

with you, and you must be given the tools with which to do the job.

We know that in the light of modern offensive and defensive net evaluation, the numbers game of opposing military forces is no longer of predominant significance. Rather, the technological ability to penetrate successfully, and to deliver undamaged strategic weapons of even limited force is now far more important than a mere head count of available delivery vehicles, warheads, throw-weight or comparisons of megaton yields. The technological ability to totally deter a missile force from weapons delivery during a few crucial hours may no longer be dependent upon the size or potential yield of that force. Again, the answer lies with you and your work.

Missile-for-missile deterrence will no longer work in this era of long range, high altitude, widespread nuclear radiation kill effects. These are all well understood and exploited by our own country and the Soviets.

For these are critical times, and electronics pervades all critical weapons areas. The confidence with which existing and currently budgeted electronics systems can be counted upon to operate effectively in a battle environment is inversely proportionate to the effectiveness of opposing EW. The concern of the Soviet Union with radar vulnerabilities to electronic countermeasures can be exemplified by the degree of effort placed on their track-while-scan principle, which became the basis for the so-called SA-2 anti-aircraft guided missile system. They started early on their system. We started late with our countermeasures. We still can't use current strategic bombers safely over North Vietnam solely because of that damned missile system. Did we know about it early enough? Yes. Can we beat it? Of course! And we have beaten it earlier? Of course! The Soviets have long recognized EW as a primary and extremely important weapon of war. Do we objectively review our vulnerabilities to it and their vulnerabilities also? We shall, and our surprises will not be so costly in the future.

Countermeasures, counter-countermeasures, hardening of electromagnetic systems against transient radiation effects and other long range radiation effects, objective self-criticism on that score, objective net evaluation of our systems effectiveness against a dynamic enemy, all of these are elements in my value judgments; all of these factors fall within the designation "Electronic Warfare". All of these factors are crucial to the viability of the United States. All of these must be supported here, adequately, and given priority I intend to ensure.

Especially to you, the experts on electronic warfare, that one of the fundamental technical spectra of the strategic balance has been entrusted. Technological surprises or dramatic breakthroughs cannot be overlooked. If not for you, the Soviet Union could alter the existing balance of strategic forces that favor the United States, and at a startling pace.

Now we see the threat. Yet does it not appear to you rather remarkable that more support was not given to EW in general, and to the missile EW complex here at White Sands in particular?

It certainly appears remarkable to me. But upon what must I base my military program approvals? Political party position? In Electronic Warfare there is none. Military committee decisions and recommendations? Yes, if all factors have been considered to my satisfaction, but I can't find factors of Electronic Warfare in their conclusions, so they were apparently not in the input data to those committees. Conscience? There is a good support! But technical guidance for my conscience? The Executive Branch is both technically and operationally sound.

When I require guidance as to the need or adequacy of a particular system, it must be based upon intelligence; both C.I.A. and D.I.A. are arms of the Executive Branch.

When I need guidance as to supporting the thrust and extent of military research and development—in necessity and adequacy—it must come from the Department of Defense, itself. If I question value judgments—systems credibility in the face of scientific phenomena exploited by the enemy net evaluation—none but the cognizant officers or their chosen representatives are ever defined technically qualified to respond—Arms of the Executive Branch. If I still question, when I need guidance as to objectivity of the proponent, realistic costs, manner of projected or past expenditures, effectiveness and operational value of the product—I must turn to the Bureau of the Budget, another arm of the Executive Branch.

Please, don't misunderstand, I admire the Executive Branch and respect it for the almost impossible tasks it is called upon to surmount in service to the country. But its rabbits are minding the most costly and most crucial cabbage patches, and it is not unknown for them to get all fouled up. At least, a Senator cannot accept all programs at stated face value. Senators must develop relationships, through their staffs, with carefully chosen objective, experienced, relatively independent experts, in support of conscience and objective Senatorial actions. One objective arm of the Executive Branch upon which I shall depend is right here, on the factual judgment level, and well separated from the more subjective policy levels. Of course, I would expect that the commands would bless, monitor, and support the MEWTA asset.

MEWTA is an activity under the command of General Tatta, who also heads the Army's Electronics Command at Fort Monmouth, New Jersey. The Electronics Command has the responsibility for conducting the Army's research and development in the non-communications electronic warfare field.

MEWTA provides a unique capability in the missile electronic warfare segment of that field. It has the responsibility of determining the vulnerability of our missile systems and other missile systems considered to be a threat to our forces, and to recommend development of suitable electronic warfare systems to cope with the situation.

Its charter also includes performing analysis of our ballistic missile systems, analysis of our ballistic missile defense systems, and their deployment to determine their combat operational effectiveness.

This is indeed a formidable task. This meeting which brings together many of the most highly specialized and talented people in the electronic warfare profession is indicative of the type and calibre of effort required to conduct successful research and development in this field.

Electronic warfare may be considered to be a few dimension in modern warfare. Although it was first introduced in the World War II time period to degrade the effectiveness of enemy radar and navigation systems, it has now progressed to a highly sophisticated science that is included in the design and tactical deployment of every weapon system that must penetrate a complex enemy electronic defense environment.

This exacting science requires that the finest scientific and technical resources be applied to the problems at hand.

This is the job that faces each of you here today. In this room are scientists, engineers, educators, technicians, combat operations and management specialists in the field of electronic warfare. You must all work individually and collectively to come up with the analysis, the hardware, and tactical solutions required.

In this ever changing environment, you are called upon to react quickly to new designs and tested and new tactics must be determined. This is a team effort with members ranging from scientists working in areas of basic research to designers putting new

ideas into hardware, no operating analysis determining new tactics for the manner in the field about the tricks.

Electronic warfare can be considered "cat and mouse" game of sorts in which the mouse attempts to outwit the cat and gain the advantage. The electronic warfare division of this game employs the most advanced technology available to the player. Current techniques sometimes make it difficult to determine who is the cat and who the mouse in any given situation and, therefore, more, who has the advantage.

Each of you is frequently called upon to provide a new or revised electronic warfare capability to counter a new enemy electronic system as soon as it is discovered. On many occasions this involves engineering systems of systems that are often time pressure defined, and a fast response must be met to negate any advantage the enemy may enjoy with his new system. This calls for an effort from every member of the staff, a personal sacrifice of time and energy, and technical resourcefulness to meet the challenge with the tools at hand.

Electronic warfare is a game of wits. We must not only know the enemy's capabilities and tactics, and we must anticipate changes in his electronic warfare capability.

This means that we must maintain a constant base of research and development of electronic warfare select techniques and arises. At MEWTA we believe that our electronic warfare capability is a national security asset.

This will enhance our ability to meet the threats facing our country where our newest equipment becomes obsolete overnight. We must be prepared to meet the new technical challenges of the resource at our command.

A dynamic and continuing warfare research and development program that will provide a MEWTA a reliable reservoir of electronic warfare technology is a resource that the Department of Defense must maintain.

A characteristic of electronic warfare research and development is that it is a periodic crisis. It is revitalized as soon as a breakthrough occurs and must catch up as quickly as possible. We must maintain continuity in our development programs with the latest ECM and equipment in the field. We must not have the luxury of an electronic warfare program between national emergencies.

It is essential that research and development in electronic warfare be maintained and expanded to meet future needs of the military. This must be backed by sufficient resources, both money and personnel, to complete assigned tasks. As our electronic warfare capabilities are continuously being expanded and refined towards sophisticated weapons systems, the U.S. must constantly maintain the proper vigilance to insure that we are not being mean by net evaluation. The electronic warfare program for the future must be allowed to be diluted. Support for the electronic warfare program must be maintained by all agencies responsible for the defense of the United States. Industry must be given responsibility of continuing research and development for the sea and space applications. The States with electronic warfare resources on a crash program in the past.

The extensive facilities of the Department of Defense

Missile Range, the unique capability of MEWTA, and the resources of Sandia Base and Los Alamos must continue to work closely with our partners in industry and other research organizations to insure that we maintain the technical advantage so necessary in the field of missile electronic warfare.

The true effectiveness of electronic warfare systems, the vulnerability of our missile systems, and future electronic warfare systems requirements can only be defined by extensive and realistic operational testing in a suitable environment.

White Sands is well suited to perform more of this type of testing and evaluation.

I will continue to work with the Department of Defense to assure that the resources of White Sands Missile Range, MEWTA and other New Mexico facilities are recognized and that they will be given the opportunity to realize their full potential in the test and evaluation of future missile programs and related electronic warfare systems.

We should examine the possibilities of utilizing this area as a central test area for other electronic warfare testing to include aircraft as well as missile systems.

We should also consider the MEWTA assets at White Sands as an Anti-Ballistic missile system defense laboratory.

New Mexico State University has played an important role in supporting the activities of White Sands Missile Range. I anticipate that it will contribute even more in the future to the work being done by White Sands Missile Range and MEWTA in the technical evaluations and analysis of missile systems.

The significance of electronic warfare is quite apparent in Department of Defense thinking these days. A Department of Defense Electronic Warfare Board has recently been formed to review the electronic warfare programs of the military Services. The President's Science Advisory Committee is also devoting serious attention to the subject of electronic warfare and the role that it plays in modern day military operations.

I personally plan to help further an understanding of electronic warfare among my associates in Washington. It is a subject not widely understood nor its importance recognized. I will need your cooperation and support in keeping me abreast of developments in this field.

Each of you here this morning is contributing to the Army's missile electronic warfare program. It is up to you to help analyze the problems, define the requirements, and deliver the equipment to meet the needs. Every task is of extreme importance to the future survival of our nation.

My technical advisors have remarked about the fine scientific coverage in this symposium. When we convene next year at the same time, in the same place, on the same subject at this national Missile EW Center, I expect that the sharp focus which will have been established in your support, will show up in your vastly enhanced capabilities. I expect that this region shall be ringed with developmental and production facilities of private enterprise, adequately supported by the government. With our form of government this is always the winning combination.

And win we shall. Let all know, the price of war against us has gone up; we complain only about the pace of our past advancements and the cost-effectiveness of our measures.

I am of peaceful mind, but of a mind to say that, confident of our strength, we may more testily lose patience in the face of crises intentionally created by our adversaries. They should right now hesitate and ponder over the advisability of depending upon attacks which would, if successful, that uncertainty will become certainty of failure. So much, you are seeing to. The "Raven" need not act like a "hawk" or a "dove", but the "Old Crows"

would make tough chewing. Missile Electronic Warfare has arrived, and this facility at White Sands is its national center.

It has been a pleasure being with you this morning.

I wish you a successful conference and every success in meeting the challenges that you will encounter in the future.

Mrs. Mary Regan, Pioneer Resident, Dies in Chicago

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP E. RUPPE

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 1, 1967

Mr. RUPPE. Mr. Speaker, a beloved civic leader in Michigan's copper country and cherished friend, Mrs. Mary Regan, died recently at the age of 84. Mrs. Regan was an artist, writer, musician, historian, and an integral part of the colorful history of northern Michigan. Great granddaughter of Capt. John Sutter, of California's goldrush, daughter of Benjamin Jeffs, one of the mining pioneers of the copper country, Mrs. Regan lived and told the history of the early mining era as no one else could. I grieve at the passing of a dear friend; those of us from the copper country will long miss her presence.

I wish to include the following article from the Ontonagon Herald of Ontonagon, Mich.

MRS. REGAN, 84, PIONEER RESIDENT, DIES IN CHICAGO

Mrs. Joseph M. (Mary) Regan, 84, one of the most widely-known and respected residents of this area, died suddenly on Sunday, Sept. 17 at St. Ann's Hospital, in Chicago, where she has been convalescing.

She was the widow of John M. Regan, publisher of a number of financial books and magazines.

Mrs. Regan was a native of Rockland and was born in 1883, a daughter of the late Mr. and Mrs. Benjamin Jeffs, who were widely-known early Ontonagon County pioneers. Her father was the owner of the famed Minnesota Mine, once one of the greatest copper producing operations in the United States, and he also controlled the Michigan Mining Co. and other mining properties.

Her mother was a Sutter girl and a granddaughter of General John Sutter, on whose California mill property gold was discovered in 1848, precipitating the famous California gold rush.

Mrs. Regan received her early education in the Rockland schools and later attended Sacred Heart Convent in Grosse Pointe. She also attended the Cincinnati Conservatory of Music and Radcliffe College, Boston, graduating from both institutions.

Mrs. Regan's interests were varied and her talents many. She was an accomplished violinist, writer and historian, and in the early part of the century she became interested in the publishing field and founded Child Life Magazine. She wrote many articles for both this and many other periodicals.

A considerable number of her children's stories were written while she was rearing seven children of her own.

During her lifetime Mrs. Regan was active in many organizations and was recently honored and donated to the Historical Society of Rockland the museum which is to be dedicated to the early days of the copper industry in the Upper Penin-

sula. She had been an active member of the Ontonagon County Historical Society and of the Republican Party.

She was a member of St. Mary's Catholic Church in Rockland.

Surviving are five sons, Benjamin of New York and Joseph, Lewis, Robert and David, all of Chicago; two daughters, Mrs. Lewis Brumleve of Effingham, Ill., and Mrs. Thomas D. Hawley on Ontonagon; 23 grandchildren and three great-grandchildren.

Her body arrived at the Memorial Airport between Hancock and Calumet Monday morning, Sept. 18 about 10:30 via private plane, which also carried members of the survivors' families.

The Driscoll Funeral Home in Ontonagon was in charge of arrangements.

Many friends called at the Regan home in Rockland between four and ten Tuesday evening, and the rosary was recited there at eight o'clock.

A concelebrated Mass was held Wednesday morning at 9:30 at St. Mary's Catholic Church in Rockland with the parish priest, Rev. Fr. Raymond Moncher as the principal celebrant. The concelebrants were the Rev. Fr. Charles M. Herbst of Ontonagon, Father Donald LeLonde of Mohawk and Fr. Clarence Donnelly of Marquette. In the sanctuary were Fr. Frank Hollenbach of South Range, Fr. Tom Ruppe of Vulcan and Fr. Paul Savageau, O. Praem, St. Joseph Hospital in Hancock.

Her five sons, Benjamin, Joseph, Lewis, Robert and David Regan and a grandson, Ben Regan, Jr., served as pallbearers.

Interment was in the Rockland Cemetery.

"The Profession of Truth"—An Address by Robert Mitchell White II, at the 101st Annual Meeting of the Missouri Press Association, at Kansas City, Mo., on October 20, 1967

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL C. JONES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 1, 1967

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege on October 20 to attend the 101st annual convention of the Missouri Press Association held at Kansas City, Mo.

One of the highlights of the outstanding 2-day program was an address by Robert Mitchell White II, a third-generation editor and publisher of the Mexico, Mo., Evening Ledger. The White family has made many outstanding contributions to the State of Missouri since the Ledger was purchased by the late Col. Robert M. White in 1876, and the present publisher, who is the national president of Sigma Delta Chi, the society of journalists, has in a brief span of years made a brilliant record in his chosen profession and has been the recipient of many national awards.

Perhaps I am prejudiced because of Mr. White's references to the late Walter Williams, founder of the School of Journalism at the University of Missouri, of which he later became president—and because of my admiration for Dean Williams who, in my opinion, made some of the greatest contributions to the profession of journalism—I was particularly