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The United States' military forces in 1979 will total $126 billion, or 40 percent of all federal spending. This fallout is due, in part, to the Cold War battle of deterrence, a nuclear arms race that has built up the military might of the Soviet Union and the United States, and continues to require this level of spending for the foreseeable future.

The authors outline major cuts in the strategic forces. US, land-based ICBMs (Minutemen) will soon be vulnerable to increasingly accurate, short-range Soviet missiles. The US should seek to reduce its nuclear forces, the authors argue, because arms control agreements, if and when they succeed, will most likely result in a world with a smaller number of nuclear weapons.

The authors raise the question of what the United States should do with the money it spends on the military. They argue that the United States could use this money to improve its own economy and to address pressing domestic issues. The authors suggest that the United States should focus on improving its infrastructure, investing in education and healthcare, and addressing social and economic inequalities.

The authors also warn that the United States should be cautious in its approach to arms control negotiations. They argue that arms control agreements should not be viewed as a way to completely eliminate nuclear weapons, but rather as a way to reduce the number of nuclear weapons and increase stability in the world.

The authors' views are in line with those of other experts in the field, who argue that the United States should focus on reducing its nuclear forces and addressing pressing domestic issues. The authors' view is also supported by the fact that the United States is already spending billions of dollars on the military, and there may be better ways to use this money to improve the country's economy and address pressing domestic issues.