



The Phyllis Schlafly Report

VOL. 15, NO. 10, SECTION 1

BOX 618, ALTON, ILLINOIS 62002

MAY, 1982

President Reagan's Blunt Warning

At his primetime televised news conference on March 31, President Ronald Reagan bluntly warned Americans about the military threat we face. He said that the Soviets are definitely superior to the United States in nuclear weapons, and furthermore that, if they hit us with nuclear weapons and we hit back, the Soviet superiority is so great that they can hit us a second time. This is the first time that an American President has told us these frightening facts. Here are Ronald Reagan's own words:

"The truth of the matter is that, on balance, the Soviet Union does have a definite margin of superiority. A [nuclear weapons] freeze would not only be disadvantageous — in fact even dangerous — to us with them in that position."

"The Soviets' great edge is one in which they could absorb our retaliatory blow and hit us again."

A reporter asked him this question, "Mr. President, in your first press conference, you referred to the Soviet Union as having shown a pattern of, I believe you used the words, lying and cheating over the years. Have you in your 15 months of office formed any different opinion than you came into office with about the Soviet Union? Are they more conciliatory than you thought they were?"

President Reagan replied: "No, I don't think they've changed their habits."

There it is. President Reagan gave it to us straight. Defending our nation from the Soviet threat is the number-one duty of the Federal Government. President Reagan should be supported in his plan to build every weapon we could possibly need to protect our lives and freedom.

Seizing the High Frontier

The maiden voyage of Space Shuttle Columbia last year marked the advent of a new era of human activity, even more momentous for the future than were the completion of the transcontinental railway, the Suez and Panama Canals, or the first flight of the Wright Brothers. It provides us with a historic opportunity to take the high ground of space.

When history presents such opportunities, the nations that have the wit to seize the military and commercial capabilities in the new arena are able to reap enormous strategic advantages. For example, the Vikings, although never a very numerous people, became

such masters of the coastal seas that their power spread over all the coasts of Europe.

In the 16th century, the nations that seized the frontier of the high seas became the dominant nations — first Spain (after the epic voyages of Columbus and Magellan) and then Great Britain (with its unsurpassed fleet of merchantmen and fighting ships). When the frontier moved to the air, the fact that the United States made rapid and effective use of this new arena for commerce and defense was a vital factor in the world dominance we achieved.

Today, the high seas of space are the strategic high ground of the future. History teaches us that those nations that become preeminent on the high ground will gain the decisive advantage. Will it be America or Russia?

A group of leading strategists and planners who have been working for many months under the name "High Frontier" and under the leadership of Lt. Gen. Daniel Graham, USA (Ret.), former chief of Defense Intelligence, have come to the conclusion that the United States must seize this high ground in order to maintain our continued freedom, independence, and prosperity.

Essentially, the High Frontier concept means the use of American technological advantages to provide an effective defense against nuclear attack for our country and our Allies. The High Frontier concept will give us great economic and commercial advantages.

The High Frontier strategy would resurrect a long-neglected aspect of our security: protective strategic defense. It would consign to the dustbin of history the long-discredited doctrine of Mutual Assured Destruction (MAD).

The doctrine of MAD is based on eliminating defensive weapons, leaving our population undefended against attack, and maximizing damage and deaths from enemy offensive weapons in event of war. High Frontier is based on saving American lives instead of killing people, so its morality cannot be questioned.

High Frontier recommends a layered strategic defense. The first layer would be a space-borne defense (that would be non-nuclear) which would effectively filter a Soviet missile attack in the early stages of flight. The second layer would use advanced beam weaponry to further reduce the effectiveness of a missile attack and to defend other space assets from a variety of attacks. The third layer would be a ground-based point defense system backed up by a strong civil defense.

High Frontier would achieve the principal purpose of deterrence which is to keep a potential aggressor at least uncertain of success and possibly certain of failure. At the present time, the Kremlin planners have a straightforward arithmetic problem in planning an attack. They need only deliver two warheads of current size and accuracy against each U.S. target in order to carry out a preemptive first-strike.

High Frontier, on the other hand, would give the Kremlin planners a problem full of uncertainties. They would never know how many warheads would reach their targets, or which ones. Such uncertainties are the essence of deterrence.

The space-based plans of High Frontier are made almost essential by the current vulnerability of U.S. space assets (intelligence and communications satellites and the Shuttle). We simply must protect all our communications materials located up in space.

Time is critical in any commitment to the High Frontier, especially with regard to the military systems. If we cannot change the adverse trends in the military balance quickly, we may not be able to change them at all.

General Graham and his group are to be commended for their vision and dedication in developing this plan which would move America from an unstable balance of terror to Assured Survival. It would open the way for America to solve its military problems at an attractive cost figure. The Reagan Administration and the Congress should implement High Frontier in 1982 in order to close our "window of vulnerability" and open up a new era of hope and progress for the Free World.

Civil Defense Needed

All of a sudden, Americans are thinking the unthinkable. It's even on the cover of *Time Magazine*. Despite treaties, theories, SALT, freezes, arms-control negotiations, and hopes, nuclear war just might happen.

The question is, will our government do its job of taking any and all precautions which can save American lives if that unthinkable event does take place? Or, will our government be caught as flatfooted as the British government when the Argentinians moved into the Falkland Islands?

The Reagan Administration doesn't intend to fall into that box. Accepting its primary responsibility of saving American lives is the reason why President Reagan has proposed a \$4.2 billion civil defense program. The purpose of civil defense is to save millions of American lives. No duty of government could be more important. No goal could be more humanitarian, or compassionate, or concerned about human welfare.

We should neither overestimate nor underestimate the protection that civil defense can provide. Civil defense cannot prevent war. It cannot totally protect all Americans. But it can greatly lessen the number of lives that would be lost in a nuclear war. If we value human life, that is a worthy enough goal to justify whatever expenditures are required.

Medians and barriers down the middle of interstates and expressways certainly cannot prevent all automobile accidents or even all auto fatalities, but our government builds them at tremendous expense because they save some lives. That's only one of dozens of examples in our daily life where the American conscience accepts the responsibility to pay a high cost in order to save some

lives that might otherwise be lost.

It is impossible any longer to reasonably deny the possibility of nuclear war. Since the first duty of government is to protect its citizens, our government has the obligation to embark on an immediate program to ensure the survival of as many American lives as possible.

Civil defense is a goal on which hawks and doves can unite because it is not aggressive; it does not seek territory or control or riches; it has no ideology except a humanitarian desire to safeguard the lives of innocent people.

Civil defense cannot save those in the immediate target area of a nuclear attack. But nobody knows how many Americans might be in the immediate target area of a possible nuclear attack. Soviet military doctrine calls for an attack on military targets first, most of which are in sparsely populated areas of the United States. If we get that kind of attack, civil defense would save millions of people living in cities.

Civil defense would be highly effective in protecting Americans against fallout in a nuclear war between other countries, such as between the U.S.S.R. and China, since the prevailing winds are from West to East. Civil defense would be very effective in protecting us against a small nuclear attack by some small terrorist country.

One of the stale arguments sometimes made against civil defense is that it is "provocative." That is ridiculous because the Soviets already have their own extensive civil defense program. Our civil defense cannot possibly be provocative.

To the clergy who today are agitating for peace, let us ask the question: Is it not your duty to demand that our government provide a passive, non-aggressive protection against the possibility that our "peace" goals will be less than successful? The Vatican is spending \$1.6 million to build a bomb shelter for the Vatican art treasures. Are not human lives just as worthy of protection as paintings and statues?

Civil defense has nothing to do with what kind of a nuclear freeze we have, or don't have. Civil defense has nothing to do with how many missiles or submarines or bombers the United States has, or doesn't have. Civil defense has nothing to do with the "overkill" argument — how many Russians we can kill how many times over.

Civil defense only has to do with saving American lives. How could anybody be against that? Just because we cannot save ALL Americans, or we can't save those in the big cities such as New York, that is no argument for refusing to save those we can save.

The cost? Yes, it will be costly. If we can't save everybody at once, we can start in one state and then keep going. After all, the lives we save may be our own.

Nuclear Freeze Propaganda

Twenty years ago, the slogan was "rather Red than dead." Today, the slogan is, let's have a "U.S. nuclear freeze." The propagandists have changed, but the pitch is the same; the tactics are the same; the objective is the same, namely, to persuade the American people to abandon their inalienable, constitutionally-guaranteed right of self-defense.

If the nuclear freeze agitators are looking for a logo to identify themselves, I suggest an umbrella. The umbrella bears the symbolism of the 1938 "Peace Declaration" of the Munich Conference, from which

British Prime Minister Neville Chamberlain returned (carrying his umbrella) to assure the West that he had secured "peace in our time."

"Our time" lasted only one year. In 1939 Hitler invaded Poland and started World War II. The eternal lesson of Munich is that agreements with greedy totalitarian dictators promote war.

Twenty years later, in 1958, Lord Bertrand Russell, prominent British Socialist, pacifist, and author of the book called "Why I Am Not A Christian," advocated surrender to Hitler's partner-in-aggression, the Soviet Union. He coined the slogan "rather Red than dead" as the rallying cry of an agitating assortment of extreme leftists, pacifists, and scientists who could be pressured into beating their breasts with a guilt complex because they had developed the atom bomb.

The 1958 "rather Red than dead" syndrome first emerged in the churches at the Fifth World Order Study Conference of the National Council of Churches of Christ assembled in Cleveland, November 18-21, 1958. This Conference produced a report called "The Power Struggle and Security in a Nuclear-Space Age."

That report issued a call to "unilateral" nuclear disarmament wrapped in language to appeal to Christians: "Since we as Christians could not ourselves press the button for such destruction, we must declare our conviction that we cannot support the concept of nuclear retaliation."

The "rather Red than dead" agitators were not successful because, in 1958, we had the good fortune to have a President who believed in defending our freedom and independence against any aggressor. Dwight Eisenhower's ideology was best expressed in a line which has since been inscribed on the aircraft carrier that bears his name: "Until war is eliminated from international relations, unpreparedness for it is well nigh as criminal as war itself."

The Eisenhower Administration deserves full credit for the Triad of strategic defenses that protect our country today. It was the Eisenhower Administration which placed the orders for 1,054 intercontinental ballistic missiles, 41 nuclear missile-firing submarines, and 600 B-52 bombers — numbers which have since been reduced but never increased.

From the time Eisenhower left the White House until Ronald Reagan entered it, the unilateral-disarmament advocates had no need to demonstrate. A freeze on building all additional strategic weapons was imposed by Defense Secretary Robert McNamara in 1961, kept in force by him for eight years, continued for the next eight years by Henry Kissinger, and then continued for the next four years by Defense Secretary Harold Brown (a former McNamara "whiz kid").

At the end of the 1961-to-1981 period, and after the expenditure of hundreds of billions of defense dollars, our ICBM total is still 1,054, our nuclear submarine total is still only 41, and our fleet of B-52 bombers has shrunk (through crashes and attrition) to only 316. Our 20-year nuclear weapons freeze not only did NOT cause the Soviets to follow suit; it actually encouraged the Soviets to accelerate their own weapons-building program. In other words, OUR nuclear weapons freeze accelerated the RUSSIAN arms race.

Now that we have a President who truthfully admits in his news conference that the Soviet Union does have "a definite margin of superiority," and who belie-

ves that the first obligation of government is to defend its citizens, the "rather Red than dead" propagandists have reemerged. Again they are using some clergy as propaganda conduits, this time under a front called "Clergy and Laity Concerned."

The lessons of history are so plain that it is painful to recite them. Agreements with aggressors, concessions and weakness invite war. A U.S. nuclear freeze encourages the enemy to accelerate the arms race. The anti-defense cackling of clergy and laity against defense is just a political ploy to sabotage the Reagan defense budget.

Fallacies of the "Freeze People"

A massive propaganda campaign is underway to convince the United States to announce a freeze on all further testing, production, and deployment of nuclear weapons and nuclear delivery vehicles; and to follow that up by negotiations culminating in a treaty. This is the essence of the "nuclear freeze" petitions now being circulated by the Council for a Nuclear Weapons Freeze for submission to Congress.

The "freeze people" suggest that "either" the U.S. or the U.S.S.R. should initiate "movement" toward this goal by taking "unilateral" steps that would demonstrate "good faith." After Afghanistan and Poland, it is hard to see how anyone in the Free World could be gullible enough to fall for such rhetoric.

The entire argument of the "freeze people" is based on false assumptions, starting with the false allegation that the United States is as responsible as the Soviets for the escalation of the arms race. This is manifestly untrue; even those who cannot read should be able to study the pictures of superior Soviet military might set forth graphically in the 1981 U.S. Defense Department publication called *Soviet Military Power* (100 pages, available from the Government Printing Office or from your Congressman).

The U.S. closed its Minuteman production line and delayed the MX program, while the Soviets deployed four new ICBMs and built up the capability to destroy most U.S. ICBMs in a surprise attack using only one-fourth of Soviet ICBMs. The U.S. and its NATO allies deployed no immediate-range nuclear missiles at all, while the Soviet Union deployed more than 750 nuclear warheads on its new SS-20 missiles threatening Western Europe.

The U.S. froze our ballistic-missile submarine force at the SALT limit of 41, while the Soviets increased their force to 84. The U.S. cancelled our B-1 bomber program while the Soviets are deploying their new bomber, the Backfire, at the rate of 30 per year.

The second false argument of the "freeze people" is to accuse U.S. officials of making "destabilizing" statements that nuclear war is "winnable." The fact is that the "winnable" doctrine and statements come from Russian military journals and other official publications of the U.S.S.R. Unfortunately, it takes two to make peace but only one to make war.

Soviet military strategists have never subscribed to the Hollywood doctrine that "there would be no winners in a nuclear war." Kremlin strategists believe that there definitely would be a winner — and they intend to be that winner. America would be making a fatal mistake if we allowed our national strategy to be made by fiction such

as *On the Beach* or *Dr. Strangelove*.

The third false argument of the "freeze people" is their assertion that parity exists between U.S. and U.S.S.R. forces at present. Fortunately, for the first time in more than ten years, we have a President who tells us the truth about the military balance.

Both President Reagan and his Secretary of Defense have told the American people clearly that the Soviets have military superiority over us. On April 14, Defense Secretary Caspar Weinberger said that "the Soviet missiles are now more accurate than ours, much more accurate than they used to be."

The facts are that the Soviet ICBM force is far more numerous, far more modern, has four times the throw-weight, and has far more numerous and more accurate guided warheads. The Soviet Navy, both on and under the surface, is far more numerous, far more modern, and more powerfully armed with nuclear missiles.

In a future war in which only non-nuclear forces would be used, the Soviets would have us outgunned at least four-to-one. Soviet superiority in conventional (non-nuclear) forces, such as troops and tanks, is overwhelming.

The "freeze people" tell us that cheating would be unlikely under the new moratorium because the risk of detection would be considerable, and the price of detection would be great. Anyone who looks at past history can see that (1) the Soviets have consistently cheated on every treaty they have ever made, including SALT, and (2) the Soviets are not ever the slightest bit deterred by "world opinion."

The best answer to the proposals of the "freeze people" is "Go tell it to the Russians." Only after the Soviets show a little good faith (such as by acceding to President Reagan's request that they remove their missiles targeted on Western Europe) should we talk.

Arms Control Out Of Control

When a new President is elected, the voters have a right to expect him to appoint new officials who believe in and enthusiastically implement the policies on which the winning candidate ran. Otherwise, it would be a farce for presidential candidates to address the issues, take stands, and make promises.

The SALT II Treaty and its arms control provisions were a major issue of the 1980 election. The difference between the two candidates was clear and unequivocal: Jimmy Carter signed it, promoted it, and said the 1980 election would be a referendum on SALT II; Ronald Reagan vigorously attacked it and called it "fatally flawed."

Has Ronald Reagan fulfilled his election victory mandate in this area? A recent report by the Heritage Foundation is very disturbing. It shows that the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency is still staffed and controlled by the Carter team which tried to shove SALT II down our throats in 1980.

Eleven of the top policymakers in the Arms Control Agency are persons who held high jobs in the Carter Administration. Three or four Republicans have been appointed for window-dressing, but only to minor or non-policymaking positions.

The Deputy Director of the ACDA, who has actual control of the day-to-day management of arms-control personnel and policies, is Robert T. Grey, who served in the Carter State Department as director of the Office of

Advanced Technology. His most recent job was as administrative assistant for Senator Alan Cranston, one of the Senate's ultra-liberals.

Reagan's two top political appointments to ACDA were longtime Democrats and disarmament advocates, although they went on record against SALT II. The Reagan Director of ACDA, Eugene Rostow, was Undersecretary of State for Political Affairs in the Johnson Administration and a fervent believer in the 1946 plan to turn over our nuclear arsenal to the United Nations. Paul Nitze, whom Reagan appointed to the Intermediate Nuclear Force negotiations, was Secretary of the Navy in the Johnson Administration, where he functioned as one of Defense Secretary Robert McNamara's chief lieutenants in cutting back our 8-to-1 nuclear superiority over the Soviets in 1962, to parity by 1968.

Since Rostow and Nitze are essentially pro-arms-control-treaty (even though they opposed SALT II), it is easy to see that their hearts are not in any effort to build an ACDA staff supportive of Reagan's hard line on Soviet treaties. The way they evade the ideological issue is to appoint what they call "career professionals" who have State Department or ACDA "experience."

Who has such experience? Obviously, those who held posts under Carter. More specifically, those who engaged in Carter's aggressive SALT-selling campaign of 1980. This first-year record proves, not only that they are not implementing Reagan's policies, but that they are still pursuing Carter's policies.

A major example of this is the record of ACDA's Bureau of Verification, which had been abolished by Carter because he didn't want to know about Soviet violations of SALT I. The Reagan White House ordered the Bureau recreated. But the Carter holdovers in ACDA have arranged that only two professionals and a total of seven persons are now assigned to it, thus assuring that it is merely a "paper" bureau. By contrast, the ACDA Bureau of Nuclear Weapons and Weapons Control has 60 employees.

Longtime Reagan supporters are increasingly alarmed over the staffing of ACDA, the Reagan Administration's unilateral decision to continue to observe Carter's unratified SALT II Treaty, and the peculiar reluctance to confront the Soviet Union on violations of existing arms-control treaties. All Carter holdovers should be removed from ACDA and replaced by Reaganauts so that Reagan policies on arms control can replace Carter policies.

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.