

Asia and the Pacific vitally important to America's national security and economic well-being

Senator Hiram L. Fong Papers

Public Relations, Speeches, statements, and messages, Box PR28, Folder 17

<https://hdl.handle.net/10524/86731>

Items in eVols are protected by copyright, with all rights reserved, unless otherwise indicated.

UHM Library Digital Collections Disclaimer and Copyright Information

Statement of U. S. Senator Hiram L. Fong (R-Hawaii)
For Delivery in the U. S. Senate
May 15, 1975

ASIA AND THE PACIFIC VITALLY IMPORTANT TO
AMERICA'S NATIONAL SECURITY AND
ECONOMIC WELL-BEING

Mr. President, it is with a deep sense of honor and responsibility that I participate in this valuable and timely discussion on the various aspects of our country's defense posture and its implications for our nation's future security and economic well-being.

My remarks today will be primarily oriented to the Asia-Pacific area which is only natural for a Senator representing the mid-Pacific State of Hawaii.

To set my remarks in context, however, it is necessary to examine briefly the current situation worldwide in terms of foreign policy and national defense. These matters are very much interrelated and, as my remarks will show, reinforce my own view that the United States must strengthen its defense structure and forces and must strengthen our ties and alliances with freedom-loving nations around the globe.

No one who is concerned about the survival of freedom and freedom-loving peoples in this world can take any comfort from the events of the past three weeks.

Loss of 40 Million More People To Communism Tragic

The litany of countries and people who have fallen under the yoke of communist regimes is a tragic and sobering one. South Vietnam with some 20 million people now communist. Cambodia with 7-1/2 million people now under communist rule. Laos, with 3.3 million people, is for all practical purposes now within the communist orbit.

On the other side of the world Portugal, once our staunch friend and ally, has now gone to the far left and, with communists determined to take control in due time, the 8.6 million people of Portugal also appear doomed to communist rule.

This is a grand total of nearly 40 million people who within a very brief space of time have or will have fallen under communist domination.

There are Americans who care not that peoples in other lands are now subject to the repressive and anti-freedom communist regimes. Besides, they say, these are just tiny countries of little importance to the United States.

But I say that these tragic events are of tremendous importance to the future of freedom in the world and to the security and economic well-being of the United States of America.

World More Dangerous Now Than Two Months Ago

For the simple truth is that the world is now a far more dangerous place and the United States faces far greater problems in keeping the peace than it did just two months ago.

Portugal, for example, has already announced that it will not allow the U. S. to use air bases in the Azores in any airlift of military equipment to Israel such as was so crucial in the last outbreak of war in the Middle East. It was U. S. assistance, timely and quantitatively, which helped maintain the balance of power in the Middle East and thereby averted an eyeball to eyeball confrontation between the super powers -- the Soviet Union and the United States.

Farther down the road, a communist takeover in Portugal could inspire further communist inroads in Spain, and it is not inconceivable that communist regimes could control the entrance to the Mediterranean through the Straits of Gibraltar. The United States could find it no longer has access to the Mediterranean.

Back in the Pacific area, with Vietnam, Cambodia, and Laos behind the Bamboo Curtain, the danger to Thailand has increased manyfold. Undoubtedly, in Burma, Malaysia, Indonesia, and the Philippines, communist insurgent forces have been given a great morale booster. And it is only logical and reasonable to expect that they would redouble their efforts and be additionally supplied with military arms and equipment now

that North Vietnam will not be receiving such large quantities from the Soviet Union and the Peoples Republic of China.

With the loss of South Vietnam, Cambodia and Laos to communist forces and the resultant humiliation of the United States, the flashpoints of danger in the Far East have shot up quite a few notches. With the victory of North Vietnam, it is only logical and reasonable to assume that the communist regime of North Korea has been immeasurably heartened and quite possibly emboldened to make new attacks on the 33.5 million free people of South Korea. Again, the war materiel from the Soviet Union and the Peoples Republic of China that had been planned for North Vietnam could well be diverted to North Korea, with all the potential for war that that would entail in the peninsula.

With the fall of South Vietnam, Cambodia and Laos, the 36.3 million people of Thailand are in far greater peril than when its neighbors were still free. As the United States demonstrated in the case of South Vietnam that it is an unreliable ally, the government of Thailand, which heretofore had allied itself with the United States felt compelled to request that all U. S. military forces leave Thailand. In order to stave off possible reprisals by its new communist neighbors, Thailand judges itself unable to assist the United States in freeing the U.S. merchant ship Mayaguez, an unarmed vessel which was seized by Cambodian naval forces earlier this week.

Who now can truthfully say it doesn't matter to us in America whether all of Southeast Asia goes communist. We did not have these incidents when Cambodia, Laos, and South Vietnam had regimes friendly to America.

I am relieved that President Ford's prompt and vigorous action brought the safe release of the crew and recovery of our merchant ship, the Mayaguez, and also the release of the Thai fishermen. I pay highest tribute to our valiant military personnel for their courage and their sacrifice.

Increased Jeopardy for U. S. and Allies

And so we see, Mr. President, how quickly and, for us, how adversely the turn of events in Southeast Asia has increased the jeopardy for United States interests in that area of the world.

As I have already pointed out, Mr. President, it is not only the United States interests which are in greater danger now than they were two months ago, it is other nations of the Far East such as Japan, Taiwan, Singapore, Australia and New Zealand.

I would remind my colleagues that a United States merchant vessel is not the only ship whose right to peaceful navigation in international waters was violated by the new communist regime of Cambodia. On May 4, a South Korean freighter was fired upon and nearly captured in the same area of the Mayaguez. On May 8, a Panamanian ship was stopped by a Cambodian gunboat. And in that same week, a Thai fishing boat was seized.

Hardly had the communists taken over Cambodia when they instigated multiple acts of piracy against ships of free countries plying the waters off Cambodia in peaceful trade and commerce.

With North Vietnam, the Khmer Rouge and the Pathet Lao no longer requiring such tremendous quantities of arms and ammunition, will their suppliers be tempted to instigate wars of liberation and insurgency to a greater degree than heretofore and perhaps in areas not now plagued by such internal communist attacks?

Are the 110 million people of Japan in greater peril now than they were before?

Are the 16 million people of the Republic of China on Taiwan in greater peril than they were before?

Are the 41.5 million people of the Philippines in greater peril now than they were before?

With the debacle in Vietnam and with America having failed to keep its commitments in Southeast Asia, are the 3.3 million people of Israel in greater peril than before?

Vietnam Loss Has Repercussions in Middle East

Here is what an Associated Press dispatch said on May 12, just three days ago under a headline "U. S. Defeat Emboldens Palestinians":

"The defeat of American-backed governments in Indochina has boosted the morale of Palestinian guerrillas in their struggle against Israel.

"'Today Vietnam, tomorrow Palestine,' rejoiced the current cover of Palestine Revolution, the weekly organ of the Palestine Liberation Organization.

"The United States departure from Saigon and Phnom Penh was taken as a lesson throughout the Palestinian movement, from chieftain Yasir Arafat to machinegun toting guerrillas in remote hill camps.

"The lesson to them is that underdog revolutionaries can get what they want against seemingly overwhelming odds if they persist in the battle against 'American imperialism and its agents.'

"Translated to the Middle East, that means renewed hope of beating the U. S. -backed forces of Israel.

"'Comrades, your victory over American imperialism and its agents in your country has given us limitless confidence to pursue and strengthen the struggle the same way you did,' Arafat cabled the Viet Cong after their triumphant entry into Saigon.

"The end of the American presence in Indochina encourage (sic) some radical groups in the conviction that victory is possible only through combat, and that negotiations with Israel are pointless anyway.

"'The will to fight must be stronger than the will to bargain and capitulate,' commented the weekly Al Hadaf, organ of the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine, in drawing lessons from the Vietnamese experience."

When our Secretary of State Henry Kissinger proposed a Middle East settlement calling for Israeli withdrawal from much of the Sinai Desert backed up by a pledge of support by the United States in the event that Egypt declaration of non-belligerency proved to be temporary, Israel rejected the plan.

Why? Because Israel did not deem a pledge by the United States as sufficient guarantee in light of our failure to keep our pledges to South Vietnam.

So it is clear the defeat of U. S. - supported countries in Southeast Asia has already had repercussions far from Indochina. The tremors of our debacle there are spreading like shocks of an earthquake around the world.

Assessing U. S. Situation Today

Mr. President, I received a letter from Dr. David N. Rowe, recently retired after 31 years on the faculty of Yale University, which summarizes very clearly where the United States of America is today. Professor Rowe told me that last March he made an extensive tour of Southeast and East Asia, visiting Taiwan, Manila, Singapore, Kuala Lumpur, Saigon, Hong Kong, Seoul and Tokyo.

Here is what Professor Rowe wrote me and I quote:

"May I say, Senator, that in my opinion as a professional student of United States foreign policy and in particular of its Pacific relations, that the United States is today in mortal danger.

"We are, in fact, in my view, standing right on the edge of a precipice, and it will not take much to push us over the edge into national oblivion. This is because we have seemingly become convinced by the Communist propaganda and our own picture of our interests, that it doesn't matter that we are losing progressively and step by step. The Communists will not ever give us another Pearl Harbor, to arouse us into flame! Their policy is the opposite, namely to cut off our right arm one inch at a time, so that, lulled by the false idea that none of our losses is vitally dangerous, we will in the end succumb to their successive and steady detractions from our power and our will to use the power we have.

"The American people and their Congress are the center of this matter. The recent constitutional crisis of the Presidency has now given all too much power and influence to the Congress as to the control of foreign affairs, and with the national popular mood being what it is, we are paralyzed and unable to act. Unless this tendency is reversed, not only stopped, we are going to go down the drain of history. My children, and certainly their children, will live under Communist domination unless we stop and reverse the course of Communist aggression against free peoples."

Let me also cite, Mr. President, comments of Sir Robert Thompson, one of the few free world military leaders who was successful against communist insurgents. It was Sir Robert who devised Britain's successful anti-insurgency campaign against local Chinese communists in Malaya in 1950.

According to an interview in the Chicago Tribune of April 27, "Vietnam, Thompson insists, is the most recent proof of a disintegration of willpower that has made the Western Alliance a sitting duck for the communists."

Thompson is quoted directly as saying:

"...the retreat of the United States before Moscow, like that of Napoleon, is going to litter the world with corpses. You have shown that you are not prepared to stand on fundamental issues -- for instance, the sanctity of treaties. This is a blatant breach of an agreement by North Vietnam and you are letting them get away with it.... You have a Congress which has only one foreign policy line -- that if you surrender the killing will stop.

"And you have a President in the position where he has no army, no air force, no navy, no money,

and no message. Look at the map; you are in full retreat before Moscow at the present time.***Once a country goes communist it comes under the communist umbrella -- and here's the point -- forever! Forever! Their staying power is forever! Where's yours?" End of quote

Let me also quote, Mr. President, from a letter I received from a gentleman who said he was an immigrant from World War II and who is now an American citizen.

"Not long ago after the second world war America donated to the world enemies Russia many countries in Europe, including my former country Lithuania. By this American action I lost my country, my freedom, my people, family and home. Threw me from country to country, treated me like a criminal, called me names, displaced person and foreigner.***

"...all Asian and Europe minor countries do not trust America anymore, because America doesn't keep its word and can protect his friends from communist aggression, no reason for them to fight because they lose anyway.***

"Thirty years ago America donated to communist Europe, today Asia, it will soon come tomorrow for America, because America can not fight and win against all the world, because they do not have any friends left.***

As for Vietnam and Cambodia, this man wrote me:

This tragedy for these countries is going to end, but will begin for our country America. First, Middle East, Portuguese, Indonesia, Thailand, Philippines, Turkey, Greece and other free countries.

"These countries will automatically surrender to the communist if received pressure from them, because they know that America can not protect them from communist aggression and for them no reason to fight, lose anyway."

Then he asked the chilling question: "Has this Senator prepared plans for American orphaned children and which country will accept our children."

Indeed, Mr. President, which country will accept our orphans?

Only America Can Save America; No Other Country Can

The plain fact of the matter is there is no country that can save America. We must save ourselves.

If we do not take the steps to ensure our survival as a free nation, we cannot count on any other nation to guarantee life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness for Americans.

Free Nations Must Exert Greater Efforts

Nevertheless, starting with the premise that free nations all over the world are in far greater peril today than they were two months ago, I believe every nation and every freedom-loving people must take steps against takeover by authoritarian regimes, be they communist, fascist, anarchist or whatever.

Every nation and every freedom-loving people must re-dedicate itself to the defense of freedom against onslaught from whatever quarter.

Third World Countries Take Heed

The so-called Third World nations cannot remain oblivious to communist gains and authoritarian triumphs in other countries. Outnumbering the United States in world forums like the United Nations and the Interparliamentary Union, the Third World Nations take a seeming delight in trying to embarrass and humiliate the United States. I say to the Third World people: if the United States falls, you will have lost the greatest force for self-determination, independence, and liberty the world has ever known.

You of the Third World know the United States does not threaten to take over your land or your government or your people. Had the U. S. been an expansionist power, the Philippines could still be U. S. territory, Japan today would be a U. S. colony, the former U. S. sector of West Germany would be today a European toehold for the U. S., and Micronesia would be U. S. territory, too.

What territory has any communist power given up? What neighbor of a communist country sleeps easy at night?

The answer in both cases is None.

Every nation and every freedom-loving people must become stronger economically, militarily, and morally. The task of

defending freedom is so enormous and costly that the United States of America cannot do the job all alone.

We are hard-pressed just to take care of our own national economy and defense and to meet our solemn treaty agreements with NATO countries, with Middle East countries, with Japan, China on the Republic of/Taiwan, **the Republic of Korea and the Philippines.**

No Time For Defense Retrenchment

Because America's burden is heavy, because our national economy has been in trouble, and because America is no longer involved militarily in Southeast Asia is no excuse for defense retrenchment. On the contrary, the danger signals are flashing red for us all over the world.

As AFL-CIO President George Meany said in a recent speech and I quote:

"Every basic Communist tactic of seizing power is now on display throughout the world -- naked aggression in Indochina; political blackmail in the Middle East; an outrageous putsch in Portugal; a heating up of the cold war in Korea, and a diplomatic and propaganda war in international institutions.

"Nobody, but nobody, with common sense can believe that the Mideast, Vietnam, Portugal, Greece, Turkey, the UN -- nobody can believe that these are separate, dismembered developments that have no relation to our policies or to the over-all policies of the Communist world. "

Now is the time for America to strengthen our national defense structure and forces. We must reevaluate our foreign policy and determine how we will prevent Uncle Sam from being pushed around, humiliated, and harassed any longer.

Prince Sihanouk, nominal leader of the Cambodian communists, was quoted in the Paris newspaper, Le Monde, as saying "We did what they said we could never do. We defeated the Americans."

Like it or not, this is how the communist world -- and let's face it, how much of the rest of the non-U. S. world -- interprets recent events in Southeast Asia. Such an attitude can evoke a spate of tests for America around the world to see how much farther we will fall back.

North Korea may instigate trouble against South Korea to see whether, in panic, the U. S. Congress will demand the withdrawal of all U. S. forces in the Republic of Korea.

We can expect further tests elsewhere -- diplomatically, against the Philippines for example, to get the U. S. kicked out of our naval base at Subic Bay and out of our Air Force Base at Clark Field.

Already, the fall of Cambodia has compelled the Thai Government to publicly announce the U. S. must quit all our bases in Thailand.

Will Japan come under pressure to close down the U. S. air and naval bases on its territory? One-third of Japan's export market is in Southeast Asia. Will communist control of Southeast Asia threaten Japan economically and politically?

The more friends America loses in the Far East and Pacific, the more forward bases we must abandon, the more difficult it will be for the U. S. to keep the sea lanes open for trade and commerce and the more difficult it will be for America to assist Japan and other now-free countries under our mutual security pacts.

All of these possibilities underscore for me the necessity for the United States to beef up our own defense mix of forces in our own territory and under our own control.

To disarm or further weaken U. S. defenses would be the worst possible course of action for us to take in our ever-more dangerous and unstable world.

Pacific-Far East Picture

Let me draw a picture of the Pacific-Far East and the U.S. defense posture there. Other Senators today will describe the situation in other parts of the world.

First of all, the Pacific Ocean is enormous, the largest body of water on the face of the earth.

Covering nearly 64 million square miles, it is twice as large as the Atlantic Ocean.

Between Panama and the China Sea, it is 11,000 miles wide. But between Alaska and the Soviet Union on the Bering Strait, it is only a few miles wide.

More than one half of the world's population of 4 billion people live in the Pacific Basin or in countries rimming the Pacific Ocean. These include the United States with the West Coast States of California, Washington and Oregon directly on the ocean, likewise Alaska; and the State of Hawaii in the mid-Pacific Ocean, 2500 miles from the U. S. West Coast. Included also in the Pacific nations are the People's Republic of China, Indonesia, Japan, Malaysia, the Republic of China, the Soviet Union, the Philippines, Vietnam and various other nations.

From the time that men became waterborne on seagoing vessels, the oceans and seas of the world have been of tremendous importance to their economic life and progress.

Because trade and commerce among nations are so important -- indeed are the lifeblood of a number of nations such as Japan -- freedom of the seas has been a cardinal tenet of international relations.

At the same time, however, throughout history piracy and interdiction of sealanes have been practiced even as they were practiced this week off the coast of Cambodia.

Freedom of the Seas Vital to U. S.

Freedom of the seas and uninterrupted shipping and commerce are of vital importance to the United States even though we have many natural resources and a fair degree of self-sufficiency.

According to the "Special Report -- Critical Imported Materials," of the Council on International Economic Policy, published in December 1974, the United States is "both a leading supplier and purchaser of internationally traded raw materials. About one-third of our exports and imports are non-manufactured. Our total trade in these commodities last year amounted to roughly \$45 billion from which we realized a trade surplus of more than \$1 billion."

The Council report went on to say:

"We are a leading supplier of raw materials to Western Europe and Japan, as well as many less developed nations. The United States plays as important a role in international grain and oilseed trade as do the Persian Gulf countries in crude oil trade."

Further, the Council report stated:

"Over two-thirds of our industrial raw material imports come from Canada, Australia, South Africa and other developed countries.... While there is relatively little trade in minerals between Communist countries and the rest of the world, the United States relies on the USSR for significant amounts of two important items -- platinum group metals and chromium."

According to the Council, "on an overall basis, U. S. import dependence on... critical industrial materials (other than energy)

is modest, about 15% of our consumption. . . our situation with respect to particular critical materials varies greatly: for example, we have exportable surpluses of phosphate but are totally dependent on foreign tin. "

In analyzing our situation further, the Council said "...the loss of supply could seriously hurt our economy, adversely affect our national security or reduce our foreign policy maneuverability. The lost supplies do not have to account for a large portion of our needs to be highly disruptive. For example, the crude oil embargo covered only 15% of our petroleum and 8% of our energy needs. "

Department of Interior figures show the United States is wholly dependent on imports for more than half our needs of the basic raw materials used in our nation's industrial economy. These are bauxite, chromium, manganese, tin, tungsten, and zinc. We are totally dependent on imports of tin, as I mentioned earlier.

Trade and Commerce Provide Jobs for Americans

When I speak of our nation's economy, Mr. President, I am endeavoring to show that these materials are vital to keep our industries operating and to provide jobs for millions of Americans. With most of the materials imported and coming to the United States by ship, we begin to realize all the more how vital freedom of the seas and peaceful commerce and trade are to the livelihood of our people and the economic health of our nation.

Strong Navy Essential for Trade by Sea and for Security

One of the most successful means of preserving and protecting the freedom of the seas is to have a strong U. S. Navy, highly visible on the oceans and seas of the world.

A strong Navy requires refueling and repair facilities, supply replenishment areas, and a number of essential support services available at convenient locations around the world. Some of these are provided by foreign countries who consent to our ships making ports of call; others by our own facilities set up on forward bases with the consent of the host government.

A strong Navy is indispensable to America for security reasons. After all, we are a three-ocean nation -- Atlantic, Pacific, and Arctic -- and the seas are no longer protective moats for our homeland. On the contrary, the oceans serve as highways for submarines armed with intermediate-range ballistic missiles -- mobile sea-launchers for nuclear bombs. With the advent of the nuclear submarines, the task of defending the United States shores and hinterland escalated enormously. So we must have a strong and versatile, modern, fast naval force to cope with the submarine threat.

From the end of World War II until the 1960's, the United States maintained virtually unquestioned naval supremacy. The Soviet Navy -- except for submarines -- generally ranked fourth, after the U.S.,

British, and French navies. Because of the lack of a far-ranging fleet, the Soviet government was unable to influence the Anglo-French Suez expedition in 1956, the U. S. naval forces landing in Lebanon in 1958, the the U. S. naval quarantine which forced the Soviets to withdraw strategic weapons from Cuba in 1962.

Soviet Naval Buildup

Since then, the Soviets have made prodigious efforts to remedy their deficiency on the high seas. In mid-1964, Soviet warships were ordered out of their traditional coastal areas and they set up a continual presence in the Mediterranean. Today, the Soviets average about 50 ships on station in the Mediterranean.

Along with the decision to "go to sea," the USSR began ambitious shipbuilding programs, which have produced modern missile-equipped ocean-going ships: the KARA class cruiser, the MOSKVA class helicopter cruiser, and the KIEV class aircraft carrier. In addition, Soviet shipyards began producing the YANKEE class nuclear-powered ballistic missile submarine. Today, they have more modern nuclear submarines than our U. S. Navy.

Soviet Strategic and Conventional Forces

On a broader spectrum, according to the Foreign Policy Task Force of the Coalition for a Democratic Majority, and I quote:

"The Soviets are well advanced in their campaign to control the Middle East and the Mediterranean basin.

The achievement of this goal would decisively tip the worldwide military balance in favor of the Soviet Union and its allies, and would leave us isolated in a bitter, hostile, and disillusioned world...."

Insofar as strategic forces are concerned, the Task Force said:

"Soviet strategic forces have been growing dramatically during the past decade, and this growth has continued unabated since the SALT I agreements of May 1972. The agreements foreseen at Vladivostok show little or no promise of slowing down this cancerous rate of growth...."

Further, the Task Force pointed out:

"While the Soviets build toward superiority in strategic forces, spending annually about twice as much on them as we do, we have unilaterally frozen the level of our strategic forces. Moreover, we have denied ourselves qualitative improvements that are within reach and are needed to implement our developing strategic doctrine...."

Pointing out that the nuclear stalemate that we have been able to maintain so far allows the Soviets the opportunity "to insure conventional wars and proxy wars" (like Vietnam), the Task Force then offered a sober comparison of American and Soviet conventional forces.

The Soviet Union has half-again as many men under arms as the United States: 3.4 million to 2.2 million.... Direct comparisons are here even more difficult than in the strategic case, and there are great uncertainties about equipment, logistics, training and readiness. But we know that the Soviet and Warsaw pact armies are heavily equipped with tanks and artillery. The Soviet Union alone is estimated to have four times as many tanks as the United

States (and five times the annual production rate, even after the projects U.S. step-up in 1975), three times as many artillery tubes and twice as many heavy mortars. While total numbers of Soviet tactical aircraft exceed those of the U. S. by about 40 per cent, they are believed to be producing such aircraft at double the U. S. rate. And their air defenses are not only far greater in their home (strategic) deployment but also in mobile or transportable systems (both missiles and artillery).

At sea, the Soviets have moved rapidly from a coastal defense to a 'blue water' navy, with almost as many surface combat ships as the United States, and over three times as many submarines (other than ballistic missile submarines). Here again, their building programs are far, far greater than our own. Their surface ships tend to be smaller, but emphasize speed and intense firepower, and they have been dramatically increasing their at-sea activity rates. They are ahead of the U. S. in surface-to-surface antiship missiles, and have nuclear antiship missiles, which we do not. In a direct conflict, these weapons could take a heavy toll of our fleet at the outset. The Soviets are behind us in endurance and in their ability to resupply their navy while it is under way. In aircraft carriers, with fifteen in service, the U. S. still enjoys a virtual monopoly, but the Soviets now have a program under way which has already produced one carrier and soon will produce another. They possess a formidable attack submarine fleet, although the U. S. currently has far greater anti-submarine resources and capabilities."

As a matter of fact, according to the Task Force:

"In terms of real defense capability, the United States is in many respects pursuing a course of unilateral disarmament, especially with regard to the Navy and other conventional forces. We are now spending a smaller fraction of our GNP on defense than has been the case for more than twenty years. Defense spending now takes only 26 cents of every federal tax dollar, compared with 45 cents in 1964" - this was before the Vietnam buildup - "and 57 cents in 1956." (This was when the U.S. was enjoying peace.)

The Task Force declared that, "In the face of the Soviet military build-up and Soviet foreign policy, our defense budget is an invitation to disaster."

Our Defense Budget "An Invitation to Disaster"?

What makes our defense budget an "invitation to disaster"?

General George Brown, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and our top military advisor, has publicly declared that "we no longer possess that predominance of strategic power which, for over a quarter of a century has protected the peace of the free world and the security of the United States."

General Weyand, Army Chief of Staff, is struggling to provide our Nation with 16 combat divisions and supporting forces -- the same as we had before Vietnam -- with only 785,000 men and women in Army uniform.

Since 1968, we have cut our Army in half, while the Soviets added 20 combat divisions! Our Army strength now is almost 200,000 personnel below pre-Vietnam totals.

Admiral Holloway, Chief of Naval Operations, must make do with the lowest number of ships since 1939 -- two years before Pearl Harbor!

General Jones, Air Force Chief of Staff, has some of the best trained personnel and some of the finest aircraft and equipment in the world, but he has less of both than at any other time since World War II.

Only our Marines have escaped drastic cutbacks. They remain at three active combat divisions under General Cushman.

The realities of our defense budget are that: all the resources added for the Indochina war -- manpower and purchasing power -- have been removed from the defense budget -- and more. As I mentioned earlier, the defense burden on the economy measured against our Gross National Output of goods and services is the smallest since 1950, the year the Korean War began. In terms of labor force, it is the smallest since 1940, a year when we were woefully unprepared for the war thrust upon us one year later by Japan and Germany. The defense shares of public sector resources (manpower and dollars) are the lowest since before Pearl Harbor.

U. S. Forces Stretched Thin in Asia-Pacific Area

Certainly, Mr. President, from my personal observation, American defense forces are stretched very, very thin in the Asia-Pacific area. Last October, I visited some of our forward bases in Japan, including Okinawa, in Korea, and in Guam. I visited the Republic of China on Taiwan and talked with our military advisory leaders there. I visited the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, where it may be necessary to install bases on the Island of Tinian and where we must retain our important missile testing facilities at Kwajalein.

While I was on Kwajalein last October, I witnessed the reentry of the first intercontinental ballistic missile ever launched from an airplane in flight, one of our huge cargo planes. It was a MIRV and it was right on targets in the Kwajalein lagoon corridor. Obviously, this adds an entirely new dimension to our strategic deterrent forces. If we can do this, however, it is only a matter of time until the Soviets can also do this.

So we face the prospect that ICBM's either from land launchers as far away as the Soviet Union or eventually from roving aircraft launchers can be targeted on key cities on the U. S. mainland and on our mid-Pacific defense establishment in Hawaii. But we know that our land and air launchers can retaliate in similar fashion.

What we will have is another stage of the nuclear stand-off, with continued likelihood that, because of the mutual destruction possible, the super powers will not resort to nuclear warfare. That leaves conventional warfare, against which we must be prepared and ready.

In conventional warfare, it is essential that we have forward bases and friendly countries in those forward areas. The Mayaguez incident proves that. Would we have retrieved the crew and our merchant vessel if we had not had an aircraft carrier and other naval vessels in the vicinity and trained personnel ready to carry out their assignments?

Returning now to our forces in the Western Pacific, in Japan, the American military presence has slowly declined, at first in response to political pressure, but recently because of defense fund cutbacks. We now have only a U. S. Navy installation at Yokosuka, a Marine Air Station at Iwakuni, and an Air Force base at Yokota. Air Force units continue to operate out of Okinawa, but no longer do we have nuclear weapons stored there or the U. S. Army units associated with Vietnam. The Marines still retain their base on Okinawa, providing capability for a modest landing force.

In Korea, we deactivated an Army division, leaving us with one division still there, plus several fighter squadrons. On Taiwan, the American presence is down from a high of over 9,000 to only 4,000 today, with further reductions in prospect before June 30 this year.

Our forces in the Philippines stand at 16,000, down from a 1969 high of 25,000.

In Thailand, from a high of 48,000 U. S. military personnel, we will be down to 19,500 by the end of June and, with the debacle in Cambodia and Vietnam, it appears we shall have to remove all our remaining personnel.

From a 1969 high of 764,000 U. S. military personnel in the Western Pacific, our forces there now total less than 140,000. Our Naval forces in the Western Pacific have been cut by about two thirds, now consisting of three carrier task forces and three and one-third patrol squadrons.

Much of the reduction stems from U. S. withdrawal from the Vietnam war. But budgetary cutbacks have taken their toll, too.

We Need Forward Bases in Pacific-Asia Area

There are those in the United States who say all U. S. military personnel and forces should be brought back from the Western Pacific. Of course, the question then arises: "Back to where?" Hawaii? We could certainly accommodate larger units there. And certainly our Pearl Harbor Shipyard facilities need beefing up so that our workforce and the capability of this vital yard can be kept at maximum efficiency.

Can we pull back our forces to Guam? Here we face limitations of land area and basic facilities.

Bases on Tinian would have to be constructed from scratch, as there is nothing there now that is usable for the Navy and Air Force with jet equipment, nuclear weapons, and so on. So Tinian as a forward base is some years down the road.

The next pullback area is the West Coast of the U. S. mainland.

Significance of U. S. Presence in Western Pacific

To my way of thinking, the military personnel we have in the Western Pacific are so relatively small that they do not pose a threat to any nation. Yet they are symbolic of America's deep interest in the free nations of Asia and of America's determination to keep sea lanes and air space open for trade, commerce, travel and communication by the international community.

Our forces in the Western Pacific countries on bases with their consent serve much the same purpose as U. S. forces in Europe. They are tangible evidence of our desire to maintain the territorial integrity and independence of the host nations inviolate from any aggressor. They are all part of what we and our host countries hope will prove to be viable deterrents to war.

The farther from our shores we can keep war, the better. And the more nations we can help to survive aggression by communist forces the better.

Free Nations on Front Lines in Western Pacific

Just as France, Belgium, the Netherlands, and West Germany
the Philippines
are on the front line of European defense, so Japan, Korea, / . . the Republic of China on Taiwan / are on the front lines of Asian-Pacific defense
and other free countries

The capitol of Seoul in South Korea is less than 30 miles from artillery fire from North Korea, and the communist regime in the north has been very bellicose toward South Korea. Like North Vietnam, North Korea does not want to leave its southern neighbor alone. South Korea has done a remarkable job of building up its economy while strengthening its defenses. All it asks is that we keep our agreement to help her modernize her defense forces. This we should by all means do, for the South Korean forces will fight very hard to defend their country.

Taiwan is just a few short miles offshore from the People's Republic of China, which contends that Taiwan is one of its provinces and

which has attacked Taiwan from time to time over the past 25 years. Taiwan has a well-trained and highly disciplined military force of more than 500,000 men, and they will fight to the end to defend the Republic of China. All the Republic of China forces want is a little easier credit terms on the military equipment they buy from us. The cost to the U.S. would be nominal and the benefits would far outweigh the nominal interest cost.

Japan, a fledgling democracy, is right in the heart of the Far East, having the People's Republic of China as its huge neighbor to the West, the Soviet Union as another neighbor. If Japan is lost to the Free World, we shall have lost one of the four mightiest industrial powers on earth.

So when we look at the situation objectively, without racial bias or rancor, we see that America's interest in freedom and self-determination and independence in the Asia-Pacific area is as important as our interest in Europe and the Middle East.

I agree with General Brown that "Military power in plain sight, close at hand and ready to fight, greatly influences perception on both sides. Any changes we make in the size and location of our forces anywhere in the Pacific will be taken as indicators of U.S. intent.

"We should not hastily cut back our military forces and bases in the Pacific. We need to continue our forward deployment strategy and security assistance."

It is inevitable, however, that as our overseas bases have dwindled, it is all the more imperative to maintain strong forces on bases on our own territory subject completely to our own jurisdiction and, in addition, to maintain a strong Navy able to patrol the oceans and serve as protectors of the freedom of the seas.

Although we all deplore the arms race that has been forced upon us by aggressive nations whose goal, so they have reminded us, is to dominate the world, still we in America know that we must provide for our own defense. There is no other country that will do it for us.

We need to signal to the rest of the world that we are concerned about communist inroads in Southeast Asia, about the left-wing coup in Portugal, about the disarray of NATO's southern flank, and about the threatening consequences that flow from these events.

We can do that by taking firm steps to improve our national defense system.

Need To Improve U. S. Defenses

The Foreign Policy Task Force which I have cited previously recommended in its analysis measures that would strengthen both our strategic and our conventional forces, at a cost of eight to ten billion dollars. The reason I note their cost estimates is that I understand this Task Force is composed of 34 scholars and former government officials described as "liberals and Democrats." I make this point clear so no one will think Republican hawks wrote the report.

There are undoubtedly many who would quarrel with their specific recommendations as to how to provide badly needed increments to our national security mix. But no one can quarrel with the fact that the dangers for our Nation have increased in the months since last January, when the President submitted his budget request.

If we can reverse our trend from what has been far too long unilateral disarmament and rebuild until we have unequivocally superior defenses - conventional as well as strategic - we will go a long way to restoring respect for the United States among friend as well as foe. Possibly we could recoup some of the loss of leadership we suffered in Southeast Asia.

By bolstering our national defenses promptly, effectively, and visibly, we shall certainly bolster America's diplomatic efforts toward peace around the world.

If we can accomplish this for eight to ten more billion dollars, it would be money well spent. After all, eight billion dollars would mean an extra cost of not quite \$58 a year per each American adult -- \$1.11 a week. A 10-billion-dollar cost would work out to not quite \$72 a year per adult American -- only \$1.33 a week. Surely these costs would be bearable, particularly when our national security is involved.

American People Support Strong Defense

Let me read a postal card I just received from a person in New York City. I quote:

"Do not cut our Defense Budget, I beg you.

"Our people want Defense superior to Russia.

"Our survival as a nation is at stake.

"We look to our Senators to keep us a free people and not a slave state!

"Cut the budget elsewhere - not on Defense!" (End of quote)

On this same point, let me read from a letter I received from a gentleman from Arkansas:

"Dear Senator Fong:

"It has been brought to our attention very vividly through the news media, magazines, radio, TV and word of mouth that Congress will very soon vote on the Defense Budget and probably to cut the Defense Budget very drastically. We think that this is the wrong move if we are to protect the United States. It is just as simple as that. We think there is no need to put out money for thousands of other projects within our own confines and not defend our shores. We believe that the front line has shrunk now to our own doorstep.

"There is no one of us asking for more taxes, but there are millions of us who would prefer to pay taxes in defense of our own country than to lose our national security and the preservation of our way of life and of the greatest government on the face of the earth.

"We sincerely hope that you will vote to maintain our Defense Budget at its highest level and possibly add to our national defense."

I truly believe that, if the Congress and the Administration would level with the American people about the world situation and about the state of our own defenses in the face of growing peril, there would be an outpouring of support from the American people in favor of more funds for procurement, for modernization of our forces, and for research and development to make sure we remain technologically in the forefront on defense matters.

To paraphrase our late President John F. Kennedy, I believe the American people would bear any burden and make any sacrifice in order to preserve the United States as a free, independent country.

To convince them to bear that burden and to make that sacrifice, however, we in the Congress and the Administration must evolve policies that will command the respect and concurrence of the American people. We cannot have 535 Secretaries of State in Congress and we cannot pull the rug out from under the President and expect the American people to rally round.

I believe the American people would give the Congress and the Administration wholehearted support if we take steps to ensure the sea and air lanes will remain open so that peaceful trade and commerce can be carried on without piracy, without extortion, and without harassment.

We in the island State of Hawaii particularly know what it is to suffer when our shipping lifelines and our air transportation services

are interrupted or cut off. Surface vessels bring in 98% of our consumer goods. Air carriers handle nearly 100% of our transport of people and sustain our vital tourist industry, one of our leading economic pillars.

Because of our cultural and ethnic ties with Far East and Pacific countries, we in Hawaii trade extensively with them. Every drop of crude oil imported into Hawaii -- and this is our only source of energy -- comes from Indonesia. We import food products from Japan, Korea, the Republic of China, Hong Kong, and the Philippines. We import cloth and finished garments from nations of the Far East, and many, many other agricultural and seafood products and manufactured goods.

Similarly, mainland United States carries on extensive trade with countries of the Pacific and Asia. We sell vast quantities of grains raised by American farmers and many different kinds of manufactured items. In 1974, U. S. exports to the Far East-South Asian region grew by a whopping 44 per cent. Because of the various disruptions in trade, this growth is expected in 1975 to be about 23 per cent, for a total of \$29 billion, with Japan taking about 46-48 per cent of the total.

As William J. Casey, Chairman and President of the Export-Import Bank noted, "America's two-way trans-Pacific trade amounted to \$34.8 billion in 1973. That was \$2.6 billion more than our trade with the European Community."

America Cannot Ignore Asia-Pacific Area

So we in America cannot ignore the Asia-Pacific area nor can we turn our backs on those nations. International trade and commerce are

vital to America's economic well-being and national security. Growing international trade and commerce mean more jobs for Americans, incentives for capital investment, dividends for stockholders, and badly needed taxes to help run our government.

Healthy and harmonious trade relations help to strengthen the free nations of the Asia-Pacific region who are our best customers. The stronger they are the better able they are to resist diplomatic pressure or blackmail and the better they can deter aggressive attacks on them.

With sufficient economic strength, all can do more to bolster their own defenses and thereby help to ensure their survival.

What the Basic Issue Is

For after all, this is what the conflict all boils down to: whether we as free people have the will and the determination and the perseverance to remain strong and ready against communism or any other brand of totalitarianism and authoritarianism, whether from within or from without.

A custodian at a junior high school in California wrote to me last week and expressed the issue very succinctly. He wrote:

"I know something about the horrid communist form of gov't through people I have met. These people fled other countries and had terrible tales to tell. I believe in America. I believe in the constitution and the bill of rights. Our country was founded on these great principles. . . . I love this great country and wouldn't want to

live anywhere else. Would you? We need to be vigilant to make sure our freedoms are preserved."

When I receive letters and postal cards and wires such as I have in recent days, I am all the more determined to do all that I can to help ensure the survival of our Republic and the precious freedoms we Americans enjoy.

I urge my colleagues to vote for more defense muscle and to formulate policies that will guide our Nation through the very dangerous months and years ahead. None of us would ever want history to record after our service in Congress the grim epitaph feared by reporter Bill Miller in the Manchester (N. H.) Union Leader last February 22:

"Here Lies the United States of America

"A Great Nation Which Almost Made It!

"Exit XX Century"

Under the previous order, the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. FONG) is recognized for not to exceed 15 minutes.

ASIA AND THE PACIFIC VITALLY IMPORTANT TO AMERICA'S NATIONAL SECURITY AND ECONOMIC WELL-BEING

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, it is with a deep sense of honor and responsibility that I participate in this valuable and timely discussion on the various aspects of our country's defense posture and its implications for our Nation's future security and economic well-being.

My remarks today will be primarily oriented to the Asia-Pacific area which is only natural for a Senator representing the mid-Pacific State of Hawaii.

To set my remarks in context, however, it is necessary to examine briefly the current situation worldwide in terms of foreign policy and national defense. These matters are very much interrelated and, as my remarks will show, reinforce my own view that the United States must strengthen its defense structure and forces and must strengthen our ties and alliances with freedom-loving nations around the globe.

No one who is concerned about the survival of freedom and freedom-loving peoples in this world can take any comfort from the events of the past 3 weeks.

LOSS OF 40 MILLION MORE PEOPLE TO COMMUNISM TRAGIC

The litany of countries and people who have fallen under the yoke of Communist regimes is a tragic and sobering one. South Vietnam with some 20 million people now Communist. Cambodia with 7½ million people now under Communist rule. Laos, with 3.3 million people, is for all practical purposes now within the Communist orbit.

On the other side of the world Portugal, once our staunch friend and ally, has now gone to the far left and, with Communists determined to take control in due time, the 8.6 million people of Portugal also appear doomed to Communist rule.

This is a grand total of nearly 40 million people who, within a very brief space of time have, or will have, fallen under Communist determination.

There are Americans who care not that peoples in other lands are now subject to the repressive and antifreedom Communist regimes. Besides, they say, these are just tiny countries of little importance to the United States.

But I say that these tragic events are of tremendous importance to the future of freedom in the world and to the security and economic well-being of the United States of America.

WORLD MORE DANGEROUS NOW THAN 2 MONTHS AGO

For the simple truth is that the world is now a far more dangerous place and the United States faces far greater problems in keeping the peace than it did just 2 months ago.

Portugal, for example, has already announced that it will not allow the United States to use air bases in the Azores in

any airlift of military equipment to Israel such as was so crucial in the last outbreak of war in the Middle East. It was U.S. assistance, timely and quantitatively, which helped maintain the balance of power in the Middle East and thereby averted an eyeball to eyeball confrontation between the super powers—the Soviet Union and the United States.

Farther down the road, a Communist takeover in Portugal could inspire further Communist inroads in Spain, and it is not inconceivable that Communist regimes could control the entrance to the Mediterranean through the Straits of Gibraltar. The United States could find it no longer has access to the Mediterranean.

Back in the Pacific area, with Vietnam, Cambodia, and Laos behind the Bamboo Curtain, the danger to Thailand has increased manifold. Undoubtedly, in Burma, Malaysia, Indonesia, and the Philippines, Communist insurgent forces have been given a great morale booster. And it is only logical and reasonable to expect that they would redouble their efforts and be additionally supplied with military arms and equipment now that North Vietnam will not be receiving such large quantities from the Soviet Union and the Peoples Republic of China.

With the loss of South Vietnam, Cambodia, and Laos to Communist forces and the resultant humiliation of the United States, the flashpoints of danger in the Far East have shot up quite a few notches. With the victory of North Vietnam, it is only logical and reasonable to assume that the Communist regime of North Korea has been immeasurably heartened and quite possibly emboldened to make new attacks on the 33.5 million free people of South Korea. Again, the war materiel from the Soviet Union and the Peoples Republic of China that had been planned for North Vietnam could well be diverted to North Korea, with all the potential for war that that would entail in the peninsula.

With the fall of South Vietnam, Cambodia, and Laos, the 36.3 million people of Thailand are in far greater peril than when its neighbors were still free. As the United States demonstrated in the case of South Vietnam that it is an unreliable ally, the Government of Thailand, which heretofore had allied itself with the United States felt compelled to request that all U.S. military forces leave Thailand. In order to stave off possible reprisals by its new Communist neighbors, Thailand judges itself unable to assist the United States in freeing the U.S. merchant ship *Mayaguez*, an unarmed vessel which was seized by Cambodian naval forces earlier this week.

Who now can truthfully say it does not matter to us in America whether all of Southeast Asia goes Communist. We did not have these incidents when Cambodia, Laos, and South Vietnam had regimes friendly to America.

I am relieved that President Ford's prompt and vigorous action brought about the safe release of the crew and recovery of our merchant ship, the *Mayaguez*, and also the release of the

Thai fishermen. I pay highest tribute to our valiant military personnel for their courage and their sacrifice.

INCREASED JEOPARDY FOR UNITED STATES AND ALLIES

And so we see, Mr. President, how quickly and, for us, how adversely the turn of events in Southeast Asia has increased the jeopardy for U.S. interests in that area of the world.

As I have already pointed out, Mr. President, it is not only the U.S. interests which are in greater danger now than they were 2 months ago, it is other nations of the Far East such as Japan, Taiwan, Singapore, Australia, and New Zealand.

I would remind my colleagues that a U.S. merchant vessel is not the only ship whose right to peaceful navigation in international waters was violated by the new Communist regime of Cambodia. On May 4, a South Korean freighter was fired upon and nearly captured in the same area of the *Mayaguez*. On May 8, a Panamanian ship was stopped by a Cambodian gunboat. And in the same week, a Thai fishing boat was seized.

Hardly had the Communists taken over Cambodia when they instigated multiple acts of piracy against ships of free countries plying the waters off Cambodia in peaceful trade and commerce.

With North Vietnam, the Khmer Rouge, and the Pathet Lao no longer requiring such tremendous quantities of arms and ammunition, will their suppliers be tempted to instigate wars of liberation and insurgency to a greater degree than heretofore and perhaps in areas not now plagued by such internal Communist attacks?

Are the 110 million people of Japan in greater peril now than they were before?

Are the 16 million people of the Republic of China on Taiwan in greater peril than they were before?

Are the 41.5 million people of the Philippines in greater peril now than they were before?

With the debacle in Vietnam and with America having failed to keep its commitments in Southeast Asia, are the 3.3 million people of Israel in greater peril than before?

VIETNAM LOSS HAS REPERCUSSIONS IN MIDDLE EAST

Here is what an Associated Press dispatch said on May 12, just 3 days ago under a headline "United States Defeat Emboldens Palestinians":

The defeat of American-backed governments in Indochina has boosted the morale of Palestinian guerrillas in their struggle against Israel.

Today Vietnam, tomorrow Palestine, rejoiced the current cover of Palestine Revolution, the weekly organ of the Palestine Liberation Organization.

The United States departure from Saigon and Phnom Penh was taken as a lesson throughout the Palestinian movement, from chieftain Yasir Arafat to machinegun toting guerrillas in remote hill camps.

The lesson to them is that underdog revolutionaries can get what they want against seemingly overwhelming odds if they persist in the battle against American imperialism and its agents.

Translated to the Middle East, that means renewed hope of beating the U.S.-backed forces of Israel.

"Comrades, your victory over American imperialism and its agents in your country has given us limitless confidence to pursue and strengthen the struggle the same way you did." Arafat cabled the Viet Cong after their triumphant entry into Saigon.

The end of the American presence in Indochina encourage (sic) some radical groups in the conviction that victory is possible only through combat, and that negotiations with Israel are pointless anyway.

"The will to fight must be stronger than the will to bargain and capitulate," commented the weekly Al Hadaf, organ of the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine, in drawing lessons from the Vietnamese experience.

When our Secretary of State Henry Kissinger proposed a Middle East settlement calling for Israeli withdrawal from much of the Sinai Desert backed up by a pledge of support by the United States in the event that Egypt declaration of nonbelligerency proved to be temporary, Israel rejected the plan.

Why? Because Israel did not deem a pledge by the United States as sufficient guarantee in light of our failure to keep our pledges to South Vietnam.

So it is clear that the defeat of U.S.-supported countries in Southeast Asia has already had repercussions far from Indochina. The tremors of our debacle there are spreading like shocks of an earthquake around the world.

ASSESSING U.S. SITUATION TODAY

Mr. President, I received a letter from Dr. David N. Rowe, recently retired after 31 years on the faculty of Yale University, which summarizes very clearly where the United States of America is today. Professor Rowe told me that last March he made an extensive tour of Southeast and East Asia, visiting Taiwan, Manila, Singapore, Kuala Lumpur, Saigon, Hong Kong, Seoul, and Tokyo.

Here is what Professor Rowe wrote me:

May I say, Senator, that in my opinion as a professional student of United States foreign policy and in particular of its Pacific relations, that the United States is today in mortal danger.

We are, in fact, in my view, standing right on the edge of a precipice, and it will not take much to push us over the edge into national oblivion. This is because we have seemingly become convinced by the Communist propaganda and our own picture of our interests, that it doesn't matter that we are losing progressively and step by step. The Communists will not ever give us another Pearl Harbor, to arouse us into flame! Their policy is the opposite, namely to cut off our right arm one inch at a time, so that, lulled by the false idea that none of our losses is vitally dangerous, we will in the end succumb to their successive and steady detractions from our power and our will to use the power we have.

The American people and their Congress are the center of this matter. The recent constitutional crisis of the Presidency has now given all too much power and influence to the Congress as to the control of foreign affairs, and with the national popular mood being what it is, we are paralyzed and unable to act. Unless this tendency is reversed, not only stopped, we are going to go down the drain of history. My children, and certainly their children, will live under Communist domination unless we stop and reverse the course of Communist aggression against free people.

Let me also cite, Mr. President, comments of Sir Robert Thompson, one of the few free world military leaders who was successful against Communist insurgents. It was Sir Robert who devised Britain's successful anti-insurgency campaign against local Chinese Communists in Malaya in 1950.

According to an interview in the Chicago Tribune of April 27, "Vietnam, Thompson insists, is the most recent proof of a disintegration of willpower that has made the Western Alliance a sitting duck for the communists."

Thompson is quoted directly as saying:

The retreat of the United States before Moscow, like that of Napoleon, is going to litter the world with corpses. You have shown that you are not prepared to stand on fundamental issues—for instance, the sanctity of treaties. This is a blatant breach of an agreement by North Vietnam and you are letting them get away with it. . . . You have a Congress which has only one foreign policy line—that if you surrender the killing will stop.

And you have a President in the position where he has no army, no air force, no navy, no money, and no message. Look at the map; you are in full retreat before Moscow at the present time. * * * Once a country goes communist it comes under the communist umbrella—and here's the point—forever! Forever! Their staying power is forever! Where's yours?

I also quote, Mr. President, from a letter I received from a gentleman who said he was an immigrant from World War II and who is now an American citizen:

Not long ago after the second world war America donated to the world enemies Russia many countries in Europe, including my former country Lithuania. By this American action I lost my country, my freedom, my people, family and home. Threw me from country to country, treated me like a criminal, called me names, displaced person and foreigner. * * *

All Asian and Europe minor countries do not trust America anymore, because America doesn't keep its word and can not protect his friends from communist aggression, no reason for them to fight because they lose anyway. * * *

Thirty years ago America donated to communist Europe, today Asia, it will soon come tomorrow for America, because America can not fight and win against all the world, because they do not have any friends left. * * *

As for Vietnam and Cambodia, this man wrote me:

This tragedy for these countries is going to end, but will begin for our country America. First, Middle East, Portuguese, Indonesia, Thailand, Philippines, Turkey, Greece and other free countries.

These countries will automatically surrender to the communist if received pressure from them, because they know that America can not protect them from communist aggression and for them no reason to fight, lose anyway.

Then he asked the chilling question: "Has this Senator prepared plans for American orphaned children and which country will accept our children?"

Indeed, Mr. President, which country will accept our orphans?

ONLY AMERICA CAN SAVE AMERICA; NO OTHER COUNTRY CAN

The plain fact of the matter is there is no country that can save America. We must save ourselves.

If we do not take the steps to insure our survival as a free nation, we cannot count on any other nation to guarantee life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness for Americans.

FREE NATIONS MUST EXERT GREATER EFFORTS

Nevertheless, starting with the premise that free nations all over the world are in far greater peril today than they were 2 months ago, I believe every nation and every freedom-loving people must take steps against takeover by authoritarian regimes, be they Communist, Fascist, anarchist, or whatever.

Every nation and every freedom-loving people must rededicate itself to the defense of freedom against onslaught from whatever quarter.

THIRD WORLD COUNTRIES TAKE HEED

The so-called third world nations cannot remain oblivious to Communist gains and authoritarian triumphs in other countries. Outnumbering the United States in world forums like the United Nations and the Interparliamentary Union, the third world nations take a seeming delight in trying to embarrass and humiliate the United States. I say to the third world people: If the United States falls, you will have lost the greatest force for self-determination, independence, and liberty the world has ever known.

You of the third world know the United States does not threaten to take over your land or your government or your people. Had the United States been an expansionist power, the Philippines could still be U.S. territory, Japan today would be a U.S. colony, the former U.S. sector of West Germany would be today a European toehold for the United States, and Micronesia would be U.S. territory, too.

What territory has any Communist power given up? What neighbor of a Communist country sleeps easy at night?

The answer in both cases is "none."

Every nation and every freedom-loving people must become stronger economically, militarily, and morally. The task of defending freedom is so enormous and costly that the United States of America cannot do the job all alone.

We are hard-pressed just to take care of our own national economy and defense and to meet our solemn treaty agreements with NATO countries, with Middle East countries, with Japan, the Republic of China on Taiwan, the Republic of Korea, and the Philippines.

NO TIME FOR DEFENSE RETRENCHMENT

Because America's burden is heavy, because our national economy has been in trouble, and because America is no longer involved militarily in Southeast Asia is no excuse for defense retrenchment. On the contrary, the danger signals are flashing red for us all over the world.

As AFL-CIO President George Meany said in a recent speech:

Every basic Communist tactic of seizing power is now on display throughout the world—naked aggression in Indochina; political blackmail in the Middle East; an outrageous putsch in Portugal; a heating up of the cold war in Korea, and a diplomatic and propaganda war in international institutions.

Nobody, but nobody, with common sense can believe that the Mideast, Vietnam, Portugal, Greece, Turkey, the UN—nobody can believe that these are separate, dismembered

developments that have no relation to our policies or to the over-all policies of the Communist world.

Now is the time for America to strengthen our national defense structure and forces. We must reevaluate our foreign policy and determine how we will prevent Uncle Sam from being pushed around, humiliated, and harassed any longer.

Prince Sihanouk, nominal leader of the Cambodian Communists, was quoted in the Paris newspaper, *Le Monde*, as saying:

We did what they said we could never do. We defeated the Americans.

Like it or not, this is how the Communist world—and let's face it, how much of the rest of the non-U.S. world—interprets recent events in Southeast Asia. Such an attitude can evoke a spate of tests for America around the world to see how much farther we will fall back.

North Korea may instigate trouble against South Korea to see whether, in panic, the U.S. Congress will demand the withdrawal of all U.S. forces in the Republic of Korea.

We can expect further tests elsewhere—diplomatically, against the Philippines for example, to get the United States kicked out of our naval base at Subic Bay and out of our Air Force base at Clark Field.

Already, the fall of Cambodia has compelled the Thai Government to publicly announce the United States must quit all our bases in Thailand.

Will Japan come under pressure to close down the U.S. air and naval base on its territory? One-third of Japan's export market is in Southeast Asia. Will Communist control of Southeast Asia threaten Japan economically and politically?

The more friends America loses in the Far East and Pacific, the more forward bases we must abandon, the more difficult it will be for the United States to keep the sea lanes open for trade and commerce and the more difficult it will be for America to assist Japan and other now-free countries under our mutual security pacts.

All of these possibilities underscore for me the necessity for the United States to beef up our defense mix of forces in our own territory and under our own control.

To disarm or further weaken U.S. defenses would be the worst possible course of action for us to take in our ever-more dangerous and unstable world.

PACIFIC-FAR EAST PICTURE

Let me draw a picture of the Pacific-Far East and the U.S. defense posture there. Other Senators today will describe the situation in other parts of the world.

First of all, the Pacific ocean is enormous, the largest body of water on the face of the Earth.

Covering nearly 64 million square miles, it is twice as large as the Atlantic ocean.

Between Panama and the China Sea, it is 11,000 miles wide. But between Alaska and the Soviet Union on the Bering Strait, it is only a few miles wide.

More than one half of the world's population of 4 billion people live in the

Pacific basin or in countries rimming the Pacific ocean. These include the United States with the west coast States of California, Washington, and Oregon directly on the ocean, likewise Alaska; and the State of Hawaii in the mid-Pacific ocean; 2,500 miles from the U.S. west coast. Included also in the Pacific nations are the People's Republic of China, Indonesia, Japan, Malaysia, the Republic of China, the Soviet Union, the Philippines, Vietnam, and various other nations.

From the time that men became waterborne on seagoing vessels, the oceans and seas of the world have been of tremendous importance to their economic life and progress.

Because trade and commerce among nations are so important—indeed are the lifeblood of a number of nations such as Japan—freedom of the seas has been a cardinal tenet of international relations.

At the same time, however, throughout history piracy and interdiction of sea lanes have been practiced even as they were practiced this week off the coast of Cambodia.

FREEDOM OF THE SEAS VITAL TO U.S.

Freedom of the seas and uninterrupted shipping and commerce are of vital importance to the United States even though we have many natural resources and a fair degree of self-sufficiency.

According to the "Special Report—Critical Imported Materials," of the Council on International Economic Policy, published in December 1974, the United States is—

Both a leading supplier and purchaser of internationally traded raw materials. About one-third of our exports and imports are non-manufactured. Our total trade in these commodities last year amounted to roughly \$45 billion from which we realized a trade surplus of more than \$1 billion.

The Council reports went on to say:

We are a leading supplier of raw materials to Western Europe and Japan, as well as many less developed nations. The United States plays as important a role in international grain and oilseed trade as do the Persian Gulf countries in crude oil trade.

Further, the Council report stated:

Over two-thirds of our industrial raw material imports come from Canada, Australia, South Africa and other developed countries. . . . While there is relatively little trade in minerals between Communist countries and the rest of the world, the United States relies on the USSR for significant amounts of two important items—platinum group metals and chromium.

According to the Council:

On an overall basis, U.S. import dependence on . . . critical industrial materials (other than energy) is modest, about 15% of our consumption. . . . our situation with respect to particular critical materials varies greatly: for example, we have exportable surpluses of phosphate but are totally dependent on foreign tin.

In analyzing our situation further, the Council said:

The loss of supply could seriously hurt our economy, adversely affect our national security or reduce our foreign policy maneuverability. The lost supplies do not have to account for a large portion of our needs to be highly disruptive. For example,

the crude oil embargo covered only 15% of our petroleum and 8% of our energy needs.

Department of Interior figures show the United States is wholly dependent on imports for more than half our needs of the basic raw materials used in our Nation's industrial economy. These are bauxite, chromium, manganese, tin, tungsten, and zinc. We are totally dependent on imports of tin, as I mentioned earlier.

TRADE AND COMMERCE PROVIDE JOBS FOR AMERICANS

When I speak of our Nation's economy, Mr. President, I am endeavoring to show that these materials are vital to keep our industries operating and to provide jobs for millions of Americans. With most of the materials imported and coming to the United States by ship, we begin to realize all the more how vital freedom of the seas and peaceful commerce and trade are to the livelihood of our people and the economic health of our Nation.

STRONG NAVY ESSENTIAL FOR TRADE BY SEA AND FOR SECURITY

One of the most successful means of preserving and protecting the freedom of the seas is to have a strong U.S. Navy, highly visible on the oceans and seas of the world.

A strong Navy requires refueling and repair facilities, supply replenishment areas, and a number of essential support services available at convenient locations around the world. Some of these are provided by foreign countries who consent to our ships making ports of call; others by our own facilities set up on forward bases with the consent of the host government.

A strong Navy is indispensable to America for security reasons. After all, we are a three-ocean nation—Atlantic, Pacific, and Arctic—and the seas are no longer protective moats for our homeland. On the contrary, the oceans serve as highways for submarines armed with intermediate-range ballistic missiles—mobile sealaunchers for nuclear bombs. With the advent of the nuclear submarines, the task of defending the United States shores and hinterland escalated enormously. So we must have a strong and versatile, modern, fast naval force to cope with the submarine threat.

From the end of World War II until the 1960's, the United States maintained virtually unquestioned naval supremacy. The Soviet Navy—except for submarines—generally ranked fourth, after the United States, British, and French navies. Because of the lack of a far-ranging fleet, the Soviet Government was unable to influence the Anglo-French Suez expedition in 1956, the U.S. naval forces landing in Lebanon in 1958, the U.S. naval quarantine which forced the Soviets to withdraw strategic weapons from Cuba in 1962.

SOVIET NAVAL BUILDUP

Since then, the Soviets have made prodigious efforts to remedy their deficiency on the high seas. In mid-1964, Soviet warships were ordered out of their traditional coastal areas and they set up a continual presence in the Mediterranean. Today, the Soviets average

about 50 ships on station in the Mediterranean.

Along with the decision to "go to sea," the U.S.S.R. began ambitious shipbuilding programs, which have produced modern missile-equipped ocean-going ships: the KARA class cruiser, the MOSKVA class helicopter cruiser, and the KIEV class aircraft carrier. In addition, Soviet shipyards began producing the YANKEE class nuclear-powered ballistic missile submarine. Today, they have more modern nuclear submarines than our U.S. Navy.

SOVIET STRATEGIC AND CONVENTIONAL FORCES

On a broader spectrum, according to the Foreign Policy Task Force of the Coalition for a Democratic Majority, and I quote:

The Soviets are well advanced in their campaign to control the Middle East and the Mediterranean basin. The achievement of this goal would decisively tip the worldwide military balance in favor of the Soviet Union, and its allies, and would leave us isolated in a bitter, hostile, and disillusioned world. . . .

- Insofar as strategic forces are concerned, the task force said:

Soviet strategic forces have been growing dramatically during the past decade, and this growth has continued unabated since the SALT I agreements of May 1972. The agreements foreseen at Vladivostok show little or no promise of slowing down this cancerous rate of growth. . . .

Further, the task force pointed out:

While the Soviets build toward superiority in strategic forces, spending annually about twice as much on them as we do, we have unilaterally frozen the level of our strategic forces. Moreover, we have denied ourselves qualitative improvements that are within reach and are needed to implement our developing strategic doctrine. . . .

Pointing out that the nuclear stalemate that we have been able to maintain so far allows the Soviets the opportunity "to insure conventional wars and proxy wars" (like Vietnam), the task force then offered a sober comparison of American and Soviet conventional forces.

The Soviet Union has half-again as many men under arms as the United States: 3.4 million to 2.2 million. . . . Direct comparisons are here even more difficult than in the strategic case, and there are great uncertainties about equipment, logistics, training and readiness. But we know that the Soviet and Warsaw pact armies are heavily equipped with tanks and artillery. The Soviet Union alone is estimated to have four times as many tanks as the United States (and five times the annual production rate, even after the projects U.S. step-up in 1975), three times as many artillery tubes and twice as many heavy mortars. While total numbers of Soviet tactical aircraft exceed those of the U.S. by about 40 per cent, they are believed to be producing such aircraft at double the U.S. rate. And their air defenses are not only far greater in their home (strategic) deployment but also in mobile or transportable systems (both missiles and artillery).

At sea, the Soviets have moved rapidly from a coastal defense to a "blue water" navy, with almost as many surface combat ships as the United States, and over three times as many submarines (other than ballistic missile submarines). Here again, their building programs are far, far greater than our own. Their surface ships tend to be smaller, but emphasize speed and intense firepower, and

they have been dramatically increasing their at-sea activity rates. They are ahead of the U.S. in surface-to-surface antiship missiles, and have nuclear antiship missiles, which we do not. In a direct conflict, these weapons could take a heavy toll of our fleet at the outset. The Soviets are behind us in endurance and in their ability to resupply their navy while it is under way. In aircraft carriers, with fifteen in service, the U.S. still enjoys a virtual monopoly, but the Soviets now have a program under way which has already produced one carrier and soon will produce another. They possess a formidable attack submarine fleet, although the U.S. currently has far greater antisubmarine resources and capabilities.

As a matter of fact, according to the task force:

In terms of real defense capability, the United States is in many respects pursuing a course of unilateral disarmament, especially with regard to the Navy and other conventional forces. We are now spending a smaller fraction of our GNP on defense than has been the case for more than twenty years. Defense spending now takes only 26 cents of every federal tax dollar, compared with 45 cents in 1964"—this was before the Vietnam buildup—and 57 cents in 1956." (This was when the U.S. was enjoying peace.)

The task force declared that:

In the face of the Soviet military build-up and Soviet foreign policy, our defense budget is an invitation to disaster.

OUR DEFENSE BUDGET "AN INVITATION TO DISASTER"?

What makes our defense budget an "invitation to disaster"?

Gen. George Brown, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and our top military adviser, has publicly declared that:

We no longer possess that predominance of strategic power which, for over a quarter of a century has protected the peace of the free world and the security of the United States.

General Weyand, Army Chief of Staff, is struggling to provide our Nation with 16 combat divisions and supporting forces—the same as we had before Vietnam—with only 785,000 men and women in Army uniform.

Since 1968, we have cut our Army in half, while the Soviets added 20 combat divisions. Our Army strength now is almost 200,000 personnel below pre-Vietnam totals.

Admiral Holloway, Chief of Naval Operations, must make do with the lowest number of ships since 1939—2 years before Pearl Harbor.

General Jones, Air Force Chief of Staff, has some of the best trained personnel and some of the finest aircraft and equipment in the world, but he has less of both than at any other time since World War II.

Only our Marines have escaped drastic cutbacks. They remain at three active combat divisions under General Cushman.

The realities of our defense budget are that: All the resources added for the Indochina war—manpower and purchasing power—have been removed from the defense budget—and more. As I mentioned earlier, the defense burden on the economy measured against our gross national output of goods and services is the smallest since 1950, the year the Korean war began. In terms of labor force, it is the smallest since 1940, a year

when we were woefully unprepared for the war thrust upon us 1 year later by Japan and Germany. The defense shares of public sector resources—manpower and dollars—are the lowest since before Pearl Harbor.

U.S. FORCES STRETCHED THIN IN ASIA-PACIFIC AREA

Certainly, Mr. President, from my personal observation, American defense forces are stretched very, very thin in the Asia-Pacific area. Last October, I visited some of our forward bases in Japan, including Okinawa, in Korea, and in Guam. I visited the Republic of China on Taiwan and talked with our military advisory leaders there. I visited the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, where it may be necessary to install bases on the island of Tinian and where we must retain our important missile testing facilities at Kwajalein.

While I was on Kwajalein last October, I witnessed the reentry of the first intercontinental ballistic missile ever launched from an airplane in flight, one of our huge cargo planes. It was a MIRV and it was right on targets in the Kwajalein lagoon corridor. Obviously, this adds an entirely new dimension to our strategic deterrent forces. If we can do this, however, it is only a matter of time until the Soviets can also do this.

So we face the prospect that ICBM's either from land launchers as far away as the Soviet Union or eventually from roving aircraft launchers can be targeted on key cities on the U.S. mainland and on our mid-Pacific defense establishment in Hawaii. But we know that our land and air launchers can retaliate in similar fashion.

What we will have is another stage of the nuclear stand-off, with continued likelihood that, because of the mutual destruction possible, the super powers will not resort to nuclear warfare. That leaves conventional warfare, against which we must be prepared and ready.

In conventional warfare, it is essential that we have forward bases and friendly countries in those forward areas. The *Mayaguez* incident proves that. Would we have retrieved the crew and our merchant vessel if we had not had an aircraft carrier and other naval vessels in the vicinity and trained personnel ready to carry out their assignments?

Returning now to our forces in the Western Pacific, in Japan, the American military presence has slowly declined, at first in response to political pressure, but recently because of defense fund cutbacks. We now have only a U.S. Navy installation at Yokosuka, a Marine air station at Iwakuni, and an Air Force base at Yokota. Air Force units continue to operate out of Okinawa, but no longer do we have nuclear weapons stored there or the U.S. Army units associated with Vietnam. The Marines still retain their base on Okinawa, providing capability for a modest landing force.

In Korea, we deactivated an Army division, leaving us with one division still there, plus several fighter squadrons. On Taiwan, the American presence is

down from a high of over 9,000 to only 4,000 today, with further reductions in prospect before June 30 this year.

Our forces in the Philippines stand at 16,000, down from a 1969 high of 25,000.

In Thailand, from a high of 48,000 U.S. military personnel, we will be down to 19,500 by the end of June and, with the debacle in Cambodia and Vietnam, it appears we shall have to remove all our remaining personnel.

From a 1969 high of 764,000 U.S. military personnel in the Western Pacific, our forces there now total less than 140,000. Our Naval forces in the Western Pacific have been cut by about two-thirds, now consisting of three carrier task forces and three and one-third patrol squadrons.

Much of the reduction stems from U.S. withdrawal from the Vietnam war. But budgetary cutbacks have taken their toll, too.

WE NEED FORWARD BASES IN PACIFIC-ASIA AREA

There are those in the United States who say all U.S. military personnel and forces should be brought back from the Western Pacific. Of course, the question then arises: "Back to where?" Hawaii? We could certainly accommodate larger units there. And certainly our Pearl Harbor Shipyard facilities need beefing up so that our workforce and the capability of this vital yard can be kept at maximum efficiency.

Can we pull back our forces to Guam? Here we face limitations of land area and basic facilities.

Bases on Tinian would have to be constructed from scratch, as there is nothing there now that is usable for the Navy and Air Force with jet equipment, nuclear weapons, and so on. So Tinian as a forward base is some years down the road.

The next pullback area is the west coast of the U.S. mainland.

SIGNIFICANCE OF U.S. PRESENCE IN WESTERN PACIFIC

To my way of thinking, the military personnel we have in the Western Pacific are so relatively small that they do not pose a threat to any nation. Yet they are symbolic of America's deep interest in the free nations of Asia and of America's determination to keep sea lanes and air space open for trade, commerce, travel, and communication by the international community.

Our forces in the Western Pacific countries on bases with their consent serve much the same purpose as U.S. forces in Europe. They are tangible evidence of our desire to maintain the territorial integrity and independence of the host nations inviolate from any aggressor. They are all part of what we and our host countries hope will prove to be viable deterrents to war.

The farther from our shores we can keep war, the better. And the more nations we can help to survive aggression by Communist forces the better.

FREE NATIONS ON FRONT LINES IN WESTERN PACIFIC

Just as France, Belgium, the Netherlands, and West Germany are on the front line of European defense, so Ja-

pan, Korea, the Philippines, the Republic of China on Taiwan and other free countries are on the front lines of Asian-Pacific defense.

The capital of Seoul in South Korea is less than 30 miles from artillery fire from North Korea, and the Communist regime in the north has been very belligerent toward South Korea. Like North Vietnam, North Korea does not want to leave its southern neighbor alone. South Korea has done a remarkable job of building up its economy while strengthening its defenses. All it asks is that we keep our agreement to help her modernize her defense forces. This we should by all means do, for the South Korean forces will fight very hard to defend their country.

Taiwan is just a few short miles offshore from the People's Republic of China, which contends that Taiwan is one of its provinces and which has attacked Taiwan from time to time over the past 25 years. Taiwan has a well-trained and highly disciplined military force of more than 500,000 men, and they will fight to the end to defend the Republic of China. All the Republic of China forces want is a little easier credit terms on the military equipment they buy from us. The cost to the United States would be nominal and the benefits would far outweigh the nominal interest cost.

Japan, a fledgling democracy, is right in the heart of the Far East, having the People's Republic of China as its huge neighbor to the west, the Soviet Union as another neighbor. If Japan is lost to the free world, we shall have lost one of the four mightiest industrial powers on Earth.

So when we look at the situation objectively, without racial bias or rancor, we see that America's interest in freedom and self-determination and independence in the Asia-Pacific area is as important as our interest in Europe and the Middle East.

I agree with General Brown that:

Military power in plain sight, close at hand and ready to fight, greatly influences perception on both sides. Any changes we make in the size and location of our forces anywhere in the Pacific will be taken as indicators of U.S. intent.

We should not hastily cut back our military forces and bases in the Pacific. We need to continue our forward deployment strategy and security assistance.

It is inevitable, however, that as our overseas bases have dwindled, it is all the more imperative to maintain strong forces on bases on our own territory subject completely to our own jurisdiction and, in addition, to maintain a strong Navy able to patrol the oceans and serve as protectors of the freedom of the seas.

Although we all deplore the arms race that has been forced upon us by aggressive nations whose goal, so they have reminded us, is to dominate the world, still we in America know that we must provide for our own defense. There is no other country that will do it for us.

We need to signal to the rest of the world that we are concerned about communist inroads in Southeast Asia, about the left-wing coup in Portugal, about the

disarray of NATO's southern flank, and about the threatening consequences that flow from these events.

We can do that by taking firm steps to improve our national defense system.

NEED TO IMPROVE U.S. DEFENSES

The Foreign Policy Task Force which I have cited previously recommended, in its analysis, measures that would strengthen both our strategic and our conventional forces, at a cost of \$8 to \$10 billion. The reason I note their cost estimates is that I understand this Task Force is composed of 34 scholars and former Government officials described as "liberals and Democrats." I make this point clear so no one will think Republican hawks wrote the report.

There are undoubtedly many who would quarrel with their specific recommendations as to how to provide badly needed increments to our national security mix. But no one can quarrel with the fact that the dangers for our Nation have increased in the months since last January, when the President submitted his budget request.

If we can reverse our trend from what has been far too long unilateral disarmament and rebuild until we have unequivocally superior defenses—conventional as well as strategic—we will go a long way to restoring respect for the United States among friends as well as foe. Possibly we could recoup some of the loss of leadership we suffered in Southeast Asia.

By bolstering our national defenses promptly, effectively, and visibly, we shall certainly bolster America's diplomatic efforts toward peace around the world.

If we can accomplish this for \$8 to \$10 billion more, it would be money well spent. After all, \$8 billion would mean an extra cost of not quite \$58 a year per each American adult—\$1.11 a week. A \$10-billion cost would work out to not quite \$72 a year per adult American—only \$1.38 a week. Surely these costs would be bearable, particularly when our national security is involved.

AMERICAN PEOPLE SUPPORT STRONG DEFENSE

Let me read a postal card I just received from a person in New York City, I quote:

Do not cut our Defense Budget, I beg you. Our people want Defense superior to Russia.

Our survival as a nation is at stake.

We look to our Senators to keep us a free people and not a slave state!

Cut the budget elsewhere—not on Defense!"

On this same point, let me read from a letter I received from a gentleman from Arkansas:

DEAR SENATOR FONG: It has been brought to our attention very vividly through the news media, magazines, radio, TV and word of mouth that Congress will very soon vote on the Defense Budget and probably to cut the Defense Budget very drastically. We think that this is the wrong move if we are to protect the United States. It is just as simple as that. We think there is no need to put out money for thousands of other projects within our own confines and not defend our shores. We believe that the front line has shrunk now to our own doorstep.

There is no one of us asking for more taxes, but there are millions of us who would prefer to pay taxes in defense of our own country

than to lose our national security and the preservation of our way of life and of the greatest government on the face of the earth.

We sincerely hope that you will vote to maintain our Defense Budget at its highest level and possibly add to our national defense.

I truly believe that, if Congress and the administration would level with the American people about the world situation and about the state of our own defenses in the face of growing peril, there would be an outpouring of support from the American people in favor of more funds for procurement, for modernization of our forces, and for research and development to make sure we remain technologically in the forefront on defense matters.

To paraphrase our late President John F. Kennedy, I believe the American people would bear any burden and make any sacrifice in order to preserve the United States as a free, independent country.

To convince them to bear that burden and to make that sacrifice, however, we in Congress and the administration must evolve policies that will command the respect and concurrence of the American people. We cannot have 535 Secretaries of State in Congress and we cannot pull the rug out from under the President and expect the American people to rally round.

I believe the American people would give Congress and the administration wholehearted support if we take steps to insure that the sea and air lanes will remain open so that peaceful trade and commerce can be carried on without piracy, without extortion, and without harassment.

We in the island State of Hawaii particularly know what it is to suffer when our shipping lifelines and our air transportation services are interrupted or cut off. Surface vessels bring in 98 percent of our consumer goods. Air carriers handle nearly 100 percent of our transport of people and sustain our vital tourist industry, one of our leading economic pillars.

Because of our cultural and ethnic ties with Far East and Pacific countries, we in Hawaii trade extensively with them. Every drop of crude oil imported into Hawaii—and this is our only source of energy—comes from Indonesia. We import food products from Japan, Korea, the Republic of China, Hong Kong, and the Philippines. We import cloth and finished garments from nations of the Far East, and many, many other agricultural and seafood products and manufactured goods.

Similarly, mainland United States carries on extensive trade with countries of the Pacific and Asia. We sell vast quantities of grains raised by American farmers and many different kinds of manufactured items. In 1974, U.S. exports to the Far East-South Asian region grew by a whopping 44 percent. Because of the various disruptions in trade, this growth is expected in 1975 to be about 23 percent, for a total of \$29 billion, with Japan taking about 46 to 48 percent of the total.

As William J. Casey, Chairman and President of the Export-Import Bank noted:

America's two-way trans-Pacific trade amounted to \$34.8 billion in 1973. That was \$2.6 billion more than our trade with the European Community.

AMERICA CANNOT IGNORE ASIA-PACIFIC AREA

So we in America cannot ignore the Asia-Pacific area nor can we turn our backs on those nations. International trade and commerce are vital to America's economic well-being and national security. Growing international trade and commerce mean more jobs for Americans, incentives for capital investment, dividends for stockholders, and badly needed taxes to help run our Government.

Healthy and harmonious trade relations help to strengthen the free nations of the Asia-Pacific region who are our best customers. The stronger they are, the better able they are to resist diplomatic pressure or blackmail and the better they can deter aggressive attacks on them.

With sufficient economic strength, all can do more to bolster their own defenses and thereby help to insure their survival.

WHAT THE BASIC ISSUE IS

After all, this is what the conflict all boils down to: whether we as free people have the will and the determination and the perseverance to remain strong and ready against communism or any other brand of totalitarianism and authoritarianism, whether from within or from without.

A custodian at a junior high school in California wrote to me last week and expressed the issue very succinctly. He wrote:

I know something about the horrid communist form of gov't through people I have met. These people fled other countries and had terrible tales to tell. I believe in America. I believe in the constitution and the bill of rights. Our country was founded on these great principles. . . . I love this great country and wouldn't want to live anywhere else. Would you? We need to be vigilant to make sure our freedoms are preserved.

When I receive letters and postal cards and wires such as I have in recent days, I am all the more determined to do all that I can to help insure the survival of our Republic and the precious freedoms we Americans enjoy.

I urge my colleagues to vote for more defense muscle and to formulate policies that will guide our Nation through the very dangerous months and years ahead. None of us would ever want history to record, after our service in Congress, the grim epitaph feared by reporter Bill Miller in the *Manchester, N.H.*; *Union Leader* last February 22:

Here Lies the United States of America,
A Great Nation Which Almost Made It!
Exit XX Century.

Mr. McCLURE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time assigned to Senator THURMOND be reserved to the end of the list.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STONE). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Under the previous order, the Senator from Arizona (Mr. FANNIN) is recognized for not to exceed 15 minutes.

BILATERAL RESPONSIBILITY OF DEFENSE COMMITMENTS

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, this morning, I am very pleased to have the privilege of talking on the bilateral responsibility of the defense commitments of the Free World.

I wish to discuss a situation which I feel is of immediate importance to the American people and the defense of the free world. The situation to which I refer is the lack of an adequate commitment on the part of many countries of the free world to share the responsibility of defense. The United States has carried the major burden of defense since World War II. Our immediate post-war responsibilities to our allies were immense given the wide-spread devastation.

The world situation has changed dramatically. Thirty years of varying degrees of prosperity have changed the world order. The commitments made and responsibilities assumed by the United States for an overwhelming share of the defense of the free world is no longer a viable solution to actual defense requirements. Events in recent years, and more pointedly, in recent days—in fact, presently happening—clearly illustrate the necessity of the other free nations of the world carrying a heavier load of that commitment.

There is no question that the defense of all free nations is essential to our own personal security. The interdependence of the free nations has never been more obvious. That interdependence necessitates a bilateral responsibility of defense commitments.

Mr. President, 30 years ago the United Nations was founded with great fanfare and naive hopes for the maintenance of future peace. That international institution was dedicated to the preservation of world peace; to the development of friendly relations between nations; to the promotion of principles of equal rights and self-determination; and to the cooperation of member nations in overcoming economic, social, and cultural problems.

The United Nations was, of course, established in this great country of ours. The United States today believes in these goals, the same goals established at that time.

These are noble goals. The United States subscribed to these goals in helping to establish the United Nations. The United States today believes in these goals. However, it has become increasingly obvious that the U.N. is a failure as an organization and that the original goals have been subverted. The nature of the U.N. has changed drastically, and I now believe that it not only is a waste of U.S. tax money to support the U.N., but it is contrary to our own national interest and that of the free world. It saddens us to come to that conclusion. This reality heightens the necessity of mutual dependence by free world countries.