

The original documents are located in Box D15, folder “Michigan Rural Teachers Association, Mt. Pleasant, MI, April 17, 1959” of the Ford Congressional Papers: Press Secretary and Speech File at the Gerald R. Ford Presidential Library.

Copyright Notice

The copyright law of the United States (Title 17, United States Code) governs the making of photocopies or other reproductions of copyrighted material. The Council donated to the United States of America his copyrights in all of his unpublished writings in National Archives collections. Works prepared by U.S. Government employees as part of their official duties are in the public domain. The copyrights to materials written by other individuals or organizations are presumed to remain with them. If you think any of the information displayed in the PDF is subject to a valid copyright claim, please contact the Gerald R. Ford Presidential Library.

" U. S. DEFENSE: \$41 BILLION OR MORE "

SPEECH BEFORE MICHIGAN RURAL TEACHERS ASSOCIATION April 17, 1959

Mt. Pleasant, Michigan

Rep. Gerald R. Ford, Jr.

It's certainly a pleasure for me to talk to this group representing the Michigan Rural Teachers Association ~~this evening~~, particularly at Mt. Pleasant. Here a newly-created university with a long-standing tradition of academic achievement has rapidly grown to its present enrollment of over ^{4,500}~~5,000~~, and turns out annually highly competent additions to the teaching profession. Many of these new teachers, I am sure, ultimately become part of our rural structure, still a very vital cog in the Michigan educational system. Those who reminisce about the "good old days" and the one-room schoolhouse sometimes fail to realize that rural schools continue to educate a sizeable proportion of our leaders of tomorrow in all fields of endeavor.

Most of you who are rural teachers, like those in other professions, have at one time or another come to grip with fear. The fear of a child falling from a swing, or of a student called on to recite with no preparation--these are duplicated in other areas of life, as well.



In the military, the story is told of the combat team meeting heavy shelling from the enemy on Omaha Beach. The commander of the unit started shouting names from his roster to determine casualties. Upon reaching one name, no answer was heard. He screamed the name louder and more frantically, until one of the men managed to interject, "Sir, that's your own name you keep calling!"

Certainly fear removes our power of sense and logic, and destroys our ability to think clearly. You in education had a prime example of this when the first Sputnik was sent ^{orbiting} into space. As Fred Hechinger points out in his book, "The Big Red Schoolhouse", we had for years laughed away and shrugged off thoughts that Russia could ever compete with us in anything, but the orbiting of Sputnik meant that "overnight the American superiority complex took a nosedive" and that "the new national mentality became that of an equally irrational inferiority complex."

As you know, for some time thereafter everything about our educational system was wrong and everything about Russia's was right. When the hysteria began to clear away and the hue and cry died down,

Americans were free to see the essential facts about the situation.

As Vice-President Nixon said in New York in December, 1957, "Too

often we hear the superficial and pat formula that the answer to all

of our problems in the educational field is more classrooms, teachers,

scholarships and scientists. Action on these fronts is essential.

But we miss the target completely if we do not recognize at the

outset that our major problem is quality and ^{not} quantity of education."

Roger Freeman, the vice president of the Institute for Social Science Research, said last month to the Economic Club of Detroit,

"Whether we like it or not, we are in competition with the Russians.

The travelers who reported on Russian education did not propose that

we copy the Soviet school system. But they did suggest that we cannot

fall behind in the 'war of the classrooms'. We can afford to spend

more money for education than other countries--but we cannot afford

to get less education for it." Mr. Freeman ^{abruptly} answered his own question

~~the~~, "Do we need more dollars for education or more education for

our dollars?" The comparable question in the field of defense and

missiles is, "Do we need more dollars for defense or more defense for

our dollars?" Tonight I propose to deal with that question in terms



4 other potent weapons

of the guided missile controversy and the contributions of missiles, to our ability to deter aggression and to press home to an enemy a successful, strategic attack.

Brigadier General Betts, executive assistant to the director of guided missiles, feels we have reached a similar point in the business of our strategic attack capability as we did in education after the launching of Sputnik I. He said in New York, March 19, "We have absolutely hit bottom with a completely irrational inferiority complex on the subject of the intercontinental ballistic missile."

Before I get into the specific area of missiles and their intricacies, let me make one thing very clear. Defense is a vital thing, and one which cannot be sidetracked by wishful thinking. We must have a defense system that will inspire, demand and secure the complete confidence of Congress and the people. Representative Mahon, chairman of the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee, said at the opening of our hearings this session that "We want economy, but make sure we keep up our guard, let us not neglect national defense, let us not put a balanced budget or any other factor under the sun ahead of the defense of the United States. That is the one thing which we cannot neglect."

As a seven year member of this committee may I assure that no such danger of neglect exists. Secretary of Defense McElroy stated at Detroit March 30 that "the charge has been made by some that the size of the defense budget for the next fiscal year has been limited in order that the budget might be balanced. This charge is simply not true. There is no question that this Administration desires to balance income and outgo. This is merely sound fiscal policy. But such a desire did not have a determining influence on the size of the defense budget. The determining influence on the budget was what was required for national security."

President Eisenhower's guidance is providing and will provide fully adequate defenses for the national security of the United States. He has no intention of playing politics with the freedom of generations of Americans still unborn. We not only must guard against the Soviet threat in a military way, developing that kind of military security that has the courage to put aside that which is outmoded, but also we must have an America which develops with determination our productive power--^{total}our national resources. We must have both.

1



May I say categorically the choice for America does not lie between a sound economy with an inadequate defense posture or ~~an unsound~~ ^{a poor} economy with an adequate defense. If either of these dire alternatives is inevitably our Nation's fate, then America is in a real bind, ^{a hopeless predicament} now and in the future. I submit that America can and must face up to the hard fact that if our free society is to be preserved we as a nation can afford neither the luxury of an inadequate defense nor an unsound economy stemming from habitual unbalanced federal budgets. It is my firm conviction we must have adequate defense and a sound economy. This nation must reject the philosophy that our only choice, in order to prevent military surrender to the Russians, is to spend ourselves into an economic and political defeat. Our basic choice is between hard-headed spending for essentials and soft-headed spending to satisfy the desires of every ^{military & civilian} pressure group and the fears of every frightened politician. This is the great task which history has thrust upon us in the last half of the 20th Century and it is made more challenging by the relatively recent threat by the Soviets to invade in a big way the Free World's economic leadership.

In this area this --7--

~~For the~~ Soviet threat is both a military and an economic one.

No less an authority than Allen Dulles, director of the Central Intelligence Agency, told an audience recently that, while "We must be ever mindful of the Soviet emphasis on the military applications of science and technology in order to anticipate any attempts at a breakthrough which would change the balance of military power, it is most probable that the fateful battles of the cold war will, in the foreseeable future, be fought in the economic and subversive arenas."

In countless ways, the Communists demonstrate that military force is but one of the means that they expect to use to take over the world, so that some three billion people on this globe can live under the domination of an atheistic dictatorship. The danger might come more from an economic offensive and thus, while we debate budgets, weapons and research, as Admiral Burke told *a recent audience* ~~the Charleston, South Carolina, Chamber of Commerce,~~ "We can lose the entire stamina and integrity of our civilization if we do not recognize the challenge presented to us by a nation sworn to take us over."

Fortunately, the development of modern weapons has enabled America

to reasonably and efficiently build up a wide mix or diversification of many weapon systems designed to hit the enemy from a combination of launching locations. ICBM's and ^{long range} manned bombers from the United States; ^{medium range} manned bombers and IRBM's from overseas bases; deployed tactical missiles of all three services; missiles from submarines at sea; and the atomic capable tactical Air Force Units and attack carrier striking forces deployed in strategic areas all constitute powerful deterrent items in a retaliatory force second to none in the history of the world. Furthermore, our mutual defense alliances such as NATO, extending from Iceland and Norway in the North Atlantic to Turkey at the eastern end of the Mediterranean, and SEATO in the Pacific add to this retaliatory power. This big advantage, U. S. or allied bases in their back yard and all around the compass, is a vital one, and must not be lost sight of as we analyze the total U. S. and Free World military strength.

a defense program is expensive. B-58 costs - GOLD
Admittedly, missiles are ^{the most} costly. Our American missile program

first hit the billion dollar mark for a 12 month period in fiscal 1952, but by fiscal 1959, which is this year, the annual total has reached the

staggering sum of over \$7 billion obligated for these most modern weapons. One surface-to-surface ICBM, the first-generation Atlas, shows an overall initial cost of \$35 million per missile on the firing line, at least until faster production drives down the average production cost. To get a picture of this amazing price, if 100 workers each making \$5,000 a year were to turn over every cent of their earnings for the next 70 years, their total wages would buy one Atlas.

*Range - 5,500 miles
Speed - 15,000 mph.
Accuracy -
Altitude - 300 miles*

However costly these missiles are, their potential effectiveness is without parallel. With the development of the Hounddog, an air-to-surface missile, our Air Force using over 600 B-52 long-range bombers will be able to fire missile-bombs at supersonic speeds 500 miles from the target, thus avoiding the enemies' heaviest anti-aircraft fire. The simpler solid-fuel Polaris missile is expected to be operational on at least three submarines by 1960. The Nautilus and Skate submarine operations in Arctic waters add tremendously to the military problems of the Soviet Union. One Polaris submarine on station is the equivalent of approximately 2,000 to 4,000 deployed World War II B-29 aircraft loaded with conventional

bombs ready to make a simultaneous attack on several vital targets. For comparative purposes, our entire planned ballistic missile attack force is the equivalent of an operational inventory of something like 100,000 B29 aircraft using the most potent conventional bombs of the last world conflict.

Despite this evidence of strategic attack capability, the advocates of overspending as well as some journalists have cast doubt on the capability of our defense effort. Unfortunately, the public generally cannot today get factual answers on many military issues because of national security considerations, or because of muddled facts due to the bias of the writer.

The term "Missile gap" has been coined to imply that within a few years the Soviet Union may have such a lead in intercontinental ballistic missiles capable of devastating nuclear attack that the United States will be open to either diplomatic blackmail or destruction by surprise attack. The most widely used figure is an alleged 3-1 lead by Russia in ICBM's by 1962. Here again the lack of constructive analysis begins to show, until people begin to think logically and look at the

whole picture to see quality and direction, rather than quantity alone.

Going in the right direction is important. A large lady on the Baltimore and Ohio railroad coach recently sought to leave the train at Cleveland. A train employee, seeing her difficulty, suggested she turn around and back down. "Back down?" she indignantly replied, "I've tried that four times. Every time I do, the porter pushes me up the steps, says 'Have a good trip, lady', and I'm three stops past Akron now." Our problem is certainly not amounts of money or amounts of missiles: it is a matter of proper application of funds available and sound direction of the programs with highest priority.

The important thing is not whether Russia has half as many or ten times as many ICBM's as the United States. What is vital is that we maintain enough strength to retaliate in strength after a first blow is struck, and to retaliate in such force that no potential enemy will risk making such an initial thrust, knowing the ^{unacceptable} unescapable destruction of both military and other targets that will follow. Remarks by Secretary of Defense McElroy and others in recent months tend to indicate that, while the United States will continue its long-standing policy of non-aggression

it will not necessarily stand idly by and wait for Russia to attack us. When a man sees robbers lurking around his house at night, he calls the police or takes other appropriate action, but very rarely sits in his living room watching television and awaiting the sound of broken glass before taking action.

A look at the record to see what qualified, experienced military personnel have to say should convince even the most ardent spender for spendings sake that the current overall United States defense program is fully adequate and that this program will remain so in the future.

*Missiles
of
Anti-missile
Radar - 2000 mill*

Research and development money spent in the past is starting to pay off. Thus, for fiscal 1960, we can spend slightly less on missiles

than in the current year but will expect to get more missiles in our operational inventory. Development of large thrust liquid rocket engines,

effects of high temperatures on metals, breakthroughs in guidance and in the whole field of aerodynamics have led our missile capability to the

point ~~where, as one expert has said, "Missiles cost money but, as far as the Russians are concerned, I think we have arrived at a balance of terror."~~

big dividends.

of unbelievable advancement.

Satellites - Project Sentinel

What we must obviously avoid is a qualitative gap, not a quantitative one. From the testimony of those who should know, our top military strategists and scientific experts, we are keeping the faith with our present defense operation and generally within our 1960 fiscal year budget request. And, despite our democratic ideals in this country of making everyone part of the act for major decisions, we must, as General Betts expressed it, "some day come face to face with the fact that the problems of comparative military strength demand the judgment of professional military people who have devoted their entire careers to the study of these problems. At some point the public and the Congress must accept on faith the judgment of senior military leaders."

Take these remarks from the leading spokesmen of the military services insofar as the adequacy of the 1960 budget requests of the President relate to our national defense:

1. This is a statement by Secretary of Defense McElroy before my Defense Appropriations subcommittee. "Last year I said to this committee, 'The Nation is prepared to meet the threat it faces today.'

That statement is still true today, in January, 1959. Our forces are fully capable of carrying out their assigned missions and will continue to have this capability during the period covered by the budget. The Joint Chiefs of Staff have gone on record with me that they consider this budget adequate to provide for the essential programs necessary for the defense of the Nation."

2. In questioning before the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee, I asked, "Are there any military targets in the Soviet Union or in the satellites which would not be adequately covered from a military point of view?", and the reply was, "We can hit them all." I continued, "You can hit them all with these extra margins that are essential?" and the reply was, "That is right."

Those replies were made by General N. F. Twining, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

3. At a January 28 press conference, President Eisenhower said, "Our missile system is going forward as rapidly as possible under the guidance of the finest scientists that we can accumulate. I believe that we are making, within the relatively short space of time we have had, remarkable progress. I think it is a matter for pride on the part

of America, and not a constant hang-dog attitude of humiliation."

But yet the prophets of gloom and doom continue to chant, "41 billion dollars is not enough in one year. We must spend one, three or five billion more." Certainly this viewpoint is unnecessary and, in fact, wasteful in view of the urgent need for overall fiscal responsibility at this time. Some of these critics have self-interest at heart, others are baffled by security censorship and conflict of facts, while still others are genuinely concerned about the security of our country.

Despite these cries that America has no defense against aggression, we have the words of Secretary McElroy that we have a highly powerful composite: "The greatest force of heavy bombers in the world--the 600+ greatest force of medium bombers in the world--the 1200+ only carrier bomber force in the world--plus tactical aircraft at forward bases, all capable of carrying atomic weapons sufficient to destroy the Soviet Union if it should attack us . . . Additional elements will be submarine based ballistic missiles, blockbusters with an immense knockout punch. . . . We will have powerful intercontinental ballistic missiles, many in hardened bases, Intermediate Range Ballistic Missiles on the soil of our

Allies, ~~consistently~~ ^{constantly} improving carrier striking forces, and, tactical fighter-bombers stationed around the periphery of Communist territory."

These facts indicate that all is in a healthy state insofar as American defenses are concerned. Besides this, we have a tremendous advantage in the man in the White House--President Dwight D. Eisenhower. He ~~is a person who~~ ^{long} has demonstrated ~~through over six years in office~~ a concern with the ~~welfare~~ ^{security} of the American people and the use of proper actions to safeguard ~~that~~ ^{our} welfare. He has an amount of military experience probably never before equalled in a United States President. To thinking Americans, this, together with Ike's clear sense of duty to his country, should inspire even more confidence in our present and future defense efforts.

An ancient Arabic legend calls to mind the man who felt a premonition that his son was to meet death at home that very night. Fearing for his boy's life, and panic-stricken over that fear, he rode rapidly to Medina, a city some 50 miles away, in order to give his

son safekeeping with friends. On his way back, however, he encountered Death himself, ~~riding toward the city with the explanation, "I have a rendezvous in Medina tonight."~~ The selfish thinking, fear and attempts to base an important decision on unsupported evidence led that man to sacrifice his ^{own} ~~son's~~ life, according to the story.

So too we today often succumb to the fear of politically-motivated, selfish or undocumented charges and denunciations, leading us to the belief that more money in and of itself will resolve all defense problems. Edmund Burke, 18th Century English political scientist, stated that "no passion so effectually robs the mind of all its powers of acting and reasoning as fear." Certainly the headlines, public opinion polls and general confusion in the area of our nation's defenses today justify Mr. Burke's observations.

I would propose a four-point program here tonight to more positively assist our civilian and military leaders in their current and future defense efforts. As Admiral Burke, Chief of Naval Operations, has time after time emphasized, "This is not a one-man job . . . it is a challenge to one hundred and seventy million Americans . . . for your children and your children's children, for as long as they live, they will live in

competition."

My suggestions are as follows:

1. The American public must come to have confidence in the judgment of top military experts, the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Commander-in-Chief of our Armed Forces, the President of the United States. These men are not infallible, but are favored by years of military experience. They have access to classified information as to the potentialities of the enemy plus the facts on our own forces, and, more importantly, occupy a high position in the overall budgeting process. Many persons in the Department of the Army, or Navy, or Air Force, to be sure, would like more money for this program or for that item. History clearly shows that no military leader has ever had all the forces or funds he felt necessary for his single segment of the Armed Forces. In terms of the overall fiscal policy of our nation, there must be a place where responsible, experienced persons take a look at the entire picture from their position where all facts and figures are available. They are the ones who must say, "Look here--this figure, in terms of our national security requirements and in terms of our anticipated revenue, is the figure which will guarantee

us an adequate national defense, both now and in future years."

These are the persons who have the overall intelligence reports, information from all areas within the Defense and other departments, and thus have a firmer grasp on this subject than do those with but a fragment of this information.

2. Responsible bipartisanism must arise in the Congress of the United States to look at the policies and programs of our defense setup as they relate to the future welfare of our country and not as they affect the future dynasty of a particular political party or individual within a party. This will be particularly effective if backed up by staunch support from the grassroots of America.

3. The American people must join the military in their recognition that war and defense have changed in the present age of missiles and nuclear warheads. The U. S. cannot prevent or win the next war with the obsolete weapons of previous conflicts. The need, for example, to have a ballistic missile early warning system operational before the Russians have developed their effective ICBM capability by far outweighs any theoretical need for matching Russia in numbers--missile by missile or, for that matter, submarine by submarine. No longer can United States

military posture be judged on the availability of one weapon alone.

The soldier in earlier decades fought with a rifle using a very simple ballistic weapon, loaded it with an inexpensive cartridge, aimed and fired at a target which he could see. Today the Atlas missile has over 300,000 intricate, separate parts, a complex fuel control system, a complicated guidance system and requires hundreds of skilled men to get it ready for the final countdown. This illustrates one of the first lessons of our defense effort--we must update our viewpoint when the facts warrant, regardless of the cost, but at the same time we must be highly selective in where we invest our resources. *41 missiles - too many - some cancellations* Vision, effort and judgment rather than money alone will keep America strong.

4. We must realize that, when all the facts and opinions I and others have mentioned have been marshalled together, we must act in a firm, positive manner to keep America in the forefront as a first class power, the leader of the Free World. Debate may ensue as to the cost of a program, or the value of one missile as compared to another, but in the last analysis defense must continue to be based on estimates of experienced, knowledgeable civilian officials and military leaders.

Almost 100 years ago, Abraham Lincoln was asked many questions regarding national defense by Governor Andrew Curtin, of Pennsylvania, in view of an imminent Civil War. The entire and complete reply President Lincoln wrote consisted of one sentence--"I think the necessity of being ready increases--look to it!"

As American citizens, though our total Armed Forces are of a sound substance and though we can sleep safely at night knowing we are protected night and day by American and allied soldiers, sailors and airmen in World-wide outposts, we still must "look to it". Our excellent variety of defense forces and strategic attack capabilities, the experienced judgment of our military leaders, and our expert use and improvement of modern weapons like missiles must be supplemented to the highest degree by sound, constructive public opinion. Then, and only then, will we be ready, in the true sense of the word, both now and in the future.

You as teachers, leaders in your community, can & must be in the forefront in this vital effort for our national security. I know you will!

Quotes

"U.S. Defense: \$41 Billion Or More"

Representative Gerald R. Ford, Jr.

Those who reminisce about the "good old days" and the one-room schoolhouse sometimes fail to realize that rural schools continue to educate a sizeable proportion of our leaders of tomorrow in all fields of endeavor.

Most of you who are rural teachers, like those in other professions, have at one time or another come to grip with fear.

Certainly fear removes our power of sense and logic, and destroys our ability to think clearly. You in education had a prime example of this when the first Sputnik was sent into space. As Fred Hechinger points out in his book, "The Big Red Schoolhouse", we had for years laughed away and shrugged off thoughts that Russia could ever compete with us in anything, but the orbiting of Sputnik meant that "overnight the American superiority complex took a nosedive", and that "the new national mentality became that of an equally irrational inferiority complex."

As you know, for some time thereafter everything about our educational system was wrong and everything about Russia's was right. When the hysteria began to clear away and the hue and cry died down, Americans were free to see the essential facts about the situation. As Vice-President Nixon said in New York in December, 1957, "Too often we hear the superficial and pat formula that the answer to all of our problems in the educational field is more classrooms, teachers, scholarships and scientists. Action on these fronts is essential. But we miss the target completely if we do not recognize at the outset that our major problem is quality and not quantity of education."

We can afford to spend more money for education than other countries—but we cannot afford to get less education for it.

This nation must reject the philosophy that our only choice in order to prevent military surrender to the Russians is to spend ourselves into an economic and political defeat. Our basic choice is between hard-headed spending for essentials and soft-headed spending to satisfy the desires of every pressure group and the fears of every frightened politician.

The important thing is not whether Russia has half as many or ten times as many ICBM's as the United States. What is vital is that we maintain enough strength to retaliate in strength after a first blow is struck, and to retaliate in such force that no potential enemy will risk making such an initial thrust, knowing the unescapable destruction of both military and other targets that will follow.

Despite these cries that America has no defense against aggression, we have the words of Secretary McElroy that we have a highly powerful composite: "The greatest force of heavy bombers in the world—the greatest force of medium bombers in the world—the only carrier bomber force in the world—plus tactical aircraft at forward bases, all capable of carrying atomic weapons sufficient to destroy the Soviet Union if it should attack us. . .

Besides this, we have a tremendous advantage in the man in the White House—President Dwight D. Eisenhower. He is a person who has demonstrated through over six years in office a concern with the welfare of the American people and the use of proper actions to safeguard that welfare. He has an amount of military experience probably never before equalled in a United States President.

1. The American public must come to have confidence in the judgment of top military experts, the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Commander-in-Chief of our Armed Forces, the President of the United States.

2. Responsible bipartisanism must arise in the Congress of the United States to look at the policies and programs of our defense setup as they relate to the future welfare of our country and not as they affect the future dynasty of a particular political party or individual within a party.

3. The American people must join the military in their recognition that war and defense have changed in the present age of missiles and nuclear warheads.

4. We must realize that, when all the facts and opinions have been marshalled together, we must act in a firm, positive manner to keep America in the forefront as a first-class power—the leader of the Free World.

Our excellent variety of defense forces and strategic attack capabilities, the experienced judgment of our military leaders and our expert use and improvement of modern weapons like missiles must be supplemented to the highest possible degree by sound, constructive public opinion. Then, and only then, will we be **ready** in the true sense of the word, both now and in the future.

"U.S. DEFENSE: \$41 BILLION OR MORE"

Address before Michigan Rural Teachers Association

Mt. Pleasant, Michigan

April 17, 1959

Representative Gerald R. Ford, Jr.

It's certainly a pleasure for me to talk to this group representing the Michigan Rural Teachers Association this evening, particularly at Mt. Pleasant. Here a newly-created university, with a long standing tradition of academic achievement, has rapidly grown to its present enrollment of over 5,000, and turns out annually highly competent additions to the teaching profession. Many of these new teachers, I am sure, ultimately become part of our rural school structure, still a very vital cog in the Michigan educational system. Those who reminisce about the "good old days" and the one-room schoolhouse sometimes fail to realize that rural schools continue to educate a sizeable proportion of our leaders of tomorrow in all fields of endeavor.

Most of you who are rural teachers, like those in other professions, have at one time or another come to grips with fear. The fear of a child falling from a swing, or of a student called on to recite with no preparation--these are duplicated in other areas of life, as well. In the military, the story is told of the combat team meeting heavy shelling from the enemy on Omaha Beach. The commander of the unit started shouting names from his roster to determine casualties. Upon reaching one name, no answer was heard. He screamed the name louder and more frantically, until one of the men managed to interject, "Sir, that's your own name you keep calling."

Certainly fear removes our power of sense and logic, and destroys our ability to think clearly. You in education had a prime example of this when the first Sputnik was sent into space. As Fred Hechinger points out in his book, "The Big Red Schoolhouse", we had for years laughed away and shrugged off thoughts that Russia could ever compete with us in anything, but the orbiting of Sputnik meant that "overnight the American superiority complex took a nosedive", and that "the new national mentality became that of an equally irrational inferiority complex."

As you know, for some time thereafter everything about our educational system was wrong and everything about Russia's was right. When the hysteria began to clear away and the hue and cry died down, Americans were free to see

the essential facts about the situation. As Vice-President Nixon said in New York in December, 1957, "Too often we hear the superficial and pat formula that the answer to all of our problems in the educational field is more classrooms, teachers, scholarships and scientists. Action on these fronts is essential. But we miss the target completely if we do not recognize at the outset that our major problem is quality and ^{not} quantity of education."

Roger Freeman, the vice president of the Institute of Social Science Research, said last month to the Economic Club of Detroit, "Whether we like it or not, we are in competition with the Russians. The travelers who reported on Russian education did not propose that we copy the Soviet school system. But they did suggest that we cannot fall behind in the 'war of the classrooms'. We can afford to spend more money for education than other countries--but we cannot afford to get less education for it." Mr. Freeman answered his own question as to, "Do we need more dollars for education or more education for our dollars?" The comparable question in the field of defense and missiles is, "Do we need more dollars for defense or more defense for our dollars?" Tonight I propose to deal with that question in terms of the guided missile controversy and the contributions of missiles to our ability to deter aggression and to press home to an enemy a successful strategic attack.

Brigadier General Betts, executive assistant to the director of guided missiles, feels we have reached a similar point in the business of our strategic attack capability as we did in education after the launching of Sputnik I. He said in New York, March 19, "We have absolutely hit bottom with a completely irrational inferiority complex on the subject of the intercontinental ballistic missile."

Before I get into the specific area of missiles and their intricacies, let me make one thing very clear. Defense is a vital thing, and one which cannot be sidetracked by wishful thinking. We must have a defense system that will inspire, demand and secure the complete confidence of Congress and the people. Representative Mahon, chairman of the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee, said at the opening of our hearings this session that "We want economy, but make sure we keep up our guard, let us not neglect national defense, let us not put a balanced budget or any other factor under the sun ahead of the defense of the United States. That is the one thing which we cannot neglect." As a seven year member of this committee may I assure that no such danger of neglect exists. Secretary of Defense McElroy stated at

Detroit March 30 that "the charge has been made by some that the size of the defense budget for the next fiscal year has been limited in order that the budget might be balanced. This charge is simply not true. There is no question that this Administration desires to balance income and outgo. This is merely sound fiscal policy. But such a desire did not have a determining influence on the size of the defense budget. The determining influence on the budget was what was required for national security."

President Eisenhower's guidance is providing and will provide fully adequate defenses for the national security of the United States. He has no intention of playing politics with the freedom of generations of Americans still unborn. We not only must guard against the Soviet threat in a military way, developing that kind of military security that has the courage to put aside that which is outmoded, but also we must have an America which develops with determination our productive power--our national resources. We must have both.

May I say categorically the choice for America does not lie between a sound economy with an inadequate defense posture or an unsound economy with an adequate defense. If either of these dire alternatives is inevitably our Nation's fate, then America is in a bind, now and in the future. I submit that America can and must face up to the hard fact that if our free society is to be preserved, we as a nation can afford neither the luxury of an inadequate defense nor an unsound economy stemming from habitual unbalanced federal budgets. It is my firm conviction we must have adequate defense and a sound economy. This nation must reject the philosophy that our only choice in order to prevent military surrender to the Russians is to spend ourselves into an economic and political defeat. Our basic choice is between hard-headed spending for essentials and soft-headed spending to satisfy the desires of every pressure group and the fears of every frightened politician. This is the great task which history has thrust upon us in the last half of the 20th Century and it is made more challenging by the relatively recent threat by the Soviets to invade in a big way the Free World's economic leadership.

For the Soviet threat is both a military and an economic one. No less an authority than Allen Dulles, director of the Central Intelligence Agency, told an audience recently that, while "We must be ever mindful of the Soviet emphasis on the military applications of science and technology in order to anticipate any attempts at a breakthrough which would change the balance of military power, it is most probable that the fateful battles of the cold war will, in the foreseeable future, be fought in the economic and subversive arenas."

In countless ways, the Communists demonstrate that military force is but one of the means that they expect to use to take over the world, so that some three billion people on this globe can live under the domination of an atheistic dictatorship. The danger might come more from an economic offensive and thus, while we debate budgets, weapons and research, as Admiral Burke told the Charleston, South Carolina, Chamber of Commerce, "We can lose the entire stamina and integrity of our civilization if we do not recognize the challenge presented to us by a nation sworn to take us over."

Fortunately, the development of modern weapons has enabled America to reasonably and efficiently build up a wide mix or diversification of many weapon systems designed to hit the enemy from a combination of launching locations. ICBM's and manned bombers from the United States; manned bombers and IRBM's from overseas bases; deployed tactical missiles of all three services; missiles from submarines at sea; and the atomic capable tactical Air Force Units and attack carrier striking forces deployed in strategic areas all constitute powerful deterrent items in a retaliatory force second to none in this world's history. Furthermore, our mutual defense alliances such as NATO extending from Iceland and Norway in the North Atlantic to Turkey at the Eastern end of the Mediterranean and SEATO in the Pacific add to this retaliatory power. This big advantage, U. S. or allied bases in their back yard and all around the compass, is a vital one, and must not be lost sight of as we analyze the total U. S. and Free World military strength.

Admittedly, missiles are costly. Our American missile program first hit the billion dollar mark for a 12 month period in fiscal 1952, but by fiscal 1959, which is this year, the annual total has reached the staggering sum of over \$7 billion obligated for these most modern weapons. One surface-to-surface ICBM, the first-generation Atlas, shows an overall initial cost of \$35 million per missile on the firing line, at least until faster production drives down the average production cost. To get a picture of this amazing price, if 100 workers each making \$5,000 a year were to turn over every cent of their earnings for the next 70 years, their total wages would buy one Atlas.

However costly these missiles are, their potential effectiveness is without parallel. With the development of the Hounddog, an air to surface missile, our Air Force using over 600 B-52 long-range bombers will be able to fire missile-bombs at supersonic speeds 500 miles from the target, thus avoiding the enemies' heaviest antiaircraft fire. The simpler solid-fuel Polaris missile is expected to be operational on at least three submarines by 1960. The

Nautilus and Skate submarine operations in Arctic waters add tremendously to the military problems of the Soviet Union. One Polaris submarine on station is the equivalent of approximately 2,000 to 4,000 deployed World War II B-29 aircraft loaded with conventional bombs ready to make a simultaneous attack on several vital targets. For comparative purposes, our entire planned ballistic missile attack force is the equivalent of an operational inventory of something like 100,000 B29 aircraft using the most potent conventional bombs of the last world conflict.

Despite this evidence of strategic attack capability, the advocates of overspending as well as some journalists have cast doubt on the capability of our defense effort. Unfortunately, the public generally cannot today get factual answers on many military issues because of national security considerations, or because of muddled facts due to the bias of the writer.

The term "Missile gap" has been coined to imply that within a few years the Soviet Union may have such a lead in intercontinental ballistic missiles capable of devastating nuclear attack that the United States will be open to either diplomatic blackmail or destruction by surprise attack. The most widely used figure is an alleged 3-1 lead by Russia in ICBM's by 1962. Here again the lack of constructive analysis begins to show, until people begin to think logically and look at the whole picture to see quality and direction, rather than quantity alone.

Going in the right direction is important. A large lady on the Baltimore and Ohio railroad coach recently sought to leave the train at Cleveland. A train employee, seeing her difficulty, suggested she turn around and back down. "Back down?" she indignantly replied, "I've tried that four times. Every time I do, the porter pushes me up the steps and says, 'Have a good trip, lady', and I'm three stops past Akron now." Our problem is certainly not amounts of money or amounts of missiles: it is a matter of proper application of funds available and sound direction of the programs with highest priority.

The important thing is not whether Russia has half as many or ten times as many ICBM's as the United States. What is vital is that we maintain enough strength to retaliate in strength after a first blow is struck, and to retaliate in such force that no potential enemy will risk making such an initial thrust, knowing the unescapable destruction of both military and other targets that will follow. Remarks by Secretary of Defense McElroy and others in recent months tend to indicate that, while the United States will continue its long-standing policy of non-aggression, it will not necessarily stand idly by



and wait for Russia to attack us. When a man sees robbers lurking around his house at night, he calls the police or takes other appropriate action, but very rarely sits in his living room watching television and awaiting the sound of broken glass before taking action.

A look at the record to see what qualified, experienced military personnel have to say should convince even the most ardent spender for spendings sake that the current overall United States defense program is fully adequate and that this program will remain so in the future.

Research and development money spent in the past is starting to pay off. Thus, for fiscal 1960, we can spend slightly less on missiles than in the current year but will expect to get more missiles in our operational inventory. Development of large thrust liquid rocket engines, effects of high temperatures on metals, breakthroughs in guidance and in the whole field of aerodynamics have led our missile capability to the point where, as one expert has said, "Missiles cost money but, as far as the Russians are concerned, I think we have arrived at a balance of terror."

What we must obviously avoid is a qualitative gap, not a quantitative one. From the testimony of those who should know, our top military strategists and scientific experts, we are keeping the faith with our present defense operation and generally within our 1960 fiscal year budget request. And, despite our democratic ideals in this country of making everyone part of the act for major decisions, we must, as General Betts expressed it, "some day come face to face with the fact that the problems of comparative military strength demand the judgment of professional military people who have devoted their entire careers to the study of these problems. At some point, the public and the Congress must accept on faith the judgment of senior military leaders."

Take these remarks from the leading spokesmen of the military services insofar as the adequacy of the 1960 Budget requests of the President relate to our national defense:

1. This is a statement by Secretary of Defense McElroy before my Defense Department subcommittee on appropriations. "Last year I said to this committee, 'The Nation is prepared to meet the threat it faces today.' That statement is still true now, in January, 1959. Our forces are fully capable of carrying out their assigned missions and will continue to have this capability during the period covered by the budget. The Joint Chiefs of Staff have gone on record with me that they consider this budget adequate to provide for the essential programs necessary for the defense of the Nation."

2. In questioning before the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee, I asked,



"Are there any military targets in the Soviet Union or in the satellites which would not be adequately covered from a military point of view?", and the reply was, "We can hit them all." I continued, "You can hit them all with these extra margins that are essential?" and the reply was, "That is right."

Those replies were made by General N. F. Twining, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

3. At a January 28 press conference, President Eisenhower said, "Our missile system is going forward as rapidly as possible under the guidance of the finest scientists that we can accumulate. I believe that we are making, within the relatively short space of time we have had, remarkable progress. I think it is a matter for pride on the part of America, and not a constant hang-dog attitude of humiliation.

But yet the prophets of gloom and doom continue to chant, "41 billion dollars is not enough in one year. We must spend one, three or five billion more." Certainly this viewpoint is unnecessary and, in fact, wasteful in view of the urgent need for overall fiscal responsibility at this time. Some of these critics have self-interest at heart, others are baffled by security censorship and conflict of facts, while still others are genuinely concerned about the security of our country.

Despite these cries that America has no defense against aggression, we have the words of Secretary McElroy that we have a highly powerful composite: "The greatest force of heavy bombers in the world--the greatest force of medium bombers in the world--the only carrier bomber force in the world--plus tactical aircraft at forward bases, all capable of carrying atomic weapons sufficient to destroy the Soviet Union if it should attack us . . . Additional elements will be submarine based ballistic missiles, blockbusters with an immense knockout punch. . . . We will have powerful intercontinental ballistic missiles, many in hardened bases, Intermediate Range Ballistic Missiles on the soil of our Allies, consistently improving carrier striking forces, and, tactical fighter-bombers stationed around the periphery of Communist territory."

These facts indicate that all is in a healthy state insofar as American defenses are concerned. Besides this, we have a tremendous advantage in the man in the White House--President Dwight D. Eisenhower. He is a person who has demonstrated through over six years in office a concern with the welfare of the American people and the use of proper actions to safeguard that welfare. He has an amount of military experience probably never before equalled in a United States President. To thinking Americans this, together with Ike's clear sense

of duty, to his country, should inspire even more confidence in our present and future defense efforts.

An ancient Arabic legend calls to mind the man who felt a premonition that his son was about to meet death at home that very night. Fearing for his boy's life, and panic-stricken over that fear, he rode rapidly to Medina, a city some 50 miles away, in order to give his son safekeeping with friends. On the way back, however, he encountered Death himself, riding toward the city with the explanation, "I have a rendezvous in Medina tonight." The selfish thinking, fear and attempts to base an important decision on unsupported evidence led that man to sacrifice his son's life, according to the story.

So too we today often succumb to the fear of politically-motivated, selfish or undocumented charges and denunciations, leading us to the belief that more money in and of itself will resolve all defense problems. Edmund Burke, 18th century English political writer, stated that "no passion so effectually robs the mind of all its powers of acting and reasoning as fear." Certainly the headlines, public opinion polls and general confusion in the area of our nation's defenses today justify Mr. Burke's observations.

I would propose a four-point program here tonight to more positively assist our civilian and military leaders in their current and future defense efforts. As Admiral Burke, Chief of Naval Operations, has time after time emphasized, "This is not a one-man job . . . it is a challenge to one hundred and seventy million Americans . . . for your children and your children's children, as long as they live, will live in competition."

1. The American public must come to have confidence in the judgment of top military experts, the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Commander-in-Chief of our Armed Forces, the President of the United States. These men are not infallible, but are favored by years of military experience. They have access to classified information as to the potentialities of the enemy plus the facts on our own forces, and, more importantly, occupy a high position in the overall budgeting process. Many persons in the Department of the Army, or Navy, or Air Force, to be sure, would like more money for this program or for that item. History clearly indicates no military leader has ever had all the forces or funds he felt necessary for his single segment of the Armed Forces. However, in terms of the overall fiscal policy of our nation, there must be a place where responsible, experienced persons take a look at the entire picture from a position where all facts and figures are available. They are the ones who must say, "Look here--this figure, in terms of our national security requirements and

in terms of our anticipated revenue, is the figure which will guarantee us an adequate national defense, both now and in future years." These are the persons who have the overall intelligence reports, information from all areas within the Defense and other departments, and thus have a firmer grasp on this subject than do those with but a fragment of this information.

2. Responsible bipartisanism must arise in the Congress of the United States to look at the policies and programs of our defense setup as they relate to the future welfare of our country and not as they affect the future dynasty of a particular political party or individual within a party. This will be particularly effective if backed up by staunch support from the grassroots of America.

3. The American people must join the military in their recognition that war and defense have changed in the present age of missiles and nuclear warheads. The U. S. cannot prevent or win the next war with the obsolete weapons of previous conflicts. The need, for example, to have a ballistic missile early warning system operational before the Russians have developed their effective ICBM capability by far outweighs any theoretical need for matching Russia in numbers--missile by missile or for that matter, submarine by submarine. No longer can the United States military posture be judged on the availability of one weapon alone. The soldier in earlier decades fought with a rifle using a very simple ballistic weapon, loaded it with an inexpensive cartridge, aimed and fired at a target which he could see. Today the Atlas missile has over 300,000 intricate, separate parts, a complex fuel control system, a complicated guidance system and requires hundreds of skilled men to get it ready for the final countdown. This illustrates one of the first lessons of our defense effort--we must update our viewpoint when the facts warrant, regardless of the cost, but at the same time we must be highly selective in where we invest our resources. Vision, effort and judgment rather than money alone will keep America strong.

4. We must realize that, when all the facts and opinions I and others have mentioned have been marshalled together, we must act in a firm, positive manner to keep America in the forefront as a first-class power--the leader of the Free World. Debate may ensue as to the cost of a program, or the value of one missile over another, but in the last analysis defense must continue to be based on the estimates of experienced, knowledgeable civilian officials and military leaders. Almost 100 years ago Abraham Lincoln was asked many questions regarding national defense by Governor Andrew Curtin, of Pennsylvania, in view of an imminent Civil War. The entire and complete reply President

Lincoln wrote consisted of one sentence--"I think the necessity of being ready increases--look to it!"

As American citizens, though our total Armed Forces are of a sound substance and though we can sleep safely at night knowing we are protected night and day by American and allied soldiers, sailors and airmen in world-wide outposts, we still must "look to it". Our excellent variety of defense forces and strategic attack capabilities, the experienced judgment of our military leaders and our expert use and improvement of modern weapons like missiles must be supplemented to the highest possible degree by sound, constructive public opinion. Then, and only then, will we be ready in the true sense of the word, both now and in the future.



"U.S. DEFENSE: \$41 BILLION OR MORE"

Address before Michigan Rural Teachers Association

Mt. Pleasant, Michigan

April 17, 1959

Representative Gerald R. Ford, Jr.

It's certainly a pleasure for me to talk to this group representing the Michigan Rural Teachers Association this evening, particularly at Mt. Pleasant. Here a newly-created university, with a long standing tradition of academic achievement, has rapidly grown to its present enrollment of over 5,000, and turns out annually highly competent additions to the teaching profession. Many of these new teachers, I am sure, ultimately become part of our rural school structure, still a very vital cog in the Michigan educational system. Those who reminisce about the "good old days" and the one-room schoolhouse sometimes fail to realize that rural schools continue to educate a sizeable proportion of our leaders of tomorrow in all fields of endeavor.

Most of you who are rural teachers, like those in other professions, have at one time or another come to grip with fear. The fear of a child falling from a swing, or of a student called on to recite with no preparation--these are duplicated in other areas of life, as well. In the military, the story is told of the combat team meeting heavy shelling from the enemy on Omaha Beach. The commander of the unit started shouting names from his roster to determine casualties. Upon reaching one name, no answer was heard. He screamed the name louder and more frantically, until one of the men managed to interject, "Sir, that's your own name you keep calling."

Certainly fear removes our power of sense and logic, and destroys our ability to think clearly. You in education had a prime example of this when the first Sputnik was sent into space. As Fred Hechinger points out in his book, "The Big Red Schoolhouse", we had for years laughed away and shrugged off thoughts that Russia could ever compete with us in anything, but the orbiting of Sputnik meant that "overnight the American superiority complex took a nosedive", and that "the new national mentality became that of an equally irrational inferiority complex."

As you know, for some time thereafter everything about our educational system was wrong and everything about Russia's was right. When the hysteria began to clear away and the hue and cry died down, Americans were free to see

the essential facts about the situation. As Vice-President Nixon said in New York in December, 1957, "Too often we hear the superficial and pat formula that the answer to all of our problems in the educational field is more classrooms, teachers, scholarships and scientists. Action on these fronts is essential. But we miss the target completely if we do not recognize at the outset that our major problem is quality and quantity of education."

Roger Freeman, the vice president of the Institute of Social Science Research, said last month to the Economic Club of Detroit, "Whether we like it or not, we are in competition with the Russians. The travelers who reported on Russian education did not propose that we copy the Soviet school system. But they did suggest that we cannot fall behind in the 'war of the classrooms'. We can afford to spend more money for education than other countries--but we cannot afford to get less education for it." Mr. Freeman answered his own question as to, "Do we need more dollars for education or more education for our dollars?" The comparable question in the field of defense and missiles is, "Do we need more dollars for defense or more defense for our dollars?" Tonight I propose to deal with that question in terms of the guided missile controversy and the contributions of missiles to our ability to deter aggression and to press home to an enemy a successful strategic attack.

Brigadier General Betts, executive assistant to the director of guided missiles, feels we have reached a similar point in the business of our strategic attack capability as we did in education after the launching of Sputnik I. He said in New York, March 19, "We have absolutely hit bottom with a completely irrational inferiority complex on the subject of the intercontinental ballistic missile."

Before I get into the specific area of missiles and their intricacies, let me make one thing very clear. Defense is a vital thing, and one which cannot be sidetracked by wishful thinking. We must have a defense system that will inspire, demand and secure the complete confidence of Congress and the people. Representative Mahon, chairman of the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee, said at the opening of our hearings this session that "We want economy, but make sure we keep up our guard, let us not neglect national defense, let us not put a balanced budget or any other factor under the sun ahead of the defense of the United States. That is the one thing which we cannot neglect." As a seven year member of this committee may I assure that no such danger of neglect exists. Secretary of Defense McElroy stated at

Detroit March 30 that "the charge has been made by some that the size of the defense budget for the next fiscal year has been limited in order that the budget might be balanced. This charge is simply not true. There is no question that this Administration desires to balance income and outgo. This is merely sound fiscal policy. But such a desire did not have a determining influence on the size of the defense budget. The determining influence on the budget was what was required for national security."

President Eisenhower's guidance is providing and will provide fully adequate defenses for the national security of the United States. He has no intention of playing politics with the freedom of generations of Americans still unborn. We not only must guard against the Soviet threat in a military way, developing that kind of military security that has the courage to put aside that which is outmoded, but also we must have an America which develops with determination our productive power--our national resources. We must have both.

May I say categorically the choice for America does not lie between a sound economy with an inadequate defense posture or an unsound economy with an adequate defense. If either of these dire alternatives is inevitably our Nation's fate, then America is in a bind, now and in the future. I submit that America can and must face up to the hard fact that if our free society is to be preserved, we as a nation can afford neither the luxury of an inadequate defense nor an unsound economy stemming from habitual unbalanced federal budgets. It is my firm conviction we must have adequate defense and a sound economy. This nation must reject the philosophy that our only choice in order to prevent military surrender to the Russians is to spend ourselves into an economic and political defeat. Our basic choice is between hard-headed spending for essentials and soft-headed spending to satisfy the desires of every pressure group and the fears of every frightened politician. This is the great task which history has thrust upon us in the last half of the 20th Century and it is made more challenging by the relatively recent threat by the Soviets to invade in a big way the Free World's economic leadership.

For the Soviet threat is both a military and an economic one. No less an authority than Allen Dulles, director of the Central Intelligence Agency, told an audience recently that, while "We must be ever mindful of the Soviet emphasis on the military applications of science and technology in order to anticipate any attempts at a breakthrough which would change the balance of military power, it is most probable that the fateful battles of the cold war will, in the foreseeable future, be fought in the economic and subversive arenas."

In countless ways, the Communists demonstrate that military force is but one of the means that they expect to use to take over the world, so that some three billion people on this globe can live under the domination of an atheistic dictatorship. The danger might come more from an economic offensive and thus, while we debate budgets, weapons and research, as Admiral Burke told the Charleston, South Carolina, Chamber of Commerce, "We can lose the entire stamina and integrity of our civilization if we do not recognize the challenge presented to us by a nation sworn to take us over."

Fortunately, the development of modern weapons has enabled America to reasonably and efficiently build up a wide mix or diversification of many weapon systems designed to hit the enemy from a combination of launching locations. ICBM's and manned bombers from the United States; manned bombers and IRBM's from overseas bases; deployed tactical missiles of all three services; missiles from submarines at sea; and the atomic capable tactical Air Force Units and attack carrier striking forces deployed in strategic areas all constitute powerful deterrent items in a retaliatory force second to none in this world's history. Furthermore, our mutual defense alliances such as NATO extending from Iceland and Norway in the North Atlantic to Turkey at the Eastern end of the Mediterranean and SEATO in the Pacific add to this retaliatory power. This big advantage, U. S. or allied bases in their back yard and all around the compass, is a vital one, and must not be lost sight of as we analyze the total U. S. and Free World military strength.

Admittedly, missiles are costly. Our American missile program first hit the billion dollar mark for a 12 month period in fiscal 1952, but by fiscal 1959, which is this year, the annual total has reached the staggering sum of over \$7 billion obligated for these most modern weapons. One surface-to-surface ICBM, the first-generation Atlas, shows an overall initial cost of \$35 million per missile on the firing line, at least until faster production drives down the average production cost. To get a picture of this amazing price, if 100 workers each making \$5,000 a year were to turn over every cent of their earnings for the next 70 years, their total wages would buy one Atlas.

However costly these missiles are, their potential effectiveness is without parallel. With the development of the Hounddog, an air to surface missile, our Air Force using over 600 B-52 long-range bombers will be able to fire missile-bombs at supersonic speeds 500 miles from the target, thus avoiding the enemies' heaviest antiaircraft fire. The simpler solid-fuel Polaris missile is expected to be operational on at least three submarines by 1960. The

Nautilus and Skate submarine operations in Arctic waters add tremendously to the military problems of the Soviet Union. One Polaris submarine on station is the equivalent of approximately 2,000 to 4,000 deployed World War II B-29 aircraft loaded with conventional bombs ready to make a simultaneous attack on several vital targets. For comparative purposes, our entire planned ballistic missile attack force is the equivalent of an operational inventory of something like 100,000 B29 aircraft using the most potent conventional bombs of the last world conflict.

Despite this evidence of strategic attack capability, the advocates of overspending as well as some journalists have cast doubt on the capability of our defense effort. Unfortunately, the public generally cannot today get factual answers on many military issues because of national security considerations, or because of muddled facts due to the bias of the writer.

The term "Missile gap" has been coined to imply that within a few years the Soviet Union may have such a lead in intercontinental ballistic missiles capable of devastating nuclear attack that the United States will be open to either diplomatic blackmail or destruction by surprise attack. The most widely used figure is an alleged 3-1 lead by Russia in ICBM's by 1962. Here again the lack of constructive analysis begins to show, until people begin to think logically and look at the whole picture to see quality and direction, rather than quantity alone.

Going in the right direction is important. A large lady on the Baltimore and Ohio railroad coach recently sought to leave the train at Cleveland. A train employee, seeing her difficulty, suggested she turn around and back down. "Back down?" she indignantly replied, "I've tried that four times. Every time I do, the porter pushes me up the steps and says, 'Have a good trip, lady', and I'm three stops past Akron now." Our problem is certainly not amounts of money or amounts of missiles: it is a matter of proper application of funds available and sound direction of the programs with highest priority.

The important thing is not whether Russia has half as many or ten times as many ICBM's as the United States. What is vital is that we maintain enough strength to retaliate in strength after a first blow is struck, and to retaliate in such force that no potential enemy will risk making such an initial thrust, knowing the unescapable destruction of both military and other targets that will follow. Remarks by Secretary of Defense McElroy and others in recent months tend to indicate that, while the United States will continue its long-standing policy of non-aggression, it will not necessarily stand idly by

and wait for Russia to attack us. When a man sees robbers lurking around his house at night, he calls the police or takes other appropriate action, but very rarely sits in his living room watching television and awaiting the sound of broken glass before taking action.

A look at the record to see what qualified, experienced military personnel have to say should convince even the most ardent spender for spendings sake that the current overall United States defense program is fully adequate and that this program will remain so in the future.

Research and development money spent in the past is starting to pay off. Thus, for fiscal 1960, we can spend slightly less on missiles than in the current year but will expect to get more missiles in our operational inventory. Development of large thrust liquid rocket engines, effects of high temperatures on metals, breakthroughs in guidance and in the whole field of aerodynamics have led our missile capability to the point where, as one expert has said, "Missiles cost money but, as far as the Russians are concerned, I think we have arrived at a balance of terror."

What we must obviously avoid is a qualitative gap, not a quantitative one. From the testimony of those who should know, our top military strategists and scientific experts, we are keeping the faith with our present defense operation and generally within our 1960 fiscal year budget request. And, despite our democratic ideals in this country of making everyone part of the act for major decisions, we must, as General Betts expressed it, "some day come face to face with the fact that the problems of comparative military strength demand the judgment of professional military people who have devoted their entire careers to the study of these problems. At some point, the public and the Congress must accept on faith the judgment of senior military leaders."

Take these remarks from the leading spokesmen of the military services insofar as the adequacy of the 1960 Budget requests of the President relate to our national defense:

1. This is a statement by Secretary of Defense McElroy before my Defense Department subcommittee on appropriations. "Last year I said to this committee, 'The Nation is prepared to meet the threat it faces today.' That statement is still true now, in January, 1959. Our forces are fully capable of carrying out their assigned missions and will continue to have this capability during the period covered by the budget. The Joint Chiefs of Staff have gone on record with me that they consider this budget adequate to provide for the essential programs necessary for the defense of the Nation."

2. In questioning before the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee, I asked,

"Are there any military targets in the Soviet Union or in the satellites which would not be adequately covered from a military point of view?", and the reply was, "We can hit them all." I continued, "You can hit them all with these extra margins that are essential?" and the reply was, "That is right."

Those replies were made by General N. F. Twining, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

3. At a January 28 press conference, President Eisenhower said, "Our missile system is going forward as rapidly as possible under the guidance of the finest scientists that we can accumulate. I believe that we are making, within the relatively short space of time we have had, remarkable progress. I think it is a matter for pride on the part of America, and not a constant hang-dog attitude of humiliation.

But yet the prophets of gloom and doom continue to chant, "41 billion dollars is not enough in one year. We must spend one, three or five billion more." Certainly this viewpoint is unnecessary and, in fact, wasteful in view of the urgent need for overall fiscal responsibility at this time. Some of these critics have self-interest at heart, others are baffled by security censorship and conflict of facts, while still others are genuinely concerned about the security of our country.

Despite these cries that America has no defense against aggression, we have the words of Secretary McElroy that we have a highly powerful composite: "The greatest force of heavy bombers in the world--the greatest force of medium bombers in the world--the only carrier bomber force in the world--plus tactical aircraft at forward bases, all capable of carrying atomic weapons sufficient to destroy the Soviet Union if it should attack us . . . Additional elements will be submarine based ballistic missiles, blockbusters with an immense knockout punch. . . . We will have powerful intercontinental ballistic missiles, many in hardened bases, Intermediate Range Ballistic Missiles on the soil of our Allies, consistently improving carrier striking forces, and, tactical fighter-bombers stationed around the periphery of Communist territory."

These facts indicate that all is in a healthy state insofar as American defenses are concerned. Besides this, we have a tremendous advantage in the man in the White House--President Dwight D. Eisenhower. He is a person who has demonstrated through over six years in office a concern with the welfare of the American people and the use of proper actions to safeguard that welfare. He has an amount of military experience probably never before equalled in a United States President. To thinking Americans this, together with Ike's clear sense

of duty, to his country, should inspire even more confidence in our present and future defense efforts,

An ancient Arabic legend calls to mind the man who felt a premonition that his son was about to meet death at home that very night. Fearing for his boy's life, and panic-stricken over that fear, he rode rapidly to Medina, a city some 50 miles away, in order to give his son safekeeping with friends. On the way back, however, he encountered Death himself, riding toward the city with the explanation, "I have a rendezvous in Medina tonight." The selfish thinking, fear and attempts to base an important decision on unsupported evidence led that man to sacrifice his son's life, according to the story.

So too we today often succumb to the fear of politically-motivated, selfish or undocumented charges and denunciations, leading us to the belief that more money in and of itself will resolve all defense problems. Edmund Burke, 18th century English political writer, stated that "no passion so effectually robs the mind of all its powers of acting and reasoning as fear." Certainly the headlines, public opinion polls and general confusion in the area of our nation's defenses today justify Mr. Burke's observations.

I would propose a four-point program here tonight to more positively assist our civilian and military leaders in their current and future defense efforts. As Admiral Burke, Chief of Naval Operations, has time after time emphasized, "This is not a one-man job . . . it is a challenge to one hundred and seventy million Americans . . . for your children and your children's children, as long as they live, will live in competition."

1. The American public must come to have confidence in the judgment of top military experts, the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Commander-in-Chief of our Armed Forces, the President of the United States. These men are not infallible, but are favored by years of military experience. They have access to classified information as to the potentialities of the enemy plus the facts on our own forces, and, more importantly, occupy a high position in the overall budgeting process. Many persons in the Department of the Army, or Navy, or Air Force, to be sure, would like more money for this program or for that item. History clearly indicates no military leader has ever had all the forces or funds he felt necessary for his single segment of the Armed Forces. However, in terms of the overall fiscal policy of our nation, there must be a place where responsible, experienced persons take a look at the entire picture from a position where all facts and figures are available. They are the ones who must say, "Look here--this figure, in terms of our national security requirements and

in terms of our anticipated revenue, is the figure which will guarantee us an adequate national defense, both now and in future years." These are the persons who have the overall intelligence reports, information from all areas within the Defense and other departments, and thus have a firmer grasp on this subject than do those with but a fragment of this information.

2. Responsible bipartisanism must arise in the Congress of the United States to look at the policies and programs of our defense setup as they relate to the future welfare of our country and not as they affect the future dynasty of a particular political party or individual within a party. This will be particularly effective if backed up by staunch support from the grassroots of America.

3. The American people must join the military in their recognition that war and defense have changed in the present age of missiles and nuclear warheads. The U. S. cannot prevent or win the next war with the obsolete weapons of previous conflicts. The need, for example, to have a ballistic missile early warning system operational before the Russians have developed their effective ICBM capability by far outweighs any theoretical need for matching Russia in numbers--missile by missile or for that matter, submarine by submarine. No longer can the United States military posture be judged on the availability of one weapon alone. The soldier in earlier decades fought with a rifle using a very simple ballistic weapon, loaded it with an inexpensive cartridge, aimed and fired at a target which he could see. Today the Atlas missile has over 300,000 intricate, separate parts, a complex fuel control system, a complicated guidance system and requires hundreds of skilled men to get it ready for the final countdown. This illustrates one of the first lessons of our defense effort--we must update our viewpoint when the facts warrant, regardless of the cost, but at the same time we must be highly selective in where we invest our resources. Vision, effort and judgment rather than money alone will keep America strong.

4. We must realize that, when all the facts and opinions I and others have mentioned have been marshalled together, we must act in a firm, positive manner to keep America in the forefront as a first-class power--the leader of the Free World. Debate may ensue as to the cost of a program, or the value of one missile over another, but in the last analysis defense must continue to be based on the estimates of experienced, knowledgeable civilian officials and military leaders. Almost 100 years ago Abraham Lincoln was asked many questions regarding national defense by Governor Andrew Curtin, of Pennsylvania, in view of an imminent Civil War. The entire and complete reply President



Lincoln wrote consisted of one sentence--"I think the necessity of being ready increases--look to it!"

As American citizens, though our total Armed Forces are of a sound substance and though we can sleep safely at night knowing we are protected night and day by American and allied soldiers, sailors and airmen in world-wide outposts, we still must "look to it". Our excellent variety of defense forces and strategic attack capabilities, the experienced judgment of our military leaders and our expert use and improvement of modern weapons like missiles must be supplemented to the highest possible degree by sound, constructive public opinion. Then, and only then, will we be ready in the true sense of the word, both now and in the future.

