



The Phyllis Schlafly Report



VOL. 4, NO. 12

Box 618, ALTON, ILLINOIS 62002

JULY, 1971

"HELL-BENT ON NATIONAL SUICIDE"

Americans are justly proud of having a system of government that guarantees more freedom than any nation in the world ever enjoyed. Let us always remember that our American freedom includes the freedom to commit suicide. In the opinion of our best informed citizens, this is exactly what we are doing. Here are four warnings which have gone largely unreported by most of the press.

General LeMay's Warning

General Curtis E. LeMay, the great commander who built up the Strategic Air Command as our first line of defense, on February 24 in Santa Ana, California predicted that within 18 months the Soviet Union will serve a "capitulation-or-else" ultimatum on the United States, and President Nixon will have no choice but to surrender and succumb to Soviet demands.

Asked what he meant by the words "or else," General LeMay replied that "or else" means an attack by "nuclear weapons." Continuing, he said:

"While the United States is wasting money on TNT for use in the jungles and rice paddies of Southeast Asia, Russia is spending money on what today is the finest strategic weapons system in the world. We have become a second-rate power, and our whole military establishment is rapidly going downhill because our weaponry--both offensive and defensive -- is outmoded. . . . Like it or not, we are at war with the Communists -- and we'd better do something about it, fast, before it's too late."

General LeMay said the American people are deceiving themselves if they "believe we have a strong national defense system. That's what we're told, but it's not so -- really. And I know."

This sensational statement by one of America's greatest living military leaders was reported in newspapers in California and Indiana. It was apparently censored out of newspapers and television and radio reports in most of the rest of the country. Five months have passed since General LeMay gave his warning about "18 months," but nothing has been done in Washington to rebuild U.S. nuclear strength.

Joint Committee Warning

The Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, made up of nine Senators and nine Congressmen, some hawks, some doves, some conservatives, some liberals, ten Democrats, eight Republicans, is one of the best informed bodies in our Government. On May 24, 1971, this Committee issued an ominous warning: The

United States, unless it moves quickly to counter a rapidly expanding Soviet naval threat, faces a future in which it will have to surrender to the Soviets on all issues or risk nuclear annihilation. Any delay may mean "no future."

The 278-page report contained hitherto unpublished official reports and statements by Admiral Hyman G. Rickover and other experts on the status of Soviet and U.S. naval forces. The bald facts are these.

The Soviet Union has a surface navy of 2,009 units compared with a U.S. surface navy of 563 units. The Soviet submarine strength is 355 compared with 142 for the United States. The advantage in nuclear submarines in which we long took comfort has disappeared. Soviet ballistic missile submarines armed with Polaris-type nuclear missiles now patrol off both coasts in range of most of our urban industrial areas.

This prestigious Congressional Committee concluded that unless prompt measures are taken to build up a nuclear navy, America will have "to give in on all issues. . . . There may be no future. . . . We will soon find ourselves unable to defend our national interests." The Committee urged recollection of the statement by President Eisenhower quoted on the keel of the nuclear aircraft carrier which bears his name: "Until war is eliminated from international relations, unpreparedness for it is well nigh as criminal as war itself."

Blue Ribbon Warning

Soon after President Nixon's inauguration, he appointed a "Blue Ribbon Defense Panel" to study the workings of the Defense Department and recommend how to make it more efficient. In the course of their investigation, seven members of that Blue Ribbon Panel became so alarmed about the inability of the United States to defend ourselves against the growing Soviet nuclear threat that they wrote a "Supplemental Statement" and submitted it to President Nixon on September 30, 1970.

Although this Statement expressly said that its purpose was to "contribute to public discussion" and result in "wider public understanding" because "the public remains uninformed and apathetic" in the face of the Soviet threat, the Pentagon suppressed it for nearly six months. When the Defense Department finally released it on March 12, 1971, no explanation was given for why it was kept secret so long.

On April 5, *U.S. News & World Report* printed a short summary of this Supplemental Statement. It was

largely ignored by the press. On April 19, Congressman John G. Schmitz of California put the full text into the *Congressional Record* (page E3162). This Supplemental Statement was signed by William Blackie, board chairman of Caterpillar Tractor Company, Peoria; George Champion, president, Economic Development Council, New York; William P. Clements, Jr., president, Southeastern Drilling, Dallas; John M. Fluke, president, John Fluke Manufacturing Company, Seattle; Hobart D. Lewis, president, Reader's Digest Association, Pleasantville, N.Y.; Admiral Wilfred J. McNeil, director, Fairchild Hiller Corporation, New York; Lewis F. Powell, Jr., lawyer, Richmond.

The Blue Ribbon Statement publicly recognizes "the abandonment by the U.S. of its former policy of maintaining strategic superiority." It will be recalled that Richard Nixon, in campaigning for the Presidency, on October 24, 1968, specifically promised to restore our "clearcut military superiority." The Blue Ribbon Panel members, all of whom are Nixon appointees, tactfully refrained from mentioning this, but they make clear that the President's promise has not been kept.

A "Second Rate" Power

The Blue Ribbon Statement bluntly states that the United States, as a "second rate" power, will be "subordinate to manifest Soviet military superiority. . . . The world order of the future will bear a Soviet trademark, with all peoples upon whom it is imprinted suffering Communist repressions." *That clearly means all Americans.* "In the 70's neither the vital interests of the U.S. nor the lives and freedom of its citizens will be secure."

The Blue Ribbon Statement says that our present danger "was predetermined by decisions made in the 1960's, which resulted in the reduction, postponement and abandonment of strategic defense measures and weapons systems." Of course, all readers of the Schlafly-Ward book, *Strike From Space*, knew this in 1965, *at the time it was going on.*

The Blue Ribbon Statement explodes the myth of relying on the "Sino-Soviet split," saying "the friendship between the Soviet Union and Red China has dissolved. . . . But this disunity among Communist powers does not necessarily enhance the chances of peace for the Free World. . . . Each has always proclaimed that the principal enemy is 'imperialistic America.' . . . The Marxist purpose of communizing the world remains the goal of every Communist party."

The Blue Ribbon Statement says flatly that "the reopening and control of the Suez Canal" is a Soviet objective; "this waterway [is] as important to the Soviet Union as the Panama Canal has been to the U.S." If Secretary of State William Rogers would read the Blue Ribbon Statement, he would see that he is directly serving the Soviet Union by his frantic efforts to pressure the Israelis into allowing the opening of the Suez Canal.

There has been much public debate in the last few months about the number of American troops which should be stationed in Western Europe. The truth is that whether we have 150,000 or 300,000 troops in Europe is an exercise in irrelevancy, as the Blue Ribbon Statement makes clear: "The Soviet Union has some 700 IRBM's deployed within convenient range of defenseless Western European cities and NATO forces." Note the word "defenseless." Western Europe has no strategic defense against the Soviet nuclear threat because former Secretary McNamara scrapped all our European-based IRBM's.

ICBM Superiority

The Blue Ribbon Statement warns flatly that "the Soviet Union has attained for the first time a superior strategic capability -- where it counts the most -- in ICBM's. . . . While we imposed a limitation on additional strategic weapons, the Soviets pressed forward to overtake and pass us. . . . More serious than the numerical superiority is the substantial megatonnage advantage enjoyed by the Soviet Union. The enormous payloads of the SS-9's have a destructive capacity incomparably greater than any U.S. missile. . . . The Soviet SS-9 ICBM force alone is capable of delivering a megatonnage of nuclear warheads several times greater than that of the entire U.S. force of ICBM's and SLBM's. . . . It is well to remember that we have *no defense whatever* against Soviet ICBM's and SLBM's which *now* have the capability of killing perhaps *half of our population* -- more than 100 million people -- by a surprise first strike." (emphasis added)

The Blue Ribbon Statement calls attention to the heavy Soviet financial commitment to building a first-strike capability: "The trend of Soviet defense spending continues steadily upward. . . . The Soviet Union is spending significantly more than the U.S. in the buildup of its strategic offensive and defensive weapons" even though its gross national product is only half of ours.

The Blue Ribbon Statement concludes: "The only viable national strategy is to regain and retain a clearly superior strategic capability," which can be done (1) by building enough new strategic nuclear weapons, and (2) "by eschewing agreements [such as SALT] which freeze the U.S. into a second-rate status. . . . The road to peace has never been through appeasement, unilateral disarmament or negotiation from weakness. The entire recorded history of mankind is precisely to the contrary. Among the great nations, only the strong survive."

The Blue Ribbon Statement warns in the strongest language against "the danger of fatal concessions or even of a deliberate trap" at the SALT talks now going on between the U.S. and the U.S.S.R. in Helsinki. The Blue Ribbon Statement says that it would be "egregious folly" for the U.S. to agree to freeze strategic capabilities "at some level of specified parity" because this would actually enable the Soviet Union to "strengthen its overall military and political position."

President Nixon's announcement that he has made "a major step in breaking the stalemate" in the SALT talks is the "egregious folly" of which the Blue Ribbon Panel members warned. What was hailed as a "major breakthrough" was really a U.S. surrender of our previous position that any agreement must cover all offensive weapons and not prevent our catching up with Soviet ABM systems.

Many people ask, "why do we need more nuclear weapons when we already have enough to kill every Russian?" The Blue Ribbon Statement clarifies the reason. We have no assurance whatsoever that our weapons can kill any substantial number of Russians because of the extensive Soviet anti-missile and anti-bomber defenses. More important, the U.S. has no missiles which can destroy Soviet weapons, while the Soviets are approaching the capability of wiping out our entire missile force with their giant SS-9's.

Our "Only Hope"

Although the Blue Ribbon Statement is "respectfully submitted to The President and The Secretary of Defense," it offers not the slightest trace of optimism that they will accept the recommendations. The impression given is that the

Blue Ribbon Panel members have despaired that President Nixon will fulfill his promise to restore our "clearcut military superiority," and so are appealing over his head to the American people. The Statement repeatedly admonishes the American people to rise up and demand nuclear superiority, but never calls on President Nixon to do anything. At one point the Blue Ribbon Statement says our "only hope . . . is to assure a wider public knowledge of the facts and an understanding of the probable consequences of second-rate military status." If we fail, "there is little future for America as we know it or for our cherished freedoms."

What the Blue Ribbon Panel members are saying is: Voters, if you want America to survive in the face of the Soviet nuclear threat, it's up to you to do something about it, because the President, the Defense Department, and the Congress certainly are not doing what needs to be done.

Congressman Rivers' Warning

The Congressional committee which is directly concerned with defense is the House Armed Services Committee. Its chairman for many years until his death this year was Congressman L. Mendel Rivers. Last September 28 he made a speech called "The Soviet Threat" which must rank as one of the most important ever given in Congress. He laid it on the line about the critical danger America faces today. Because this great speech was given the silent treatment by most of the press, we reprint here selected excerpts. The full text can be found on page H9294 of the September 28, 1970 *Congressional Record*.

"Mr. Speaker, never before in the 30 years of my membership in this body have I stepped into the well of this House with greater concern for the future of this Nation.

"The fears that I have are those that must be shared by every American regardless of his political or social philosophy or his economic status.

"All Americans have been given the blessed and priceless heritage of freedom -- a freedom which I am convinced is in terrible jeopardy. . . .

"Consideration of the defense budget, contrary to what some would have us believe, is not a question of assigning relative priorities between defense and domestic programs.

"Decisions on the defense budget should be based on the simple question of national survival -- and nothing more.

"The issue should be 'what is required to survive?'; and not 'how should we allocate the national budget between defense and domestic programs?'

"The final measure of our ability to survive as a nation in a hostile world will not be how well we have managed our domestic resources and domestic programs, but whether or not we have avoided and frustrated the forces of evil which would draw us into the crucible of war with the Soviet Union.

"If we fail in that endeavor, we will have failed in everything.

"It is this circumstance which demands that we maintain a level of strategic and conventional military capability that will insure against any misunderstanding by the leaders in the Kremlin of our intentions to survive.

"Regrettably, the leaders in the Kremlin are now evidently unimpressed by both our military capability and our national determination to survive. . . .

"Since the deterioration of our military capability vis-a-vis the Soviet Union is no secret to the Kremlin, I believe it is high time that we tell the American people the facts of life. I plan on doing that today. . . .

[Congressman Rivers then set forth in specific detail how the Soviet Navy has achieved superiority over the U.S. Navy, especially in submarines, modernization, speed, and surface-to-surface missiles. He spelled out the formidable Soviet naval threat in the Mediterranean, in the Caribbean, in the Atlantic, and off Cape Kennedy.]

"The Brink of Disaster"

"I cannot overemphasize the seriousness of this situation. Yet, I know that there are people in the Congress of the United States who will say 'so what?' I can only warn the Members of this House that we are on the brink of disaster and I have never before been so concerned in all the years I have served in the Congress of the United States.

"We must, therefore, acknowledge the fact that our naval vessels are today simply not capable of discharging their wartime mission requirements if called upon to do so. . . .

"The deliberate and calculated offensive plans of the Soviet Union are now becoming crystal clear with the release of information by the administration of evidence of new Soviet activity in Cuba. I have no doubt that the Soviets are now building a missile-launching nuclear-submarine naval base in Cuba. . . .

"We cannot live with this new Soviet threat at our very doorstep. We cannot permit the cities of the eastern seaboard to become hostages of the Soviet Union. . . .

"Do not be misled into believing we can make up for this frightening loss of naval superiority by relying upon a superior strategic nuclear capability vis-a-vis the Soviet Union. Since 1965, the Soviet Union has engaged in a major effort to change the balance of power in this area of military capability. In that period it has more than tripled its inventory of strategic offensive nuclear weapon launchers. . . .

"In the same period, the United States has made no increase in its established level of 1,710 strategic nuclear missile launchers, and has reduced its heavy bomber strength from 780 to less than 600. . . .

"Although the 300 SS-9's will represent considerably less than half of the total inventory of the Soviet land-based ICBM's, this portion of the Soviet ICBM inventory will alone be capable of delivering a megatonnage in nuclear weaponry which exceeds the combined total nuclear weapon megatonnage delivery capability of all of our existing strategic delivery systems, including not only our ICBM force, but our Polaris force, as well as our heavy bomber force. Certainly this fact alone ought to raise serious questions concerning the alleged 'defensive' posture of the Soviet Union.

"We have no counterpart for this huge Soviet nuclear weapon delivery system. . . .

"In 1965 neither the Soviet Union nor the United States had a depressed trajectory ICBM or a fractional orbital bombardment system -- FOBS. Today, the Soviet Union has tested both, and could very well have operational versions of these weapons systems already deployed. Both of these developments have far-reaching implications on our defense capability.

"Unfortunately, we have nothing like these, and to the best of my knowledge, none on our drawing boards.

"Today the Soviets can launch over 200 ballistic missiles from their nuclear-powered submarines. Two years from now 400 to 500 of these Polaris-type missile launchers are expected to be operational, and by early 1974, this Soviet submarine-launched ballistic missile force will inevitably exceed the constant U.S.

force we now have of 656 Polaris launchers. Further, most of our major cities are close to our coasts within short range of their potential submarine stations. . . .

"Our tactical air capability, when compared to the Soviet capability, also raises serious questions as to our ability to cope with the Soviet Union in a conventional confrontation. For example, since 1954 the Soviets have designed and produced 18 new types of fighter planes -- 13 of these models we have actually photographed in flight. In the same time frame, the United States has not produced a single new air superiority fighter, and actually we have not had one on order until this year. . . .

"Hangs By a Thread"

"I say to this House that the future of this Nation hangs by a thread.

"We are in a far more serious situation than many would have you believe. Our way of life is not only being challenged from within, it is being very definitely threatened from without. . . .

"Now let me summarize for a moment. I have outlined to you that our former 5-to-1 margin in nuclear strategic weapons has in a few short years vanished. The Soviet Union now has a nuclear strategic weapon capability in excess of ours, and this superiority will continue to increase if we do not take dramatic action to stem the tide. We can no longer look upon our threat of nuclear war as a satisfactory deterrent to aggression with conventional arms, as we could in the two decades past. From here on if we threaten nuclear war in response to aggression, we risk our own destruction.

"Moreover, I pointed out that the Soviet Union has within a few short years negated our naval superiority. This same accomplishment is evident in other areas of conventional warfare, including our ground and air capabilities.

"As a matter of fact, while Congress is still debating the necessity for building an advanced manned strategic bomber, the B-1, we now know that the Soviet Union has already built such an aircraft, and it should be coming into their operational inventory at least 3 to 4 years before we can hope to have our B-1 operational.

"Hell-Bent on National Suicide"

"The circumstances of the B-1 bomber debate in this country illustrate the reasons why we seem hell-bent on national suicide. While we debate the question of maintaining our military capability, the Soviet Union quietly but openly forges ahead.

"It may be that the gap which has now been created in our defense capability can never be bridged. The Soviets have the bit in their teeth, and make no mistake about it, are both capable and determined to maintain this newly developed superiority. . . .

"In calendar year 1969, the United States spent a total of \$7.5 billion on strategic offensive and defensive weaponry. During that same period, the Soviet Union expended approximately \$13 billion for the same effort. Thus, it is evident that the Soviet Union in a single calendar year has spent approximately \$5.5 billion more for increased strategic capability than did the United States.

"I recognize that a \$5.5 billion added effort is somewhat difficult for laymen to comprehend. However, since the cost of a single Minuteman missile is approximately \$4.8 million, the added Soviet effort is roughly equivalent to the procurement of a thousand Minuteman missiles.

"All of this in one calendar year. . . .

"As a matter of fact, this circumstance alone illustrates the cold and calculating master plan of the Soviet Union, who in entering the SALT negotiations hope to freeze the United States in an inferior position in strategic weaponry.

"I pray to God that the American people, and the Congress in particular, will soon awaken to these realities and recognize that the question confronting us is no longer one involving the relative allocation of priorities in spending between defense and domestic programs, but rather the fundamental question of national survival.

"We cannot as a Nation afford to spend one penny less on national defense than that amount which is required to insure that you and I, and our children, can convince the Soviets they dare not pull the trigger when a Soviet gun is placed against our heads.

"The issue, therefore, is very simply how much money must be spent to insure our survival -- since if we fail to demonstrate to the Soviet Union our determination to survive -- the amount of money we spend for domestic programs will become merely an academic exercise.

"I plead, and I beg you, my colleagues who collectively have the responsibility of the security of our Nation in your hands, to ponder these facts which I have brought to you today. They are proof positive that we are in serious trouble. Unpleasant as these facts may be, you can not ignore them, for if you do, you are failing not only your constituency but also all the peoples of the world who, in the final analysis, look upon the United States as the fountainhead and guardian of the highest aspiration of genuine freedom in this chaotic world. . . .

"These are the facts which reflect the prophetic wisdom of an observation once made by a gentleman by the name of Mr. Richard M. Nixon, when he said:

"If present trends continue, the United States, a very few years hence, will find itself clearly in second position -- with the Soviet Union undisputably the greatest military power on earth."

"I am afraid that the day has already arrived."

"If Not Us, Who?"

When Congressman Rivers concluded his speech, he was warmly commended by Congressmen of both parties. Congressman Durward Hall said: "What you have said today can be construed as neither hawkish, or dovish, but english, that gallant and magnificent creature that symbolizes the strength and honor of this great Nation. . . . In the defense of freedom, if not us, who? If not now, when? If not here, where? I hear no answers. . . . If we do not first concern ourselves with the survival of this Nation, all the rest will go for naught."

Congressman Don H. Clausen said: "This historic and well-documented speech of Chairman Rivers could well record him as the 'jet, space, and nuclear age Paul Revere.'" Mr. Rivers responded: "I only hope that someone, somewhere in the smoldering ruins, will say, 'Old Rivers did the best he could.'"

Are you, my friends, doing the very best you can to save our beloved America from being "hell-bent on national suicide"?

The Phyllis Schlafly Report

Box 618, Alton, Illinois 62002

Published monthly by Phyllis Schlafly, Fairmount, Alton, Illinois 62002.

Second Class Postage Paid at Alton, Illinois.

Subscription Price: For donors to the Eagle Trust Fund -- \$5 yearly (included in annual contribution). Extra copies available: 15 cents each; 8 copies \$1; 50 copies \$4; 100 copies \$8.