



The Phyllis Schlafly Report

VOL. 14, NO. 2, SECTION 1

BOX 618, ALTON, ILLINOIS 62002

SEPTEMBER, 1980

“Coming To Grips With Foreign Policy”

Everybody Makes Mistakes?

“Everybody makes mistakes” is the common excuse for our fumbling, bumbling foreign policy which leaves us buffeted back and forth by dictators and losing at least a country a year to Communism. While everybody does indeed make mistakes, those who make major mistakes in their particular line of work simply don't keep their jobs.

The primary duty of the federal government is to provide for the common defense. The President is given jurisdiction over foreign policy, and the “everybody makes mistakes” slogan cannot excuse him from fundamental, disastrous, and repeated mistakes.

President Carter cancelled the B-1 bomber, leaving us with no replacement for our 20-year-old subsonic B-52s. He stopped production of the Minuteman III missile and delayed for three years the building of the MX missile to replace it.

His most successful foreign policy project was his surrender of our Panama Canal to the drug-peddling, Castro-loving Omar Torrijos.

As soon as Carter took office, he cancelled U.S. intelligence flights over Cuba. The Soviets took the cue and moved in their MIG-23s capable of dropping atomic bombs on the United States. The MIGs are still there.

He firmly proclaimed that the U.S. would not tolerate the “status quo” of 3,000 Soviet troops in Cuba. A few weeks later he weakly accepted the status quo and the troops are still there.

Carter's policy toward Nicaragua helped to overthrow the pro-U.S. President Anastasio Somoza and replace him with the Marxist Sandinistas. Carter refused to send aid to Guatemala and El Salvador during critical weeks, and the leftists are now likely to take over.

He cut off U.S. aid to and alienated the big important ABC countries of Latin America, Argentina, Brazil, and Chile because of his phony “human rights” campaign and the nuclear power issue.

In Rhodesia he allowed pro-Communists to take over a non-Communist country by an election, the only time in history that this ever happened. The moderate, democratically elected black-and-white government was replaced by the Marxist Robert Mugabe.

In Iran, his policies allowed the pro-American government of the Shah, which was bringing Iran into the 20th century, to be replaced by a far more repressive regime and certainly one of the most insulting to the United States.

Carter's China policy betrayed and humiliated our longtime friend and ally, Taiwan, by breaking (without Senate approval) the 20-year U.S.-Taiwan defense treaty. Then he granted diplomatic recognition to Red China, the champion mass murderer of all time.

His much publicized “human rights” policy was selectively applied to offend and undermine pro-Western dictators but to sin-by-silence when it came to Communist dictators. Contrast, for example the use of the “human rights” jargon to overthrow the pro-American governments of Nicaragua, Rhodesia, and Iran with the failure to condemn the Communist massacre of millions in Cambodia — until after it was all over.

He cut the size and the morale of the CIA so drastically that our government does not receive forewarning of major international happenings, such as the revolution in Iran and the seizure of the U.S. hostages.

Carter's record vis-a-vis the Soviet Union has been the biggest disaster of all. He gave in to the Soviets on every point of the SALT II negotiations. The Soviets are allowed 308 heavy missiles, the U.S. none. They are allowed an unlimited number of Backfire bombers; we are not allowed any B-1s (unless we destroy an ICBM for each B-1 built).

Carter has allowed the shipment to the Soviets of U.S. high technology for which they pay a miniscule of the price it cost Americans and which allows the Soviets to add the latest U.S. modernizations to their giant war machine.

It's time that the American people recognize the truth of the testament handed down by the late great Senator Robert A. Taft shortly before his death: “We cannot clean up the mess in Washington, balance the budget, reduce taxes, check creeping Socialism, tell what is muscle or fat in our sprawling rearmament programs, purge subversives from our State Department, unless we come to grips with our foreign policy, upon which all other policies depend.”

Power Counts, Not “World Opinion”

The real explanation for why the great United States had to endure months of unprecedented national humiliation and mistreatment of our citizens at the embassy in Teheran was contained in a small AP dispatch which didn't even reach the top of the news. Soviet Foreign Minister Andrei Gromyko assured Ayatollah Ruhollah Khomeini that the Soviet Union would not tolerate U.S. military action against Iran.

Why didn't the United States try to duplicate the brilliant and daring Israeli commando raid on the Fourth of July, 1976, which rescued 104 hostages from terrorists at the Uganda airport? The military superiority of the United States over Iran, and our capability to carry out such a raid, is at least as great as the superiority of Israel over Uganda.

Why didn't the United States emulate the repeatedly successful tactics used by our police departments in rescuing hostages from snipers, hijackers and other varieties of madmen who grab hostages and then hurl their unreasonable demands on society? The police surround the criminal, isolate him, and cut off all communication and supplies, until he

knows that he is cornered like a rat, soon to be without food, and then he usually becomes more reasonable.

Iran imports at least 30 percent of its food. To blockade Iran and cut off its food supply would have been an easy mission for the U.S. Navy. The Soviet Union, which is in short food supply itself because of poor grain harvests, would not have been able to feed Iran.

So why were we humiliated for months, with embassy personnel tied up, while the international blackmailers reviled us and marched through the streets in the largest anti-American demonstrations in history. Some reports estimated the angry, shouting, anti-American mobs at a million persons.

For years, the American people have been told we must bend our military and diplomatic policies because of an undefinable something called "world opinion." If there is any such thing as world opinion, it is with us and the hostages, and against the Khomeini regime which has violated all rules of international conduct. But Khomeini cares absolutely nothing about world opinion. Like other dictators of the world, he cares only for power. He knows he is safe from the mighty American Navy, Air Force, Army, and Marines because the United States does not dare to use them after Gromyko says "Nyet."

Gromyko is not a magician who can weave a spell or a prophet who has a supernatural gift. The power he holds up his sleeve is the power of Soviet nuclear-weapons superiority over the United States. The holding of American hostages in Teheran is only one little taste of what that superiority can do.

Soviet strategic superiority is the reason why President Carter cannot make the Russians take their combat troops out of Cuba. He doesn't even dare to ask them. If we cannot make the Soviets take their troops out of Cuba, we cannot make them take out their missiles, bombers, or submarines.

Treaties, negotiations, the United Nations, and "world opinion" are all irrelevancies in the real world. Power is what determines whether nations live or die, whether freedom endures or perishes, and whether civilization is sustained or is trampled on by the barbarians.

The issue in Iran is the same as the issue in Cuba and is the same as the issue in SALT II: which is the preeminent world power, America or Russia? Iran and Cuba have answered that question for today. The 1980 President election will answer that question for our lifetime, because Ronald Reagan is for American superiority and Jimmy Carter is for SALT II which accords to the Soviets the right to build every weapon they could conceivably want in order to control the world, and prohibits us from ever catching up.

The United States must start a crash strategic weapons-building program immediately in order to restore America to its place in world leadership. We need B-1s and MXs and mobile Minuteman IIIs and Tridents and a modern Navy and anti-ballistic missiles and civil defense. The total price tag on all the weapons we need is still cheaper than the colossal loss we would suffer if we are cut off from the 40 percent of our oil which comes from Africa and the Middle East.

A Better Class of Problems?

President Carter started his address to the League of Women Voters in the spring of 1980 with what he and his audience apparently thought was a joke. The typed transcript shows the word "(Laughter)" immediately after it.

The President said, "When people ask me now, 'How can we solve our problems on an international and national basis quicker and more incisively?', my answer is 'We need a better class of problems.'" It is true that Carter has had a very difficult set of problems to deal with, but the principal difficulty has not been in the circumstances but in the inexperience, inability, and lack of will in the man who so eagerly sought and got the job of being our presidential problem-solver.

Take, for example, the question which one woman in his audience asked him about the SALT II Treaty. Carter replied, "It is still on the calendar as a top priority busi-

ness. . . . I have made it plain to the Soviet Union leaders that until this treaty is ratified, provided there is a reciprocal commitment by the Soviet Union honored through our own close observation of their action, that we will also honor the provisions of SALT II even before it is ratified."

Carter will never get "a better class of problems" as long as he salts down U.S. defenses by the humiliating inferiorities imposed in SALT II. When he committed to SALT II, he committed us to a policy of inferiority to the Soviet Union in the weapons that count in the nuclear-space age such as ICBMs, submarines, and long-range bombers.

The threat of nuclear war has never been real to the American people. Because nuclear war is so horrible to contemplate, and because the sloganeers have told us it is "unthinkable," most people don't believe it would ever happen.

The popular notion of nuclear war is that, after the pushing of one fatal button (either accidentally or on purpose), the end result would be that the whole world would go up in smoke, that survival for anyone would be next to impossible, and that the living (if any) would envy the dead. Popular acceptance of this scenario has been fostered by such scientifically false movies as "On the Beach" and "Dr. Strangelove."

The popular notion of nuclear war is a macabre vision of Russia and the United States each firing all their missiles and bombs at each other, resulting in the near-total devastation of both countries and decimation of their populations. Nuclear war is *not* going to happen that way.

The Soviet missile force is designed for one primary mission: to destroy American missiles in their silos. Defense Secretary Harold Brown has been testifying for several years that the Soviets will have the capability to do that in the "early 1980s."

If the Soviets carry out their primary mission of firing their SS-18 heavy ICBMs to knock out our Minuteman missiles in their concrete silos, less than one percent of the American people would become casualties. The rest of us would hear about it on television as we hear about the Miami riots or the eruption of Mount St. Helens.

The popular mythology propagated by disarmament advocates tells us that, if this should ever happen, our President would fire our missiles back at the Russians. That's what is called "mutual assured destruction." But would he? In the first place, he would only have a maximum of about 20 minutes to make that dread decision, and even that length of time assumes perfect functioning of all watchdog personnel and equipment.

In the second place, what good would such a retaliatory strike possibly do? Our missiles are built and programmed only to kill people, not weapons. Killing millions of Russians would serve no moral or military purpose and would only bring upon our cities a sure retaliation from the hundreds of still unused Soviet missiles.

The end result of this most probable scenario for nuclear war is that our nation would be defeated by the Soviet Union. The Soviets would then have the capability to do to us what they have done to every other nation they have conquered.

The American people would be as helpless as our hostages in Iran and the conquered people of Afghanistan. The only way to get a better class of problems is to rebuild our military superiority so that we can avoid being the loser in the nuclear confrontation that is coming just as soon as the Soviets *think* they have the power to knock out our Minuteman missiles.

Navy Facts, Not Fiction

In his acceptance speech at the Democratic Convention, President Carter boasted: "Our modernized strategic forces, a revitalized NATO, the Trident submarine, the Cruise missile, the Rapid Deployment Force — all these guarantee that we will never be second to any nation. Deeds, not words — fact, not fiction."

The clear implication of that paragraph is that the U.S. Trident submarine is a weapon which helps us to be "second

to none." That is fiction, not fact. The true fact is that the United States does not have a single Trident submarine operational (our first one is scheduled to be operational in October 1981), whereas the Soviet Union has 32 Trident-class submarines, called the Delta, operational today.

President Carter is either living in some kind of a dream world, isolated from the facts of the strategic balance of weapons between the U.S. and the U.S.S.R., or he is deliberately misleading the American public.

The most respected authority in counting ships in navies all over the world is *Jane's Fighting Ships*, published annually in London since 1897. The latest edition, published a few weeks ago, shows that the Soviet fleet has a total of 70 nuclear-powered submarines which can fire missiles at targets 700 to 4,800 miles away, and is producing additional submarines at the rate of 10 a year.

The SALT I Agreement limits the United States to a maximum of 41 nuclear-powered submarines. We have lived up to the spirit and the letter of the treaty whereas the Soviets have not.

Jane's Fighting Ships hurled a warning in words unusually blunt. The Soviet Union, the ten-pound volume said, has built a massive naval force "far beyond the needs of defense of the Soviet sea frontiers" and is "truly a formidable force." In the event of a major crisis, the Soviet Union could have 240 submarines at sea, while the combined NATO navies, deployed worldwide for all purposes would have only about 150.

Look at a world map and you will see that the Soviet Union has no need of such a formidable navy for its own defense, or even for keeping the satellite states in submission. There is no rational mission for such a superior Soviet Navy except aggression and cutting off the lifelines of those nations which depend on imports via the seas.

Carter's use of the Cruise missile in his acceptance speech as an example of his "guarantee that we will never be second to any nation" is also just words, not deeds. Our Cruise missile is not ready for deployment. We can't protect ourselves with future weapons; the only ones that count are those in-being when the attack hits.

Carter's boasting about "our modernized strategic forces" is the biggest myth of all! "Modernized" is a trick word which means we are putting some new features on our old strategic ICBMs and submarines, but not rebuilding any additional ones which are truly modern. The total number of U.S. ICBMs and nuclear missile-firing submarines has remained constant since 1967 at 1,054 and 41, respectively. It is a semantic trick to call those forces "modernized" in the face of the fantastically powerful Soviet strategic forces which are so much more modern than ours.

It is worse than a trick; it is a lie to suggest that our strategic bomber force is "modernized." Carter cancelled the B-1, the world's greatest bomber, and is forcing us to limp along with the old, slow B-52s, which are older than the pilots who fly them. In order to keep them in the air, we have to keep cannibalizing others for parts, which means we have a constantly shrinking number.

Carter criticized Ronald Reagan for "abandoning arms control policies." It is obvious that arms control policies which "control" U.S. weapons, but not the Soviets', are *not* in the best interests of the United States.

Carter said that his objective is "to seek balanced reductions in nuclear arms." The trouble is that he seeks reductions even if they are *not* balanced, and that is why the United States is falling farther and farther behind Russia.

As long as our national policy is arms control no matter how unbalanced and peace at any price, we will continue to lose power, prestige, geography, and people to the Soviets to whom "arms control" means control only the United States, and "peace" means conquer the world one piece at a time.

Building the Army

Many people thought that the anti-ballistic missile system (ABM) was killed off at least ten years ago. It has been a

non-issue since Nixon and Kissinger gave away our right to build it in the SALT I Anti-ABM Treaty in 1972.

But, like Mark Twain's death, those reports were greatly exaggerated. The ABM was revived in the Republican Platform adopted in Detroit in July 1980, and could be restored to full health if a pro-ABM Congress is elected in November.

The Platform calls for "vigorous research and development of an effective anti-ballistic missile system, such as is already at hand in the Soviet Union, as well as more modern ABM technologies." With that sentence, the Platform not only demands that the United States have an ABM, but admits that the Soviets already have one.

The ABM is not a weapon of war. It is a weapon of peace. It is not designed to kill people; its purpose is to prevent people from being killed. The ABM is the best and only way to defend our Minuteman missiles against being destroyed in their silos.

The mission of the ABM has been accurately described as "hitting a bullet with a bullet in a blizzard." It is actually even more difficult than that because real warheads must be sorted out from concealment in clouds of decoys, and then destroyed within seconds. Yet American technological genius was equal to that challenge, and U.S. scientists perfected our anti-ballistic missile system during the 1960s. Our government planned to install enough batteries of ABMs to protect all our population centers as well as our ICBMs from enemy missiles.

During the two years of the SALT I negotiations in 1970 and 1971, all the components of our ABM system were tested. The accuracy and reliability of the intercepts greatly exceeded expectations. This applied both to our ABM endoatmospheric defensive missile, the Sprint, which intercepts the enemy missile after it reenters the earth's atmosphere, and to our ABM exoatmospheric defensive missile, the Spartan, which intercepts the enemy missile while it is still in outer space, near the end of its midcourse.

Our radar systems demonstrated their capability of reliably detecting and tracking enemy missiles. Just as important, the anticipated difficulties in distinguishing between real warheads and decoys were met and overcome.

Since ABMs are purely defensive, they cannot threaten any other country. If the Soviet Union objects to our ABMs, this would be an indication that it plans to attack us with what our ABMs could shoot down.

The chief reason the Soviets were so eager for the SALT I Treaty was their desire to stop our ABM deployment. Henry Kissinger, the architect of SALT I, testified that "what drove these (SALT) negotiations for the first year was their desire to limit our ABM deployment. . . . In the ABM field we had the more dynamic program which is being arrested." It would appear to be a logical deduction that the Soviets would simply not be interested in blocking a U.S. program that would not be effective. Rather, if they did not expect it to be effective, they would be happy to see us waste a few billion dollars on a worthless program.

Now that the Soviets have attained nuclear superiority over us, the need to build an ABM system to protect America is greater than ever. Nothing would prevent a Soviet nuclear attack so effectively as knowing in advance that we have an effective weapon against war which will prevent their missiles from hitting their targets.

The SALT I Anti-ABM Treaty is probably the most immoral action our government ever took because it surrendered our people's right of self-defense against incoming missiles. The Treaty should be renounced so that we can begin deployment of the ABM missile to defend our people and our weapons.

The Treaty's terms allow renunciation if a nation's "supreme interests" are jeopardized. What could be a more supreme interest than saving the lives of the American people?

Building the MX Missile

Talking an issue to death is one of the easiest ways to kill any proposal. The mission can be accomplished without logic

or arguments or the majority, and sometimes even without the adversary knowing what happened. That is how the opponents of the MX mobile missile are trying to kill a weapon which is essential to the survival of both the United States and our NATO allies.

The proposal to build the MX missile is bogged down in endless discussions about what the basing mode should be. Should it be the "racetrack" scheme or the "loading dock" scheme? Let's compare costs! Let's argue the politics of the locations! Meanwhile the urgent need to build the MX is almost forgotten.

Defense Secretary Harold Brown, in his annual Department report for fiscal 1981, said, "We must assume that the ICBM leg of our Triad could be destroyed within a very short time as one result of a Soviet surprise attack." The MX mobile missile is the one weapon which can prevent that catastrophic event, but no progress is being made in building it.

What Brown calls "the ICBM leg of our Triad" is 1,000 intercontinental ballistic missiles called Minuteman missiles, located in our northern and western states. When they were built in the 1960s and until recently, they were safe from enemy attack because they are buried in the ground in hardened concrete silos, built thick enough to withstand the tremendous blast of a nuclear attack unless the enemy missile scored a direct hit, which was considered unlikely.

However, missile accuracy is improving very rapidly. The day is fast approaching when Russian missiles will be accurate enough to target our Minuteman missiles and hit them head on. All their locations are a matter of public information.

If the Russian missiles score direct hits, even the hardened silos will be destroyed. That is what Brown now admits is possible; but the months drag on while he talks about the MX missile rather than builds it.

Mobile missiles are the solution to the problem of the "vulnerability" of our Minuteman missile force. Mobile missiles can be moved around and therefore avoid being targeted by the Soviets with their increasingly accurate heavy missiles.

One of the fundamental problems with U.S. strategic planning is that our new weapons are discussed only within the constraints of how they will serve the goals of arms control and disarmament, rather than how they will help the United States develop military forces able to win a war if we get into one. This peculiarity is particularly true of MX missile discussions.

Prove this for yourself. Try reading any of the arguments or the literature about the MX. You will find no discussion of how the weapon can be built to maximize its effectiveness in defeating or outmaneuvering an enemy, or defending the population and territory of the United States. All the literature is concerned with how it can be built to conform to the SALT II Treaty which we never even ratified, and which advantages the Soviets in almost every section.

What we are witnessing is truly an incredible situation. The Defense Department admits we are in danger of having the backbone of our defense system wiped out in a surprise attack, but is designing weapons to conform to the unratified SALT II Treaty instead of building weapons to win a possible war.

The Soviet view of the world is very different from ours. For nearly 20 years, the Soviets have planned for war and built for war. They believe that war is "thinkable, is probably inevitable, and is definitely winnable." And they intend to win it.

The American people must understand and learn the meaning of some very simple propositions if our nation is to survive in an unfriendly and uncertain world. Weapons that cannot win will not deter an enemy. Our military weapons must be designed to win. We can lose. We cannot afford to lose. We can win. We can afford to win.

An old adage warns us that those who warm their feet at the gates of Hell will never go there. If we build the weapons to win a nuclear war, we will never have to use them.

Soviet Weapons — Made in the U.S.A.

The Soviet Union has acquired military superiority over the United States because (1) the Kremlin made the decision to be number-one, no matter what the cost, (2) for ten years, the Soviets have been spending at least three times more on defense than the United States in the percentage of each country's Gross National Product, and (3) U.S. corporations have made it easy for the Russians by selling them vital technology and components without which modern weapons could not have been built.

Soviet ICBMs targeted on America? U.S. businesses sold the Russians large-scale integrated circuits and tiny precision ball bearings essential to the missiles' guidance system.

Soviet trucks used to invade Afghanistan? U.S. business shipped technology, computers and other equipment to the Kama River plant, the largest truck factory in the world, and to the ZiL truck plant near Moscow.

The U.S. Department of Commerce, and especially its Office of Export Administration (OEA), has for years been urging technology and industrial shipments to Russia even though OEA knew they would be used for military purposes. The trucks which carried the invading Russians were available for that task because OEA had approved the sale of a \$6 million computer to the ZiL plant and other American computers to the Kama River plant, all of which helped the Russians to reach their truck-production goal five years ahead of schedule. After OEA approved shipments to the truck plants knowing that they would be used for military uses, OEA tried to cover up what it had done by firing the official who testified truthfully about it, Lawrence J. Brady.

Trucks are big, conventional military assets which threaten Russia's neighbors. Far more dangerous are the tiny sophisticated devices that are components of the nuclear weapons which threaten the United States.

Two of the most important elements of nuclear weapons are the integrated circuit, which enables weapons to be made smaller and more reliable, and the miniature ball bearing which is so essential to a missile guidance system. U.S. companies were allowed by OEA to sell both those devices to the Soviet Union, sometimes directly and sometimes through satellite countries. This is why the Soviets have been able to build MIRVs on their ICBMs which have enough accuracy to target and destroy our Minuteman missile force.

With an insignificant investment, the Russians have been able to buy the fruits of billions of dollars of American research and development. Because of a handful of greedy U.S. corporations, encouraged by pro-Soviet U.S. officials, the U.S. taxpayers will now have to spend tens of billions of dollars to try to build better weapons than the Soviets have built using our technology.

Export control should be removed from the Department of Commerce which has already proved that it cannot be trusted to tell the difference between military and civilian uses. Nothing should be shipped to the Soviet Union which can directly or indirectly be used for military purposes, and all doubts should be resolved in favor of U.S. security.

Phyllis Schlafly is the co-author of five books on defense and foreign policy: *Kissinger on the Couch* (1975) and *Ambush at Vladivostok* (1976) covering the Kissinger years, *The Gravediggers* (1964), *Strike From Space* (1965), and *The Betrayers* (1968) covering the McNamara years.

The Phyllis Schlafly Report

Box 618, Alton, Illinois 62002
ISSN0556-0152

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 -- \$10 yearly (included in annual contribution). Extra copies available: 25 cents each; 6 copies \$1; 50 copies \$5; 100 copies \$8.