



# The Phyllis Schlafly Report



VOL. 8, NO. 9, SECTION 1

Box 618, ALTON, ILLINOIS 62002

APRIL, 1975

## Our Allies Got The Message--But Did We?

Ten years ago, the United States had steadfast allies all over the world. In Europe, our solid lineup of friends extended from Norway to Greece and Turkey. It was especially strong in the center with Britain and West Germany, and secure in the south with Spain and Portugal.

When we came to the aid of South Vietnam, our Pacific allies stood loyally with us. Japan and Taiwan furnished bases in support of our effort. Australia, Thailand, South Korea, and the Philippines furnished bases and troops.

Today, all that is changed. We have no firm, dependable major allies anywhere in the world. In 1973 when we asked our European friends to permit our planes to land and refuel on their long journey to transport essential military aid to Israel, Portugal was the only country that granted this favor. Now, Portugal is considering a Soviet request for a naval base in the Madeira Islands. This will enable Soviet nuclear-armed submarines to double their patrol time off American coasts because they will not have to make the long trip back to their Black Sea and Murmansk bases.

Britain, West Germany and France say they cannot afford the cost of a strong NATO to defend Western Europe. Instead these countries have all been tendering their own bribes to the Kremlin in terms of billion-dollar gifts disguised as long-term, low-interest loans and access to Western technology. (Britain is not even considering the repayment of her multi-billion dollar postwar loan from the United States.)

In the Pacific, Japan is negotiating with the Soviets to pay the same kind of economic tribute, and has asked us to reduce our military presence there. Thailand asked us to do likewise, and Australia has withdrawn from SEATO. In clear violation of the Paris Peace Agreement, the Soviets are supplying tanks, rockets, artillery, anti-aircraft, trucks, gasoline and ammunition for the Communist conquest of South Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia.

What has caused this dramatic change? In international politics, just as in domestic politics, there is an irresistible momentum to join the side of the winner, a psychological phenomenon known as the get-on-the-bandwagon appeal.

When Nixon signed the Kissinger-negotiated SALT Agreements in 1972 giving the Soviets a 3-to-2 advantage in nuclear missiles and submarines, a 10-to-1 advantage in missile megatonnage, and surrendering the

right to defend the United States or our allies with the great American-developed ABM, the world was notified that we would not defend our allies, or even our own cities. The center of world power dramatically shifted from Washington to Moscow.

Our allies made an agonizing reappraisal and came to the conclusion that, in the ongoing conflict between the Communist world and the Free World, the Reds will ultimately prevail. Our former friends concluded that the United States is no longer a dependable ally, and that we lack both the will and the military power to protect them. The only practical course of action for them to pursue is to race to make their accommodation with the new winner.

The Nixon-Kissinger policy of detente with Soviet Russia and Red China is an even greater failure than British Prime Minister Neville Chamberlain's 1938 policy of appeasement of Adolf Hitler.

### Schlesinger's Shocking Scenario

Secretary of Defense James Schlesinger, in an interview in January 1975, confirmed the deployment by the Soviet Union of its new supermissile, the SS-18. This missile has a payload at least ten times greater than the principal American missile, the Minuteman. This means that the Soviet MIRVs on their SS-18s are ten times more powerful than our MIRVs on our Minuteman missiles.

To get the full impact of Secretary Schlesinger's press conference, however, it must be matched up with his testimony before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee given on September 11, 1974, and made public on January 10, 1975. Armed with charts and graphs, Secretary Schlesinger spun out a scenario of how the Soviets could use their nuclear missiles, and how the United States would react. He told how the Soviets could deliver a nuclear strike on us that would wipe out our ICBM silos, our SAC bases, and our nuclear submarine bases.

This much was not news. What was a stunning surprise was Dr. Schlesinger's description of U.S. reaction to this calamity. He said that the Soviet attack would kill only six million Americans and would hardly disrupt our economy; that the psychological impact probably would result in an initial "loss of confidence in [our] government," but that the American survivors would adapt to the situation and "support re-establishment of normal cooperative relationships at all levels of community life."



The reporters asked good questions about the tremendous Soviet superiority in missile throw-weight. President Ford brushed them off by saying four times that the United States can increase our throw-weight if we want to. Someone should have said, "But Mr. President, you should know that it is impossible for us to increase our throw-weight by a significant amount so long as we are bound by the SALT Agreements of 1972, which limit us to an increase of only 15 percent in the size of missile launchers. We cannot match the Soviets in throw-weight within that 15 percent limit because we do not have the new pop-up cold-launch technique that enables the Soviets to increase their throw-weight by 300 to 500 percent."

One reporter asked the excellent question: "Are you satisfied that the Soviets are carrying out the spirit and the letter of the 1972 [SALT] Agreements?" President Ford blandly answered that "We know of no violations." He didn't say who he meant by "We," but it apparently does not include our military or intelligence authorities because Admiral Elmo Zumwalt said recently, "I'm satisfied [the Soviets] are cheating, and I believe most intelligence specialists believe they're cheating."

We were led to believe by the Ford Administration that the Soviets made some kind of concession in agreeing not to count the forward-based planes that we have in Europe. This was no concession at all because even Dr. Kissinger admitted that they "are not suitable for a significant attack on the Soviet Union." Someone should have asked President Ford about the Soviet weapons we agreed not to count including the Soviet medium bombers (of which they have 800 capable of attacking the United States by refueling in Cuba), or the Soviet IRBMs and MRBMs (of which they have at least 800 targeted on Western Europe, which has no ABM defenses), or the Soviet reloads (of which we have none).

Finally, when President Ford bragged about limiting the number of missiles that can be MIRVed to 1,320, why didn't some reporter ask him: "But Mr. President, isn't it true that the Soviets would have to MIRV only 500 of their giant missiles to achieve the capability to knock out our Minuteman missile force?"

Unfortunately, the record of presidential press conferences following Soviet agreements, such as Yalta, Moscow SALT, and Vladivostok, shows that the American public is not given the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth.

## Civil Defense

Among the hundred or so publications I subscribe to is a small bimonthly called *Survive: The American Journal of Civil Defense*. Now in its eighth year of publication, this magazine has maintained a high level of original research and intellectual competence worthy of the eminent names that grace its masthead, including Nobel prize winner Dr. Eugene Wigner and nuclear physicist Dr. Edward Teller.

The January 1975 issue of this journal features reports on the elaborate civil defense shelter systems against nuclear attack which exist in four other countries: China, Russia, Sweden, and Switzerland. These reports are eye-openers for those who still cherish the illusion that the United States leads the world in everything.

The Red Chinese have built the most extensive and modern network of shelters, miles and miles of brick

and concrete underground tunnels, with entrances from every office building, department store, apartment, and residence. They are equipped with kitchens, running water, sanitary facilities, food storage, and medical facilities.

In the event of nuclear attack, Peking's seven million people can be safe inside the tunnels in seven minutes, and can walk through them 20 miles outside the city. Every major city in China has similar tunnels. It is estimated that 90 percent of the Chinese would survive a nuclear attack.

How could Red China afford such a massive investment in construction? Simple. Chairman Mao ordered hours of daily volunteer labor donated from the leisure time of every Chinese worker.

*Survive* Magazine then describes the current Soviet shelter program that is similar to the Red Chinese and has been accelerated during the period of detente. Civil defense is a regular subject taught in Russian schools beginning in the second grade. The students are taught how to enter and spend time in shelters, use gas masks and respirators.

Sweden already has five million shelter spaces for its eight million inhabitants, and is still building toward a goal of 12 million. Sweden has schools, garages, hangars, factories, power facilities, and berths for ships under granite shields of 50 feet or more. The goal is simple: to make Sweden "so tough to attack that no rational enemy will ever try." The Swedes are well on the way toward achievement of that goal.

Switzerland has already built shelter spaces for two-thirds of its population. They have 600 emergency centers and 250 standby facilities. By a policy of being always prepared, the Swiss have avoided war for 150 years in the midst of warring nations on all sides. The Swiss approach civil defense realistically under the philosophy: "The best thing about a good shelter program is that nobody may ever need it."

Does our government value human life so little that we cannot give our people the basic protections today enjoyed by the citizens of China, Russia, Sweden, and Switzerland? It is time for Congress to address itself to the problem of assuring that our people survive in the nuclear age. An effective civil defense shelter program is the least expensive way to accomplish this; and, as a side benefit, it would be the shot in the arm needed to rescue the construction industry from its current deep depression.

## Longevity of Brezhnev and Dobrynin

It has been a little more than ten years since, at a secret meeting of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, Nikita Khrushchev was rendered an unperson and Leonid Brezhnev was elevated to the top position of General Secretary of the Communist Party -- the top post in Russia. At that time, most of the commentators thought Brezhnev was just a party hack put there to keep the seat warm during an alleged struggle for supremacy.

Those who understood what was taking place, however, knew at the time that Brezhnev was Khrushchev's own handpicked successor. News photographs of Richard Nixon's visit to Russia in 1959 reveal Brezhnev standing next to Khrushchev even then. Brezhnev was one of the two co-conspirators who plotted with Khrushchev to ship offensive nuclear missiles into Cuba in 1962.

Since taking power in 1964, Brezhnev has presided

over the building of the most powerful arsenal of military might ever built by any nation in the history of the world. And he has demonstrated his ruthlessness in the use of power by ordering the invasion of Czechoslovakia in 1968, enunciating the Brezhnev Doctrine, which is the *ex post facto* rationalization of that invasion, and by his continuing war on the scientists and writers who dare to speak out against Soviet tyranny.

The continuity and consolidation of Brezhnev's personal power are a phenomenon typical of Communist countries. His longevity in top office is the customary way Communist bosses hang onto their power.

What should cause surprise and comment among Americans, however, is the remarkable twelve-year tenure of Anatoly Dobrynin as Soviet Ambassador to the United States.

On the afternoon that Gerald Ford took office as President, he attended meetings with diplomats from 57 countries and was heard to remark that Dobrynin "seems to go on and on." And so he does, each year becoming more valuable to the Kremlin because he knows more and more key U.S. officials, and more and more about each of them and their weaknesses. His value to the Kremlin was acknowledged by his promotion to become the only nonresident member of the Soviet Communist Central Committee.

Dobrynin's long record of deceit raises the question as to whether he might even deceive his close friend, Secretary of State Henry Kissinger. Dobrynin participated with Soviet Foreign Minister Gromyko in lying to President John Kennedy at the White House in October 1962 by telling him that the Soviets had no strategic nuclear missiles in Cuba. At that very time, Kennedy had in his desk drawer the U-2 photographs of the missiles. That should have made Dobrynin *persona non grata* right then.

President Ford, who has the discretion to receive or reject any foreign diplomat, would be well advised to look into the matter of why Dobrynin goes "on and on" in Washington.

### Aiken's Explanation

Every prosecuting attorney knows that, no matter how conclusive the eyewitness and circumstantial evidence, it is next to impossible to convince a jury to return a conviction unless a plausible motive for the crime can be presented. Human nature seems to demand a motive before we can judge anyone guilty of a wrongful act.

Likewise, anyone who speaks on national issues is constantly confronted with one recurrent question: *why* do our leaders tolerate such military weakness, vote for those bad bills, approve those bad treaties, and confirm those bad appointments? Like the Greek monster Hydra that grew two more heads every time Hercules cut one off, heads in every audience pop up to demand *why* our President, Congressmen, and other Government officials do the unwise and unpopular things they do.

We are indebted to Senator George Aiken, the dean of the Senate, for explaining the motivation behind much of what happens in Washington. Retiring from the Senate at age 82, he made a final speech which he labelled a "confession." Here is what Senator Aiken said:

"During the 34 years of my tenure as U.S. Senator, I have committed many sins. I have voted for measures which I felt were wrong, comforting myself with the excuse that the House of Representatives, the confer-

ence committee, or, if necessary, the chief occupant of the White House would make the proper corrections. At other times, I have voted for measures with which I did not agree for the purpose of preventing the approval of other measures which I felt would be worse."

So now we know *why* our Senators and Congressmen vote for fatal cutbacks in our military defenses, tax increases, deficit spending, foreign giveaways, low-interest long-term loans to Communist countries, busing, government controls over education, and hundreds of other bills that defy logic, common sense, fiscal sanity, and the wishes of their constituents. Each one is giving in to the pressures of the moment, secretly hoping that the other "house" will display more wisdom or more courage.

### Future of Conservatives

Conservatives are currently agonizing over what course of action they should take for 1976, and how they should respond to the Ford-Rockefeller-Kissinger Administration. Conservatives appear to be about evenly divided between Republican Party loyalists and those who want to go the new party route.

There are good arguments on both sides. The state laws are rigged against the emergence of a new party. The difficulties of getting a new party qualified, on the ballot, and fairly counted in the next election, are matched only by the difficulties of recapturing the Republican Party from the Rockefeller-Kissinger group now in control. Then, there is always the possibility that inflation and unemployment may have so damaged the Republican Party that the nomination is not worth anything anyway.

And yet, everyone knows that the majority of voters rejected both parties in the last election, and are out there waiting for new leadership. If we could get away from party labels and ideological epithets, the majority of voters would quickly line up on the same side of the issues as conservatives: *for* a strong national defense, *for* lower taxes, *for* cutting down on foreign and domestic giveaways, and *for* a stricter morality in handling crime and education.

Yet, the conservatives are so engulfed in hesitation and indecision that they are the Hamlet of current politics. To be a Republican or not to be a Republican, that is the question. Indecisive figures such as Hamlet never won a battle, an election, or a fair lady. The rewards of this world go to the fearless and the daring.

The greatest newspaperman it has been my pleasure to know, the late Richard Amberg, publisher of the *St. Louis Globe-Democrat*, used to keep this motto hanging in his office: "Courage is a virtue which the young cannot spare. To lose it is to grow old before your time. It is better to make a thousand mistakes and to suffer a thousand defeats, than to run away from battle."

Unless conservatives rekindle their faith in ultimate victory and their courage to act no matter what the odds, they will continue to play the role of Hamlet in American politics.

#### 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.