

# OUR SECURITY

## The Department Of Defense

Gary Allen, a graduate of Stanford University, is author of *Communist Revolution In The Streets*; Richard Nixon: *The Man Behind The Mask*; Nixon's *Palace Guard*; and, *None Dare Call It Conspiracy* — a sensational new best-seller with 6 million copies already in print. Mr. Allen, a former instructor of both history and English, is active in anti-Communist and other humanitarian causes. Now a film writer, author, and journalist, he is a Contributing Editor to AMERICAN OPINION. Gary Allen is also nationally celebrated as a lecturer.

■ THE vast Department of Defense disburses scores of billions annually for the declared purpose of defending 205 million Americans against foreign enemies. As of December 31, 1971, the Department had 2,519,000 men in uniform distributed among the four major services. In addition, it employs another 2,122,000 civilians for a total payroll of 4,641,000. It is an enormous operation, and it needs to be. As a result, it requires inspired leadership and administration.

### Secretary Melvin Laird

When President-elect Nixon began announcing the names of the men who would be filling the key spots in his new Administration, most knowledgeable Conservatives reacted to the proposed appointments with moans and groans. The single bright spot among committed Leftists like Henry Kissinger and Daniel Moynihan, and good grey nobodies like David Kennedy, was Congressman Melvin Laird. Conservatives could barely resist the urge to stand up and cheer.

Melvin Laird's credentials had seemed impeccable. During his years in Congress his voting record was virtually beyond reproach. And he earned the gratitude of Conservatives for having tailored the 1964 Republican platform to fit the candidacy of Barry Goldwater like a handsewn suit. But closer investigation revealed some most disturbing contradictions.

It was columnists Evans and Novak who reported on January 8, 1968, that one of Laird's closest friends is John Gardner, a member of the Establishment *Insiders'* Council on Foreign Relations, and one of the Rockefeller's most energetic advisors. Gardner created and heads a socialist organization known as Common Cause. Funded by the super-rich, it is a powerful lobby promoting collectivism with a sophistication that would have turned Karl Marx pink with envy. Laird had even boosted the radical Gardner as Mr. Nixon's running mate.

Another Laird crony, according to Peter Lisagor in the *Chicago Daily News* of July 11, 1970, is former H.E.W. Secretary Wilbur Cohen. One of the most outspoken Leftists among the Washington bureaucrats, and long the nation's chief proponent of socialized medicine, Cohen is now a top advisor to Nelson Rockefeller. He has quite a record, having affiliated himself with the Washington Committee to Aid China, officially cited as "Communist controlled"; the Washington Committee for Democratic Action, officially cited as "subversive and Communist"; and, the Washington Book Shop Association, officially cited as "subversive and Communist."



Throughout the 1960s, Laird built his credentials as a Conservative on his vociferous opposition to the "no-win" policies of Robert McNamara. But apparently this was also an act, put on for the benefit of the voters in Mr. Laird's Conservative Congressional District. Nationally syndicated columnist Holmes Alexander blew the cover on December 17, 1968, when he revealed:

*In times of stress Defense Secretary Robert McNamara frequently slipped off from the Pentagon, crossed the river and eased himself into the House office suite for a talk with Congressman Melvin Laird.*

*I would not have known about this except for the accident of being in Laird's office one day and of being told that McNamara had been there shortly before. This little-known, almost covert relationship between the past Secretary and the incoming Secretary says a good deal about Mr. Nixon's choice of Laird to run the Defense Department.*

McNamara, a member of the Establishment *Insiders'* Council on Foreign Relations, is now head of the World Bank, another operation smiled upon by the Rockefellers' Chase Manhattan Bank and Standard Oil interests. And, incredibly enough, Laird is himself a political ally of Daddy Oilbucks, having done his best to persuade Rockefeller to enter the 1968 primaries against Richard Nixon. Columnists Evans and Novak inform us that it was Nelson Rockefeller who secured Laird's employment as Nixon's Secretary of Defense.

Had these things been known four years ago, Conservatives would have been less than ecstatic about the appointment of Melvin Laird as Secretary of Defense. They would also be less shocked about his actions since assuming office. It did not, however, take long for Conservative

disillusionment with Laird to develop. Early in the Administration, the generally pro-Nixon *Human Events* observed:

*Contrary to expectations, Defense Secretary Melvin Laird, a hardliner on most military matters, is providing extremely "dovish" counsel to the President on the Viet Nam war. . . . Laird, according to well informed sources, rather than pressing for military victory, is still pushing a soft line on Viet Nam with the new Administration.*

As time passed, Secretary Laird began to coo louder and louder for a Coalition Government with the Communists. The *New York Times* of March 7, 1970, quoted the Defense chief as maintaining: "I would certainly accept a coalition government. . . . I am not one who believes that it is necessarily like putting a fox in a chicken coop." Secretary Laird neglected to cite a single case where the Communist foxes have failed to devour the non-Communist chickens in such a coalition. And there was a good reason for such neglect. The Communists look upon a Coalition Government as a first step toward takeover.

Then there was the matter of Secretary Laird's appointments — which were thoroughly baffling in light of his earlier railings against Robert McNamara and the Whiz Kids. The *Wall Street Journal* observed at the time that Laird "indicated there will be much business-as-usual under his leadership. Three appointees are holdovers from the present [Johnson] Administration, and Mr. Laird stressed the controversial Office of Systems Analysis will continue its 'very important function.'"

In short, Melvin Laird elected to retain Secretary McNamara's Whiz Kid Brigade, long the target of attacks by both himself and Mr. Nixon. Amazed, the *Journal* continued: "Mr. [John] Foster's retention, though previously rumored, seem-



Above, President Richard Nixon and Premier Alexei Kosygin drink a toast to the signing of a nuclear arms agreement, described below, which is designed to freeze U.S. nuclear arms at a level inferior to that assured the Soviets. President Nixon, who as a candidate in 1968 had warned of a security gap created by President Johnson's failure to develop new weapons systems, has himself prevented the production of improved weaponry and has cut America's vital Defense budget by almost \$20 billion. As author Gary Allen observes: "It was in the 1950s that our current strategic weapons — Minuteman, Atlas, and Titan missiles; Polaris submarines; and B-52 bombers — were ordered. If the Soviets were then twenty years behind us, they are about to catch up and, thanks to the Nixon treaty, pull ahead — not because of any Soviet superiority in the arms race, but because Richard Nixon has paralyzed our legs. Incredibly, we are being set up for surrender to blackmail. And, it is part of a continuing plan which extends into every phase of our military preparedness."





ingly contradicts some other Nixon campaign statements. The President frequently complained that the Pentagon's current management has been falling behind in the research race with the Soviet Union, but now has reappointed the man in charge of criticized research and development programs."

"Liberal" pundits, who in the past had described Laird as the reincarnation of Attila the Hun and a pawn of "The Generals," immediately began to cheer him. Columnist Flora Lewis, among the first women to be invited to the inner sanctum of C.F.R. membership, rhapsodized that he is "the doves' secret weapon in the Pentagon." Establishment radical James Reston (C.F.R.) mused of Laird in the *New York Times*:

*He came into the cabinet and the Pentagon with the reputation as a hawk on the Vietnam War and as one of the shrewdest politicians in the Republican Party, and he has been cutting the defense budget ever since.*

*In fact, for the last few months he has been carrying around a pocketful of little plastic cards which he has been handing out to his old friends on Capitol Hill and the press to show the Nixon Administration's trend away from defense spending.*

*The cards show that the defense budget decreased from 89.1 billions in 1968 to 71.8 for 1971 while the outlay for other federal programs has increased from 117 billions to 135 billions.*

Secretary Laird even rates praise as a "secret good guy" from "Liberal" columnist Joseph Kraft (C.F.R.), who hints about the Secretary's motives:

*As the Nixon Administration shapes up its basic foreign and domestic choices for next year, it is*

*increasingly apparent that there is a secret good guy operating behind the scenes. He turns out to be, of all people, Secretary of Defense Melvin Laird. . . . And his role is the more interesting in that, unlike previous defense secretaries, he has well-founded ambitions for the highest office in the land. . . . He did not give up a highly promising career in the Congress just to be saluted as secretary of defense. He has it in him to be the Republican nominee for President in 1976. . . .*

With radicals dancing with each other for joy over the "new" Laird, Conservatives were stunned. *Human Events*, which had formally supported the Nixon candidacy, was especially stung by the reasons given for the cuts:

*Defense Secretary Laird seriously tells the public on TV's Face the Nation show that we are drastically cutting our military budget so we can spend more money on health, education and welfare. . . . \* Laird then steps forward in a wondrous garb that makes him look half hawk, half dove. One day Laird can be heard fiercely bellowing like Mars and issuing ringing declarations about how the Soviets are surpassing us in nuclear weaponry; but the next day he will just as avidly announce heavy cuts in military spending and talk about beating missiles into plowshares.*

Equally frustrated by the duplicity of Secretary of Defense Laird, the *Houston Tribune* commented:

\*The *Chicago Daily News* of July 11, 1970, reports that at a recent banquet Laird and former H.E.W. Secretary Wilbur Cohen "fell into each others arms," and quotes a Laird associate as saying: "You don't have to scratch Mel very deep to discover his heart's still with HEW."



*Of all President Nixon's appointees to the cabinet, former Rep. Melvin R. Laird of Wisconsin was greeted most enthusiastically by conservatives and patriots generally in his post of Secretary of Defense. Now... the fact must be faced that Laird's conduct of his office has been disturbing...*

*But even Laird's strongest supporters are baffled by his advocacy of defense spending reductions at the same time he admits that such a course weakens our defense posture; also at the same time he repeatedly warns that the Russians are forging ahead in offensive weapons.... The reductions, he indicated, were to enable the nation to spend more money on domestic programs. The fact is, however, that of the vast increase in federal spending since the end of the Korean War, the Defense Department is responsible for only one-sixth. Health, Education and Welfare gobbled up most of the increase.*

*Years ago, under McNamara, the status of United States defense became acutely disturbing. It remains so today.*

One is baffled in trying to assess the "new" Laird. But it matters little whether he has been felled by Acton's Disease (whereby "Power tends to corrupt, absolute power corrupts absolutely") or was (as his close friendships with Gardner, Cohen, McNamara, and Rockefeller suggest) a "Liberal" from the very beginning. The fact is that Melvin R. Laird has made a Left turn and hit the accelerator.

Secretary Laird's top aide at Defense, until a year ago, was David Packard. A Rockefeller man, Packard was on record as an outspoken advocate of expanding "trade" with the Soviet Union long before Richard Nixon and Mel Laird tapped him with the imperial scepter. Packard's successor as Deputy Defense Secretary is

Kenneth Rush, former president of Union Carbide. Rush is not a military expert and has few, if any, qualifications for the job — unless one considers as qualifications his membership in the Establishment *Insiders'* Council on Foreign Relations and his position as trustee of its subsidiary, the subversive Foreign Policy Association. Of course, as Ambassador to Germany, Rush did arrange the sellout treaty by which Willy Brandt is formally surrendering occupied Germany to Communist control!

### The Claimed Imbalance

While the American military machine literally is being dismantled, the Soviets are making every attempt to increase their military might.

When President Nixon announced in 1968 that the United States would enter into talks with the U.S.S.R. on the limitation of strategic arms, our country had 1,054 I.C.B.M.s and over 600 long-range bombers. We have since added no more I.C.B.M.s or long-range aircraft. Now, here is the score for the Soviets:

In 1968, the U.S.S.R. claimed to possess a total of 600 I.C.B.M.s, including less than 100 SS-9s, the heaviest missiles said to be in the Soviet arsenal. By the time the first round of SALT (Strategic Arms Limitation Talks) began in late 1969, the Soviets claimed to have a long-range missile force which had bal-



**Defense Secretary  
Melvin Laird  
has made major cuts.**

looned to 1,200 I.C.B.M.s. During the second round in 1970, some 100 more Soviet I.C.B.M.s were said to have been added. Each time America met with the U.S.S.R. during the third, fourth, and fifth rounds, it was claimed that the Soviets added another 100 missiles to



their intercontinental arsenal. By the end of 1971, our own military intelligence reported that the U.S.S.R. had nearly 1,600 I.C.B.M.s, including 300 of the giant SS-9s.

Thus, while the American public was being told by President Nixon that the Russians were really "serious" about arms limitations, Mr. Nixon's own military intelligence claimed that the Soviets were actually adding no less than 1,000 I.C.B.M.s to their repertoire while we added nary a one. In just two years the U.S.S.R. reportedly increased its missile force by 266 percent — an increase which is the equivalent of our entire Minuteman force — while we stood still. The SALT show was used by Mr. Nixon to placate the American public and stop our arms deployment while the Communists armed as fast as they were able.

At the start of SALT, the U.S.S.R. was beginning to deploy Y-class submarines, their principal carrier of the S.L.M. (Submarine Launched Missile). At the end of 1970, Secretary of Defense Laird told the House Armed Services Committee that the Russian Navy had "at least 17 such subs operational — capable of launching at least 272 missiles with a range of 1,300 nautical miles." Laird estimated that "the U.S.S.R. could develop an operation force of Y-class submarines by 1974, comparable in size to the current Polaris force." On October 13, 1971, just seven months later, Laird declared that the Soviet fleet of Y-class submarines would match the U.S. Polaris force of forty-one subs "at least a year" earlier than he had originally predicted. The implication is that the Russians now have some 25 Y-class subs, with 400 S.L.M.s, and that they will have 41 or more of these submarines by mid-1973.

Aside from manned bombers, the current Soviet strategic force is generally reported to consist of 1,600 I.C.B.M.s plus 400 S.L.M.s. To this the "authorities" add some 650 Intermediate Range Ballistic Missiles (M.R./I.R.B.M.s), for

which the United States has no operational equivalent. It is claimed that the Soviet M.R./I.R.B.M.s can hit a substantial number of U.S. military installations overseas. In any conflict involving Western Europe or Japan, such missiles would be used by the Soviets as their primary strategic weapon. Thus, if these figures



Secretary McNamara  
had already reduced  
defenses dangerously.

are accurate, the U.S.S.R. possesses today 2,650 strategic missiles against 1,710 U.S. strategic missiles, a numerical superiority of 55 percent.

And, *if the intelligence is correct*, numbers alone do not tell the whole story. The Soviets' 300 SS-9 missiles — each said to pack a 25-megaton warhead in a weapon which makes our one-megaton Minuteman look like a pygmy — are credited with several times the destructive capability of our entire land and sea-based missile force. These weapons, if they do exist, could be used to knock out our Minuteman force and largely preclude a response by the United States to a Soviet attack on our nation.

According to the McNamara philosophy which has pervaded the Kennedy, Johnson, and Nixon Administrations, the Russians would strive to acquire only parity with the United States, and would not be so gauche as to try to achieve strategic superiority, let alone supremacy. So, the Establishment has not dwelled on the above figures lest they build public distrust of the Soviets and negate the influence of Mr. Nixon's "era of negotiations."

In July 1969, President Nixon appointed a Blue Ribbon Panel to make a thorough study of the Department of Defense and recommend necessary changes. The Panel submitted its major



report in July 1970. During the year's study, seven members of the Panel became so concerned about the deteriorating state of our defenses in relation to claimed Soviet increases in offensive forces that they reserved the right to issue a supplemental report. They stated:

*In the course of the Panel's study during the past year, it became increasingly clear to the undersigned that if... observable trends continue the United States will become... incapable of assuring the future security and freedom of its people.*

To date this supplemental report, submitted in early October of 1970 and not officially released until after a six-months' delay, has not even been commented upon by the Administration.

The President's own Blue Ribbon Panel reported: "The situation which our country faces is without precedent... Within the span of two decades we have moved from complete security to perilous insecurity." The Panel warned that if this continues: "The United States will become a 'second rate' power subordinate to manifest Soviet military superiority. In that case, the world order of the future will bear a Soviet trademark, with all peoples upon whom it is imprinted suffering Communist repressions."

The Panel closed its report with these words: "The most ominous danger of being second rate in the nuclear age is that it multiplies the chances — not of peace — but of nuclear war... The road to peace has never been through appeasement, unilateral disarmament or negotiation from weakness. The entire recorded history of mankind is precisely to the contrary. Among the great nations, only the strong survive."

#### How Much Is Bluff?

Do the Soviets really possess the enormous military might claimed for them by

the "experts"? We do not pretend to know. But, at the risk of being accused of being against fright-peddling, we must emphasize that we doubt it. We certainly do not quarrel with the sincerity of many of those who express concern about the reported military ascendancy of the Soviet Union over the United States. However, we think they are being victimized by a gigantic, though terribly important, strategic hoax.

We find it difficult to believe that a nation which cannot even produce a ball-point pen could produce, for example, the incredibly sophisticated guidance systems required to pinpoint an I.C.B.M. on a target thousands of miles away. We grant that it could be argued plausibly that the Russians might not be interested in producing ball-point pens for consumers, but intensely interested in being able to lob a missile onto Pennsylvania Avenue. On the other hand, we note that in Vietnam the very latest in Soviet ground-to-air missilery has yet to bring down a single American B-52 — a capacity we have been assured they have had for over a decade!

It is especially significant that the Soviets seem to be able to produce very little without aid from the West. The Hoover Institute's Antony Sutton, doubtless the non-Communist world's foremost expert on Soviet economy, technology, and military capability, writes:

*I have no hesitation in stating, on the basis of my research findings, that the ability of the Soviets to present any credible threat at all to the United States, to push its influence into the Mediterranean, the Caribbean and the Indian Ocean, is only possible because of our past and present technical assistance. While this statement has been supported with precise technical detail in my work, the fundamental and critical nature of our assistance has not been made*



known by successive Administrations to the Congress and to the American public. Indeed, all Administration public statements have been to the contrary — i.e., to the effect that we do not provide assistance to the Soviet military-industrial complex.

In other words, what the Soviets have of technical capacity has been systematically given to them by the West. It is American technology which has built the Soviets into a credible threat. If this is allowed to continue long enough, we will turn the backward Soviet Union into a real threat. In the meantime, however, the Soviets come to us and ask us to build for them a giant truck factory on the Kama River. Unlike ball-point pens, trucks are a comparatively simple, yet fundamental, component of any war machine. Western nations were mass producing trucks during World War I, yet the Soviets are still unable to master such technology over fifty years later. And trucks are much less complicated than inertial guidance systems.

One thing we know for sure: The Soviet space program, a reflection of military missilery, is largely a fraud. Lloyd Mallan demonstrated this beyond reasonable doubt several years ago in his carefully documented book, *The Soviet Space Hoax*.

Now we have even more conclusive evidence. Leonid Vladimirov, a Soviet space scientist who defected in 1966 and now lives in England, recently published a book in Britain entitled *The Russian Space Bluff*. The Associated Press quotes Vladimirov as revealing that "Moscow's space program is a gigantic bluff covering bad workmanship and technical inadequacy." Mr. Vladimirov blames the failure of the Soviet space program on political meddling and frustration inherent in totalitarian bureaucracies. The Russian scientist is astounded at the gullibility of the Americans in swallowing whole the

fakery of Communist space propaganda, noting that the Russian space programs began as a series of publicity stunts. "Russia knew a long time ago," says the scientist, "that she could not beat America to the moon because she cannot build a moon rocket."

And remember that the American space and missile industry is largely based upon incredibly sophisticated computers which perform in a few seconds calculations that would require hundreds of thousands of man-hours. Consider how many of these calculations are required to build, launch, and control a large rocket. Consider that the Russians have failed to produce third-generation computers and are trying desperately to get us to sell them ours. Consider that early this year *U.S. News & World Report* carried a picture of a Soviet space laboratory in the foreground of which is a row of abacuses. Consider trying to calculate tens of thousands of parabolic curves (or whatever) on an abacus. Consider that a space program



Admiral Moorer of Joint Chiefs warns Laird.

and a missile program are intimately related. Consider that Russia's alleged military might may be as big a myth as its alleged space exploits. Consider that, just as with space, it would be in the interest of Soviet military intelligence deliberately to leak phony information to the West about nonexistent super weapons.

Then, again, consider that maybe the Communists have *part* of what they claim they have. *Quien sabe?*

But these are not matters over which prudent nations take risks. And, America is definitely taking unnecessary risks.



From the point of view of the Communists, what is important is not whether they have 300 SS-9s, but whether Americans can be led to believe the Russians have 300 SS-9s. While one can argue effectively that the Soviets are working to develop "first strike capability," it makes more sense to assume that the Communists want to take America in peace, not pieces. Blackmailing your wealthy adversary is more profitable than killing him. We believe that blackmail, not nuclear holocaust, is the name of the game. It is the threat of "nuclear holocaust" that makes the blackmail possible.

It must be admitted that for some time most of our Establishment media have bent over backwards to avoid playing up the Soviet military threat. This can be ascribed in part to the knee-jerk commitment of our "Liberals" to speak no ill of the kindly Communists. Of late, however, the *New York Times* and *Life* magazine have indeed been trumpeting about vast Communist armaments. One should beware. When the time comes for the Soviet arm of the *Insider* conspiracy to blackmail Americans into surrender to a Communist-controlled New World Order under the United Nations, one can bet one's last gold sovereign that the whole of the Left will suddenly become aware of the mighty Soviet military machine.

You can be sure that the mass media will then make it seem that matching the American defense force against the Soviets will be like pitting a disarmed Italian brigade, led by a befuddled Polish private, against the hordes of Genghis Khan.

#### **Outright Sabotage**

While we cannot be absolutely sure of the military strength of the U.S.S.R., we can be certain that American military strength is deteriorating. We can also be sure that this is not an accident, and that we need unquestioned military superiority over the Communists to avoid being blackmailed.

Richard Nixon, while campaigning for the Presidency, was very specific about the crucial importance of America having absolute military superiority over the Communists. Candidate Nixon told a New York audience in January of 1968:

*Seven years ago . . . there was no question about our power . . . Today, that power which was at least 6 or 7 to 1 in our favor has been reduced to 2½ to 1 in terms of deliverable nuclear capability. Unless there is new leadership, and a change of policy, within two or three years the Soviet Union will equal us in nuclear capabilities, and will then pass us — unless we do something about it.*

In his 1968 campaign book, *Nixon On The Issues*, Candidate Nixon declared:

*. . . in recent years our country has followed policies which now threaten to make America second best both in numbers and quality of major weapons. That is why I charge the opposition with creating a security gap for America . . . I intend to restore our objective of clear-cut military superiority . . .*

While on the campaign trail, Candidate Nixon told his audiences: "Second best is not good enough when the defense of the United States is at stake." Repeatedly, while stumping the hustings, he raked the Kennedy-Johnson Administrations for their incredibly "mistaken" defense policies, as when he told a C.B.S. audience on October 19, 1968: "When President Eisenhower left office, the United States held a massive advantage in strategic nuclear power . . . But under the short-sighted defense policies of the present Administration, that advantage has been dissipated . . ."

Candidate Nixon spelled out the con-



sequences of not having unquestioned military superiority:

*If we allow our superior strength to become second best — if we let those who threaten world peace outpace us — in time we will generate tensions which could lead to war. . . . The hard truth is this: the present state of our defenses is too close to peril point, and our future prospects are in some respects downright alarming. We have a gravely serious security gap.*

As his fast-paced campaign neared its climax, Richard Nixon stressed the necessity of military superiority if we were to negotiate with the Russians, stating:

*At this time I do not believe that the United States can afford to accept the concept of parity with the Soviet Union. I believe that we face a . . . potentially dangerous situation. . . . I do not mean that the United States maintain superiority for the purpose of threatening anybody or waging war. I do mean that, as you look at today's world, the Soviet Union's goal in the world is somewhat different than ours, strikingly different. They are still in an expansionist stage. Our goal in the world is defensive, to keep the peace.*

Incredibly, only seven days after his inauguration, Mr. Nixon repudiated his oft-spoken promises about military superiority. The retired generals and admirals who had advised Nixon during the campaign, and prepared his defense positions for him, found themselves out in the cold — totally isolated from the President. They were discarded like wilted roses after the ball. A new flower had taken their place, and had no desire to share the limelight. This new rose, whose name had never been mentioned during the cam-

paign, was Henry Kissinger. Conservatives claim that he would not smell sweet by any name.

Kissinger immediately announced a rejection of the concept of military superiority and substituted a concept which the new Wizards of Washington dubbed "sufficiency." Mr. Nixon told a news conference on January 27, 1969:

*I would say that in regard to Dr. Kissinger's suggestion as to "sufficiency," that that would certainly meet my guideline. . . . I think "sufficiency" is a better term, actually, than either "superiority" or "parity."*

Many Republicans have attempted to rationalize the demise of Richard Nixon's professed Conservatism by blaming Kissinger and attributing to him evil powers to cloud men's minds. But it strains credulity to believe that in one week even Kissinger could reverse Mr. Nixon's outspoken formal commitment to military superiority if that commitment had ever been genuine. Wags in Washington began to speculate that the motto on the coat of arms of the Nixon family means, "Be Sincere, Whether You Mean It Or Not."

The Nixon Administration has used the "sufficiency" doctrine to rationalize potential Russian superiority in atomic arms under the hoary "Liberal" theory of "overkill" — by which it is argued that if we have sufficient power to destroy the Soviet Union, it matters not how much capability the Russians have. This overlooks the fact that we have foresworn a first strike, so that our capability must be measured in terms of our ability to absorb a Communist strike and then retaliate. It means our one-megaton Minutemen would have to survive hits from the vaunted 25-megaton SS-9s, about which we are told endlessly by the intelligence "experts." Common sense infers that true nuclear "sufficiency" requires missile and megatonnage far su-



perior to that with which the Soviets are credited.

### We Are Being Disarmed

While the quantity and quality of Soviet arms are open to considerable question, the fact that we are deliberately disarming is not. As M. Stanton Evans, editor of the *Indianapolis News* and author of numerous books on defense and disarmament, writes:

*The Republicans inherited a set of surrealistic axioms about the need to "reassure" the Kremlin; it was reasonable to suppose a President acclaimed for anti-Communism would jettison these. Instead, they have been confirmed.*

*The deterioration of U.S. defenses since the early 1960s has not been an accident. Cutbacks in our manned bomber force and slowdown in the development of our missile technology, particularly antimissile defenses, have been the result of design. Under defense chief Robert McNamara, the idea became established that we should limit our forces to placate Moscow, and that in pursuit of this goal we should go so far as to inhibit defenses protecting our population from enemy attack.*

Since Robert McNamara, a member of the Establishment *Insiders'* Council on Foreign Relations, was as Secretary of Defense a favorite target of Republicans in general and Richard Nixon in particular, it is more than ironic that his policies should be permitted to bear bitter fruit during a Republican Administration. Mr. Evans continues:

*In other words, the United States should avoid developing a defensive weapon whose only purpose is to prevent the annihilation of millions of our citizens because*

*such a measure would interfere with the dream of disarmament. Our population must be left hostage to potential destruction to avoid giving provocation to the enemy. In their further modulations, such notions were carried to the point of contending that we should simultaneously reduce our ability to monitor the movement of enemy forces and to inflict damage on the USSR. All of which had the additional alleged benefit of keeping Americans in a state of terror and therefore receptive to the idea of disarmament.*

*It is distressing to note that the Nixon Administration, which was elected at least in part to correct such baneful conceptions, has instead been perpetuating them. This is clearly indicated by the Nixon stance on ABM, which has been formulated exactly along lines of disarmament lobby reasoning: defense for strategic forces, but no defense for population. The President in his March 14, 1969, statement announcing replacement of the Johnson Sentinel program with the Safeguard system stressed that we were forsaking population defense and that Safeguard was therefore "not provocative."*

Once Mr. Nixon announced that we would enter the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks with the Soviets, this was used as an excuse for not developing any new weapons systems which might prove "provocative" or "de-stabilizing." This despite the fact that McNamara had scrapped three-fourths of our multi-megaton missiles — 149 Atlas and Titan I missiles; all our intermediate and medium-range missiles based in Europe and Turkey; three-fourths of our strategic bombers — 30 B-52s, 1,400 B-47s, and 600 carrier heavy-attack bombers which were stripped of their nuclear weapons;



the 24-megaton bomb, our largest weapon; our airborne alert; 23 anti-bomber missile batteries (Nike-Hercules); and, our missile and bomber bases close to Soviet borders in Turkey, Italy, North Africa, and England.

Here are the Class A nuclear weapon systems which the disarmers abandoned or refused to build: the second thousand Minuteman missiles which had originally been scheduled; an advanced supersonic strategic bomber which was actually built and successfully flown as early as 1965; an advanced bomber interceptor; the Skybolt air-to-surface long-range missile; space weapons such as the Pluto, Dynasoar, and Orion; and, all plans to make our missiles mobile by putting them on surface ships and freight trains.

If Mr. Nixon had really wanted to deal with the Russians from strength at the SALT talks, he would have begun a no-holds-barred spree to develop and produce new strategic weapons. What kind of bargaining position are you in if you keep your deuces and throw away your aces? But, despite all the campaign promises and the formal commitments of the G.O.P. Party Platform,\* the Nixon Administration refused to push production of a single new weapons system.

The Nixon Administration has done nothing to alter the disastrous course of nuclear disarmament carried out for seven years by McNamara and his band of Whiz Kids. The Nixon Administration made no move to build new weapons, more missiles, more nuclear-armed submarines, any surface-to-surface missile ships, or to support production of an advanced strategic bomber. The Nixon Safeguard A.B.M. (Anti-Ballistic Missile) System called for only two A.B.M. sites — which is ten less than the dozen ordered by Lyndon Johnson. Regardless of whether Russia possesses the super weapons she is reported

to possess, if Nixon continues to disarm *à la* McNamara, some future Paul Revere may have to shout, "The Guatemalans are coming!"

Already President Nixon has signed at Moscow an arms limitation treaty designed to freeze America's key nuclear arms and insuring, by formal commitment, a Soviet nuclear superiority. We are to give up the right to protect ourselves effectively, and they are to be assured the opportunity to go right on building arms until they are stronger than we are — however long it takes. Here is how Congressman John Ashbrook described the Nixon treaty in a speech reproduced in *Human Events* for June 3, 1972:

● *We would have to scrap two of the three ABM sites now under construction. The Soviets would have to scrap none of their ABM launchers, and in fact could double what they already have.*

● *We could add only three Polaris submarines to our present total of 41. The Soviets could add 42 Polaris-type subs to the present deployed total of 25. A 5-to-3 U.S. lead would become a 3-2 Soviet lead.*

● *We could neither add to nor expand the size of our land-based missiles, which now number 1,054. The Soviets could keep 1,400 of their land-based missiles, and over 1,600 if they fail to exercise their submarine option.*

● *They could replace their already gigantic Scarp (SS-9) missile with a larger and still unnamed missile now being tested. According to the estimate of Sen. Henry Jackson, a leading defense expert in Congress, a single one of these new missiles would have more destructive power (50 megatons) than 25 of our largest missiles.*

*As Sen. Jackson pointed out, 300 missiles of this immense size*

\*Some day soon, columnist Jack Anderson may release the 1968 Republican Party Platform, one of the great suppressed documents of our time.



*could have only one purpose: the destruction of our entire Minuteman force in a first-strike attack. While the Soviets are installing 100 of these 50-megaton missiles, we will not be able to replace a single one of our own [one-megaton missiles].*

*The facts are clear. They have not been seriously contested. Under this agreement, the United States would be locked into a nuclear inferiority that will almost certainly be permanent.*

Whether the Soviets have all that Senator Jackson claims is not relevant. The Nixon treaty assures that we sit idly by while they develop the capacity to destroy us — however long it takes.

Richard Nixon has adopted the policy of "speak softly and throw away the sticks." Even Secretary Laird admits:

*We have been in a period of almost moratorium since 1967 on new strategic weapons deployment. That was the time that the last Polaris went forward; that was the time that the last of the Minutemen deployments were approved. We have not come forward with any new bombers. I think we can characterize the Soviet activity as momentum; our activity has been almost moratorium.*

That moratorium has now been formalized by the Nixon treaty!

It was in the 1950s that our current strategic weapons — Minuteman, Atlas, and Titan missiles; Polaris submarines; and B-52 bombers — were ordered. If the Soviets were then twenty years behind us, they are about to catch up and, thanks to the Nixon treaty, pull ahead — not because of any Soviet superiority in the arms race, but because Richard Nixon has paralyzed our legs. Incredibly, we are being set up for surrender to blackmail.

And, it is part of a continuing plan which extends into every phase of our military preparedness.

According to *U.S. News & World Report* for October 11, 1971, under the Nixon Administration contracts for airframes are down 20 percent, aircraft engines are down 44 percent, other aircraft equipment down 23 percent, missiles and space systems down 6 percent, tanks and combat vehicles down 24 percent, truck and noncombat vehicles down 45 percent, rifles, artillery and weapons down 54 percent, ammunition down 52 percent, electronic communication equip-



**David Packard**  
said Nixon refused  
to improve M.I.R.V.

ment down 15 percent, and all other military goods down 28 percent. All of this is measured in dollars expended, and does not allow for the 20 percent inflation during the Nixon years. And it has been done despite continuing depletion of military supplies resulting from the Vietnam War.

Since American mothers can never hope to outproduce the Communist world in baby boys, our hope for survival lies in our technological superiority. America has more scientific and technical ability than the rest of the world combined, and that ability should be the keystone of our defense. But words and blueprints cannot defend us against the Communists. Only military superiority can do that.

One of the main tricks of the disarmers has been to spend vast amounts of money on developing a weapons system and then cancel the project before actual production begins — a few years after which the Soviets are credited with producing hardware suspiciously like what our best scientists have "needlessly" de-



signed. Over the past eighteen years, \$10.8 billion worth of research and development have gone down the drain as eighty-two separate weapons systems were cancelled.

New research and development is vital to maintaining our lead. But the Nixon Administration actually fought an amendment by Senator James Buckley to spend \$42 million on research and development to expand the range of our comparatively tiny Minuteman missiles and improve the accuracy of our principal strategic missiles, the land-based Minuteman III and the sea-based Poseidon. Laird's Defense Department lobbied ardently against the Buckley amendment, darkly suggesting that it might "be construed by the Soviets" as giving the United States a "first strike" capability and "might provide an incentive for the Soviets to strike first." Think about the implications of such arguments.

Assistant Secretary of Defense David Packard admitted without apology to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee:

*The small size of the MIRVed warheads resulted in a lower capability of our forces to destroy Soviet retaliation forces than could otherwise have been the case.... this administration made a deliberate decision not to improve the accuracy of our MIRV....*

How many votes would Richard Nixon have received in 1968 if he had campaigned on a platform which said we mustn't offend the Russians by deliberately increasing the accuracy and size of our missiles? The Nixon Administration has even refused to "harden" our missile silos against attack, on the preposterous theory that doing so would provoke the Soviets.

Laird's Defense Department has tried to give the impression that M.I.R.V.ing the Minuteman — providing it with the independently-targetable multiple warheads — is a Nixon accomplishment.

M.I.R.V.ing is not a Nixon project, but a McNamara plan. It does not add a single missile launcher to our strategic forces. And the M.I.R.V. project cuts our megatonnage drastically because the M.I.R.V.ed missiles can carry only a fraction of the megatonnage of our earlier missiles.

The Nixon Administration has also tried to treat the M.I.R.V.ing of the Polaris submarines as a new development, but the Polaris-based Poseidon is not a new weapon or an additional weapon. It is merely a modernization of the earlier Polaris missile. The "conversion" project is not a Nixon project, but a McNamara project to reduce megatonnage.

The Nixon Administration has budgeted some funds for the development of the B-1 bomber. However, no money has been sought to go into production with the highly advanced intercontinental bomber which, in any case, cannot be made operational until 1978. Meanwhile, as military expert Robert Heintz observes:

*The Air Force today is slowly ceasing to be a flying service. The Army, illogically perhaps, has more aircraft in commission than the Air Force. The Air Force now flies only 42 percent of the number of planes it had in 1956: then, it had 26,760; today, it has only 11,000.*

More than half of the nation's strategic nuclear punch is still carried by the 400 (down from 742) aging B-52s designed in the 1940s and put into production in 1952. These twenty-year-old bombers, while hardly in the Wright Brothers class, are nevertheless ancient as far as modern military weapons are concerned. According to *U.S. News & World Report* for December 27, 1971, "Pilots and mechanics say the B-52s are gradually being 'shaken apart'.... Patches are visible on wings and other surfaces. On some B-52s, a metal 'girdle' has been riveted on both



sides of the fuselage to keep it from falling apart."

Still, Nixondom has not committed itself to *building* a replacement. Most military experts believe that a modern bomber with large and accurate air-to-ground missiles such as Skybolt (killed by McNamara and not resurrected by Nixon) are among the most impervious to attack of all strategic weapons. As one Air Force general put it: "The B-1 is about 18 years behind schedule." The Air Force's only other "strategic" bomber is the small FB-111, the infamous T.F.X. known as McNamara's "Flying Edsel."

In addition, our non-strategic air forces are suffering the pangs of aging from their ten-year stint in Vietnam, and we have not built a really new fighter plane since 1955.

Certainly our air defense system is not one conducive to promoting sound sleep. A defecting Cuban pilot flew a MIG-17 fighter to a Florida air base in 1969, and a Russian-built transport flew from Havana to New Orleans last year. How were these unannounced flights made without triggering an air defense alert? Representative F. Edward Hébert, Chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, now provides the answer: There is virtually no air defense system along our southern border and the Gulf of Mexico. And the commander of the North American Air Defense Command has told the House Armed Services Committee that the radar screen protecting the north, east, and west approaches to North America is completely vulnerable to a low-level

\*It should be kept in mind that sixty-six of the seventy-six raw materials on our strategic stockpile list are imported wholly or in part. The United States has no significant domestic production of chrome (for jet engines), cobalt (high strength alloys), manganese (steel), thorium (critical in space and military programs), or zircon (vital to our nuclear programs), to mention just a few of the critical materials which we must bring in by sea. If the Soviets control the oceans, we will be denied these resources.

bomber attack. Our radar coverage is ineffective below 2,000 feet.

Admiral Thomas Moorer, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, has testified that "In the past 10 years, the air defense of the North American continent has been reduced approximately 60 percent." Nonetheless, the Nixon Administration is still cutting back our radar coverage!

Meanwhile, our Navy urgently needs crash development of sophisticated missiles and bombs to defend itself against the growing number of enemy ships; it needs vastly improved techniques in anti-submarine warfare; electronic interception systems to protect surface ships against Soviet missiles; development of high-speed surface ships; and, a new fighter to replace the aging Phantom.

During the 1968 campaign, Richard Nixon accurately described the plight of the U.S. Navy. He stated:

*Two-thirds of the Navy's tonnage now afloat was designed during World War II to meet the conditions of that time. The replacement needs of the United States Navy are so great that last year the Secretary of the Navy stated that the Navy needs to build a ship each week for the next 10 years just to keep up.*

Four years later the catching up has not yet begun.

Since 1965, the strength of the U.S. Navy has been reduced by 25 percent of its ships, 20 percent of its combat aircraft, and 7 percent of its total uniformed and civilian personnel. While the Soviet fleet has been expanding by the proverbial leaps and bounds, our Navy has been literally starving for want of shipbuilding and weapons funds. In the last two years alone, the U.S. fleet has been reduced from 900 to 700 ships, so that our Navy in 1971 had the same number of ships in commission as it did in 1936.\* Admiral Hyman Rickover testified in 1971:



*In almost all respects the position of the United States as a naval and maritime power has continued to decline from what it was a year ago. The United States is weaker, and our weakness is the world's danger.*

The responsibility rests with Richard Nixon.

#### About That Responsibility

President Nixon boasts that his new Budget "for the first time, allocates more money to the Department of Health, Education and Welfare than to the Department of Defense." In other words, we are now spending more for socialism than for defense — and Mr. Nixon is proud of it.

When Richard Nixon assumed office, Defense spending was \$89 billion. It is now approximately \$70 billion despite the fact that we have had a nearly 20 percent inflation in the intervening years. The President has boasted that "Reduction in defense spending gives us more room in the federal budget to meet human needs at home. It makes it possible to build a much more enduring prosperity in this country." That makes you feel safe, doesn't it?

*Aviation Week & Space Technology* informs us that Defense Department contracts stood at \$42 billion in fiscal 1969, were cut to \$36 billion in 1970, and were pushed back by Mr. Nixon to \$34 billion in fiscal 1971. Manpower costs now absorb nearly two-thirds of the Defense budget when related costs such as housing, recruiting, and the like are included. In 1964, the payroll took only 43.5 percent of the budget. This means that less than 10 percent of the 1972 defense funds will go toward our strategic forces. In terms of 1972 constant dollars we will be spending one-half as much on our strategic forces as we did a decade ago. In fact, this year we will spend considerably more on federal aid to education than we

will on the strategic forces needed to assure our survival.

The *San Diego Union* of March 27, 1972, notes that "In the new budget, defense accounts for only 32 percent of total federal spending [as compared with 65.8 percent in 1952] — the lowest percentage in 23 years — while spending for welfare, education, the environment and other 'human resources' programs accounts for fully 45 percent. The defense outlay also would represent a 22-year low in the portion of our gross national product devoted to national security — 6.4 percent."

In short, we don't have a Defense budget, we have a \$70 billion slush fund.

The United States has 781,000 troops stationed around the world because our country is committed to defending forty-two nations through treaties and nineteen other countries by other agreements. At the same time, we give foreign aid and export increasing amounts of technology, food, and sophisticated technical equipment to Communist nations — all of which makes them a bigger threat to the sixty-one countries we are committed to defend. By the time you read this, President Nixon, who promised to stop aid and trade with the Communist nations, but instead has multiplied it by a factor of ten, will have arranged to export our technology to the Communists on Export-Import Bank credits — credits you guarantee with your taxes. We spend \$70 billion a year allegedly to defend ourselves from an enemy we are systematically building up to destroy us. It does not seem to make sense, does it? It does if you are an *Insider* and your goal is a monolithic World Government.

Recently the G.O.P. issued a document titled "The Republican Goal: Peace With A Chance To Survive." That title says it all. Most Americans who put their X's beside the name of Richard Nixon in 1968 did so because they believed they were casting their ballot for survival — with a chance for peace. ■ ■