Guidelines for action

LEADERSHIP of this Association recently passed from one set of hands to another as part of our biennial election process. It is worth noting, however, that our approach to major defense issues and our objectives are not altered by this change in the names on our roster of elected officers and Executive Council members.

Delegates to our General Conferences, representing every state and every corner of the far-flung Guard system, determine our policies. They do this by their vote on policy statements and resolutions. It seems appropriate, therefore, that I publish our 1976-77 Statement of Policy as my first presidential message. From it, members can obtain a good picture of what our Association officers, Executive Council members, and staff will use as their guidelines for action in the year ahead.

Elsewhere in this issue can be found the resolutions adopted by our recent General Conference. These flush out our program, enumerating the specific objectives to which we will apply ourselves.

Statement of Policy — 1976

UNITED States military power has been a keystone in the security of several decades. It has deterred large-scale war by checking the aggressive inclinations of major Communist powers. It has assured our own national survival and given many smaller nations the ability and determination to resist attempts to subjugate them.

This has made the world a safer place for those who cherish such ideals and national values as freedom, individual rights, and government with the consent of the governed.

It has strengthened our influence for good in the world. As an Englishwoman recently wrote in her own personal biographical greeting to Americans: "The world is a better place because you're in it."

Had we permitted our power to wane or our will to falter, the world would be vastly different and indescribably worse than the one we inhabit. Millions of people who today control their own destinies would, instead, be captives of a Communist world order, perhaps even ourselves.

Americans for several years have been engaged in a soul-searching national dialogue over their country's role in world affairs. Much of the debate has centered on the size and cost of our Armed Forces, and their proper use in the international arena.

There are many who believe that we can safely make further reductions in our military establishment, to free more resources for social and human needs. The facts, unfortunately, do not bear out such a view.

This nation is spending less on defense, in real terms, than at any time since the Korean War. Its forces are smaller by 600,000 persons than they were in 1964, before we became embroiled in Vietnam. On the other hand, the Soviet Union, our most dangerous foe, has steadily increased its Armed Forces in both size and capability. It has caught up with, and in many crucial areas far surpassed, this nation in the size and capability of its armed forces.

Efforts are still being pursued to establish a permanent and reasonable ceiling on strategic weapons, and to achieve a mutual reduction of conventional forces in the European theater of potential conflict. Those initiatives have been only marginally productive. We must continue to seek an equitable balance of forces, at a lower force level than now exists. There'll be no hope of achieving any equitable arrangement with our powerful adversary, however, if we continue to reduce our own military forces unilaterally.

The Soviet military threat exists. It is not a delusion. It will not go away. The Soviet Union has never concealed its antipathy to this country nor its intention of achieving dominance, in Europe if not globally. We must deal with matters as they stand, and not as we'd like them to be.

PROPONENTS of smaller U.S. military forces have not so much argued against defending the nation as against big defense budgets. Thus the real argument centers on how much is required — in funds, weapons, planes, tanks, and trained people — to assure the security of our nation and the efforts of nations allied with us.

Defense planners face a dilemma. Personnel costs consume the greatest share of our defense appropriations — 60 percent at present. Thus, manpower becomes the inevitable target in efforts to reduce military costs.

On the other hand, we have lagged far behind requirements in developing and producing modern weapons and equipment, and those costs alone have soared under the impact of inflation. Where shall we cut — in force structure, or hardware?

The only answer, in the firm view of this Association, is neither. We believe our military strength already has been reduced to the lowest level consistent with safety in the current world environment. Any further cuts would place our security and that of other free nations in great jeopardy. Technological superiority, in the form of weapons and equipment of high quality and in sufficient quantity, is the best safeguard.
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