



The Phyllis Schlafly Report

VOL. 21, NO. 9, SECTION 2

BOX 618, ALTON, ILLINOIS 62002

APRIL, 1988

Loopholes in the INF Treaty

President Ronald Reagan has called for the ratification of a U.S.-U.S.S.R. treaty that eliminates a whole class of nuclear weapons, destroys thousands of warheads, and is verifiable. Unfortunately, that worthy goal is not met by the Intermediate Nuclear Force (INF) Treaty that he signed with Gorbachev last Pearl Harbor Day (a day of inappropriate imagery) and which is now awaiting ratification by the U.S. Senate.

The INF Treaty does not eliminate nuclear weapons at all, despite the apparent belief to the contrary by practically everybody from presidential candidates to plain people. INF destroys only the missiles, while allowing both the U.S. and the U.S.S.R. to take their "nuclear warhead devices" and "guidance systems" off of old missiles and put them onto new ones.

The part that kills people and destroys property is not banned under the terms of the treaty. Senator John Glenn said that he has found an appalling number of people "who were not aware that this treaty does not destroy one single nuclear explosive device."

Does the INF Treaty eliminate a whole class of nuclear missiles? The answer is yes for the United States but no for the Soviets. INF only requires the Soviets to eliminate the SS-20 missiles they admitted in the treaty that they have.

The National Intelligence Estimate (based on our four military service intelligence departments plus the National Security Agency) figures that the Soviets have at least 300 more SS-20s than they declared in the treaty, and could have up to 1,600 more. Even 50 to 100 hidden SS-20s would be militarily significant, as each has three warheads, each of which is seven times more powerful than the Hiroshima bomb.

We are told that the INF Treaty provides for on-site verification. The joker in this statement is that verification is permitted only on those sites pre-selected by the Soviets but not on other sites where the Soviets may be hiding hundreds of missiles, including those sites where they formerly deployed INF-type missiles.

Furthermore, there are no procedures for doing anything about it if verification shows that the Soviets have cheated. After all, we never did anything about their cheating on previous treaties.

The INF Treaty involves scrapping only three percent of

the missiles held by each superpower, leaving us with 4,000 nuclear warheads remaining in Europe. Unfortunately, the 3 percent to be scrapped are the only ground-based missiles in Europe that are capable of striking the Soviet Union, while the 4,000 others are short-range battlefield weapons that cannot reach the U.S.S.R.

Of course it is good to limit the number and destructiveness of nuclear weapons. But that process has been proceeding steadily for the last 20 years and has nothing to do with treaties, agreements, or the mythology of "arms control."

Technological improvements, primarily in making weapons more accurate, have made it more cost-efficient to have fewer nuclear weapons of improved accuracy but less destructive power. Accordingly, the total explosive power of the U.S. nuclear arsenal is now only one-fourth of our peak in 1960.

It is hard to maintain with a straight face that the INF Treaty would be a step toward peace. INF requires the United States to give up our most effective deterrent in Europe, the Pershing II missiles, while the Soviets are permitted to keep their new SS-25s that are capable of hitting the same Western European targets as their SS-20s and also have ICBM capabilities.

The INF Treaty does not reduce by a single one the number of missiles aimed at the United States. It makes Western Europe more vulnerable to the massive superiority in conventional weapons possessed by the Warsaw Pact nations.

The INF Treaty retargets, but does not scrap, any nuclear weapons, and we can't verify it well enough to know whether the Soviets reduced their SS-20 missiles to zero or concealed additional hundreds they are not admitting. Under the INF Treaty, Gorbachev can take all his SS-20 warheads now targeted on Europe, put ten of them on each of his new missiles, and retarget them on the United States.

All this certainly does not fit the definition of "promoting peace," "arms control," or "reducing tensions." It's no wonder that Senators are asking questions, and it's no wonder that the State Department finds them too embarrassing to answer.

Are the Soviets a Good Treaty Risk?

In his most famous speech, Patrick Henry laid down a guide for prudent decision making: "I have but one lamp by

which my feet are guided, and that is the lamp of experience. I know of no way of judging of the future but by the past."

Based on that forever valid precept, how can we sign a treaty with the Soviets? If the future follows the pattern of the past, the ink will scarcely be dry on any new treaty before the Soviets cheat again.

Massive and repeated Soviet treaty violations have been exhaustively exposed by official U.S. Government agencies. Four reports were issued prior to the Reagan Administration detailing more than 150 international security treaty violations between 1917 and 1964. Seven more reports were issued during the Reagan Administration detailing more than 50 Soviet violations of SALT and other recent arms control treaties.

The Soviets' pattern of cheating is not only consistent but is totally in accord with their political ideology. Lenin warned us: "Promises are like pie crusts — made to be broken."

Stalin was more explicit: "Words must have no relation to actions — otherwise what kind of diplomacy is it? Words are one thing, actions another. Good words are a mask for concealment of bad deeds. Sincere diplomacy is no more possible than dry water or iron wood."

Khrushchev was even more colorful: "If anyone thinks that our smiles mean the abandonment of the teachings of Marx, Engels, and Lenin, he is deceiving himself cruelly. Those who expect this to happen might just as well wait for a shrimp to learn how to whistle."

When the Soviets occupied Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, Poland, Romania, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, East Germany, Albania, Bulgaria, and the other Captive Nations, they violated not only the Atlantic Charter of 1941 and the Kellogg-Briand Pact of 1928, but numerous nonaggression treaties with those individual countries.

At Yalta in 1945, the Soviet Union pledged that Poland would have "free and unfettered elections on the basis of universal suffrage and secret ballot." The Soviets have not yet allowed Poland to have free elections.

At Potsdam in 1945, the Soviet Union promised that U.S. troops would have "free access by air, road, and rail" to Berlin. The Berlin Blockade of 1949 repudiated this agreement.

In one of the most dramatic examples of treaty breaking, the Soviets signed a Joint Declaration of "unity" with Warsaw Pact nations on August 3, 1968. Soviet troops were immediately withdrawn from Czechoslovakia.

Seventeen days later, on August 20, the Soviets carried out a surprise invasion of Czechoslovakia using 650,000 troops, thousands of tanks, armored cars, trucks, artillery, and rocket-launchers. The conclusion is unavoidable that the treaty was just a ruse to prepare for a sneak attack.

The U.S. Government has confirmed ten violations of the 1972 SALT I ABM Treaty, five violations of the 1972 SALT I Interim Agreement, 25 violations of the SALT II Treaty (which we observe even though we never ratified it), 30 violations of the Limited Test Ban Treaty, and multiple violations of the Threshold Test Ban Treaty, the Biological Warfare Convention, the Geneva Protocol on Chemical Weapons, and the Kennedy-Khrushchev Agreement of 1962.

The central provision of the 1972 SALT I ABM Treaty was the agreement by both countries NOT to build an anti-missile defense except for one site. The Soviets placed their

one site in Moscow.

In direct violation of this treaty, the Soviets have built an enormous phased-array radar at Krasnoyarsk in Siberia, and construction has continued even during Gorbachev's much-heralded *glasnost* (openness) and *perestroika* (restructuring). The siting, orientation and capabilities of this radar prove that it directly violates three provisions of the ABM Treaty, and Soviet officials have privately admitted this.

In 1987, both Houses of Congress voted almost unanimously to agree with President Reagan that the Krasnoyarsk radar is a clear violation of the ABM Treaty. The eleven official U.S. Government reports confirming more than 200 Soviet international security treaty violations prove conclusively that we are dealing with a pattern of violations and an arrogance of cheating unmatched in modern times.

Just as a confirmed alcoholic is not cured by being invited to take one more drink, so a confirmed treaty-breaker is not cured by being invited to sign one more treaty.

Who Has the Moral Right to Preach?

Among the several times that Mikhail and Raisa Gorbachev showed their bad manners while in Washington for the recent Summit, the most outrageous was when Gorby declaimed, "What moral right does the United States have to preach to us, to the rest of human society?"

This petulant arrogance apparently snowed some of the media. *Newsweek* led off its cover story about the Summit with a sympathetic report that the "intelligent and charming" Gorbachev is convinced that "the Soviet system is materially and morally superior to capitalism."

Americans should rise up in indignation at this insult. Yes, indeed, America does have the moral right to assume the role of a teacher, and we'll tell you why.

In all recorded history, there never was a great nation that achieved so much individual freedom plus so much material abundance for more people as America has done. America is light years ahead of whatever nation can claim second place.

That's why people from the far corners of the globe want so desperately to come here that they are willing to risk death for the chance to make it to America. They climb over barbed-wire fences, run across mined fields, dodge machine-gunfire, swim through shark-infested waters, spend hungry days in an open, crowded, leaky boat, or endure the underground life of an illegal alien — just for a chance to live in America.

Nobody is trying to get into the Soviet Union, but millions are trying to get out! The Soviets have erected military barricades all along their long border to keep people locked in who are eager to escape, even though they can take with them only the clothes on their backs.

To the question of who has the moral right to preach about human rights, the whole world has voted with its feet. The answer is America!

Americans live in such a free society that it's hard to contemplate what it is like elsewhere. By American standards, even most Western democracies have an oppressively regulated society.

The freedom to practice one's religion, the preeminent individual right, is practically total in America. In the Soviet Union religion is prohibited, proscribed, harassed, and dis-

criminated against in a thousand ways.

The results of individual political, religious, and economic freedom have given Americans a material abundance that has made us the envy of the world. Prosperity is a by-product of freedom.

The monthly wage of the average American worker is \$1,486. That's four and a half times as much as the monthly wage of the average Soviet worker, who earns rubles the equivalent of \$320.

The difference is even more striking when we compare what this wage will buy. The average U.S. worker has to work 4.4 months to buy the least expensive U.S.-made automobile, the Ford Escort, which costs \$6,586. The average Soviet worker has to work two years and 4.2 months to buy the least expensive Soviet automobile, the Zaporozhets.

Under Communist management, the state is "total." The state is the sole employer; it fixes all wages and prices, and determines the quantity and quality of goods to be produced. Education, publications, the arts, sports, entertainment, and recreation are all state monopolies. Internal movement is tightly regulated; external movement is practically prohibited.

In Communist countries, the harvest has a shortfall every year. Soviet farm production requires at least a fourth of the labor force (compared to less than five percent in the United States). Under the Czars, Russia was a grain-exporting nation; under Communism, food imports have increased tenfold over the last decade, and Russia is wholly dependent on the excess production of American farmers.

Only a consuming lust for power would force the Kremlin bosses to continue to regurgitate their failed plans for centrally controlled agriculture rather than allowing expansion of the 3 percent of land in private hands which produces nearly a third of the food. Only a consuming lust for power would force the Kremlin bosses to put twice their percentage of Gross National Product into military weapons than does the United States.

The ruling Soviet Communists have a different value system and, by their own standards, they have been highly successful. They have iron control over their population and their satellites. They have made the Soviet Union into the preeminent military power on land and sea. It is of no consequence to them that the lot of the average woman is to suffer eight abortions without anesthetics and spend literally years of her life standing in long lines for such bare necessities as a head of cabbage and a roll of toilet paper.

For the two and a half decades from 1945 to 1970, the United States enjoyed such massive military superiority over the entire rest of the world combined that we literally could have achieved that elusive goal of world conquest which evil dictators have always sought. We not only could have successfully imposed our military and political objectives on the entire rest of the world, but we could have done so with practically no risk to ourselves.

Yet, we didn't resort to aggression. History affords no other example of a great nation exercising such self-restraint.

But that's only half of the remarkable post-World War II history. We taxed our people to send generous foreign aid to more than a hundred other countries around the globe.

Billions of American taxpayer dollars were doled out, even to people who hate us, and often in ways that were more

preferential than we treat the needy in our own country. More remarkable still, we even built up our enemies, Germany and Japan, whose armies had killed or maimed a million of our finest young men.

While we were sending all those billions in an unprecedented outpouring of generosity to other lands, the Soviet Union was using its power and resources to capture and consolidate its control over every small country along its border.

Yes, indeed, Gorbachev, the America that treated the rest of the world with Marshall Plan generosity is indeed morally superior to the U.S.S.R. that has demonstrated an unbroken record of invasions of small countries from the Baltic States and the Captive Nations in the 1940s to Afghanistan in the 1980s.

Yes, Gorbachev, America is morally superior to the Soviet Union. America has not only the moral right but the duty to preach our message of freedom to the world.

Sagan's Hate America Campaign

Parade magazine recently departed from its generally nonideological Sunday magazine themes to publish a diatribe against the United States by Carl Sagan. Sagan falsely accuses the United States of every sin in the book — of invading other countries on 130 occasions, of being consumed with racism and greed, of a conspiracy of the rich against the poor, and of destroying Canadian forests.

Sagan equates the United States with the Soviet Union. A plague on both your houses is Sagan's thesis, erecting a false parallel between our noble (though unsuccessful) attempt to save South Vietnam and Cambodia from Communism, with the Soviet enslavement of the Captive Nations.

Sagan peddles fear under cover of "science" and falsehood under cover of concern. Sagan is paranoid about what he calls America's "unseen dangers" from transparent gases and invisible radiation that can be understood only by Ph.D.s like himself who give them "careful thought."

In Sagan's hall of horrors, a hundred years from now, the great grain fields of midwest United States will be reduced to "scrub deserts" as a result of carbon dioxide from burning coal which, he says, will raise the temperature of Planet Earth. Surely, the can-do American scientific community can solve this problem, or develop alternatives, before our corn and wheat turn to cactus.

Sagan wants to make countries "agriculturally self-sufficient." He apparently has not grasped the fundamental fact about agricultural self-sufficiency, namely, that it depends on an economic system of private property, plus freedom of the farmers to produce, inventors to invent, and investors to manufacture and sell the marvelous machinery of American agriculture.

Only America has such a system! That's why we are the only country in history that has never had a famine, and why our 2.3 million farms produce far more than our 240 million Americans can consume.

Sagan ridicules what he calls the protestations of both superpowers to "moral rectitude." What he fails to tell his readers is that American morality is constitutionally based on the individual's right to life, liberty and private property, whereas Soviet "morality" is based on subservience to the all-powerful state.

Since Sagan takes the liberty of speculating about the

future, let's take the liberty of speculating about what might have been in the not-so-distant past.

At the end of World War II, the United States had such overwhelming military and nuclear superiority that we could have dictated to, occupied, conquered, or even destroyed any other nation in the world. Instead of using that power for American aggrandizement, we taxed our people to send foreign aid to a hundred other countries. Just imagine, for a moment, how different world geography would have been if the atom bomb had been the exclusive possession of Stalin, or Hitler, or Imperial Japan. It's not a pretty thought.

Sagan's silliness reminds us of one of the Russian jokes that Russians tell to each other. An American visiting in Moscow bragged to a local Russian, "In the United States, we have freedom of speech. I can stand in front of the White House and yell 'To hell with Ronald Reagan.'" To which the Russian replied, "So what! I can stand in front of the Kremlin and yell 'To hell with Ronald Reagan.'"

Carl Sagan would be welcome to peddle his hate America rantings in front of the Kremlin. But you can be sure he won't go there and tell the truth about the Soviet Union.

Paul Nitze: Peace Through Weakness

If President Reagan is to maintain his commitment to his Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI), he needs to have the support of a staff that is loyal to America, to Reagan, and to the goal of building SDI. Paul Nitze fails on all three counts and should not be an adviser to the Reagan or any Republican administration.

The record shows that Nitze has no commitment to maintaining American freedom and independence against an aggressor, no belief in the principle of peace through strength, and he does not support the building of SDI or any system to defend American cities against incoming enemy nuclear missiles.

President Reagan has already been warned by the liberal media. Four years ago, the *New York Times* called Nitze "smart, devious, charming, tough, and fiercely determined to get his way."

And what does Nitze want today? He is working to extend the 1972 ABM Treaty for 7 to 10 years by linking it to any current U.S.-U.S.S.R. treaties. This would mean that we would promise not to build SDI for 15 years, at which time the Soviets would already have fully deployed their own SDI-type defense.

The 80-year-old Nitze is a 30-year advocate of U.S. unilateral disarmament in the face of the Soviet missile threat. He is the author of the peculiar notion of laying down our arms and announcing that the United States will not retaliate even if attacked.

Rejecting "nuclear retaliation" means telling the Soviets in advance that, if they hit us, we will not hit back. That's a step beyond Mutual Assured Destruction; it means Assured U.S. Surrender.

At a National Strategy Seminar at Asilomar, California on April 29, 1960, Paul Nitze carried his unilateral disarmament message to one of the most important gatherings of military strategists ever assembled. He proposed that the United States scrap all "Class A" or counterforce-capable strategic weapons (the weapons that are capable of knocking out Soviet weapons) and retain only systems capable of retaliation.

But that's not all. He advocated giving the trigger on our retaliatory weapons to the United Nations, where they would be controlled by Soviet and Third World enemies.

Specifically, Nitze then urged "(3) that we multilateralize the command of our retaliatory systems by making SAC [our Strategic Air Command] a NATO command, and (4) that we inform the United Nations that NATO will turn over ultimate power of decision on the use of these systems to the General Assembly of the United Nations."

Of course, that would mean that we could never defend ourselves against an aggressor. How could any American advocate such an incredible plan to scrap or surrender all our nuclear weapons?

Nitze presented his rationale by means of an analogy. He said, "In a poker game with several players, what is the most dangerous hand? Not the worst hand, but the second best hand. With the second best hand, one is tempted to follow up the betting, but if one does, one gets clobbered."

In other words, Nitze's plan to scrap our counterforce weapons and turn our retaliatory weapons over to the U.N. was designed to make us so very much weaker than the Soviets that they would never feel the "need" to attack us.

Nitze served the John F. Kennedy Administration first as Secretary of the Navy, and subsequently as Deputy Secretary of Defense. As one of the key policymakers in the Kennedy Administration, Nitze helped implement Defense Secretary Robert McNamara's program of scrapping all the weapons he could, while the Russians scrapped none at all.

The Reagan White House staff and State Department have no business accepting advice from a retread from the Kennedy Administration. Nitze was the leading architect of the discredited policy of peace through weakness which Ronald Reagan so eloquently campaigned against.

Now, Nitze is trying to con President Reagan and George Shultz into making an agreement with the Soviets which would prevent us from building SDI, while the Soviets rush forward with theirs. If Nitze is included in any Summit negotiations, he will arrange a sellout not only of SDI, but of America. We will, indeed, then have the "worst hand" in the nuclear poker game, and our only option will be to surrender to the men in the Kremlin holding all the aces.

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 and a member of the National Security Subcommittee of the 1984 Republican Platform Committee. President Reagan appointed her a member of the Commission on the Bicentennial of the United States Constitution.

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. Postmaster: Address Corrections should be sent to the Phyllis Schlafly Report, Box 618, Alton, Illinois 62002.

Subscription Price: \$15 per year. Extra copies available: 50 cents each; 4 copies \$1; 30 copies \$5; 100 copies \$10.