

The original documents are located in Box D27, folder “Annual Flag Day Services of Grand Rapids Elks Lodge and Century Club with VFW Post No. 830, at Elks Lodge No. 48, June 14, 1969” of the Ford Congressional Papers: Press Secretary and Speech File at the Gerald R. Ford Presidential Library.

Copyright Notice

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 The Council donated to the United States of America his copyrights in all of his unpublished writings in National Archives collections.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

ANNUAL CONVENTION OF THE MICHIGAN DEPARTMENT
OF AMVETS AT 7 P.M. SATURDAY, JUNE 14,
1969, PANTLIND HOTEL, GRAND RAPIDS, MICH.

Dick O'Leary
Comm. Barthe
Gen. of J. J. Blood
JOHNSON

126

MR. COMMANDER, OTHER OFFICERS
OF THE MICHIGAN DEPARTMENT OF AMVETS AND
DELEGATES TO THIS GREAT CONVENTION:

YOURS IS A VETERANS
ORGANIZATION; I AM YOUR CONVENTION KEYNOTE
SPEAKER; AND TODAY IS FLAG DAY. UNDER THE
CIRCUMSTANCES, IT MIGHT BE EXPECTED THAT I
WOULD SPEAK ONLY OF THE PRINCIPLES WE HOLD
DEAR AS AMERICANS, THE FLAG AS THE EMBLEM
OF THE LAND WE LOVE, AND THE NEED FOR A
RESURGENCE OF PATRIOTISM IN A NATION DEEPLY
DIVIDED OVER A TRAGIC WAR.

TONIGHT I WOULD LIKE TO DO
MORE THAN THAT. I WOULD LIKE TO ASK SOME
HARD QUESTIONS ABOUT OUR NATIONAL SECURITY --
AND PERHAPS GIVE YOU SOME HARD ANSWERS.



I DO NOT LIKE LONG SPEECHES,
AND I AM SURE YOU DON'T EITHER.

I PLAN TO SPEAK ABOUT
20 MINUTES. IF I SEE YOU GLANCING AT YOUR
WATCHES, I WILL BECOME CONCERNED. IF YOU
START SHAKING THEM AND HOLDING THEM UP TO
YOUR EARS, I WILL JUST STOP TALKING AND SIT
DOWN.

IT IS DIFFICULT FOR A
POLITICIAN TO GIVE A SHORT SPEECH, YOU KNOW.
SOMEBODY ONCE ASKED PRESIDENT WOODROW WILSON
HOW LONG IT TOOK HIM TO PREPARE A 10-MINUTE
SPEECH. "ABOUT TWO WEEKS," HE SAID. "AND A
ONE-HOUR SPEECH?" "THAT WOULD TAKE ME ABOUT
A WEEK," WILSON REPLIED. "AND A TWO-HOUR
SPEECH?" "OH," PRESIDENT WILSON LAUGHED,
"IF YOU'LL LET ME RAMBLE ON FOR TWO HOURS,
I'M READY RIGHT NOW."

I AM NOT GOING TO RAMBLE. MY
BEGINNING POINT IS THIS. WE IN THIS COUNTRY

HAVE REACHED A WATERSHED IN THE HISTORY OF OUR NATION, A POINT OF CRITICAL DECISION IN OUR NATIONAL AFFAIRS, A TIME OF CRUCIAL JUDGMENT IN DETERMINATION OF OUR FUTURE FOREIGN POLICY.

PRESIDENT NIXON WENT STRAIGHT TO THE HEART OF THE QUESTION WHEN HE SPOKE AT THE RECENT AIR FORCE ACADEMY COMMENCEMENT EXERCISES.


THERE ARE THOSE IN THIS COUNTRY, THE PRESIDENT SAID, WHO BELIEVE THAT THE "ROAD TO UNDERSTANDING WITH THE SOVIET UNION AND COMMUNIST CHINA LIES THROUGH A DOWNGRADING OF OUR ALLIANCES AND WHAT AMOUNTS TO A UNILATERAL REDUCTION OF ARMS -- AS A DEMONSTRATION OF OUR 'GOOD FAITH.' "

THE PRESIDENT BELIEVES -- AND I BELIEVE -- THAT THESE MEN, MANY OF THEM HIGHLY PLACED AND INFLUENTIAL -- ARE WELL-INTENTIONED AND UNDOUBTEDLY PATRIOTIC,

BUT WOEFULLY MISTAKEN. THEIRS IS NOT THE WAY TO WORLD PEACE.

THE ISSUE WAS FIRST AND FULLY JOINED WHEN PRESIDENT NIXON PROPOSED THAT WE BUILD THE SAFEGUARD MISSILE DEFENSE SYSTEM. NOT A NEW AND TERRIBLE OFFENSIVE WEAPONS SYSTEM, MIND YOU, BUT A SYSTEM SIMPLY DESIGNED TO PROTECT THE MISSILES WE HAVE PLACED AT STRATEGIC SITES THROUGHOUT THE UNITED STATES AS A DETERRENT TO NUCLEAR WAR. THE OBJECTIVE WAS CLEAR -- TO INSURE WORLD PEACE BY CONVINCING ANY WOULD-BE AGGRESSOR THAT IT COULD NOT LAUNCH A NUCLEAR ATTACK UPON THE UNITED STATES WITHOUT SUFFERING A DEVASTATING NUCLEAR RESPONSE.

IMMEDIATELY THOSE MEMBERS OF CONGRESS WHO BELIEVE WE SHOULD SEARCH FOR PEACE BY WITHDRAWING FROM THE WORLD AND WEAKENING OUR BARGAINING POSITION WITH THE SOVIET UNION BEGAN ATTACKING THE PRESIDENT'S



SAFEGUARD ANTI-BALLISTIC-MISSILE PROPOSAL.

THEY CHARGED IT WOULD WRECK ANY CHANCE FOR REACHING AN ARMS CONTROL AGREEMENT WITH THE RUSSIANS. THEY LINED UP SCIENTISTS TO SAY THE SAFEGUARD SYSTEM WOULDN'T WORK. THEY MADE IT APPEAR THAT THOSE WHO FAVOR THE BUILDING OF A MISSILE DEFENSE SYSTEM WERE REALLY JUST INTERESTED IN HUGE PROFITS FOR DEFENSE INDUSTRIES OR HAD BEEN DUPED BY THE DEFENSE DEPARTMENT.

ONE SENATOR EVEN ASSEMBLED A PANEL OF SO-CALLED EXPERTS TO BUILD A CASE AGAINST THE SAFEGUARD SYSTEM, AND THE RESULTS WERE PUBLISHED IN BOOK FORM. WHEN THIS DEVELOPED, I BEGAN TO WONDER ABOUT THEIR CREDENTIALS FOR MAINTAINING AN ADEQUATE DEFENSE POSTURE FOR AMERICA.

THE SO-CALLED EXPERTS FIERCELY FIGHTING THE SAFEGUARD SYSTEM AT THE SENATOR'S BIDDING INCLUDED THREE MEN



WHO IN 1961 VIGOROUSLY URGED THE LAUNCHING OF A VAST AND FANTASTICALLY COSTLY FALLOUT SHELTER-CIVIL DEFENSE PROGRAM -- A MAGINOT LINE APPROACH FOR THE 1960'S. AMONG THESE "EXPERTS" ARE A FORMER PRESIDENTIAL SPEECH WRITER AND ANOTHER GENTLEMAN WHO DID THE WHITE HOUSE STAFFWORK ON WHICH THE CIVIL DEFENSE SPEECH WAS BASED.

THE EFFORTS OF THOSE SO-CALLED EXPERTS SEEMED TO SERVE AS A LIGHTNING ROD. VERY QUICKLY, EVERY INDIVIDUAL AND GROUP WITH LIKE-MINDED MOTIVATION RALLIED AROUND THE ANTI-ABM BANNER.

THE FEVER SPREAD, AND SOON SOUNDS WERE HEARD OF OPPOSITION TO EVERY NEW WEAPONS PROPOSAL BEING ADVANCED BY THE DEFENSE DEPARTMENT AND SOME PROGRAMS ALREADY IN BEING. SOME MEMBERS OF CONGRESS TALKED OF CHOPPING THE DEFENSE DEPARTMENT'S BUDGET FROM \$80 BILLION TO \$60 BILLION IN ONE FELL

SWOOP AND ARGUED THAT WE WOULD HAVE JUST AS MUCH SECURITY FOR THE MONEY. THE SUM EFFECT WAS THE FORMATION OF A GIGANTIC LOBBY AGAINST DEFENSE SPENDING.

MORE THAN A MONTH AGO, I SPOKE OUT AGAINST THESE ATTACKS ON OUR DEFENSE EFFORT BECAUSE I BECAME ALARMED AT WHAT AMOUNTED TO A MOVEMENT TOWARD UNILATERAL DISARMAMENT WHEN IT WAS ALL ADDED TOGETHER.

AT A WHITE HOUSE PRESS CONFERENCE ON APRIL 29, AFTER MEETING WITH PRESIDENT NIXON, I ASKED WHETHER THIS CONGLOMERATION OF CRITICS INDEED WANTED TO UNILATERALLY DISARM AMERICA. AT THE SAME TIME I MADE IT CLEAR THAT I WAS NOT QUESTIONING THEIR MOTIVES. I SIMPLY FELT THAT THEY WERE SADLY AND BADLY MISTAKEN AND THAT THEIR ATTACK ON THE SAFEGUARD SYSTEM AND OTHER PROPOSED DEFENSE PROGRAMS WAS PLACING THE UNITED STATES IN JEOPARDY.



FOR ANYONE TO SAY THAT I WAS CALLING ABM CRITICS UNPATRIOTIC IS UTTER NONSENSE. I JUST THINK THEY ARE WRONG. I BELIEVE THAT -- ON THE BASIS OF THE FACTS -- THE SAFEGUARD PROGRAM IS NEEDED.

I BELIEVE WE MUST BUILD AT LEAST A MINIMAL MISSILE DEFENSE SYSTEM IF WE ARE TO MAINTAIN AN ADEQUATE STRATEGIC STRENGTH OR EVEN MAINTAIN PARITY OF NUCLEAR STRENGTH WITH THE SOVIET UNION.

IT IS NOT UNPATRIOTIC TO QUESTION ITEMS ON THE MILITARY SHOPPING LIST. I DID SO REPEATEDLY AS RANKING REPUBLICAN ON THE HOUSE DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE BEFORE BECOMING MINORITY LEADER OF THE HOUSE AND I CONTINUE TO DO SO NOW. THIS IS A DUTY OF A CONGRESSMAN OR SENATOR.

BUT I WANT SECURITY FOR AMERICA -- "SECURITY WITH SOLVENCY," AS



PRESIDENT EISENHOWER DESCRIBED IT. I WANT SECURITY WITH PROPER COST ACCOUNTING PROCEDURES, FIRM CONTROL OF DEFENSE SPENDING BY THE PRESIDENT AND THE CONGRESS. AND I ALSO WANT -- JUST AS FERVENTLY AS DO THE ABM CRITICS -- A DILIGENT PURSUIT OF ARMS CONTROL AND OPPORTUNITIES TO PROMOTE PEACE. BUT IN THE WORDS OF PRESIDENT NIXON I AM WILLING ONLY THAT WE TAKE "CALCULATED RISKS FOR PEACE," NOT FOOLISH RISKS.

THIS IS FLAG DAY. I CAN NEVER LOOK AT THE AMERICAN FLAG WITHOUT FEELING A SURGE OF THE DEEP LOVE I HAVE FOR MY COUNTRY. BUT I DO NOT ASK YOU TO **CONSIDER** THE QUESTION OF A MISSILE DEFENSE IN A CLOUD OF PATRIOTIC EMOTION. I ASK YOU AND ALL AMERICANS MERELY TO LOOK AT THE FACTS.

THESE ARE THE FACTS:

IN THE PAST TWO YEARS, RUSSIA



HAS MADE STRONG AND CONTINUING EFFORTS TO EXPAND ITS MILITARY POWER AND CONTROL. SHE HAS MADE TREMENDOUS GAINS, INCREASING HER FORCE OF INTERCONTINENTAL BALLISTIC MISSILES (ICBMs) FROM 250 TO AT LEAST A PARITY WITH THIS COUNTRY'S 1,054. RECENT INTELLIGENCE SHOWS THE RUSSIANS ARE BUILDING THEIR FANTASTICALLY POWERFUL ICBM -- THE 25-MEGATON SS-9 -- AT A RATE OF FROM 40 TO 50 A YEAR, WITH NO SIGN OF A LETUP. THE UNITED STATES PRESENTLY IS BUILDING NO MORE ICBMs.

THE SS-9 COULD HAVE AN ACCURACY TO WITHIN ONE-QUARTER OF A MILE OF ITS TARGET. THIS MEANS THE SOVIET UNION COULD BE IN A POSITION BY 1974 TO WIPE OUT ALL BUT A SMALL PERCENTAGE OF U.S. MISSILES...UNLESS WE BUILD THE SAFEGUARD MISSILE DEFENSE SYSTEM.

WHAT ABOUT RED CHINA? UNLIKE



THE SOVIET UNION WITH ITS URBAN CENTERS,
RED CHINA HAS ITS TREMENDOUS POPULATION OF
700 MILLION SCATTERED OVER ITS IMMENSE LAND
MASS. SO AN IRRATIONAL NUCLEAR ATTACK CAN
BE FEARED FROM THAT QUARTER.

RED CHINA COULD BLACKMAIL
THE UNITED STATES WITH A RELATIVELY SMALL
NUMBER OF PRIMITIVE BUT DELIVERABLE ICBMs
BY THE LATE 1970s -- UNLESS WE HAD AN ABM
SYSTEM.

EXPERTS ON RED CHINA FOR
YEARS HAVE RAISED THE QUESTION WHETHER RED
CHINESE LEADERS MIGHT NOT BE WILLING TO
ABSORB HEAVY CASUALTIES IN A NUCLEAR
EXCHANGE WITH THE UNITED STATES, SINCE THE
POPULATION OF RED CHINA IS MORE THAN THREE
TIMES THAT OF AMERICA AND IS THINLY SCATTERED
OVER A GREAT AREA.

IN THE LIGHT OF THESE FACTS,
I BELIEVE AMERICA NEEDS AND MUST BEGIN -- NOW --

TO BUILD A MINIMAL MISSILE DEFENSE SYSTEM.
TO FAIL TO DO SO WOULD BE TO TAKE WHAT I
CONSIDER TO BE AN UNACCEPTABLE GAMBLE WITH
THIS NATION'S FUTURE SECURITY.

WILL A DECISION TO GO AHEAD
WITH THE SAFEGUARD SYSTEM BLOCK ARMS CONTROL
TALKS WITH THE SOVIET UNION? NONSENSE. THE
RUSSIANS HAVE RAISED NO OBJECTIONS TO OUR
BUILDING AN ABM SYSTEM. ONLY OUR PEOPLE
HAVE. THE RUSSIANS ALREADY HAVE AN ABM
SYSTEM DEPLOYED FOR THEIR PROTECTION.
MEANTIME THEY ARE DEVELOPING A MORE
SOPHISTICATED ABM THAT CAN LOITER IN THE
ATMOSPHERE AND THEN BE DIRECTED AT AN
INCOMING OFFENSIVE MISSILE. WE ARE ALSO
DEVELOPING SUCH AN ABM.

WILL THE SAFEGUARD MISSILE
DEFENSE SYSTEM WORK? TESTS OF ALL THE
COMPONENTS INDICATE THAT IT SHOULD WORK.
THE U.S. HAS ALREADY INTERCEPTED AND

DESTROYED ONE OF OUR OWN BALLISTIC MISSILES WITH A VERSION OF OUR ABM SYSTEM.

IN ESSENCE, ALL THE PRESIDENT IS ASKING FOR NOW IS CONGRESSIONAL APPROVAL OF TWO PROTOTYPE INSTALLATIONS AT GRAND FORKS, N.D., AND MALMSTROM AIR FORCE BASE IN MONTANA, TO BE COMPLETED BY 1973. COST OF THE PROTOTYPES IS ESTIMATED AT \$2.1 BILLION -- OR AN AVERAGE OF \$400 MILLION ANNUALLY FOR FIVE YEARS, WHICH IS JUST ABOUT ONE-HALF OF 1 PER CENT OF OUR TOTAL DEFENSE BUDGET. THE FULL SAFEGUARD SYSTEM, IF BUILT TO INCLUDE 12 SITES WITH WARHEADS, WOULD COST \$10.8 BILLION.

A NUMBER OF PROMINENT SCIENTISTS HAVE QUESTIONED WHETHER SAFEGUARD WILL ACTUALLY WORK. BUT EQUALLY PROMINENT SCIENTISTS ARE CONVINCED IT WILL. AS ONE EMINENT SCIENTIST PUT IT, "THE RUSSIANS WILL BE DETERRED BY THE VERY FACT THAT IT



MIGHT WORK."

ARMS CONTROL TALKS WITH THE RUSSIANS ARE EXPECTED TO BEGIN IN JULY OR AUGUST. A CONGRESSIONAL DECISION TO PROCEED WITH THE TWO PROTOTYPE SAFEGUARD INSTALLATIONS WILL BE NO OBSTACLE.

THE TALKS MIGHT DRAG ON FOR YEARS. MEANTIME SAFEGUARD WILL GIVE THE PRESIDENT A WAY OF KEEPING HIS OPTIONS OPEN AT A TIME WHEN NOBODY KNOWS WHETHER THE RUSSIANS WILL COME DOWN ON THE SIDE OF ARMS CONTROL OR A CONTINUED EFFORT TO ACHIEVE OVERWHELMING NUCLEAR SUPERIORITY.

WE ARE ENTERING UPON AN ERA OF NEGOTIATION IN THE HOPE OF BUILDING A MORE STABLE WORLD. LET US DO SO WITH A RATIONAL, REASONABLE AND RESPONSIBLE APPROACH, NOT AS A HAT-IN-HAND PETITIONER. THE COMMUNISTS HAVE REPEATEDLY DEMONSTRATED THAT THEY RESPECT ONLY STRENGTH.




AS THE LATE PRESIDENT
EISENHOWER PUT IT IN HIS FAREWELL ADDRESS
TO THE NATION: "A VITAL ELEMENT IN KEEPING
THE PEACE IS OUR MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT.
OUR ARMS MUST BE MIGHTY, READY FOR INSTANT
ACTION, SO THAT NO POTENTIAL AGGRESSOR MAY
BE TEMPTED TO RISK HIS OWN DESTRUCTION."

THE OLD ORDER CHANGETH, BUT
I THINK THOSE WORDS OF PRESIDENT
EISENHOWER'S STILL SERVE AMERICA WELL TODAY.

LET US CONTINUE TO HEED
THOSE WORDS. AND LET US JOIN PROUDLY IN
THE DEFENSE OF OUR COUNTRY TODAY WITH
ANOTHER AMERICAN PRESIDENT WHO BELIEVES
THAT A STRONG DEFENSE CAPABILITY IS THE
FIRST REQUIREMENT FOR PEACE -- RICHARD M.
NIXON.

GLOBAL IN ITS POTENTIAL
DESTRUCTIVENESS, NUCLEAR WAR SEEMS
ABSOLUTELY UNTHINKABLE. BUT THINK ABOUT IT




WE MUST, AS LONG AS ANY THREAT EXISTS. LET US DO EXACTLY THAT -- THINK, NOT PLACE FOOLISH HOPE IN THE INTENTIONS OF THOSE WHO DISPLAY CONSTANT ENMITY TOWARD US.

EVEN AT THIS MOMENT OTHER AMERICANS ARE PAYING THE SUPREME PRICE SO THAT MEN MAY BE FREE. THEY NEED MORE THAN OUR PRAYERS. THEY NEED OUR SUPPORT.

A FATHER WITH A SON WHO ENLISTED TO FIGHT IN VIETNAM RECENTLY CALLED MY OFFICE AND SAID HIS SON FEELS THAT THE PEOPLE BACK HOME HAVE ABANDONED HIM AND HIS BUDDIES.

I TOLD THIS FATHER THAT THE OVERWHELMING MAJORITY OF AMERICANS ARE TERRIBLY PROUD OF OUR MEN IN VIETNAM. I TOLD HIM THAT NO MATTER WHETHER THEY DISAGREE WITH OUR DECISION TO MAKE A MASSIVE COMMITMENT OF MANPOWER THERE, THEY STILL SUPPORT OUR FIGHTING MEN.



LET NO INDIFFERENCE, NO
SLUGGISH CITIZENSHIP, NO MORAL WEAKNESS,
NO SHIRKING OF OUR RESPONSIBILITIES
UNDERMINE THE TREMENDOUS JOB OUR MEN IN
VIETNAM ARE DOING IN THWARTING COMMUNIST
TAKEOVER OF A TINY NATION BY FORCE. LET
US KEEP FAITH WITH THEM EVERY DAY AND IN
EVERY WAY.

FREEDOM'S FUTURE IS IN OUR
HANDS. BRAVE MEN LIKE YOU HAVE MADE IT SO.
IT IS FOR US TO SEE THAT THE PROMISE OF
FREEDOM BECOMES A REALITY IN THE LIVES AND
HEARTS OF ALL AMERICANS. THANK YOU.

-- END --



M Office Copy

AN ADDRESS BY REP. GERALD R. FORD
REPUBLICAN LEADER, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
AT THE ANNUAL CONVENTION OF THE MICHIGAN DEPARTMENT OF AMVETS
AT THE PANTLIND HOTEL, GRAND RAPIDS, MICHIGAN
7 P.M. SATURDAY, JUNE 14, 1969

FOR RELEASE ON DELIVERY

Mr. Commander, other officers of the Michigan Department of Amvets and delegates to this great convention:

Yours is a veterans organization; I am your convention keynote speaker; and today is Flag Day. Under the circumstances, it might be expected that I would speak only of the principles we hold dear as Americans, the Flag as the emblem of the land we love, and the need for a resurgence of patriotism in a Nation deeply divided over a tragic war.

Tonight I would like to do more than that. I would like to ask some hard questions about our national security -- and perhaps give you some hard answers.

I do not like long speeches, and I am sure you don't either.

I plan to speak about 20 minutes. If I see you glancing at your watches, I will become concerned. If you start shaking them and holding them up to your ears, I will just stop talking and sit down.

It is difficult for a politician to give a short speech, you know. Somebody once asked President Woodrow Wilson how long it took him to prepare a 10-minute speech. "About two weeks," he said. "And a one-hour speech?" "That would take me about a week," Wilson replied. "And a two-hour speech?" "Oh," President Wilson laughed, "if you'll let me ramble on for two hours, I'm ready right now."

I am not going to ramble. My beginning point is this. We in this country have reached a watershed in the history of our Nation, a point of critical decision in our national affairs, a time of crucial judgment in determination of our future foreign policy.

President Nixon went straight to the heart of the question when he spoke at the recent Air Force Academy commencement exercises.

There are those in this country, the President said, who believe that the "road to understanding with the Soviet Union and Communist China lies through a downgrading of our alliances and what amounts to a unilateral reduction of arms -- as a demonstration of our 'good faith.'"

(more)

The President believes -- and I believe -- that these men, many of them highly placed and influential -- are well intentioned and undoubtedly patriotic, but woefully mistaken. Theirs is not the way to world peace.

The issue was first and fully joined when President Nixon proposed that we build the Safeguard missile defense system. Not a new and terrible offensive weapons system, mind you, but a system simply designed to protect the missiles we have placed at strategic sites throughout the United States as a deterrent to nuclear war. The objective was clear -- to insure world peace by convincing any would-be aggressor that it could not launch a nuclear attack upon the United States without suffering a devastating nuclear response.

Immediately those members of Congress who believe we should search for peace by withdrawing from the world and weakening our bargaining position with the Soviet Union began attacking the President's Safeguard anti-ballistic-missile proposal.

They charged it would wreck any chance for reaching an arms control agreement with the Russians. They lined up scientists to say the Safeguard system wouldn't work. They made it appear that those who favor the building of a missile defense system were really just interested in huge profits for defense industries or had been duped by the Defense Department.

One senator even assembled a panel of so-called experts to build a case against the Safeguard system, and the results were published in book form. When this developed, I began to wonder about their credentials for maintaining an adequate defense posture for America.

The so-called experts fiercely fighting the Safeguard system at the senator's bidding included three men who in 1961 vigorously urged the launching of a vast and fantastically costly fallout shelter-civil defense program -- a Maginot Line approach for the 1960s. Among these "experts" are a former presidential speech writer and another gentleman who did the White House staffwork on which the civil defense speech was based.

The efforts of these so-called experts seemed to serve as a lightning rod. Very quickly, every individual and group with like-minded motivation rallied around the anti-ABM banner.

The fever spread, and soon sounds were heard of opposition to every new weapons proposal being advanced by the Defense Department and some programs already in being. Some members of Congress talked of chopping the Defense

(more)

Department's budget from \$80 billion to \$60 billion in one fell swoop and argued that we would have just as much security for the money. The sum effect was the formation of a gigantic lobby against defense spending.

More than a month ago, I spoke out against these attacks on our defense effort because I became alarmed at what amounted to a movement toward unilateral disarmament when it was all added together.

At a White House press conference on April 29, after meeting with President Nixon, I asked whether this conglomeration of critics indeed wanted to unilaterally disarm America. At the same time I made it clear that I was not questioning their motives. I simply felt that they were sadly and badly mistaken and that their attack on the Safeguard system and other proposed defense programs was placing the United States in jeopardy.

For anyone to say that I was calling ABM critics unpatriotic is utter nonsense. I just think they are wrong. I believe that -- on the basis of the facts -- the Safeguard program is needed.

I believe we must build at least a minimal missile defense system if we are to maintain adequate strategic strength or even maintain parity of nuclear strength with the Soviet Union.

It is not unpatriotic to question items on the military shopping list. I did so repeatedly as ranking Republican on the House defense appropriations subcommittee before becoming minority leader of the House and I continue to do so now. This is a duty of a congressman or senator.

But I want security for America -- "security with solvency," as President Eisenhower described it. I want security with proper cost accounting procedures, firm control of defense spending by the President and the Congress. And I also want -- just as fervently as do the ABM critics -- a diligent pursuit of arms control and opportunities to promote peace. But in the words of President Nixon I am willing only that we take "calculated risks for peace," not foolish risks.

This is Flag Day. I can never look at the American Flag without feeling a surge of the deep love I have for my country. But I do not ask you to consider the question of a missile defense in a cloud of patriotic emotion. I ask you and all Americans merely to look at the facts.

These are the facts:

In the past two years, Russia has made strong and continuing efforts to expand its military power and control. She has made tremendous gains, increasing

(more)

her force of intercontinental ballistic missiles (ICBMs) from 250 to at least a parity with this country's 1,054. Recent intelligence shows the Russians are building their fantastically powerful ICBM -- the 25-megaton SS-9 -- at a rate of from 40 to 50 a year, with no sign of a letup. The United States presently is building no more ICBMs.

The SS-9 could have an accuracy to within one-quarter of a mile of its target. This means the Soviet Union could be in a position by 1974 to wipe out all but a small percentage of U.S. missiles...unless we build the Safeguard missile defense system.

What about Red China? Unlike the Soviet Union with its urban centers, Red China has its tremendous population of 700 million scattered over its immense land mass. So an irrational nuclear attack can be feared from that quarter.

Red China could blackmail the United States with a relatively small number of primitive but deliverable ICBMs by the late 1970s -- unless we had an ABM system.

Experts on Red China for years have raised the question whether Red Chinese leaders might not be willing to absorb heavy casualties in a nuclear exchange with the United States, since the population of Red China is more than three times that of America and is thinly scattered over a great area.

In the light of these facts, I believe America needs and must begin -- now -- to build a minimal missile defense system. To fail to do so would be to take what I consider to be an unacceptable gamble with this nation's future security.

Will a decision to go ahead with the Safeguard system block arms control talks with the Soviet Union? Nonsense. The Russians have raised no objections to our building an ABM system. Only our people have. The Russians already have an ABM system deployed for their protection. Meantime they are developing a more sophisticated ABM that can loiter in the atmosphere and then be directed at an incoming offensive missile. We are also developing such an ABM.

Will the Safeguard missile defense system work? Tests of all the components indicate that it should work. The U.S. has already intercepted and destroyed one of our own ballistic missiles with a version of our ABM system.

In essence, all the President is asking for now is Congressional approval of two prototype installations at Grand Forks, N.D., and Malmstrom Air Force Base in Montana, to be completed by 1973. Cost of the prototypes is estimated at

(more)

\$2.1 billion -- or an average of \$400 million annually for five years, which is just about one-half of 1 per cent of our total defense budget. The full Safeguard system, if built to include 12 sites with warheads, would cost \$10.8 billion.

A number of prominent scientists have questioned whether Safeguard will actually work. But equally prominent scientists are convinced it will. As one eminent scientist put it, "The Russians will be deterred by the very fact that it might work."

Arms control talks with the Russians are expected to begin in July or August. A Congressional decision to proceed with the two prototype Safeguard installations will be no obstacle.

The talks might drag on for years. Meantime Safeguard will give the President a way of keeping his options open at a time when nobody knows whether the Russians will come down on the side of arms control or a continued effort to achieve overwhelming nuclear superiority.

We are entering upon an era of negotiation in the hope of building a more stable world. Let us do so with a rational, reasonable and responsible approach, not as a hat-in-hand petitioner. The Communists have repeatedly demonstrated that they respect only strength.

As the late President Eisenhower put it in his farewell address to the Nation: "A vital element in keeping the peace is our military establishment. Our arms must be mighty, ready for instant action, so that no potential aggressor may be tempted to risk his own destruction."

The old order changeth, but I think those words of President Eisenhower's still serve America well today.

Let us continue to heed those words. And let us join proudly in the defense of our country today with another American President who believes that a strong defense capability is the first requirement for peace -- Richard M. Nixon.

Global in its potential destructiveness, nuclear war seems absolutely unthinkable. But think about it we must, as long as any threat exists. Let us do exactly that -- think, not place foolish hope in the intentions of those who display constant enmity toward us.

Even at this moment other Americans are paying the supreme price so that men may be free. They need more than our prayers. They need our support.

A father with a son who enlisted to fight in Vietnam recently called my

(more)

office and said his son feels that the people back home have abandoned him and his buddies.

I told this father that the overwhelming majority of Americans are terribly proud of our men in Vietnam. I told him that no matter whether they disagree with our decision to make a massive commitment of manpower there, they still support our fighting men.

Let no indifference, no sluggish citizenship, no moral weakness, no shirking of our responsibilities undermine the tremendous job our men in Vietnam are doing in thwarting Communist takeover of a tiny nation by force. Let us keep faith with them every day and in every way.

Freedom's future is in our hands. Brave men like you have made it so. It is for us to see that the promise of freedom becomes a reality in the lives and hearts of all Americans. Thank you.

#

Office Copy

AN ADDRESS BY REP. GERALD R. FORD
REPUBLICAN LEADER, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
AT THE ANNUAL CONVENTION OF THE MICHIGAN DEPARTMENT OF AMVETS
AT THE PANTLIND HOTEL, GRAND RAPIDS, MICHIGAN
7 P.M. SATURDAY, JUNE 14, 1969

FOR RELEASE ON DELIVERY

Mr. Commander, other officers of the Michigan Department of Amvets and delegates to this great convention:

Yours is a veterans organization; I am your convention keynote speaker; and today is Flag Day. Under the circumstances, it might be expected that I would speak only of the principles we hold dear as Americans, the Flag as the emblem of the land we love, and the need for a resurgence of patriotism in a Nation deeply divided over a tragic war.

Tonight I would like to do more than that. I would like to ask some hard questions about our national security -- and perhaps give you some hard answers.

I do not like long speeches, and I am sure you don't either.

I plan to speak about 20 minutes. If I see you glancing at your watches, I will become concerned. If you start shaking them and holding them up to your ears, I will just stop talking and sit down.

It is difficult for a politician to give a short speech, you know. Somebody once asked President Woodrow Wilson how long it took him to prepare a 10-minute speech. "About two weeks," he said. "And a one-hour speech?" "That would take me about a week," Wilson replied. "And a two-hour speech?" "Oh," President Wilson laughed, "if you'll let me ramble on for two hours, I'm ready right now."

I am not going to ramble. My beginning point is this. We in this country have reached a watershed in the history of our Nation, a point of critical decision in our national affairs, a time of crucial judgment in determination of our future foreign policy.

President Nixon went straight to the heart of the question when he spoke at the recent Air Force Academy commencement exercises.

There are those in this country, the President said, who believe that the "road to understanding with the Soviet Union and Communist China lies through a downgrading of our alliances and what amounts to a unilateral reduction of arms -- as a demonstration of our 'good faith.'"

(more)

The President believes -- and I believe -- that these men, many of them highly placed and influential -- are well intentioned and undoubtedly patriotic, but woefully mistaken. Theirs is not the way to world peace.

The issue was first and fully joined when President Nixon proposed that we build the Safeguard missile defense system. Not a new and terrible offensive weapons system, mind you, but a system simply designed to protect the missiles we have placed at strategic sites throughout the United States as a deterrent to nuclear war. The objective was clear -- to insure world peace by convincing any would-be aggressor that it could not launch a nuclear attack upon the United States without suffering a devastating nuclear response.

Immediately those members of Congress who believe we should search for peace by withdrawing from the world and weakening our bargaining position with the Soviet Union began attacking the President's Safeguard anti-ballistic-missile proposal.

They charged it would wreck any chance for reaching an arms control agreement with the Russians. They lined up scientists to say the Safeguard system wouldn't work. They made it appear that those who favor the building of a missile defense system were really just interested in huge profits for defense industries or had been duped by the Defense Department.

One senator even assembled a panel of so-called experts to build a case against the Safeguard system, and the results were published in book form. When this developed, I began to wonder about their credentials for maintaining an adequate defense posture for America.

The so-called experts fiercely fighting the Safeguard system at the senator's bidding included three men who in 1961 vigorously urged the launching of a vast and fantastically costly fallout shelter-civil defense program -- a Maginot Line approach for the 1960s. Among these "experts" are a former presidential speech writer and another gentleman who did the White House staffwork on which the civil defense speech was based.

The efforts of these so-called experts seemed to serve as a lightning rod. Very quickly, every individual and group with like-minded motivation rallied around the anti-ABM banner.

The fever spread, and soon sounds were heard of opposition to every new weapons proposal being advanced by the Defense Department and some programs already in being. Some members of Congress talked of chopping the Defense

(more)

Department's budget from \$80 billion to \$60 billion in one fell swoop and argued that we would have just as much security for the money. The sum effect was the formation of a gigantic lobby against defense spending.

More than a month ago, I spoke out against these attacks on our defense effort because I became alarmed at what amounted to a movement toward unilateral disarmament when it was all added together.

At a White House press conference on April 29, after meeting with President Nixon, I asked whether this conglomeration of critics indeed wanted to unilaterally disarm America. At the same time I made it clear that I was not questioning their motives. I simply felt that they were sadly and badly mistaken and that their attack on the Safeguard system and other proposed defense programs was placing the United States in jeopardy.

For anyone to say that I was calling ABM critics unpatriotic is utter nonsense. I just think they are wrong. I believe that -- on the basis of the facts -- the Safeguard program is needed.

I believe we must build at least a minimal missile defense system if we are to maintain adequate strategic strength or even maintain parity of nuclear strength with the Soviet Union.

It is not unpatriotic to question items on the military shopping list. I did so repeatedly as ranking Republican on the House defense appropriations subcommittee before becoming minority leader of the House and I continue to do so now. This is a duty of a congressman or senator.

But I want security for America -- "security with solvency," as President Eisenhower described it. I want security with proper cost accounting procedures, firm control of defense spending by the President and the Congress. And I also want -- just as fervently as do the ABM critics -- a diligent pursuit of arms control and opportunities to promote peace. But in the words of President Nixon I am willing only that we take "calculated risks for peace," not foolish risks.

This is Flag Day. I can never look at the American Flag without feeling a surge of the deep love I have for my country. But I do not ask you to consider the question of a missile defense in a cloud of patriotic emotion. I ask you and all Americans merely to look at the facts.

These are the facts:

In the past two years, Russia has made strong and continuing efforts to expand its military power and control. She has made tremendous gains, increasing

(more)

her force of intercontinental ballistic missiles (ICBMs) from 250 to at least a parity with this country's 1,054. Recent intelligence shows the Russians are building their fantastically powerful ICBM -- the 25-megaton SS-9 -- at a rate of from 40 to 50 a year, with no sign of a letup. The United States presently is building no more ICBMs.

The SS-9 could have an accuracy to within one-quarter of a mile of its target. This means the Soviet Union could be in a position by 1974 to wipe out all but a small percentage of U.S. missiles...unless we build the Safeguard missile defense system.

What about Red China? Unlike the Soviet Union with its urban centers, Red China has its tremendous population of 700 million scattered over its immense land mass. So an irrational nuclear attack can be feared from that quarter.

Red China could blackmail the United States with a relatively small number of primitive but deliverable ICBMs by the late 1970s -- unless we had an ABM system.

Experts on Red China for years have raised the question whether Red Chinese leaders might not be willing to absorb heavy casualties in a nuclear exchange with the United States, since the population of Red China is more than three times that of America and is thinly scattered over a great area.

In the light of these facts, I believe America needs and must begin -- now -- to build a minimal missile defense system. To fail to do so would be to take what I consider to be an unacceptable gamble with this nation's future security.

Will a decision to go ahead with the Safeguard system block arms control talks with the Soviet Union? Nonsense. The Russians have raised no objections to our building an ABM system. Only our people have. The Russians already have an ABM system deployed for their protection. Meantime they are developing a more sophisticated ABM that can loiter in the atmosphere and then be directed at an incoming offensive missile. We are also developing such an ABM.

Will the Safeguard missile defense system work? Tests of all the components indicate that it should work. The U.S. has already intercepted and destroyed one of our own ballistic missiles with a version of our ABM system.

In essence, all the President is asking for now is Congressional approval of two prototype installations at Grand Forks, N.D., and Malmstrom Air Force Base in Montana, to be completed by 1973. Cost of the prototypes is estimated at

(more)

\$2.1 billion -- or an average of \$400 million annually for five years, which is just about one-half of 1 per cent of our total defense budget. The full Safeguard system, if built to include 12 sites with warheads, would cost \$10.8 billion.

A number of prominent scientists have questioned whether Safeguard will actually work. But equally prominent scientists are convinced it will. As one eminent scientist put it, "The Russians will be deterred by the very fact that it might work."

Arms control talks with the Russians are expected to begin in July or August. A Congressional decision to proceed with the two prototype Safeguard installations will be no obstacle.

The talks might drag on for years. Meantime Safeguard will give the President a way of keeping his options open at a time when nobody knows whether the Russians will come down on the side of arms control or a continued effort to achieve overwhelming nuclear superiority.

We are entering upon an era of negotiation in the hope of building a more stable world. Let us do so with a rational, reasonable and responsible approach, not as a hat-in-hand petitioner. The Communists have repeatedly demonstrated that they respect only strength.

As the late President Eisenhower put it in his farewell address to the Nation: "A vital element in keeping the peace is our military establishment. Our arms must be mighty, ready for instant action, so that no potential aggressor may be tempted to risk his own destruction."

The old order changeth, but I think those words of President Eisenhower's still serve America well today.

Let us continue to heed those words. And let us join proudly in the defense of our country today with another American President who believes that a strong defense capability is the first requirement for peace -- Richard M. Nixon.

Global in its potential destructiveness, nuclear war seems absolutely unthinkable. But think about it we must, as long as any threat exists. Let us do exactly that -- think, not place foolish hope in the intentions of those who display constant enmity toward us.

Even at this moment other Americans are paying the supreme price so that men may be free. They need more than our prayers. They need our support.

A father with a son who enlisted to fight in Vietnam recently called my

(more)

office and said his son feels that the people back home have abandoned him and his buddies.

I told this father that the overwhelming majority of Americans are terribly proud of our men in Vietnam. I told him that no matter whether they disagree with our decision to make a massive commitment of manpower there, they still support our fighting men.

Let no indifference, no sluggish citizenship, no moral weakness, no shirking of our responsibilities undermine the tremendous job our men in Vietnam are doing in thwarting Communist takeover of a tiny nation by force. Let us keep faith with them every day and in every way.

Freedom's future is in our hands. Brave men like you have made it so. It is for us to see that the promise of freedom becomes a reality in the lives and hearts of all Americans. Thank you.

#