



The Phyllis Schlafly Report

VOL. 2, NO. 11

Box 618, ALTON, ILLINOIS 62002

JUNE 1969

Kennedy Book Hurts His Presidential Chances

Senator Teddy Kennedy fired the first broadside of the 1970 and 1972 campaigns with the publication on May 6, 1969 of a new book personally sponsored by him entitled *ABM: An Evaluation Of The Decision To Deploy An Anti-Ballistic Missile System*. The book was actually written by 15 different contributors and edited by Abram Chayes and Jerome B. Wiesner. While the impression was carefully cultivated that the Kennedy book was the product of scientists, actually the majority of the authors of the Kennedy book were not physical scientists, but merely political scientists — and therefore the Kennedy book is primarily a book of politics.

Newspaper columnists have been reporting for months that Kennedy is already in full swing in his drive for the presidency in 1972. It is said that Teddy does not need to spend time and money building an *organization* (because he inherited the extensive organization of Jack and Bobby) and therefore can devote himself to building a national following on the *issues*.

The first issue which Kennedy personally selected to confront the Nixon Administration is the ABM. In choosing the wrong side of this issue, Kennedy may have made a fatal mistake because he allied himself with the rather-Red-than-risk-being-dead crowd which would rather surrender to the Kremlin than build the weapons we need to defend America against the Communists. The Bible tells us: "Oh that mine adversary had written a book." Well, Teddy Kennedy did, and he has made himself very vulnerable.

On May 15, 1969, Phyllis Schlafly gave a critical analysis of the Teddy Kennedy anti-ABM book to the Senate Armed Services Committee. Here are some excerpts from her lengthy statement which will be printed as part of the Hearings on the ABM by the Senate Armed Services Committee:

* * * * *

The dozens upon dozens of typographical errors in what *The New York Times* charitably referred to as the "hastily printed" report, are exceeded only by its errors of historical fact, of logic, and of strategic analysis, and by its internal inconsistencies. Let us examine some of the many errors in this Kennedy anti-ABM book.

1. The principal argument made against the ABM in the Kennedy book is the claim that an American ABM would "start a new round in the arms race," and set the stage for "another action-reaction cycle." This argument is false. It has no logic to support it, and it is completely contrary to the historical facts of the last seven years.

The "new round in the arms race" started seven years ago, right after the Cuban Missile Crisis of October 1962. Since that time, the Soviets have quite literally been "racing" for superiority in strategic weapons — and the United States has not even been in the race. Since the Cuban Missile Crisis, the Soviets have increased their nuclear striking power 300%, but the U. S. has reduced its nuclear striking power 50%.

The way the "action-reaction cycle" has actually worked is that, when the United States takes "action" to disarm, the Soviets "react" by increasing their nuclear weapons at an even faster rate. When Robert McNamara was Secretary of Defense, he took the following disarmament action: He scrapped three-fourths of our strategic bombers, he scrapped three-fourths of our multi-megaton

(continued on page 2)

"An Open Letter To President Nixon"

This is the title of a long article by Phyllis Schlafly and Rear Admiral Chester Ward, USN (Ret.) published in the May 24, issue of *Human Events*. The "Open Letter" is original, newsworthy, and "must" reading for those concerned with the survival of America. It tells where the secret Soviet war plans are, what is in them, how they have been suppressed from the American people, and why it is vital that they be declassified and made public now. You are urged to read this article without delay, to buy reprints, and to distribute them to all the influential persons you can. Order reprints from *Human Events*, 422 First St., SE, Washington, D. C. 20003; Single copy 35c; 10 copies for \$3.00; 50 copies for \$12.50; 100 copies for \$25.00.

Phyllis Schlafly gave a radio interview on the "Open Letter" on the *Manion Forum* during June 1969, and conducted a radio interview with General Arthur Trudeau on the subject of the ABM during May. Order reprints of both these interviews from the *Manion Forum*, South Bend, Indiana: Single copy 15c; 10 copies for \$1.00; 25 copies for \$2.00; 100 copies for \$7.00

Kennedy Book Hurts His Presidential Chances

(continued from page 1)

missiles, he cut in half the number of Minuteman missiles previously planned by the Eisenhower Administration, he scrapped all our MRBM and IRBM missiles, he abandoned our strategic missile and bomber bases in Europe and North Africa, he cancelled or refused to build the new strategic weapons we need including the Skybolt, Pluto, Dynasoar, Orion, any advanced manned strategic bomber, and the anti-missile.

And how did the Soviets "react"? Secretary of Defense Melvin Laird gave the result in March 1969 when he presented the facts which conclusively prove that the Soviets "are going for a first-strike capability".

It is absolutely ridiculous for the Kennedy book to assert that the U. S. Safeguard ABM "must be considered escalatory" — when the Soviets have been deploying their own ABM for at least three years! The fact that the Soviets already have heavily invested in ABM defenses proves the utter phoniness of the slogan that we would be guilty of starting "a new round in the arms race."

The Kennedy anti-ABM book attempts to camouflage the real threat from the Soviet nuclear arsenal by a crude semantic trick. The Kennedy book refers to a "Laird" type attack, and to a "Laird" threat. The threat to America is not caused by Melvin Laird, nor will American citizens ever be the victim of a "Laird" attack. The threat to our country comes from the Soviet nuclear arsenal — and we should thank, not smear, those who are trying to defend America against it.

2. The Kennedy anti-ABM book argues against the ABM, saying "now we are in the best bargaining position" because we are in "a moment of rare and precarious strategic balance," a time "when both sides appeared to be leveling off on the number of their nuclear weapons."

The fact is that the moment of rare and precarious balance with the Soviets passed by two years ago. The so-called nuclear "parity" has come and gone, and the Soviets are building nuclear weapons at an even more rapid rate. The May 1969 report published by the American Security Council called *The ABM and The Changed Strategic Military Balance: U.S.A. vs. U.S.S.R.* shows that the Soviets are now ahead of the United States, not only in nuclear striking power, but also in total strategic missiles (ICBMs, SLMs, MRBMs, IRBMs), namely, 2,750 to 1,710. In some areas, the Soviets are ahead of us by a factor of 20 (many of their ICBMs carry 20 times more destructive power), and in space weapons the Soviets are ahead of us by a factor of up to infinity (we have none at all).

3. The Kennedy book argues against the ABM because of its alleged great cost.

The fact is that the Safeguard ABM proposed by President Nixon will cost only \$8 per person per year. Isn't your life worth \$8 per year? The ABM could be the cheapest life and property insurance we ever bought. Our most urgent objective should be to enable America to survive as a nation, and the ABM would be a bargain if it only saved our lives once.

The Kennedy book charges that the ABM would cost "a good fraction of our defense budget." The Safeguard ABM is projected to cost an average of \$1.6 billion per fiscal year out of a total defense budget of \$80 billion. There is something seriously wrong about the professional competence of any scientist (be he a physical scientist or

even a political scientist) who calls one-fiftieth of the defense budget "a good fraction."

It is significant that the authors of the book who now complain so loudly about the cost of the ABM never opened their mouths to criticize the \$10 billion which has gone down the drain on the TFX plane, now known as the Flying Edsel. If the authors of the Kennedy anti-ABM book want to worry about costs, let them dig into their own responsibilities for approving the TFX, for the Wiesner-designed SAGE failure, and the billions given to dictator enemies of the United States such as Sukarno, Nasser and Nkrumah. The authors of the Kennedy book declined to save billions when they had the opportunity because of their high positions and influence. Now, they want to save money by eliminating the defense of American lives.

The Kennedy book also opposes the ABM because the "cost advantage is with the attacker," that is, "an attacker can increase his offensive capability enough to overcome completely an ABM for less than it would cost the defender to build the system as proposed." This is a typical McNamara-type argument, totally lacking in common sense. It is just like saying we should not spend money for fire departments because it cost us more to build and maintain them than it costs the arsonist to buy matches and gasoline. Even though the "cost advantage" is with the arsonist, most people with common sense recognize that we must spend money to protect our lives and property from the damage criminals may do.

That is what the ABM is — a way to protect American lives and property from damage the Kremlin criminals may do. No reasonable person should complain that we don't get our money's worth if the attack never comes. There are not many people who want their house to catch on fire in order to get their money's worth out of fire insurance premiums. The ABM, like fire insurance, is protection for a contingency we hope will never happen.

4. The specter of the so-called "military-industrial complex" is raised as an argument against the ABM in the Kennedy book in a special article signed by Adam Yarmolinsky. This is a phrase inserted into the farewell speech of President Dwight Eisenhower by ghost-writer Malcolm Moos, and taken out of context by Yarmolinsky and others for purposes clearly never intended by President Eisenhower.

In the same speech Eisenhower also said: "We face a hostile ideology — global in scope, atheistic in character, ruthless in purpose, and insidious in method. Unhappily, the danger it poses promises to be of indefinite duration. . . . A vital element in keeping the peace is our military establishment. Our arms must be mighty, ready for instant action, so that no potential aggressor may be tempted to risk his own destruction."

5. The Kennedy book boasts that "a very substantial portion of the scientific and technical community" has taken the position that the ABM will not work. The Kennedy book attempts to enmesh the reader in a mass of minutiae citing technical reasons why the ABM may not operate as it should.

Of course there are many technological difficulties in perfecting an ABM system! No one ever said there weren't! But if the United States is capable of solving

(continued on page 3)

Kennedy Book Hurts His Presidential Chances

(continued from page 2)

the immense scientific problems involved in sending men around the moon and having a man walk in space, surely we can solve the problems of defending ourselves against a nuclear missile attack! If we want to, that is. The Kennedy book gives the unmistakable impression that the authors don't want to defend America against a missile attack, and they therefore try to make the problem sound as complicated and insoluble as only a fuzzy-minded academician can.

The authors of the Kennedy book don't want the ABM to work. If it is true that there are still unsolved scientific problems connected with the ABM, then let us apply the spirit with which we won World War II: "The difficult we do immediately; the impossible takes a little longer." We cannot afford to concede that anything is "impossible" when it comes to defending American lives against the devastation of a nuclear attack.

Actually, there is scientific opinion with vastly higher credentials than any offered by the authors of the Kennedy book to prove that the ABM is workable, practical, and necessary. On May 7, 1969, a distinguished committee headed by Nobel prize winners Dr. Willard F. Libby and Dr. Eugene P. Wigner, and by Dr. William J. Thaler who developed over-the-horizon radar, concluded that "Safeguard makes sense. . . . An American ABM system is the soundest insurance for peace and against war that the United States can buy in 1969, for the 1970s. . . . It may well be, in fact, the single most important step the United States can take toward a real and lasting peace at this moment in history."

6. Bill D. Moyers, in the Kennedy book, proclaims himself against the ABM because it "must be fired in less than 1,200 seconds," which he calls "a spasm response to an enemy attack," and a situation which requires the President to surrender "his decision-making authority to the computers." Moyers is terribly worried for fear that an ABM might shoot down an enemy missile before the President has a chance "to consult with his senior advisors."

For sheer silliness, this argument takes the prize. One of the surest ways to protect America against attack is for the enemy to know in advance that our ABM will be activated by a computer, promptly and surely, regardless of whether the President is temporarily out of reach or if his communication system breaks down. In the confusion which followed the assassination of President Kennedy, President Johnson was separated from the man carrying the coded communication box for more than an hour.

Suppose the unlikely event that the ABM computer makes a mistake, that it goes off accidentally, or too soon, or against some radar-screen object which is not an attacking missile after all — then no damage is done, no lives are lost, no nuclear war is started, because the ABM cannot kill any person — it can only kill incoming missiles.

Why in the world would we need to locate the President and have him consult with his advisors to decide whether or not to shoot down an attacking missile? To require such an unworkable process is about like saying that, if a bank installs a burglar-alarm system equipped with tear gas, it should not be activated unless and until the bank president is located and presses a button. A weapon which is purely defensive, and which can do

absolutely nothing except disable the criminal after he or it is actually on the premises, *should* be set to go into action automatically. This is its prime deterrent value.

7. The Kennedy book charges that the ABM is unnecessary because of "the operation of mutual deterrence" or "nuclear stalemate." "This means that each side knows the other can absorb an all-out attack and still be able to inflict 'unacceptable' damage on the attacker in retaliation. . . . The essence of this relationship is the maintenance of an 'invulnerable deterrent' or 'assured destruction capability' — a retaliatory force secure at all times against being knocked out by a surprise attack."

Of course, this is exactly what the ABM is designed to give us — "a retaliatory force secure at all times against being knocked out by a surprise attack." But the authors of the Kennedy book don't want our retaliatory force to be made secure by an ABM — they want us to trust in their judgment that we are secure without an ABM. Well, we don't trust in their judgment. We need the hardware to make sure that our retaliatory force is secure.

The United States needs far more nuclear power than the Soviet Union just to compensate for the geography, the winds, the dispersal of population, and the location of major cities on coasts vulnerable to submarines; all these factors are favorable to the U.S.S.R. Secretaries McNamara and Laird agreed on the statistic that the Soviets can destroy more of the U. S. population with 200 one-megaton warheads than the U. S. can destroy of the Soviet population with 1,200 one-megaton warheads.

8. The Kennedy book opposes the ABM because "even if an ABM system were 90% successful, several hundred megatons would be delivered on the United States — meaning virtual destruction of . . . perhaps 50,000,000 people." This is the morally indefensible argument that, since we can't save everybody in case of a nuclear attack, there is no point in saving anyone.

This would be just like a mother who, finding her six children in a burning house, refuses to save the three who could be saved on the premise that, since she cannot save all six, there is no point in saving any.

It would be horrible to lose 50,000,000 Americans in a nuclear attack. But America could certainly survive as a nation with the 150,000,000 remaining. We only had 150,000,000 people in the United States in 1950, and we were a wonderful country. Even in 1915, we only had 100,000,000 Americans — and we were a great nation. We should defend as much of America as we can — not roll over and play dead because we cannot save everyone.

9. What is the alternative to the ABM offered by the Kennedy book? None other than an "arms control agreement" with the Soviet Union which the authors call "the best hope for ultimate security."

We cannot put our hope for peace in agreements with the Communists who have broken their pledged word to every country with which they signed a major agreement. When the Soviets invaded Czechoslovakia in August 1968, they violated 17 treaties, one of which was only 17 days old.

The best way to sum up the purpose of the Kennedy book is that its authors are trying to saddle the McNamara policies on America forever. There is no record of the McNamara crowd ever being right in evaluating Soviet capabilities or intentions. The advice given in the Kennedy anti-ABM book should be rejected now.

What One Woman Can Do — The Miami Story

The Republican Women's Action Council of Dade County, Florida is proof of what can be accomplished by a few dedicated women. It opens up a whole new avenue of possibilities for what women can accomplish in politics.

The success of the Council is due to two principal factors: (1) its energetic and effective leadership, especially of its Chairman, Mrs. Paul J. O'Neill, and (2) the fact that it strictly limits its membership to the "doers" and the "workers" instead of diluting itself with those who merely "meet, eat and retreat" at social meetings. Their motto is: "All that is necessary for the triumph of evil is that good men do nothing."

After only five months of operation, the Republican Women's Action Council has piled up this impressive record of activity:

C.U.R.E. — Citizens United for Responsible Entertainment is a fulltime committee whose motto is "Check to see who is in your living room." These women are *not* willing to have their children's morals corrupted by the glamorizing of irresponsible crime and sex in advertising, in entertainment, and on television. These women are organized to express individual and collective disapproval to the entertainment media for violent and uninspiring television programs and movies. C.U.R.E. has written to 470 national sponsors of TV programs and their advertisers, and is cooperating with a Florida TV station interested in this project.

A Police Appreciation Luncheon this spring was a huge success for all who participated in it. The Republican Women's Action Council cooperated with the Crime Commission and other community and civic organizations to make this a day to remember and to show support of the firm law-and-order policies of the Miami police force.

The Education Committee submitted an 11-point program to the Florida Legislature. This program calls for textbooks which encourage individual responsibility and morality, the stopping of disorders on school campuses, and an educational priority list which has compassion for the taxpayers.

The National Legislation Committee has been actively urging everyone to write letters to Senators and Congressmen in behalf of the anti-ballistic missile, in order to combat the



MRS. PAUL J. O'NEILL

flood of letters showered on Capitol Hill by the left wing. One member of this committee has made a thorough study of the proposal to lower the voting age to 18 and testified against this before the Florida Legislature.

Other active committees include Drug Abuse, State Legislation, Court Room Procedure, and New Citizens.

The objectives of the Republican Women's Action Council, as stated in the Bylaws, are:

"1) To keep Republican women organized and functioning with responsibility year round." Many talented Republican volunteers who accept responsibility during campaigns disappear in between elections. An "action" group holds them together for projects of benefit to our nation, our community, and our Party.

"2) To take an active part in civic affairs as a well-organized group of Republicans in order to become more effective in our goals." Many women leaders are already doing valuable work for our country and Party through pursuit of their own special interests. By banding together as a Republican Women's Action Council, they opened up new channels of effectiveness and support for work they are *already* doing.

"3) To have an alert telephone squad organized so that important information can be relayed within a short period of time." "Alert" doesn't just mean "available." "Alert" means ready to go into action on a moment's notice. Whether the emergency is to send letters to Washington on the ABM, or to counteract a TV show at 8 P.M. tonight, or to cope with some pressing community crisis,

the "alert" telephone squad is always ready for action and an asset in all patriotic work.

"4) To produce good public relations for the Republican Party by being an *action* group." The Council pays great attention to press relations and notifies the press about all Council activities. The Council is building a good image for the Republican Party — youthful, energetic, active, moral, concerned about people, and patriotic about America. This unique group of women has gained the respect of the communications media and of all who know of their activities.

Alyse O'Neill launched the Republican Women's Action Council with 25 charter members handpicked because they had already proven themselves working leaders. In describing them, Mrs. O'Neill said: "I looked for key people. By that I mean they are dedicated and will assume responsibility. Many others asked to join, but I told them, 'No, I love you dearly, but you are not a key person.'"

Congratulations to Alyse O'Neill and her group for proving that a handful of women can move mountains when they are vocal, organized, and on the offense instead of the defensive.

If you would like to be on the mailing list of the Republican Women's Action Council, send \$1 or more to Mrs. Paul J. O'Neill, 1260 N.E. 97th St., Miami Shores, Florida 33138.

HELP WANTED. Do you have extra unused copies of *The Betrayers* by Phyllis Schlafly and Chester Ward? This book is now sold out. The publisher will buy back fresh copies @ 20c each. Ship postpaid to Pere Marquette Press, Box 495, Alton, Ill. 62002. Each shipment submitted for refund must contain at least 10 copies and be clearly marked with name and address of sender so check can be sent. By returning your unused copies, you will enable others to read this fine book. Sorry, this offer does not apply to any other titles.

The Phyllis Schlafly Report

Box 618, Alton, Illinois 62002

Published monthly by Phyllis Schlafly, Fairmount, Alton, Illinois 62002. Second Class Postage Paid at Alton, Illinois.

Subscription Price: For donors to the Eagle Trust Fund — \$5 yearly (included in annual contribution). Extra copies available: 15c each; 8 copies \$1; 50 copies \$4.