

*Bob Dole
Oleg H. J. J.
Don H. J.*

REMARKS OF SENATOR BOB DOLE
NORTH CAROLINA 11TH DISTRICT
FRANKLIN, NORTH CAROLINA
SATURDAY, APRIL 28, 1979

*W. J. J.
M. J. J.
C. J. J.
W. J. J.*

I'M DELIGHTED TO BE WITH YOU THIS EVENING, AND SALUTE THE GROWING POWER OF NORTH CAROLINA'S REPUBLICANS. AS A FORMER NATIONAL CHAIRMAN OF OUR PARTY, I CAN THINK OF NO TREND THAT GIVES ME GREATER ENCOURAGEMENT FOR THE FUTURE.

NOW, AS POLITICAL VETERANS, YOU KNOW HOW EVERY ADMINISTRATION TRIED TO PROMOTE THE THEMES OF PEACE AND PROSPERITY. AS PEOPLE WHO ARE CONCERNED ABOUT WHAT INFLATION IS DOING TO YOUR PURCHASING POWER, YOU KNOW HOW THIS ADMINISTRATION HAS ERODED PROSPERITY. YOU KNOW HOW DEMOCRATIC POLICIES DISCOURAGE PRODUCTIVITY AND FUEL THE FIRES OF INFLATION. YOU KNOW HOW THE CURRENT ADMINISTRATION HAS BROKEN ITS BALANCED BUDGET PROMISES, AND YOU KNOW THAT WE CAN OFFER THE PEOPLE OF NORTH CAROLINA SOMETHING BETTER THAN MORE OF THE SAME TIRED OLD NEW DEAL THAT JIMMY SEEMS UNABLE TO TRANSCEND.

*Y. J. J.
C. J. J.*

-2-

BUT THIS EVENING, I WANT TO TALK FOR A FEW MINUTES ABOUT THE OTHER HALF OF THAT EQUATION. I WANT TO TALK ABOUT PEACE--WHAT IT IS AND WHAT IT ISN'T. PEACE SHOULD NOT BE CONFUSED WITH THE MERE ABSENCE OF WAR. THERE ARE SUCH THINGS AS A FALSE PEACE, A PERIOD WHEN NO BULLETS FLY BUT CONDITIONS ARE CREATED THAT CAN ULTIMATELY LEAD TO WAR.

I HAVE SEEN WAR FIRSTHAND. I HAVE WATCHED MEN DIE AT MY FEET. I CARRY WITH ME THE PHYSICAL AND EMOTIONAL SCARS OF COMBAT. THERE ARE NO MEN OF MY GENERATION WHO MORE PROFOUNDLY DETEST THE HORRORS OF WARFARE. NO ONE LONGS MORE FOR PEACE, FOR THE PEACE THAT LASTS, THE PEACE CONSTRUCTED ON A FOUNDATION OF AMERICAN STRENGTH AND PURPOSE.

IN THIS NUCLEAR AGE, WHEN SCIENCE HAS DEVISED AND POLITICS HAS PUT INTO PLACE THE FORCES OF MASS ANNIHILATION, A FEW GREAT POWERS HOLD IN THEIR HANDS THE FATE OF ALL MANKIND. THE ORDEAL OF LEADERSHIP IN THE MODERN ERA DEMAND SACRIFICE. IT DEMANDS OUR PERMANENT COURAGE. AND IT CALLS FOR A NEW BIPARTISAN SPIRIT UNITED AROUND STRONG PRESIDENTIAL LEADERSHIP IN THE PURSUIT OF VITAL AND LEGITIMATE AMERICAN INTERESTS. IT IS THAT SPIRIT I WISH TO CALL FORTH TONIGHT.

-3-

THE WORLD IS NOT A FRIENDLY PLACE FOR AMERICA TONIGHT. THERE IS IRAN, CONVULSED BY REVOLUTION AND CONVERTED TO A SHRILL ANTI-ISRAELI LINE. SAUDI ARABIA, MADE NERVOUS BY THE TURMOIL IN THE PERSIAN GULF, BROODS BEHIND A WARY EXTERIOR. AND WHILE WE ALL HOPE AND PRAY THAT THE EGYPTIAN-ISRAELI PEACE TREATY MAY SUCCEED IN BRINGING PEACE TO THAT TROUBLED CORNER OF THE GLOBE, WE KNOW FROM BITTER EXPERIENCE THAT THE ROAD TO LASTING PEACE IN THE MIDDLE EAST WILL BE A ROCKY AND UNCERTAIN ONE.

HALF A GLOBE AWAY, AMERICAN RECOGNITION OF THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA IS FOLLOWED BY THE RAPID REVERSAL OF SO-CALLED DEMOCRATIZATION. I WARN YOU: WE SHOULD NEVER MAKE THE MISTAKE OF CONFUSING A DEMOCRACY WALL WITH DEMOCRACY ITSELF.

IN/E

-4-

INDEED, WE MUST ASK OURSELVES IF OUR HASTY AND ONE-SIDED RECOGNITION OF THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC, FOLLOWED BY THE CHINESE INVASION OF VIETNAM, MAY NOT ACTUALLY INCREASE THE RUSSIAN PRESENCE IN THE FAR EAST. FOR THE SOVIETS ARE ANXIOUS TO CONSOLIDATE THEIR MILITARY PRESENCE BY CONSTRUCTING A NAVAL BASE AT CAM RANH BAY, A DANGER WE MAY HAVE INDIRECTLY ENCOURAGED.

PULLING BACK TO IMPOTENCE

IN THE WAKE OF THE VIETNAM WAR, MILLIONS OF AMERICANS DECIDED THAT NEO-ISOLATIONISM WAS THE ONLY COURSE THAT COULD PRESERVE PEACE. TO THOSE AMERICANS, ANY SIGN OF ASSERTIVE FOREIGN POLICY COULD BE EQUATED WITH INTELLECTUAL MACHISMO. THEY CONFUSED ASSERTIVE DIPLOMACY WITH SENDING IN THE MARINES.

-5-

AT THE SAME TIME, CONFIDENCE IN AMERICAN GOVERNMENT ITSELF HAS BEEN ERODING AT AN ALARMING RATE FOR THE LAST TWENTY YEARS. JIMMY CARTER DIDN'T START THE TREND, BUT NEITHER HAS HE STOPPED IT. VIETNAM ACCELERATED THIS PROCESS, AS DID WATERGATE. BUT SUCH EROSION--WHILE NOT NECESSARILY RELATED DIRECTLY TO INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS--BECOMES A CLEAR AND PRESENT DANGER WHEN IT SPREADS TO THE CONDUCT OF FOREIGN POLICY. IT CAN POISON THE EFFECTIVENESS OF ANY PRESIDENT, AND UNDERMINE OUR CREDIBILITY WITH ALLIES AND ENEMIES ALIKE.

THE COMBINED EFFECT OF ALL THIS HAS BEEN A KIND OF SELF-IMPOSED IMPOTENCE. AMERICA HAS RETREATED INTO AN UNCERTAIN SHELL. SHE HAS EMBRACED TIMIDITY OVER COURAGE, IN THE VAIN CONVICTION THAT THE REST OF THE WORLD WILL PASS US BY IF ONLY WE WOULD REFRAIN FROM CAUSING TROUBLE.

RESTORING A CREDIBLE DEFENSE

IN THE ATOMIC AGE, WHERE DANGER IS EVERPRESENT AND DESTRUCTION JUST A PUSHBUTTON AWAY, WE MIGHT AS WELL ACCEPT LEO DUROCHER'S WARNING THAT NICE GUYS FINISH LAST.

THE NEW BIPARTISANSHIP CALLS FOR IMMEDIATE MEASURES TO COUNTER THAT THREAT. WE REJECT COMPLETELY ANY THEORY THAT AMERICA CAN DISARM UNILATERALLY. WE REJECT THE WEAKENING OF THE CIA, WHERE CURRENT MORALE IS SO LOW THAT AGENCY ANALYSTS ARE RELUCTANT TO INTERPRET INTELLIGENCE INTO ANY PATTERN AT ODDS WITH THE ADMINISTRATION'S WELL MEANING BUT DANGEROUS VIEW OF THE WORLD.

FACTS ARE FACTS, AND THE FACTS OF CURRENT AMERICAN PREPAREDNESS ARE HARDLY ENCOURAGING. JUST THREE YEARS AGO, A WIDESPREAD CONSENSUS EXISTED IN SUPPORT OF THE FORD ADMINISTRATION'S CALL FOR A 5 TO 6 PERCENT REAL GROWTH IN THE ANNUAL DEFENSE BUDGET. INSTEAD OF THIS INCREASE, WE HAVE BEEN GIVEN DEFENSE BUDGETS THAT AVERAGE A 2 PERCENT DECLINE IN REAL SPENDING.

-7-

THE DANGERS DON'T END THERE: AMERICAN FORCES IN EUROPE ARE SUPPLIED WITH MECHANIZED INFANTRY VEHICLES 20 YEARS BEHIND THEIR SOVIET ADVERSARIES. THE AMERICAN NAVY HAS FEWER THAN 400 SHIPS LEFT IN THE ACTIVE FLEET, WHILE THE FIVE YEAR SHIPBUILDING PROGRAM PRESENTED TO CONGRESS BY PRESIDENT FORD IN JANUARY, 1977, IS LEFT TO GATHER DUST. THE B-1 BOMBER IS DROPPED, THE TOMAHAWK CRUISE MISSILE DEFERRED, THE MX MISSILE LANGUISHES.

THE LEADERSHIP VACUUM

THROUGH ALL THIS, WE CAN HEAR FROM THE LEFT IN THIS COUNTRY THE RECURRENT THEME--AMERICA IS AN INTERNATIONAL TROUBLEMAKER. STRIP HER PRESIDENT OF HIS AUTHORITY TO ACT, REDUCE THE MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT TO NEAR-IMPOTENCE--THEN, SAY THE NEW ISOLATIONISTS, THEN AND ONLY THEN WILL INTERNATIONAL PEACE BE SECURED.

WELL, AMERICA IS NOT AN INTERNATIONAL TROUBLEMAKER.

-8-

AMERICA REMAINS, NOW AS IN THE PAST, THE ONLY PROTECTOR OF THAT SUNLIT PORTION OF MANKIND THAT KNOWS, OR HOPES TO KNOW, FREEDOM. AMERICA IS THE ULTIMATE BULWARK AGAINST TOTALITARIAN TYRANNY. I HAVEN'T FORGOTTEN THAT FACT, EVEN IF SOME FOREIGN POLICYMAKERS HAVE.

I DO NOT CRITICIZE THE PRESIDENT OUT OF POLITICAL SELFISHNESS. I DO NOT HESITATE TO ~~CRITICIZE~~ ^{change was} MEMBERS OF MY OWN PARTY FOR VOTING TO ABANDON THE PANAMA CANAL AT A TIME WHEN AMERICA WAS PERCEIVED BY FRIEND AND FOE ALIKE TO BE IN RETREAT FROM ITS RESPONSIBILITIES AND OBLIGATIONS. PANAMA REPRESENTED A DANGEROUS MISUSE OF BIPARTISANSHIP IN FOREIGN POLICY.

VOTE TO SUPPORT THE PRESIDENT ON PANAMA, WE WERE TOLD, OR HE WILL LOSE HIS CREDIBILITY TO CONDUCT FOREIGN AFFAIRS. WELL, HE WON THAT VOTE, AND DOES ANYONE SERIOUSLY SUGGEST THAT OUR FOREIGN POLICY IS ANY MORE CREDIBLE TODAY THAN IT WAS A YEAR AGO?

-9-

THE ISSUE HERE IS LARGER THAN ONE MAN. THE NEW BIPARTISANSHIP PREFERS ACTION TO INACTION, ADVANCE TO RETREAT. IT BELIEVES IN A MILITARY DEFENSE SECOND TO NONE, FOR MILITARY STRENGTH IS RESPECTED MORE THAN PIOUS PLEDGES OR THE RHETORIC OF LEADERSHIP WITHOUT THE REALITY.

SALT AND THE QUEST FOR PEACE

SO LET ME TURN BRIEFLY TO THE SALT II TREATY, AND THE DEBATE ABOUT TO GET UNDERWAY IN THE SENATE AND THE COUNTRY.

THIS ISSUE WILL SURELY BE ONE OF THE MAJOR TESTS I WILL FACE AS A SENATOR AND AS A NATIONAL LEADER. HAVING NOT READ THE TREATY, WHICH HAS YET TO BE MADE PUBLIC, I HAVE NOT FORMULATED A FIRM POSITION ONE WAY OR ANOTHER. I REMAIN OPEN-MINDED BUT STILL WARY OF ENTERING INTO AN AGREEMENT WHICH WOULD ULTIMATELY RELY UPON SOVIET HONOR FOR ENFORCEMENT.

-10-

THE BEHAVIOR, THE PAST RECORD, THE WHOLE MODE OF OPERATION OF THE KREMLIN'S LEADERS INSTILLS LITTLE CONFIDENCE IN THEIR COMPLIANCE. WITH THEIR STRETCHING EVERY PROVISION OF SALT I, WITH THEIR OBJECTIONABLE BEHAVIOR AROUND THE WORLD, FROM AFGHANISTAN TO IRAN, FROM ETHIOPIA TO VIETNAM, WITH THEIR RELENTLESS MILITARY BUILDUP, WE MUST KEEP OUR GUARD HIGH.

HISTORY HAS TAUGHT THIS SENATOR TO BE WARY OF MAKING ANY AGREEMENT WITH THE SOVIETS THAT DOES NOT CARRY WITHIN ITS FRAMEWORK A GUARANTEED PROCESS OF VERIFICATION. I PLEDGE TO YOU TONIGHT TO FIGHT HARD FOR SUCH INDEPENDENT VERIFICATION.

IF I DON'T GET IT, THEN I WON'T GO ALONG WITH SALT II, IF

I DON'T GET IT, I WILL URGE OTHER SENATORS TO REJECT ILLUSIONS--OR DELUSIONS--CAUSED BY PRESIDENTIAL SONGS OF ARMS CONTROL AND DISARMAMENT.

-11-

L OUR FIRST OBLIGATION IS TO NATIONAL SECURITY. WE CANNOT MOLD OUR NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS TO FIT ARMS CONTROL VISIONS; RATHER, OUR ARMS CONTROL PROGRAMS MUST FIT INTO--AND FURTHER-- THE REQUIREMENTS OF NATIONAL SECURITY REQUIREMENTS.

THERE ARE ISSUES HERE WHICH DEMAND OUR CAREFUL CONSIDERATION, HAVING STUDIED THE SALT TREATY WITH EXPERTS LIKE HENRY KISSINGER, GENERAL ALEXANDER HAIG AND FORMER BRITISH DISARMAMENT MINISTER LORD CHALFONT, I CAN TELL YOU THAT IT IS IMPERFECT AT BEST, AND AT WORST A POTENTIAL THREAT TO THIS NATION'S VERY SECURITY UNLESS AMENDED TO PROVIDE FOR STRATEGIC PARITY.

-12-

?? what
THE DECEMBER TEST ALSO INVOLVED THE RELAYING OF TELEMETRY IN CODE, A PRACTICE WE HAVE INSISTED BE BANNED IN ANY NEW SALT TREATY. INDEED, THE WHOLE ISSUE OF VERIFICATION GOES TO THE VERY HEART OF ARMS CONTROL. WE CAN HARDLY AFFORD TO RELY ON SOVIET PLEDGES ALONE: EVENTS HAVE SHOWN CONCLUSIVELY THAT THE SOVIETS HAVE EXPLOITED EVERY POSSIBLE LOOPHOLE OF PAST TREATIES.

HISTORY HAS TAUGHT THIS SENATOR TO BE WARY OF MAKING ANY AGREEMENT WITH THE SOVIETS THAT DOES NOT CARRY WITHIN ITS FRAMEWORK A GUARANTEED PROCESS OF VERIFICATION.

THERE ARE ISSUES HERE WHICH DEMAND OUR CAREFUL CONSIDERATION, HAVING STUDIED THE SALT TREATY WITH EXPERTS LIKE HENRY KISSINGER, GENERAL ALEXANDER HAIG AND FORMER BRITISH DISARMAMENT MINISTER LORD CHALFONT, I CAN TELL YOU THAT IT IS IMPERFECT AT BEST, AND AT WORST A POTENTIAL THREAT TO THIS NATION'S VERY SECURITY UNLESS AMENDED TO PROVIDE FOR STRATEGIC PARITY.

-13-

THE PROPOSED TREATY DOES NOT DO THIS. INSTEAD, IT ALLOWS THE RUSSIANS TO MAINTAIN THEIR STRONG ADVANTAGE IN THROWWEIGHT AND HEAVY MISSILES. IT DOES NOT EVEN INCLUDE THEIR BACKFIRE BOMBER FORCE, WHILE THE U.S. IS COMPELLED TO INCLUDE B-52'S.

IF WE HAD SOME GUARANTEE THAT THE SOVIET UNION WOULD REDUCE ITS FINANCIAL COMMITMENT TO MILITARY DEVELOPMENT, IF WE HAD SOME CREDIBLE EVIDENCE THAT THE SOVIETS WERE NOT DETERMINED TO FORGE EVEN FURTHER AHEAD OF THE UNITED STATES IN MILITARY MIGHT, IF WE COULD BELIEVE THE SOVIET CLAIMS OF INNOCENCE ABOUT THEIR ACTIVITIES IN AFRICA AND ASIA--THEN I MIGHT BE LESS ANXIOUS LEST SALT II SIGNIFY AMERICA'S WITHDRAWAL FROM WORLD LEADERSHIP.

BUT THE TREATY IS NOT BEING CONSIDERED IN A VACUUM. WE HAVE NO SUCH GUARANTEES FROM THE SOVIETS. WE HAVE INSTEAD, COLD, HARD FACTS AND FIGURES THAT POINT TO AN ALARMING DECLINE IN OUR OWN DEFENSE SPENDING, WHILE THE RUSSIANS STEP UP THEIR EFFORT TO ATTAIN STRATEGIC SUPERIORITY.

-14-

WITH SUCH A BLEAK PROSPECT STARING US IN THE FACE, ANY ARMS LIMITATION TREATY MUST BE EXAMINED WITH THE GLOBAL PICTURE IN MIND. WE CAN APPROVE NO TREATY WHICH COULD LOCK THE U.S. PERMANENTLY INTO AN INFERIOR POSITION.

I WOULD LIKE TO SUPPORT THE NEW SALT TREATY--I SUPPORTED THE FIRST ONE. BUT SUCH SUPPORT WILL BE WITHHELD UNTIL AND UNLESS I AM CONVINCED THAT IT MEETS OUR NATIONAL SECURITY NEEDS. EVEN NOW, IT IS STILL POSSIBLE FOR US TO REGAIN THE INITIATIVE. MILITARY EXPERTS ESTIMATE THAT THE CURRENT TREND TOWARD SOVIET SUPERIORITY COULD BE REVERSED FOR LESS THAN \$4 BILLION PER YEAR, FOR EIGHT YEARS.

BUT BUDGETS ALONE DO NOT SAFEGUARD A NATION. EVEN MODERN MILITARY WEAPONRY IS USELESS WITHOUT THE DIRECTION OF A STRONG FOREIGN POLICY. THAT DIRECTION SEEMS LACKING TODAY. DRIFT AND DISARRAY MARK OUR APPROACH TO THE WORLD. TO REVERSE THAT TREND WILL REQUIRE THE LEADERSHIP OF A STRONG AND DETERMINED PRESIDENT. THAT'S THE KIND OF LEADERSHIP WE SHOULD OFFER THE AMERICAN PEOPLE.

-15-

TO PROTECT PEACE, YOU MUST BE STRONG. YOU MUST BE WILLING TO SPEND IN DOLLARS SO YOU WON'T HAVE TO SPEND IN BLOOD.

SALT II OUGHT NOT TO BE ROMANTICIZED. IT OUGHT NOT TO BE SOLD LIKE SOME DIPLOMATIC SNAKE OIL, GUARANTEED TO PRODUCE MIRACLES AMONG NATIONS AND MAKE THE WORLD SAFE FOR THE PEACELOVERS.

SALT II OUGHT NOT BE APPROVED, UNLESS WE MAKE CERTAIN IT WILL STRENGTHEN THE FORCES OF PEACE AND STABILIZE THE BALANCE OF POWER. ANYTHING LESS WOULD BE A BETRAYAL OF THE NATION WE LOVE, OF THE CHILDREN WHOSE FUTURES ARE AT STAKE, OF ALL THAT WE HONOR IN OUR HERITAGE.

-16-

SALT IS A CRITICAL TEST FOR THE ADMINISTRATION. MORE IMPORTANT, IT IS A TEST FOR THE NATION. TONIGHT, I CALL UPON THE REPUBLICANS OF THE 11TH DISTRICT TO JOIN WITH ME AND OTHERS-- DEMOCRATS AND REPUBLICANS--TO FORGE A NEW BIPARTISANSHIP FOR AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY. IT IS BASED ON A BELIEF IN OUR MISSION AS FREEDOM'S GUARDIAN. IT IS ROOTED IN A STRONG NATIONAL DEFENSE AND A CLEAR SENSE OF WHAT GOOD CAN BE ACCOMPLISHED, NOT BY PARTISAN POTSHOTS AT ANY PRESIDENT, BUT BY THE CAREFUL PROMOTION OF A POLICY OF PEACE THROUGH STRENGTH.

I CALL ON YOU TO BE PARTISANS FOR PEACE.

MAY GOD GRANT US THE COURAGE OF OUR CONVICTIONS, THE WISDOM OF OUR FOREFATHERS--AND MOTHERS, AND THE STRENGTH TO STAND UP FOR A JUST PEACE. HISTORY--AND OUR CHILDREN--ARE WATCHING.

REMARKS OF SENATOR BOB DOLE

NORTH CAROLINA 11TH DISTRICT

FRANKLIN, NORTH CAROLINA

SATURDAY, APRIL 28, 1979

I'm delighted to be with you this evening, and salute the growing power of North Carolina's Republicans. As a former National Chairman of our party, I can think of no trend that gives me greater encouragement for the future.

Now, as political veterans, you know how every administration tried to promote the themes of peace and prosperity. As people who are concerned about what inflation is doing to your purchasing power, you know how this Administration has eroded prosperity. You know how Democratic policies discourage productivity and fuel the fires of inflation. You know how the current Administration has broken its balanced budget promises, and you know that we can offer the people of North Carolina something better than more of the same tired old New Deal that Jimmy seems unable to transcend.

But this evening, I want to talk for a few minutes about the other half of that equation. I want to talk about peace--what it is and what it isn't. Peace should not be confused with the mere absence of war. There are such things as a false peace, a period when no bullets fly but conditions are created that can ultimately lead to war.

I have seen war firsthand. I have watched men die at my feet. I carry with me the physical and emotional scars of combat. There are no men of my generation who more profoundly detest the horrors of warfare. No one longs more for peace, for the peace that lasts, the peace constructed on a foundation of American strength and purpose.

In this nuclear age, when science has devised and politics has put into place the forces of mass annihilation, a few great powers hold in their hands the fate of all mankind. The ordeal of leadership in the modern era demands sacrifice. It demands our permanent courage. And it calls for a new bipartisan spirit united around strong presidential leadership in the pursuit of vital and legitimate American interests. It is that spirit I wish to call forth tonight.

The world is not a friendly place for America tonight. There is Iran, convulsed by revolution and converted to a shrill anti-Israeli line. Saudi Arabia, made nervous by the turmoil in the Persian Gulf, broods behind a wary exterior. And while we all hope and pray that the Egyptian-Israeli peace treaty may succeed in bringing peace to that troubled corner of the globe, we know from bitter experience that the road to lasting peace in the Middle East will be a rocky and uncertain one.

Half a globe away, American recognition of the People's Republic of China is followed by the rapid reversal of so-called democratization. I warn you: we should never make the mistake of confusing a democracy wall with democracy itself.

Indeed, we must ask ourselves if our hasty and one-sided recognition of the People's Republic, followed by the Chinese invasion of Vietnam, may not actually increase the Russian presence in the Far East. For the Soviets are anxious to consolidate their military presence by constructing a naval base at Cam Ranh Bay, a danger we may have indirectly encouraged.

PULLING BACK TO IMPOTENCE

In the wake of the Vietnam war, millions of Americans decided that neo-isolationism was the only course that could preserve peace. To those Americans, any sign of assertive foreign policy could be equated with intellectual machismo. They confused assertive diplomacy with sending in the Marines.

At the same time, confidence in American government itself has been eroding at an alarming rate for the last twenty years. Jimmy Carter didn't start the trend, but neither has he stopped it. Vietnam accelerated this process, as did Watergate. But such erosion--while not necessarily related directly to international relations--becomes a clear and present danger when it spreads to the conduct of foreign policy. It can poison the effectiveness of any president, and undermine our credibility with allies and enemies alike.

The combined effect of all this has been a kind of self-imposed impotence. America has retreated into an uncertain shell. She has embraced timidity over courage, in the vain conviction that the rest of the world will pass us by if only we would refrain from causing trouble.

RESTORING A CREDIBLE DEFENSE

In the atomic age, where danger is everpresent and destruction just a pushbutton away, we might as well accept Leo Durocher's warning that nice guys finish last.

The new bipartisanship calls for immediate measures to counter that threat. We reject completely any theory that America can disarm unilaterally. We reject the weakening of the CIA, where current morale is so low that agency analysts are reluctant to interpret intelligence into any pattern at odds with the Administration's well meaning but dangerous view of the world.

Facts are facts, and the facts of current American preparedness are hardly encouraging. Just three years ago, a widespread consensus existed in support of the Ford Administration's call for a 5 to 6 percent real growth in the annual defense budget. Instead of this increase, we have been given defense budgets that average a 2 percent decline in real spendi

The dangers don't end there: American forces in Europe are supplied with mechanized infantry vehicles 20 years behind their Soviet adversaries. The American Navy has fewer than 400 ships left in the active fleet, while the five year shipbuilding program presented to Congress by President Ford in January, 1977, is left to gather dust. The B-1 bomber is dropped, the Tomahawk cruise missile deferred, the MX missile languishes.

THE LEADERSHIP VACUUM

Through all this, we can hear from the left in this country the recurrent theme--America is an international troublemaker. Strip her President of his authority to act, reduce the military establishment to near-impotence--then, say the new isolationists, then and only then will international peace be secured.

Well, America is not an international troublemaker.

America remains, now as in the past, the only protector of that sunlit portion of mankind that knows, or hopes to know, freedom. America is the ultimate bulwark against totalitarian tyranny. I haven't forgotten that fact, even if some foreign policymakers have.

I do not criticize the President out of political selfishness. I do not hesitate to criticize members of my own party for voting to abandon the Panama Canal at a time when America was perceived by friend and foe alike to be in retreat from its responsibilities and obligations. Panama represented a dangerous misuse of bipartisanship in foreign policy.

Vote to support the President on Panama, we were told, or he will lose his credibility to conduct foreign affairs. Well, he won that vote, and does anyone seriously suggest that our foreign policy is any more credible today than it was a year ago?

The issue here is larger than one man. The new bipartisanship prefers action to inaction, advance to retreat. It believes in a military defense second to none, for military strength is respected more than pious pledges or the rhetoric of leadership without the reality.

SALT AND THE QUEST FOR PEACE

So let me turn briefly to the SALT II treaty, and the debate about to get underway in the Senate and the country.

This issue will surely be one of the major tests I will face as a Senator and as a national leader. Having not read the treaty, which has yet to be made public, I have not formulated a firm position one way or another. I remain open-minded but still wary of entering into an agreement which would ultimately rely upon Soviet honor for enforcement.

The behavior, the past record, the whole mode of operation of the Kremlin's leaders installs little confidence in their compliance. With their stretching every provision of SALT I, with their objectionable behavior around the world, from Afghanistan to Iran, from Ethiopia to Vietnam, with their relentless military buildup, we must keep our guard high.

History has taught this Senator to be wary of making any agreement with the Soviets that does not carry within its framework a guaranteed process of verification. I pledge to you tonight to fight hard for such independent verification. If I don't get it, then I won't go along with SALT II. If I don't get it, I will urge other Senators to reject illusions--or delusions-- caused by Presidential songs of arms control and disarmament.

Our first obligation is to national security. We cannot mold our national security programs to fit arms control visions; rather, our arms control programs must fit into--and further--the requirements of national security requirements.

There are issues here which demand our careful consideration, having studied the SALT treaty with experts like Henry Kissinger, General Alexander Haig and former British disarmament Minister Lord Chalfont, I can tell you that it is imperfect at best, and at worst a potential threat to this nation's very security unless amended to provide for strategic parity.

The proposed treaty does not do this. Instead, it allows the Russians to maintain their strong advantage in throwweight and heavy missiles. It does not even include their Backfire bomber force, while the U.S. is compelled to include B-52's.

If we had some guarantee that the Soviet Union would reduce its financial commitment to military development, if we had some credible evidence that the Soviets were not determined to forge even further ahead of the United States in military might, if we could believe the Soviet claims of innocence about their activities in Africa and Asia--then I might be less anxious lest SALT II signify America's withdrawal from world leadership.

But the treaty is not being considered in a vacuum. We have no such guarantees from the Soviets. We have instead, cold, hard facts and figures that point to an alarming decline in our own defense spending, while the Russians step up their effort to attain strategic superiority.

With such a bleak prospect staring us in the face, any arms limitation treaty must be examined with the global picture in mind. We can approve no treaty which could lock the U.S. permanently into an inferior position.

I would like to support the new SALT treaty--I supported the first one. But such support will be withheld until and unless I am convinced that it meets our national security needs. Even now, it is still possible for us to regain the initiative. Military experts estimate that the current trend toward Soviet superiority could be reversed for less than \$4 billion per year, for eight years.

But budgets alone do not safeguard a nation. Even modern military weaponry is useless without the direction of a strong foreign policy. That direction seems lacking today. Drift and disarray mark our approach to the world. To reverse that trend will require the leadership of a strong and determined president. That's the kind of leadership we should offer the American people.

To protect peace, you must be strong. You must be willing to spend in dollars so you won't have to spend in blood.

SALT II ought not to be romanticized. It ought not to be sold like some diplomatic snake oil, guaranteed to produce miracles among nations and make the world safe for the peacelovers.

SALT II ought not be approved, unless we make certain it will strengthen the forces of peace and stabilize the balance of power. Anything less would be a betrayal of the nation we love, of the children whose futures are at stake, of all that we honor in our heritage.

SALT is a critical test for the Administration. More important, it is a test for the nation. Tonight, I call upon the Republicans of the 11th District to join with me and others--Democrats and Republicans--to forge a new bipartisanship for American foreign policy. It is based on a belief in our mission as freedom's guardian. It is rooted in a strong national defense and a clear sense of what good can be accomplished, not by partisan potshots at any president, but by the careful promotion of a policy of peace through strength.

I call on you to be partisans for peace.

May God grant us the courage of our convictions, the wisdom of our forefathers--and mothers--and the strength to stand up for a just peace. History--and our children--are watching.