



The Phyllis Schlafly Report



VOL. 10, NO. 6, SECTION 1

BOX 618, ALTON, ILLINOIS 62002

JANUARY, 1977

The Biggest News Story

The most dramatic news event of the last decade is not the presidential election, not exchange visits of foreign heads of state, not Watergate, not space flight, not the Vietnam War, not even New York's financial default. It is the shift in the strategic balance of power from the United States to the Soviet Union.

Fourteen years ago, the United States had nuclear superiority over the Soviet Union of eight to one. Today, the Soviets have clear superiority. Russia even has a navy with twice the combat ships we have.

Yet, despite its overriding importance to our political independence and economic future, the dramatic decline in American military power is treated as a non-event by the national news media. Even the unmentionable escalation in venereal disease rates is more discussed than the new American military inferiority. The question is, why don't we hear, see, or read about it in the news?

Although some people explain this silence in terms of an alleged anti-defense pro-disarmament bias of the press, there are other causes.

The first explanation is the compulsion of the news media to report only news that happened today -- not yesterday, not last week, and certainly not last year. The media are highly competitive in reporting the latest scoop, and they hate stale news like the devil hates holy water. However, the shift in the strategic balance is not reportable as something that happened in a day or a week. The long lead-times of sophisticated weapons make it an event that can be seen only from the long view of a year or five years or ten years.

If you were to plot on a graph the statistics of the steady, 14-year U.S. decline and the consistent 14-year Soviet increases in nuclear striking power, you would find that they pattern into two straight lines which form a big X. Time is on the side of those who use it, and the record is clear that the Soviets are using it.

The second reason is the way Defense Secretaries use bureaucratic doubletalk to conceal their failure to keep up with the Soviets. For example, their favorite phrase "we have retained the option" translates into "we are doing nothing now and won't even make a decision until some time in the future."

The third explanation is that our news gathering facilities are geared to report what *is* happening -- and they do not easily adapt to the challenge of reporting what is *not* happening.

The big news about the shift in the strategic balance is that we have *not* added ICBMs or nuclear

submarines to keep pace with the Soviet building program. How do you report on missiles and submarines that are *not* built? Non-productions and non-launchings simply don't make good pictures on television.

The result is that the American people are left in almost total ignorance of the most important news event of the decade -- the shocking change in the relative strength of the two nuclear super-powers.

Soviet Superiority

When Khrushchev sneaked his 2,000-mile missiles into Cuba in 1962, the United States had an 8-to-1 lead over the Soviet Union in nuclear striking power and the means of delivering it to enemy targets. Lieutenant General Daniel O. Graham, until recently director of the Defense Intelligence Agency, has provided the proof of how the Soviets have caught and passed us in both nuclear and conventional military strength.

From a lead of 600 intercontinental ballistic missiles, the United States is now 600 behind. All the Soviet ICBMs are many times more powerful than our ICBMs. From a lead of 16 Polaris-type submarines, the United States is now 13 behind. Incidentally, the secret blueprints of our Polaris submarines were stolen by Russian spies.

From a lead of 2,900 tactical aircraft, the United States is now 350 behind. The Soviets now have 10,000 surface-to-air missiles to our none, 500 intermediate-range ballistic missiles to our none, and 64 anti-ballistic missiles to our none.

In major surface ships, the United States has gone from 130 ahead to 70 behind. In men under arms, the United States has 2.1 million to 4.8 million for the Soviets.

General Graham concludes that "these figures add up to overall military superiority of the Soviet Union."

Meanwhile the Soviets have successfully tested five new long-range offensive missiles -- the SS-16, SS-17, SS-18, SS-19, and the mobile SS-20. They have also developed transportable anti-ballistic missile systems, including high energy lasers on a broad scale, which the editor of *Aviation Week and Space Technology* describes "as a truly effective system."

Not since the war preparations of Nazi Germany under Hitler in the 1930's has a major nation at peace devoted such a high percentage of its resources to the production of weapons and to the buildup of the re-

lated scientific, technical, and industrial base for military production.

And what has been the response of the United States in the face of this increasing Soviet military threat? Congressman Jack Kemp has shown how U.S. spending for national security has been drastically cut in real dollars. Of course, all figures are up because of inflation. But, whereas defense spending has increased 100 percent since 1962, everything else has increased much, much more. Expenditures for national resources have increased 420 percent, education 772 percent, health 2,778 percent, interest on the Federal debt 400 percent, Federal law enforcement 708 percent, and revenue sharing 4,174 percent.

These figures give the lie to all the current claims that we spend too much on defense and can't afford to buy the weapons we need to stay ahead of the Russians.

History will record that Richard Nixon's greatest mistake was to appoint Henry Kissinger, and that Gerald Ford's greatest mistake was to fall for the folly of Kissinger's detente and his agreements with the Soviets which froze us in second place.

Kissinger's Legacy

When historians describe the years 1969 to 1976, the name of Secretary of State Henry Kissinger will emerge as more influential than Presidents Richard Nixon or Gerald Ford.

Because Kissinger was probably the hardest working, the wittiest, and the most popular public official during those years, criticism of him was rare. The beautiful girls in the 1974 Miss Universe contest voted him "the greatest person in the world today." But will his legacy be good or bad for the United States?

The chief reason Kissinger rates so high in public opinion polls is his name identification. This is partially due to his constant participation in newsworthy happenings, his shuttle diplomacy, and his meetings with VIPs all over the world.

His coverage is due even more, however, to the fact that he made himself the fountainhead of all important news on foreign policy and national defense. He gathered the strings of power into his own hands through his position on the National Security Council and his chairmanship of all important national security committees.

As all roads once led to Rome, all channels of our many intelligence-gathering facilities led to Kissinger. It is unlikely that there ever was a time in our history when so few people had access to sensitive information.

Kissinger's statements to the American people are always generously laced with phrases that connote stability such as "new world order," "structure of peace," and "balance of power." Let's examine the high points of Kissinger's eight-year stewardship to see if these words are substance or illusion.

The SALT Agreements of 1972 were negotiated by Kissinger and proclaimed to the world as a device to "stop the spiraling arms race." They did, indeed, stop the United States from racing. Regrettably, they did not stop the Soviets, who have built and deployed five new series of intercontinental missiles since then.

The Helsinki Agreement of 1975 was negotiated by Kissinger and proclaimed to the world as a means of getting the Soviets to permit freer movement of people and ideas in Eastern Europe. However, it only put the stamp

of respectability and permanence on the borders closed by Soviet troops along the Iron Curtain.

The Paris Agreement on Vietnam of January 1973 was concocted by Kissinger and proclaimed to the world as a promise of peace. Even while he was accepting the Nobel Peace Prize for this feat, its inherent defects were obvious. When Kissinger agreed to allow North Vietnamese troops to remain in South Vietnam while U.S. troops pulled out, he sealed the doom of Southeast Asia.

The fragile peace that Kissinger has wrought in the Middle East is laced together with tremendous amounts of American aid, first to one side, then to the other. Yet Israel would not have needed our aid if Kissinger had not snatched defeat from the jaws of victory in 1973.

After Egypt committed the surprise Yom Kippur attack, the Israelis countered with a daring and successful military maneuver that trapped the Egyptian army on the wrong side of the Suez Canal, cut off from reinforcements. Kissinger then forced the Israelis to give up their victory and release the Egyptian army.

It is no wonder that, after Jimmy Carter was elected, former Israeli defense minister Moshe Dayan remarked: "It is satisfying to know that Kissinger will be replaced."

Finally, there was the African adventure. Kissinger did nothing to oppose the Cuban conquest with Soviet weapons of Angola, but he labored long and hard to overthrow the anti-Communist government of Rhodesia, even offering millions of American tax dollars to countries invading Rhodesia such as Communist Mozambique.

Will the "new world order" that Kissinger negotiated collapse like Neville Chamberlain's umbrella?

Harold Brown Appointment

Harold Brown, former Secretary of the Air Force and more recently president of California Institute of Technology, has emerged as one of the few controversial appointees in Jimmy Carter's cabinet.

The military headliners are critical of him because of his soft stance toward the Soviets during 2½ years of SALT I negotiations in Helsinki and Vienna. The military softliners are critical of Brown because of his hawkish support of the Vietnam War.

Contrary to popular assumption, these two policies are not contradictory but complementary. These two attitudes are the identifying characteristics of most of the leading defense and foreign policy-makers of the Johnson and Nixon Administrations, including former Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara, former Secretary of State Dean Rusk, former National Security Advisors McGeorge Bundy and Walt W. Rostow, and Secretary of State Henry Kissinger.

These are the same leaders who have been telling us for more than a decade that our security should be based on U.S.-Soviet agreements and U.S. restraint in weapons-building instead of on U.S. military superiority.

This was the group that prolonged the eight-year war in Vietnam by a policy of creeping escalation. The proof is spelled out in the secret "Pentagon Papers" that Daniel Ellsberg turned over to the *New York Times* and the *Washington Post*, and in the way Henry Kissinger pressed the panic button to try to plug the Ellsberg leak. The "Pentagon Papers" laid bare how the McNamara crowd prolonged the Vietnam War. The Kissinger policies on Vietnam were essentially the same.

The proof that being hawkish on Vietnam and dovish on SALT is a wholly compatible position lies in the fact that the Soviet Union was the one who profited from both policies.

The United States squandered 55,000 lives and \$140 billion on a war that is now lost, on an ally who is now crushed, and on weapons that are now destroyed or captured by the enemy. During that same period of time, the Soviets spent a comparable amount of money to build the mightiest and most modern strategic force the world has ever seen.

The SALT I negotiations extended for 2½ years and culminated in the Moscow Summit of May 1972. The U.S. negotiating team, of which Harold Brown was a member, was backed up by a large staff of experts and all the facilities of the National Security Council, the Defense and State Departments, and the U.S. Disarmament Agency.

Yet the result was a document shot through with loopholes that advantage the Soviets and spell out our inferiority by a ratio of 3 to 2. Even the mechanics of the drafting were so defective that it was necessary to issue four different official interpretations.

The best summary of the SALT I Agreements was given by Senator Henry Jackson: "Simply put, the agreements give 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 agreements is the United States permitted to maintain parity with the Soviet Union."

Harold Brown was one of Defense Secretary Robert McNamara's principal lieutenants in conducting the Vietnam tragedy that McNamara once said he would be glad to have known as "McNamara's war." Harold Brown was one of Henry Kissinger's principal lieutenants in negotiating the SALT I agreements.

The Vietnam War made it financially impossible to build strategic weapons to stay ahead of the Soviets because our defense dollars were diverted into a bottomless pit in Southeast Asia. The SALT I agreements made it legally impossible to build strategic weapons even to maintain parity with the Soviets.

There are no contradictions or inconsistencies in Harold Brown's record. Despite his boast that he is "not ideological," his actions mark him as a man who should be called "Secretary of Unilateral Disarmament" instead of Secretary of Defense.

Military-Industrial Complex

You would think that the people who are always complaining about the Defense Department budget would cheer if the Pentagon saves money. But no. The recent announcement that the Defense Department underspent its budget by some \$13 billion last year brought forth as much criticism as if it had overspent, plus demands to punish the Defense Department by reducing next year's budget. Some commentators also used this announcement as an excuse to trot out the favorite left-wing cliche that President Eisenhower "warned about the military-industrial complex."

This is a classic example of taking a quotation out of context to misrepresent the author's meaning. The principal message of Eisenhower's Farewell Address of 1961 was his warning against the Soviet military threat: "We face a hostile ideology -- global in scope, atheistic in character, ruthless in purpose, and insidious in method. . . . A vital element in keeping the peace is our military establishment. Our arms must be mighty, ready for instant action, so that no potential aggressor may be tempted to risk his own destruction."

Based on this analysis, the Eisenhower Adminis-

ration initiated and funded the three great weapons systems that still defend us today: the Minuteman missiles, the Polaris submarines, and the B-52 bombers.

President Eisenhower gave another important warning in his Farewell Address about an entirely different group of power-seekers: "Yet in holding scientific research and discovery in respect, as we should, we must also be alert to the equal and opposite danger that public policy could itself become the captive of a scientific-technological elite."

The scientific-technological elite of which Eisenhower warned consisted principally of the men who attended the Pugwash Conferences, a series of semi-secret meetings which take their name from Pugwash, Nova Scotia, the home of Cyrus Eaton, who hosted and bankrolled the first conference in 1957. Most of those who attend are Soviet and American nuclear scientists and government officials and advisers.

The organizer of Pugwash was Lord Bertrand Russell, author of the famous slogan "Rather Red than dead," and that is an accurate summary of what the Pugwash Conferences are all about. Their long-range objective was to eliminate the Eisenhower strategy of defending America through military superiority and to replace it with U.S. disarmament and accommodation of the Soviet Union.

Pugwashers worked toward this goal by articles written for prestigious journals and research studies financed through the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. Two of the most notorious were the 1963 reports called "Phoenix Study" and "Study Fair."

As soon as Eisenhower left the White House, this elite flooded into government office. They successfully blocked all programs to build additional weapons over the ones Eisenhower had already ordered. They cancelled Eisenhower's plans for a second thousand Minuteman missiles. For 14 years, they have been able to prevent the building of an advanced strategic bomber to replace the aging B-52s.

It is a great tragedy that Americans did not heed Eisenhower's warning against the scientific-technological elite. This group did capture U.S. public policy, and today is still persuading our leaders to persist in the folly of detente instead of meeting the challenge of reality. Harold Brown has been part of that elite for 15 years.

Build the B-1 Bomber

The CIA, which has a consistent record of always underestimating Soviet actions and capabilities, discovered in 1976 that the Soviet Union is devoting two and a half times as much of its Gross National Product to military expenditures as the CIA had previously estimated. This new figure means that the Soviets are spending three times as much of their GNP for military weapons as the United States is spending of our GNP.

Of course, the Soviets get much more bang for the buck because so much of our defense budget goes into personnel and fringe benefits instead of into hardware. The Soviets have thus put their money where their mouth is and sacrificed consumer production to their military goal of world superiority.

This policy has paid big dividends. The Soviets have fielded three new ICBMs (two with multiple warhead capability) and are developing a fourth (which is probably mobile-based). They have built 34 Polaris-type submarines, and eleven submarines that carry missiles comparable in range to those we plan for our Trident but will not have until 1979. The Soviets have

deployed the most advanced operational bomber in the world today, called the Backfire, which is years newer than our old standby, the B-52.

In the face of this Soviet arms program, the United States should waste no time in going ahead with building the B-1 bomber and the cruise missile.

Test flights of the B-1 have been a huge success. The B-1 is backed up by 14 years and \$1.5 billion in research and development. It is the most thoroughly studied and tested aircraft ever developed. It is only two-thirds the size of the B-52, but the B-1 carries nearly twice the payload. It flies efficiently at supersonic speeds but can take off and land on shorter runways.

The B-52s are great planes, but they are all at least 14 years old. We don't ask our President to drive around in an automobile that is 14 years old, and we shouldn't ask our pilots to depend on a plane that was mass-produced 14 years ago and represents the technology of nearly 20 years ago.

The B-1 is the most versatile of all our potential weapons because, unlike missiles, it can be recalled after launch and its targets can be changed after launch.

The Cruise Missile

Some people are trying to confuse the issue by arguing that we should cancel the B-1 and choose the cruise missile instead. Since the cruise missile is untested technology, the net effect of this proposal would be to delay the decision a couple more years. This type of postponement was a typical tactic of former Defense Secretary Robert McNamara. He called it "reserving his options." He reserved his option on a new strategic bomber for the entire seven years he was in office and never did build one.

The cruise missile is not a substitute for the B-1 but supplementary to it. The B-1 can carry the cruise missile and launch it toward enemy targets without ever flying over enemy territory. The B-1 cruise-missile combination would give us the advantages of both aircraft and missiles.

The cruise missile is a pilotless jet drone, basically a flying bomb, which can be launched from air, land, surface ships, or submarines. It has a range of 2,000 miles. It is highly maneuverable and flies low enough to elude radar and aircraft defenses. Its computer guidance system provides such pinpoint accuracy that the cruise missile will be an effective weapon with conventional as well as nuclear warheads.

Production of the B-1 bomber is threatened by the usual clique within our country which always wants Americans to put our faith in treaties with Communist countries instead of in weapons. The cruise missile is threatened by the slick Soviet negotiators who want to checkmate our production by forcing us to include the cruise missile under the limitations of the forthcoming SALT II agreement.

Both tactics should be recognized for what they are -- a device to prevent the United States from building the weapons we need to protect ourselves against the armed might of the Soviet Union.

If your country is planning aggression, you can select your time and place of attack and build only the weapons systems needed for use on specified targets. If you are not planning on striking first, then you must build a mix of weapons systems and be ready on all fronts at all times. That costs more, but it is the price of freedom and independence.

Testing Jimmy Carter

John Connally, former Cabinet official and Governor of Texas, recently predicted that President Jimmy Carter will be "tested" by the Soviets within the first 90 days of his new administration.

This statement by former Governor Connally shows unusual perception about the men in the Kremlin. Those who understand the Communists find it easy to forecast their actions. It is the regular practice of the Soviets to test each new American President to see what stuff he is made of, and whether he can be deceived, brainwashed, pushed, shoved, or intimidated by Soviet demands.

Khrushchev tested President John F. Kennedy within five months of his taking office. Kennedy never gave an official report on his private conferences with Khrushchev at Vienna in 1961, but eventually the major facts leaked out. The crude and earthy Khrushchev ranted and raved, bullied and shouted.

He threatened to move against West Berlin with all the might of the huge Soviet conventional military forces. He even threatened the use of nuclear weapons. He reminded Kennedy that the Soviets had developed the world's first ICBM even before they successfully orbited the world's first artificial satellite, Sputnik I.

After making his personal estimate of Kennedy's character and vulnerabilities at Vienna, Khrushchev followed up with an additional test. It was a taunt that the United States was "too liberal to fight -- even in defense of U.S. vital interests."

When President Kennedy made no response, Khrushchev conspired with Kosygin and Castro to secretly ship offensive missiles to Cuba, thereby bringing most U.S. cities within minutes of nuclear attack.

Gerald Ford was tested by the Soviets three months after he became President. Brezhnev invited Ford to Vladivostok in November 1974.

When President Ford arrived, Brezhnev bear-hugged him and then put him through an intensive nine-hour eyeball-to-eyeball negotiating session on strategic arms. Ford was suffering from fatigue and jet-lag after a 17,000-mile trip to the Far East.

Brezhnev was rested and relaxed on his own home territory, and was supported by the two most experienced and dishonest negotiators in the world, Andrei Gromyko and Anatoly Dobrynin. Those were the same two diplomats who were publicly denounced by Kennedy for lying to him about missiles in Cuba in 1962.

Brezhnev came out of that smoke-filled room with a SALT II agreement that puts no lid on the Soviet attainment of a first-strike capability against the United States. The Vladivostok agreement will permit the Soviets to MIRV all their giant SS-18 ICBMs plus a thousand other ICBMs. This total will be more than adequate to knock out all our Minuteman missiles.

To the men in the Kremlin, President-elect Jimmy Carter is an unknown quantity. They will surely test him within months of his taking office, probably in an ordeal of summyry, in order to find out if he is made of steel or cotton-candy in dealing with the Russians.

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.