

I would like to begin by saying that there is no issue more significant today than the question of nuclear weaponry and whether or not we will do what is necessary to assure that the build up of those arms will not be put to the use they were intended. It is an issue I care most passionately about.

Our current build-up of arsenals has reached the point of provoking the other side to respond in kind. It is to the point where, purely from an arithmetic question of probabilities, the build-up has dangerously increased the chance of an act of madness or miscalculation which would bring nuclear war.

With this as the prospect, unless we reverse course, it becomes an issue in which every man, woman and child in this country who cares must act in a very firm, positive, and direct way

I have come across a book called War By Timetables written in 1969 by J.P. Taylor. It describes how World War I began in a simple, yet very incredible way. It reveals a fascinating set of circumstances in which six great super-powers had been building-up their military power during 30 years of peace prior to World War I.

Firstly, during those critical years, each country had its highest military commanders create complex and sophisticated plans of warfare. These plans were continually revised to utilize the latest innovations, yet all the while it was in hopes that they would never have to be used.

Secondly, mass mobilization plans were developed for deterrence, to stop warfare from happening. These plans involved the entire societies and economies of the countries involved.

Thirdly, for defensive purposes, an incredible network of military alliances were designed. Although they were supposed to decrease the probability of someone attacking, in fact, they ensnared every one of the great powers in an inescapable way

Finally, the highest state of the technology was employed. It is almost laughable today, when we think of aircraft carriers, missiles, B-1 bombers, and the like, to think that then it was basically a question of railroads. This book describes, however, the importance of the intricate network of railroads in facilitating mobilization for a first alert.

No opportunity for improvisation existed as the entire plan was highly organized. Absolute faith was given to the planners of that system. No one stopped to question whether it would work since to civilian use precluded any testing. Therefore, complete faith was given to elaborate plans using the state of the art of technology and commanders totally unaccustomed to this type of warfare. Then, an assassination of an arch-duke of Austria-Hungary took place. National pride set in, and Austria-Hungary moved against an entire people, bringing into the conflict all existing alliances.

The timetables of the railroads were triggered. However, it turned out that complete mobilization could not be achieved by several of the countries unless the early troops were mobilized, pushed off the rails and then deployed in order to enable reserve troops to be brought in. Consequently, it was impossible to stage all the troops in place and then decide whether to strike. Mobilization became activization and the first world war exploded.

What is to be gained from this event is a prompting reminder of how spurious and how dangerous some of the claims we are hearing today actually are. Don't you hear the echoes in some of the rhetoric of military planners today? People who are putting so much faith in a missile system that has never been tested. No one knows exactly what an ICBM will do when it's deployed. One has never been fired over the trajectory that it would have to be fired over in the event of a nuclear war. We do not know, and the Soviet Union does not know.

What kind of thinking is it that allows rational leaders to believe that we can play games with weapons as menacing as those that are in our arsenals today?

As I travel across my congressional district in northwest Oregon, I frequently speak about the need for a nuclear weapons freeze. I'm co-chairman of the state effort to put this issue on the Oregon ballot in order to allow the people to express themselves and petition their government to put an end to this madness, this build-up of nuclear weapons. It will only provoke the other side to respond in kind, to which then we would find no end on either side.

As I talk to people about this issue, I find that it is met with absolute incredulity by those who listen to the threat posed by the prospect of further expanding our nuclear arms and proceeding to test them. People cannot believe that a Secretary of State, of any party, can actually speak or even think that we can have a test shot of a nuclear missile or a bomb to try to prove something to the other side. People cannot believe that anyone in position of power can even conceive of such a thing. They can't understand why David Stockman or OMB can say that we don't have enough money to feed the hungry in this country, yet can still afford, however, to spend \$4.2 billion in the next five years for a civil defense-bomb shelter--evacuation plan combination designed to somehow make us safe.

They don't think that's rational and they're right. They can't believe that something so outrageously irrational can possibly remain a question of American policy. My friends, let me tell you, unless you seize the issue, that act of rationality will become permanent policy and will prevail as long as we allow it to take place.

These are questions that the people should decide. We must face the fact that there are those today, just as there were those in history, who believe that these steps are legitimately going to make us safe. They fail to see the chain reaction which inevitably follows these deeds.

Yes, there are those who think that it's irrational, but think of history and how many other times that short-term steps in thinking led us to the kinds of problems that we envision by these policies today. It happened in World War I and it could happen again where short-sightedness and national pride overwhelm better judgement.

At the time of the nuclear arms freeze, I don't think that any person wants the history of their life written and will choose to sit on the sidelines on a question such as this. It is time to work through the political process, to petition those in office who have a say over how our budget resources are going to be allocated.

Let me finally say just how winable this issue is. We can turn this policy around because there abides in the hearts of American citizens of every party, every background, every religious conviction, a desire for peace. No reasonable person wants a defense posture which would put us in peril. People, I think, understand that there's a limit which we must recognize as we build up our arsenals. Beyond that limit, it is no longer defense, it becomes provocation. It endangers not only the other side, but us. And, unlike World War I, today we are dealing with weapons which have the combined capacity to completely annihilate the entire human race. There can be no limited nuclear war, it would inevitably escalate into all-out warfare--leaving no one to walk the face of the earth.

Please, act on what we've discussed today and involve yourself in this great debate. I think this is one of the cross-roads of American history, where the people will decide whether we follow a path to peace or whether we follow a path which leads us to the edge of cliff and into an abyss which we cannot even begin today to imagine.

We have much more that we could be doing with our resources. There is \$1.6 trillion proposed for our defense budget over the next three years--\$1.6 trillion. Those are dollars which come out of the mouths of hungry children, out of health care services for our senior citizens, out of environmental protection programs which will preserve the planet rather than bring its destruction.

These are important questions and I just hope that with the emergence of the nuclear freeze movement in this country, fueled by the efforts of people from all walks of life, these questions can be turned around.

This member of congress has not voted for a single defense appropriations bill since he was elected to office eight years ago--not a single one. And there's a very simple reason for that--because it's no longer a defense budget anymore, it is a military provocation budget and, for that reason, it deserves to be defeated.

I've been standing alone in the halls of Congress in a very distinct minority. How do we get people like Mark Hatfield and Les AuCoin in a position where they're the majority? When the people, themselves, will work in their neighborhoods and communities throughout Oregon and the throughout the country so that a political climate will be created in which others in public office cannot ignore their legitimate demands for a path to peace rather than a path to war.

And so, fundamentally, my friends, it is in your hands to create a climate in which we can build a peace. So that there will continue to be generations to walk the earth, continue to be poets, continue to be teachers, continue to be philosophers, continue to be people who will lead great lives for as far forward into the future as we can imagine.

That's your challenge. That's my challenge. Together I think we can build that kind of future. Thank you very much.