



# The Phyllis Schlafly Report



VOL. 8, NO. 4, SECTION 1

Box 618, ALTON, ILLINOIS 62002

NOVEMBER, 1974

## Dr. Kissinger's Strange Question

While Dr. Henry Kissinger was attending the Moscow Summit in June, he declaimed to reporters: "One of the things we have to ask ourselves as a country is what in the name of God is strategic superiority? What is the significance of it, politically, militarily, operationally -- at these levels of numbers? What do you do with it?"

This may rank in history with Pontius Pilate's question: "What is truth?" We expect high public officials to know the answers to such fundamental questions.

From 1945 to 1968, the United States had clear strategic superiority. This was known as the U.S. nuclear umbrella. It defended the United States, U.S. interests, and U.S. allies all over the world. Winston Churchill explained its significance in the 1940s and 1950s by saying that there would not be a free man left in Western Europe if it were not for the U.S. nuclear umbrella.

President Eisenhower had the national will to maintain U.S. strategic superiority over any possible Soviet challenge. His Administration erected the great triad of our defense: the Minuteman missiles, the Polaris submarines, and the B-52 bombers.

During the Robert McNamara and Henry Kissinger years, however, the secret decision was made to stop building strategic weapons and thereby permit the Soviets to attain strategic superiority over us. Since 1967, the United States has not added one single missile launcher, either land-based or sea-based, while the Soviets have added more than a thousand.

The Soviets can now use their nuclear umbrella to push their military, political, and economic goals. We are already seeing one of the many consequences of this new Soviet strategic superiority in our present double-digit inflation. Paper currency is nothing but the promise of a government to pay. Its value depends completely on public confidence in the stability and strength of that government. A century ago, the value of Confederate money declined as it became increasingly obvious that the Southern Confederacy was inferior to the military power of the North.

Likewise, the purchasing power of U.S. and European currencies sharply declined after the oil crisis of October 1973 demonstrated to the world that the Soviet nuclear umbrella could protect Soviet economic interests, but that there is no longer any superior U.S. nuclear umbrella to protect American and NATO interests.

*Business Week* conceded that 1974 would be remembered as "the year the forecasters blew it," and con-

cluded that "when all forecasts miss the mark, it suggests that the entire body of economic thinking . . . is inadequate to describe and analyze the problems of our time." The reason the economists cannot explain our present runaway inflation is because they failed to take into account the shift in the strategic balance.

Yes, Dr. Kissinger, in the name of God, there is such a thing as strategic superiority, and it is very useful, indeed. The tragedy is that the United States no longer has it.

### The Spiraling Arms Race

The Soviets received Henry Kissinger in Moscow in October, 1974, with something less than their previous eagerness to sign new agreements on strategic arms limitations. Some commentators have speculated that this is because the Kremlin is moving more cautiously in dealing with Gerald Ford because they are not sure he will be reelected in 1976.

The real reason why the Soviets are playing their cards close to their chest is that they don't need another strategic arms agreement. They got everything they wanted in the SALT Agreements signed by Brezhnev and Nixon in May 1972. Those agreements gave the Soviets everything they could possibly need to advantage them and disadvantage us.

In 1974 the Soviets simply want the unamended continuation of the 1972 SALT Agreements -- under which the Soviets will continue to build weapons at a wartime rate, and under which the United States is not adding a single missile launcher, either land-based or sea-based.

One of the biggest lies put out in connection with the SALT Agreements was that they stopped the spiraling arms race. It is now completely obvious that the Soviets have never stopped racing, but have redoubled their speed, while we have been standing still.

Since SALT, the Soviets have developed five new series of ICBMs. Their SS-16 is a mobile missile, and under SALT the Soviets have every right to deploy this by the hundreds, or even thousands, because there is absolutely no restriction in SALT on mobile missiles. Their SS-18 is a tremendously powerful ICBM, probably twice as powerful as the SS-9 and 50 times the power of our Minuteman missile. The Soviets have every right to deploy the giant SS-18s because their silos were dug before SALT was signed, and therefore construction was begun before the cutoff dates.

The Soviets can freely replace their old light missiles

(the SS-11s and SS-13s) with their new heavy SS-17s and SS-19s, which have three to five times the throw-weight, because the SALT Agreements did not define what is a heavy missile. The Soviets have tested all these new types of powerful ICBMs with MIRVed warheads.

In addition, the Soviets recently tested their new submarine-launched intercontinental ballistic missile with a range of nearly 5,000 miles, that is, 2,000 miles longer than our best submarine-launched missile. It is an ideal first-strike weapon and is on station at all times. Even Admiral Zumwalt admitted that it is "capable of reaching our population centers from their home ports and in many respects (is) comparable to our planned Trident submarine."

Admiral Hyman Rickover testified, "in effect, the Russians already have their equivalent of our Trident." The trouble with this comparison is that we don't have a Trident submarine, and won't have one for five more years. We will not be able to reach Soviet cities from our home ports until we get Trident II.

So cocky are the Soviets with their new missile superiority that without ever giving any promise to allow even one member of the Jewish faith to emigrate, they demanded, and got, the Ford Administration to authorize the shipment this year of 2.2 million tons of wheat and corn, on credit and at low interest rates. It is now clear that the so-called Soviet "promise" to allow 60,000 Jews to leave Russia annually was not a "promise" and involved no actual number of persons.

The Soviets don't need a new strategic arms agreement. All they need is to stall us into thinking they want one, while they continue to build more and more weapons and import more and more of the fruits of our free enterprise system.

### Woody Hayes' Advice

When President Ford recently made his flying visit to speak at Ohio State University in September 1974, he deliberately associated himself with the mystique of one of the country's top football coaches, Woody Hayes. Few coaches have been able to play the tough schedule and produce the winners year after year like Woody Hayes.

Several years ago, while en route to the Rose Bowl, Woody Hayes gave a press interview in which he philosophized a bit about his formula for success. He said: "Football is a game of fundamentals. . . . You have to come back to the basic techniques every day. Niceness never won a football game. I can't get sold on nice people. On fair people, yes, but not nice people. . . . You have to pay the price to win. You have to want to win." And then Woody added: "Let me tell you something about those Communists. . . . They want to win, and they're willing to pay the price."

I thought of Woody Hayes' advice when the leading authority on navies all over the world, called *Jane's Fighting Ships*, issued its impressive 1974 annual ten-pound volume with 3,000 illustrations describing 15,000 naval vessels from eleven countries. This authority states bluntly that the Soviet Navy has surpassed the United States in submarines, missiles, and cruisers, and is even challenging America's aircraft carrier supremacy. The Soviets have built 911 ships since 1962. They have 277 submarines to our 127, and 34 cruisers to our 6. The average age of the Soviet ship is 9 years while the U.S. average ship age is 16 years.

*Jane's Fighting Ships* points out that the U.S. Navy has been slashed "as a matter of direct policy" from 1,000 ships in 1968 to 514 today. U.S. carriers have been

reduced from 24 to 15, other combatant ships from 364 to 168, amphibious ships from 133 to 65, auxiliary ships and patrol craft from 271 to 142, naval combat aircraft from 3,170 to 3,012, and support aircraft from 1,442 to 773.

*Jane's* said that the Soviet Navy "leads the world in sea-borne missile armament, both strategic and tactical, both ship and submarine launched."

By the SALT Agreement in 1972, the United States agreed that we would limit ourselves to only two nuclear missile-firing submarines for every three the Soviet Union has. We are keeping our number frozen at 41, while we gave the Soviets the green light to go on turning out submarines like sausages until they reach their full projected force level of 62.

How could the Soviet Navy come from so far behind and surpass the great United States Navy? The answer is in Woody Hayes' philosophy.

According to the Soviet physicist, Andrei Sakharov, the Soviets are spending at least 40 percent of their Gross National Product on defense, whereas the United States today is spending only about six percent of our GNP. The Soviets "want to win" the game for control of the world, and they are "willing to pay the price" for a superior navy.

If we keep on being "nice" to the Soviets instead of paying the price to build a Navy, we will surely go down to defeat. As Woody Hayes would say, that is just one of the "fundamentals."

### Bombers and Bomber Defenses

When World War II ended, the American Air Force was superior to the combined forces of the rest of the world. That superiority is now passing to the Soviet Union. It is the Soviets, not the Americans, who have by far the most modern, most effective, and fastest strategic bomber in the world -- the supersonic bomber called the Backfire. The Soviets probably have more than four squadrons of Backfire bombers already deployed, and can have hundreds operational within the next three years. They fly at more than mach 2, which is more than twice as fast as our subsonic B-52s.

Our new advanced bomber is called the B-1. The only trouble is, we don't have it in production, or anywhere near production. According to the last official report made just before he retired by Joint Chiefs Chairman Thomas H. Moorer, the B-1 will only begin flight tests with the first prototype late this year, "a production decision" will not be made until November 1977, and the B-1 force is planned to be operational "in the early 1980s." In other words, we may have in the 1980s a bomber force comparable to what the Soviets have right now.

The Soviets are also years ahead of us in fighter-interceptor aircraft. The Soviets have 3,000 of which more than half are nearly new, including the Foxbat, the fastest military aircraft in the world. We have only 500 old and slow interceptor aircraft, which are substantially useless anyway because of the scrapping or obsolescence of our aircraft warning system. Thousands of miles of our borders are unguarded and open.

In the face of this Soviet bomber threat, Secretary Schlesinger has ordered the scrapping of all our remaining bomber defenses. This means that, if the Soviets give the Cubans 17 old bomber aircraft and 17 one-megaton bombs, the Cubans could attack 17 U.S. cities with a total population of more than 50 million Americans -- and not encounter any anti-aircraft missile opposition.

## Testing Minutemen

For years, the appeasement-minded Senators have been assuring us that the Soviets will never fire their nuclear missiles at us because the United States has sufficient missiles to retaliate and destroy the Soviet Union. The plain fact is, however, that we don't know whether our missiles can hit the Soviet Union at all -- because our principal weapon, the Minuteman missile, has *never* had an operational test. Hardly ever? No, never.

For two years during World War II, I fired machine guns and rifles to test ammunition at the largest ammunition plant in the world. I know that the principle of the random-sample operational test is not only valid, but it is essential both to our national security and to the safety of the men who handle our weapons.

Only by a sound testing program can we be sure of the reliability, accuracy, velocity, penetration, and function capability of our weapons. Without tests to determine that they will fulfill their missions, we are placing our servicemen and our nation in dire danger.

Prior to World War II, Congress made the foolish mistake of not appropriating funds to test our torpedoes. After Pearl Harbor, we were forced to use those untested torpedoes. As a result, our submarine commanders had to watch their well-aimed torpedoes bounce off the hulls of Japanese warships.

In the last few years, we have conducted many tests of our Poseidon missile. It's a good thing that we did, because these tests revealed a failure rate of 58 percent. We are now in the process of making the changes and modifications in our Poseidon missiles which these tests showed were necessary.

It is vitally important that we have similar operational tests of our Minuteman missiles from their actual silos so we can find out if they work, or if they, too, have a failure rate of 58 percent.

Until now, the Minuteman has been flight-tested by taking one missile out of its operational base and moving it to the Vandenberg base where it is tested under highly controlled conditions. In no way can this be considered a random operational test. In addition, between 1965 and 1968, the Air Force made four tests by firing a missile from a silo and destroying it after seven seconds. But only one of those four tests was completely successful.

Soviets have conducted more than 100 operational missile tests during the last ten years, including 50 tests during the last year alone. They know what their missiles can do, but we don't know what ours can do. There is no time to delay in finding out if our Minuteman missiles will work if we ever need them.

## The MAD Strategy

What does MAD mean to you? It might mean insane, it might mean angry. But if you were a nuclear strategist, it would be an acronym standing for Mutual Assured Destruction. The MAD strategy is the basis of the SALT Treaty of 1972, and is colloquially defined as "We can destroy the Soviets, and the Soviets can destroy us."

The fact is that the MAD strategy is not mutual, is not assured, and involves only America's destruction.

Two years ago, the great nuclear physicist Dr. Edward Teller said that, "in a few years, if present trends continue," the Soviet Union will be able to kill "more than 50 percent of our people" in a surprise nuclear attack, whereas "there would be very few casualties in Russia because we would not have forces enough left to re-

taliate." That doesn't sound very mutual, does it?

Dr. Donald G. Brennan, a leading U.S. nuclear strategist, stated that "it is actually doubtful that . . . the United States has an assured destruction capability against the Soviets."

Even more important is the fact that the men in the Kremlin don't believe that there is any mutual assured destruction capability. The Soviet Government estimates that its forces can destroy about 60 percent of the American population, whereas the United States can destroy only six percent of the Russian population.

Of course, even if the M-A-D strategy were mutual, it would indeed be MAD as well as immoral, because it is based on killing millions of Russians -- instead of on keeping Americans alive. The Moscow SALT Treaty of 1972, which is based on MAD, guarantees what Dr. Henry Kissinger so accurately described as a "free ride" into our cities for Soviet and Red Chinese nuclear missiles. Nobel prizewinner Dr. Eugene Wigner summed up the problem very well when he said: "It would have been better if each nation was assured that the other could *not* destroy it."

## Evacuation of Cities

When Defense Secretary James Schlesinger presented his massive annual report to Congress in March 1974, it included the momentous announcement that the Pentagon is making plans to evaluate millions of Americans from 250 urban areas in times of intense crisis with the Soviet Union. The Pentagon is going to start publishing pamphlets telling us how to flee from our cities, and pilot projects are to be started in eight or ten areas.

Most of our U.S. population lives in our 250 largest urban areas. We have averaged a crisis a year with the Soviet Union, including the Berlin Wall, the Cuban Missile Crisis, the Vietnam War, and the Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia. The most recent was the Soviet mobilization which brought about our strategic alert last October during the war between Israel and Egypt.

The thought of more than 100,000,000 Americans leaving their jobs and homes and heading for the hills at a time of a crisis with the Soviet Union is so far out that it is beyond the ability of most of us to imagine. What could possibly make the Secretary of Defense suggest such a thing?

Secretary Schlesinger's stunning announcement can only mean that the Pentagon experts have finally read the fine print in the SALT Treaty President Nixon signed in Moscow in May 1972. In that Treaty, he surrendered our right to defend all our cities (except Washington, D.C.) against nuclear attack. He gave up our right to deploy an anti-ballistic missile system, called the ABM -- a marvelous American defensive weapon, which tests at Eniwetok Island proved can intercept and destroy incoming nuclear missiles before they can destroy us.

President Lyndon Johnson planned to build 20 ABM complexes which would interlock to defend a large part of the United States against missile attacks. President Nixon originally planned to build most of what Johnson ordered. In February 1970, the then Secretary of Defense Melvin Laird officially stated that the ABM is a "crucial" need, and he quoted President Nixon as saying, "No President with the responsibility for the lives and the security of American people could fail to provide this protection."

Yet, the chilling facts are that Richard Nixon failed to provide this protection. He traded our birthright, our

lives and our security as American citizens, for a piece of paper called the SALT Treaty. The history of the SALT Talks reveals that the Soviets were desperately eager to get us to abandon our marvelous ABM defense program and they succeeded. In Henry Kissinger's own language, the SALT Treaty guarantees a "free ride" to nuclear missiles, be they from the Soviet Union or Red China.

Our U.S. Constitution makes it the duty of the Federal Government to provide for the common defense. Yet, now the Defense Department tells us that, come the next Soviet crisis, we will be defended by a pamphlet on how to flee from our urban cities to try to escape incineration from enemy missiles.

### Censorship: U.S. Style

During President Nixon's 1974 Summit Conference in Moscow, the whole world had a close look at what happens when the Government controls the news. As soon as the TV networks began to relay news that the Kremlin did not want the American people to hear, the Soviet television technicians simply pulled out the plugs. The TV screens went blank and the sound went dead.

The Soviets were very crude with such tactics, and the media reacted with righteous indignation. However, only two days earlier, the U.S. Government imposed another type of censorship, and hardly anyone protested.

When Chief of Naval Operations Admiral Elmo Zumwalt appeared on a Sunday network television program in July 1974, reporters asked him important and relevant questions about the SALT Agreements and about our prospects for regaining strategic equality with the Soviets. Admiral Zumwalt declined to answer, pleading that it would not be appropriate to reply while President Nixon was in Moscow.

Finally, a persistent reporter asked the question which exposed the real reason for the Admiral's reluctance: Defense Secretary Schlesinger had issued a direct order forbidding Admiral Zumwalt to answer questions on strategic matters. We were deprived of the answers that Sunday morning just as effectively as if the television technicians had pulled out the plugs.

These gag orders are far more widespread than is generally realized. When the great physicist, Dr. Edward Teller, was questioned by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, he sadly replied: "It is secrecy, the keeping of Russian secrets, which happens to be imposed on me by the United States Government, which prevents me from describing to you this tremendous Russian research effort which outstrips us. . . . Secrecy unfortunately prohibits me from giving you real details."

The Soviets disconnected the TV cameras in order to prevent us from learning about their terror tactics used against the dissidents. The U.S. Government issues secret gag orders to prevent us from learning about the enormous investment the Kremlin has made in military research and in submarines and missiles to destroy us. Both are censorship of information the American people have a right to know.

### Freedom of Information

President Gerald Ford's veto of the amendments strengthening the Freedom of Information Act provides new proof that this All-American football player is becoming the victim of a bureaucratic blitz, and that he is losing touch with the thinking of the American people.

The new amendments to the Freedom of Information Act would have put teeth into the present law passed in 1966, but since then nullified by the courts. The new amendments would have made it realistically possible for a citizen to sue in Federal Court to force a Government agency to declassify documents.

The amendments contained adequate safeguards so that they would not require the release of information legitimately classified, such as the location of our submarines and bombers. Nor would they require releasing personal information such as medical reports. But they would have opened the door on classified documents which have been wrongfully kept secret under the phony cover of "national security."

In the last several decades the Federal bureaucracy has repeatedly used the false claim of "national security" to hide from the American people information we have a right to know. This power of classification has been used for three purposes:

1) To hide partisan political activities, as was done in the case of the burglary of the office of Daniel Ellsberg's psychiatrist.

2) To hide secrets of the Soviet Union so the American people will not know Soviet intentions and capabilities of waging nuclear war. The most flagrant example of this is the suppression of the Kremlin documents sent to this country in 1962 by Colonel Oleg Penkovskiy. It makes no sense to prevent Americans from learning what the Russians have known for 12 years.

3) The third type of material hidden by the device of classification is information that could prove damaging to the reputations of powerful politicians. Examples are the continued suppression of the documents of the Teheran Conference of 1943, and of the Operation Keelhaul papers which tell about the forcible repatriation of anti-Communist Russians. It is ridiculous to claim that the release of these 30-year old documents would harm national security.

Congress should repass over the President's veto the amendments to strengthen the Freedom of Information Act. The American people deserve to know the truth about our national security.

**KISSINGER ON THE COUCH — the new book by Phyllis Schlafly and Admiral Ward — will be published in December 1974. You can place your order now.**

TO: Phyllis Schlafly  
Box 618  
Alton, Illinois 62002

Please send me \_\_\_\_\_ copies of "KISSINGER ON THE COUCH" as soon as available. After shipment, bill me for \$12.95 per copy.

NAME \_\_\_\_\_ (Please Print)

STREET \_\_\_\_\_

CITY \_\_\_\_\_ STATE \_\_\_\_\_ ZIP \_\_\_\_\_

### 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.