probability."

Even though the nuclear winter theory has been discredited, and many nuclear winterists have been forced, by the weight of the evidence, to discard the idea, much propaganda damage has still been done. Many people will remember only what they read in ***Parade*** and will still have visions of ice skating in July. This misinformation will sway many minds into accepting disarmament as a means of avoiding the end of "the human species" as Carl Sagan envisions it.

-- RONALD A. PEIK

ODDLY ENOUGH

Easy for Him to Say

If any sort of error committed by practitioners of the English language as she is spoke can be said to be beloved by all hearers, it is surely the spoonerism. We all make slips of the tongue, and the spoonerism is a slip so notably successful that it sounds intentional. It was invented (inadvertently, of course) by English clergyman and educator William A. Spooner (1844-1930), who enlivened his sermons with such attention-riveting phrases as "shoving leopard of his flock" (when he meant to say "loving shepherd of his flock"); "sew the ladies to their sheets" instead of "show the ladies to their seats"; "queer old dean" for "dear old queen"; and "tons of soil" for "sons of toil." The Reverend Mr. Spooner's creation was memorialized this year on July 22nd, Spooners Day. If they all work at it until July 22, 1988, our politicians may be able to devise some examples half as amusing for use in their campaigns.

Teddy Patrol

Don't be startled to see a teddy bear riding in a patrol car in Morgan Hill, California. Mayor Lorraine Barke explains that stuffed animals have a calming effect on youngsters traumatized by shootings, traffic accidents, or domestic crises. The mayor has promised to purchase the bears with money raised from private sources.

Hysterical Perspective

Eloise Lano of Springfield, Massachusetts wanted to cover her house with vinyl siding. But the Springfield Historical Commission said no -- no vinyl siding in that historic district. Over the weekend, Eloise staged a protest. She and a group of friends painted the house pink and purple, and adorned a prominent wall with a large gingerbread man. It was all perfectly legal: The Historical Commission has no say about colors people apply to their own houses. It may relent about the siding by the time the gingerbread man peels off.

La Cucaracha

Cockroaches have been around since the days of the dinosaur. From the beginning, they have been so consistently successful in life that they have never felt the need to participate in natural selection, punctuated equilibrium, or any of the various approved methods of achieving evolution that are supposed to have been adopted by less efficient organisms such as man.

Some cockroaches have distinguished themselves. A half-century ago the poet and humorist Don Marquis made a celebrity of Archy, an enterprising cockroach who used Marquis' typewriter to author a volume of poetry, ***Archy and Mehitabel***, for which Marquis took credit.

This summer in Dallas, another cockroach distinguished himself (herself?). A local pest control service sponsored a contest for the longest cockroach in Texas, predicting a winner of 3-4 inches. The $1,000 prize, however, went to the finders of a communications-oriented cockroach only (sic!) 1.92 inches long, discovered among the subterranean cables at phone company

(c) 2000 American Opinion Publishing, Inc. -- www.thenewamerican.com

headquarters.

-- RICHARD MCKINNEY

AMERICAN HERO A Triumphant Maverick

It has become somewhat trite to label the passing of celebrated personages as "the end of an era." Given both the magnitude of his accomplishments and the longevity of his career, however, any other way of describing the recent death of Admiral Hyman G. Rickover seems inadequate. Always controversial and more universally respected than liked (such conditions being almost prerequisites for greatness), Admiral Rickover received varying degrees of recognition, some from quarters normally expected to be unsympathetic to a strong American defense policy.

In a 1982 review of the book ***Rickover***, John W. Finney, news editor of the ***New York Times*** Washington Bureau, said of Admiral Rickover: "Almost singlehandedly ... he developed the atomic submarine, thus providing the nation with an invulnerable nuclear deterrant."

William L. Givens, a member of Rickover's staff from 1966-71, wrote of the Admiral in the usually far-left ***Boston Globe***: "With a single stroke, he opened the age of nuclear power, revolutionized naval warfare and provided his country with its principal military deterrent for decades to come. He has since designed and built, and continues to oversee, the largest collection of nuclear power reactors in the world, with operational and safety records that are phenomenal."

What was the background that produced a man of such foresight, tenacity, and accomplishment?

Fittingly, Hyman George Rickover entered this world with the Twentieth Century, which historians will record as the beginning of the Atomic Age. He was born on January 27, 1900 of Jewish parents in Russian Poland. A true American success story (common in the days before government handouts), Rickover grew up as a tailor's son in Chicago, diligently applying himself to his studies while working as a Western Union messenger boy. The result was an appointment to the United States Naval Academy, from which Rickover graduated in 1922 in the top quarter of his class.

Rickover advanced to the rank of Lieutenant Commander by 1937, having assumed command of the *USS Finch* (a mine-sweeper) that same year. In the years since his graduation, he had earned a master's degree in electrical engineering from Columbia University.

After serving as head of the electrical section of the Bureau of Ships during World War II, Captain Rickover was a Senior Naval Officer at the Oak Ridge, Tennessee site of the Manhattan (Atomic Bomb) Project, where he became convinced that atomic energy could be used peacefully to power submarines. A true believer in the concept of "Peace through Strength," Rickover summed up his military philosophy this way: "The more you sweat in peace, the less you bleed in war."

Encountering bureaucratic resistance to his idea for a nuclear-powered Navy, Rickover appealed directly to Admiral Chester W. Nimitz, who gave Rickover encouragement and support.

In 1947, Captain Rickover served as Special Advisor on Nuclear Matters to the Chief of the Bureau of Ships, becoming Assistant Chief for Nuclear Propulsion in March, 1949. That same month, he also became the Manager of the Naval Reactor Branch of the newly-formed Reactor Development Division of the Atomic Energy Commission.

Freed from restraints on creativity, and with the encouragement of Admiral Nimitz, work

(c) 2000 American Opinion Publishing, Inc. -- www.thenewamerican.com

on the development of our nuclear-powered Navy proceeded rapidly. This was not done without ruffling the feathers of some Navy brass, however, and Captain Rickover was passed over for promotion to Rear Admiral until July 1, 1953, when recognition for his achievements could no longer be ignored.

Admiral Rickover's triumph came in January, 1955, with the launching of the *Nautilus*, the world's first nuclear-powered submarine. A domestic by-product of his nuclear program, the civilian nuclear-power plant, manifested itself in the first such plant at Shippingport, Pennsylvania.

More than a career Naval Officer, or a scientific pioneer, Admiral Rickover had some definite (lack of definitiveness was not in his makeup) opinions on the quality of American education. He once said that current shortages of skilled workers and professionals in this country "are in large part a result of our having a public school system with a built-in bias against bright youngsters."

After his retirement, Admiral Rickover gave a series of talks on public affairs, the first of which urged basic reform of our educational practices. In Admiral Rickover's own words: "The deepest joy in life is to be *creative* ... to find an undeveloped situation, to see the possibilities, to decide upon a course of action and then devote the whole of one's resources to carry it out, even if it means battling against the stream of contemporary opinion."

Rickover cited *ignorance* as a cause of "many of our contemporary problems [including] an overwhelming national ignorance of facts about the rest of the world." He concluded: "[A] nation, or an individual, cannot function unless the truth is available and understood."

Admiral Hyman G. Rickover has been recognized for his outstanding Naval career. (He was only the third individual in U.S. history to have a Navy ship named after him during his lifetime.) But he leaves us another legacy: his concern for the development of our most important resource -- our people.

-- WARREN P. MASS

OPINION PAST — No Wonder We're Losing!

Twenty-five years ago, on September 25, 1961, President John F. Kennedy presented to the 16th General Assembly of the United Nations a disarmament proposal entitled, ***Freedom from War: The United States Program for General and Complete Disarmament in a Peaceful World*** (State Department Publication 7277). Excerpts from this official U.S. government proposal follow.

The Nations of the world,

Conscious of the crisis ... produced by the revolutionary development of modern weapons within a world divided by serious ideological differences;

Determined to save present and succeeding generations from the scourge of war and the dangers and burdens of the arms race....

Declare their goal to be: A free, secure, and peaceful world of independent states adhering to common standards of justice and international conduct and subjecting the use of force to the rule of law; a world where adjustment to change takes place in accordance with the principles of the United Nations; a world where there shall be a permanent state of general and complete disarmament under effective international control....

Set forth as the objectives of a program of general and complete disarmament in a

(c) 2000 American Opinion Publishing, Inc. -- www.thenewamerican.com

peaceful world:

(a) The disbanding of all national armed forces and the prohibition of their reestablishment in any form whatsoever other than those required to preserve internal order and for contributions to a United Nations Peace Force;

(b) The elimination from national arsenals of all armaments, including all weapons of mass destruction and the means for their delivery, other than those required for a United Nations Peace Force and for maintaining internal order;

(c) The establishment and effective operation of an International Disarmament Organization within the framework of the United Nations to ensure compliance ... with all disarmament obligations;

(d) The institution of effective means for the enforcement of international agreements, for the settlement of disputes, and for the maintenance of peace in accordance with the principles of the United Nations.

Call on the negotiating states:

(a) To develop the outline program set forth below into an agreed plan for general and complete disarmament and to continue their efforts without interruption until the whole program has been achieved....

Affirm that disarmament negotiations should be guided by the following principles:

(a) Disarmament shall take place as rapidly as possible until it is completed in [a program of three] stages containing balanced, phased and safeguarded measures, with each measure and stage to be carried out in an agreed period of time....

(d) As states relinquish their arms, the United Nations shall be progressively strengthened in order to improve its capacity to assure international security and the peaceful settlement of differences as well as to facilitate the development of international cooperation in common tasks for the benefit of mankind.

* * *

By the time Stage II has been completed, the confidence produced through a verified disarmament program, the acceptance of rules of peaceful international behavior, and the development of strengthened international peace-keeping processes within the framework of the U.N. should have reached a point where the states of the world can move forward to Stage III. In Stage III progressive controlled disarmament and continuously developing principles and procedures of international law would proceed to a point where no state would have the military power to challenge the progressively strengthened U.N. Peace Force and all international disputes would be settled according to the agreed principles of international conduct.

The progressive steps to be taken during the final phase of the disarmament program would be directed toward the attainment of a world in which:

(a) States would retain only those forces, non-nuclear armaments, and establishments required for the purpose of maintaining internal order; they would also support and provide agreed manpower for a U.N. Peace Force.

* * *

(b) The U.N. Peace Force, equipped with agreed types and quantities of armaments, would be fully functioning.

(c) The manufacture of armaments would be prohibited except for those of agreed types and quantities to be used by the U.N. Peace Force and those required to maintain internal order. All other armaments would be destroyed or converted to peaceful purposes.

(d) The peace-keeping capabilities of the United Nations would be sufficiently strong and

(c) 2000 American Opinion Publishing, Inc. -- www.thenewamerican.com

the obligations of all states under such arrangements sufficiently far-reaching as to assure peace and the just settlement of differences in a disarmed world.

On April 18, 1962, President Kennedy submitted another disarmament proposal to an 18-member disarmament committee, this one entitled: **Blueprint for the Peace Race: Outline of Basic Provisions of a Treaty on General and Complete Disarmament in a Peaceful World**. *Similar to the original proposal, it stated: "The Parties to the Treaty would progressively strengthen the United Nations Peace Force ... until it had sufficient armed forces and armaments so that no state could challenge it." Twenty years later, on May 25, 1982, Congressman Ted Weiss (D-NY) had the entire text of* **Blueprint for the Peace Race** *inserted into the* **Congressional Record**. *The Congressman pointed out that this proposal has never formally been withdrawn and called for its implementation.*

IN LIGHT OF THE PAST
Department of Defeat

"What's in a name?" Shakespeare asked. Not much, we gather, because the reply was, "A rose by any other name would smell as sweet." That may well be, but one example doesn't necessarily add up to a universal. In any case, a Department of Defense is not necessarily the same thing as a War Department. The words, both of which continue to signify something, certainly do not mean the same thing.

Moreover, there has been a decided change in the conduct of war since the United States replaced its war and navy departments with a Department of Defense. From the earliest days, the main military force of the country had been called the War Department. That changed in 1949 when the National Security Act combined all military forces in a Department of Defense. Prior to the change in name, the United States had won every war in which it had engaged. Since the change to Department of Defense, the United States has not won any major conflict in which it has become involved.

What did the change in name from War to Defense have to do with America's fortunes in war? At the time the change was made just after World War II, not much attention was paid to any strategic implications. The main debate, or argument, was over unified command of the armed forces. The Constitution provides for unification by making the President commander-in-chief of these forces. President Truman worked to extend this idea into the military bureaucracy rather than leaving the unification in the person of the president; that is, he sought to unify command at the cabinet level and at the military and diplomatic level.

The first result was the National Security Act of 1947. Among other things, this act provided for a cabinet-level civilian head of the armed forces to be called the Secretary of Defense. Under him, there were to be three subcabinet departments, the Army, Navy, and Air Force, each with a civilian head. Militarily, command over these was unified in the person of the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, in which each of the branches was represented. Initially, the title of this unified cabinet-level department was the National Military Establishment. It was changed in 1949 to the Department of Defense, though the head had been called the Secretary of Defense since 1947.

Whatever the motives or purposes of this reorganization, it did not so much unify command as disperse authority and responsibility. Rather than being directly under an individual leader, the armed forces now had collective civilian control. Each branch now had its own civilian head under a civilian Secretary of Defense, but the collectivization was also expanded in the executive branch with a National Security Council, whose members took part, under the

(c) 2000 American Opinion Publishing, Inc. -- www.thenewamerican.com

direction of the President, in making military and diplomatic decisions. In consequence, military leaders were remote from their constitutional commander-in-chief and what little influence they had was filtered through a collective network of underlings. In effect, the military had been muffled if not entirely silenced.

There is no reason to doubt, either, that this collective civilian leadership shifted the use of the armed forces from war to defense from 1949 onward. There is, let it be emphasized, a big difference between making war and mounting a defense. War involves both offense and defense; but, ultimately, wars are won or lost on the offense. If wars were won on the defense, Lee should have won the War Between the States by May of 1863. Or, to turn it around, the Union should have won in July, 1863 at Gettysburg. But defense only prolongs war -- and does not end it.

The futility of defensive war was more fully demonstrated in the latter part of the Korean War and during the whole of the War in Vietnam. The United States lost in the War in Vietnam and gained only a stalemate in Korea. The distinction between making war successfully and defensive failure was dramatized during the Korean War. It came to a climactic head in what is known as the Truman-MacArthur Controversy. General MacArthur, as commander of the armed forces in Korea, had made war initially the way successful war is made. He had gone on the offensive as quickly as he could, and quite successfully, too. With his daring invasion at Inchon, he cut off the North Korean army and soon drove it out of South Korea. In short order, his armies drove into and through North Korea, crushing the Communist armies. At that juncture, Communist China intervened with the cream of its armies.

Denied the means to deal with the Chinese invasion across the Yalu by the collective leadership in Washington, MacArthur had to go on the defensive. When MacArthur pled for the means to regain the offensive, the Joint Chiefs did everything they could to silence him. When they did not absolutely succeed in this, he was dismissed. Truman raised the bogus issue of civilian control of the military, but by creating the collective civilian leadership he had already abrogated much of his constitutional responsibility by cutting himself off from his military commanders.

The new command in Korea could do little more than fight a futile defensive-war, since it was prohibited from invading North Korea. The result was a war of attrition, which ended in stalemate. The War in Vietnam was even more tragic. It was a defensive war. It was the only kind of war the Department of Defense has ever yet made.

-- CLARENCE B. CARSON

(c) 2000 American Opinion Publishing, Inc. -- www.thenewamerican.com