



Federal Maritime Commission  
Washington, D. C. 20573

Office of the Chairman

October 19, 1971

Dear Miss Ervin:

Per our conversation, would appreciate very much if Lt. General Knowles (or his designee) could read over the enclosed proposed speech for policy and/or any glaring factual mistakes. Chairman Bentley plans to deliver the text next week before a Navy League banquet in Houston and we would like a call back this afternoon if this is at all possible. [REDACTED].

Thank you so much for taking care of this.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Gloria".

Gloria E. Cataneo

Ladies and gentlemen of the Navy League:

During any week of the year I would consider it an honor and a privilege to address such a distinguished group of dedicated Americans as you who are gathered here ~~at~~ today. But this is more than just any week of the year -- it is ~~xx~~ a very special week, a week when the most powerful nation on earth takes pause to honor its armed forces and to recognize the vital role of its military in preserving freedom.

It is thus a week with a message, and I am proud to be able to play a part in ~~delivering~~ transmitting that message to the ~~men~~ world. For during this week America ~~reaffirms~~ reaffirms its belief in freedom wrought by strength, in preservation of peace through <sup>(capability)</sup> ~~preparation~~ for war. We all know that if America is to remain free, it must first remain strong. It is fitting, therefore, that we set aside this particular week each October to pay tribute to the guardians ~~of~~ of our liberty.

But why, I wonder, do we set aside only one week? Our fighting men and women work to protect ~~our~~ our freedom every day of every week, 52 weeks a year. And the way they've been treated of late, a single week's notice ~~in~~ each October is ~~hardly~~ hardly recompense for their deeds.

It ~~doesn't~~ doesn't do much for our military leadership either. We expect our admirals and generals to devise new strategies for keeping our ~~forces~~ forces ~~and~~ on their toes -- and would-be enemies from our shores. Yet we consistently deny them the money and materiel necessary to get the job done, and instead label men who in ~~the~~ other times would be considered heroes as warmongers, ~~killers~~ murderers and perpetrators of ~~militarism~~ a militaristic state.

When are we going to learn that in order to keep peace we must <sup>continue to</sup> ~~also~~ maintain the ability to ~~also~~ make war?

The critics of our military ~~establishment~~ base their argument for dismantling the ~~XX~~ U.S. defense establishment on the need for social reform. In order to cure our nation's social ills, they maintain, additional funds must be continually provided in increasing amounts. And what better place to take those funds than from what they considered to be a right-wing, and unneeded self-serving military establishment?

You and I know the fallacy of that argument. We know that our armed ~~forces~~ <sup>services</sup> must be maintained and strengthened if we are to survive as a free nation. We also recognize the pressing need for social reform. But at the same time we are aware that ~~ex~~ a weakening of defense invites ~~aggression~~ aggression, and that the spending of money does not in and of ~~itself~~ itself provide solution for the problems of society.

President Nixon recently summed up the situation in these

words; ~~and I~~ quote:

"In determining the strength of our defenses, we must ~~not~~ make precise and crucial judgments. We should spend no more than is necessary. But there is an irreducible minimum of essential ~~and~~ military security; for if we are less strong than necessary, and if the worst happens, there will be no domestic society to look after."

The reality is so obvious that only a person with both ~~eyes~~ eyes closed could miss seeing it. Yet an increasing percentage of our ~~entire~~ citizenry either cannot or will not see the light, and continues to call for ~~unilateral~~ unilateral disarmament in the face of Communist ~~military~~ military buildup.

We learned a hard lesson in preparedness during World War II when we had ~~to~~ to fight back from weakness following the Japanese attack ~~on~~ on Pearl Harbor. We were attacked <sup>precisely</sup> because we were weak; and if the Japanese had realized how completely vulnerable we were those <sup>30</sup> ~~20 years~~ years ago, there might not

have been a United States today to tell the ~~xxx~~ tale. Have we forgotten that horrifying ~~experim~~ experience so quickly? Apparently we have.

Not only have we forgiven the Japanese for killing our sons and loved ones but we have put their entire nation back on its feet and made it competitive in world markets to the extent that our own <sup>industry is</sup> ~~businessmen~~ suffering as a result.

We have done much the same for West Germany <sup>and others.</sup> Are we now planning to add the ~~Communist~~ Communist world to our list? Are we planning to weaken ~~ourselves~~ ourselves so drastically that Russia ~~may~~ may attack us because she believes we are vulnerable? Does anyone actually think we would not be attacked if such conditions prevailed? Does anyone dare ~~to~~ suggest we could then rehabilitate the Soviets after miraculously defeating ~~the~~ them, as we did with Japan and Germany <sup>following</sup> World War II?

Well, let me tell you that anyone looking at the condition of our Navy would ~~thanklessly~~ suspect that was what we had in

mind. Vice Admiral Hyman G. ~~Admiral~~ Rickover set the record straight in his recent testimony before the House Appropriations ~~and~~ Committee when he told the Congress he believed, quote:

". . . the real danger lies in our ~~allowing~~ allowing the capability of our general purpose forces for conventional warfare to deteriorate relative to the rapidly expanding Soviet capability for conventional ~~warfare~~ warfare. They already have an army far superior to ours. If they now succeed in building a Navy which can ~~prevent~~ prevent our own Navy from supporting overseas military operations they can have their way over any issue for which we are not willing to risk nuclear war. They could then whittle away at us and there would be no need for them to resort to nuclear war."

And if any among us still doubts the Russian intent let him

heed the satellite <sup>report</sup> ~~photographs~~ made public just two weeks ago;

these pictures ~~which these~~ are graphic evidence of a substantial buildup ~~of~~ by

the Soviet Union ~~of~~ of more and better strategic nuclear weapons.

The satellite <sup>photographs</sup> ~~photos~~ revealed Soviet building of three new types of missile emplacements -- and a doubling of production facilities for missile submarines at Russia's principal nuclear submarine construction yard at Severodvinsk, on the White Sea. This yard is now the largest submarine facility in the world.

With some 350 Soviet <sup>subs</sup> ~~submarines~~ in ~~ex~~ operation, compared to less than 150 under the American flag, the crisis becomes clear. Then when we consider that the Russians ~~are~~ are outbuilding us by three or four to one, is it any wonder that our military leaders are concerned?

Ladies and ~~gent~~ gentlemen: unless there is a sudden change in our popular and congressional attitudes, the Soviet Union will outbuild the United States in all areas of naval ~~endeavor~~ endeavor and soon achieve the numerical superiority in large ~~vessels~~ surface vessels that it ~~now~~ now holds in submarines.

American  
The Navy may well be able to get along with fewer ships --  
as congressional critics and others contend -- but only if  
the United States is to become a ~~second-rate~~ second-class  
power with a second-rate fleet. I don't believe any <sup>intelligent person</sup> in  
this country really ~~is~~ wants to see ~~it~~ that happen.

But happen it will, unless we do something to stem the tide  
while we still have the chance. Elmo R. Jr., the Chief  
Admiral Zumwalt, made the  
of Naval Operations, made the point  
point abundantly clear not too long ago when he testified ~~and~~  
before the Congress in support of the Navy's budget request for  
fiscal year 1972. The admiral stressed in his testimony what  
he termed "the single overriding point" regarding the Soviet  
buildup; quote:

". . . ~~that~~ the ~~militar~~ military and ~~mar~~  
maritime situation of the United States  
is changing and ~~that~~ it is essential that  
we understand the implication of the  
change. For many years Soviet~~s~~ land and  
air forces have posed a serious threat  
to contiguous free-world and uncommitted  
nations. Added to these forces, expanding  
Soviet seapower represents a new dimension  
in world affairs. When considered in  
conjunction with the recent attainment

of nuclear ~~parity~~ parity by the Soviets, their new and expanding seapower will act increasingly to influence the options open to the United States in the pursuit of our foreign policy. As a result of their concentrated development and building efforts in the 1960's, the Soviets have emerged as a naval power with first class ~~ex~~ capabilities to counter the naval power of the United States."

③ A year ago the United States had 769 naval ~~ships~~ <sup>vessels;</sup> today it has ~~700~~ <sup>700.</sup> Of that number 527 are combatant ships, compared to 574 this time in 1970. The Soviet Union numbers its naval forces at ~~2354~~ <sup>3,000</sup> ~~vessels~~ <sup>more than 2350</sup>, with ~~over~~ <sup>over</sup> two-thirds of that total representing combatant ships ~~and~~ and craft.

Included in the Soviet ~~submarine force~~ <sup>(tally)</sup> are 55 ballistic missile, ~~subs~~ and 65 cruise missile submarines. The United States fleet of ~~missile~~ <sup>(ballistic)</sup> subs totals 41 in commission, ~~with~~ with none now under construction. And in nuclear missile subs, according to Admiral Zumwalt, "Soviet strategic ~~sub~~ capability already is at least the equal of ours, and probably slightly superior."

What then ~~is~~ is to be done? Admiral Zumwalt ~~believes~~ believes that if the United States is to rebuild a first-line naval fleet, the nation must be prepared to spend more than \$50 billion ~~on~~ on ~~Naval shipbuilding during the~~ ~~remodernization~~ during the next 10 years.

The Navy's proposed building program calls for ~~an~~ an increase in spending for Navy ships from \$3.3 billion (requested for the current fiscal year) to \$5.1 billion in 1980, ~~with~~ with expenditures then tapering off ~~slightly~~ slightly through 1983. The proposed jumps in spending are significantly ~~high~~ above the \$2.5 billion <sup>(allocated)</sup> for shipbuilding in fiscal 1971.

There is cause for hope. The current defense budget ~~calls~~ provides for ~~an~~ an expenditure of \$76 billion in fiscal year 1972 -- some \$3.2 billion more than ~~the~~ Congress <sup>authorized</sup> ~~permitted~~ for defense purposes last year. Inflation may well negate the dollar increase -- but at least it is not a decrease -- yet.

But yearly ~~the~~ budgetary constraint has reduced the ~~minimum~~ strength of the U.S. fleet and delayed the much-needed replacement of old ships by new. In the opinion of President Nixon, ~~and Defense Secretary James Laird~~, the budget currently before the Congress constitutes the minimum needed to keep America secure in the face of rapidly advancing Soviet power and technology.

Melvin R.

And Defense Secretary Laird has warned strongly against budgetary cuts which ~~would~~ could further jeopardize our already tenuous military capability. Chief among the targets of our defense establishment ~~and its~~ critics are the Safeguard antiballistic missile system, multiple-missile warheads, and new naval ship construction.

Vice President Agnew recently deplored the proposed slashing of any of our vitally needed defense funds, citing <sup>the</sup> our Navy as being ~~the~~ "in particular . . . need of a drastic overhaul."

The Congress last year cut \$2 billion from the ~~amount~~ amount requested by the Administration for modernizing the Navy.

But according to Mr. Agnew, quote:

". . . it may be that the axe wielders ~~will~~ will be checked this year by the widespread publicity currently being given to the recent~~ly~~ edition of Jane's Fighting Ships, the recognized world authority on ~~such~~ comparative national naval strength, which is published in Great Britain. It has sent shock waves around the world and brought new attention to previously unheeded voices in this country."

The current Jane's details the phenomenal increase in Soviet ~~navy~~ naval strength following the Cuban missile crisis of 1962. The ~~sp~~ report notes the three-to-one Soviet edge in submarines and the Russian ~~or~~ Navy's development of a large, modern surface fleet that is now ~~showing~~ showing the hammer and sickle ~~in the Mediterranean~~ in oceans round the world, including areas where it had seldom been seen before.

Yet ~~and~~ as the Soviet fleet becomes more and more sophisticated, ~~ours~~ becomes increasingly obsolete. The Soviets have a new fleet: only two of its ships are over 20 years old. By comparison, 47 percent of American combatant ships and submarines are past the 20-year mark.

In addition, research and development has enabled the Russians to build vessels with higher sustained speed capabilities and greater ~~the~~ horsepower than their ~~ex~~ American ~~the~~ counterparts.

The newest Soviet ships ~~may~~ boast maximum speeds in the ~~the~~

34 to 38-knot range. ~~And in 1970 the~~ ~~the 1970 the~~ ~~the~~ Soviets spent \$17

billion on R & D while we were spending \$14 billion. Need I say more?

The Soviet surface fleet currently numbers 216 large combatant vessels including two helicopter carriers, 11 missile cruisers, 11 conventional cruisers (some of which are now being converted to ~~also~~ carry missiles), 37 missile destroyers, 45 conventional destroyers and 110 ~~the~~ escorts.

There are also more than 1300 small combatants and over 1100 support ships in the Russian fleet, for a grand total of some 3,000 vessels (including submarines). Granted, many of the 120-some American-flag vessels of the Military Sealift Command -- not counted in the tally of U.S. Navy ships -- have counterparts in the Soviet fleet. But the ~~difference~~ differential between 700 and 3,000 is nonetheless staggering.

Still other ~~differe~~ basic differences exist. The Soviets place great emphasis on minor ~~com~~ combatants; we ~~stress~~ stress ~~our~~ aircraft carriers. They have 65 cruise missile submarines; we have none. The new Russian ships are faster than their American counterparts; but the U.S. Navy's ships are quieter -- an important element <sup>in</sup> ~~of~~ avoiding detection.

In the field of aircraft carriers we have left the ~~Soviets~~ Soviets at the post. (It's nice to be able to say we're still

first in something.) But we're first in carriers only because the Russians started out way behind. Their first priority was to <sup>construct</sup> ~~build~~ a fleet capable of dealing ~~with~~ with our ~~previous~~ previously superior Navy as quickly as possible. That meant building submarines and ~~surface~~ expendable surface ships with a capability of firing ~~surface~~ surface-to-surface <sup>(</sup>missiles~~)~~ in a first strike against our carriers. The basis for such a strategy is to create enough ~~damaging~~ damage <sup>on</sup> ~~with~~ the first strike <sup>so that</sup> ~~that~~ submarines and aircraft can then come in and finish ~~up~~ up the job.

We control the seas with our aircraft carriers, and we have <sup>Ten years ago we had 24, and qualitative improvement in new</sup> 16 currently in commission. ~~Of these, only one is nuclear-~~ escort vessels has not yet compensated for the loss in numbers. Of the 16 only one is nuclear-powered, ~~powered,~~ but we are building two ~~more~~ more. The Navy feels that we badly need a fourth -- but such ~~ex~~ vessels cost ~~in the~~ many millions of dollars, ~~neighborhood of \$800 million a piece,~~ and I don't have ~~to~~ to tell you how ~~react~~ congressmen ~~react~~ react when they ~~hear~~ hear monetary figures like that bandied about. (Unless of ~~course~~ course the money's going into the ~~campaign~~ campaign chest, that is.)

The two new carriers -- the U.S.S. Nimitz (CVAN 68) and her sister ship, the Dwight D. Eisenhower (CVAN 69) -- will each carry two ~~atomic reactors~~ of the highest powered atomic reactors under development in the naval program. In addition ~~to their high power power~~ these reactors are being designed so that the ~~new aircraft~~ carriers will be able to operate for 13 years without refueling.

But it is unlikely the <sup>determination</sup> ~~decision~~ on the proposed ~~carrier~~ CVAN 70 ~~will~~ will reach the Congress, at least not during <sup>the current</sup> ~~this~~ session.

For the Defense Department has decided to ~~for~~ defer construction of <sup>this</sup> ~~the~~ third new ~~new~~ atomic-powered carrier and two proposed nuclear frigates as well.

According to Admiral Rickover the Defense ~~Dept~~ Department decision is tantamount to "an acknowledgment that we intend to become the number two naval power in the world." My sentiments exactly.

The Soviet Union this year "surged ahead of us" in the ~~area~~  
number of nuclear-powered submarines, Admiral Rickover *points out,*  
*predicting*  
~~reclaimed, and predicted~~ that at the current rate of  
construction in ~~the two~~ the two countries, ~~that~~ Russia ~~would~~ *will*  
have 50 percent more nuclear subs ~~than~~ than the U.S. by  
1975. Current figures place the American nuclear submarine  
total at 93 in operation.

In order to counter this dangerous trend *Admiral Rickover*  
~~he~~ recommends  
~~that~~ the United States ~~start~~ begin developing nuclear-powered  
attack submarines with capability for firing jet-powered cruise  
~~antiship~~ missiles at surface targets. The Soviet Union already  
has 65 subs equipped for firing such antiship missiles, 37 of  
which are nuclear-powered powered. Additionally the Russians  
are augmenting their submarine fleet at the rate of about 15  
~~nuclear-powered~~ boats a year. In comparison the United States  
sub fleet was expanded ~~last~~ last year by five. ~~quite a~~ *A* marked  
difference!

<sup>Thus</sup>  
~~the~~ the need for new and better ships in the United States  
Navy is <sup>obvious.</sup> ~~clearly~~ ~~obvious~~ Questions are: how  
~~many~~ many? and what types?

One thing that is certain so far is that our ~~admirals~~ admirals  
would like ~~a~~ a core of 10 to 15 ~~nuclear~~ atomic-~~power~~ powered  
aircraft carriers. They have also indicated they want a  
fleet of 50 or more ~~of~~ 3400-ton patrol escorts.

Design fund requests ~~were~~ <sup>for</sup> came too late, however, ~~for~~ the  
current fiscal year, and Congress refuses to allow the money  
to be diverted from other programs to ~~go~~ start the boats.

And the \$800 million ~~price~~ price tag on a nuclear-powered  
aircraft carrier doesn't require a mathematician to ~~figure~~ figure  
out how many of those we're likely to get.

So the Navy is studying new ship types <sup>in the hope</sup> ~~of~~ ~~finding~~ of  
finding a common solution to the Soviet ~~submarine~~ submarine  
challenge and the rising costs factor as well. The ~~sea control~~  
"sea control ship" -- <sup>though</sup> ~~is~~ not the ultimate answer -- may at least  
provide a way out of the dilemma.

1)

This new type of antisubmarine carrier -- an economy-size aircraft carrier, if you will -- would be smaller than its \$800 million ~~predecessors~~ <sup>sisters,</sup> costing only about an eighth as much. It would range from 12,000 to ~~25,000~~ <sup>20,000</sup> tons, with ~~armament~~ armament including VSTOL (very short take-off and landing) fixed wing aircraft, long-range ~~air~~ helicopters, and ship-to-ship and ship-to-air missiles, instead of the conventional fighters ~~transported~~ <sup>transported</sup> by the large ~~aircraft~~ carriers. The Navy expects one ~~STOL~~ sea control vessel to be able to dominate the ocean for a ~~radius~~ radius of 100 to 200 miles around a convoy.

At face value the STOL ship seems to be an ~~easy~~ easy solution to the Navy's problems. Why build huge, expensive aircraft carriers when you can have the same thing for a fraction of the cost? The answer is simple. You can't. While the sea control ship has great ~~possibilities~~ <sup>potential</sup> it cannot do the impossible. And ~~one~~ one of the very practical things it ~~cannot~~ <sup>can't</sup> do -- which the large

aircraft carrier can -- is to project our military power inland,  
as our carriers have done both in Korea and Southeast Asia.

The STOL ship nonetheless should significantly contribute to  
the protection of convoys and task forces, and ~~along~~ along with  
the various new classes of destroyers -- such as the DD 963 --  
high-speed attack submarines -- such ~~as~~ as the SSN 688 -- and  
revolutionary surface effect ~~ships~~ ~~ships~~ ship -- capable of  
traveling above at speeds of 80 knots the water ~~up~~ on a cushion of jet-produced air  
and propelled by powerful jet engines -- offers the prospect of  
enabling the American Navy to remain competitive on the sea  
~~and~~ lanes of the world.

*Support for the modernization program is essential. And you*  
~~can~~ in the Navy League can help. You can make your voices  
felt. You can make an all-out effort to impress ~~us~~ upon the  
people of this nation the dire emergency that exists as a  
result of our allowing ~~ourselves~~ ourselves to become  
~~our~~ weak.

Our military leaders are painfully aware ~~the~~ that ~~the~~ emphasis on the Soviet challenge, ~~many~~ coupled ~~with~~ with requests for greater resources, has ~~many~~ gained little notice in the country. They find many of our congressmen ~~are~~ suspicious of their warnings against a further reduction in our strength.

Not to be outdone by our admirals -- who don't mince ~~and~~ any words where <sup>the</sup> Russian ~~is~~ threat is concerned -- Navy Secretary John H. Chafee last month ~~said~~ echoed the call to arms.

Speaking at the launching of the U.S.S. California, the nuclear powered ~~frigates~~ guided missile frigate which is the nation's fifth atomic-propelled ~~warship~~ warship, Secretary Chafee asserted that the best way to deal with the Soviet Union's naval challenge is to, quote:

" . . . remain strong enough and ready enough at sea to deter war at any ~~level~~ level."

In the face of ~~the most~~ even the most severe criticism we must ~~not~~ strive to maintain that advantage. For despite our problems in Vietnam I truly believe that this nation does not desire war. Yet I know well that if we are ever to preserve the peace we must sustain our ~~ability to protect ourselves.~~ <sup>ability to protect ourselves.</sup> ~~ability to protect ourselves.~~

This is not new to ~~you~~ many of you who are seated here today <sup>likely</sup> and are thinking to yourselves: I've been through all this before. Well let me tell you, we've been lucky to have survived such neglect of our defenses before. What worries me is ~~that~~ that next time we might not be so ~~so~~ fortunate.

It used to be that when I heard people criticize our military establishment and shrug off the warnings of our ~~generals~~ generals and admirals, I'd ~~think~~ <sup>think</sup> to myself that the old joke about there being two solutions to any problem -- the right way and the Army way -- was pretty appropriate. After all, America was the globe's undisputed leader for ~~more than~~ nearly a ~~quarter~~ quarter of a

century following World War II. And military solutions often seem somewhat roundabout to a layman, even a concerned layman.

But in this dog-eat-dog world of the seventies, where the security of a nation is based on the ~~strength~~ strength of its armed forces -- and particularly its seapower, then the right ~~way~~ way and the Navy way become one: the only way, if freedom is to be preserved.

So we'd better heed the warnings of our leaders, before it's too late. They're not trying ~~to~~ to deceive us or scare us unnecessarily. They're only trying to wake us up to reality, the reality that if we don't do ~~it~~ something to protect what we've got in this country of ours, then pretty soon we might not have a country of our own to protect at all.

And that's a frightening enough denouement<sup>nc</sup> to scare anybody.