FROM: Phyllis Schlafly

68 FAIRMOUNT, ALTON, ILLINOIS 62002 / (618) 462-5415

RELEASE: JANUARY 27, 1984

ARMS CONTROL WITHOUT COMPLIANCE

Although the "emperor who wore no clothes" is an overworked metaphor to describe a false establishment consensus which no one but a child has the temerity to puncture, it certainly is appropriate when it comes to "arms control." That shibboleth is clothed only with a sort of imperial invulnerability; everyone must bow before it before discussing national defense.

It's time for someone to come right out and say that arms control without compliance is a sham; it leaves the United States as naked to the elements as Hans Christian Andersen's emperor. Not only have the Soviets consistently violated all so-called arms control agreements, but they have done it in flagrant disregard of both U.S. reaction and world opinion. Even President Reagan and pro-defense Senators feel a compulsion to aver that arms control is our goal before they advocate any military program.

How can one talk about an arms control agreement as desirable unless we have confidence that the Soviets will abide by its terms? What sense does it make to suffer all the diplomatic gamesmanship if the underlying reality is that the Soviets will violate the agreement promptly, repeatedly, and with immunity from sanctions? Why would the Soviets behave any differently in the future when they have gotten by with blatant violations in the past without any reaction or retaliation from the Americans?

American diplomatic representatives naively go into conferences believing that the bargaining table is a forum where both sides give a little to reach a mutually beneficial compromise. The Soviets, on the other hand, believe that one side must win while the other loses; they seek unilateral advantages at our expense and look upon negotiations as a chance to engage in international posturing against the West.

The Heritage Foundation has just published a long list of Soviet violations of arms control agreements. There is no space in this column to list even half of them, but here are a few of the more significant violations.

Soviet violations of the SALT I ABM Treaty: Deployment of several phased-array

radars in the ABM mode inside the Soviet Union for interior land defense; SAM testing in ABM mode for SAM upgrade; deployment of ABM Battle Management Radars for nationwide defense; ABM camouflage and concealment.

Soviet violations of the SALT I Interim Agreement: Deployment of the SS-20s; deployment of mobile ICBMs; deployment of the heavy SS-19 ICBMs to replace the light SS-11 ICBMs; construction of 68 strategic submarines (only 62 were allowed); keeping several thousand old ICBMs stockpiled for covert soft launch and rapid reload of silos.

Soviet violations of the SALT II Treaty: Development and testing of a second new ICBM, the PL-5; wholesale encryption of data from missile tests; rapid reload/refire exercises for the SS-18 cold-launched ICBMs; and camouflage of new submarines.

Soviet violations of the Threshhold Test Ban Treaty: Over 15 known nuclear tests above 150 kilotons.

Soviet violations of the Biological Weapons Convention: Biological weapons manufacture and storage; the use of chemical weapons in Afghanistan and Laos which has resulted in the deaths of thousands.

The arms control enthusiasts who ignore all of these violations are fond of saying, "Don't worry, our satellites can read an automobile license plate on the ground and report exactly what is going on." But funny thing, U.S. intelligence didn't discover the tons of military equipment that had been off-loaded in Grenada -- until after our Marines landed.

Furthermore, assuming that our intelligence did discover the above massive Soviet violations of the arms control agreements, the question then becomes, why hasn't the United States done something about them? There seems to be a prevailing attitude in Washington that the media would be more upset at our telling the truth about the violations than about the President discussing the violations themselves.

The problem of verification has always been a soft spot in the faith of the arms control enthusiasts, but compliance is a far more important problem. Verification isn't and can't be perfect, but it's good enough to verify a long list of outrageous examples of noncompliance.

The question to ask your Senators and Congressman is, "Are you for arms control with compliance -- or for arms control without compliance?"