

freedom is our best ally, and the world's only hope, to conquer poverty and preserve peace. Every blow we inflict against poverty will be a blow against its dark allies of oppression and war. Every victory for human freedom will be a victory for peace. . . .

During the next four years, many of you here today will have to make decisions of state perhaps greater than any of those made by your predecessors. Because of modern technology, you will hold in your hands the destiny not only of America, but the entire world. . . .

As an older American, I remember a time when people of different race, creed, or ethnic origin in our land found hatred and prejudice installed in social custom and law. There is no story more heartening in our history than the progress we've made toward the "brotherhood of man" that God intended for us. Let us resolve there will be no turning back or hesitation on the road to an America rich in dignity and abundant with opportunity for all our citizens.

Let us resolve that we the people will build an American opportunity society, in which all of us—white, black, rich and poor, young and old—will go forward together, arm in arm. Again, let us remember that, though our heritage is one of blood lines from every corner of the earth, we are all Americans pledged to carry on this last, best hope of man on Earth.

So we go forward today, a nation still mighty in its youth and powerful in its purpose. With our alliances strengthened, with our economy leading the world to a new age of economic expansion, we look to a future rich in possibilities. All this because we worked and acted together, not as members of political parties, but as Americans. . . .

History is a ribbon, always unfurling, history is a journey. And as we continue our journey we think of those who travelled it before us. We stand again at the steps of this symbol of our democracy, and we see and hear again the echoes of our past.

A general falls to his knees in the hard snow of Valley Forge; a lonely president paces the darkened halls, and ponders his struggle to preserve the Union; the men of the Alamo call out encouragement to each other; a settler pushes west and sings a song, and the song echoes out forever and fills the unknowing air.

It is the American sound: hopeful, big-hearted, idealistic—daring, decent and fair. That is our heritage, that is our song. We sing it still. For all our problems, our differences, we are together as of old, as we raise our voices to the God who is the author of this most tender music. And may He continue to hold us close as we fill the world with our sound—in unity, affection, and love. One people under God, dedicated to the dream of freedom He has placed in the human heart, called upon now to pass that dream on to a waiting and hopeful world.

God bless you and God bless America.

Reagan meant what he said on the SDI

by Brig. Gen. (ret.) E.F. Black

The following paper by Brigadier General (ret.) E.F. Black was read in part at the Fourth International Conference of the Schiller Institute in Richmond, Virginia on Jan. 12.

The Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI), America's program to develop defenses against ballistic missile attack ("Star Wars," in media terminology), is "not negotiable."

These are the instructions President Ronald Reagan gave his Secretary of State George P. Shultz before he left for Geneva for his Jan. 7-8 meeting with Soviet Foreign Minister Andrei Gromyko.

In the aftermath of this historic meeting, some pundits of the press persisted in referring to the SDI as a "bargaining chip," speculating that it would be sacrificed as a trade-off for reductions in strategic weapons during the 1985 round of arms-control talks.

No way. The President meant what he said. His instructions are firm. They are not subject to change in the hope of achieving some tactical negotiating advantage.

Nor will the President allow the SDI to be placed in a state of suspended animation by accepting the classic Soviet gambit: a "moratorium" on antiballistic-missile (ABM) research. Once bitten, twice shy. The United States fell for that once when we accepted a moratorium on nuclear weapons tests by signing the Limited Test Ban Treaty in 1963.

A new defense posture

The fact is, the President's instructions stem from the carefully considered national policy announced on March 23, 1983—a policy based on the most important strategic/political decision since the beginning of the Atomic Age. Henceforth, U. S. national security was no longer to be based on the premise of deterring nuclear war by the threat of Mutual Assured Destruction (MAD). Instead, we would begin working toward a new defense posture which will provide, in the years ahead, Mutual Assured Survival, not only for Americans, but for the people of all other nations who wish to join in this common effort. This will be made possible through the development of an effective ABM system.

Thus, the SDI was established as a long-term national security project which would provide future generations with prospects for survival should they be threatened by nuclear attack. No longer will Americans be condemned to serve as unwilling hostages to the immoral doctrine of MAD. Security will be provided by a defensive system which uses weapons to destroy weapons rather than people.

Considerations behind the SDI

In arriving at this "watershed" decision, a number of important political, strategic, and technological considerations must have been taken into account. These would include:

- The recognition that the historic cycle of competition between offensive and defensive weapons systems has entered a new phase. Technological breakthroughs, particularly those resulting from space-related research, have made it possible to design new ABM defense systems which, within the not-too-distant future, show promise of eventually neutralizing the threat posed by today's strategic offensive forces.
- Solid evidence that not only the United States, but the Soviets as well, are basing their long-range strategic plans on the assumption that 1) defense against ballistic missiles is feasible and will improve with time; and 2) significant elements of such defenses can be in place within this decade.
- Acceptance of the fact that it is impossible for arms control negotiations to halt, or even impose a moratorium on, this continuing offense-defense cycle. To attempt it would be as futile as trying to put the nuclear genie back in the bottle.
- The considered judgment of military and political experts that the world no longer can rely on the concept of Mutual Assured Destruction to preserve the peace. MAD is OBE—overtaken by events and technology.
- The realization that the peoples of the world are fed up with their role as helpless hostages in the superpowers' continuing game of "nuclear chicken"; that they resent the absurd practice of wasting needed resources to add to the already excessive stockpiles of nuclear weapons.
- An appreciation of the speed with which science and technology are thrusting mankind into space. Today space has become the fourth dimension of national security along with land, sea, and air. Future historians may identify the January 1985 Geneva meeting (the first to discuss military applications of space) as the political beginning of the Space Age.
- The clear understanding that the world is now embarked on a new and difficult course: a transition from today's unstable political condition caused by reliance on the obsolete MAD doctrine to preserve deterrence, to a far more stable situation where deterrence can one day be based on Mutual Assured Survival. There can be no turning back. The task of statesmen is to accelerate, not retard, this transition.
- An awareness that the future composition of alliances

and the alignment of multinational power blocs will be determined as much by technology's impact on national security and on economic development as by political considerations.

These last two points deserve some amplification.

The transition from MAD to Mutual Assured Survival will require at least a decade, perhaps more. During that period, deterrence will have to rely on MAD initially, while the superpowers take steps to modernize rather than increase the size of their strategic forces. Then there will be a volatile period when deterrence will be based on a combination of strategic ICBM forces and ABM defenses. As the superpowers gain confidence in their ABM defenses, they will recognize the economic advantages of reducing their present stockpiles of offensive weapons. (Recent studies show that ABM defenses will have a 4:1 cost effectiveness advantage over offensive systems in terms of the outlays required to add penetration capabilities to existing ICBM systems.) Ulti-

What the President's SDI project has done is to emphasize the interrelationship of the political, economic, technological and national security aspects of space. It forces strategic planners to lift their eyes to the stars.

mately, deterrence may be based on virtually penetration-proof ABM systems, backed up by highly accurate, recallable, non-nuclear retaliatory forces built around cruise missiles and manned bombers.

The political impact of the development of effective ABM systems will be profound. Ideally, both superpowers have much to gain if they could work together to perfect a global missile defense. President Reagan has twice publicly invited the Soviets to join in such a cooperative venture. To date, however, Moscow has shown no interest in discussing the offer.

Instead, it seems likely that the Politburo will, as it did in 1946 when the U.S. proposed placing all nuclear weapons under United Nations control, reject the American suggestion on grounds that it would constitute a threat to their national sovereignty. (What they actually mean, of course, is that it might set in motion forces that could undermine the Soviet bureaucracy's tight control over the Russian people.) Under such circumstances, the world faces the prospect of a decade of intense competition between the two superpowers as they race to build their own separate ABM defenses.

Since technological progress inevitably will project essential elements of these defense systems into space, they will have an inherent capability to protect areas hemispheric in size. Thus what probably will emerge is two regional systems.

Decision for the non-aligned

This will mean that the non-aligned states, including the emerging industrialized states as well as those falling into the general category of undeveloped nations of the Third World, will be forced by circumstance to decide whose ABM shield they want over their heads. Even such larger nations as India and China lack the technological resources and the supporting industrial base to go it alone.

Thus, as Russia and the United States drive ahead with their own regional ABM systems, other states will have to choose not only which shield, but which political affiliation will best serve their long-term national interests. To the extent that they have any freedom of choice, the governments involved will probably opt for the system which is based on the most advanced technology.

Fortunately for the Free World, the three centers having the greatest technological and industrial capabilities are Western Europe, Japan, and the United States. All of these adhere to an economic philosophy of free enterprise, are firmly committed to the principles of democracy, and are linked together with the United States through mutual defense treaty arrangements. The U.S. Government has already pledged that any ABM defense it builds will be built in cooperation with, and for the protection of, our allies as well as ourselves. Western statesmen are working to establish the framework for SDI cooperation and technological exchange within these groups. There is no question that the combination of the scientific and industrial capabilities of these three economic centers will give them an overwhelming advantage over any similar combined effort of the U.S.S.R. and the Soviet bloc. In short, the SDI opens far-reaching political opportunities for the West.

There is no question that as the world moves into the Space Age, space-related technology will provide enormous economic benefits for mankind. During his visit to China last April, President Reagan outlined some of the more immediate prospects. He pointed out that experiments conducted in the zero-gravity environment of our Space Shuttle show that life-saving medicines can be manufactured in space with four times the purity of the same medicines on Earth, and can be produced over 400 times more rapidly. One month's production of medicines in space yields as much as 30 years' production on the ground. Similarly, the manufacture of semiconductor chips under zero gravity produces crystals of exceptional purity, making possible the design of vastly improved "high-tech" computers at far cheaper cost.

It is U.S. policy to give the private sector every oppor-

tunity to translate the results of space-based research into commercial products for the public. For its part, the government is committed to bearing the cost of such basic research and providing low-cost access to space. In fiscal year 1983, the Congress approved a budget authority of \$15.6 billion to cover the total space activities of the U.S. government, including NASA and Defense. The comparable estimated figure for FY 1985 has soared to \$20 billion. (Compare this to the SDI's estimated five-year budget of \$26 billion.)

Eyes raised to the stars

What the President's SDI project has done is to emphasize the interrelationship of the political, economic, technological and national security aspects of space. It forces strategic planners to lift their eyes to the stars.

The area of space that has the major strategic significance in coming decades is low-earth-orbit (LEO). As the U.S. investment in space continues to grow asymptotically and as the economic returns from this investment grow in like manner, it will have to be protected. Just as the growth of ocean-borne commerce led to the development of navies to enforce the principle of "freedom of the seas," it seems likely that looking beyond the national security requirements of ABM defense, the United States must develop a capability to work with all nations in the peaceful exploitation of the new dimension under the principle of "freedom of space." Interplanetary space can be considered as the "common heritage of mankind" as man turns to the exciting task of exploring the planets. Within the low-earth-orbit, however, there is already the requirement to deter possible hostile actions against our space vehicles, to ensure access to space for all and to maintain the safe environment needed to permit the peaceful exploitation of space-related technologies.

As we begin this new 1985 round of disarmament negotiations, the \$64 billion question is, as it has been in the past, "Are the Russians sincere? Are they really seeking equitable, verifiable arms control agreements or are they merely continuing their traditional campaign of political warfare designed to permit the further expansion of their Communist empire?" The historical record to date indicates the answer is "No," they are not sincere.

But times and circumstances change. Our offer to join with them in the development of a global system of ballistic missile defense which will permit the whole world to live under conditions of Mutual Assured Survival remains on the table. Should internal economic and political pressures lead them to accept our offer, the world will be a better place. If they do not, the SDI will protect the United States and its allies as mankind moves forward into the Space Age, where unforeseen incentives for cooperation lie ahead for all. The inevitability and rapidity of scientific progress soon will have more influence on international affairs than will the narrow political ambitions of nation-states.