



The Phyllis Schlafly Report



VOL. 5, NO. 12

Box 618, ALTON, ILLINOIS 62002

JULY, 1972

"Number 2" Tried Harder

Why did President Nixon sign the SALT Pact (consisting of the *Treaty, Interim Agreement, Protocol, and Agreed Interpretations*) which freezes the United States as a poor second to the Soviet Union in the nuclear weapons which will control the world? (The June issue of *The Phyllis Schlafly Report* sets forth the provisions and the arithmetic which prove that the SALT Pact does exactly this.) With each passing week, more mysteries and secrets about SALT surface to provide further proof that it is the most dangerous, disadvantageous, and devious document the United States has ever signed.

What Was The Hurry?

One of the mysteries connected with SALT is that probably never before in American history was a treaty of major importance signed under such rushed, late-at-night circumstances. It is unlikely that President Nixon read the full SALT Pact before he signed it, and it is a certainty that he did not have time to study it.

These amazing statements are proved by a front-page article in the *New York Times* of June 18, 1972 in which that newspaper made public the embarrassing secret that the so-called SALT Pact -- so ceremoniously signed by Nixon and Brezhnev on May 26 -- was not the real SALT Pact at all! The Treaty signed in that television limelight was found to contain errors and was secretly consigned to the burn-bag. The SALT Pact, according to the *Times*, "had to be retyped the next morning and quietly re-signed by Mr. Nixon in his Kremlin suite and then taken to Mr. Brezhnev for his signature to make the signing official."

Whenever the average fellow gets in a jam involving some kind of a contract, his lawyer usually tells him, "You should have read the fine print in the contract." Well, President Nixon *is* a lawyer, and the American people have a right to expect him to read the fine print before he signs away our right to defend ourselves against enemy attack. But now we find that he had not read either the fine print or the large print before he smilingly signed the documents in front of television cameras. His staff apparently had not read the SALT Pact, either.

The obvious thought that comes to mind is that, in this embarrassing circumstance, President Nixon was just the victim of a stenographer's typographical error, and that surely he must have studied the SALT Pact in advance of the dramatic signing on May 26. After all, President Nixon was in Russia for nearly a week before the SALT Pact was signed.

But the SALT Pact was not written in Moscow; it was written in Helsinki. President Nixon had nothing to do with writing the SALT terms. They were written by the Soviet negotiators and agreed to by our negotiators Paul Nitze and Harold Brown (who, as Deputy Secretary of Defense and Secretary of the Air Force, had disarmed the United States of our former vast nuclear superiority). The night before the treaty-signing, President Nixon went to the Bolshoi Ballet. Brezhnev did not attend -- preferring to work on last-minute SALT demands.

The final terms on nuclear submarines, freezing the U.S. at a 3 to 2 inferiority, were worked out by the negotiators on the plane between Helsinki and Moscow and tacked on to the end in a peculiar little addendum called the *Protocol*.

Flown in to Moscow at night, the SALT Pact was signed by President Nixon and Brezhnev at 11:00 P.M. -- after a long evening which included a state banquet, rich food, free-flowing liquors, and numerous toasts. At the end of such an evening, it is no wonder that President Nixon and Henry Kissinger didn't feel like bothering to read the fine print.

What was the great hurry to get the SALT Pact signed at 11:00 P.M. before President Nixon or Henry Kissinger had time to study the fine print? After all, the negotiations had been limping along for two and a half years. Why did the SALT Pact have to be signed that night at any cost, carelessness, or confusion? The SALT negotiators had never before in two and a half years displayed any urgency to produce an agreement.

I went to Vienna last November to find out at first hand about the SALT Talks. It is doubtful that any negotiations in history ever proceeded at a more leisurely pace. The SALT Talks were, in fact, nothing but a stall to keep the U.S. in a self-imposed missile freeze -- while the Soviets raced ahead and acquired nuclear weapons superiority.

My on-the-spot investigation uncovered the fact that, since the SALT Talks started November 17, 1969, there was an average of two sessions per week for only four months out of the year. The summer sessions were held in Helsinki, the winter sessions in Vienna. A principal business of each session was to determine the date and time of the next session, and how many men from each side would be permitted to attend the next session. At the time I was there, the 95th SALT session was going on.

The SALT sessions alternated between the U.S. and

the Soviet embassies. The secrecy of the sessions was guarded more carefully than the gold at Fort Knox. Although half the sessions took place in a building paid for by U.S. taxpayers, the uniformed U.S. soldier guarding the door would not let American visitors in the vestibule although Soviet citizens came and went freely.

The Show Must Go On

With this stalling pace over two and a half years, what was the rush to sign the SALT Pact at 11:00 P.M. on Friday night, May 26, before President Nixon or the White House staff had time to read it?

The only rational explanation is, to use the famous Broadway slogan, "the show must go on." The stage lights were on, Nixon and Brezhnev had moved front and center, the cameras were grinding, the lines had been ghosted and rehearsed, and the pressure was on to raise the curtain and proceed with the show.

Beginning on February 12, 1972, Republican speakers on the Lincoln Day Dinner circuit had been dutifully reciting the canned speeches provided by the White House and the Republican National Committee, which said that the most important reason why we must reelect President Nixon is because he is on the verge of signing a SALT agreement with the Soviets when he goes to Moscow. The White House experts on "image-building" argued that signing a SALT Treaty in Moscow would be a PR coup of the first magnitude and a boost to the President's reelection campaign.

The Soviets, expert horse-traders that they are, sensed the desperate eagerness of the White House staff to cash in on the television theatrics of a treaty-signing in Moscow, and they pushed U.S. negotiators to the wall for every weapons advantage they could squeeze out of us. The Soviet negotiators played a cat-and-mouse game all week, and on Friday, May 26, radio commentators were still telling the world that an agreement had not yet been reached.

As time ran out on Friday, the SALT negotiators boarded the plane to Moscow anyway, working out the last details in the air. When the plane arrived in Moscow, the dignitaries were enjoying the state banquet.

Why did the SALT Pact have to be signed that night? Why couldn't it be reevaluated in the bright dawn of Saturday morning after everyone had slept off the toasts of the evening before? What was the rush? President Nixon wasn't scheduled to leave Moscow until Saturday anyway.

It had to be signed Friday night in order to make the Friday evening Walter Cronkite and David Brinkley national network television newscasts. If the drama were not enacted right then, at 11:00 P.M. Moscow time (which was 4:00 P.M. Eastern Daylight Time), the treaty-signing would miss the nationwide television audience. Television newscasts on weekends have only a small fraction of the Friday night audience, and by Monday it would be stale news and lose its public-relations impact.

Secrecy About The Text And Terms

One of the most curious aspects of the SALT Pact is the fact that only a tiny fraction of the American people have been able to read the text or terms, and therefore cannot possibly know how advantageous it is to the Soviet Union and how disadvantageous it is to the United States. In addition, even those who do have access to the text and the terms (such as Congressmen and the press) have been frustrated and cunningly outmaneuvered in their attempts to secure further information which they need before ratification.

This mystery about SALT starts with the failure of the majority of the news media to give the American people the text and terms. Surely it is the big news of the decade that President Nixon signed an agreement to freeze America at a 3 to 2 inferiority to the Soviet Union in intercontinental ballistic missiles, in missile-launching submarines, and in submarine-launched missiles.

We have already seen how the treaty-signing was geared for a nationwide television audience on Friday, May 26. But that news merely involved the fanfare and falderal of the signing celebration. The cameras showed the champagne being passed and the toasts being drunk -- but they did not delineate the text and terms of the treaty.

Very few major metropolitan newspapers published the actual text of the SALT Pact. The *New York Times*, the *Los Angeles Times* and the *Boston Herald Traveler* printed the text in their Saturday editions, which are the least read of any day in the week. (This is not the fault of the newspapers because the SALT Pact was signed on Friday night; but it does help to explain why so many Americans are still unaware of the SALT terms.) In many cities, not a single newspaper published the SALT Pact text.

The newspapers which failed to print the text and terms of the SALT Pact cannot plead lack of space because it is not very long. The *Treaty, Interim Agreement and Protocol* all together occupy only one-half of a newspaper page. Many newspapers which did not print the SALT Pact text, on the other hand, did publish the longer Joint Communique issued by Nixon and Brezhnev at the end of their visit. This document consisted of a lot of wordy platitudes which have no binding effect. It is a misjudgment of news importance to print the text of the Joint Communique but not of the SALT Pact, in which President Nixon signed away our right to use anti-ballistic missiles and radars to defend our lives, our families and our homes against a Soviet missile attack.

The United States has three news magazines: *U.S. News, Newsweek*, and *Time*. Not one of them saw fit to publish the text of the SALT Pact or even to quote verbatim the key paragraphs which lock our country into a poor second place. *U.S. News* published the Joint Communique in full, but only an inadequate summary of the SALT Pact.

Evading Questions About SALT

On June 15, President Nixon held a White House briefing on the SALT Pact for about 100 Congressional leaders. This briefing was another theatrical production like the helicopter landing at the foot of the Capitol when he returned from Moscow.

President Nixon is considered to be very skillful at answering questions, yet at this vitally important conference with the 100 Congressmen who serve on the Foreign Relations and Armed Services Committees concerned with the SALT Pact, he declined to answer a single question. He made a 12-minute statement, and then departed to perform social functions in connection with a visit by the Mexican President.

A visiting head of state is entitled to receive all the customary diplomatic courtesies. The White House staff surely could have scheduled President Nixon's welcome of the Mexican President so that it did not conflict with the exact moment of the *only* time that President Nixon would have Congressional leaders gathered to discuss the SALT Pact. Such a perfect conflict of the two meetings could hardly be coincidence.

As President Nixon departed, he turned the meeting over to Henry Kissinger to field the questions. The Cronkite and Brinkley television newscasts that evening showed the East Room of the White House filled with eager listeners from Congress and the press. Then the cameras zeroed in on Henry Kissinger presiding at the podium. He opened his mouth to speak -- but we heard no sound. The White House did not permit any sound recording of what Henry Kissinger said. The television quickly cut to Dan Rather telling us how brilliant, witty and knowledgeable Kissinger is, but little of what he actually said.

The White House has consistently refused to permit Kissinger to be sound-recorded. The first few times he held news conferences, Dan Rather would explain, "No sound recording was permitted of Dr. Kissinger's voice." By the time of the June 15 news conference on SALT, this had become such standard operating procedure that Dan Rather did not even explain why he was telling CBS listeners what Kissinger said, instead of letting Kissinger speak for himself.

No official explanation has been given of *why* the Nixon Administration will not permit a sound recording of Kissinger's voice. There are two possible explanations: the White House either does not want the American people to hear *what* Kissinger is saying, or does not want us to hear the heavy foreign accent of the second most powerful man in the Government.

The more important part, however, is the refusal of the White House to permit Kissinger to testify before the appropriate Congressional committees, claiming "executive privilege." Congress is asked to ratify the SALT Pact as soon as possible -- but President Nixon who signed it did not answer any Congressional questions about it, and Kissinger who advised him to sign it will not answer any questions under oath in the normal procedure on Capitol Hill. He only answered questions in the carefully-controlled East Room of the White House where the Congressmen could not bring prepared questions or ask follow-up questions.

To ask Congressmen to ratify the SALT Pact when they can't get any answers to their legitimate questions from either President Nixon or Henry Kissinger is to bypass good democratic procedures.

In addition to Congressional investigations, another important source of information is the Presidential news conference. A most revealing article in the New York *Times* of June 19 gave the facts and figures which prove how President Nixon has practically eliminated press conferences at which reporters can ask him any searching questions about his policies and decisions. The article gave a whole list of important questions about vital national issues which the American people have a right to have answered by their President -- but which he has avoided answering by the technique of not permitting spontaneous questioning by reporters at press conferences. Among the questions that the *Times* believes should be answered by the President is:

"If the numbers of nuclear missiles do not matter too much in the new arms agreements, why did the Russians agree to a freeze only after they were assured a larger number in each category than the United States?"

The Strange Ratification Procedure

We are told, apparently without qualification or question, that the SALT *Treaty* must be ratified by a 2/3 vote of the Senate, but the SALT *Interim Agreement* requires only a *majority* in *both* Houses of

Congress.

No one has produced any constitutional or legal precedent for such a procedure. The U.S. Constitution clearly states that the President "shall have power, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties, provide 2/3 of the Senators present concur." Nowhere does the Constitution, or any law, or any judicial precedent, authorize one type of a treaty to be ratified by 2/3 of the Senate, and another type of a treaty to be ratified by only a majority of both the Senate and the House. There are, of course, precedents for the "Executive Agreement" technique of bypassing Congress altogether.

The strange ratification procedure selected for the SALT Pact has the dual advantage of avoiding an odious comparison with the World War II sellouts of Teheran, Yalta and Potsdam which were not submitted to Congress at all, and also avoiding the necessity of winning a 2/3 majority in the Senate on the SALT *Interim Agreement* and the *Protocol* which have the very discriminatory language and arithmetic dooming the United States to gross inferiority to the Soviets in Polaris-type submarines, in the nuclear missiles they carry, and in land-based strategic missiles.

Loopholes For the Soviets

Soon after the signing of the SALT Pact on May 26, Senator Henry Jackson charged that there were "secret agreements" in addition to the *Treaty*, *Interim Agreement*, and *Protocol*. On June 13, the White House made public these secret additional clauses which were labeled "*Agreed Interpretations*" of the SALT Pact. This document, which occupied about a half-page in the few newspapers which published it, is also an official, signed part of our SALT Pact with the Soviets. It is filled with additional loopholes and interpretations which further confirm American inferiority to the Soviet Union.

The biggest loophole which leaps out of the *Agreed Interpretations* is that the Soviets absolutely refused to reveal how many ICBMs they have now and how many they have under construction. Everyone knows that the United States is frozen at the McNamara figure of 1,054. The generally-used Soviet figure of 1,618 is a Kissinger estimate which the Soviets refused to confirm or deny. This means that the Soviets have retained their legal option to come up with *any* larger figure they desire. They can always claim that construction was started before July 1, 1972 (the cutoff date in the Treaty).

Noting this stunning omission, Senator Henry Jackson stated that the "Soviet refusal to state clearly the number they feel obligated to respect raises the most fundamental doubts about whether they have negotiated in good faith."

The second type of loophole for the Soviets in the SALT *Agreed Interpretations* is the many types of nuclear weapons which are *not* limited by the SALT Pact.

Why is it important to consider the weapons *not* covered by the SALT Pact? Because President Nixon stated clearly on June 15: "Mr. Brezhnev and his colleagues made it absolutely clear that they are going forward with defense programs in the offensive area which are not limited by these agreements." On June 22, *Pravda* announced that the Soviets plan to push ahead with offensive weapons development. What are these offensive areas?

1) *Mobile ICBM launchers*. Both the *Interim Agreement* and the *Agreed Interpretations* make clear that the Soviets can go ahead full-speed with their huge

mobile ICBM program. It is incredible naivete or deliberate deception to allege that the SALT Pact "slows down the arms race" in ICBMs. The Soviets can keep their production line for the manufacture of missiles, their technology, and their momentum by simply making their new ICBMs mobile, by putting them on railroad cars or trucks. In an official *Unilateral Statement*, our U.S. negotiators specifically agreed "to defer the question of limitation of operational land-mobile ICBM launchers." Then, while agreeing that the Soviets could go ahead in mobile ICBMs, our negotiators in effect bound the United States *not* to do likewise, by stating that "the U.S. would consider the deployment of operational land-mobile ICBM launchers during the period of the *Interim Agreement* as inconsistent with the objectives of that *Agreement*."

In other words, our negotiators said in effect: Mr. Brezhnev, this agreement permits you to build and deploy all the mobile ICBM launchers you want, complete with missiles -- but we promise we won't deploy any at all. This is just one more example to prove that there never was a more unequal, craven and degrading agreement signed by any nation -- except by a nation which was defeated in war, or about to be defeated in war.

2) *Space Weapons and FOBS*. The Soviets are vastly ahead of us in space weapons and in fractional orbital bombardment systems. These are the weapons which can strike with zero warning, and against which we have no defense. Under the SALT Pact the Soviets can continue full speed ahead. The Nixon Administration is continuing the McNamara policy of not building or planning any space weapons whatsoever, and not building any defense against Soviet space weapons.

3) *Strategic bombers*. The Soviets now outnumber us in strategic bombers by 900 to 450. Their medium-range bombers are refuelable, and also can use Cuba as a base. Robert McNamara scrapped more than 1,000 of our medium-range bombers and he abandoned the bases close to Russia from which they operated. Our B-52s have now developed metal fatigue because of excessive use in Vietnam, and no replacements for them have been ordered.

The Soviets are at least five years ahead of us in their supersonic bomber, called the Backfire, which has already been flight tested. Our B-1 is only a wooden mockup, and the Nixon Administration has no plans to *produce* it. At no time has the Administration ever asked for one dollar to *produce* even one new strategic bomber, not even in next year's budget.

4) *Reload capability of ICBM launchers*. At least 140 Soviet ICBMs have on-site reload capability, and there is nothing in the SALT Pact to prevent the Soviets from adding an on-site reload capability to 1,000 more missile launchers, including their SS-11s and SS-13s. This loophole allows the Soviets to tremendously increase their first-strike capability against us.

While theoretically we could also develop a reload capability, in practice we cannot because our reload missiles would be useless unless they were "hardened" like our Minutemen -- because the Soviets have SS-9s to knock them out (whereas we have no comparable missiles to knock out Soviet missiles).

How The U.S. Retreated At SALT

Senator Henry Jackson summed up the SALT Treaty very well: "Simply put, the agreement gives the Soviets more of everything: more light ICBMs, more heavy ICBMs, more submarine-launched missiles, more

submarines, more payload, even more ABM radars. In no area covered by the agreement is the United States permitted to maintain parity with the Soviet Union."

Senator James Buckley, in testifying against the SALT Pact on June 29, described the gross inequality this way: "There is nothing in SALT which prevents the Soviets from catching up in areas where we are ahead; but SALT prevents the U.S. from catching up with the Soviets in areas where they are ahead."

On June 28, Senator Henry Jackson made public the previously-secret U.S. proposal of August 4, 1970 which conclusively proves that the Soviets got the better of the Nixon Administration in the SALT Pact. Jackson produced a chart which showed that, in August 1970, the U.S. demanded that each side be permitted parity at 1,900 land-based and submarine-launched missiles.

However, the SALT Pact which President Nixon signed in Moscow freezes the U.S. at a total of 1,710 -- but permits the Soviets to continue building until they have 2,358. The U.S. also retreated on other points, such as the number of "heavy" missiles to be permitted the Soviets, the right to move missile launching sites, and the number of ABM sites.

U.S. News & World Report on May 29, 1972 published the Soviet record on Summit Agreements. In seven summit meetings between a U.S. President and a Soviet leader, 25 agreements have been reached. The Soviets violated 24 of those 25 agreements. When Brezhnev ordered the invasion of Czechoslovakia on August 20, 1968, he broke a solemn treaty he had signed with the Czechs only three weeks before. What kind of sense does it make for us to sign another treaty with the Soviets?

The Soviets *were* Number 2 in nuclear weapons -- but they *tried harder*. Now they are Number 1. What the SALT Pact means is that the Nixon Administration has given up trying, and has agreed to let the Soviets be the most powerful nation in the world. Is this what the American people want? I don't believe it. Send your Senator and Congressman this message:

Vote NO on the SALT Pact which freezes the U.S. as a poor Number 2 -- and *try harder* to make the U.S. again Number 1.

Phyllis Schlafly is the co-author of three books on nuclear strategy, *The Gravediggers* (1964), *Strike From Space* (1965), and *The Betrayers* (1968), which *accurately* predicted that the Soviet Union had a program to overtake and surpass the U.S. in nuclear weapons, and also that Defense Secretary Robert McNamara had a plan to permit this to happen by scrapping and freezing production of U.S. nuclear weapons.

Mrs. Schlafly has testified repeatedly on national security before the Senate Foreign Relations and Armed Services Committees. She has given feature television interviews on military affairs in 12 major cities, and is the news director for a series of interviews with military and nuclear experts aired currently on 70 television and 50 radio stations. An honors graduate of Washington University and member of Phi Beta Kappa, she has a Master's Degree from Harvard University. She began her study of military affairs by working her way through college on the night shift as a gunner and ballistics technician at the largest ammunition plant in the world.

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.