



The Phyllis Schlafly Report

VOL. 12, NO. 10, SECTION 1

BOX 618, ALTON, ILLINOIS 62002

MAY, 1979

The Costs and Inequalities of SALT II

The Shock of Iran

"The Iranian revolution is the Pearl Harbor of our day . . . the greatest thing that happened to America since the Second World War, the thing that shook America to its foundations." So said Dr. Charles Malik of Lebanon in a recent major address in Washington, D.C.

Dr. Malik, a former President of the United Nations, understands the middle east and its relationship to Western civilization as do few men of our time. He points out that even losing the Vietnam War, or the Korean War, or the Communist takeover of Cuba did not touch our vital interests to the extent that the Iranian revolution does.

Dr. Malik believes that the Ayatollah Ruhollah Khomeini will turn out to be "the Kerensky of the Iranian revolution." In other words, his historic function is only to last long enough to get rid of the shah, and then to be replaced by a Soviet-Marxist-Communist regime in Iran.

If that happens, the loss of Iran would prove to be a far greater blow to the West than the recent loss of three countries in Asia and five countries in Africa. The uninterrupted flow of oil from the middle east is a matter of life or death to the West and to Japan, and we are now on the brink of having our mideast energy sources fall into hands that can blackmail us into economic submission on any terms they dictate.

Americans, who tend to think in practical terms, view the loss of Iran only in terms of higher gasoline prices at the pump. But that is only the symptom of the malady. The rest of the world perceives the collapse of Iran as proof that Western civilization has neither the will nor the wit nor the power to hold back the Marxist-Communist wave of the future.

The chief reason that our nation's economists cannot devise effective solutions for skyrocketing prices is that they do not understand that the causes are not merely economic. Oil did not suddenly become more expensive to produce. What happened was that our government, in signing SALT I in 1972, poured SALT into the gasoline tank of the free world, and we've been paying the price ever since.

Look at any chart of prices for the last decade or so: food, gasoline, fuel oil, or commodities. Prices were relatively stable until 1972, but started their steep upward climb after May 1972 when SALT I was signed in

Moscow.

That was the day when the United States officially recognized that the Soviet Union is the superior military power by formally agreeing that, for every three ICBMs the Soviets have, we can have only two; and for every three nuclear missile-firing submarines the Soviets possess, we can have only two. That signed agreement folded up the nuclear umbrella which had sheltered the political and economic stability of the free world so effectively for 27 years, and the power brokers of the world woke up to the fact that they could thumb their noses at us -- diplomatically, economically, and militarily -- and there was nothing we could do about it.

The following year, the Soviet Union openly goaded the middle east oil producers to use their "oil weapon" against the West. They got the message, and have been using it ever since. They know they have us over a barrel (of oil), and we have no choice but to pay the highway robber five times what the oil is worth.

Dr. Malik, who has infinite respect for the 4,000 years of cumulative culture that form Western civilization, believes that our primary task is to "convince the world that the West is still alive and kicking and is not prepared to die." The chief challenge of the West is to reestablish its credibility after years of fumbling, hesitation, indecision, and retreat.

If American leaders do not display a faith that our civilization is the greatest, and that we are determined to defend it at any cost, how can envious aggressors or fence-sitters believe we are committed to survival?

If America accepts SALT II, it will be perceived by the world as one more craven attempt to appease the unappeasable barbarian who is determined to rule the world. With Dr. Malik, we hope that the shock of Iran, as the "Pearl Harbor" of our time, will make America resolve to build whatever weapons may be necessary to defend our priceless civilization against any and all attacks.

Oil Embargo Scenario

Both those who argue for and against the forthcoming SALT II treaty seem to assume that the only utility of nuclear weapons is to attack or retaliate, and that the denouement in the nuclear drama will occur in the mid-1980s. That is a highly dangerous and costly assumption. Nuclear weapons have immediate utility, as

the following hypothetical scenario shows.

Scene: The Kremlin, Moscow. *Time:* October 1979. *Dramatis personae:* Members of the Politburo are hosting a meeting of the chiefs of Iran and the Arab-producing states. Brezhnev (or his successor) is doing all the talking.

"Comrades of the Middle East, we all have a common interest in world peace and prosperity. Although we have been enjoying apparent peace, our great leader Lenin warned us that, so long as Capitalist Imperialism exists, war is a constant danger. Our courageous intelligence agents have uncovered a massive plot by the Capitalist Imperialist Warmongers to launch a new world war. This would bring death and destruction such as the world has never seen before.

"This would be bad for your business. Your good customers, the United States and Western Europe, would be destroyed by our necessary retaliation. Since your economies are based on continuing revenues from your great oil resources, you have a vital interest in preventing such a senseless Armageddon.

"Fortunately, there is a peaceful way to avert this nuclear destruction and depletion of your treasuries, and that is why I have invited you to Moscow. I want you all to agree to impose immediately a total embargo on sales of oil to the warmongering United States and all her NATO allies.

"Within a few weeks, hardly a wheel will be turning in Western factories. They will have little electricity. They may even be unable to pump water. They will be on their knees pleading to you, pleading for oil on any terms.

"Then you and the great peace-loving U.S.S.R. will impose our joint terms. The Western democracies will pay any price you set for your oil and you can easily recover tenfold the revenues you lost during the embargo.

"For our part in the settlement, the Soviet Union will demand that the Capitalist Imperialist Warmongers surrender all their nuclear and conventional weapons to the United Nations. Since most UN members are too small and unsophisticated to handle the takeover of those terrible weapons, the U.S.S.R. will gladly take custody for the UN.

"Do you want to know what the United States will do to pressure you into terminating your embargo? The answer is NOTHING. Just remember back to your first courageous and innovative use of your "oil weapon" back in 1973. What did the United States and Western Europe do then? Nothing! They meekly agreed to pay you a five-fold increase in the price of oil, even though that increase disrupted the stability of their governments and their economies.

"It was your courageous action in 1973 which brought about so much costly inflation and unemployment in the Western nations. The following year became known as "the year Europe lost its head" because the heads of all European nations were ousted.

"Note that the United States and every one of the Western nations had more conventional military power than any of the Arab nations. Yet the Western nations dared not use their power because the great peace-loving Soviet Union gave you the protection of our strategic nuclear umbrella.

"Our technique of keeping SALT negotiations pending continuously for ten years has kept the United States from building any additional ICBMs, submarines or bombers, while we built up continuously and massively.

"The Soviet nuclear umbrella is now three times more powerful than it was in 1973. During the last six years, we have tripled the throw-weight of our strategic forces. We have replaced a thousand of our older ICBMs with advanced models five times more powerful and vastly more accurate. We have deployed 27 of our huge Delta-class missile-firing submarines and hundreds of our new strategic bombers.

"Thus Oil Embargo II will enable our Middle East friends to become richer and richer at the expense of the Capitalist Imperialist nations, and it will give the great Soviet Union the power to enforce world peace, on our terms. Nuclear superiority is, indeed, very useable in the 1970s."

U.S. vs. U.S.S.R. Navies

The newsphoto of Mrs. John Glenn christening the new Trident submarine called the "Ohio" in Groton, Connecticut, while 3,000 demonstrators protested the event, may have misled some Americans into believing that the U.S. Navy is still the greatest and most up-to-date in the world. It isn't. One boat does not make a Navy.

The "Ohio" is not scheduled to be delivered to the Navy until November 1980 or to be deployed as part of our nuclear deterrent until August 1981. The Soviets already have 27 Trident-class submarines operational, and by the time the Ohio reaches the water, the Soviets will have 30 Trident-class submarines at sea.

Even on paper, our Pentagon plans to build only about 10 Tridents. Few will hazard a guess as to when or whether that number will ever come about, at the current snail's pace of production.

The Soviet Trident-class submarine, called the Delta, carries the world's first SLICBM (Submarine-Launched Inter-Continental Ballistic Missile), having a range of at least 4,500 miles (or even 5,000 miles). It can reach every significant target and city in the United States with missiles fired from the home water ports of the U.S.S.R.

The depressing contrast between our planned Trident "force" and the presently-existing Delta force is only one aspect of U.S. naval inferiority to the Soviet Union. The Soviets now have a total of 90 ballistic missile-firing submarines prowling the seas -- almost twice the number of ours -- and they are building more. Our 41 Polaris and Poseidon submarines are all relatively old and their missiles have a range 1,700 to 2,000 miles shorter than the Soviet Delta's missiles.

The Soviets have the world's largest attack submarine fleet -- 200 submarines available for anti-submarine and anti-shipping missions. All are torpedo-armed and nearly 70 of them are also armed with anti-surface ship cruise missiles. We have only 77 torpedo-armed submarines.

The Soviets have more cruisers, more destroyers, more escort ships, and more amphibious ships than we have. They outnumber us by 850 to 15 in small attack boats. They have the largest naval mine warfare force in the world.

The Soviets have the world's largest fleet of intelligence gatherers. Their 50 spy ships are in constant surveillance near our submarine bases, our missile test center, the world's strategic waterways, and everywhere our Navy sails. We have no such intelligence collection fleet, having opted out of the business after the North Koreans seized our "Pueblo."

When the USS Francis Scott Key, a Poseidon sub-

marine, test-fired a new Trident missile from underneath the Atlantic Ocean on April 10, which malfunctioned 30 seconds later, a Soviet ship was close by. How did the Russians know the time and place of that underwater launching?

It is bad enough that the Soviet Navy is superior to ours in numbers, in modern construction, in missile range, and in onboard weapons. But the disparity becomes overwhelming when we consider the different purpose and mission of the two navies.

The United States is really an island nation. We depend on the uninterrupted flow of essential raw materials and energy. Of 47 essential raw materials, we import 46 including nearly half our oil; and 99 percent of our overseas trade is carried by ship. Our Navy's mission, in addition to national defense, is to keep those commercial sea lanes open.

The Soviet Union, by contrast, is relatively self-sufficient in energy and raw materials. The Warsaw Pact nations are contiguous and can supply each other by land. Unless the Soviets have expansionist objectives, they have no need for an expensive blue water navy.

Furthermore, it takes fewer ships to interrupt the sea lanes than to keep them open. It takes fewer ships to threaten the peace than to keep the peace. Yet our Navy has fewer ships than at any time since before Pearl Harbor, and the Soviet Union has more ships than any nation in history.

The need is clear. We must rebuild our U.S. Navy if we want to keep Island America afloat -- politically, economically, and militarily.

Israel: Please Lend Us Begin

Now that President Carter has promised Israel billions of dollars of U.S. aid in order to induce a signing of a Middle East Treaty, Israel ought to show its gratitude. I suggest that Israel loan us Prime Minister Menachem Begin to negotiate for us with the Russians on SALT II.

Begin is clearly the world's best negotiator. He is tough, persevering, daring, and has a passionate dedication to his country's security. In a word, he has all the qualities that President Carter and Secretary Vance lack. Here are some of the holes in SALT II which Begin might be able to dig the U.S. out of.

The supposed limitation in overall number of strategic weapons specifically excludes some of the major Soviet weapons, the Backfire bomber and the SS-20 mobile missile. That means that the Soviets can have hundreds of additional weapons over and above the SALT II "limit."

By contrast, the United States will be forced to count as strategic weapons some that are not even operational. We have agreed to count B-52s now in the "bone yard" in the Arizona desert, along with the four experimental B-1s for which no crews are even being trained. The Soviets are now turning out new Backfire bombers every month, while Carter cancelled our B-1 bomber without any quid pro quo whatsoever.

SALT II will allow the Soviets to keep their "heavy" ICBMs, of which they have 308. The United States is specifically prohibited from deploying a similar heavy missile even if we want to do so.

SALT II will allow the Soviets to keep their new "medium" ICBMs, the SS-17 with a throwweight of 6,000 pounds and four MIRVed warheads, and the SS-19 with a throwweight of 7,000 pounds and six

MIRVed warheads. The U.S. Minuteman, by contrast, has a throwweight of only 2,500 pounds and carries three MIRVed warheads.

SALT II does nothing to protect us from the Soviet advantage of reloads. The Soviets have perfected a cold-launch technique which means that their rocket motors do not ignite until the missiles are clear of the silos, and therefore the silos do not burn up in the launch process. This enables the Soviets to get the benefit of reloads stored in warehouses nearby. We use a hot-launch method and cannot use reloads.

SALT II does not include air defense systems, an area in which the Soviet Union is tremendously superior. The United States has approximately 325 interceptor aircraft and about 60 radars in our air defense system. We have no surface-to-air (SAM) missiles. By comparison, the Soviets have more than 2,700 interceptor aircraft, 7,000 radars, and 12,000 SAM launchers.

It is rather ridiculous to sign an agreement supposedly "limiting" both sides to a particular number of strategic weapons when the Soviets won't tell us how many missiles they have. They have never revealed how many ICBMs they have deployed. Missile figures commonly used are simply those that U.S. intelligence gathering facilities have counted. No one knows how many more the Soviets may have.

In recent months, the Soviets have been encrypting data transmitted from missiles making tests, which makes it extremely difficult for the U.S. to gather accurate information. This clearly shows the Soviets' determination to conceal everything they possibly can.

We recently discovered that the giant Soviet SS-18 ICBM is being given the capability of carrying up to 14 MIRVs, although SALT II is supposed to limit that missile to 10 warheads. So it looks as though the Soviets are violating SALT II before it is even signed.

It is easy to predict that Vance and the SALT-sellers will try to allay our fears by saying, "Even though the Soviets are building and testing the expensive capability to put 14 MIRVs on the giant SS-18, we should rely on them not to use more than 10 MIRVs." Please, Israel, lend us Mr. Begin while there is still time to prevent the lopsidedness and the loopholes of SALT II.

SALT II Prospects

The Carter Administration claims that SALT II will provide for parity because each side would be limited to 2,250 strategic weapons. This sales pitch is a deception because the Soviets get a long count and we get a short one.

All existing 415 U.S. bombers which can hit the Soviet Union will be counted in the total and are subject to the SALT limitation. On the other hand, the Soviet Backfire, Badger and Blinder bombers, which can hit the United States from Russia, are not counted and not limited.

SALT II negotiators don't seem to think that the distance from the U.S. to the U.S.S.R. is the same as the distance from the U.S.S.R. to the U.S. The bomber deal they are working out is just as lopsided as when the Soviets increased their production of Backfire bombers after President Carter cancelled our B-1. We still plan to continue to rely on our 25-year-old B-52s.

Any M-X mobile missiles which our country might build (if President Carter ever allows them to be built) will have to be counted under the SALT II ceiling of 2,250 strategic weapons. The hundreds of Soviet

SS-20 mobile missiles, however, will not be counted.

Another example of the phony proposed "equality" of SALT II is the prohibition of ground- and sea-launched cruise missiles which fly more than 600 kilometers.

Get out a world map or globe and see how unequal that is. This provision will enable the Soviets to launch their missiles from off our Atlantic, Pacific and Gulf coasts and strike 69 percent of the U.S. population, while we could target only 15 percent of the Soviet population.

SALT II is expected to prohibit or restrict the development of new strategic missile systems. The Soviets have eight new ICBMs which are in testing or production, whereas the United States has none. If both sides agree not to develop any "new" missiles, the United States will never be able to match the new advances the Soviets have made during the years that they stalled negotiations.

Soviet ICBMs carry at least six times more explosive power than our ICBMs. SALT II limitations would prevent the United States from building "heavy" missiles such as the Soviets have, or from trying to match their tremendous superiority in missile megatonnage.

Of course, SALT II will not provide for on-site inspection. The way will be clear for the Soviets to cheat on SALT II just as they have cheated on SALT I, a fact fully documented by former Defense Secretary Melvin Laird.

When SALT I was signed in 1972 allowing the Soviets a numerical superiority of three to two in both ICBMs and missile-firing submarines, the SALT sellers told us that this was balanced by U.S. superiority in technology, missile accuracy, and greater numbers of MIRVs. All those advantages are now gone. Soviet tests have proved their impressive missile accuracy, and their far greater throw-weight gives them the potential of having far greater numbers of MIRVs.

SALT I was sold to the American people on the slogan "it will stop the spiraling arms race." With the 20-20 vision of hindsight, all Americans should now be able to see that it stopped our country from racing, but it did not stop the Soviets.

Now SALT II is being sold as a numerical limitation on the strategic weapons of both sides. It is becoming clearer every day that SALT II will merely legalize and perpetuate Soviet military superiority and make it forever impossible for us to catch up.

Faulty U.S. Intelligence

Defense Secretary Harold Brown, in making the Pentagon's Annual Posture Statement to Congress, testified that the Soviets have added 1,000 strategic nuclear warheads to their forces -- twice the increase he predicted only a year ago. Thus, Brown admitted not only that he was 100 percent wrong in forecasting Soviet weapons, but that the Soviets are moving so rapidly that his 100 percent error was exposed within one year.

Only two days earlier, President Carter went before Congress to promise in his State of the Union Message: "I will sign no agreement which cannot be verified." That is a solemn promise the President cannot and will not keep. He has made it clear that he is pushing as hard as he can to sign a SALT II Treaty.

Brown's 100 percent mistake, plus the total failure of our worldwide intelligence-gathering apparatus to forewarn about the tragic events in Iran, should be

proof to even the most starry-eyed dreamers that our government is either incapable of gathering proper intelligence about what is going on in other countries, or is incapable of evaluating it once it is gathered.

In an important recent revelation that may become the "Pentagon Papers" of the SALT negotiations because both reveal how policy decisions were arrived at behind closed doors, former CIA analyst David S. Sullivan charges that "the Soviets have used the SALT negotiating process as a smoke screen to conceal their increasing strategic superiority from a complacent United States."

His report, an unclassified version of a top-secret CIA report, says that the Soviet Union won virtually all its objectives in SALT I by repeatedly deceiving U.S. negotiators and by exploiting the "conciliatory attitude" toward the Kremlin of Secretary of State Henry A. Kissinger. Among the crucial issues on which our side was duped in SALT I were the deployment of Soviet heavy missiles and the range of their most advanced submarine-launched missiles.

Sullivan spent two years preparing his SALT analysis and reportedly another two years resisting efforts inside the Central Intelligence Agency to rewrite and suppress his book-length report.

Sullivan concludes in his report that "the Soviets clearly have gained the most from the SALT process. SALT has stimulated the arms race by allowing a Soviet buildup without any real quantitative and qualitative constraints. The United States traded away its ABM [anti-missile system] for a tripling or a quadrupling of the Soviet strategic threat against it, all the while tolerating Soviet negotiating deception and massive operational concealments and ruses in Soviet strategic [weapons] deployment."

Although Kissinger was at the helm during the SALT I negotiations, Sullivan makes clear that the basic errors were made by Robert S. McNamara, Secretary of Defense from 1961 to 1968. These errors included the decisions to impose a U.S. freeze on additional land-based and submarine launched missiles in 1967 which has continued to this day, to scrap our large force of B-47 and B-58 bombers and to cancel the great new B-70, and to deactivate about 185 Atlas and Titan I land-based missiles (most of which were brand new).

Of course, the Soviets did not scrap any weapons or freeze any building programs, but kept pushing forward to parity and then to superiority. The McNamara decisions to impose unilateral restraints were then compounded by the Kissinger errors at the SALT I bargaining table. Sullivan quotes Kissinger as later lamenting, "We obviously did not know in 1972 what missiles the Soviet Union would be testing in 1974."

It takes much longer than two years to bring a major weapons system from development to testing. If our government doesn't know today what weapons the Soviets will be testing in two years hence, we have no business signing a SALT II agreement that binds us not to build weapons to defend America. And the sorry evidence is that our government is, indeed, precisely that uninformed about Soviet weapons.

The Phyllis Schlafly Report

ISSN056-0152

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.