



The Phyllis Schlafly Report



VOL. 15, NO. 6, SECTION 1

BOX 618, ALTON, ILLINOIS 62002

JANUARY, 1982

The Key to Peace: U.S. Superiority

The Russians made themselves look ridiculous with their hysterical response to President Ronald Reagan's televised address on nuclear arms reduction. Maybe that's why, days later, they decided to finance a massive surrogate anti-nuclear demonstration in Holland. The street demonstrators could be given signs (and maybe a little travel money), but they didn't need any facts.

Immediately following President Reagan's speech (which 200 million people in 40 countries saw on television), the Russian government news agency *Tass* flailed around emotionally at the charts Reagan showed on TV, calling them "absolutely fantastic figures." The Soviets could not deny their accuracy. Then, *Tass* accused the United States of seeking "military superiority"!

So what's wrong with that? The surest key to peace is for the United States to have military superiority over all other nations in the world. That is not just speculation, not merely a hope, not an untried hypothesis, but a fact proved by historical experience.

For the benefit of those too young to remember, and those who ought to remember but are blinded by their own pacifist biases, President Reagan explained one of the world's most important events. During the years when the United States "could have dominated the world with no risk to itself ... when the United States had the only undamaged industrial power in the world ... [when] our military might was at its peak, and we alone had the ultimate weapon — the nuclear weapon — with the unquestioned ability to deliver it anywhere in the world," America chose *not* to take one single step toward aggression, imperialism, or world domination.

Instead, as the President so eloquently described it, "the United States followed a course "unique in all the history of mankind. We used our power and wealth to rebuild the war-ravaged economies of the world, including those of the nations who had been our enemies."

In all history, there is no record of any other nation holding such power in its hands and failing to use it to assert dominion over other nations and men. We proved that the peace and freedom of the world are safe when America has military superiority.

The news media and the history books are geared to report events that happen. They aren't geared to report great events that don't happen. The Russian invasions of Hungary, Czechoslovakia, and Afghanistan made news and will probably each rate a couple of paragraphs in the history books.

When the United States did *not* use our vast power to invade any nation on earth, that news wasn't reported. Most people still don't realize the momentous nature of what did not happen.

In his televised speech, President Reagan went on to tell the American people the facts of life about Soviet military superiority today — a fact which had been concealed from the American people by previous Administrations. He said that, in the kinds of weapons that might be used in Europe, the Soviet Union now has "an increasing, overwhelming advantage. They now enjoy a superiority on the order of 6 to 1."

The greatest service the Reagan Administration can provide in the field of national defense is to give the American people the facts so they can make the right decisions. In order to do this, the Defense Department recently published what may be the most important government document in recent memory: *Soviet Military Power* (available at \$6.50 from the Government Printing Office).

This factual and pictorial explanation of Soviet weaponry is clear enough for any citizen to understand, and it should be required reading for all Congressmen, media personnel, educators, and community leaders. It describes and lists the Soviet Union's strategic (nuclear) forces, theater (conventional) forces, armed forces personnel, resource allocation, quest for technological superiority, and global power projections.

In the past, the U. S. intelligence network and American leaders have done a miserable job of predicting Soviet intentions and of being prepared for their surprise moves. We would be a lot better off if U. S. strategic doctrine were based on Soviet military *capabilities* instead of on some U. S. official's guess about Soviet intentions. *Soviet Military Power* shows how tremendous those Soviet capabilities are.

America: A Nuclear Nudist Colony

"Are we dangerously behind the Russians?" a television reporter asked President Ronald Reagan at his California White House. To which the President replied, "I think we have been for some time."

A few days later, also from Reagan's ranch headquarters, Defense Secretary Caspar Weinberger discussed the national defense budget and why arms spending must remain high. He matter-of-factly commented, "We're way behind ... we have to close the window of vulnerability."

Behind those two casually-reported statements lies the most shocking news story of our lifetime. Yet it was never reported as sensational news by the national media when it was happening, and, now that it has happened, it is treated as though it were a lesser item of stale news. It's a classic example of how the national media package the news in order to manage the thinking and direct the policies of the United States. The media decide what is important and what isn't.

The event thus minimized by such low-key coverage is the fact that our country's previous leaders allowed the United States to fall "dangerously behind the Russians," and that we've been "way behind" the Russians "for some time." Wouldn't you think that this default of responsibility was worthy of at least as much indignation as Watergate or Abscam?

How far behind is "way behind"? Very far, indeed. "Window of vulnerability" is a figure of speech craftily chosen to conceal the horror of it all behind a gentle euphemism. "Windows" are pleasant things to look through and see the sights.

In this context, "window" has nothing to do with looking out to see the countryside. "Window" has nothing to do with a material substance, glass or solid; it has nothing to do with an opening of space to look out of. As used in this soothing metaphor, "window" means a period of time, a certain number of years, specifically 1981 through 1985.

Vulnerability is another word that conceals the awful truth of our present military predicament. As used here, that euphonious six-syllable word should be defined by such expressions as "naked to the enemy," "sitting ducks," or "they can kill us dead and we can't hit back."

Our present "window of vulnerability" was more accurately described years ago by General Arthur G. Trudeau in a far more apt metaphor. He said that we were fast becoming a "nuclear nudist colony." By that he meant that we are naked to the enemy; we have no defenses that can shoot down the Russian missiles if they come at us.

The prestigious eastern newspapers, no less than network television, also treat the fact of our military inferiority to Russia as less important than the latest Medfly discovery or Jimmy Carter's trip to Red China. Here is how the horrendous truth was casually reported by the *New York Times*.

"There is nothing the United States can do in the next four years to amend what many officials and ex-

perts see as the vulnerability of stationary land-based missiles. Thus there is no short-term solution to what Mr. Reagan has called 'the window of vulnerability' to a Soviet first strike."

"Virtually all officials at the top layer of the Reagan Administration," the *Times* continued, "believe that Moscow, by launching only a small fraction of its powerful and accurate missiles, could destroy in a first strike almost all 1,000 American Minuteman missiles. They hold this view even though they recognize that Soviet leaders would face considerable uncertainties in deciding to launch such an attack."

Were those awesome facts reported under black headlines to alert the nation to our peril? Not at all. Those paragraphs were quietly buried under a headline and a lead story discussing the debate over the basing of the MX missile.

Our present drastic inferiority to the Soviet Union in nuclear missile power didn't just happen. It took many years to reverse the strategic military balance from the 8-to-1 superiority we enjoyed at the time of the Cuban Missile Crisis in 1962.

The shift in the balance of power was the result of a gigantic Russian weapons building program, the U. S. weapons freeze since 1967, and the falsehoods told to the American people by our own leaders. If the American people are told the truth about the danger we face, they will support an arms building program at any cost necessary to regain our superiority.

A Reagan Weapons Strategy Needed

"The man who makes the first bad move always loses the game," says a Japanese proverb. In 1967 the United States made the first bad move in the nuclear arms game, and we've been losing ever since. The year 1967 was when the United States froze the number of its strategic nuclear delivery vehicles, and we've been in retreat ever since. Since then, we have reduced our 1967 number by more than 410.

In contrast, during the same period of time, the Soviet Union has added 1,000 strategic missile launchers and 300 intercontinental Backfire bombers. Since 1974 the Soviets have been adding nuclear warheads at the alarming rate of more than 1,000 nuclear warheads per year.

The Soviet missile force has many important advantages in addition to numbers. More than half of its warheads are extremely accurate, have a tremendous megatonnage superiority, and can be delivered by modern "heavy" ICBMs. More than half of U. S. warheads are deployed on submarines and have low accuracy and low yield.

In addition to the freeze on building additional nuclear weapons which has been in effect since 1967, our government has deliberately and unilaterally reduced our nuclear striking power. A partial list of the American weapons systems cancelled or scrapped since 1967 includes: 1,400 B-47 bombers, 70 B-58 bombers, the B-70 bomber (which still holds fantastic speed records), 250 B-1 bombers, 100 Jupiter/Thor IRBMs, the Skybolt, 160

Polaris SLBMs, and our single U. S. ABM site.

Other strategic weapons have been deliberately delayed beyond all reasonable expectations: the MX ICBM, the Trident submarine, the Trident II missile, the Minuteman III, the ALCM, the laser and the particle beam weapons. The Soviets haven't scrapped or delayed anything; they've been building weapons as fast as they can.

The result of this awesome disparity in weapons building programs is what strategists call "the window of vulnerability." That's an extraordinary euphemism to conceal the horror of the fact that the Soviets have the power to wipe us out during the next five years, and there is nothing we can do about it because of the long lead-time it takes to build any weapons.

In the years when Robert McNamara and Henry Kissinger controlled our defense policy, "studying the options" on new weapons was a deliberate device for delaying decisions and postponing production. It was the principal ploy by which those two put us in a nuclear weapons freeze and carried on unilateral disarmament.

The first step in developing a new strategy for America is to get us out of the straitjacket of complying with the unratified SALT II Treaty. The useless debate over the basing of the MX missile in Utah and Nevada was caused by the Carter Administration's attempt to tailor our weapons to meet the specifications of the non-treaty.

The second shackle the Reagan Administration should shed is MAD — the theory of Mutual Assured Destruction. That is the discredited McNamara theory which supposedly ensures that we can inflict as much "assured destruction" on the Soviets as they can on us. We can't — and it is foolish to be bound by a theory that pretends we can.

The Reagan Defense Department needs a new strategic doctrine immediately which can credibly assure our safety against the Soviet missile force. It should start with a reaffirmation of former Secretary of State Christian Herter's statement: "The threat of surprise attack ... presents a constant danger. It is unacceptable that the Soviet political system should be given the opportunity to make secret preparations to face the Free World with the choice of abject surrender or nuclear destruction."

Remember Pearl Harbor

As we observed the fortieth anniversary of Pearl Harbor last month, it must have seemed incredible to the current generation that the Japanese rulers, no matter how warlike, could ever have thought they could have defeated the great United States. Cross the Pacific with carriers and small propeller planes and tackle America with its vast resources?

But they did. They thought the United States wasn't ready for battle and didn't have the will to fight. "Enjoy your dream of peace just one more day. ... Hawaii, you will be caught like a rat in a trap," said Admiral I. Yamamoto's chief of staff, on the day before Pearl Harbor.

America was caught completely by surprise. We weren't ready for war, but we did have the will and the

resources to get ready. As Yamamoto said ruefully, the Pearl Harbor attack awakened "the sleeping giant."

It took years of investigation, but now we know that America's leaders weren't surprised at all; they had plenty of warnings. Americans had broken the Japanese codes and had built marvelous machines, invented by Navy Captain Laurance Safford, which deciphered Japanese messages faster than the Japanese could decode their own messages.

Our military intelligence about the enemy was probably more accurate, up-to-the-minute, and complete than at any time in our country's history. Captain Safford testified that, on November 19, 1941, the Navy decoded a Japanese message to their embassies saying that a weather broadcast in the clear — "East wind rain" — would mean "War with the United States, war with Britain, peace with Russia."

On the morning of December 4, Tokyo radio broadcast the "East wind rain" message. A copy was sent to the White House at noon the same day. Our machines also decoded the Japanese messages which ordered their agents at Hawaii to give daily reports on the location of U. S. ships based at Pearl Harbor — information obviously designed for the purpose of telling the Japanese attack force where to drop their bombs and torpedoes.

At the Congressional hearings on Pearl Harbor, Lieutenant L. R. Schulz testified that, on the evening of December 6, 1941, he personally handed President Franklin Roosevelt a 13-part decoded Japanese message which conclusively proved that an attack was imminent. After reading the 13 parts, Roosevelt looked up and said to Schultz, "This means war." But Roosevelt did *not* tell this to our commanders in Hawaii or anywhere else; he kept that vital information to himself. Pearl Harbor Commanders Admiral H. E. Kimmel and General W. C. Short were unjustly blamed for our worst military disaster.

Fortunately, the weapons of war in 1941 were slow enough that we had time to rearm. It took us four years and the lives of nearly 100,000 Americans to prove that the Japanese were wrong in believing they could defeat us.

America went to work and built a mighty war machine which defeated two powerful aggressors on two fronts and successfully defended ourselves and all our allies. That unparalleled military superiority lasted from the end of World War II in 1945 until the SALT I Agreements of 1972 under which our leaders agreed that the Soviet Union would have more offensive weapons than we have and that we would not build defensive weapons to protect our people from a missile attack.

Although we stopped building the kind of weapons that could reach the Soviet Union, they kept building the kinds of weapons that can reach us. On November 7, 1981, the Kremlin leaders stood on a balcony and watched their weapons rolling through Red Square to celebrate the anniversary of the Bolshevik revolution. "No nation will ever overtake the Soviet Union in military might," boasted Defense Minister Dmitri F. Ustinov.

The problem with thinking the unthinkable about a Pearl Harbor-type attack in the 1980s is that there will be no time to get ready after a surprise attack. The only weapons that count are the ones in place when the first shot is fired.

That's why Winston Churchill's eloquent warning

to the United States should be studied by all those trying to sabotage President Reagan's military budget: "Sometimes in the past we have committed the folly of throwing away our arms. Under the mercy of Providence, and at great cost and sacrifice, we have been able to recreate them when the need arose. But if we abandon our nuclear deterrent, there will be no second chance. To abandon it now would be to abandon it forever."

The Russian Party Line on CBS

CBS television on June 18, 1981 hurled a broadside attack on Ronald Reagan's plans to defend America against the Russian military buildup. This piece of political propaganda was thinly disguised as a five-hour primetime series to "examine" and "report" on "The Defense of the United States" against the Soviet Union.

For the final hour of this expensive production, CBS sent Walter Cronkite to Moscow "looking for some answers." The Russians gave him the answers they want the American public to hear. Walter then allowed his program to be used as a conduit for the Russian party line and its efforts to discredit the Reagan Administration's defense program.

Here is a summary of the propaganda message presented by the CBS "documentary," as heard on national television from the mouths of Russians in Moscow (whom Walter treated with much deference), skillfully interwoven with complementary comments by Walter Cronkite himself and a couple of Western journalists in Moscow (who, of course, operate under Soviet restrictions on resident newsmen).

The Reagan Administration is falsifying and exaggerating the Soviet military threat in order to get Congress to vote bigger defense budgets, which are unnecessary. Walter: "The Administration tells you only half the story — the half it uses to press its case for higher and higher defense budgets."

The Soviet Union is not a threat; that "misperception" is just a relic of the "cold war." Walter: Since 1960, "Soviet influence around the world actually has declined."

We should put our trust in treaties with the Russians rather than in military weapons. Russian: "We have never violated our agreements, even those that were not signed." Journalist: "We can trust them to observe a formal agreement. Their record is pretty good."

The Russians are not aggressive. Russian: "What you consider aggressive, we consider defensive. We are only defending ourselves against the Americans. ... It is a political fantasy to think that the Soviet Union intends to move from Afghanistan to the Indian Ocean."

The invasion of Afghanistan really proved that the Soviet army is not formidable and is badly equipped. Walter: Although the invasion "renewed our fears," it really proved that "the Russian soldier is not ten feet tall. ... While the size and training of their military may look impressive, looks can be deceiving."

The Russians are not behind the Marxist revolutionary forces all over the world. Russian: "The Soviet Union is not trying to implant revolution in other countries. ... Categorically, the Soviet Union does not provide any assistance to the national liberation movement in El Salvador. ... Or Nicaragua, or Ethiopia."

The United States doesn't need any more nuclear weapons because we already have "overkill." Russian: "The United States has enough to destroy us 20 to 30 times." Journalist: "We reached overkill years and years ago."

The Russians are not superior to the United States in military weapons, but merely equal. Russian: "We are equal ... there is an approximate parity. ... The problem is psychological. ... Americans cannot psychologically accept equality with the Russians."

Another Russian: "There is asymmetrical parity because in one field the U. S. and NATO are much ahead of the Soviet Union and Warsaw Treaty nations, while in other fields the Soviet Union and Warsaw Treaty nations are ahead."

Nuclear war will never happen, so stop worrying about it and stop preparing against it. Walter: Get rid of those "old fears and doubts." Russian: "Any idea that the Soviet Union is planning a first-strike against U. S. land-based missiles is just very dangerous propaganda. ... Nuclear war is impossible."

The Soviets are not building nuclear weapons faster than the United States. Russian: "Categorically not!" Walter: The Soviets are only "playing catch-up ball with us."

America should not strive to restore our former military superiority. Russian: "Military superiority is impossible. ... It is very dangerous." Journalist: "You can't buy peace simply by spending more for arms."

President Ronald Reagan was allotted 65 seconds at the start of this program to state his views, while the entire rest of the hour was spent torpedoing his program with the above anti-defense propaganda spoken by Russians and journalists. Is that what the FCC would call giving "both sides" of a controversial issue under the "fairness doctrine"?

Phyllis Schlafly is the 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. She was a member of Ronald Reagan's 1980 Defense Policy Advisory Group. President Reagan wrote her, "Thank you for your assistance as a Member of my Defense Policy Advisory Group. The results of your work will help set the agenda for the new Administration."

The Phyllis Schlafly Report

Box 618, Alton, Illinois 62002
ISSN0556-0152

Published monthly by The Eagle Trust Fund, Box 618, Alton, Illinois 62002.

Second Class Postage Paid at Alton, Illinois.

Subscription Price: \$10 per year. Extra copies available: 50 cents each; 4 copies \$1; 30 copies \$5; 100 copies \$10.