



Statement of Senator Dianne Feinstein On National Missile Defense  
April 21, 2004

*Washington, DC – The U.S. Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on Defense today held a hearing on the FY 05 Missile Defense Agency budget. The following is the prepared text of a statement of Senator Dianne Feinstein, who is a member of the Subcommittee:*

**“I believe National Missile Defense is one of the key foreign policy and national security issues that we will face in the coming decades. The Administration's decisions on this issue should be made in a deliberate and thoughtful manner and in close consultation with our allies, and, most importantly, the United States Congress.**

**Previously, I have stated that my concerns about NMD revolve largely around four issues: the nature of the threat; the implications for arms control and the international security environment; the feasibility of the technology; and the cost.**

**Given the high cost and the still uncertain and untested technology, I found it surprising that President Bush has declared his intention to deploy a nation-wide missile defense this year. Given our mounting budget deficit, the threats to United States national security interests around the world and the numerous problems facing our military such as aging helicopters, aircraft with high accident rates, and a lack of bullet proof vests, the Administration's decision to seek \$10.2 billion for a largely untested and unproven missile defense program raises serious concerns.**

**While we no longer fear the threat of all-out nuclear war, the likelihood that America will be attacked with a nuclear, chemical, or biological weapon has increased. The proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, and the increasing availability to other nations as well as transnational groups such as terrorist organizations, to the technology and material necessary to develop and deliver WMD is perhaps the most serious threat to U.S. national security today.**

**We need to spend our resources wisely to make sure that we can protect our nation from these threats. But the odds that terrorists or non-state actors will use ballistics missiles to attack the United States in this manner remains, in my estimation, relatively low. Missile defense would have done nothing to stop 9-11. And missile defense would do nothing to stop a bomb smuggled into this country on a container ship or through another ‘soft’ point of entry.**

**National Missile Defense is not and should not be seen as a one-size-fits-all substitute for an effective non-proliferation strategy. The United States must have a balanced program to effectively safeguard our interests and clearly calibrate and allocate resources to meet the real**

**challenges that face U.S. national security interests including providing for effective strategies for non-proliferation activities, deterrence, homeland defense, and counter-proliferation.**

**I believe it would be folly and far too costly to place too much of an emphasis on missile defense and to unilaterally develop and deploy NMD before we even know what defensive systems are feasible. And likewise I am greatly concerned that even as we spend large sums on missile defense, we are not doing enough to make sure that resources are allocated to such areas as port security. We simply cannot afford to gamble with a national security strategy based on cultivating a missile defense system of unknown effectiveness on one hand with a less stable and less secure world on the other.”**

**###**