

University of Montana

ScholarWorks at University of Montana

Mike Mansfield Speeches, Statements and Interviews

Mike Mansfield Papers

3-15-1973

Congressional Record - Reduction of Military Spending Overseas

Mike Mansfield 1903-2001

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.umt.edu/mansfield_speeches

Let us know how access to this document benefits you.

Recommended Citation

Mansfield, Mike 1903-2001, "Congressional Record - Reduction of Military Spending Overseas" (1973). *Mike Mansfield Speeches, Statements and Interviews*. 1091.
https://scholarworks.umt.edu/mansfield_speeches/1091

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.

MAJORITY CONFERENCE RESOLUTION ON REDUCTION OF MILITARY EXPENDITURES OVERSEAS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, earlier today the Senate majority conference adopted a resolution on the question of reduction of military outlays overseas. I ask unanimous consent that the text of that resolution be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the conference resolution was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

POLICY COMMITTEE RESOLUTION

Whereas, At home, Americans are plagued with inflation, and abroad the value of the dollar declines;

Whereas, The current U.S. military base structure and deployment around the world constitutes a serious drain on the budget and bite deeply into tax revenues available for essential needs inside the United States;

Whereas, Reductions of U.S. forces overseas and the closing of excessive and obsolete military bases abroad would save billions of dollars and help, thereby, to halt inflation, strengthen the dollar and permit additional use of tax revenues for domestic purposes;

Whereas, Such reductions are commensurate with the nation's defense, feasible in terms of present military strategy and technology, and in no way contradictory to the nation's foreign policies under the Nixon Doctrine;

The Majority Policy Committee urges:

1. That the Administration consider, forthwith, in conjunction with the appropriate committees of the Congress revisions in the proposed budget with a view to making specific recommendations on the reduction of military expenditures through the prompt close-out of installations abroad which are obsolete or excessive to the current security needs of the nation;

2. That the contingent of U.S. troops stationed overseas be substantially reduced, such reductions to be accomplished in stages over the next one and one-half years.

The Majority Leader is directed to bring this resolution before the Majority Conference for consideration. If concurred in by the Conference, he is requested to confer with the Speaker of the House, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, and with the Chairmen of the Committee on Appropriations, Foreign Relations and Armed Services on the contents of this resolution and ways and means of implementation by Executive Order or legislative action and to report to the Policy Committee on or before April 30 on the results of these conferences.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The resolution, which I shall not read in full, ends with this directive:

The Majority Leader is directed to bring this resolution before the Majority Conference for consideration. If concurred in by the Conference, he is requested to confer

with the Speaker of the House, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, and with the Chairmen of the Committees on Appropriations, Foreign Relations and Armed Services on the contents of this resolution and ways and means of implementation by Executive Order or legislative action and to report to the Policy Committee on or before April 30 on the results of these conferences.

Mr. President, the operative part of the resolution calls for the following:

1. That the Administration consider, forthwith, in conjunction with the appropriate committees of the Congress revisions in the proposed budget with a view to making specific recommendations on the reduction of military expenditures through the prompt close-out of installations abroad which are obsolescent or excessive to the current security needs of the nation;

2. That the contingent of U.S. troops stationed overseas be substantially reduced, such reductions to be accomplished in stages over the next one and one-half years.

The concerns which led to the adoption of this resolution are not too difficult to pinpoint. This month, wholesale prices climbed at rates more excessive and inflationary than at any time in over two decades. Food prices alone went up by 3.2 percent. To the consumer, the cost of fuel, lumber, and basic commodities and services are going out of reach. Abroad, the value of the dollar continues to shrink. The Senate is about to revalue gold by 10 percent to cover the lost dollar devaluation—the second in about 14 months. Still, monetary stability remains in doubt.

It was in part to accommodate to this financial situation that the administration says it was forced to cut back domestic priorities. Nevertheless, the administration has continued to pour even more money into the military budget and foreign assistance.

In the past, Senators have taken the lead in efforts to have the executive branch pare back superfluous foreign military and other involvements. Time and again, this administration has been urged from the Senate floor to act, and to no avail. Finally, with the support of the Democratic policy committee, amendments to compel cuts in U.S. forces in NATO were offered to legislation in the last Congress. The first attempt on May 19, 1971, called for a straight troop reduction of 50 percent. It was defeated by a margin of 25 votes. The second try came late that year. It would have provided staged reductions, removing 50 percent of our forces from Europe over a 3-year period. The amendment was again defeated 39 to 54 but the idea had gained strength and the losing margin shrank to 15 votes.

It costs the people of the United States about \$30 billion annually to maintain bases, troops, and facilities abroad. Using the administration's own figures, the price to the United States of NATO participation is about \$17 billion. The balance-of-payments impact of NATO is in the neighborhood of \$5 billion, considering official expenditures and dollar usage by dependents of servicemen.

While Europe receives the greatest portion of the defense dollar outflow, the

United States maintains well over 600,000 uniformed service people around the globe at \$10,000 per man in pay and allowances alone. Our Naval Forces carry tens of thousands more to foreign ports, appearing on station in nearly every body of water on earth that is deep enough to float a vessel. More dollars go out through that channel.

As this calendar year opened, increases in U.S. troops strength were even recorded in Britain—2,000 more U.S. servicemen were deployed there, presumably to defend the British Isles from foreign aggression. We also increased our presence in the Indian Ocean, Australia, and elsewhere.

While in some areas there were downward adjustments of our military presence, the fact remains that overseas there are still too many Americans, too many dependents, too many bases, too many facilities at too great a cost to the people of this Nation and at little or no cost to those whose security, presumably, is being defended. Indeed, one German state is in the process of levying taxes on certain U.S. installations. As if to add insult to injury, the American taxpayer is forced to listen to a Government which wastes billions for antiquated and irrelevant purposes of this kind tell him that the Nation's resources are just not big enough to provide adequately for domestic services—whether for health, education welfare, or rural services—to the people of this Nation.

It is true that talks on mutual force reductions, after being first urged from the Senate over 11 years ago, are now being pursued, finally, by the executive branch with the Russians. At this late date, however, insofar as they involve U.S. forces deployed in Western Europe, they are not much more, in my judgment, than a last ditch stall. If the present deployment of men is too high in Europe—and it is—talking with the Russians about reducing them simply prolongs what is already an unnecessary and wasteful drain on this Nation. If these U.S. forces in Europe are an excess and a waste to us they cannot increase by one iota our bargaining power with the Russians. Nor can they make any contribution commensurate with cost to our security or to Europe's. If these talks delay what are clearly desirable reductions of our forces, then the talks actually act contrary to our national interests by intensifying the financial debilitation of the United States.

In any event, the possibility of mutual force reductions ought in no way to inhibit the efforts to cut unilaterally this Nation's excessive military involvement abroad, be it in Europe, Africa, Latin America, Asia, Australia, in the islands or on the oceans. Actually, unilateral action by the United States to remove an excess of troops from Europe without diminishing our basic commitment to the NATO Treaty might serve to prod a similar move on the part of the Soviet Union in Eastern Europe. But as long as we stay put in Europe, the Russians will be under no pressure to move out. In short, unilateral action, now, to require a phased reduction of U.S. troops from Europe is needed in our unilateral inter-

est. At the same time, it could very well accelerate the timetable of the mutual force reduction talks.

It has been well over a year since the Senate has addressed this issue. In my judgment, it is particularly appropriate now, with the dollar suffering new declines in confidence abroad a continuing adverse balance of trade and inflation rampant at home that the Senate be given the opportunity again.

In my judgment, no single act which the Congress or the President or both can take at this time would do more to check the inflation at home or the enfeeblement of the dollar abroad than to move without delay to reduce the farflung and outdated overseas military deployment in an orderly fashion. I urge its favorable consideration and I pray that the Republican minority in the Congress and the President will join with us in the pursuit of its contents.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the distinguished majority leader yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I should like to associate myself with the statement of the distinguished majority leader and congratulate him on the very concise and lucid summary of the situation with which we are now faced. He has long advocated certain aspects of this matter.

Let me say that his initiative in asking the policy committee and others to seek a congressional budget is very much to be applauded. This aspect of it is a very important part of that.

Thus, I look forward to joining the majority leader in doing anything we can to get the conference to take the lead.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I appreciate what the Senator has just said.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, first of all, I should like to echo the sentiments expressed by the distinguished Senator from Arkansas (Mr. FULBRIGHT) and to congratulate the distinguished majority leader on what I consider to be a most appropriate and timely statement.

One thing that impresses me more than most anything in the resolution is the fact that it is not of a partisan character. It is not an attempt to criticize anyone for anything but merely to point up in a patriotic way the commitments we have made in Europe after World War II at a time when Europe was actually insolvent and where we at the time felt that our responsibility was so great, we committed ourselves according to the exigencies of the time.

But times have changed. Here we are in the year 1973 being told by the same nations, who were prostrate economically speaking and whom we have been helping all these years, the very same nations to whom we gave our Marshall plan money, that America must now defend its dollar abroad.

What an insult that is to the fiscal integrity of our own currency.

Rumors are rampant in many places in Europe that American dollars are not being accepted, even to pay hotel bills. I think that is a disgraceful situation.

What are we saying in this resolution?

We are not saying that America is ready to pull out of the alliance in Eu-

rope. We are not saying that for one moment. What we are saying is that many of the weapons in Europe today are absolutely obsolete and are not serving the purpose intended at the time they were installed, that we have more weapons in Europe than are necessary and that our allies in Europe are not living up to their obligations. In all these years, we are the only Nation in the alliance which has lived up to its commitments.

What we are asking today is that our friends in Europe do a little more for their own survival, their own defense, and their own protection.

Here they are, sending negotiators to Moscow to make trade agreements—I mention specifically, Italy, France, Great Britain, and Belgium. They are all there in Moscow, and also the Japanese, to work out what business arrangements they can make with the Russians.

Here we are on the other hand supporting a tremendous military posture in that part of the world, at a tremendous cost to the American people. Much of the weakness of the dollar in Europe is attributable to the fact that our commitments there are too great.

All we are saying today is to look at it sensibly, from the vista of 1973 and not from the vista of 1950.

While we intend to remain in Europe and do our share, I think the time has come when we have to bring our posture up to date. If we do, even our allies will congratulate us for stabilizing the American dollar.

Once more, I congratulate the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I commend the distinguished majority leader for his statement. I certainly join wholeheartedly in supporting the kind of action that he has outlined. It seems to me that the adjustment talked about is long, long overdue.

As the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. PASTORE) has just pointed out, this does not mean that we withdraw from Europe or retreat into any sort of isolationist position. It simply means that we recognize the realities of the times in which we live today which, coupled with our economic problems, indicate that we must withdraw a great deal of the money we are sending overseas for no apparent purpose.

What could we do with three divisions in Europe if a ground war started there? All those three divisions could constitute would be a trip wire. All of us recognize that.

Why do we need three divisions, over 300,000 men, or whatever the number is, if all we are doing is a symbolic thing, of having a trip wire to show our concern for the Europeans? We must recognize that fact.

As I understand it, we are talking about other worldwide commitments that we have. We have farflung bases around the world, many of them set up at one time which, for one reason or another, have continued to exist and we continue to support them for no reasonable military purpose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HATHAWAY). The time of the Senator from Montana has expired.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my remaining time under the order and all other reserved time remaining under the orders previously entered may be allotted to the distinguished Senator from Montana (Mr. MANSFIELD).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The time remaining is 20 minutes.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I shall conclude because I know many of my colleagues wish to speak in the same vein and I need not argue the ground all over again, but it seems to me that the time is long past due when we must make this kind of economic commitment, because of what we have been doing so profligately around the world. At the same time, we should take immediate action, in concert with the President and with our minority party in Congress, to take the immediate steps we need to withdraw much of our military power abroad.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the distinguished Senator.

I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I will not take more than a moment to voice support of the action that has been described by the majority leader. Many reasons can be assigned in support of it.

First, the time to eliminate waste of money is when you identify a waste. I think we have long discussed the imprudence economically of the kind of personnel we have committed in Europe. Let us now act to reduce, if not eliminate, that kind of waste.

Second, events in the last month—the Warsaw and Moscow Treaties—I think highlight the kind of stability that has developed on the continent, which argues again that we should recognize that our commitment initially was made in response to a world that no longer exists, that it is a different kind of continent, that tensions have lessened, and that the need for our presence proportionately lessens.

I appreciate what the majority leader has done, and I hope we will find that the Senate, without reference to the aisle that divides us, will support him.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the Senator.

I yield to the distinguished Senator from Missouri.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I commend the distinguished Senator from Montana, our majority leader, for the submission of his resolution in the matter of reducing American troops overseas. He has been the leader in this matter in the Congress, but not the leader in the United States. The original suggestion came from the late, great President Dwight D. Eisenhower, who knew at least as much about the military aspects of NATO as anybody, he being the first commander of SHAPE.

It would seem the problem is becoming ever more simple. Do we or do we not want to destroy the economy of the United States? Ten years ago, 1963, on this floor in a series of speeches, I presented that if we continued with policies which resulted in shipping bil-

lions, upon billions, upon billions of dollars out of this country, we could only end up by passing over the control of our economy to foreign central banks and foreign governments, primarily, of course, the central banks of Europe.

Not long ago the Smithsonian Agreement was termed by the President the greatest financial arrangement in the history of the world, but 14 months later the dollar was devalued again; and I am as sure as I am standing in this Chamber that unless policies change, it will be further devalued.

Last year, we had a heavy deficit in the private trade sector, much heavier than the year before; and the year before was the first deficit in the private sector since 1888. It is my understanding that today foreign interests, including the current very wealthy people in the Middle East who have oil, are purchasing heavily in U.S. corporations. All this but accentuates the growing danger to our economy resulting from the policies we have adopted with respect to the cost to our taxpayers of our overseas commitments all over the world. No economy, not even that of the United States, can continue indefinitely to police and babysit the world. Anyone who travels knows we have few friends except those we pay in order to be able to tell them how to govern their lives.

The distinguished majority leader has been consistent over the years in his position on this matter.

I believe a sound economy is just as important to the security of the United States as the latest weapons system, and am only sorry some of my colleagues have not agreed.

Today much if not most of the control of the American economy has passed to financial interests outside of this country. That is a dangerous development; therefore I am glad to support the resolution brought to the floor by the distinguished majority leader, for this reason as well as others.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the distinguished Senator.

I yield to the distinguished Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, I commend the majority leader on his leadership.

The point here is that, since the President laid down the gauntlet of fiscal integrity, balanced budgets, controlled spending and spending limits, the reaction of the U.S. Congress has been only that of increased spending. This reaction was brought about by the fact that the President unconstitutionally impounded funds, and the only recourse Congress had to continue certain ongoing programs was to reinstitute them and to reaffirm our confidence in them as viable and responsible programs. But that action has brought us generally into disrepute, because it has caused the people to believe that rather than trying to save, rather than standing foursquare for balanced budgets, rather than pursuing our prior record during the Nixon years of 1969-72 which actually reduced President Nixon's requests by some \$20.2 billion, that we are guilty of being reckless spenders.

It is significant, therefore, that the majority leader is taking the lead in showing how we can intelligently and responsibly respond by the constitutional act of Congress, and come to grips with the problem.

I emphasize "constitutional act" rather than "constitutional law" or "petition." Up to now, some of our colleagues have used different ways—to bring a lawsuit; to cite the Constitution; to angrily appear on TV, talking about image and the unwarranted and unconstitutional invasion of congressional power by the President.

The people could care less about power. What they are looking for is results. They are looking for economy, and a government that can stabilize and control itself and order its priorities.

The majority leader has begun to order those priorities in a responsible fashion by stating, simply, that we are not bugging out, that we are not going isolationist, but that we are looking at the front line of the defense of America—the stability and value of our American dollar. As we look to that, we find the dollar seriously undermined by two devaluations in a 14-month period, by the imposition of wage and price controls, by attempts to bolster the gold standard and rearrange our responsibilities under the gold reserves of America.

In every fashion, the United States is somewhat like a 10-round boxer, reeling, and trying to catch his balance. I believe the first place to catch our balance is in the matter of military deterrence. What really is the best way to put the American foot forward and stand as strong as we possibly can?

I yield to none of the hawks. I happen to be one who voted against the SALT agreement. While I voted for the ratification of the SALT treaty, I voted against the agreement, because inherently it guaranteed an imbalance; and I felt that in our zeal for an agreement, we had given the balance and the advantage to the Soviets.

I am one who called for the type bombing we saw in December last year, from the 18th to the 28th; and not a blanket bombing, by the way. We never have discussed this matter intelligently on the floor of the Senate. When the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BAYH), the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. INOUE), the Senator from Alaska (Mr. STEVENS) and others visited Southeast Asia earlier this year and were briefed, we discovered the meticulous, careful, pinpointing of military targets that had taken place during the 10-day period. We saw how our military force was brought to bear on the North Vietnamese to show that we meant business.

So to come from me, a proposal to withdraw U.S. troops from Western Europe is not in any sense a "bug-out" or a "withdrawal of commitment to NATO." On the contrary, it is strengthening NATO for what it is, because at this time our part on the frontline with NATO is vested more in the nuclear than in the number of troops.

If we get to the number of troops, we do not have to use the actual number which we as Senators are furnished on

a restricted basis. We can look at last month's issue of U.S. News & World Report and find out that the Soviet Union has a 2-to-1 advantage in troops, that she has a 2-to-1 advantage in aircraft, that she has a 3-to-1 advantage in the number of tanks. So discard the word "balance," and the notion that anything there is balanced. That is one of those Madison Avenue gimmicks that have gone on since NATO was established. There is no idea of employing a so-called balance of threat with the Soviet countries. Colleagues will talk about Czechoslovakia and Hungary, and I say to them, we did not use that so-called balance because that is not the posture of the U.S. defense.

Our posture is the same policy of commitment and resolve of the little country of Israel. Those who support Israel come here and argue about pulling the rug from under NATO, and those who support NATO talking about withdrawing commitments and making things shaky through reduction of forces.

Let us hearken the physical fact and experience of Israel. I went to the front lines of this little country, and on the Bar-Lev line on the Suez Canal where men were unbunkered in a 360 degree posture and could be easily overrun in 2 hours by the Egyptian forces on the other side. The Israelis say they could be overrun in the first hour or two, but in the next hour Israel would take Cairo, and the Egyptians know it. They are supplied by 14 countries. They stand fast. Why? Not because of the number of troops in the front line; but rather, because of the real deterrent, the resolve of commitment. And this is America's first or front line as well.

Specifically, as to our forces in Europe, I visited the Central Army Command in Heidelberg last November. I reiterate my support for ABM, for equipment, and materiel, but it is my considered judgment, and I would challenge my military friends to refute the statement, that our military policy, posture and deterrent in Europe is to go nuclear within 72 hours.

With the present mutual balance of force reduction, we would have to go at this present minute. They will tell you from the lowest private to the highest general that we have to go nuclear in 72 hours.

Then we can back our Commander in Chief, Gen. Dwight David Eisenhower, one of the greatest military minds of all time, the Republican President of 8 years. He was not pulling the rug out from under anyone, he was not springing up by sudden Senate resolution on March 15, 1973. On the contrary, as a result of his considered judgment, experience as both Commander in Chief and President, military, and civilian, he said, and I quote him:

One American division in Europe can show the flag as definitely as can several.

This is a Republican initiative and I hope Republicans will respond to it.

So there it is. What we are getting at is 100,000 trip wires are just as good as 535,000 troops and dependents. At the present time we have 325,000 actual troops, and the rest are dependents they

are all spending their time skiing, sledging, and apple struddling all over Western Europe, especially Germany. They are getting into trouble and argument involving drugs and other things—and from a policy standpoint, they are bringing rejection and disrepute upon America itself. We do not need those dependents, we do not need all those troops to maintain our posture. We can accomplish our military objectives with 100,000 troops. We can save the recriminations and disrepute by bringing the rest home.

If 27 years later we had foreign troops walking down my main street, I would resent it. It is human nature. The admonition is on the main street in Bonn, Germany: get out of your uniform and try to look like a German. We do not want to go through the terrible political struggles that came about in France where if we had not gotten out a free government would have fallen. France and Charles de Gaulle knew. He was tickled to death to have our troops over there. Then we had become an object of disregard and dispute and it worked against our military policy and national security, rather than assisting it.

I would emphasize one other point about unilateralism. I accompanied the distinguished majority leader to seven capitals in Europe. One could see that State Department crowd at work. Wherever we went the local interests knew about Senator MANSFIELD and the Mansfield amendment. They wanted to get him into immediate action by pointing out how it would all come apart at the seams if he did anything, by way of reducing our number of troops. What the multinational corporations and the local interests are concerned about is financial support and deposits.

Well, it did not come apart at the seams when France said to get out. It did not come apart at the seams when Norway said, "We do not want them here." It did not come apart at the seams when Denmark acted unilaterally and reduced its draft from 1½ years to 6 months. It did not come apart at the seams when Israel acted unilaterally and brought into question our base there. It did not come apart at the seams when any other nation has acted unilaterally. It did not come apart at the seams when they acted, as the leader pointed out, to tax our facilities.

It all comes into focus when the Germans say, "Mr. America, defend your dollar." Here we have gone out for years helping to pay the bills of the other crowd, being taxed by them, and actually being derided about not being economically sound. Then, when we act in an economically responsible fashion, we are asked to defend our dollar.

Mr. President, this has gotten to the ridiculous stage.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Montana has expired. Under the previous order the Senator from Virginia is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. Mr. President, I am glad to yield 3 minutes to the Senator from South Carolina.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recognized.

Mr. HOLLINGS. I thank my colleague.

Mr. President, I would emphasize, in addition to the unilateralism, in addition to the matter of mutual balance of forces, the point made by Lord Palmerston some 100 years ago that England has no permanent friends or permanent enemies; she only has permanent interests.

What is the best interests of the United States of America? We must first, in this Congress, get on with establishing and stabilizing a fiscally sound economy or we will not have a front line of defense. I intend to elaborate later when he have more time, but simply stated this proposed withdrawal is nothing more than President Richard Nixon's "Nixon doctrine."

I think the best way to memorialize the returning prisoners of war—as well as those who have gone on, some 55,000 killed in Vietnam and 303,000 who have been wounded there—is to tell the truth about Vietnam.

One of the salient features and thrust of our policy there was that we would be treating the yellow man the same way as the white man, that American foreign policy was color blind. The Nixon doctrine for the Far East is no troops, just economic support and military aid. What we are trying here today is not to pull out any rugs, withdraw from any treaties, bug out, or anything like that. We are trying to turn the ship around and to act responsibly by changing our priorities, saving the American dollar, and, in foreign policy, enacting the Nixon doctrine in Europe as well as in the Far East.

I thank my distinguished colleague from Virginia.