

"THE SUREST WAY TO PEACE"

— By —

MRS. PHYLLIS SCHLAFLY

Author of "A Choice Not An Echo"

Alton, Illinois

Presented at the 23rd Annual Meeting of the Association of American Physicians and Surgeons, October 13, 14 and 15, 1966, Anaheim, California.

Thank you very much Dr. Dwyer. Doctors and ladies, it is a very great pleasure to be with you here today. I first learned what doctors can do to save our country and about your fine organization 14 years ago in 1952, when your past President George Hess put on a wonderful meeting at which I spoke in his home town of Bunker Hill, Illinois. I have been an AAPS fan ever since then. Dr. Dwyer and I helped with the formation of a conservative dinner club in St. Louis, and I remember back in 1957 when your Dr. Doenges came to address this club. I know of the great educational influence and the lasting help toward freedom that doctors have exerted in the St. Louis area. I have come to the conclusion that, if the country is going to be saved, it will be by the women and the doctors.

The doctors are a very wonderful group in our society who have made their own way in life. Perhaps they are the last bastion of free enterprise. I wonder if you have heard the joke about the bill signed recently by President Johnson. It is a law to require all future automobiles to have automatic transmission. You see, in the Great Society, no one is going to be permitted to shift for himself.

My Subject today is "The Surest Way to Peace" — more specifically, the defense of our country. Probably the question in the mind of most of you, particularly of the men in this audience, is why do we have a woman (even a woman with small children) talking to us about the subject of national defense? I would like to offer to you my credentials for presuming to speak on this subject traditionally reserved to men.

I began my interest in this field during World War II, when I was a gunner and ballistics technician at the largest ammunition plant in the world, the St. Louis Ordnance Plant. I have continued it ever since. Incidentally, the story of what happened to the St. Louis Ordnance Plant has been a subject of particular interest to me. This was an enormous plant which produced billions of rounds of ammunition in World War II and employed 42,000 people. At the end of the Korean War, it was put on what we call a layaway basis. All the machinery was carefully cleaned and greased and put in perfect condition; like this, it would have kept for 20 years, ready to produce on a day's notice. Then, in 1961, along came Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara. In one of the gigantic giveaways of all times, Secretary McNamara gave this entire plant to India. One of my neighbors in Alton, Illinois was sent to India by the United States Government to supervise the installation of this plant near New Delhi. A special appropriation covered the very expensive task of crating all this machinery and sending it down to New Orleans. Finally it was installed in India, and the plant went into production in the summer of 1965 — just in time for the India-Pakistan war. This was at the very same time that our own boys in Vietnam suffered shortages of that exact type of ammunition. I wonder if it gave comfort to our men in Vietnam to know that the ammunition they should have had was, at that moment, being produced to kill our friends in Pakistan.

Another of my credentials is that I have had the very great privilege during the last few years of working in this field with Admiral Chester Ward, one of our country's leading nuclear strategists. My third credential is that I have no connection in any way with any of the companies which produce any weapons. I have no relatives in these companies; I do not own any stock in these companies; there is absolutely no way I can personally profit from the proposals which I make to you in this matter of defense.

Many of the things I will tell you today, you will not hear from our military men. They simply are not able to say these things. Under the operation of the Fulbright Memorandum, no military man on active duty can tell you anything about the threat of Communism, or the failure of the Ad-

ministration to defend us against it. Even those who are retired cannot depart from a lifetime of obedience to their civilian superiors. Many come to me and say, "We can't say these things, but we are so glad you are saying them, and we wish you well in this effort to save our country in the nuclear age."

When we come to meetings such as this, we hear about many, many problems which face our country. But if we are not able to provide for the survival of our country in a military way, all of these other issues will be purely academic. The country which has superiority in nuclear weapons is the country which is going to control the world. The only way we can make sure that we survive is to make sure that we have more weapons than the enemy. Today we find that America is bogged down in a war with one-half of an undustrialized, underdeveloped country called Vietnam. We have fought there two years, and now we are told that it may take 750,000 men and 3 to 5 years to win. What kind of a state of readiness or preparation are we in, that this is the best we can do against — not a first-rate power, not a second-rate power — but a thirtieth rate nation?

Recently in one of the leading left-wing liberal newspapers of the country, the ST. LOUIS POST-DISPATCH, there was an interesting article by Marquis Childs headlined "Vietnam Overtaxes U.S. Brains." Let me read you the first paragraph. "Part of the cause of this spreading conflict in Vietnam can be placed under the heading of the Brain Drain. The military to one side, the concentration of brains, skill and ability in Southeast Asia has put a strain on half a dozen civilian agencies." I would like to suggest that there is one way to end the "Brain Drain." That is to call in a new team of men who can cope with the task of solving this little war in Vietnam.

A couple of weeks ago, there was an excellent article in U.S. NEWS & WORLD REPORT headlined: "General LeMay Tells How to Win the War in Vietnam." If you haven't read this, you should. It is three or four pages of good common sense about how to win in Vietnam, written by the man who was head of the Strategic Air Command, and then Chief of Staff of the United States Air Force. It is such sound common sense that, after you read it, you cannot help but ask: "Why is it that nobody follows these sound proposals, or similar ones which have been made? Why is it that we have this 'no-win policy' in Vietnam? Why don't we go ahead and win?" We know that the way we are fighting the war today is the most costly way it could possibly be fought — costly in lives and costly in money; and that to go ahead and win quickly would save the lives of many American boys. Then, why don't we do it?

In searching for the answer to this question, I came across a very revealing statement by Secretary of State Dean Rusk, made a few weeks ago when he testified before a Senate Committee. Senator Strom Thurmond was asking why the United States is following this weak-kneed, spineless policy of not winning. Dean Rusk's reply displayed uncharacteristic heat, as the newspapers reported it. This is what he said: "Senator, we can have a great war any five minutes we want it. We can let this action in Vietnam move into a general area that would knock out 300,000,000 people in the first hour. The effort has been to take the action necessary to sustain the peace and prevent a cause of aggression being launched, and, at the same time to prevent us from sliding down the slippery slope into a general-nuclear war."

Let us examine for a few minutes the strategic significance of this answer which was given by Secretary of State Dean Rusk. When you talk about general-nuclear war causing 300 million casualties, there is only one thing you can be possibly talking about, and that is a nuclear exchange between the Soviet Union and the United States. Those are the only two

countries which can wage nuclear war. Of course, we know that the U.S. is not going to attack the Soviets. Therefore, what Secretary Rusk said was: the reason we do not dare to win in Vietnam is because we are afraid that, if we did, the Soviet Union would launch a nuclear attack on the United States. Now, if we can be blackmailed into the position where we don't dare to win in Vietnam, where we send our boys over to be hostages to a "no-win, no-end" policy in Vietnam, because we are afraid of a Soviet nuclear attack, then we can be blackmailed into anything else — including the surrender of our country.

Let us examine the capability of the Soviets to attack the United States with nuclear missiles. In 1963, the men most competent to make such an assessment, the United States Joint Chiefs of Staff, testified before a Senate Committee that the USSR was then ahead of the United States in high-yield technology (that is, in the super-megaton weapons), and that the Moscow Test Ban Treaty would freeze the United States in second place. This was the strongest statement ever made by men in the position to make such a judgment. Nothing has happened since that time to change this evaluation except that the Soviets have continued to build super-megaton weapons at an alarming rate. We know that the Soviets are building enormous nuclear weapons and their average size is 30 megatons. Our principal weapon today is one megaton. We know that the Soviets have the capability of launching an orbital missile. They have displayed it; they have proved that they have the thrust to put it in orbit, and the warhead power to put a tremendous weapon on the end of it. The most authoritative article which has ever appeared on Soviet capabilities, appeared in *FORTUNE* Magazine in February of this year. Even with the restrained writing of *FORTUNE* Magazine, you can appreciate the threat we face: "Any speculation about what's next in the Soviet's space program must consider the probability that the Russians may deploy orbital bombardment vehicles. Passing with their deadly cargo several times a day over the United States, they would add a sobering new factor to nuclear diplomacy."

Yes, it would indeed be sobering if the Soviets put an orbital weapon in space which could hit any target on earth with zero warning. The Soviets have recently concluded very impressive rocket tests in the Pacific theatre. Their rockets demonstrated remarkable accuracy and the most sophisticated kinds of guidance. We know that the Soviets are ahead of us in surveillance; their surveillance vehicles have passed over every county in the United States, whereas ours do not cross over the Soviet Union.

These are just some of the many aspects of Soviet nuclear capability which are available in the public records. In his testimony every year, Secretary McNamara admits that the Soviets have the capability to hit the United States and destroy 149,000,000 Americans. His strategy is based on his opinion that, even though the Soviets have the capability, they are not going to use it. He says it is "unlikely" that they will attack. Do you want to put your hope for "peace" in the judgment of a man whose every major decision, both about Vietnam and in his assessment of the Soviet threat, has been wrong? McNamara started his career as Secretary of Defense by recommending the Bay of Pigs invasion plan. He was wrong about the Soviets sending their missiles into Cuba in 1962. He was wrong about the Soviets' betrayal of the nuclear test ban. McNamara has been wrong in every single decision and prediction in connection with Vietnam. To sum up, McNamara concedes that the Soviets have the capability to destroy 149,000,000 Americans — but he says he is sure they are not going to do it. Do you want to stake your life on his judgment — or wouldn't you rather have a weapons system which can save your life if McNamara is wrong?

The most shocking fact that Americans must face today is the strategic disarmament which has taken place during the last five years of McNamara. Let us look at what has happened to our defense under the McNamara policies. He has scrapped 3/4ths of our strategic bombers — and when I say scrapped, I mean that most of them are sitting out in the desert sun near Tucson, rotting. Then McNamara announced last December that he was going to scrap 2/3rds of our remaining bombers. In May he cancelled the airborne alert, one of the most marvelous of the U.S. defenses against attack.

McNamara gives the impression that he is getting rid of bombers because they are obsolete, and instead concentrating

on missiles. What has been kept very quiet, but which is of extreme significance, is that he has scrapped 3/4ths of our multi-megaton missiles, the so-called big guns in our nuclear arsenal. McNamara is concentrating on weapons of one-megaton in strength, whereas the Soviets are building weapons up to 100 megatons in strength, with an average size of 30 megatons.

Then there is the matter of the overseas bases. Just a few years ago we had important missile and bomber bases in Turkey, Italy, North Africa and other points close to the Soviet Union — and they had none close to us. Today the situation is dramatically reversed. Secretary McNamara has given up all of our overseas missile and bomber bases, and the Soviets have Cuba just 90 miles off our shore.

Consider the wonderful new weapons, developed by American technological genius, which have been cancelled by McNamara. He has cancelled the Skybolt, the Pluto, the B-70, the Dynasoar, Orion, and many others. The most important is that McNamara has adamantly refused to permit the United States to have any anti-missile defense. As *U.S. NEWS & WORLD REPORT* stated a few weeks ago, "The United States, in a world of growing nuclear threats, has no defensive weapon of any kind." When I visited some of the military installations in this country, the officer said: "If the Soviets launch an ICBM attack against us today, we cannot shoot down a single enemy missile." The reason we can't is because Secretary McNamara, and his clique of men whom I call the gravediggers, will not permit us to have an anti-missile defense.

The gravediggers are depending largely on the ignorance of the American people about this subject to get by with their plan to prevent us from having an anti-missile system. Some months ago, the Pentagon ordered the University of Chicago to conduct a secret survey to find out what the American people think about an anti-missile defense. This survey reported that nearly everybody thinks we ought to have a defense against nuclear weapons. This is not surprising. But the sensational result is that the survey showed 66 out of every 100 Americans think we already have an anti-missile defense! In other words, the average American thinks that, after all that money we've been spending on defense, we just might have some defense against enemy missile attack. But the shocking fact is that we have absolutely no defense against any enemy missiles. We are relying on Secretary McNamara's judgment that a nuclear attack is "unlikely," and we are not building the defense which can really protect us if an attack is launched.

American technological genius has developed a marvelous new weapon which can give us the anti-missile defense we need. It is called the Nike X. It has been developed, and thoroughly tested, so that we know it is reliable and ready to go into production. It consists of three parts. First there is MAB, or multi-function array radar, which is what separates the real missile from the decoys. Then there is the Zeus, the long-range missile which goes out into space and kills the enemy missile before it hits us. Finally, there is the Sprint, the short range missile which goes up and kills any enemy missile which might have gotten past Zeus. We have already spent a great sum of money in developing and testing the Nike X, under the direction of General Austin Betts, and it is ready to put into production. This Nike X has been unanimously recommended by the U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff since early 1965. It has the near-unanimous support of the United States Congress. In May of this year, the House Armed Services Committee of 38 members, released a unanimous report which was an across-the-board indictment of the McNamara policies and specifically recommended appropriations to proceed with engineering on the Nike X. When this was presented to the Congress of the United States, it passed the House of Representatives by a vote of 356 to 2, and it passed the Senate by a vote of 81 to 1. But in spite of the fact that this weapon has been unanimously endorsed by the U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff for more than a year, and has received this remarkable unanimity of support in Congress, Secretary McNamara and his clique of gravediggers are determined that we shall not have it. He is refusing to spend the money and is opposing the building of the anti-missile defense we need.

The Nike X is a miraculous new weapon which not only can give us almost sure protection against a nuclear attack

from any enemy, whether it be the Soviet Union or Red China, but it can also solve the war in Vietnam. The reason the Soviets have been unwilling to make peace in Vietnam is that the war is so useful to the Communists in diverting our attention, our men, and our money into building weapons for a so-called conventional war. We are spending enormous sums of money to make ammunition and helicopters, rifles and machine guns, and all the material we need to fight a "little" war. This money has been taken away from our strategic defense budget — the only part of the budget which can insure our survival as a free nation. Our strategic defense budget is down 45%. If we would go ahead with the Nike X, we would show the Soviets that we are no longer being diverted away from our strategic defense. This would solve the war in Vietnam on terms which would be satisfactory and honorable for the United States.

With all the sound arguments in favor of the Nike X, why don't we have it? The answer is that powerful men including Secretary McNamara have overruled the Joint Chiefs of Staff and blocked its production. THE SATURDAY EVENING POST on August 27, after a special interview with McNamara, reported that he is "as steadfastly anti-Nike X as ever." Let us examine the arguments made against it.

1) The first argument advanced against the Nike X is the cost. The Nike X already represents 9 years of research and development effort and an investment of \$2 billion. The cost of the extensive Nike X system necessary to defend our population and weapons against a massive Soviet missile attack would total about \$36.9 billion, according to McNamara's own figures. This would include the entire Nike X anti-missile "package," with a full fallout shelter program, added bomber defenses, and more offensive missile power. Spread over 5 years, the cost of this Nike X "package" would come to \$7.38 billion per year.

This is a big sum of money. But by comparison with the \$30 billion we are now spending per year on Vietnam, Nike X is quite a bargain. It costs the Defense Department \$475,000 for each Viet Cong killed. An anti-missile system would cost only \$430 for each American life saved, or \$86 per year for 5 years. Even on the basis of "cost effectiveness," the Nike X has it; that is, if you consider that saving your life is worth \$86 per year of your tax money. This could be the cheapest life and property insurance you ever bought. The Nike X would be a bargain if it only saves your life once!

Secretary McNamara further argues that Nike X isn't "cost effective" because our "damage-limiting" defensive measures are more costly than enemy offensive weapons. This is a typical egghead argument — full of big words, but lacking in common sense. Just because the arsonist can buy matches and gasoline more cheaply than we can maintain fire departments, this is no reason for us to stop hiring firemen and stop buying fire engines. Just because it costs more to install a burglar alarm system than it does for a robber to buy a gun, this is no reason for our banks to stop taking every precaution to "limit" the damage that criminals can do to our savings.

2) The second reason given by those who oppose the Nike X is that it is "provocative." This is the favorite argument of Dr. Jerome Wiesner and the other gravediggers who met at the White House Conference last December and produced a report urging the U.S. NOT to build an anti-missile defense. The gravedigger argument goes like this: If the U.S. builds an anti-missile defense, it would make the Soviets think we are not peace-loving, and therefore would "provoke" the Soviets into another round in the arms race and just make them more belligerent.

This argument is, of course, just gravedigger doubletalk. A weapon such as a rifle can be offensive or defensive, depending on how it is used. But an anti-missile system is purely defensive; it cannot kill anyone, and could not possibly provoke an enemy. There is nothing any more "provocative" about an anti-missile system than there is about a burglar alarm system. The burglar alarm system is purely defensive, and never goes into action unless and until the burglar is on your premises. Likewise, the Nike X would never go into action until enemy missiles were streaking toward America at speeds up to 18,000 miles per hour.

General Austin Betts, the man who conducted the long

series of tests which proved that the Nike X is reliable, exposed this gravedigger argument by saying that an anti-missile system is no more provocative than putting seat belts in your automobile. Just because you have seat belts installed, this does not mean that you intend to drive down the highway and crash into another car. They are a sensible safety precaution which may save your life. So is the Nike X. And, incidentally, the Nike X will cost you only a little more than the seat belts in your automobile.

The final coup de grace was given to this gravedigger argument when the Soviet Union itself began deploying its own anti-missile system. In other words, the Soviets have themselves already gone this one more round in the arms race — and left the U.S. trailing behind.

3) The third line of argument against the Nike X is the favorite liberal delusion expressed by William C. Foster, Director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. On "Meet the Press" he solemnly said that he believes that a treaty with the Soviets is "better than any anti-ballistic system." Well, I don't. I don't believe that we can put our hope for peace in treaties with the Communists who have broken their pledged word to every country with whom they ever signed a treaty, and who follow Lenin's dictum that "promises are like piecrusts, made to be broken." 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.

Mr. Foster went on to say on "Meet the Press" that if we sign another treaty with the Soviets instead of spending all that money on an anti-missile system, this will "save millions and millions of dollars of economic sources." There is a good example of the liberal mind. Put your faith in treaties with the Communists, take the money away from defense, and spend it instead on the vote-buying projects of the Great Society to socialize our economy.

Instead of following men who have been wrong about the Communists for 25 years, we should heed the advice of our first and greatest President George Washington, who said: "If we desire to secure the peace . . . it must be known that we are at all times ready for war."

4) The fourth argument made against the Nike X is a falsehood put out by those who should know better in order to deceive and frighten the average American citizen who is not knowledgeable in technological matters. It was given wide currency by James Reston, columnist for THE NEW YORK TIMES, who put out the line that an anti-missile system "would require the construction of an immense shelter program in all the populous centers of the nation. Without that, the firing of the anti-missile weapons would contaminate and threaten the lives of our own people."

There is absolutely no basis in fact for these statements. If Reston's statements could be supported, McNamara himself would have used them. The missiles we developed for the Nike X are, for all practical purposes, "clean" and fallout free. They will be exploded so far out in space that there would be no fatal or even serious fallout problem anyway. Fallout shelters are not needed to protect us against Nike X. As McNamara's own statements make clear, the fallout shelters recommended to accompany the Nike X are to protect against any possible enemy missiles which might get through the system.

5) McNamara's final argument against the Nike X, as directly quoted by THE SATURDAY EVENING POST, is this statement: "It is clear that you just cannot win a strategic nuclear war today." What a terrible admission of defeatism and weakness! This is the first time in the history of America that we have had a Secretary of Defense who stated in print that America cannot win a future war. Obviously, if he can't win against the little underdeveloped, unindustrialized country we call North Vietnam, then he isn't likely to be able to win any big war, either. If you had a fire chief who couldn't put out little fires, would you trust him to put out the big ones? The obvious answer is for us to get a new Secretary of Defense who CAN win any time, any place, no matter who the enemy is.

McNamara's argument is full of holes anyway. The U.S. CAN win or deter a strategic nuclear war IF we have the NIKIE X anti-missile. IF we do NOT have it, the Soviets can

win by a surprise sneak attack. Americans should shake themselves out of their complacency and realize that our country needs an anti-missile defense in order to protect against a nuclear attack. Every single committee of Congress which is concerned with defense has been openly critical of the McNamara policy. The House Armed Services Committee said that the building of an anti-missile defense is a matter of "transcendent importance."

Sometimes in history we find that countries prepared themselves to fight the last war, instead of the next one. At the beginning of World War II, France was wonderfully prepared with the Maginot Line — for World War I. But the next war will not be fought with the same weapons as the last. It means nothing that McNamara's weapons are many times stronger than the weapons we used at Hiroshima and Nagasaki. That is utterly irrelevant to the present situation. What we need are the weapons to stay out of any future war.

For your further reading on this subject I recommend THE PENKOVSKIY PAPERS, a remarkable book written by a very high-ranking defector from the Soviet Union; this book describes the Soviet strategy today. General Thomas Power's book, DESIGN FOR SURVIVAL, is extremely important on why we should maintain nuclear superiority; he is the past Commander-in-Chief of our Strategic Air Command. General Arthur Trudeau's speech on the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency has been reprinted by America's Future and is quite valuable. STRIKE FROM SPACE, co-authored by Admiral Chester Ward and myself, is now available in a new edition, which confirms and updates everything in the original book, and also explains in detail our solution for the Vietnam war which I mentioned only briefly today.

Finally, I would like to emphasize the importance of public opinion in the matter of our national defense. Sometimes we feel very helpless in these matters, we wonder what one individual can do for national defense. What happened in 1962 is a wonderful illustration of how American citizens can be effective. You remember that, for several months, there were reports that the Soviets were shipping their missiles into Cuba. This was said on the floor of the Senate and in the press, but the Administration would not believe it. I bet that everybody in this room knew there were missiles in Cuba before the State Department knew it! At that time we were in the middle of a Congressional campaign.

When some of the politicians got out on the campaign trail, they discovered that the American people were very much upset about the missiles in Cuba. Because of this rising tide of public opinion, in the last desperate inch of time, the President decided he had to do something. In response to public demand, what he did was to send a U-2 flight over Cuba. The first U-2 that went over Cuba took a picture and proved that Soviet missiles were really there. At that moment, our Strategic Air Command went on alert and we had 50,000 megatons of nuclear weapons which protected our country with a powerful shield. This, and only this, made Khrushchev pull his missiles off their launching pads in Cuba. We were saved, as General Shoup of the U.S. Marine Corps said, "Only by the grace of God and an aerial photograph." It was only the rising tide of public opinion which literally forced the Administration to take the action which saved us from the "no-warning attack" the Soviets could have launched against us in 1962.

Today, we can do the same thing on the matter of an anti-missile defense, and on the strategic disarmament of our country which has taken place under Secretary McNamara. Since that day in 1962, we have scrapped more than half our nuclear striking power. If the Soviets put missiles back into Cuba, we only have half of what it takes to save our country that we had in 1962. So, I urge you to inform yourself on nuclear weapons, and to work in every possible way to build a rising tide of public opinion in behalf of a strong national defense.

Sometimes our constant battle to save America gets a little discouraging. I know that all you good doctors and your wives have been fighting the good fight for many years. So in conclusion let me tell you this little story.

In the last year it was my privilege to conduct a national American History Essay Contest for the 5th, 6th, 7th and 8th Grades, on the subject of George Washington. Of all the essays I read, the one line that stays with me is the line from a 5th grade pupil in Tennessee. He wrote straight from the heart when he concluded his essay with these words: "I admire George Washington because he never gave up." This is the kind of perseverance in the face of discouragement which made our country great. This is the kind of perseverance and determination which will keep America the greatest land in the world.

Write AAPS for additional copies. One to five without charge; 100 - \$3.00; 200 - \$5.00; 500 - \$10.00; 1,000 - \$17.50.

ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN PHYSICIANS AND SURGEONS • 230 North Michigan Avenue • Chicago, Illinois 60601