Guided missiles replace familiar heavy guns on U.S. Navy cruiser Canberra and sister ship Boston.

WHY AMERICA WILL NEVER BE BOMBED!

(Continued)

We are also building another form of sea-based striking power—the nuclear-engined submarines which will carry the 1,500-mile Polaris missiles, 16 missiles to each submarine. The first Polaris sub will go into commission in 1960. Another nine, under construction or contracted for, will be ready by 1962, the year when Soviet missile strength may begin to reach the danger level. Still others will be building by that time.

When at sea, neither aircraft carriers nor missile-armed submarines can be attacked successfully with ballistic missiles. Nor can the Soviets count on destroying such targets by surprise in any other way. These are moving targets which have to be searched for, found and identified before they can be attacked, say by aircraft or submarines, and against such attack there will be warning.

There is no safety factor for the U.S.S.R. in such a situation. There could be no Soviet assurance of destroying even one carrier or Polaris submarine in time to prevent its nuclear weapons being launched into the Red heartland. A 1,500-mile range is ample for this purpose when the launching site can be moved close enough to the target.

Therefore we have, in our sea-based forces, the ultimate deterrent against ballistic missile attack on the United States.

Do we have enough such forces at present? No. Do we have enough under construction that will be ready in time? Probably not, but we can do better once we all understand what the score is.

We can bridge the so-called missile gap by speeding up our present programs, and we can add to those programs very substantially by putting more missiles at sea—not all in submarines, but in surface ships. We have a number of strong, hard-to-sink battleships in mothballs. They could be equipped to carry as many as 64 Polaris missiles each, as well as a lesser number of missiles of longer range.

Like the aircraft carriers, such ships can be given powerful defenses against attack by planes or submarines. Like the carriers, they are moving targets, immune to successful surprise by ballistic missiles.

THERE IS something more we could do along this line, too. We could reappraise the cancelled program for jet seaplanes. They can carry the heaviest H-bombs from any direction where there is salt water; they can even use lakes and rivers as landing and take-off points.

It is in a combination of all these sea-based striking forces that we find our effective deterrent against Soviet H-bomb attack, and our answer to Soviet threats. It is the answer of *inevitable consequences*: the only answer the Soviets have respected so far or are likely to respect in future. If the consequences of attack will inevitably be the destruction of the U.S.S.R. and all that Communism has to show for 40 years of Red rule, the risk will not be taken.

What is here suggested is simply that we, the world's greatest sea power, make the fullest use of the sea, the air above it and the depths beneath it to surround the Soviet Union with *mobile* striking forces—instead of locating them in fixed bases.

The Soviets can use the sea only to a limited extent; their access to it is restricted by geography, and their fleet—including submarines—is split into four separate sea frontiers. They can choose the time to start a war because we won't start one. But we can choose the place where the war will be fought by our ability to place our decisive forces where the enemy must attack them under conditions of grave disadvantage and suicidal risk — and thus make sure that the time will never come when he will consider the risk worth taking.

Indeed it is quite likely that the Soviet ballistic missile program will itself fade away when the men in the Kremlin see that it offers no hope of risk-free victory: just as the Soviets stopped building giant planes when they realized they could not hope for surprise success in the face of our DEW line and other warning systems.

SEA-BASED nuclear striking power in many forms is our American answer to the Soviet ballistic missile. It is an answer which does not attract enemy missiles to our homeland or those of our friends. It is an answer against which the enemy has no effective countermeasure. It is an answer which will make sense to the American people once they understand it, as they are beginning to do.

So we come back to the faith which I expressed earlier in this article, faith that our people will do what is necessary for security when they understand what is required. Whence do I derive that faith? From the record. We have faced dangers before, and have not shrunk from sacrifice nor failed in ultimate wisdom. We will not do so now.

I do not believe that we will go on with the suicidal course of studding our homeland with fixed missile bases that can only be targets for Soviet missiles.

I believe that we will seek our safety in *power in motion*, not power sunk in concrete-lined pits; in freedom of action against a land-locked foe, not in becoming immobilized ourselves, and thus adopting his disadvantages. I believe that we will survive the period of danger just ahead of us by using the mobility of sea-based weapons and thus bridge the gap to the space-based weapons which we shall attain in the next round. I believe that in these weapons, too, we shall prove consistently superior to the enemy.

All of which is simply saying that the record of the American people does not suggest that they are lacking in wisdom, in courage or in plain horse sense.