The Moscow Agreements and Strategic Arms Limitation
The Strategic Arms Limitations Talks Agreements are the most important result of the long search by the United States and the Soviet Union for a means of controlling nuclear weapons. This paper presents an authoritative analysis of the Agreements, which were signed in Moscow in 1972.

Professor Bull seeks to estimate the value of the Agreements in relation to the objectives of arms control set out more than a decade ago in his pioneering theoretical work *The Control of the Arms Race* and to assess their significance for the political and strategic relations among the major powers. His findings are based on research and conversations in America, Europe and Japan.
The Strategic Arms Limitation Talks (SALT), which began in November 1969 and are still in progress, are the most important formal arms control negotiations of the post-1945 era. Previous negotiations have been of two kinds. Either they have been sterile polemical exchanges, lacking in seriousness — like the canvassing of rival schemes for general and complete disarmament. Or, in cases where serious discussion and bargaining have taken place, they have concerned subjects which — like the Partial Nuclear Test Ban Treaty of 1963 or the Non-Proliferation Treaty of 1968 — are important in themselves but marginal to the central issue of the nuclear confrontation of the superpowers.

The SALT may be seen in two dimensions. On the one hand they may be assessed from the point of view of their contribution to the long-term goals of arms control — reduction of the dangers of war and of the cost of arms competition. On the other hand they may be examined for their implications for the political and strategic relations among the powers. In this paper I have sought to provide an authoritative analysis of the first fruit of the talks, the two agreements about strategic arms signed by President Nixon in Moscow on 26 May 1972.

I propose to attempt to answer the following questions:
(a) What is the meaning of the strategic arms limitation agreements signed in Moscow on 26 May 1972?
(b) What do they contribute to the goals of arms control?
(c) What is the significance of these agreements for international politics? In particular, what is their likely effect upon

(i) the political and strategic balance between the United States and the Soviet Union?

(ii) the relations between these two powers and China?

(iii) the American alliance system in Europe and the Pacific?

THE AGREEMENTS

The agreements with which we are concerned are the Treaty on the Limitation of Anti-Ballistic Missile Systems (ABMs), and the Interim Agreement on Certain Measures with respect to the Limitation of Strategic Offensive Arms (hereafter the Agreements). These agreements must be read in conjunction with the Protocol on Limitation of Submarine-Launched Ballistic Missiles (SLBMs) and Modern Ballistic Missile Submarines, which forms an integral part of the Interim Agreement; the Agreed Interpretations and Common Understandings reached by the United States and the Soviet Union, in which they record their agreement on the interpretation of some aspects of the Agreements; and the Unilateral Statements in which each of the two powers puts forward its own interpretation in certain other areas in which they did not find it possible to agree.¹

It is important to bear in mind also that the Agreements form part of a wider series of accords signed in Moscow by President Nixon and the Soviet leadership, including a statement of Basic Principles of Relations between the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and agreements dealing with environmental protection, medical science and public health, space co-operation, science and technology, prevention of incidents at sea, and commercial relations. It should be remembered also that the Agreements are part of an ongoing series of formal arms control agreements, beginning with the partial nuclear test ban treaty of 1963, of which the two super powers are the principal authors and backers.

These links between the Agreements and other accords reached at the same time and earlier must be seen, if not as a guarantee that the parties will abide by them, then at least as providing a strong disincentive to disregard of them. The agreement on strategic arms, Dr Kissinger has said,

¹ The text of these Agreements, together with interpretative documents, is available in Survival, Vol. XIV, No. 4, July/August 1972. It is reprinted in the Appendix to this paper.
does not stand alone, isolated and incongruous in the relationship of hostility, vulnerable at any moment to the shock of some sudden crisis. It stands, rather, linked organically to a chain of agreements and to a broad understanding about international conduct appropriate to the dangers of a nuclear age . . . any country which contemplates a rupture of the agreement or a circumvention of its letter and spirit must now face the fact that it will be placing in jeopardy not only a limited arms control agreement, but a broad political relationship.2

The ABM Treaty

The chief import of the ABM Treaty is that in it each signatory undertakes not to deploy a nationwide defence of its territory against ballistic missile attack, and not to deploy a defence of any particular region apart from one system in defence of its national capital, and another in defence of an ICBM complex.

The prohibitions laid down in the Treaty are more stringent than may appear at first sight. In particular, it may be noted:

(a) Each party undertakes not merely 'not to deploy ABM systems for the defence of the territory of its country', but 'not to deploy a base for such a defence' (Article I). This refers to the deployment of a radar that could be used as the foundation of a nationwide defence. Radars concerned with air defence, space tracking, intelligence and other purposes are not prohibited per se, but their conversion to ABM purposes is prohibited.

(b) An ABM system is defined as 'a system to counter strategic ballistic missiles or their elements in flight trajectory', currently consisting of ABM interceptor missiles, ABM launchers and ABM radars (Article II). The limitations on each of these three elements are spelt out: the parties are allowed 100 launchers and 100 interceptor missiles at each of their permitted ABM system deployment areas; they are allowed two large phased-array radars in the missile site defence area, and eighteen radars in the national capital defence area. The Treaty also spells out that each permitted ABM system is to be within an area of 150 km radius, and the Agreed Interpretations lay down that the two deployment areas will be at least 1,300 km apart.

(c) The prohibitions extend beyond the elements of which ABM

systems are said to 'currently consist'. The Treaty prohibits not only the deployment but also the development or testing of ABM systems or components that are 'sea-based, air-based, space-based or mobile land-based', and of launchers for launching more than one missile at a time or rapid reload launchers (Article V). The Agreed Interpretations also veto development, testing or deployment of ABM interceptor missiles with multiple warheads. The Agreed Interpretations lay down that ABM systems 'based on other physical principles and including components capable of substituting for ABM interceptors, launchers and radars . . . are vetoed in the future'. This applies most immediately to the exploitation of lasers for ABM purposes. Research and development of lasers for ABM purposes is, of course, not restricted; and Dr John S. Foster, Director of Defense Research and Engineering in the Pentagon, indicated in testimony that in his view lasers could be deployed as an adjunct to a current ABM system, provided that they did not serve as a substitute for it or for any one of its components. It should be noted also that nothing in the ABM Treaty restricts deployment of lasers in connection with offensive systems, and that it might be difficult in practice to distinguish lasers which were permitted under the Treaty (for example, in air-to-air systems), from those which were not.

(d) The Treaty also seeks to guard against the possibility that other systems, such as surface-to-air missiles or ballistic missile early warning systems will be upgraded for use as ABM systems or components of them. Thus Article VI of the Treaty requires the parties not to give non-ABM missiles, launchers or radars capabilities to counter strategic ballistic missiles in flight trajectory, and not to test them in an ABM mode. The same article also lays down that in future radars for early warning of strategic ballistic missile attack will not be deployed 'except at locations along the periphery of its national territory and oriented outward'. This would minimise the possibility of their contributing to ABM defence of points in the interior. This article has the effect, incidentally, of prohibiting any further deployment of ballistic missile early warning radars outside the territories of the signatories. Existing super power early warning radars in third countries, like the US system in Britain, are not affected.

(e) The Treaty is also in effect an agreement not to disseminate ABM

3 Hearings SASC, p. 222. This, however, may not represent the view of the US Administration as a whole. Some elements in it take the view that any such deployment, without Soviet concurrence, would violate the treaty.
systems or technology. Article IX requires the parties not to transfer ABM systems or their components to other states, and not to deploy them outside their national territory. An Agreed Interpretation holds that this includes the obligation not to transfer blueprints for the construction of ABM systems or their components. The United States, however, has indicated in a Unilateral Statement that it does not regard the non-transfer article as setting a precedent for any provision in a possible future Treaty on strategic offensive arms; it seems likely that this Statement was made in response to allied concerns about the possible spill-over of the non-transfer item into the area of offensive technology, to which I shall refer below. Article X of the Treaty reinforces Article IX by having the parties undertake ‘not to assume any international obligations that would conflict with this Treaty’.

While these restrictions are very stringent, it should be noted that the following modes of ABM activity are still consistent with the Treaty:

(a) Modernisation and replacements of ABM systems permitted under the Treaty are provided for (Article VII).

(b) ABM systems and their components, used for development and testing and located within agreed test ranges, are permitted under the Treaty, and are additional to the systems allowed in the two permitted deployment areas (Article IV). The Treaty states that each party may have up to fifteen ABM launchers at test ranges; a Common Understanding spells out which are the current US and Soviet test ranges, and states that additional test ranges will require prior agreement, and that radars used for range safety and instrumentation purposes may be located outside of ABM test ranges.

(c) While development and testing as well as deployment of a range of possible ABM systems alternative to those that are now ‘current’ are prohibited (see (c) above), this prohibition clearly does not apply, at least in the United States view, to work ‘in the laboratory stage’. Research work on advanced ABM systems of all kinds is clearly continuing. It is a moot point how far research can progress in such areas as space-based systems, rapid reload or multiple warhead systems, or the exploitation of lasers for ABM purposes, given restrictions on development and testing. It is possible to see in these provisions a novel approach to the old and baffling problem of the control of research and technology, capable of being applied to offensive arms as well as defensive.4

It is worth noting also the following formal or procedural features of the Treaty.

(a) The Treaty marks an important innovation in its provisions for verification. Article XII lays down that to provide assurance of compliance with the Treaty each party will use 'national technical means of verification at its disposal in a manner consistent with generally recognised principles of international law' (use of space satellites for reconnaissance purposes is consistent with international law, for example, but invasion of national airspace by reconnaissance aircraft is not). The parties also undertake not to interfere with each other's national technical means of verification (e.g. by attacking or impeding the working of each other's information-gathering satellites). They also undertake not to use deliberate concealment measures which impede verification of compliance with the Treaty.

These provisions institutionalise the two super powers' practice of tolerating each other's intelligence-gathering activities in relation to numbers and types of deployed missile launchers and radars. An identical provision is included also in the Interim Agreement on strategic offensive arms. The United States, in the course of the SALT negotiations, did make some exploratory proposals that would have involved on-site inspection: for example, it proposed an inspected ban on the deployment of Multiple Independently-targetable Re-entry Vehicles (MIRVs). However, Soviet opposition to on-site inspection has again prevailed, and the Agreements limit only those categories of strategic arms that can be adequately verified by national technical means. While verification continues to be by these means only, a range of possible further arms control agreements will remain out of court. Most presently conceivable agreements in the field of strategic arms are verifiable by national means, however.

(b) The Treaty provides for a standing consultative commission (SCC) which will consider questions concerning compliance with obligations, provide 'such information as either party considers necessary to assure confidence in compliance with the obligations assumed', consider 'questions involving unintended interference with national technical means of verification', 'consider possible changes in the strategic situation which have a bearing on the provisions of the Treaty', agree on dates and procedures for destruction or dismantling of ABM systems, consider proposals for amendment or 'for increasing the viability' of the Treaty, and consider further measures of strategic arms limitation (Article XIII). The SCC is also assigned functions by the Interim Agreement.
The SCC proposal is also an important innovation and reflects the proposition, advanced in the planning stages of SALT, that one of the most important objectives of the talks was to institutionalise the talks themselves.\(^5\) It is not yet clear how the SCC will be constituted, what its precise agenda will be, or what division of functions will prevail as between it and continuing negotiations. To determine this will be the first task of SALT II. It will clearly have wider functions than the management of the strategic arms agreements themselves. It would be wrong to read in the provision that the SCC will concern itself with 'possible changes in the strategic situation' a design for US-Soviet co-operation against China. However, the work of the SCC in promoting a common understanding of the nature of strategic armaments and of strategic and arms control doctrine, may establish habits of co-operation that will have repercussions in wider fields.

(c) The Treaty is of unlimited duration, and includes provision for amendment, and for review every five years, and an 'escape clause' stating that a party may withdraw if it decides that 'extraordinary events related to the subject matter of this Treaty have jeopardised its supreme interests' (Article XV). These are standard items in recent arms control agreements. Of special interest in relation to the 'escape clause' is the statement issued by the US Delegation on 9 May 1972 stressing the importance of a follow-on agreement on offensive arms that would constrain the threat to survivability of US strategic retaliatory forces. The statement included the following passage: 'If an agreement providing for more complete strategic offensive arms limitations were not achieved within five years, US supreme interests could be jeopardised. Should that occur, it would constitute a basis for withdrawal from the ABM Treaty'.\(^6\)

**The Interim Agreement**

By contrast with the ABM Treaty, the Interim Agreement on offensive strategic nuclear arms has the status of an executive agreement rather than a Treaty, and a duration of only five years. Its chief import is to call a halt, for the five year period, to further construction of ICBM launchers; within this limitation, to forbid any increase in the numbers of 'heavy' ICBM launchers, that would result from the replacement of 'light' launchers by 'heavy' ones; and to restrict numbers of

---


\(^6\) Hearings SASC, p. 84.
SLBMs and modern ballistic missile submarines to the numbers at present operational and under construction, except that certain further SLBMs and submarines can be built as replacements for certain older strategic arms, under procedures that will be explained below.

In greater detail, the crucial limitations are as follows:

(a) The parties undertake not to construct additional 'fixed land-based intercontinental ballistic missile (ICBM) launchers' after 1 July 1972 (Article I). An informal understanding ensures that this and the other obligations of the Treaty apply from the date of signature, 26 May. Some points to note about this are as follows:

(i) An Agreed Interpretation restricts land based ICBM launchers to those for strategic ballistic missiles capable of ranges in excess of the shortest distance between the north-east border of the United States and the north-west border of the Soviet Union, i.e., about 3,000 nautical miles. Ballistic missiles of medium and intermediate range, of the sort possessed by the Soviet Union and China, are not restricted.

(ii) The Agreement restricts only 'fixed' missiles. A United States Unilateral Declaration states that it would consider the deployment of land-mobile ICBM launchers as 'inconsistent with the objectives of the agreement'. The Soviet Union has refused to assent to this proposition. The United States sought in the course of the negotiations to have the Agreement prohibit the deployment of land-mobile launchers, the reason being that it is not possible through national technical means to verify adequately numbers of deployed land-mobile ICBMs, although it is possible to establish whether or not some are being deployed. It is worth noting that the United States itself has a number of times considered the possibility of developing a land-mobile ICBM force, and that some American opinion still favours this course. Mobilisation of the ICBM force is one means of making it invulnerable; the US Unilateral Declaration, however, now effectively closes this option for the United States, at least for the next five years unless a SALT II agreement, covering mobile ICBMs, is concluded before the Interim Agreement runs out.

(iii) The Agreement permits 'modernisation and replacement' of ICBM's and launchers (as also of SLBMs and their launchers), but an Agreed Interpretation states that in this process the dimensions of ICBM silo launchers will not be 'significantly increased'. A Common Understanding defines a significant increase as one of not greater than

7 See e.g. the views of Senator Symington in Hearings SASC, p. 260.
10-15 per cent of the present dimensions of these launchers. Senator Jackson, in the course of his critique of the Interim Agreement, pointed out that an increase of 15 per cent, if it applied to both the depth and the diameter of the silo, would yield an increase in volume of over 50 per cent. Secretary Laird later made it clear that in the US understanding the increase of up to 15 per cent could be in one dimension only. The Soviet Union has not stated publicly its interpretation on this point.

(iv) It should be noted that in the case of the ICBM limitations, by contrast with those relating to SLBMs and submarines, neither the Agreement nor the supporting interpretative statements say what the numbers of US and Soviet launchers operational and under construction were on 26 May 1972. US estimates give the figures as 1,618 for the Soviet Union and 1,054 for the United States. But the Soviet Union, as Senator Jackson has pointed out, is not committed not to exceed any particular number of launchers, only not to construct any additional ones.

(b) The parties undertake not to convert ICBM launchers for 'light' or 'old' ICBMs into launchers for 'heavy' ICBMs of types deployed during or after 1964 (Article II). The significance of this limitation, a major US objective in the negotiations, is that it restricts the further increase of 'heavy' Soviet ICBM launchers, such as the SS-9, and a successor being developed for it, sometimes referred to as the SS-16. Some points to note are:

(i) Here, as in relation to the overall ICBM launcher limitation, the Agreement does not commit the Soviet Union to any actual number of 'heavy' launchers operational and under construction. United States estimates give the number as 313.

(ii) The Soviet Union was not willing to agree on any volumetric definition of a 'heavy' ICBM launcher. A US Unilateral Statement says it is one that 'has a volume significantly greater than that of the largest "light" ICBM now operational on either side'. This is the SS-11, which can carry a 2 megaton (MT) warhead. The SS-9 is said to be capable of carrying a 25 MT warhead, or 3 of 5 MT. All currently operational ICBMs other than the SS-9 are either 'light', like the US Minuteman and the Soviet SS-11 and SS-13, or 'older', i.e., deployed before 1964, like the US Titan II and the Soviet SS-7 and SS-8.

8 Ibid., pp. 341-2.
9 Ibid., p. 167.
The parties undertake to limit SLBM launchers and modern ballistic missile submarines to the numbers operational and under construction on 26 May 1972, and in addition launchers and submarines that are replacements for an equal number of pre-1964 ICBM launchers or launchers on older submarines (Article III). The Protocol on submarines spells out that the Soviet Union may have a maximum of 950 SLBM launchers and 62 modern ballistic missile submarines, and the United States 710 launchers and 44 submarines. It also states the numbers of launchers the two powers may have, above which any further that are constructed must be replacements for older launchers. The Soviet Union is allowed 740 SLBM launchers without replacements and the United States 656. Some points to note are:

(i) 656 is the number of SLBM launchers the United States now has, and 740 represents a negotiated agreement as to the current number of Soviet SLBM launchers operational and under construction. This is probably the closest the Soviet Union has ever come to stating publicly what the number of any of its weapons-systems are, although strictly the Protocol does not say that the Soviet Union has this number.

(ii) The American maximum figure of 710 derives from the right of building additional SLBM launchers to replace the 54 ‘old’ Titan II launchers. The Soviet maximum figure of 950 launchers implies replacements of the 209 ‘old’ SS-7s and SS-8s, or of modern ballistic missile launchers on G and H class submarines.

(iii) This clumsy replacement formula was devised at the final, Moscow stage of the negotiations, in an attempt to square the Soviet Union’s unwillingness to restrict its building program to the numbers then under construction, with the unwillingness of the United States to agree to the ABM Treaty unless some ceiling were put on the Russian program.

The Interim Agreement is concerned only with missile launchers and submarines, and, apart from the restrictions on ‘heavy’ ICBM launchers and on increases in silo size, imposes only quantitative limitations on these. It is worth listing the elements of strategic offensive strength that are not limited by the Agreement:

(i) the development, testing and deployment of multiple warheads, including MIRVs;
(ii) accuracy of missiles;
(iii) land-mobile ICBMs;
(iv) missiles and launchers of less than 3,000 nm range, such as those in the Soviet MR/IRBM force;
(v) missiles, of whatever range, launched from air, surface sea or space platforms. (The last of these, if they carry 'weapons of mass destruction' are of course prohibited by the Outer Space Treaty);

(vi) long range bombers;

(vii) Forward Based Systems, such as the US land- and sea-based aircraft with capability of delivering nuclear weapons on the Soviet Union (the United States, of course, does not accept that these systems are 'strategic');

(viii) cruise missiles. The Soviet Union has some of these deployed on submarines; the United States is now proposing to initiate a program for cruise missiles, which might be launched from converted Polaris A-1 submarines, or from aircraft.

The Interim Agreement repeats the verification provisions and escape clause contained in the ABM Treaty, and indicates that in implementing the Agreement the parties will make use of the SCC established by that Treaty. It also states that the parties will continue active negotiations for limitations on offensive arms, and that the obligations of the Agreement will not prejudice the scope of future limitations that may be agreed. The United States has registered its dissatisfaction with the terms of the Interim Agreement in the statement of the US delegation, quoted above, which indicates that if an agreement on strategic offensive arms more satisfactory to the United States than the present one is not achieved in due course, the United States may invoke the withdrawal clause in the ABM Treaty. Such an action, however, would be difficult to carry out in practice, unless the prevailing mood of Congress were to change radically.

THE AGREEMENTS AND ARMS CONTROL

What have the Agreements contributed to the goals of arms control? These goals I should define as (i) to enhance international security, especially by reducing the likelihood of nuclear war and the severity of it if it occurs; and (ii) to reduce the economic costs of the so-called 'arms race'.

Security

At least in most recent Western thinking about arms control the chief way in which it has been hoped that agreements about strategic arms might increase international security is by helping to stabilise the 'balance of terror' or relationship of mutual deterrence. This, of course,
cannot be seen as the only goal of arms control, for even given a highly stable relationship of mutual deterrence there remain other dangers, e.g., that war will break out by accident or miscalculation, that if it does break out it will become unlimited, and that threats to security will arise as a consequence of nuclear proliferation. The prevention of war by accident, the limitation of war and the control of nuclear proliferation are independent goals of arms control that cannot be subsumed under the objective of stabilisation of mutual nuclear deterrence. Moreover, I have always held myself that stabilisation of mutual deterrence cannot be seen as the final and permanent goal of arms control endeavours.¹⁰ I have referred to stabilisation of mutual nuclear deterrence as ‘the chief proximate goal of arms control’.”¹¹

The criticisms that are being made of the Agreements illustrate the disagreement and uncertainty that prevail in the Western world about this proximate goal. On the one hand, some critics complain that the Agreements do not help to stabilise mutual nuclear deterrence, or even that they tend to undermine it. On the other hand the objection of other critics is that the Agreements do serve to stabilise and legitimise mutual nuclear deterrence — the contention of these critics being that mutual nuclear deterrence is not an acceptable goal of arms control, or that it is not a sufficient goal, or not a final goal. There are, then, two questions that we need to ask. Do the Agreements help to stabilise mutual nuclear deterrence? And is the stability of mutual nuclear deterrence itself an acceptable goal?

The Agreements and Stability of Mutual Nuclear Deterrence

Some observers still argue that even without the Agreements the Soviet-American relationship of mutual nuclear deterrence is so stable that attempts to increase its stability, or to prevent erosion of stability, by positive action are unnecessary. In principle, however, the relationship of mutual nuclear deterrence can be upset either by the emergence of an effective defence of cities and populations, or by the development by one side of an effective disarming capacity. Neither of these possibilities would have been in sight within the next few years, whether the Agreements had been signed or not. But experts have been concerned that either possibility might eventuate as a longer-term consequence of the projection of present trends. Broadly, the ABM Treaty makes a contribution to the stability of mutual deterrence by placing powerful

¹⁰ See The Control of the Arms Race, London, 1961, chap. II.
inhibitions in the way of the development of an effective defence of cities and populations. On the other hand, the Agreements taken together have not made any serious contribution to eliminating the possibility of development by one side of a disarming capacity.

The deployment of a heavy ABM defence of cities and population by either of the super powers would constitute a direct challenge to the other's capacity to deter nuclear attack. It may be argued that an effective defence of populations was not in any case in prospect in May 1972; that both the Soviet Union and the United States were by that time in any case turning against ABM defence as a whole, as indicated by the halting of Soviet ABM deployment and the difficulties the Safeguard program was encountering in Congress. The ABM Treaty, however, addresses itself to the long-term possibility of an effective ABM defence, and has dealt a grave blow to those in the United States and the Soviet Union who placed their hopes in this possibility.

The ABM Treaty, however, while it rules out any nationwide defence of cities and population, also rules out a general defence of land-based missile sites. Thus while it excludes the threat to stability posed by the defence of populations it exacerbates the threat posed by a disarming strike inasmuch as it excludes one of the means whereby provision may be made for the survivability of retaliatory forces. This would not in itself be any cause for concern if the agreement on strategic offensive forces restricted their future development in such a way as to reduce the threat they are likely to pose to the survivability of land-based missile forces to manageable proportions, or if it included measures to reinforce the survivability of other retaliatory forces, such as sea-based missile forces or bomber forces. These things, however, the Interim Agreement does not do.

As we have seen the Interim Agreement imposes (apart from the restrictions on silo size) restrictions of a purely quantitative nature on ICBM launchers, 'heavy' ICBM launchers, SLBM launchers and modern ballistic missile submarines. These numerical ceilings are not insignificant in a calculation of the invulnerability of retaliatory forces: the sheer number of launchers available to the attacking side is one of the elements in the equation which determines whether a given land-based missile force will survive. But numerous other elements

---

12 To establish this proposition we do not have to assume that both sides view deterrence in terms of the capacity to produce given 'levels of damage', or that each side is bound to react to the growth of the other's city defences automatically, or that they are bound to react proportionately so as to 'restore' previous 'levels of damage'.
enter into this equation also, none of them limited by the Agreement. Among them we may single out, as especially dynamic factors uncontrolled by the Agreements, the accuracy of strategic offensive missiles, the numbers of independently targeted warheads per missile, and the size or yield of the warheads.

In a later section I shall consider the contention of Senator Jackson and other critics of the Agreements, that, given the virtual elimination of site defence by the ABM Treaty and within the numerical ceilings laid down by the Interim Agreement for offensive forces, the Soviet Union, by improving missile accuracy or by MIRVing its missile force, can within the five-year period of the Interim Agreement place itself in the position to eliminate 95 per cent of the US Minuteman force. If this happened, it would not in itself undermine the ability of the United States to deter nuclear attack by the Soviet Union. The survival of mutual deterrence might still be assured by other factors, e.g., the survival of SLBM forces, bomber forces, and Forward Based Systems, the MIRVing of the Minuteman force in such a way as to ensure that the surviving 5 per cent of it (i.e., 50 missiles with 3 warheads each) remained a powerful deterrent in itself, the deterrent effects of Soviet uncertainty, etc.

Nevertheless one major element, making for the stability of mutual deterrence, would have been weakened; the margin of safety would have narrowed. Moreover incentives would have been created for further force building, for example of mobile systems. It is possible, also, to see the vulnerability of the Minuteman force as a danger to prospects of the limitation of war, inasmuch as a Soviet disarming strike that crippled the Minuteman and bomber forces, leaving the United States in a position where it could respond only with sea-based weapons, might leave it with the options only of not responding at all or of responding by striking at cities. Current American SLBM forces can hit military targets, including 'hard' targets, but with much less effectiveness against the latter than ICBMs, because of inferior accuracy. A Soviet Senator Jackson also could not find in the Agreements any assurance that the United States could not, within the framework of the limitations, pose a threat to the survivability of the Soviet land-based missile force.

This basic limitation of the Agreements, when measured against the goal of the stability of mutual deterrence, indicates the need in the next or subsequent round of SALT to seek means of limiting the disarming capability of strategic offensive forces, especially by reducing the vulnerability of fixed ICBMs. Among the measures being canvassed are an agreement that would permit greater substitution of submarine-based
for land-based forces; revision of the ABM Treaty to permit more site defence; limitations on the improvement of missile accuracy, brought about by limitations on testing; limitations on the deployment or the testing of MIRVs; limitations on defence against bomber attack; and limitations designed to assist the survivability of ballistic missile submarines, for example, the establishment of sanctuary areas for these vessels, or limitations on the movements or the numbers of attack submarines, or limitations on other instrumentalities of Anti-Submarine Warfare, such as sonar devices.¹³ No formal arms control system is likely by itself to preclude the possibility that disarming capabilities will develop. But one might be devised which at least renders some assistance to other factors making against the development of a disarming capacity.

In the planning stages of SALT it was emphasised that the talks had other important objectives besides the reaching of arms control agreements: the exchange of strategic ideas between the super powers and the institutionalisation of the dialogue between them. It is clear that these other objectives, which bear closely upon the goal of the stabilisation of mutual deterrence, have been advanced. There is evidence that the negotiations have helped to promote common understanding of the nature and capabilities of the strategic arms at the disposal of America and Russia, and of alternative doctrines about their use. They have also helped to promote understanding of strategic doctrine within the United States Government, and presumably the Soviet Government. The SCC, moreover, holds out the promise that this common understanding will be taken further, as does the continuation of SALT itself.

It should be noted, however, that much uncertainty remains as to how far the United States and the Soviet Union have yet jointly committed themselves to the proposition that they have a common interest in preserving the stability of mutual nuclear deterrence. The ABM Treaty, no doubt, can be read as meaning that they do conceive their interests in this way. The preamble to that Treaty, which states that limitation of ABM systems would decrease the likelihood of nuclear war, supports this interpretation. On the American side, moreover, Ambassador Gerard Smith and others closely connected with the negotiations have made statements justifying the Agreements in terms of this doctrine. The ABM Treaty, Ambassador Gerard Smith has said, 'says that neither side is going to try to defend its nationwide territory. This is . . . recognition that the deterrent forces of both sides are not going

¹³ For a systematic discussion of SALT II options see Jerome H. Kahan's testimony on 'SALT and Strategic Policy Issues' before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, 28 June 1972.
to be challenged'.\textsuperscript{14} Most important, the act of renouncing ABM defence of populations signifies more clearly than words could have done that each side places its security on the basis of deterrence rather than defence.

However, the ABM Treaty does not formally spell out any doctrine of mutual nuclear deterrence. The two Agreements, taken together, as has been noted, signally fail to deal with threats to stability of the balance deriving from the development of disarming capacity. The Soviet attitude towards the idea of peace through mutual deterrence is still obscure. Finally, while much of the support for the Agreements inside the United States derives from those who attach great importance to the doctrine, there is still widespread disagreement, inside and outside the US Administration, about the goal of mutual nuclear deterrence, as the next section will show.

\textit{Mutual Nuclear Deterrence as a Goal of Arms Control}

The Agreements have been criticised not only on the ground that they fail adequately to contribute to the stability of mutual nuclear deterrence, but also on the contrary ground that they promote the stability of mutual deterrence all too effectively. The critics united around this proposition are an odd coalition and I shall try to indicate briefly some of their views:

My colleague Arthur Burns takes the view that basing the nuclear peace on the threat of destruction of populations is morally wicked. The Agreements, he thinks, are 'an open diplomatic avowal of the long-practised, paradoxical and criminal doctrine of peace kept by terror'.\textsuperscript{15} He also asserts a causal link between nuclear hostage-taking and the global contagion of civil violence.

Donald Brennan of the Hudson Institute, whose objections to the Agreements derive from arguments about security more than from a high moral stance, holds that the ABM Treaty by precluding population defences enshrines a posture of 'Mutual Assured Destruction'. Correctly, he sees in the ABM Treaty a body blow to his own view, and what at one time appeared to be the Soviet view, that peace is best

\textsuperscript{14} Ambassador Gerard Smith, Hearings SASC, p. 99.

\textsuperscript{15} Arthur Burns has commented on the Agreements in an unpublished paper 'Peace Kept by Terror: The Super Powers' Moscow Agreements on Strategic Nuclear Forces'. His views on mutual deterrence are stated at greater length in 'Ethics and Deterrence: A Nuclear Balance Without Hostage Cities?', \textit{Adelphi Papers}, No. 69, July 1970.
assured by strong defences rather than by deterrence.16 (Brennan is also critical of the Interim Agreement on the more familiar ground that it promotes Soviet superiority. This criticism I consider in a later section.) Some critics, who would neither dismiss mutual nuclear deterrence on high moral grounds nor share Donald Brennan's belief in population defence as an alternative to deterrence, contend that the Agreements embody a tendency to regard 'deterrence as the only means to war-prevention', that they do not take account, for example, of the danger of war by accident or miscalculation, and that to purchase increases in deterrent effectiveness at the expense of increased risk of war by accident represents a wrong set of priorities. Fred Iklé, in an important article which is not directly critical of the Moscow Agreements, but is rather aimed at the doctrine of peace through mutual nuclear deterrence that underlies much support for it on the American side, criticises a tendency to place exclusive emphasis on deterrence, and to ignore the case of an 'irrational' decision to unleash a nuclear war.17 In particular, he rejects three 'dogmas' that derive from this tendency: that strategic nuclear forces should be designed for retaliation only, that retaliation should take the form of a swift and massive strike, and that it should issue in the killing of a major fraction of the opponent's population.

Some critics place their emphasis on the fact that mutual deterrence does not provide for rational strategies for the conduct of nuclear war, should it break out. They see the Agreements as encouraging a tendency to view the conduct of general nuclear war in apocalyptic terms, as if the only option available once deterrence had failed were a blind and savage assault on centres of population. The ABM Treaty they see as excluding one route through which, in a nuclear war, the objective of Damage Limitation might be pursued. They fear that further negotiations may lead to an agreement about strategic offensive arms that would confirm this tendency by leaving the super powers with arms that were too few or too inaccurate to be capable of accomplishing any other than city-busting missions.18

Some critics emphasise the implications of mutual nuclear deterrence for nuclear proliferation. They contend, correctly, that the implications of the Agreements for international security have to be assessed in

18 My reference here is to unpublished work.
relation to the international political system as a whole, and not merely
the relations between the super powers. They hold that the Agreements
promote nuclear proliferation by weakening super power guarantees of
allies that are potential nuclear powers, and by easing the task of a
secondary nuclear power seeking to deter a super power.19

I cannot here provide a full discussion of all the issues raised by
these criticisms. It does seem to me, however, that the Agreements can
be defended in the following ways:

(a) I accept the contention that mutual nuclear deterrence cannot
be regarded as a final or permanent goal of arms control. The case
against it can be made on moral grounds, but also on the practical
ground that threats of mass destruction inherently obstruct the long­
term goal of the development of an international community. There is
nothing in the Agreements which suggests that mutual nuclear deterrence
is regarded by the signatories as the end of the road. Indeed, the goal of
mutual nuclear deterrence, as has been noted, is not spelt out in the
agreements at all; and the Agreements pay lip service to long-term goals
of general disarmament. This lip service does at least serve the function
of indicating dissatisfaction with 'the balance of terror' as a permanent
basis of the peace. My own view is that long-term goals are better stated
in terms of political accommodation and community-building between
the parties.

(b) There would be something to be said for (but still much to be
said against) the idea that the nuclear peace should be based on
effective defences rather than on deterrence if there were really any
clear prospect that effective defence of cities and populations against
missile attack were likely to be available at an acceptable cost. Few
authorities believe that there is any such prospect, at all events if by
an 'effective' defence we mean one that reduces likely casualties to, say,
thousands rather than millions.

(c) There is nothing in the idea of mutual nuclear deterrence or in
the Agreements which precludes attention to the problem of prevention
of war by accident or miscalculation. The SALT talks, of course, them­
selves issued in the Agreement on Reducing Risk of Nuclear War of
30 September 1971, concerned with controlling the risks of accident;
and at Moscow, an agreement on prevention of incidents at sea, also
addressed to this problem, was signed.20

19 Ibid.
20 For the text of the Agreement on Reducing the Risk of Nuclear War see
(d) Nor is there anything in the idea of mutual nuclear deterrence or in the Agreements which precludes or hinders attempts to devise alternative strategies for the conduct of a nuclear war. International security requires that the super powers be capable of strategic nuclear responses other than a massive assault on cities. Moreover, the SALT negotiations are an appropriate forum in which to seek common understandings about limitations in nuclear war. But there is nothing in the Agreements that in any way determines what strategies for the conduct of a nuclear war the super powers will pursue, or which prevents their choice of options other than massive strikes against centres of population. Nor does the concept of mutual nuclear deterrence entail mutual commitment to the carrying out of threats of mutual Assured Destruction, or preclude strategies or understandings directed towards ‘city-sparing’, of the kind envisaged by Robert McNamara in his 1962 Ann Arbor speech. Mutual deterrence logically does not imply, and empirically does not require, the commitment of both parties to Assured Destruction in the sense of the will and capacity to create some absolute level of damage to the opponent’s society. Nor does it imply that if deterrence fails, the strategy of the war will be determined by threats previously made. The US Administration is reported to be at present seeking to increase the range of its retaliatory options, and in particular the range of limited retaliatory options.21

(e) There is some force in the contention that the elimination of population defences and the acceptance of offensive arms ceilings implies a narrowing of the gap between the super powers on the one hand, and secondary nuclear powers on the other. Under the Agreements, however, this gap remains very large, and the super powers are still free to enlarge it further through advances in areas not subject to limitations. Moreover, it does not seem likely that a policy simply of maintaining the military lead of the super powers over their rivals provides an adequate approach to the control of nuclear proliferation. Such an adequate approach must seek to strike a balance between the need of the super powers for armed strength, if they are to play a managerial role, and their need to combat the idea of the political utility of nuclear weapons by accepting restraints on their own armaments, which they are required to pursue under Article VI of the Non-Proliferation Treaty.

Economy

No arms control agreement does more than limit a particular area of ‘the arms race’, shifting the emphasis of the competition to other areas,
or registering a shift that has already taken place. It leads to a reduction or cessation of expenditure in the area restricted, but also creates pressures for more expenditure in other areas. Whether on balance there is a net saving is not determined by the agreement itself but by the subsequent history of the countries that have signed it.

In the United States the only savings that can be ascribed to the Agreements are reductions in the Safeguard ABM program. When the Johnson Administration introduced the first ABM deployment program—Sentinel—seventeen sites were envisaged. The Safeguard program with which the Nixon Administration replaced it envisaged twelve sites, to be deployed in stages; Congress had given approval for four, all in defence of missile sites. The ABM Treaty sets a maximum of two, of which one has to be a missile site defence and the other a defence of the National Command Authority (NCA). The Administration’s current proposals in the ABM field envisage completion of the Grand Forks ABM complex, building of an NCA defence (for which plans did not exist prior to SALT), and cancellation of plans for the additional three missile site defence complexes previously envisaged. Dismantling of work begun on the Malmstrom complex will take place under the terms of the Treaty.

As against this the Administration’s proposals also envisage that work will continue as previously planned on the B1 bomber (designed as a replacement for the B52 in the late 1970s), the Trident submarine and its associated SLBMs (a replacement for the Polaris and Poseidon systems, deployment of which is envisaged for the early 1980s), the replacement of Minuteman I with MIRV’d Minuteman IIIs, and of Polaris with MIRV’d Poseidon, and other missile programs such as SRAM (Short Range Attack Missile) and SCAD (Subsonic Cruise Armed Decoy). In addition, as a consequence of the Agreements, the Administration has asked for additional funds in connection with acceleration of the development of missile site defence (deployment of which, however, is essentially precluded by the ABM Treaty); a Submarine-Launched Cruise Missile (SLCM) program; acceleration of bomber rebasing; acceleration of its improved re-entry vehicle program; augmentation of verification and intelligence capabilities; and acceleration of advanced command, control and communications systems.

As envisaged by the Administration, the impact of the Agreements on its budgetary proposals for F1973 is to bring net savings of $543 million:
**Adjustments to F1973 Defence Program**

*in millions*)22

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost (in millions)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cancel Safeguard construction at Malmstrom; complete Grand Forks; deploy NCA defence</td>
<td>$711</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accelerate development of site defence</td>
<td>+ 60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop SLCM</td>
<td>+ 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accelerate bomber rebasing</td>
<td>+ 45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Augment verification capabilities</td>
<td>+ 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop improved re-entry vehicles</td>
<td>+ 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Augment advanced command, control and communications</td>
<td>+ 10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

$543

In a defence budget of over $80 billion savings of $543 million do not loom large. The Administration might argue that the Agreements have brought immensely larger savings for the long run: the total cost of the two complex Safeguard programs it now favours is estimated at $8.7 billion, as against $8.9 billion for the four sites authorised and $18.4 billion for the full, twelve-site program. On present indications, however, Congress would be unlikely to authorise the twelve-site program, with or without the ABM Treaty. The Senate has already rejected the NCA defence complex, and the probability is that the United States for the foreseeable future will have only one ABM complex, not the two to which it is entitled under the Treaty.

We may conclude therefore that the impact of the Agreements on the US defence budget so far has been slight, that whether large net savings will accrue in the long run is uncertain, and that if they do accrue we shall not be able to ascribe this to the Treaty alone. It would be superficial, however, to argue that the pruning away of the US ABM deployment program would have taken place even if there had been no SALT negotiations and no resultant ABM Treaty. The negotiations and the Treaty provided part of the setting in which Congress has voted down successive ABM programs, and we cannot speak of the will of Congress as if it could be abstracted from that setting.

**THE AGREEMENTS AND INTERNATIONAL POLITICS**

We must assess the Agreements not only from the abstract perspective of their contribution to the goals of arms control, but also from the

---

22 This table is derived from one submitted by the U.S. Secretary of Defence, Mr Laird, to the Senate Armed Services Committee. See Hearings SASC, p. 19.
perspective from which governments will actually assess them, that is of their implications for political and strategic relationships among the powers.

The Soviet-American Strategic Balance

In the United States the Agreements have been strongly attacked by Senator Jackson and others on the ground that they confer strategic advantages upon the Soviet Union. On 14 September 1972, the United States Senate passed by 56 votes to 35 an amendment to the resolution approving the Agreements, to the effect that:

(a) if further negotiations fail to achieve a Treaty limiting the threat to the survivability of US strategic deterrent forces, US supreme national interests will be jeopardised;

(b) equality in intercontinental strategic forces (to be achieved without the inclusion of the forces of the European allies in US totals) must be achieved in any follow-on agreement;

(c) research, development and force modernisation, consistent with the terms of the Treaty, should be prosecuted vigorously. The Jackson Amendment, to which the Administration gave its support, while also indicating that it could not be bound by it, is of course addressed to the next round of SALT. But it implicitly lent support to the view that the Agreements left US land-based strategic forces potentially vulnerable to Soviet offensive forces and failed to achieve equality.

There are two questions which we need to consider. Is it true that the Agreements imposed upon the United States a position of inferiority, or (to use Senator Jackson’s more cautious expression) ‘subparity’? And if they do, does this matter in terms of political and strategic relationships between the two countries?

Parity in the Agreements

The ABM Treaty treats the two powers equally, allowing each the same numbers of ABM interceptors, launchers, radars and test launchers. It may be argued that, since the United States was ahead of the Soviet Union in ABM technology, then by accepting formal parity with the Soviet Union it was conceding something, for which it should have got something in return in the agreement on offensive arms. Indeed, it did get something in return: the bargain underlying the Agreements is essentially that the United States agreed to limit its ABM deployments in return for acceptance by the Soviet Union of limitations on its offensive
building program. But this does not alter the fact that the terms of the ABM Treaty itself imply strict parity.

The terms of the Interim Agreement, by contrast, confer numerical advantages upon the Soviet Union of roughly the order of 50 per cent. The freeze on ICBM launchers leaves the United States with 1,054 and the Soviet Union with 1,618. The limitation on 'heavy' ICBM launchers leaves the Soviet Union with 313 and the United States with none comparable with the Soviet ones. The Soviet Union is left with an overall permitted maximum of 62 submarines and 950 SLBM launchers, and the United States with 44 and 710 respectively. (As explained above, if the parties built up to their maximum levels of SLBMs, they would have to reduce their levels of ICBMs.)

If one looks to the factors not limited by the Agreements the position is more complex. The Soviet Union, as a consequence of the fact that many of its missiles are very heavy ones, has a lead in total 'throw-weight', and in total deliverable megatonnage. The United States, on the other hand, has a lead over the Soviet Union in strategic bombers of 457 to 140. It is ahead in deployed MIRVs, and thus has a higher ratio of deployed warhead-carrying re-entry vehicles to deployed strategic missile launchers. It also has a superiority in so-called Forward-Based Systems (land- and carrier-based strike aircraft, cast in a tactical role but capable of delivering nuclear weapons on the Soviet Union). As a consequence of these last three factors taken together, the United States is superior to the Soviet Union in total deliverable warheads: the figures have been given as 5,598 to 2,220. In addition, the United States is thought to have an overall lead in military technology.

Dr Kissinger has made a spirited defence of the Interim Agreement. He points out that although it confers upon the Soviet Union superiority in the categories limited it was the American side, not the Russian, which pressed for the Agreement. From December 1970 until 20 May 1971 the Soviet side pressed for an agreement on ABM only. On the latter date a compromise was arrived at, on the basis that only the ABM problem would be settled definitely, but that there would also be an interim freeze on select categories of offensive arms. Even after this time, however, the Soviet Union sought to exclude submarines from the offensive freeze, and it was only in April 1972 that an agreement was reached to include them, the final details of which were settled in the last phase in Moscow.

23 See Hearings SASC, p. 164.
24 The texts of Dr Kissinger's and other White House briefings on the Agreements were given in Hearings SASC, pp. 97-138.
Dr Kissinger has stressed that in the course of the negotiations the Soviet Union had ongoing building programs in both land-based and submarine-based systems, whereas the United States had none, and therefore did not have 'the most brilliant bargaining position'\textsuperscript{25} His defence is that in this weak position the United States was successful in setting ceilings to the expansion of Soviet ICBM and SLBM forces, without itself in return setting limits to any ongoing strategic offensive program of its own. The United States had no plans for building new ICBM launchers, and while it has plans for new SLBMs and submarines (the Trident system) these are not due to be deployed until after the five-year period of the Interim Agreement has elapsed. The Administration has sought to strengthen the idea that the ceilings accepted by the Soviet Union represent a gain for the United States by publishing intelligence estimates of what the Soviet strategic force levels would be by mid-1977 in the absence of the Agreements. According to these by that time the Soviet Union was expected to have 2,250 ICBMs, 1,050 SLBMs, and 80 to 90 modern ballistic missile submarines\textsuperscript{26}

Even if we accept Dr Kissinger's argument, that from a weak bargaining position the United States was able to secure an agreement which in effect imposed limitations on the other side but not on itself, the fact remains that the terms of the Interim Agreement are remarkably one-sided. As William Van Cleave has pointed out, throughout the two and a half years of the SALT negotiations the missile balance was changing rapidly against the United States. When the negotiations began, Soviet ICBM forces were still numerically just below those of the United States. Whereas an agreement freezing existing levels would have established parity had it been concluded at the end of 1969, the actual agreement of May 1972 has frozen Soviet superiority\textsuperscript{27}. Moreover, in the case of the submarine forces, where in May 1972 there did exist something like parity (41 operational US boats; and, according to US estimates something of the order of 41-43 Soviet boats operational and under construction), what emerged was an Agreement which did not impose a freeze, but allowed the Russians to go on building for another five years, in a situation in which they were in a position to expand their numbers and the Americans were not. Senator Jackson has cast doubt on the proposition that Soviet force levels without the Agreements would reach the numbers claimed by the Administration; he contends that the SLBM and submarine levels permitted under the Agreement by mid-

\textsuperscript{25} Ibid., p. 110.
\textsuperscript{26} Ibid., p. 164.
\textsuperscript{27} Ibid., pp. 570-92.
1977 are only marginally different from those that would have been likely had no Agreement been reached. But even if the ceilings for submarine-based systems do promise to slow Soviet construction, the Agreement departs from the principle of parity by allowing the Soviet Union to begin new constructions on a scale that destroys the situation of rough equality that already existed.

Moreover, Dr Kissinger's claim to have brought off a diplomatic *tour de force* overlooks the fact that the Soviet Union accepted ceilings in strategic offensive forces not in return for nothing, but in return for US acceptance of the ABM Treaty. The question raised by Senator Jackson's critique of the Agreements is whether the United States got any worthwhile return for forgoing, in effect, the Safeguard program. The Administration's own past arguments in defence of the Safeguard program, as Senator Jackson has been quick to point out, emphasised the threat posed by the Soviet offensive build-up, and especially the SS9 force, to the US Minuteman force, and the need to provide that force with ABM protection. In the Agreements, he argues, the United States has abandoned the option of protecting its Minuteman force, and has also abandoned three other routes to maintaining its viability: the land-mobile option, virtually excluded for the next five years by a US Unilateral Declaration; the option of 'going to sea', forgone because of the failure of the Interim Agreement to allow more than a partial freedom to 'mix' land-based and sea-based systems; and the option of significantly increasing missile size. And the United States has done this without securing limitations that would seriously restrict the capability of the Soviet offensive force to strike at the Minuteman force. Senator Jackson has quoted an earlier Administration estimate that 1,250 Soviet strategic missiles, given 5 megaton warheads and the accuracy then available to US missiles, could destroy 95 per cent of the US Minuteman force. The Agreements do nothing to restrict the improvement of Soviet missile accuracy, or the deployment of MIRVs, expected during the five-year period.

*The Strategic Significance of Parity*

We may conclude, then, that in respect of the categories limited by the Agreements they establish not parity but limited Soviet numerical superiority. If we look instead at the Soviet-American military balance as a whole, there is not Soviet superiority: the position is rather that the United States is superior in some indices and the Soviet Union in others. We may speak crudely of this situation as one of 'overall parity', although that would imply what is perhaps not the case, that there is
one measure or yardstick to which all indices are reducible. Finally, we must conclude that the Interim Agreement leaves the Soviet Union in a position where within the next five years it may establish parity or superiority in categories in which the United States is now superior, and that a successor to the Interim Agreement which extended the life of its current provisions might pave the way to a situation in which the Soviet Union might be regarded as having ‘overall superiority’.

Given that the United States and the Soviet Union each has forces sufficient to maintain a relationship of mutual nuclear deterrence, does it matter whether the ratio of numbers of weapons reflects ‘parity’ or ‘superiority’? ‘Parity’ in strategic nuclear weapons is not necessary for mutual nuclear deterrence: the Soviet Union was able to deter United States nuclear attack from a position of ‘inferiority’ for many years. Nor, of course, is ‘parity’ sufficient for mutual nuclear deterrence: forces that are equal but below the level of sufficiency will not be able to create this relationship. From the mere fact of ‘parity’ or ‘superiority’, without information about other variables, nothing follows about the relationship of mutual nuclear deterrence.

However, from the point of view of the United States there are two rational sources of concern about Soviet superiority, which were, of course, also sources of concern to the Soviet Union during the period of American superiority. The first is that Soviet superiority, for example, in numbers of missiles or total throw weight, while it does not in itself undermine the American nuclear deterrent, might contribute to the undermining of it in conjunction with other factors. Relative missile numbers and throw weight are not in themselves decisive for the relationship of mutual nuclear deterrence, but they are among the elements that make it up.

The second source of concern is that while ‘parity’ or ‘superiority’ is not in itself strategically significant, it takes on a political significance if people think it is. American critics of the Agreements have contended that the idea of Soviet numerical superiority, now dramatised by the Interim Agreement, will cause Soviet leaders to be more self-confident in bargaining situations, American leaders to be less self-confident, and third parties to regard the Soviet Union as more powerful than the United States. This argument reflects the point of view which prevailed in the United States during the long years of American ‘superiority’, which the American leadership undoubtedly regarded as a major diplomatic asset in confronting opponents and reassuring allies, for example, in the Berlin and Cuban missile crises. It is difficult, perhaps, to demonstrate that ‘superiority’ has these political and psychological effects, but
it seems likely that it has. Soviet writers, in commenting on the Agree­ments, have not in fact claimed that they confer "superiority" upon the Soviet Union, but have been content to stress the achievement of "parity". Moreover, their determination to outbuild the United States in ICBMs and SLBMs can be adequately explained as an attempt to compensate for American superiority in other dimensions. Nevertheless one cannot exclude the possibility that they are themselves influenced by the long­standing American doctrine of the political significance of the quantita­tive ratio.

The Super Powers and China

The Chinese leadership is, of course, hostile towards the Agreements, as it is towards any evidence of Soviet-American co-operation. The Agreements dramatise the gap that still exists between the strategic arms available to the super powers and those commanded by China, which as yet has no "strategic ballistic missiles" of the sort limited by the Interim Agreement. Moreover, the indications that through the medium of the SCC and the ongoing SALT negotiations themselves, the Soviet-Ameri­can strategic dialogue will become more permanent and more intimate, must give China cause for concern. However, two aspects of the Agree­ments may bring her some comfort.

First, the ABM Treaty eases China’s problem of providing an adequate nuclear deterrent of attack by America or Russia. The ABM Treaty not only rules out the thick nationwide defence intended to protect the populations of the super powers against attack by each other. It also rules out the thin nationwide defence that many thought the United States and the Soviet Union would wish to retain, so as to provide protection against third powers, especially China. The Sentinel system, introduced by the Johnson Administration in early 1968, had defence against China as a major part of its rationale; and this rationale was until recently widely assumed to account, at least in part, for Soviet interest in ABM defence. Moreover, the ABM Treaty appears to preclude not only defences against the ICBMs and SLBMs which China does not yet have, but also against the MRBMs which already threaten the Soviet Union. ABM systems are defined in the Treaty as systems to counter strategic ballistic missiles; the Agreed Interpretation which con­fines the strategic ballistic missiles limited by the Interim Agreement to those of 3,000 nm and more, does not appear to qualify the ABM Treaty.

28 That is to say, of 3,000 nm range and greater. The IISS publication The Military Balance 1971-1972 credits China with about 20 IRBMs of up to 1,000 nm range, and 30 medium bombers of 1,500 nm range.
Secondly, the numerical ceilings laid down for strategic offensive arms might be read by the Chinese leadership as indicating that the goal of overtaking the super powers, distant though it is, is at least not moving further away from them. Of course, this goal quite probably is moving further away from them, as a consequence of qualitative improvements. Moreover, the Interim Agreement does not limit the American and Soviet theatre forces that threaten China. Nor should it be assumed that if China should at some future time begin to show signs of overtaking Soviet and American ceilings, these ceilings will not then be revised upward. A possible model for the super powers is the naval disarmament Treaty of 1936, which contained an escalator clause enabling the United States and Britain to increase their permitted tonnages of warships, in the event of increases by non-signatories.\textsuperscript{29} How the United States and the Soviet Union would respond to a serious Chinese challenge to their supremacy will of course be determined by the general state of the political relations among the powers at the time, which cannot now be foreseen. What can be foreseen, however, is that no such challenge will arise during the life of the Interim Agreement.

It is, of course, vitally important for international security that China be brought into the arms control conversation among the nuclear powers. For the foreseeable future, however, the SALT negotiations are not the right forum into which to seek to bring China. China, we may assume, would not be willing to negotiate any agreements with America and Russia on any other basis than equality with them. Even if a Chinese government were willing to accept a ratio of strategic nuclear arms that spelt out its inferiority to America and Russia, as Japan was willing to accept inferiority to America and Britain in capital ships and aircraft carriers in 1922, such an agreement would contain the seeds of future discord. The United States and the Soviet Union, on the other hand, cannot now accept a relationship of equality with China. In the foreseeable future, equality with China can be brought about only by American and Soviet disarmament, not by Chinese rearmament. Even if America and Russia were ready to accept the principle of parity with China they would still not be prepared, for wider reasons of national policy, to accept the drastic disarmament which alone could bring such parity about.

If the SALT forum is not the right one into which to seek to bring China, nor is the Geneva conference as it is at present constituted. Its system of co-chairmanship by the two super powers, together with

representation based on the three main groups of powers, reflects a view of world politics at loggerheads with China's. A main subject on its agenda, the comprehensive test ban Treaty, stands in the way of Chinese nuclear ambitions.

Another possibility is that China should be invited to participate in a conference of the five nuclear powers which would be concerned to discuss the dangers of nuclear war and the responsibilities of states disposing of nuclear weapons, for example, in relation to the danger of war by accident or miscalculation. Unlike the SALT negotiations, such a conference would not be concerned with relative levels of nuclear arms; and unlike the Geneva Conference, it would not debate measures which could be held to discriminate against any one nuclear power. This has the disadvantage that it would underline the special position of the nuclear powers, which are now the same as the permanent members of the UN Security Council, and might provide an incentive for potential nuclear states such as India and Japan to acquire nuclear weapons. Moreover, a conference constituted in this way might be unwelcome to some elements in China, in that it would tend to undermine China's claim to be a leader of the Have Nots, and to be without great power ambitions. This nettle, however, may have to be grasped.

The American Alliance System

A number of commentators consider that the Agreements degrade the nuclear guarantees afforded by the United States to its allies in the North Atlantic and the Pacific, and encourage nuclear proliferation. First, the virtual demise of the US ABM screen is said to weaken US guarantees against the Soviet Union and China. Granted ABM protection of American cities, these commentators say, it might have been credible that the United States would risk the destruction of Chicago or Los Angeles in order to deter a threat to London or Tokyo; without this protection it is not.

Secondly, it is argued, the Agreements by codifying parity with the Soviet Union, or perhaps inferiority to it, in place of the superiority that provided the background to past confrontations with the Soviet Union, will have reduced American will in bargaining on behalf of allies.

Thirdly, some say, the sanctification of mutual nuclear deterrence implies that the United States will use nuclear weapons only in response to an attack on its own territory. One commentator wrote before the Agreements were signed that 'The closer the two sides get to a rough

30 See Burns, 'Peace Kept by Terror'.
parity of capabilities, the more its implications will be equivalent to a mutual pledge of no first use'.

Fourthly, it is argued, the Agreements have the effect of encouraging nuclear proliferation. The demise of the ABM screens, and to a lesser extent the acceptance of ceilings on offensive forces, ease the problem that secondary nuclear powers have to face in deterring the super powers. To this Arthur Burns adds the argument that Agreements open the way to nuclear coercion of third parties by the super powers, and thus provide an additional motive for would-be nuclear powers.

There can be little doubt that the American alliance system is in decline for a number of reasons other than the strategic arms agreements, too obvious to be worth enumerating. However, it appears to me that these commentators overstate the impact of the Agreements on the credibility of nuclear guarantees of allies. In particular, they exaggerate the extent to which the Agreements have altered strategic realities, and they do not take account of the evidence of what allied reactions to the Agreements actually are, relying instead upon notions of what, in strategic logic, these reactions ought to be.

As regards the ABM treaty it should be remembered that the United States has never had a means of defending its population against Soviet missile attack, yet this has never been said in itself to have impaired the credibility of US guarantees in Europe. The effect of the treaty is simply to help preserve this state of affairs. The ABM treaty does have greater significance for US guarantees in the Pacific. An ABM defence of American cities may have helped to prolong, although only temporarily and at great cost, US strategic nuclear ascendancy over China into the era of a Chinese ICBM or SLBM force. Without an American city defence, a relationship of mutual nuclear deterrence between the United States and China is likely to arise somewhat earlier than might otherwise have been the case. There is no reason to assume, however, that a relationship of mutual nuclear deterrence between America and China in itself renders United States guarantees of China’s neighbours devoid of meaning. The long-standing American-Soviet relationship of mutual nuclear deterrence has not had this effect on the credibility of American guarantees in Europe.

As regards the contention that loss of ‘superiority’ over the Soviet Union may weaken the will of the United States in bargaining on behalf of allies I have already indicated that I believe this has some

32 ‘Peace Kept by Terror’.
force. However, it should be noted that, as far as can be known from the public evidence, the European allies have never taken the view, held by some American analysts in the early 1960s, that the American guarantee depended upon the ability of the United States to exploit its superiority by launching a counter force strike at Soviet nuclear forces. This kind of American thinking has never met with much sympathy or even understanding in Europe, where informed opinion has always considered that the crux of the guarantee lies in the presence in Europe of large numbers of American servicemen and their dependants.

Do the Agreements imply that the United States will use nuclear weapons only in response to an attack on its own territory, and only use them in retaliation? I believe myself that a No First Use agreement may eventually be negotiated among the five nuclear powers, and that on broad grounds of international security it is desirable that it should be. An objective which arms control understandings should seek to promote is the removal of threats of nuclear war from the foreground into the background of international politics, and while it creates present difficulties for the American alliance system, a No First Use agreement would serve this end.

However, it would be mistaken to imagine that this state of affairs is already brought about by the Agreements. Mutual nuclear deterrence between the United States and the Soviet Union is a state of affairs that has long co-existed with American assurances of willingness to use nuclear weapons on behalf of allies, in response to both nuclear and non-nuclear threats. The Agreements do not in themselves in any way alter the position. Nor is there any connection between US policy on the first use of nuclear weapons, and the existence or non-existence of parity. (It is interesting that while Harry Gelber draws the conclusion that the Agreements imply that the United States will use nuclear weapons only in response to a nuclear attack on its territory, Arthur Burns draws the opposite conclusion that they pave the way for nuclear coercion of third parties by the super powers.)

The argument that the Agreements encourage proliferation should be stated with caution. The ABM treaty, as has been noted in relation to China, removes a long-term obstacle in the path of secondary nuclear powers. The ceilings of offensive arms, however, which relate only to a five-year period and allow the two super powers larger forces than they have now, can hardly be said to diminish their lead in relation to

competitors. It would be wrong to assume that these ceilings are bound, as a consequence of the next phase of SALT, to be lowered. Moreover, if the United States and the Soviet Union were to accept lower ceilings, the repercussions of this on nuclear proliferation would be ambiguous. Some potential nuclear powers (e.g. India, Sweden, Japan) contend or at least state that if proliferation is to be avoided, the super powers must disarm. Others (e.g. West Germany, Australia) are inclined to the view that avoidance of proliferation requires strong super power guarantees made credible by high levels of arms.

It is difficult to find evidence that any of the Atlantic or Pacific allies of the United States actually feel that their interests have been jeopardised by the Agreements. The United States consulted its Nato allies very closely during SALT I, and reported on the talks very fully. The main professed interest of the European allies, viz. that Forward Based Systems not be included in the Agreements, was defended by the Americans. The British and French had special reasons to be satisfied with the ABM treaty, which affords a new lease of life to their nuclear deterrent forces. There is no evidence that West Germany or any of the other allies sought to oppose America’s relinquishment of the option of a nationwide defence or her formal renunciation of superiority, or that as a consequence of the Agreements any of them has felt that its interests have been endangered. Partly this reflects the still low level of public knowledge and understanding of strategic nuclear problems in Western Europe, and the inclination of most governments not to challenge American judgment in this field. It also reflects the absence, noted above, of any positive West European belief in the proposition that the American guarantee depends upon manifestations of superiority. West European anxieties about the future of the US guarantee are focused upon American domestic pressures for the withdrawal of troops in Western Europe, and upon evidence of a general increase in neo-isolationist sentiment in America.

In Japan likewise no voices have been raised in protest against the demise of the US ABM shield or against the loss of US strategic superiority. Press comment reflects a certain disappointment that the Agreements have not resulted in more substantial super power disarmament, in line with expectations created by Article VI of the Non-Proliferation Treaty. The clause in the Nixon-Tanaka communique welcoming the Agreements was inserted at the request of the United States. There is much evidence to suggest that in Japan interest in the US guarantee is in decline, along with belief in the availability of it. The sources of this disillusion, however, lie in the broader United States
foreign policy of the 'Nixon shocks' and in the reawakening of Japanese national self-confidence, not in concern about the content of the Agreements.

However, while the views I have been discussing exaggerate the deleterious effect of the Agreements on the American alliance system, their general thrust is correct. The Agreements signed in Moscow did nothing to strengthen the credibility of America's guarantees of her allies and some of the latter are anxious as to what the next phase of the negotiations might bring. The demise of the American ABM screen, the acceptance of parity or inferiority with Russia in offensive arms, the steps taken towards sanctification of mutual nuclear deterrence, and the removal of obstacles in the path of secondary nuclear powers—all provide arguments which will be used by the critics of reliance on the United States in Western Europe and in the Pacific.

My own view is that the American alliance system is in inexorable decline and that in the assessments they make of the continuing SALT negotiations neither America nor her allies will attach such importance to the preservation of the American guarantees as they have done in the past. Both America and her European and Pacific allies will have to think out their place in relation to the triangle, quadrilateral or pentagon of nuclear powers, in which the alliances forged twenty years or more ago will have at best a reduced and precarious position.

The Moscow Agreements are the culmination of fears and hopes conceived during the period of polarisation of power between America and Russia: fears that they would become embroiled in nuclear war, and hopes that they would recognise common interests in minimising the risk of it. Now a foundation has been laid for Soviet-American co-operation in arms control, but in the meantime the world's fears and hopes have changed: given the existence of five actual nuclear powers, and several more potential ones, the consolidation of Soviet-American co-operation in arms control is at best insufficient, and at worst a positive obstacle to the progress of understandings about arms control among the nuclear powers as a whole. The United States and the Soviet Union in co-operating to control the central balance of strategic nuclear power, are promoting not only their own interests, but also the primary interest of international society as a whole in the avoidance of nuclear war between them; the official view of China, which presents the SALT negotiations as concerned only with the special interests of the superpowers, is superficial and crass. But if the security of international society as a whole requires that the United States and the Soviet Union seek to strengthen the foundations of their bilateral agreement on
strategic arms, it also requires that they seek ultimately to create a comity of nuclear powers in which the restraints they have accepted for themselves will be generalised. The problem for the United States and the Soviet Union in the continuing SALT discussions will be to carry forward the first of these objectives without jeopardising the second.
Appendix

I. TREATY BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND THE UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS ON THE LIMITATION OF ANTI-BALLISTIC MISSILE SYSTEMS.

The United States and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics herein-after referred to as the parties,

Proceeding from the premise that nuclear war would have devastating consequences for all mankind,

Considering that effective measures to limit anti-ballistic missile systems would be a substantial factor in curbing the race in strategic offensive arms and would lead to a decrease in the risk of outbreak of war involving nuclear weapons,

Proceeding from the premise that the limitation of anti-ballistic missile systems, as well as certain agreed measures with respect to the limitation of strategic offensive arms, would contribute to the creation of more favourable conditions for further negotiations on limiting strategic arms,

Mindful of their obligations under Article VI of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons,

Declaring their intention to achieve at the earliest possible date the cessation of the nuclear arms race and to take effective measures toward reductions in strategic arms, nuclear disarmament, and general and complete disarmament,

Desiring to contribute to the relaxation of international tension and the strengthening of trust between states, have agreed as follows:

Article I

1. Each party undertakes to limit anti-ballistic missile (ABM) systems and to adopt other measures in accordance with the provisions of this treaty.

2. Each party undertakes not to deploy ABM systems for the defence of the territory of its country and not to provide a base for such a
defence and not to deploy ABM systems for defence of an individual region except as provided for in Article III of this treaty.

*Article II*

1. For the purposes of this treaty an ABM system is a system to counter strategic ballistic missiles or their elements in flight trajectory, currently consisting of:

   (A) ABM interceptor missiles, which are interceptor missiles constructed and deployed for an ABM role, or of a type tested in an ABM mode;

   (B) ABM launchers, which are launchers constructed and deployed for launching ABM interceptor missiles; and

   (C) ABM radars, which are radars constructed and deployed for ABM role, or of a type tested in an ABM mode.

2. The ABM system components listed in paragraph 1 of this article include those which are:

   (A) operational; (B) under construction; (C) undergoing testing; (D) undergoing overhaul, repair or conversion; or (E) mothballed.

*Article III*

Each party undertakes not to deploy ABM systems or their components except that:

(A) Within one ABM system deployment area having a radius of 150 kilometres and centred on the party's national capital, a party may deploy: (1) no more than 100 ABM launchers and no more than 100 ABM interceptor missiles at launch sites, and (2) ABM radars within no more than six ABM radar complexes. The area of each complex being circular and having a diameter of no more than three kilometres; and

(B) Within one ABM system deployment area having a radius of 150 kilometres and containing ICBM silo launchers, a party may deploy: (1) no more than 100 ABM launchers and no more than 100 ABM interceptor missiles at launch sites; (2) two large phased-array ABM radars comparable in potential to corresponding ABM radars operational or under construction on the date of signature of the treaty in an ABM system deployment area containing ICBM silo launchers; and (3) no more than 18 ABM radars, each having a potential less than the potential of the smaller of the above-mentioned two large phased-array ABM radars.
Article IV
The limitations provided for in Article III shall not apply to ABM systems or their components used for development or testing, and located within current or additionally agreed test ranges. Each party may have no more than a total of fifteen ABM launchers at test ranges.

Article V
1. Each party undertakes not to develop, test, or deploy ABM systems or components which are sea-based, air-based, space-based, or mobile land-based.

2. Each party undertakes not to develop, test or deploy ABM launchers for launching more than one ABM interceptor missile at a time from each launcher, nor to modify deployed launchers to provide them with such a capability, nor to develop, test or deploy automatic or semi-automatic or other similar systems for rapid reload of ABM launchers.

Article VI
To enhance assurance of the effectiveness of the limitations on ABM systems and their components provided by this treaty, each party undertakes:

(A) Not to give missiles, launchers, or radars, other than ABM interceptor missiles, ABM launchers, or ABM radars, capabilities to counter strategic ballistic missiles or their elements in flight trajectory and not to test them in an ABM mode; and

(B) Not to deploy in the future radars for early warning of strategic ballistic missile attack, except at locations along the periphery of its national territory and oriented outward.

Article VII
Subject to the provisions of this treaty, modernization and replacements of ABM systems or their components may be carried out.

Article VIII
ABM systems or their components in excess of the numbers or outside the areas specified in this treaty, as well as ABM systems or their components prohibited by this treaty, shall be destroyed or dismantled under agreed procedures within the shortest possible agreed period of time.

Article IX
To assure the viability and effectiveness of this treaty, each party
undertakes not to transfer to other states, and not to deploy outside its
national territory, ABM systems or their components limited by this
treaty.

Article X
Each party undertakes not to assume any international obligations
which would conflict with this treaty.

Article XI
Each of the parties undertakes to continue active negotiations for limita-
tions on strategic offensive arms.

Article XII
1. For the purpose of providing assurance of compliance with the
provisions of this treaty, each party shall use national technical means
of verification at its disposal in a manner consistent with generally
recognized principles of international law.

2. Each party undertakes not to interfere with the national technical
means of verification of the other party operating in accordance with
Paragraph 1 of this article.

3. Each party undertakes not to use deliberate concealment measures
which impede verification by national technical means of compliance
with the provisions of this treaty. This obligation shall not require
changes in current construction, assembly, conversion or overhaul
practices.

Article XIII
1. To promote the objectives and implementation of the provisions
of this treaty, the parties shall establish promptly a standing consultative
commission, within the framework of which they will:
   (A) Consider questions concerning compliance with the obligations
       assumed and related situations which may be considered ambiguous:
   (B) Provide on a voluntary basis such information as either party
       considers necessary to assure confidence in compliance with the obliga-
       tions assumed:
   (C) Consider questions involving unintended interference with
       national technical means of verification:
   (D) Consider possible changes in the strategic situation which have
       a bearing on the provisions of this treaty:
   (E) Agree upon procedures and dates for destruction or dismantling
of ABM systems or their components in cases provided for by the provisions of this treaty:

(F) Consider, as appropriate, possible proposals for further increasing the viability of this treaty, including proposals for amendments in accordance with the provisions of this treaty:

(G) Consider, as appropriate, proposals for further measures aimed at limiting strategic arms.

2. The parties through consultation shall establish, and may amend as appropriate, regulations for the standing consultative commission governing procedures, composition and other relevant matters.

**Article XIV**

1. Each party may propose amendments to this treaty. Agreed amendments shall enter into force in accordance with the procedures governing the entry into force of this treaty.

2. Five years after entry into force of this treaty, and at five-year intervals thereafter, the parties shall together conduct a review of this treaty.

**Article XV**

1. This treaty shall be of unlimited duration.

2. Each party shall, in exercising its national sovereignty, have the right to withdraw from this treaty if it decides that extraordinary events related to the subject matter of this treaty have jeopardized its supreme interests. It shall give notice of its decision to the other party six months prior to withdrawal from the treaty. Such notice shall include a statement of the extraordinary events the notifying party regards as having jeopardized its supreme interests.

**Article XVI**

1. This treaty shall be subject to ratification in accordance with the constitutional procedure of each party. The treaty shall enter into force on the day of the exchange of instruments of ratification.

2. This treaty shall be registered pursuant to Article 102 of the Charter of the United Nations.

Done at Moscow on 26 May 1972, in two copies, each in the English and Russian languages, both texts being equally authentic.
II. INTERIM AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND THE UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS ON CERTAIN MEASURES WITH RESPECT TO THE LIMITATION OF STRATEGIC OFFENSIVE WEAPONS.

The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the United States of America, hereinafter referred to as the parties,

Convinced that the treaty on the limitation of anti-ballistic missile systems and this interim agreement on certain measures with respect to the limitation of strategic offensive arms will contribute to the creation of more favourable conditions for active negotiations on limiting strategic arms as well as to the relaxation of international tension and the strengthening of trust between states,

Taking into account the relationships between strategic offensive and defensive arms,

Mindful of their obligations under Article VI of the Treaty on the Non-proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, have agreed as follows:

Article I
The parties undertake not to start construction of additional fixed land-based intercontinental ballistic missile (ICBM) launchers after 1 July 1972.

Article II
The parties undertake not to convert land-based launchers for light ICBMs or for ICBMs of older types deployed prior to 1964 into land-based launchers for heavy ICBMs of types deployed after that time.

Article III
The parties undertake to limit submarine-launched ballistic missile (SLBM) launchers and modern ballistic missile submarines to the numbers operational and under construction on the date of signature of this interim agreement, and in addition launchers and submarines constructed under procedures established by the parties as replacements for an equal number of ICBM launchers of older types deployed prior to 1964 or for launchers on older submarines.

Article IV
Subject to the provisions of this interim agreement, modernization and replacement of strategic offensive ballistic missiles and launchers covered by this interim agreement may be undertaken.
Article V

1. For the purpose of providing assurance of compliance with the provisions of this interim agreement, each party shall use national technical means of verification at its disposal in a manner consistent with generally recognized principles of international law.

2. Each party undertakes not to interfere with the national technical means of verification of the other party operating in accordance with Paragraph 1 of this article.

3. Each party undertakes not to use deliberate concealment measures which impede verification by national technical means of compliance with the provisions of this interim agreement. This obligation shall not require changes in current construction, assembly, conversion or overhaul practices.

Article VI

To promote the objectives and implementation of the provisions of this interim agreement, the parties shall use the standing consultative commission established under Article 13 of the Treaty on the Limitation of Anti-ballistic Missile Systems in accordance with the provisions of that article.

Article VII

The parties undertake to continue active negotiations for limitations on strategic offensive arms. The obligations provided for in this interim agreement shall not prejudice the scope of terms of the limitations on strategic offensive arms which may be worked out in the course of further negotiations.

Article VIII

1. This interim agreement shall enter into force upon exchange of written notices of acceptance by each party, which exchange shall take place simultaneously with the exchange of the instruments of ratification of the Treaty on the Limitation of Anti-ballistic Missile Systems.

2. This interim agreement shall remain in force for a period of five years unless replaced earlier by an agreement on more complete measures limiting strategic offensive arms. It is the objective of the parties to conduct active follow-on negotiations with the aim of concluding such an agreement as soon as possible.

3. Each party shall, in exercising its national sovereignty, have the right to withdraw from this interim agreement if it decides that extraordinary events related to the subject matter of this interim agreement
have jeopardized its supreme interests. It shall give notice of its decision to the other party six months prior to withdrawal from this interim agreement. Such notice shall include a statement of the extraordinary events the notifying party regards as having jeopardized its supreme interests.

Done at Moscow on 26 May 1972, in two copies, each in the Russian and English languages, both texts being equally authentic.

PROTOCOL TO THE INTERIM AGREEMENT

The United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, hereinafter referred to as the parties.

Having agreed on certain limitations relating to submarine-launched ballistic missile launchers and modern ballistic missile submarines, and to replacement procedures, in the Interim Agreement have agreed as follows:

The parties understand that, under Article 3 of the Interim Agreement for the period during which that agreement remains in force:

The United States may have no more than 710 ballistic missile launchers on submarines (SLBMs) and no more than 44 modern ballistic missile submarines. The Soviet Union may have no more than 950 ballistic missile launchers on submarines and no more than 62 modern ballistic missile submarines.

Additional ballistic missile launchers on submarines up to the above-mentioned levels, in the United States over 656 ballistic missile launchers on nuclear-powered submarines, and in the Soviet Union over 740 ballistic missile launchers on nuclear-powered submarines, operational and under construction, may become operational as replacements for equal numbers of ballistic missile launchers of older types deployed prior to 1964 or of ballistic missile launchers on older submarines.

The deployment of modern SLBMs on any submarine, regardless of type, will be counted against the total level of SLBMs permitted for the United States and the Soviet Union.

This protocol shall be considered an integral part of the interim agreement.

AGREED INTERPRETATIONS

ABM TREATY

(a) The parties understand that, in addition to the ABM radars which may be deployed in accordance with sub-paragraph (A) of article
III of the Treaty, those non-phased-array ABM radars operational on the date of signature of the Treaty within the ABM system deployment area for defence of the national capital may be retained.

(b) The parties understand that the potential (the product of mean emitted power in watts and antenna area in square metres) of the smaller of the two large phased-array ABM radars referred to in sub-paragraph (B) of article III of the Treaty is considered for purposes of the Treaty to be three million.

(c) The parties understand that the centre of the ABM system deployment area centred on the national capital and the centre of the ABM system deployment area containing ICBM silo launchers for each party shall be separated by no less than thirteen hundred kilometres.

(d) The parties agree not to deploy phased-array radars having a potential (the product of mean emitted power in watts and antenna area in square metres) exceeding three million, except as provided for in articles III, IV and VI of the Treaty, or except for the purposes of tracking objects in outer space or for use as national technical means of verification.

(e) In order to insure fulfilment of the obligation not to deploy ABM systems and their components except as provided in article III of the Treaty, the parties agree that in the event of ABM systems based on other physical principles and including components capable of substituting for ABM interceptor missiles, ABM launchers, or ABM radars, are vetoed in the future. Specific limitations on such systems and their components would be subject to discussion in accordance with article XIII and agreement in accordance with article XIV of the Treaty.

(f) The parties understand that article V of the Treaty includes obligations not to develop, test or deploy ABM interceptor missiles for the delivery by each ABM interceptor missile of more than one independently guided warhead.

(g) The parties understand that article IX of the Treaty includes the obligation of the US and the USSR not to provide to other states technical descriptions of blueprints specially worked out for the construction of ABM systems and their components limited by the Treaty.

INTERIM AGREEMENT ON OFFENSIVE WEAPONS

(h) The parties understand that land-based ICBM launchers referred
to in the interim agreement are understood to be launchers for strategic ballistic missiles capable of ranges in excess of the shortest distance between the North-Eastern border of the continental US and the North-Western border of the continental USSR.

(i) The parties understand that fixed land-based ICBM launchers under active construction at the date of signature of the interim agreement may be completed.

(j) The parties understand that in the process of modernization and replacement the dimensions of land-based ICBM silo launchers will not be significantly increased.

(k) The parties understand that dismantling or destruction of ICBM launchers of older types deployed prior to 1964 and ballistic missile launchers on older submarines being replaced by new SLBM launchers on modern submarines will be initiated at the time of the beginning of sea trials of a replacement submarine, and will be completed in the shortest possible agreed period of time. Such dismantling or destruction, and timely notification thereof, will be accomplished under procedures to be agreed in the standing consultative commission.

(l) The parties understand that during the period of the interim agreement there shall be no significant increase in the number of ICBM or SLBM test and training launchers, or in the number of such launchers for modern land-based heavy ICBMs. The parties further understand that construction or conversion of ICBM launchers at test ranges shall be undertaken only for purposes of testing and training.

COMMON UNDERSTANDINGS

(a) Increase in ICBM Silo Dimensions
Ambassador Smith made the following statement on 26 May 1972: 'The parties agree that the term “significantly increased” means that an increase will not be greater than 10-15 per cent of the present dimensions of land-based ICBM silo launchers'.

Minister Semenov replied that this statement corresponded to the Soviet understanding.

(b) Location of ICBM Defences
The US delegation made the following statement on 26 May 1972: 'Article III of the ABM Treaty provides for each side one ABM system
deployment area centred on its national capital and one ABM system deployment area containing ICBM silo launchers. The two sides have registered agreement on the following statement: "The parties understand that the centre of the ABM system deployment area centred on the national capital and the centre of the ABM system deployment area containing ICBM silo launchers for each party shall be separated by no less than thirteen hundred kilometres." In this connection, the US side notes that its ABM system deployment area for defence of ICBM silo launchers, located West of the Mississippi River, will be centred in the Grand Forks ICBM silo launcher deployment area'.

(c) **ABM Test Ranges**

The US delegation made the following statement on 26 April 1972: 'Article IV of the ABM Treaty provides that "The limitations provided for in article III shall not apply to ABM systems or their components used for development or testing, and located within current or additionally agreed test ranges". We believe it would be useful to assure that there is no misunderstanding as to current ABM test ranges. It is our understanding that ABM test ranges encompass the area within which ABM components are located for test purposes. The current US ABM test ranges are at White Sands, New Mexico, and at Kwajalein Atoll, and the current Soviet ABM test range is near Sary Shagan in Kazakhstan. We consider that non-phased-array radars of types used for range safety or instrumentation purposes may be located outside of ABM test ranges. We interpret the reference in article IV to "Additionally agreed test ranges" to mean that ABM components will not be located at any other test ranges without prior agreement between our governments that there will be such additional ABM test ranges'.

On 5 May 1972, the Soviet delegation stated that there was a common understanding on what ABM test ranges were, that the use of the types of non-ABM radars for range safety or instrumentation was not limited under the Treaty, that the reference in Article IV to 'additionally agreed' test ranges was sufficiently clear, and that national means permitted identifying current test ranges.

(d) **Mobile ABM System**

On 28 January 1972, the US delegation made the following statement: 'Article V (1) of the joint draft text of the ABM Treaty includes an undertaking not to develop, test, or deploy mobile land-based ABM systems and their components. On 5 May 1971, the US side indicated that, in its view, a prohibition on deployment of mobile ABM systems and components would rule out the deployment of ABM launchers and
radars which were not permanent fixed types. At that time, we asked for the Soviet view of this interpretation. Does the Soviet side agree with the US side’s interpretation put forward on 5 May 1971?*

On 13 April 1972, the Soviet delegation said there is a general common understanding on this matter.

(e) **Standing Consultative Commission**

Ambassador Smith made the following statement on 23 May 1972: ‘The United States proposes that the sides agree that, with regard to initial implementation of the ABM Treaty’s article XIII on the Standing Consultative Commission (SCC) and of the consultation articles to the interim agreement on offensive arms and the accidents agreement,* agreement establishing the SCC will be worked out early in the follow-on SALT negotiations; until that is completed, the following arrangements will prevail: when SALT is in session, any consultation desired by either side under these articles can be carried out by the two SALT delegations; when SALT is not in session, *ad hoc* arrangements for any desired consultations under these articles may be made through diplomatic channels’.

Minister Semenov replied that, on an *ad referendum* basis, he could agree that the US statement corresponded to the Soviet understanding.

(f) **Standstill**

On 6 May 1972, Minister Semenov made the following statement: ‘In an effort to accommodate the wishes of the US side, the Soviet delegation is prepared to proceed on the basis that the two sides will in fact observe the obligations of both the interim agreement and the ABM Treaty beginning from the date of signature of these two documents’.

In reply, the US delegation made the following statement on 20 May 1972: ‘The US agrees in principle with the Soviet statement made on 6 May concerning observance of obligations beginning from date of signature but we would like to make clear our understanding that this means that, pending ratification and acceptance, neither side would take any action prohibited by the agreements after they had entered into force. This understanding would continue to apply in the absence of notification by either signatory of its intention not to proceed with ratification or approval.’

The Soviet delegation indicated agreement with the US statement.

* See article 7 of agreement to reduce the risk of outbreak of nuclear war between the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, signed 30 September 1971 (reprinted in *Survival*, December 1971).
UNILATERAL STATEMENTS

(A) The following noteworthy unilateral statements were made during the negotiations by the US delegation:

(a) *Withdrawal from the ABM Treaty*
On 9 May 1972, Ambassador Smith made the following statement: 'The US delegation has stressed the importance the US government attaches to achieving agreement on more complete limitations on strategic offensive arms, following agreement on an ABM Treaty and on an interim agreement on certain measures with respect to the limitation of strategic offensive arms. The US delegation believes that an objective of the follow-on negotiations should be to constrain and reduce on a long-term basis threats to the survivability of our respective strategic retaliatory forces. The USSR delegation has also indicated that the objectives of SALT would remain unfulfilled without the achievement of an agreement provided for more complete limitations on strategic offensive arms. Both sides recognize that the initial agreements would be steps toward the achievement of more complete limitations on strategic offensive arms. The US Executive will inform the Congress, in connection with congressional consideration of the ABM Treaty and the interim agreement of this statement of the US position'.

(b) *Land-Mobile ICBM Launchers*
The US delegation made the following statement on 20 May 1972: 'In connection with the important subject of land-mobile ICBM launchers, in the interest of concluding the interim agreement the US delegation now withdraws its proposal that article I or an agreed statement explicitly prohibit the deployment of mobile land-based ICBM launchers. I have been instructed to inform you that, while agreeing to defer the question of negotiations on more complete limitations on strategic offensive arms, the US would consider the deployment of operational land-mobile ICBM launchers during the period of the interim agreement as inconsistent with the objectives of that agreement'.

(c) *Covered Facilities*
The US delegation made the following statement on 20 May 1972: 'I wish to emphasize the importance that the United States attaches to the provisions of Article V [of the Interim Agreement — Ed.], including in particular their application to fitting out or berthing submarines'.
(d) 'Heavy' ICBMs
The US delegation made the following statement on 26 May 1972: 'The US delegation regrets that the Soviet delegation has not been willing to agree on a common definition of a heavy missile. Under these circumstances, the US delegation believes it necessary to state the following: The United States would consider any ICBM having a volume significantly greater than that of the largest light ICBM now operational on either side to be a heavy ICBM. The US proceeds on the premise that the Soviet side will give due account to this consideration'.

(e) 'Tested in an ABM Mode'
On 7 April 1972, the US delegation made the following statement: 'Article II of the joint draft text uses the term "tested in an ABM mode", in defining ABM components, and Article VI includes certain obligations concerning such testing. We believe that the sides should have a common understanding of this phrase. First, we would note that the testing provisions of the ABM Treaty are intended to apply to testing which occurs after the date of signature of the Treaty, and not to any testing which may have occurred in the past. Next, we would amplify the remarks we have made on this subject during the previous Helsinki phase by setting forth the objectives which govern the US view on the subject, namely, while prohibiting testing of non-ABM components for ABM purposes: not to prevent testing of ABM components, and not to prevent testing of non-ABM components for non-ABM purposes. To clarify our interpretation of "tested in an ABM mode", we note that we would consider a launcher, missile or radar to be "tested in an ABM mode" if, for example, any of the following events occur: (1) A launcher is used to launch an ABM interceptor missile; (2) an interceptor missile is flight tested against a target vehicle which has a flight trajectory with characteristics of a strategic ballistic missile flight trajectory, or is flight tested in conjunction with the test of an ABM interceptor missile or an ABM radar at the same test range, or is flight tested to an altitude inconsistent with interception of targets against which air defences are deployed; (3) a radar makes measurements on a co-operative target vehicle of the kind referred to in item (2) above during the re-entry portion of its trajectory or makes measurements in conjunction with the test of an ABM interceptor missile or an ABM radar at the same test range. Radars used for purposes such as range safety or instrumentation would be exempt from application of these criteria.'
(f) No-Transfer Article of ABM Treaty
On 18 April 1972, the US delegation made the following statement: ‘In regard to this Article (IX), I have a brief and I believe self-explanatory statement to make. The US side wishes to make clear that the provisions of this article do not set a precedent for whatever provision may be considered for a treaty on limiting strategic offensive arms. The question of transfer of strategic offensive arms is a far more complex issue, which may require a different solution’.

(g) No Increase in Defence of Early Warning Radars
On 28 July 1970, the US delegation made the following statement: ‘Since Hen House Radars (Soviet ballistic missile early warning radars) can detect and track ballistic missile warheads at great distances, they have a significant ABM potential. Accordingly, the US would regard any increase in the defences of such radars by surface-to-air missiles as inconsistent with an agreement’.

(B) The following noteworthy unilateral statement was made by the delegation of the USSR and is shown here with the US reply:

On 17 May 1972, Minister Semenov made the following unilateral ‘Statement of the Soviet Side’: ‘Taking into account that modern ballistic missile submarines are presently in the possession of not only the US, but also of its NATO allies, the Soviet Union agrees that for the period of effectiveness of the interim “freeze” agreement the US and its NATO allies have up to 50 such submarines with a total of up to 800 ballistic missile launchers thereon (including 41 US submarines with 656 ballistic missile launchers). However, if during the period of effectiveness of the agreement US allies in NATO should increase the number of their modern submarines to exceed the numbers of submarines they would have operational or under construction on the date of signature of the agreement, the Soviet Union will have the right to a corresponding increase in the number of its submarines. In the opinion of the Soviet side, the solution of the question of modern ballistic missile submarines provided for in the Interim Agreement only partially compensates for the strategic imbalance in the deployment of the nuclear-powered missile submarines of the USSR and the US. Therefore, the Soviet side believes that this whole question, and above all the question of liquidating the American missile submarine bases outside the US, will be appropriately resolved in the course of follow-on negotiations’.

On 24 May 1972, Ambassador Smith made the following reply to Minister Semenov: ‘The United States side has studied the “Statement
made by the Soviet side” of 17 May concerning compensation for submarine basing and SLBM submarines belonging to third countries. The United States does not accept the validity of the considerations in that statement.

On 26 May 1972, Minister Semenov repeated the unilateral statement made on 17 May. Ambassador Smith also repeated the US rejection on 26 May.
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