

U. S. Congress

UNITED STATES



OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 91st CONGRESS
SECOND SESSION

VOLUME 116—PART 4

FEBRUARY 20, 1970, TO MARCH 2, 1970
(PAGES 4247 TO 5596)

... It is quite uncertain, under these circumstances, how a nuclear war could be ended."

That being so, do we want to be able to fight "limited" nuclear wars? Wouldn't it be better—since the chances are that controlled war would get out of control anyway—to take Symington's suggestion and announce that we will respond to any Soviet attack with a counter-attack on cities? Such a policy—it's called "mutual unconditional deterrence"—would eliminate any thought on either side of "winning" a nuclear war. Both sides would lose everything. It would be the best incentive not to start a war. It would, in fact, make strategic nuclear weapons irrelevant and unusable; and it could provide the basis for a gradual trimming down of arsenals on both sides.

Furthermore, it would reduce the need for "damage limitation" as a goal in national strategic policy, saving considerable money. All we would need in the way of strategic weaponry (research might continue, but deployment would not be necessary) would be enough to inflict unacceptable losses on an attacker. That amount would be a matter for debate, but in the past we have always built much more than we have needed—so much, in fact, that we have plenty left over for damage limitation (i.e., war-winning). This is known as overkill, and we both have plenty. Senator Albert Gore (D-Tenn.) has figured out that the United States has 48 times the number of warheads needed to destroy the 50 largest Soviet cities. The Soviets have 22 times the number needed to destroy our 50 largest cities.

Some damage-limitation weapons are bound to be deployed. We plan our deterrent needs not against what the Soviet have, or even what they are expected to have, but against a "greater-than-expected threat," which, in Enthoven's words, "assumes that the Soviets develop . . . their forces to a degree we believe is only remotely possible." As a result, "five years later, when the forces are actually in the field, we are likely to find that the actual Soviet threat is not as great as we had predicted it would be, so we have forces left over that can be used for other missions" besides deterrence. He was talking about a damage-limitation mission. It is probably neither possible nor desirable to eliminate all damage-limiting forces. But it is wise to have enough assured destruction to cover all circumstances. Some excess is an inevitable result.

It is quite another matter to plan for damage limitation or to build it stealthily, using cover assertions that "gaps" exist in our ability to deter war. The planner who is significantly and unnecessarily boosting our damage-limiting capability is thinking about winning a nuclear war—or starting one. The Joint Chiefs of Staff, straightforward soldiers that they are, want to build more damage-limiting hardware, and they say so. They consider it unpatriotic to think that nuclear war is unthinkable.

Counsel KENDALL. Are you concerned that in some way we may not be in or approaching a stage of unconditional mutual deterrence whereby neither side would dare to use its strategic nuclear weapons under any circumstances?

"General WHEELER. I do not think we have reached that stage, nor do I think we will necessarily reach it if we exert our brains and if we have the will not to permit it to happen. . . . I do not see this unconditional mutual deterrence. It could well be that you are going to arrive at a situation where the decision is going to be harder to make to use these forces.

KENDALL. Suppose the numbers of casualties . . . were doubled (to 160 million for the U.S., 200 million for the Soviets). . . . Obviously, you would have no country left, neither of us.

WHEELER. Mr. Kendall, I reject the "better Red than dead" theory—lock, stock, and barrel.

The Chiefs want to retain the option of trying to win wars and they want the equipment with which to pick up on that option. They want a large, advanced ICBM with multiple warheads. They want a new manned bomber equipped with SRAM (an air-to-ground nuclear missile) and SCAD (a bomber-carried drone plane). They want fallout shelters for the entire population and a thick, city-protecting ABM system. Total cost: classified but gigantic. Piled on, these damage-limiting systems might begin to approach the kind of all-out superiority you need if you want to think about launching a pre-emptive strike or threatening one to blackmail an enemy into submission. Unfortunately for the Joint Chiefs, these programs were not approved by McNamara. Neither was the theory of "exploitable nuclear superiority," simply because it was impossible to attain—any effort we made to achieve it would be matched by the Soviets. We would be matched by the Soviets. We would both have more weapons, concluded McNamara, but each side would still be able to kill off the same numbers of people.

GAP VERSUS FACT

But now we are embarked on a new Administration which speaks with two voices. One voice says that we will talk with the Soviets about limiting nuclear weapons and perhaps negotiate an agreement which will "codify equality." The same soft voice says that the goal of the U.S. strategic arsenal is "sufficiency" for deterrence, not "superiority." However, another voice tells us that the Soviets are striving for a first strike capability against us with "no question about it."

The same voice says that unless we build new weapons the Soviets will be ahead "in all areas" by the mid-1970's. This latter voice, which is heard most often from the mouth of Melvin R. Laird, echoes back to the days of yore, when "missile gaps" and "bomber gaps" were dreamed up (by Democrats, it should be noted) as opportunities to establish U.S. superiority in weapons. Laird may be right—and in the unfortunate position of the boy crying wolf the third time. But, having heard "wolf" before, suspicions among the population are natural. They should lead to vigorous debate.

If Americans are suspicious, what about the Soviets? They have seen the "gap" pattern develop before in the U.S. In 1962, it cost them dearly. They have reason to be suspicious now, too, because we are readying two programs that are at least partly damage-limiting (war-winning), though we are justifying them as maintaining assured destruction (deterrence). One such program is the Safeguard ABM system, which Laird says we need to plug a deterrent gap, but which also has a war-winning role against both China and the Soviets that could be expanded. The other program, on the verge of being deployed, is Minuteman III with MIRV (for multiple independently-targeted re-entry vehicle), a system for equipping each rocket with several warheads that can be directed to different targets. MIRV is justified these days in the name of assured destruction (in a retaliatory strike, to get through Soviet ABMs). But last year, Foster testified to its original purpose: "to increase our targeting ability." Our MIRVs are highly accurate—a requirement not needed for use on cities, but necessary for destroying somebody's missiles. Or, as Foster testified last spring, "we are beginning (with MIRV) to get a rather effective damage-limiting capability."

This being so, MIRV is an even better issue than ABM around which to debate the question of war-winning. This has not yet been done. The doves on the Senate Foreign

Relations Committee have skipped around both MIRV and the larger question. They shouldn't: we could all get killed. If we want Adam and Eve to be Americans, we should decide it publicly.

BOUNDARY WATERS CANOE AREA, MINN.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, the million-acre Boundary Waters Canoe Area is the pride of Minnesota. This magnificent expanse of forests, lakes, and rivers along the Canadian border is visited annually by thousands of persons seeking a breath of fresh air.

The Boundary Waters Canoe Area has escaped commercialism through the years. Now, however, the threat of mining has arisen within the area.

I am very much disturbed over this prospect, because it would be completely inconsistent with the history and purpose of this matchless region. It is apparent that many Minnesota citizens are also upset over the possibility of exploitation in this wilderness area.

A lawsuit by the Izaak Walton League to prevent mining there is now before the U.S. district court in Duluth, and I am watching developments in the case closely.

Mr. President, in this connection, I ask: unanimous consent that the text of an article by Jim Kimball on the Boundary Waters Canoe Area, published in the Sunday picture magazine of the Minneapolis Tribune of February 8, be printed in the RECORD.

This fine article, which was accompanied by a number of excellent photographs, captures the feeling that most Minnesotans—indeed, thousands of out-of-State visitors—have for this region.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE BOUNDARY WATERS CANOE AREA

For more than half a century Minnesota's famed wilderness lying along the Canadian border has been the scene of a running battle between conservationists and the commercial interests.

The area within the Superior National Forest known as the Boundary Waters Canoe Area (BWCA) covers more than a million acres of pine, spruce, balsam, cedar and hardwoods surrounding pure lakes, rushing rivers, dashing waterfalls and sluggish creeks and beaver ponds where water lilies grow. This is the place where granite cliffs rise vertically from clear blue lakes, the picturesque settings where massive pines or stunted cedars survive on rocks by extending the tentacles of their roots far into the crevices. Here too is the home of the timber wolf and the moose, the pine marten, the fisher and the spruce grouse.

It is big country, even bigger when you consider that it adjoins another million acres of comparable beauty in the Quetico National Park of Canada.

There are words to describe beauty, but there are no words to describe the sensation within the chest of the man who has fallen in love with the Quetico-Superior. An indescribable feeling builds up within him—a feeling that he is not only in the wilderness but part of the wilderness. This feeling builds as he glides over the deep blue waters along a rock-rimmed shore with a canoe paddle in his hand, shoots the rapids or travels its trails and crosses its lake on

snowshoes in the depth of winter. He becomes one with nature and her Maker. He feels small, humble and insecure in the presence of such grandeur, and yet, at the same time, he has a sensation of strength, self-sufficiency and of being as big as the whole world of which he has become part.

When the spirit of wilderness invades the soul of a man it changes him. His animal senses are sharpened. The calluses are peeled away from his human sensitivities. He experiences a fresh new awareness of the world he lives in and of the magnificence of life itself.

I cannot remember the date of my first trip into this great wilderness, but it has to be more than 40 years ago because I had not yet graduated from the two-room country school. A borrowed canoe was shipped to Ely on the train, and with two companions I hitch-hiked to that town where we spent our combined resources, except one dollar, for food.

A man forgets a lot of things in 40-odd years, but this trip? Never. After two weeks our grub supply was gone except for onions. But we couldn't bear to leave so we ate fish and onions. And when the onions were gone we ate fish until we could stand it no more.

Of course we did not know that even then the canoe country would have been gone, flooded over by dams which the lumber barons wanted to build, had it not been for fighting conservationists. We had not heard of Ernest Oberholtzer (Ober), the little man with the Harvard degree who had adopted the wilderness and who, supported by men of wealth and influence, had fought the lumbermen to a standstill.

There were many other canoe trips, and I recall the first one with my wife when we paddled for five days into a remote area which we could imagine no one else had ever seen. Then an airplane sat down beside us and three fat, soft, cigar-smoking men in business suits cast fishing lures in front of our tent. This couldn't happen now. Battling conservationists, led by the Izaak Walton League of America, put a stop to aerial invasion of this wilderness. I recall the first trip with our kids when David kept sliding off the rocks and had to be fished out of the water. And a later trip when the two boys, bigger now, had learned to sail and, making sails out of their ponchos, traveled farther by wind power than by paddle power.

I was involved in the battles to stop road building and logging in the BWCA. But the man who best knows the history of the long struggle is Sig Olson, Minnesota's most famous author, ecologist and authority on wilderness.

In discussing the new threat by New York mining interests to the BWCA, Olson said, "We have fought the dams. We have fought the roads. We have fought to get rid of the private resorts and the airplanes.

"As a result of the dedication of many people, not only in Minnesota but all over the nation, the Quetico-Superior country, and especially the BWCA, has become a sort of national treasure, a heritage of all the people. It is important to the people of America spiritually as well as physically and is loved by countless hundreds of thousands. It is an area that deserves to be held in a state of undevelopment. I have always favored the elimination of all logging in the BWCA. It is far too precious an area to be logged when all the needed timber can be harvested elsewhere. "And as for the mining, this is unthinkable. We don't need the minerals. They will keep for some future generation who might need them.

"I think the time has come for everyone to take a firm stand to say this must not happen to an area which has been fought

over for so long, to a wilderness that millions of people recognize as superlative."

THE NEED FOR A SECURE SOURCE OF OIL

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, on Thursday, February 19, I introduced a bill which would maintain our oil import control program with some modification to meet regional needs. That bill has as one of its foundations the security requirements of the United States. Its aim is to protect our Nation from a growing dependence upon unstable foreign oil supplies.

Today's Washington Post carries a news dispatch which quotes the Libyan leader, Muammar Qadhafi, as saying that he would cut off all oil shipments to the West if asked to do so by other Arab leaders. This is the type of circumstance to which my bill is addressed.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LIBYA WOULD CUT OIL IF NASSER ASKS

DAMASCUS, SYRIA, February 22.—Libya's revolutionary leader, Col. Muammar Qadhafi, said today he would be willing to cut off Libya's vast oil shipments to the West if Egypt's President Nasser asked him to do so for the Palestine cause.

Qadhafi was speaking in Tripoli as his first press conference since he took over power last September. The conference was broadcast by Tripoli radio.

The colonel was asked whether Libya was willing to stop the oil flow to the West and move against vast American oil investments in his country if asked to do so by the Egyptian leader or other countries bordering Israel.

"We are always prepared to sacrifice all our resources for the sake of the common cause in Palestine," he replied.

Asked his opinion on the spate attacks by Palestinian guerrillas on civilian aircraft and passengers, he replied:

"Attacks on civilian targets are generally inhuman. But Israel has attacked civilian targets in Arab countries . . . Therefore we cannot hold the guerrillas to blame for attacking civilian targets."

Qadhafi said the close cooperation among Libya, Egypt and Sudan was a prelude to a federation of the three countries. But he denied reports that Egyptian troops were stationed in his country.

He answered sharply when asked whether the Mirage Jets that Libya has bought from France might be made available to Egypt for use against Israel.

"I believe the motive for this question is America's fear regarding the protection of Israel," Qadhafi said. "Since Israel has expansion plans covering the whole Arab world which could one day extend to Libya, then Libyan Mirages may well be used against Israel, even if they are not made available to Egypt."

SENATE YOUTH PROGRAM DELEGATES

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, traditionally, the reconvening of the Senate is a time of full schedules, innumerable visitors, and activity of every conceivable description. This year, reconvening very nearly coincided with the annual visit to the Senate by the eighth successive Senate youth program delegates, but those

of us who were able to meet personally with the students from our States were again encouraged and impressed by the consistently high caliber of those young people. I know my colleague and cochairman for 1970, the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. BAKER), will join me in a salute to the high school leaders who were our guests and the guests of the Senate the final week in January.

As we in Congress have had occasion to learn, constituents come in many and varied models. Some are more welcome than others, coming as they do with bright, open minds to see and learn. The 102 student constituents brought to Washington by the William Randolph Hearst Foundation to participate in the annual Senate youth program represented the best of young America and surprised many of us with their perception and challenging queries. Hopefully, we acquitted ourselves with equanimity and anticipate that future day when some of these same young leaders will join us at this enormous task of law making and national guidance.

The Capital showed the visitors its best during their 6-day stay. Top officials, including Secretary of Defense Melvin Laird, Deputy Attorney General Richard Kleindienst, Associate Justice of the Supreme Court Byron White, J. Edgar Hoover, and Astronaut Michael Collins, now Assistant Secretary of State for Public Affairs, briefed the SYP delegates who also were conducted on a specially arranged tour of the White House and honored at a buffet luncheon in the elegant Ben Franklin Room of the Department of State.

Not the least among the good things befalling the delegates was the presentation to each of a scholarship in the amount of \$1,000 by the Hearst Foundation. On behalf of the Senate Advisory Committee, I wish to express to the trustees of the foundation our appreciation of their generous gesture to the promising leaders of tomorrow. Likewise, we wish to thank our fellow Senators and their staffs who made the students welcome on "the Hill" on January 28.

Similarly, a special word of thanks must go to Mr. and Mrs. George Hearst Sr., who devote long hours of their time both to the planning aspects of and later to the actual week here in the city in company with the students when they assume the roles of super-parents to the 102 participants. Recognition and thanks go, too, to Mr. Ira Walsh, director of the program, who gives endlessly of himself to insure its complete success.

It is understood, of course, that without the generous assists received from departments and agencies of the U.S. Government and the hard-working staffs thereof, our agenda for the week would be barren indeed.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the names of the student delegates to the 1970 Senate youth program and of the escorting officers of the various military services be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the lists were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows: