FROM: Phyllis Schlafly

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

RELEASE: OCTOBER 30, 1984

CIVIL DEFENSE NEEDED

Common contemporary wisdom is that, (a) if the Soviets push the nuclear button and we retaliate, there will be no winners and the world's population will be destroyed, and (b) therefore, nuclear war can be avoided by a mutual fear of the horror of it all.

The validity of this proposition does not depend only on its being true; its validity depends on the Soviets' believing it is true. The key element is that both sides must fear the horror. In other words, in the first paragraph above, the truth of (a) absolutely depends on the word "mutual" in (b).

Do the Soviets believe that nuclear war will destroy their country? There is no evidence that they do; and there is much evidence that they are planning on fighting, surviving and winning a nuclear war.

That's why the Soviets have a massive civil defense system. It is a key element in their military strategy for surviving a retaliatory strike by the United States and then rebuilding their country.

According to a Heritage Foundation study, Soviet civil defense has three objectives: (1) to protect the Soviet bosses, essential workers, and the general population from nuclear destruction, (2) to protect their economic production after nuclear attack, and (3) to sustain the population after a nuclear attack and ensure national recovery.

To achieve these objectives, the Soviets have built 15,000 blast and fallout shelters, of which 1,500 are hardened and situated to assure the survival of the 175,000 top Party officials. The others are for essential workers. Many are stocked with food, medicine, protective equipment and communications equipment.

The national commitment is tremendous: $2 to $3 billion per year and 100,000 full-time civilian and military personnel. All adults receive 20 hours of civil defense training. Every school, farm, factory, and government unit has its own group.

The Reagan Administration in 1982 announced a seven-year coordinated plan of action with four objectives. It would enhance deterrence and stability, reduce the possibility

that our nation could be the victim of coercion in time of crisis, provide for continuity of government and survival of a substantial portion of our population in the event of attack, and greatly improve our ability to deal with natural disasters and large scale domestic emergencies.

The United States clearly has the technology and the resources to do an impressive job in civil defense <u>if</u> Congress ever gives the executive branch the go-ahead. Food, our greatest production surplus, could easily be stockpiled to ensure adequate short-term supplies for our people in any emergency.

We could go into mass production of a corrugated steel blast shelter at a cost of $200 per protected person for such key personnel as doctors, firemen and policemen. We could construct and/or modernize some 3,000 Emergency Operating Centers equipped with fallout protection, emergency power, food, medical supplies, and a telecommunications network to protect against the electromagnetic effects of nuclear weapons.

Opponents of civil defense argue that such plans are destabilizing or even provocative. Even assuming for the sake of argument that there may be some validity to that charge, our civil defense simply cannot be destabilizing so long as the Soviet system is so extensive and we are so far behind.

Actually, a U.S. "catch-up" civil defense program would be stabilizing, at least until ours equals theirs. It is pathetic that we spent only $169 million on civil defense in 1984.

Critics of civil defense argue that the problems of transportation, communication, evacuation, and distribution are simply too immense for any civil defense program to be practical. That argument of pessimism has now been overtaken by events: the potential of civil defense is very positive because the new defensive technologies, such as High Frontier, can destroy a large percentage of incoming missiles.

Civil defense is the most humanitarian of all forms of defense because it is solely designed to save human lives. It poses no moral or environmental problems. Without it, we are always at risk; with it, we are always protected.

Civil defense should be looked upon like the expense of fire insurance on your home. None of us begrudges the cost of the premiums, even if we never collect on a burned-down house.