

University of Montana

## ScholarWorks at University of Montana

---

Mike Mansfield Speeches, Statements and Interviews

Mike Mansfield Papers

---

4-1-1969

### Congressional Record - ABM (No. 4)

Mike Mansfield 1903-2001

Follow this and additional works at: [https://scholarworks.umt.edu/mansfield\\_speeches](https://scholarworks.umt.edu/mansfield_speeches)

**Let us know how access to this document benefits you.**

---

#### Recommended Citation

Mansfield, Mike 1903-2001, "Congressional Record - ABM (No. 4)" (1969). *Mike Mansfield Speeches, Statements and Interviews*. 751.

[https://scholarworks.umt.edu/mansfield\\_speeches/751](https://scholarworks.umt.edu/mansfield_speeches/751)

This Speech is brought to you for free and open access by the Mike Mansfield Papers at ScholarWorks at University of Montana. It has been accepted for inclusion in Mike Mansfield Speeches, Statements and Interviews by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks at University of Montana. For more information, please contact [scholarworks@mso.umt.edu](mailto:scholarworks@mso.umt.edu).

the toxic elements in the tonic of technology, is now a major challenge. For, basically, it challenges our faith in ourselves, it challenges our ability to use our skills in the service of man.

John Diebold has probably coined more money from the new technology than any other man; he even coined the word "automation." In 1964, he made the statement with which I would like to close my speech.

"The problem of identifying and understanding goals to match the new means that technology provides us is the central problem of our time—one of the greatest problems in human history. Its solution can be one of the most exciting and one of the most important areas for human activity. And the time is now."

In 1969, even more than ever, the time is now.

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate go into executive session to consider a nomination at the desk, as reported earlier today.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Harrison Loesch, of Colorado, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of this nomination.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### THE ABM AND MONTANA

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on March 14, President Nixon presented a new concept of an ABM system to the Nation. Since then, his proposal has been elaborated on by the executive branch. Committees of the Senate are now engaged in trying to clarify what it is that has been suggested. The examination of the proposal may be expected to continue at least for several weeks.

In due course the issue of the ABM should emerge in legislative form on the floor of the Senate. It would be my expectation that when that time comes, ambiguities and obscurities will have been removed. By then, hopefully, scientific fact will have been separated from science fiction. By then, substantial dangers from abroad and practicable defenses against them should be distinguishable from the paranoid possibilities. By then, we should have a more accurate measure of the cost of the newly proposed system. By then, too, we should better be able to understand the prospects of breaking the action-reaction pattern



of two decades—the nuclear arms competition between the United States and the Soviet Union which, while pursued in the name of security by each nation, has lead to greater insecurity for both nations and the world.

In short, when the issue reaches the Senate floor, we should have a clear idea not only of the reliability of the ABM but also of the relevance or redundancy of its deployment. We will then be in a position to weigh the priorities of the ABM in the external security structure of the Nation against urgent requirements for internal stability and progress.

It has been said that it would profit us little to concentrate on internal national needs only to have the Nation fall victim to an external aggressor. That is true; but would it profit us more to build another massive ring of nuclear defense of questionable value around decaying cities and impoverished rural areas? Would it profit us more, in an obsessive concentration on potential threats from abroad, to overlook the actual threat from within—the threat of a society confused by inner strife and racked by violence, crime and disorder?

These questions are appropriate to the Senate's consideration of the ABM because there are grave doubts as to the technical feasibility of the proposed missile system. There are grave doubts as to its costs—if not its initial costs, its ultimate costs—and may I say once again, the day of automatic acceptance of expenditures in the name of security—however superfluous, duplicative, or wasteful the expenditures—that day is over in the Senate. There are grave doubts as to the necessity of the Safeguard system, as there were with the Sentinel. There are grave doubts as to its effect on Soviet-United States arms competition. There are grave doubts as to the urgency of its deployment in the light of other national needs. All of these uncertainties should be explored in full in the Senate; and they will be explored.

By contrast, there is one matter which, it would be my hope, will not enter into consideration. I refer to the economic benefit which presumably will flow to certain States in the form of Federal expenditures for the missile system. It is particularly appropriate that I address myself to this question. One of the two sites at which ABM's would be located initially is the Malmstrom Minuteman installation in central-northern Montana; the other is in North Dakota. While these two States are immediately involved, the situation is not without its analogies elsewhere since it seems clear that the extension of the system to many other States is already expected.

Insofar as the people of Montana are concerned they have been willing to assume an equitable share of the responsibility for the Nation's military defense. The families of Montana, as have other American families, have suffered the personal grief of dead and wounded in the conflict in Vietnam.

We have also welcomed to the State, in the past, various military installations which have been deemed essential to the defense of the Nation. To be sure, these

installations have resulted in some expenditures of wealth in the State but they have also brought burdens in the form of increased loads on the services of local governments—police, fire, public education, and the like. The people of the State have accepted these burdens along with the benefits since they have accepted the national necessity for the installations.

Similarly, an ABM deployment at Malmstrom would undoubtedly provide some economic stimulus to the region, even though the benefits would be small and they would dwindle rapidly once the initial construction were complete. Such was the experience on a much greater scale at Glasgow Air Force Base. The building of this most modern of jet facilities brought a convergence of several thousand persons to provide skills and labor for construction. After 10 years, however, that costly effort has been scrapped; the field has been closed as obsolete and unnecessary. Its closing leaves a swollen population in the Glasgow region, filled with an understandable concern about their personal futures and the future of the community.

May I say that the decision to establish the Glasgow base was strictly that of the Department of Defense. The people of Montana did not seek this installation. The Senators from Montana did not seek it. I had nothing whatever to do with its placement even though I am now doing whatever I can to have the base converted to a useful civilian function.

I am doing so because, as a Senator, I have a valid concern in the welfare of the people of my State, particularly as they are affected by decisions of the Federal Government. I have said it many times, and I say it again: I am, before all else, a Senator of Montana and of the United States.

I make no apologies, therefore, for working to try to find some civilian usefulness for the Glasgow base. Neither do I apologize for having helped to bring to Montana a Hungry Horse Dam on the Flathead or a Libby Dam on the Kootenai. Nor do I regret resisting, a few years ago, the cavernous impersonality of this Government which would have brought about the closing of a desperately needed veterans hospital at Miles City.

We have—all of us in the Senate—sought, in one way or another, to enhance the welfare of our States. It is neither petty nor irrelevant to make that effort. It is one of the reasons why we are here. It is one of the ways in which this Nation moves toward a greater unity and equity among all of its citizens, because out of the progress of the several States has come a substantial contribution to the general progress of the United States.

By the same token, out of programs for the benefit of the people of the Nation as a whole have come benefits to the people of our States. I refer to the Federal highway program, medicare, educational aid, programs to curb water and air pollution, and countless other social measures which have been of benefit to the people of Montana as well as to tens of millions of other Americans.

In the end, gains for the Nation are

gains for the people of the States. In the end, gains for the people of the States will be gains for the Nation. If this proposed ABM missile system, therefore, is right for the Nation, it will be right for Montana. If it is wrong for the Nation, however, the location of one site at Malmstrom cannot make it right.

What economic benefit to a Montana community will equal the additional tax burdens and the new inflation which will weigh on all the people of Montana and the Nation if the cost of the ABM proposal runs to many billions of dollars? If the system becomes an insatiable maw for the consumption of public resources, who will pay for the neglect of other urgent national needs, if not all the people of the Nation, including Montanans?

The ABM proposal is not just another public works project. It is not some trivial boondoggle, a minor item out of the military pork barrel. It touches questions which go to the structure of a free society and to the civilized survival of this Nation, the Soviet Union, and, perhaps, of all nations. What local economic benefit can take precedence over these life and death issues? If the proposal is wasteful, dangerous, defective, and counterproductive to the peace of the Nation, of what lasting value can it be to the State of Montana?

To permit considerations of some local monetary gain to enter into the ABM decision would be tantamount to deciding to continue the Vietnamese war because it has kept the helicopter industry prosperous. May I say to the Senate that I regard this issue as so serious that if I thought I might be influenced by such considerations, I would not participate in deciding this question in the Senate.

The people of Montana have permitted me to represent them in the Congress and in the Senate for many years. They have stayed with me through many decisions—some of which they have approved, some of which they have disapproved. They have been most tolerant and understanding. I do not believe their tolerance is such, however, that they would understand a vote by me on this question on the basis of some ephemeral economic benefit. They are not that cynical; I am not that cynical.

Whatever factors may enter into my conclusions on the ABM, let it be clearly understood, now, that the proposed Malmstrom location is not one of them. The people of Montana do not put profits before peace. As a Senator from Montana, I will not put profits before peace.