

The Beaverton Rotary Speech  
January 15, 1986

in progress...

The real question is whether there will be enough of a basis of understanding that an arms control treaty can be achieved. Today I want to talk about the problem of arms control, having set that context, and then about one of the specific issues in the arms race that will be one of the front burner issues that will be debated in the Congress and will be debated throughout the country for the balance of this Congress and for the rest of this year.

Let me illustrate the problem of the arms race in this way. I brought with me a couple of props and I think that as Americans we hear statistics about megatons, throw weights and size of missiles and so forth and the numbers really get well beyond our comprehension. In order to describe where we have come in only 40 years I have brought these props to illustrate the situation that we're in.

If you would, I would like you to look down at the table or close your eyes and just listen because listening will tell the whole story. This sound you're about to hear represents the total fire power expended by the allies during the entire six years of WWII. plop. What you're about to hear is what happened since the bomb dropped on Hiroshima and both superpowers got the atomic weapon and began adding to their arsenals, weapons on top of weapons trying to outdo each other and this is the sum and substance of the arms race. Remember that other sound? That represented all the firepower of the allies in six years. This represents the firepower of the world's arsenal, the nuclear firepower. Schoosh..... We have a problem. We have a very real problem and the problem is clear. We have added weapons to arsenals on both sides that far exceed what is necessary to defend each superpower.

The real question is how do we bring it to a stop on a secure basis that doesn't endanger the security of either superpower or any country of the world. That is the key problem. Star Wars is one of the issues I want to speak about today because it specifically figures in to this context. I want to raise the subject of whether or not Star Wars or some alternative makes sense as a way to deal with that problem and keep it from getting worse. In other words, will Star Wars save us or will it break us? Plus, how does it fit into the whole Reagan-Gorbechev interchange that has now begun?

The corollary problem is how do we deal with this arms race and how do we take steps to insure we remain secure, and in doing so do it within the confines and restrictions of the newly passed G-R budget resolution which requires the elimination of two hundred billion dollar deficits over the next five years?

Another question Congress is going to have to consider as it thinks about Star Wars and the arms race, how do we make America secure and keep government from borrowing so much out of the available capital pool that we are unable to modernize our industrial machinery, our economy itself and be able to be viable as a world economic leader.

And finally, the Star Wars question bears on the related problem of how we at this point use it or perhaps put it aside in order to take advantage, if there is an advantage, of the new man in the Kremlin, Mr. Gorbachev, who comes as the first new Soviet leader from the post World War II generation.

I am directly involved in this issue in three different ways. First as a member of the Defense Appropriations Committee which handles the budgeting of Star Wars and other weapons systems deciding on what should be funded and what should not be funded. I am involved in these trade offs and apparent conflicts in policy from the standpoint of being a supporter of G-R and its requirement of 20% reductions in the deficit over the next five years. I am involved as an official who is working for policies to promote investments to give American industry a competitive edge in what has become an increasingly international market place.

When it comes to Star Wars, as we try to sort this out in the context of all these other things, this is the case that is made. Neither superpower has a defense against the other's arsenal. Both superpowers stand naked against the other's offensive forces and it is only the risk of retaliation on the part of one or the other that presents a defensive factor in the minds of military planners on both sides. This is called mutually assured destruction. It means that if one side dares launch an attack it risks a devastating counter attack and certain annihilation. The Star Wars case is "is that moral? Why not have a defense? Why not be able to stop these incoming missiles and render them obsolete? Why not have, indeed, a shield that protects us?"

Here is the problem as I see it as a member of the Defense Appropriations committee. In describing this problem I draw from the testimony of former members of the Defense Department who came into office at the time that Star Wars was originally conceived. Let me quote from Dr. DeLauer, the former top scientist of the Pentagon. "The first problem with Star Wars that has to be thought of, particularly at a time of budget deficits the size we are dealing with is, if it works it would require at least 10 technological breakthroughs of the magnitude of the Manhattan Project itself and it would require the development of technology that would have to destroy within one half hour of a Soviet launch, thousands of warheads in flight.

In each of those instances would have to have laser beams aimed so precisely that it would be the equivalent of spotlighting from earth a basketball on the surface of the moon." That's the magnitude of the technology that we're investing in in trying to seek a workable Star Wars.

Problem number 2. Estimated entry cost of the complete life cycle cost of Star Wars is one trillion dollars. We have just watched, in the last 5 years, our total aggregate national debt double from 1 trillion to 2 trillion dollars. The cost of this going in with all the question marks left open is one trillion dollars. My experience in military spending is that when you're dealing with massive weapon the opening estimate usually is the floor. This may be an exception to the rule but the history has been that it is usually the floor.

The third problem. My judgment is that if we insist on going forward with Star Wars, we'll ruin chances for genuine arms control that will reduce offensive missiles on both sides. The reason I say that and for you to understand why that is so, you have to reverse the roles. Put the Star Wars construction on the part of the Soviets for a second, and put ourselves on the receiving end of this. If we were in that position and if we saw a country like the Soviet Union running something like two hundred billion dollar deficits, and if we knew that some were proposing a system in space at a cost, on top of that deficit, of one trillion dollars, and if we knew that in order for it to be fully defensive it would have to be perfectly effective, and no defense ever designed by man has ever been 100% effective, one would begin to doubt if was purely defensive or whether it would be better used as an offense. Truthfully, if only 10% of the lasers worked in shooting down the Soviet warheads, it would not be much of a defense but it would be a major technological breakthrough. It wouldn't leave much protection for those targets in the U.S. but it would be a major technological breakthrough just to get to 10%. But if it had that capability of doing only 10% work on defense it would be almost 95% effective as an offense targeted on the adversary's early warning satellites. Satellites that the adversary has to have in order to be sure that there isn't an incoming attack. So what Mr. Gorbachev is thinking right now and what we would be thinking I suspect, is that a Star Wars system, though labeled defensive, is more easily targeted on early warning satellites since they are soft inviting targets, easy to zap in space, and therefore could represent a threat to deterrence, could represent a threat to the satellites, could represent a blinding first strike blinding them to an offensive attack and leave them in a position where what remained of Star Wars would mop up what was left of their retaliation. Not a position, I submit, that the US would like to find itself in and I believe that is Mr. Gorbachev's problem with Star Wars right now when he said that last winter when he met with our President that Star Wars has to be restrained in a treaty if we're going to have deep cuts in offensive missiles.

The fourth problem I think we have with Star Wars is that without such a treaty, without a trade-off, us giving up flight tests on SW the Soviet Union will do what it can do best. And that's not to build their own SW because frankly our technology is better than theirs. They can do something that is just as effective. And that is to build larger numbers of offensive missiles at a lower cost than it takes us to put all of this machinery in space and have enough of an increase in offensive capability to overwhelm our SW system. And more than that to have an incentive to go first. To take it out rather than our using it as an offense against them.

That's the problem we have. I met with the President shortly before the last vote on SW and shortly before he went to Geneva. He called the appropriations committee down to the White House and we had a wonderful discussion of strategic problems and the real desire that he has to strike a bargain that is truly historic for arms control and end the arms race. I do not doubt in any way his sincerity but I do believe that he misunderstands the Soviet perception of SW and how it is an obstacle to the arms control treaty that he, himself, seeks. Mr. Reagan said that he had a dream that SW would be built. A shield will be put in space and we would be able to render obsolete and impotent all nuclear weapons. The problem with that is that SW, as the Joint Chiefs of Staff have consistently testified before my committee, cannot deal with every single kind of nuclear weapon. For instance, it cannot touch cruise missiles. Cruise missiles are small, radar avoiding, terrain following, sea skimming missiles that skim just feet over the surface of the sea, follow the terrain of the land and are absolutely undetectable by radar. So the problem would be, if we moved forward on SW not only would we be spending one trillion \$ at a time when we have a 2 hundred billion \$ deficit and not being certain we would have something that would work once we spent that money but secondly we would be following a path that would prevent the deep cuts in offensive missiles that I think everyone in the US wants and thirdly we would not render nuclear weapons obsolete at all but instead simply change the configuration of the arms race. If you open a window to a technology, in this case cruise missiles, I can tell you what's going to happen. The illustration I began with is the story. You open a window to a technology without restraint and countries that have that technology will march right through it. We will see the construction of massive numbers of cruise missiles, large numbers of warheads with a trillion dollars of borrowed money up in space as an investment, a maginot line in space, and be less secure than we are today.

I hope very, very much that in the June summit both leaders will understand that they have a chance to go down in history as the best peacemakers either country has ever produced.

Ronald Reagan certainly has that chance and so does Mr. Gorbachev. I don't think Mr. Gorbachev is one we can simply trust. Any treaty we enter into has to be mutual and verifiable and has to have strong insurance safeguards. But if we are willing to say that we will put a ban on flight testing on SW and save our own treasury that money I believe the moment is right with Mr. Gorbachev having come to power at the expense and without the help of his own military establishment, the time is right for a bargain to be struck that is a real blow for national security.

What is the alternative to SW and to MAD? Let me tell you what I believe it is. I believe it is a comprehensive test ban. If you can't flight test weapons, neither side has reliability in those weapons. And if you don't, as a military planner, have complete confidence in the weapons that you have you dare not use them. If you should use them they can go off target, they can do things that are not intended and you set yourself up for a devastating counterpunch. A CTB would do exactly what SW is intended to do. Render nuclear weapons obsolete. Numbers then can surely be reduced because of the obsolescence of the existing stockpiles and more importantly, unlike the investment that we're talking about up in space, running deficits in government borrowing up to the extent that I have described, a CTB is verifiable is absolutely free. It doesn't cost the treasury a dime and that would unleash the ability of the government to get out of the borrowing mode that its in today, makes possible the release of productive capital for investment in the kinds of technology that we truly need for our economic security and to put those investments fully to work here at home and do so on a basis on which we know that we will not be challenged from a nuclear standpoint in a menacing and lethal way.

Its going to be a facinating year for this country and for members of Congress who deal with this issue to see how events unfold. To what extent talk we are hearing today is bargaining talk, tough talk going into a tough negotiation or just hardheadedness really remains to be seen on both sides. I think that we should all hope at the beginning of this year as we look toward 1986 that both men can realize that history is watching them and the fate of all of us and those who follow us rides on the decisions they end up making in June of this year in Washington and in Moscow in 1987. This will be a crucial decision and its going to decide whether or not this business continues or comes to a stop.

Thank you very much for the chance to describe these thoughts to you and I look forward to your questions.

- Cut the deficit and still provide services for the elderly, the poor and the sick.

What's even more amazing is the fact that this action was taken while the constitutionality of Gramm-Rudman is in legal limbo.

As you know, a federal court has held this plan unconstitutional over the issue of the role of the General Accounting Office.

The issue is now before the Supreme Court. But I can assure you that if the Court upholds the lower court decision, I'd be the first back to the drawing board to try to correct any constitutional infirmities that might exist.

But, getting back to the budget we just passed this week, I voted in favor of this budget because I felt its passage would be the best dose of good economic news we've gotten this year. I did so because I believe it reflected many of my priorities and the priorities of the people I work for in the First District.

Considering the budgetary restraints we are working under these days, the budget we passed is the best that money can buy.

It's a budget with compassion.