

Originally Processed With FOIA(s):

S

FOIA Number:

S

FOIA MARKER

This is not a textual record. This is used as an administrative marker by the George Bush Presidential Library Staff.

Record Group/Collection: George H.W. Bush Presidential Records
Collection/Office of Origin: Speechwriting, White House Office of
Series: Speech File Backup Files
Subseries: Chron File, 1989-1993

OA/ID Number: 13772
Folder ID Number: 13772-011

Folder Title:
Disarmament Address to the Nation 9/27/91 [OA 8329]

Stack:	Row:	Section:	Shelf:	Position:
G	26	21	6	4

September 26, 1991

MEMORANDUM FOR DAVE DEMAREST

FROM: JENNIFER GROSSMAN
SUBJECT: MATERIAL FOR TOMORROW'S SPEECH

Many of the Cold War's historical speeches have had had a line, a slug or slogan, that helped preserve their potency for future audiences. Witness "an iron curtain has descended," "man must put an end to war, or war will put an end to mankind." The truly explosive message of this speech deserves some silver bullets. Some suggestions...

--(re. abolishing weapons) THAT CAN STILL MAKE WAR \ BUT CAN NO LONGER MAKE SENSE.

--WE HAVE UNTIL NOW ACHIEVED PEACE THROUGH STRENGTH...WE NOW HAVE THE CHANCE TO ACHIEVE STRENGTH THROUGH PEACE.

**Kennedy: nations do not mistrust each other because they are armed, they are armed because they mistrust each other. (maybe we can play around with this, e.g. it has often been debated whether nations mistrust each other because they are armed, or whether they are armed because they mistrust each other...)

OPPOSITION FROM THE RIGHT, how we can turn this around, steal their thunder:

--we have always insisted on peace though strength, we were right. now we may reap the harvest of strength through peace. we have always followed the path of measured deterrence, not mindless buildup. we were right. now we may follow that triumphant principle to its logical conclusion.

--JFK: on joining a race for peace, not war

RESONANCE

--"we stood where duty required us to stand" (now let us walk where destiny requires us to lead)

--part of something larger than ourselves

QUOTES

- 1) "Events, which are the arguments of God, are stronger than words, which are the arguments of men."
--"Beveridge the "Brilliant" 1898

2) "Destiny is not a matter of chance, it is a matter of choice; it is not a thing to be waited for, it is a thing to be achieved."

--William Jennings Bryan, 1899

3) (When asked the secret of his success, Wayne Gretsky replied) "I skate to where the puck is going to be, not where it has been."

4) "...and they shall beat their swords into plowshares...nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neitehr shall they learn war anymore."

5) REAGAN ('87 UN address): "[DeTocqueville] predicted that the two great powers of the future world would be, on one hand, the United States, which would be built, as he said, 'by the plowshare,' and on the other, Russia, which would go forward, again, as he said, 'by the sword.' Yet need it be so? Cannot swords be turned into plowshares?"

6) "What kind of man would live where there is no daring? I don't believe in taking foolish chances, but nothing can be accomplished without taking any chance at all."

--Charles Lindbergh

7) Ambassador Bush at Gloucester County Community College, May 7, 1971:

"You know the vision that was in the mind of the UN's founders -- how they dreamed of a new age when the great powers of the world would cooperate in peace as they had as allies in war, and would take the lead in stopping aggression."

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

For Immediate Release

September 27, 1991

ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT TO THE NATION

The Oval Office

8:02 P.M. EDT

Good evening. Tonight I'd like to speak with you about our future, and the future of the generations to come.

The world has changed at a fantastic pace, with each day writing a fresh page of history before yesterday's ink has even dried. And most recently, we've seen the peoples of the Soviet Union turn to democracy and freedom and discard a system of government based on oppression and fear.

Like the East Europeans before them, they face the daunting challenge of building fresh political structures, based on human rights, democratic principles, and market economies. Their task is far from easy, and far from over. They will need our help. And they will get it.

But these dramatic changes challenge our nation as well. Our country has always stood for freedom and democracy. And when the newly elected leaders of Eastern Europe grappled with forming their new governments, they looked to the United States. They looked to American democratic principles in building their own free societies. Even the leaders of the USSR republics are reading The Federalist Papers, written by America's founders, to find new ideas and inspiration.

Today, America must lead again, as it always has, as only it can. And we will. We must also provide the inspiration for lasting peace. And we will do that, too. We can now take steps in response to these dramatic developments, steps that can help the Soviet peoples in their quest for peace and prosperity. More importantly, we can now take steps to make the world a less dangerous place than ever before in the nuclear age.

A year ago, I described a new strategy for American defenses, reflecting the world's changing security environment. That strategy shifted our focus away from the fear that preoccupied us for 40 years, the prospect of a global confrontation. Instead, it concentrated more on regional conflicts, such as the one we just faced in the Persian Gulf.

I spelled out a strategic concept, guided by the need to maintain the forces required to exercise forward presence in key areas, to respond effectively in crises, to maintain a credible nuclear deterrent, and to retain the national capacity to rebuild our forces, should that be needed.

We are now moving to reshape the U.S. military to reflect that concept. The new base force will be smaller by half a million than today's military -- with fewer Army divisions, Air Force wings, Navy ships, and strategic nuclear forces. This new force will

MORE

be versatile, able to respond around the world to challenges -- old and new.

As I just mentioned, the changes that allowed us to adjust our security strategy a year ago have greatly accelerated. The prospect of a Soviet invasion into Western Europe, launched with little or no warning, is no longer a realistic threat. The Warsaw Pact has crumbled. In the Soviet Union, the advocates of democracy triumphed over a coup that would have restored the old system of repression. The reformers are now starting to fashion their own futures, moving even faster toward democracy's horizon.

New leaders in the Kremlin and the republics are now questioning the need for their huge nuclear arsenal. The Soviet nuclear stockpile now seems less an instrument of national security, and more of a burden. As a result, we now have an unparalleled opportunity to change the nuclear posture of both the United States and the Soviet Union.

If we and the Soviet leaders take the right steps -- some on our own, some on their own, some together -- we can dramatically shrink the arsenal of the world's nuclear weapons. We can more effectively discourage the spread of nuclear weapons. We can rely more on defensive measures in our strategic relationship. We can enhance stability, and actually reduce the risk of nuclear war. Now is the time to seize this opportunity.

After careful study and consultations with my senior advisors, and after considering valuable counsel from Prime Minister Major, President Mitterand, Chancellor Kohl and other allied leaders, I am announcing today a series of sweeping initiatives affecting every aspect of our nuclear forces on land, on ships, and on aircraft. I met again today with our Joint Chiefs of Staff, and I can tell you they wholeheartedly endorse each of these steps.

I will begin with the category in which we will make the most fundamental change in nuclear forces in over 40 years -- non-strategic or theater weapons.

Last year, I cancelled U.S. plans to modernize our ground-launched theater nuclear weapons. Later, our NATO allies joined us in announcing that the Alliance would propose the mutual elimination of all nuclear artillery shells from Europe, as soon as short-range nuclear force negotiations began with the Soviets. But starting these talks now would only perpetuate these systems, while we engage in lengthy negotiations. Last months' events not only permit, but indeed demand swifter, bolder, action.

I am therefore directing that the United States eliminate its entire worldwide inventory of ground-launched short-range, that is, theater nuclear weapons. We will bring home and destroy all of our nuclear artillery shells and short-range ballistic missile warheads. We will, of course, ensure that we preserve an effective air-delivered nuclear capability in Europe. That is essential to NATO's security.

In turn, I have asked the Soviets to go down this road with us -- to destroy their entire inventory of ground-launched theater nuclear weapons: not only their nuclear artillery, and nuclear warheads for short-range ballistic missiles, but also the theater systems the U.S. no longer has -- systems like nuclear warheads for air-defense missiles, and nuclear land mines.

Recognizing further the major changes in the international military landscape, the United States will withdraw all tactical nuclear weapons from its surface ships and attack submarines, as well as those nuclear weapons associated with our land-based naval aircraft. This means removing all nuclear Tomahawk cruise missiles from U.S. ships and submarines, as well as nuclear

bombs aboard aircraft carriers. The bottom line is that under normal circumstances, our ships will not carry tactical nuclear weapons.

Many of these land and sea-based warheads will be dismantled and destroyed. Those remaining will be secured in central areas where they would be available if necessary in a future crisis.

Again, there is every reason for the Soviet Union to match our actions -- by removing all tactical nuclear weapons from its ships and attack submarines; by withdrawing nuclear weapons for land-based naval aircraft; and by destroying many of them and consolidating what remains at central locations. I urge them to do so.

No category of nuclear weapons has received more attention than those in our strategic arsenals. The Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty, START, which President Gorbachev and I signed last July was the culmination of almost a decade's work. It calls for substantial stabilizing reductions and effective verification. Prompt ratification by both parties is essential.

But I also believe the time is right to use START as a springboard to achieve additional stabilizing changes.

First, to further reduce tensions, I am directing that all United States strategic bombers immediately stand down from their alert posture. As a comparable gesture, I call upon the Soviet Union to confine its mobile missiles to their garrisons, where they will be safer and more secure.

Second, the United States will immediately stand down from alert all intercontinental ballistic missiles scheduled for deactivation under START. Rather than waiting for the treaty's reduction plan to run its full seven year course, we will accelerate elimination of these systems, once START is ratified. I call upon the Soviet Union to do the same.

Third, I am terminating the development of the mobile Peacekeeper ICBM as well as the mobile portions of the small ICBM program. The small single-warhead ICBM will be our only remaining ICBM modernization program. And I call upon the Soviets to terminate any and all programs for future ICBMs with more than one warhead, and to limit ICBM modernization to one type of single warhead missile -- just as we have done.

Fourth, I am cancelling the current program to build a replacement for the nuclear short-range attack missile for our strategic bombers.

Fifth, as a result of the strategic nuclear weapons adjustments that I've just outlined, the United States will streamline its command and control procedures, allowing us to more effectively manage our strategic nuclear forces.

As the system works now, the Navy commands the submarine part of our strategic deterrent, while the Air Force commands the bomber and land-based elements. But as we reduce our strategic forces, the operational command structure must be as direct as possible. And I have therefore approved the recommendation of Secretary Cheney and the Joint Chiefs to consolidate operational command of these forces into a U.S. Strategic Command, under one commander, with participation from both services.

Since the 1970s, the most vulnerable and unstable part of the U.S. and Soviet nuclear forces has been intercontinental missiles with more than one warhead. Both sides have these ICBMs in fixed silos in the ground where they are more vulnerable than missiles on submarines.

I propose that the U.S. and the Soviet Union seek early agreement to eliminate from their inventories all ICBMs with multiple warheads. After developing a timetable acceptable to both sides, we could rapidly move to modify or eliminate these systems under procedures already established in the START agreement. In short, such an action would take away the single most unstable part of our nuclear arsenals.

But there is more to do. The United States and the Soviet Union are not the only nations with ballistic missiles. Some 15 nations have them now, and in less than a decade, that number could grow to 20.

The recent conflict in the Persian Gulf demonstrates in no uncertain terms that the time has come for strong action on this growing threat to world peace.

Accordingly, I am calling on the Soviet leadership to join us in taking immediate concrete steps to permit the limited deployment of non-nuclear defenses to protect against limited ballistic missile strikes -- whatever their source -- without undermining the credibility of existing deterrent forces. And we will intensify our effort to curb nuclear and missile proliferation. These two efforts will be mutually reinforcing. To foster cooperation, the United States soon will propose additional initiatives in the area of ballistic missile early warning.

Finally, let me discuss yet another opportunity for cooperation that can make our world safer.

During last month's attempted coup in Moscow, many Americans asked me if I thought Soviet nuclear weapons were under adequate control. I do not believe that America was at increased risk of nuclear attack during those tense days. But I do believe more can be done to ensure the safe handling and dismantling of Soviet nuclear weapons. Therefore, I propose that we begin discussions with the Soviet Union to explore cooperation in three areas: First, we should explore joint technical cooperation on the safe and environmentally responsible storage, transportation, dismantling, and destruction of nuclear warheads. Second, we should discuss existing arrangements for the physical security and safety of nuclear weapons and how these might be enhanced. And third, we should discuss nuclear command and control arrangements, and how these might be improved to provide more protection against the unauthorized or accidental use of nuclear weapons.

My friend, French President Mitterrand, offered a similar idea a short while ago. After further consultations with the Alliance, and when the leadership in the USSR is ready, we will begin this effort.

The initiatives that I'm announcing build on the new defense strategy that I set out a year ago -- one that shifted our focus away from the prospect of global confrontation. We're consulting with our Allies on the implementation of many of these steps which fit well with the new post Cold-War strategy and force posture that we've developed in NATO.

As we implement these initiatives we will closely watch how the new Soviet leadership responds. We expect our bold initiatives to meet with equally bold steps on the Soviet side. If this happens, further cooperation is inevitable. If it does not, then an historic opportunity will have been lost. Regardless, let me one doubt we will still retain the necessary strength to protect our security and that of our allies, and to respond as necessary.

In addition, regional instabilities, the spread of weapons of mass destruction, and as we saw during the conflict in the Gulf, territorial ambitions of power-hungry tyrants, still require us

to maintain a strong military to protect our national interests and to honor commitments to our allies.

Therefore, we must implement a coherent plan for a significantly smaller but fully capable military, one that enhances stability but is still sufficient to convince any potential adversary that the cost of aggression would exceed any possible gain.

We can safely afford to take the steps I've announced today, steps that are designed to reduce the dangers of miscalculation in a crisis. But to do so, we must also pursue vigorously those elements of our strategic modernization program that serve the same purpose. We must fully fund the B-2 and SDI program. We can make radical changes in the nuclear postures of both sides to make them smaller, safer and more stable. But the United States must maintain modern nuclear forces including the strategic triad and thus ensure the credibility of our deterrent.

Some will say that these initiatives call for a budget windfall for domestic programs. But the peace dividend I seek is not measured in dollars but in greater security. In the near term, some of these steps may even cost money. Given the ambitious plan I have already proposed to reduce U.S. defense spending by 25 percent, we cannot afford to make any unwise or unwarranted cuts in the defense budget that I have submitted to Congress. I am counting on congressional support to ensure we have the funds necessary to restructure our forces prudently and implement the decisions I have outlined tonight.

Twenty years ago when I had the opportunity to serve this country as Ambassador to the United Nations, I once talked about the vision that was in the minds of the U.N.'s founders -- how they dreamed of a new age when the great powers of the world would cooperate in peace as they had as allies in war.

Today I consulted with President Gorbachev. And while he hasn't had time to absorb the details, I believe the Soviet response will clearly be positive. I also spoke with President Yeltsin and he had a similar reaction -- positive, hopeful.

Now, the Soviet people and their leaders can shed the heavy burden of a dangerous and costly nuclear arsenal which has threatened world peace for the past five decades. They can join us in these dramatic moves toward a new world of peace and security.

Tonight, as I see the drama of democracy unfolding around the globe, perhaps -- perhaps we are closer to that new world than ever before. The future is ours to influence, to shape, to mold. While we must not gamble that future, neither can we forfeit the historic opportunity now before us.

It has been said, "Destiny is not a matter of chance, it is a matter of choice; it is not a thing to be waited for, it's a thing to be achieved." The United States has always stood where duty required us to stand. Now let them say, that we led where destiny required us to lead -- to a more peaceful, hopeful future. We cannot give a more precious gift to the children of the world.

Thank you, good night, and God bless the United States of America.

END

8:24 P.M. EDT

September 26, 1991

MEMORANDUM FOR DD

FROM: JAG

SUBJ: MORE LANGUAGE FOR TOMORROW'S SPEECH

- 1) George Washington in his first annual message to Congress in 1790 (i.e. "two centuries ago") coined the famous line:

"To be prepared for war is one of the most effectual means of preserving peace." (we might use this in qualifying total disarmament, yet adding something like: "yet to be prepared for peace, is also one of the surest ways of avoiding war.")

- ✓ 2) "The future doesn't belong to the fainthearted; it belongs to the brave."
--Reagan, Challenger address, 1986

NOTE: on beating right-wing critics to the punch, I guess it all comes down to the essence of what Lincoln meant when he said: **"We must be devoted with all our heart to the values we defended."** Those values have proven victorious; if we fail to respond to their victory, we retrospectively discredit their validity.

- 3) REAGAN: "After all our struggles to restore America, to revive confidence in our country, hope for our future, after all our hard-won victories earned through the patience and courage of every citizen, we cannot, must not, and will not turn back. We will finish our job. How could we do less. We're Americans." ('84 SOU)
- 4) REAGAN: "History is no captive of some inevitable force. History is made by men and women of vision and courage." ('86 SOU)

steps which fit well with the new post Cold-War strategy and force posture we have developed in NATO.

As we implement these initiatives we will closely watch how the new Soviet leadership responds. We expect our bold initiatives to be met with equally bold steps on the Soviet side. If this happens, further cooperation is inevitable; if it does not, some reassessment of the dramatic steps I have announced today, may be necessary.

At the same time, regional instabilities, the spread of weapons of mass destruction, and as we saw in during the conflict in the Gulf, territorial ambitions of power-hungry tyrants, still require us to maintain a strong military to protect our national interests, and to honor our commitments to our allies.

Therefore, we are planning a significantly smaller but fully capable military, one that enhances stability but is still sufficient to convince any potential adversary that the cost of aggression would exceed any possible gain.

It is vitally important that we implement these reductions coherently to ensure the right combination of military forces -- balanced, ready, and capable.

The same is true for our strategic forces. We can safely afford to take the steps I have announced today, steps that are designed to reduce the dangers of miscalculation in a crisis. But to do so, we must also pursue vigorously those elements of our strategic modernization program that serve the same purpose. We must fully fund the B-2 and SDI program. We can make radical

changes in the nuclear postures of both sides to make them smaller, safer and more stable. But the United States must maintain a modern strategic triad that ensures the credibility of our deterrent.

Twenty years ago when I had the opportunity to serve this country as Ambassador to the United Nations, I once talked about the vision that was in the minds of the UN's founders -- how they dreamed of a new age when the great powers of the world would cooperate in peace as they had as allies in war.

As I see the drama of democracy unfolding today in the Soviet Union, perhaps we are closer to that new age than ever before. Today, the Soviet people and their leaders can shed the heavy burden of a dangerous and costly nuclear arsenal which has threatened world peace for the past five decades and join us in these dramatic moves toward increased security and stability.

The future is ours to influence, to shape, to mold. While we must not gamble that future, neither can we forfeit the historic opportunity now before us.

It has been said, "Destiny is not a matter of chance, it is a matter of choice; it is not a thing to be waited for, it is a thing to be achieved." The United States has always stood where duty required us to stand. ^{let it be said that we led} Now let us lead where destiny requires us to lead -- to a more peaceful, hopeful future. We cannot give a more precious gift to our children.

Thank you, and God bless the United States of America.



LEVEL 1 - 1 OF 5 STORIES

Copyright 1991 Southam Inc.
Calgary Herald

July 30, 1991, Tuesday, FINAL EDITION

SECTION: EDITORIAL; Pg. A5

LENGTH: 1965 words

HEADLINE: The end of the Cold War

BYLINE: Ed Timms, Dallas Morning News

BODY:

RAPID CITY, S.D.

The hills of South Dakota are home to silos that store grain - and others that hold weapons of nuclear destruction.

In all, the 150 Minuteman II missiles of Ellsworth Air Force Base wait silently for a launch command that seems ever more unlikely. Soon, they'll be retired.

1991 Calgary Herald, July 30, 1991

These nuclear swords of the Cold War may not literally be beaten into plowshares.

But when the Minutemen are gone, farmers and ranchers suggest a new use for the silos - to store grain or as artesian wells.

Linda Eisenbraun's ...

... right moves, then you risk annihilation," said Richard Scribner, an associate professor with Georgetown University's School of Foreign Service.

"Nuclear saber-rattling" makes little sense, he said, when U.S. forces were able to demolish the Iraqis with conventional forces.

Even one ICBM would be devastating. The single warhead atop Ellsworth's Minutemen IIs, for example, is at least 90 times more powerful than the atomic bomb dropped on Hiroshima.

At ...



1991 Calgary Herald, July 30, 1991

These nuclear swords of the Cold War may not literally be beaten into plowshares.

But when the Minutemen are gone, farmers and ranchers suggest a new use for the silos - to store grain or as artesian wells.

Linda Eisenbraun's farmhouse is perhaps a half-kilometre from a Minuteman silo.

"We've lived with them," said Eisenbraun, 43, as she talked with a stranger through her screen door. "We can live without them."

The demise of the Cold War seems certain.

Baby boomers, who as children learned "duck-and-cover" drills and the dubious protective qualities of a school desk, apparently have outlived it.

More than 40 years in the making, the U.S. nuclear juggernaut is slowly, deliberately being downsized.

"We . . . somehow made the Cold War go away," said Air Force Brig. Gen. Robert Linhard, a former national security aide to former U.S. president

1991 Calgary Herald, July 30, 1991

Ronald Reagan and a top planner at Strategic Air Command headquarters in Omaha, Neb.

"In the process, we didn't pay for it with liberty, we didn't pay for it with a lack of integrity. We stuck to our principles, and we've lived through that period."

This week, U.S. President George Bush and Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev will meet in Moscow to sign the Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty, a historic agreement that will reduce long-range nuclear weapons by 30 per cent.

Yet START still will leave the United States and the Soviet Union enough weapons to destroy each other several times over.

Political and economic turmoil threaten to dissolve the Soviet Union. Developing nations, led by President Saddam Hussein's Iraq, keep trying to join the nuclear club.

On the front lines of nuclear deterrence, the work continues - at least until the threat is gone.



1991 Calgary Herald, July 30, 1991

Minuteman II missile crews head for the hills every day from Ellsworth to descend into concrete and steel cocoons. There, they wait for the launch order they hope will never come.

The roar of B-1B bombers and KC-135 tankers overhead is background noise for those who live near the base.

"I don't wake up feeling easier now versus two or three or five years ago," said Capt. Norm Pallister, 29, a B-1B pilot at Ellsworth.

"We still go out and practise what taxpayers pay us to do. I don't think we're going to be letting our guard down at all in the future."

At the same time, this Air Force Academy graduate and father of four is willing to call the outcome of the Cold War.

"I think we won," he said. "You could say, 'Well, nothing happened. How can you say we won?' But that has been our job, to deter any kind of a conflict, particularly with the Soviet Union. And that is exactly what we did."

* * *

(c) 1991 The San Francisco Chronicle, MARCH 17, 1991

from the public library and has the librarian fired because of her political views.

With some of the leading lights of the town, Earl has opened a steak joint named the Bull's Eye in honor of the local Air Force men who service the Minutemen, "150 nuclear weapons buried under 20,000 square miles of Montana prairie."

Dorrie begins waiting tables at the Bull's Eye and moves into an apartment above Madrid's only drugstore. She hires Margaret Greenfield, the novel's other central character, as Sam's baby-sitter. Margaret is an 11-year-old with an active mind and a more active imagination. Her first taste of adolescent disillusionment is an airplane ride in which she gets an aerial view of Madrid. Formerly a "place of layers and mysteries," Madrid now appears "bald" and "gappy," "lost at sea" in the unsheltering prairie.

By the time she meets Dorrie and Sam, Margaret is accelerating into adulthood faster than she can assimilate, becoming a source of confusion to her parents and herself. On the one hand she feels like a desperada: "Outlaw energy surges through her." On the other, she tosses frequent, quickie prayers she calls "ejaculations" heavenward to negotiate for favors and protection.



(c) 1989 Time Inc., Fortune, July 31, 1989

13,000 or so nuclear warheads (excluding 10,000 tactical weapons) and the Soviets about 11,000. Says Steinbruner: "There aren't more than 2,000 targets in the Soviet Union you can usefully attack." He suggests dropping the limit on warheads for both sides to 3,000. Kaufmann, convincingly cautious, would keep 4,000.

The ICBMs now in place -- Minutemen with one or three warheads and MXs with up to ten bombs each -- sit in silos in the Great Plains, vulnerable to accurate, multiwarhead Soviet missiles. So the Pentagon is going ahead with three expensive alternatives for protection: scattering 50 MX missiles on railway cars in an alert (estimated total cost: \$5.8 billion); running 500 Midgetmen missiles around in trucks (\$24 billion); and the Strategic Defense Initiative, whose object seems to have shifted away from building a shield over the whole country to providing guard dogs to keep incoming missiles away from the ICBMs.

The Pentagon could abandon all three methods in favor of 500 or so single-warhead missiles in silos, 3,500 other warheads apportioned among the Navy's Trident submarines and the Air Force's B1-B bombers, and a treaty with the Soviets. Under such a treaty both superpowers would eliminate all multiwarhead missiles accurate enough to vaporize the other side's ICBMs. And if the Soviets cheat and tuck some silo-busters away? They would also have to

LEVEL 1 - 4 OF 5 STORIES

Copyright (c) 1989 The Christian Science Publishing Society;
The Christian Science Monitor

May 9, 1989, Tuesday

SECTION: EDITORIAL; LETTERS; Pg. 20

LENGTH: 187 words

HEADLINE: Back and Forth on Mobile Missiles

BODY:

The article "Mobile Missile Debate Heating Up," April 3, hits a real hot button.

The United States currently has the largest mobile nuclear weapons arsenal in the world. The US Navy promotes its Trident 2 submarine and missiles as providing the delivery precision of land-based missiles. The cruise missiles and conventional nuclear bombs on Air Force planes provide a second source of mobility. If land-based missiles are vulnerable, eliminate them. Redundancy upon redundancy is overkill.



(c) 1989 The Christian Science Publishing Society, May 9, 1989

How can Congress seriously consider two new basing systems for nuclear weapons when it is struggling to balance the federal budget and find accommodation with the Soviets on nuclear weapons?

The country doesn't want or need nuclear turtles (Minutemen) on our highways or nuclear rail cars (MX Peacekeepers) on our tracks. Deploying these two new basing systems is a compromise with the devil: You can never win.

Willard B. Hunter, Midland, Mich., Coalition for Peace and Justice

Letters are welcome. Only a selection can be published, subject to condensation, and none acknowledged. Please address to "readers write."