

NAVY FLOOR SPEECH

MR. PRESIDENT, DURING THE LAST YEAR OR SO THE RAPID EXPANSION OF SOVIET NAVAL POWER HAS, QUITE PROPERLY, BECOME OF INCREASING CONCERN TO MANY MEMBERS OF CONGRESS, AS WELL AS TO THE GENERAL PUBLIC.

I THINK IT IMPORTANT THAT WE REVIEW, AT THIS TIME, THE BACKGROUND OF THIS ISSUE: THE VITAL, COMPLEX RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN AMERICA AND THE SEA. WE SHOULD HAVE THIS BACKGROUND IN MIND AS WE REVIEW OUR DEFENSE BUDGET.

A LOOK AT THE MAP SHOWS THE ORIGIN OF THIS RELATIONSHIP: WE ARE AN ISLAND. WHILE OUR OVERLAND CONNECTIONS TO THE NORTH AND TO THE SOUTH ARE NOT INSIGNIFICANT, OVER 60% OF OUR BORDER IS SHORELINE. OUR BASIC ORIENTATION HAS ALWAYS BEEN TO THE EAST AND WEST, TO THE ATLANTIC AND PACIFIC OCEANS AND THE RESOURCES AND MARKETS THAT LIE BEYOND THEM.

OUR GEOGRAPHY HAS TRANSLATED ITSELF INTO OUR HISTORY. OUR NATION WAS SETTLED FROM ACROSS THE SEA AND ITS EARLY INHABITANTS LOOKED TO AND OVER THE SEA FOR THEIR GOVERNMENT, THEIR TRADE, AND THEIR CULTURE. FROM WELL BEFORE OUR BIRTH AS AN INDEPENDENT NATION, WE WERE A SEA PEOPLE, FEEDING OURSELVES ON THE COD OF THE GRAND BANKS AND CARRYING OUR PRODUCTS IN AMERICAN-BUILT SHIPS WITH AMERICAN CREWS TO ENGLAND, THE CONTINENT, AFRICA, AND THE INDIES. THE FIRST AMERICAN-BUILT WARSHIP WENT DOWN THE WAYS IN 1690.

OUR NAVY WAS FOUNDED NINE MONTHS BEFORE THE DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE, AND IT IS SIGNIFICANT THAT THE AMERICAN FLAG RECEIVED ITS FIRST INTERNATIONAL RECOGNITION AT SEA. OUR FLAG BECAME A SYMBOL OF WORLD-WIDE COMMERCE IN A VERY SHORT TIME: IT APPEARED IN CHINESE WATERS AS EARLY AS 1784.

FOR A BRIEF PERIOD IN THE EARLY 1800'S WE THOUGHT WE COULD DISPENSE WITH A SEA-GOING NAVY. WE SHELVED OUR PLANS FOR LINE-OF-BATTLE SHIPS, LET OUR FEW FRIGATES IDLE AT THEIR MOORINGS, AND BUILT GUNBOATS FOR COASTAL DEFENSE. WE PAID THE PRICE OF THIS POLICY IN THE WAR OF 1812, WHEN BRITISH SEA POWER BOTTLED UP OUR PORTS AND, UTILIZING THE ABILITY OF SEA POWER TO PROJECT FORCE ASHORE WHERE AND WHEN IT CHOOSES, RAZED THE CITY OF WASHINGTON.

WE LEARNED OUR LESSON, AND THE 19TH CENTURY SAW AMERICA LEAD THE WORLD IN MANY ASPECTS OF MARITIME DEVELOPMENT. THE FIRST STEAMBOAT WAS AMERICAN; THE WORLD'S FASTEST MERCHANT SHIPS, THE CLIPPERS, WERE AMERICAN; THE WORLD'S FIRST EXAMPLE OF THE MODERN, ARMORED WARSHIP WITH TURRET GUNS WAS AMERICAN. THE CIVIL WAR GAVE OUR MERCHANT FLEET A BLOW FROM WHICH IT WAS LONG IN RECOVERING, BUT THE STEEL NAVY OF THE 1880'S RENEWED OUR NAVAL STRENGTH AND ENABLED US TO ENTER THE 20TH CENTURY A MAJOR MARITIME POWER. OUR SEA POWER WAS INSTRUMENTAL IN THE ALLIED VICTORY IN THE FIRST WORLD WAR AND DECISIVE IN THE SECOND. OUR UNDISPUTED COMMAND OF THE SEA DURING OUR POST-WAR CONTEST

WITH THE SOVIET UNION WAS A KEY ELEMENT IN CHECKING THE SPREAD OF SOVIET POWER.

TODAY, THE SEA IS OUR LIFELINE. OUR FOREIGN TRADE, IMPORTS AND EXPORTS, WAS WORTH OVER \$139 BILLION IN 1973; 45,795 FOREIGN FLAG SHIPS ENTERED OUR PORTS IN THAT YEAR; AND AN INCREASING PERCENTAGE OF THE VITAL RAW MATERIALS FOR OUR INDUSTRIES CAME FROM OVERSEAS, INCLUDING OVER 84% OF OUR BAUXITE, 64% OF OUR CHROMITE, 42% OF OUR COPPER, 84% OF OUR MANGANESE, 92% OF OUR NICKEL, AND 36% OF OUR PETROLEUM. THE IMPORTANCE OF THIS TRADE, AND THE ALREADY STARTLING DEGREE TO WHICH WE DEPEND ON IMPORTED NATURAL RESOURCES INCREASE EACH YEAR.

IN MANY WAYS OUR POSITION ON THE SEA IN THIS CENTURY IS SIMILAR TO THAT OF BRITAIN IN THE 200 YEARS PRECEDING THE FIRST WORLD WAR. IF WE ARE SOMEWHAT LESS DEPENDENT ON IMPORTS AND EXPORTS THAN WAS ENGLAND, WE NONETHELESS BEAR THE SAME BURDEN OF MAINTAINING THE WORLDWIDE FREEDOM AND SECURITY OF THE SEAS THAT BRITAIN BORE BEFORE US. THE AMERICAN FLAG AT THE MAST OF AN AIRCRAFT CARRIER HAS BECOME THE SAME SYMBOL OF POWER FOR PEACE, ORDER, AND COMMERCE THAT THE UNION JACK ON A CRUISER WAS 70 YEARS AGO.

BUT ALSO LIKE BRITAIN IN THE EARLY PART OF THE CENTURY, WE FACE A CHALLENGE TO OUR SEA POWER -- A CHALLENGE FROM A NEW NAVAL POWER WITH STRONG INTERESTS IN DISRUPTING THE PEACE, ORDER, AND COMMERCE WE SEEK TO PROTECT. THEN, THE CHALLENGE WAS IMPERIAL GERMANY, WHERE THE GENIUS OF ADMIRAL TIRPITZ AND THE KAISER'S

DRIVE FOR A "PLACE IN THE SUN" SENT DREADNOUGHTS, BATTLECRUISERS, AND U-BOATS DOWN THE WAYS AT A PACE WHICH BRITAIN WAS STRAINED TO MATCH. TODAY, THE CHALLENGE COMES FROM MOSCOW, NOT BERLIN, BUT ITS MEANING FOR THE DOMINANT NAVAL POWER, THE UNITED STATES, IS MUCH THE SAME AS IT WAS THEN FOR BRITAIN.

SINCE ADMIRAL ZUMWALT, THEN CHIEF OF NAVAL OPERATIONS, STATED THE SOVIET NAVY WAS NUMBER ONE IN THE WORLD, THERE HAS BEEN A GREAT DEAL OF INCONCLUSIVE DEBATE OVER THE ACCURACY OF HIS ASSERTION. WHILE HIS STATEMENT WAS RELATIVE TO THE ABILITY OF EACH NAVY TO PERFORM ITS ASSIGNED MISSION, MOST OF THE DEBATE HAS BEEN IN TERMS OF NUMBERS AND SHIP TYPES: YET EVEN IN THOSE TERMS, A CASE CAN BE MADE FOR THE ADMIRAL'S OPINION. THE SOVIET UNION CURRENTLY HAS 1062 NAVAL VESSELS IN COMMISSION TO OUR 514. THEY HAVE 387 SUBMARINES TO OUR 117. THEY HAVE 54 MAJOR FLEET UNITS BUILT SINCE 1960 IN COMMISSION, EXCLUDING SUBMARINES AND AMPHIBIOUS SHIPS; WE HAVE 66. BUT OUR SLIGHT NUMERICAL EDGE IS PARTLY OFFSET BY THE FACT THAT A LARGE NUMBER OF THEIR MAJOR UNITS ARE EQUIPPED WITH ANTI-SHIP MISSILES, A POTENT ARMAMENT THAT NOT ONE OF OUR MAJOR UNITS PRESENTLY CARRIES. THE RUSSIANS, HAVE, IN ADDITION, OVER 150 MISSILE-ARMED ATTACK BOATS.

TYPE-FOR-TYPE, THEIR SHIPS CLEARLY OUTCLASS OUR EQUIVALENTS: THEIR "KARA"-CLASS CRUISER, ARMED WITH THREE SEPARATE MISSILE SYSTEMS, IS THE MOST POWERFUL CRUISER IN THE WORLD. JANE'S

1974-75 EDITION, SPEAKING ABOUT OUR ROUGH EQUIVALENT, THE DLGN'S, NOTES THAT "IT IS DIFFICULT TO SEE THE JUSTIFICATION FOR THESE SHIPS... THEY COULD BE HIGHLY EXPENSIVE HOSTAGES IF INVOLVED WITH SHIPS ARMED WITH ANTI-SHIP MISSILES..." SIMILARLY, THE SOVIET "KRIVAK" CLASS DESTROYERS POSSESS COMPREHENSIVE ANTI-SHIP AND ANTI-AIRCRAFT MISSILE SYSTEMS. JANE'S, AGAIN SPEAKING OF THE U.S. EQUIVALENT, THE "SPRUANCE" CLASS DESTROYERS NOW BEING BUILT, NOTES THAT "THEY WILL HAVE AN ANTI-SUBMARINE CAPABILITY BUT LITTLE ELSE, LACKING, IN A MISSILE AGE, BOTH ANTI-SHIP MISSILES AND LONG-RANGE SURFACE-TO-AIR MISSILES".

THE UNITED STATES STILL HAS AN ADVANTAGE IN NUMBERS OF AIRCRAFT CARRIERS -- THE SOVIETS ARE NOW COMMISSIONING THEIR FIRST -- BUT, PARADOXICALLY, THIS ADVANTAGE HAS TRANSLATED ITSELF INTO A FAR STRONGER ARGUMENT FOR ADMIRAL ZUMWALT'S VIEW THAN CAN BE MADE ON TYPES AND NUMBERS ALONE. THE ESSENTIAL ELEMENT IN ANY MILITARY FORCE IS NOT EQUIPMENT, NOT EVEN MEN, BUT RATHER THE CONCEPTS WHICH DIRECT HOW THE EQUIPMENT AND MEN WILL BE USED. FOR EXAMPLE, IN 1940, THE FRENCH HAD MORE AND BETTER TANKS THAN THE GERMANS, BUT THE DECISIVE ELEMENT WAS THE GERMANS' CONCEPT OF ARMORED WARFARE. IN OUR NAVY, THE FUNDAMENTAL OPERATIONAL CONCEPT IS THE CARRIER TASK FORCE -- AN ATTACK CARRIER WITH ITS ANTI-AIRCRAFT AND ANTI-SUBMARINE ESCORT VESSELS. WE EVOLVED THIS CONCEPT IN WORLD WAR II, AND TODAY IT REMAINS THE BASIS OF OUR FLEET. ALMOST ALL THE NON-NUCLEAR STRIKING POWER

IN THE NAVY, BOTH FOR THE ANTI-SHIP ROLE AND FOR THE PROJECTION OF POWER ASHORE, IS CONTAINED IN THE CARRIERS' AIRCRAFT.

THE FLAW IN THIS FUNDAMENTAL CONCEPT IS THE FACT THAT, IN A PRE-EMPTIVE SITUATION, OUR CARRIERS COULD BE VERY VULNERABLE TO THE ANTI-SHIP MISSILES WITH WHICH THE SOVIET NAVY IS EQUIPPED. A FEW HITS CAN RENDER A CARRIER INCAPABLE OF LAUNCHING OR RECEIVING AIRCRAFT UNTIL THE DECISIVE PHASE OF THE BATTLE IS PAST.

THIS IS NOT TO SAY THAT THE CARRIER IS OBSOLETE; IT STILL RETAINS GREAT UTILITY IN CERTAIN ROLES. BUT IT HAS, IN ESSENCE, UNDERGONE THE SAME TRANSFORMATION THE BATTLESHIP UNDERWENT IN WORLD WAR II: FROM THE MAJOR FLEET UNIT FOR SHIP-TO-SHIP ENGAGEMENTS TO A VERY USEFUL BUT HIGHLY VULNERABLE MEANS OF PROJECTING POWER ASHORE. ITS VULNERABILITY TO PRE-EMPTIVE MISSILE ATTACK, A POSSIBLE SITUATION IN A CRISIS, BRINGS INTO DOUBT THE ENTIRE CONCEPT OF THE CARRIER TASK FORCE AS THE STANDARD FLEET ORGANIZATION IN PEACE OR WAR. THIS CONCEPT PUTS OUR NAVY, WHICH HAS MOST OF ITS EGGS IN THE CARRIER BASKET, IN A VERY DANGEROUS POSITION, AND GIVES THE SOVIET NAVY A CREDIBLE CHANCE OF SUCCESS, PARTICULARLY IF, AS IS POSSIBLE, THE SOVIETS CHOOSE THE TIME AND PLACE OF ENGAGEMENT.

THE END OF THE AIRCRAFT CARRIER'S UNQUESTIONED NAVAL DOMINANCE IS ONE WEIGHTY ARGUMENT FOR ADMIRAL ZUMWALT'S CLAIM OF SOVIET NAVAL SUPERIORITY. THE SECOND ARGUMENT IS ALSO THE RESULT OF A CONCEPT PLUS THE PIECE OF EQUIPMENT IT INVOLVES.

THE CONCEPT IS THAT, WHEREAS OUR NAVY'S JOB IS TO KEEP THE SEA LANES OPEN, THE SOVIETS HAVE THE EASIER JOB OF CUTTING THEM AND THE EQUIPMENT IS THE SUBMARINE.

THE SOVIET UNION TODAY OPERATES BY FAR THE LARGEST FLEET OF SUBMARINES IN THE WORLD. SHE HAS A LONG NAVAL TRADITION OF EMPHASIS ON SUBMARINES, AND HER BOATS ARE HIGH QUALITY: THE LATEST SOVIET ATTACK SUBMARINES ARE THE FASTEST IN THE WORLD, AND SOME CARRY ANTI-SHIP MISSILES WHICH CAN BE LAUNCHED WHILE SUBMERGED.

ADMIRAL OF THE SOVIET FLEET SERGEI GORSHKOV HAS NOTED THAT IN WORLD WAR II:

FOR EACH GERMAN U-BOAT, THERE WERE 25 BRITISH AND U.S. WARSHIPS AND 100 AIRCRAFT, AND FOR EVERY GERMAN SUBMARINER AT SEA THERE WERE 100 BRITISH AND AMERICAN ANTI-SUBMARINERS...YET, NEVERTHELESS, THIS SIGNIFICANT NUMERICAL SUPERIORITY OF DEFENDERS WAS INSUFFICIENT TO FORCE THE ATTACKERS TO FULLY CURTAIL THEIR ACTIVE OPERATION. THEREFORE, THE QUESTION OF THE RATIO OF SUBMARINES TO ANTI-SUBMARINE FORCES IS OF GREAT INTEREST EVEN UNDER PRESENT-DAY CONDITIONS, SINCE, IF ASW FORCES, WHICH WERE SO NUMEROUS AND TECHNICALLY UP TO DATE (FOR THAT TIME), POSSESSING A VAST SUPERIORITY, TURNED OUT TO BE CAPABLE OF ONLY PARTIALLY LIMITING THE OPERATIONS OF DIESEL SUBMARINES, THEN WHAT MUST

THIS SUPERIORITY BE TODAY TO COUNTER NUCLEAR SUBMARINES,
WHOSE COMBAT CAPABILITIES CANNOT BE COMPARED WITH THE
CAPABILITIES OF WORLD WAR II-ERA SUBMARINES"

GIVEN THAT NATO CAN AT BEST MUSTER NOT A 25:1 RATIO OF ANTI-
SUBMARINE SHIPS TO SOVIET SUBMARINES, BUT ABOUT A 2:1 RATIO. AND
THAT, AS ADMIRAL GORSHKOV ALSO INDICATES, THE SOVIET SUBMARINES
WOULD RECEIVE THE SUPPORT FROM SURFACE SHIPS AND AIRCRAFT WHICH
THE U-BOATS SELDOM HAD. IT IS HARD NOT TO AGREE WITH ADMIRAL
ZUMWALT THAT THE SOVIETS CAN PERFORM THEIR MISSION OF CUTTING
THE WEST'S SEA LIFELINE. AS ADMIRAL GORSHKOV SAID FULLY SEVEN YEARS
AGO. "THE SOVIET NAVY HAS BEEN CONVERTED, IN THE FULL SENSE OF THE
WORD, INTO AN OFFENSIVE TYPE OF LONG-RANGE ARMED FORCE".

THE DISTINGUISHED CHAIRMAN OF THE ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE,
SENATOR STENNIS, LAST FALL REFERRED TO THOSE WHO QUESTION U.S.
NAVAL SUPERIORITY AS "ALARMISTS" WHO MAY BE ENCOURAGING SOVIET
BELLIGERANCE. DESPITE MY GREAT RESPECT FOR THE DISTINGUISHED
CHAIRMAN, I CANNOT ACCEPT THIS VIEWPOINT. WE MUST CONSIDER
SERIOUSLY AND CAREFULLY THE U.S.-SOVIET NAVAL BALANCE, AND
WE MUST NOT REJECT A PRIORI THE POSSIBILITY THAT THE SOVIET NAVY
FORCES HAVE MORE CAPABILITY TO PERFORM THEIR ASSIGNED MISSION
-- SEA DENIAL -- THAN WE HAVE OF PERFORMING THE MORE DIFFICULT
MISSION OF SEA CONTROL.

WE MUST BE PREPARED TO EXAMINE THIS YEAR'S PROPOSED NAVAL
PROCUREMENT AND R & D PROGRAM NOT ONLY FROM THE STANDPOINT OF

ASSURING THAT THE TAXPAYERS' DOLLARS ARE USED EFFICIENTLY, BUT ALSO FROM THE STANDPOINT OF JUDGING WHETHER THE PROPOSED PROGRAM IS ADEQUATE, IN VIEW OF SOVIET NAVAL EXPANSION. I AM EXAMINING THE PROPOSED PROGRAMS CAREFULLY AT THIS TIME; AND I AM NOT CERTAIN IT IS ADEQUATE, PARTICULARLY IN TERMS OF THE R & D FUNDS WHICH THE NAVY MUST HAVE IF SOVIET SUPERIORITY IS NOT TO BE AN UNQUESTIONABLE FACT IN THE 1980'S.

OVER MY OBJECTIONS, THE R & D SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE, ON WHICH I HAVE THE PRIVILEGE TO SERVE, VOTED TO REDUCE FUNDS IN SEVERAL NAVAL R & D AREAS WHICH, I BELIEVE, ARE KEY TO OUR MEETING THE SOVIET CHALLENGE. THEY VOTED TO REDUCE ADVANCED SHIP DEVELOPMENT FUNDS FOR NEW CARRIER DESIGNS, FOR THE NUCLEAR POWERED STRIKE CRUISER, FOR THE NEW MINE COUNTERMEASURE SHIP, AND FOR THE ADVANCED HYDROFOIL. THE SUBCOMMITTEE VOTED TO REMOVE ALL FUNDS FROM THE PROGRAM FOR CONCEPT FEASIBILITY STUDIES OF NEW DESIGNS.

IT IS PRECISELY IN THE AREA OF NEW CONCEPTS AND NEW SHIP DESIGNS THAT WE MUST ACCELERATE, NOT SLOW DOWN, OUR EFFORTS, IF WE ARE TO MEET THE SOVIET CHALLENGE I HAVE DISCUSSED. AS I POINTED OUT, MUCH OF THE SOVIET CAPABILITY SPRINGS FROM THEIR NEW CONCEPTS AND THE ADVANCED NATURE OF THEIR SHIP DESIGNS.

AS I NOTED, ALTHOUGH THE SOVIET ANTI-SHIP MISSILE CAPABILITY REQUIRES THAT WE DIVERSIFY THE STRIKING POWER OF OUR FLEET AWAY FROM COMPLETE DEPENDENCE ON THE AIRCRAFT CARRIER, THE CARRIER

PAGE TEN

STILL RETAINS GREAT UTILITY IN MANY ROLES, AND IT IS CERTAIN THAT WE WILL REQUIRE NEW CARRIERS IN THE FUTURE. IT IS ALSO CLEAR THAT WE MUST EXAMINE NEW DESIGNS FOR THESE CARRIERS, DESIGNS WHICH WILL BETTER ENABLE THEM TO MEET THE ANTI-SHIP MISSILE THREAT. ACCORDINGLY, I VOTED IN THE SUBCOMMITTEE TO RESTORE REQUESTED FUNDING FOR WORK IN THIS AREA.

THE STRIKE CRUISER IS A NEW CONCEPT; AND WE SHOULD NOTE THAT THE SOVIETS PLACE HEAVY RELIANCE ON SUCH SHIPS, AND VALUE THEIR CAPABILITY HIGHLY. I THUS VOTED FULL FUNDING IN 1977 - WHICH THE SUBCOMMITTEE CUT - FOR ADVANCED DESIGN WORK ON THIS SHIP.

THE SOVIETS ARE TODAY THE WORLD'S LEADER IN NAVAL MINE WARFARE. IN THIS THEY CONTINUE A LONG TRADITION: IMPERIAL RUSSIA INVENTED AND FIRST USED NAVAL MINES, DURING THE CRIMEAN WAR. I THUS VOTED TO RESTORE FUNDS FOR ADVANCED DESIGN WORK FOR A MINE COUNTERMEASURE SHIP; THE SUBCOMMITTEE VOTED TO REDUCE THE FUNDS TO ZERO.

THE VOTE TO ZERO THE FUNDS FOR CONCEPT FEASIBILITY STUDIES OF NEW SHIP DESIGNS PARTICULARLY DISTRESSED ME; THIS AREA, ABOVE ALL, SHOULD BE FUNDED, AND FUNDED GENEROUSLY.

I INTEND TO WORK IN THE FULL COMMITTEE AND ON THE FLOOR OF THE SENATE TO SEE THAT THESE AND OTHER VITAL AREAS OF NAVAL RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT AND SHIP CONSTRUCTION RECEIVE THE FUNDING NECESSARY TO PERMIT US TO MEET THE SOVIET NAVAL CHALLENGE.

PAGE ELEVEN

MR. PRESIDENT, I DO NOT THINK I AM BEING AN "ALARMIST" BY ASKING THE CONGRESS TO CONSIDER THE U.S.-SOVIET NAVAL BALANCE CAREFULLY, THOROUGHLY, AND IMPARTIALLY. I REALIZE IT IS DIFFICULT TO FACE QUESTIONS AS COMPLEX AS THIS - QUESTIONS, THE ANSWERS TO WHICH MAY NECESSITATE VOTING ADDITIONAL DEFENSE FUNDS, OR TRANSFERRING FUNDS FROM ONE SERVICE TO ANOTHER. BUT I DO NOT BELIEVE THE CONGRESS CAN RESPONSIBLY IGNORE THE VITAL QUESTION OF WHETHER THE U.S. WILL CONTINUE TO HAVE MARITIME SUPERIORITY. THE QUESTION IS VITAL BECAUSE THE FACT IS VITAL; AMERICA DEPENDS ON THE SEAS. I HOPE THAT EACH OF MY COLLEAGUES WILL KEEP IN MIND THIS FUNDAMENTAL FACT DURING THE FORTHCOMING DEBATE ON THE FY 76 NAVAL BUDGET, AND THAT WE WILL ALL EXAMINE THE ISSUE WITH THE ATTENTION AND OPEN-MINDEDNESS IT REQUIRES.

11