MEMORANDUM FOR THE RECORD

SUBJECT: Debriefing on the SALT Negotiations

Colonel VonIns and Capt McLean debriefed the staff on January 20, on the current status of the SALT talks. Colonel VonIns led off the debriefing by explaining the proceedings of SALT I at Helsinki, and SALT II at Vienna. SALT I consisted of the U. S. tabling two kinds of "illustrative" proposals to show what types of an agreement could be made. SALT II ended with the U. S. tabling a definitive proposal, sometimes referred to as "Option E". The proposal, directed by NSDM 74 remains the U. S. position. It is less comprehensive than the proposals prepared earlier under NSSM 28 but did include mention of specific verification of the agreement by "national means."

Capt McLean then explained what had occurred during SALT III at Helsinki, which ended December 18. The U. S. stand during this round was one of "standing fast" on the tabled proposal and to let the Soviets do the talking. Several topics of interest arose during both formal and informal discussions.

1. The Soviets began "piecemealing out" counters to the U. S. proposal but never wrapped this up. Then toward the end of the round the Soviets tabled an "ABM only" proposal which was tabled with blanks for radius permitted and numbers of systems to be positioned around Moscow and Washington. The Soviets apparently are treating their
proposal as their beginning position and not their final one. This has implications for the decision on the U. S. FY 72 budget for the SAFEGUARD system.

2. There were informal discussions relating to verification by "national means." The formal proposal set forth some points which appear to confirm that the Soviets desire to protect their own satellite capability. OSD legal people feel that there were no traps in the Soviet proposal with regards to a potential dispute over what constitutes national sovereignty. The Soviets have privately discussed their desire to keep the overhead reconnaissance effort viable and it is indicated that they have a sincere desire to retain their capability. There is an implied "understanding" of non-interference with national means as well as an "understanding" of no deliberate concealment which deviates from established practices of construction and building.

Colonel VonIns then went on to discuss the matter of Inter-Agency papers in support of policy decisions affecting the SALT negotiations. He stated that there had been 42 Inter-Agency papers generated by the National Security Council between SALT II and SALT III. Only two or three of these papers ever reached the top decision group. After explaining the mechanism for working these papers Colonel VonIns speculated that the preparation for SALT IV to begin in Vienna on March 15 will be more rational and there will be fewer study requests generated. There are presently four papers under review at this time which are considered meaningful for the negotiations. These are verification of mobile ICBM's, fixed ICBM's, SAM upgraded to ABM capability, and strategic forces survivability. There is still apparently a desire to review and reassess the October 1969 Verification Panel Study. Mr. Kissinger's present feelings are that the four papers mentioned above, especially the strategic forces survivability paper, serve as the reassessment to the original Verification Panel Study. We share the view of JCS that a consolidated review of our verification capabilities directly associated with the tabled proposal should be accomplished.
In summary there seems to be optimism as to the potential of reaching a fairly extensive Arms Limitation Treaty with the Soviets but the question remains--when will an agreement be reached. No one is willing to speculate on this. Contrary to the reports in the press, the Soviet Party Congress which convenes in March apparently is not expected to have significant impact on the talks. The NRO will continue to support the efforts of General Allison's office as required. It is evident that the NRP is going to be the major element in the process of evaluating adherence to an Arms Limitation agreement.

HAROLD S. COYLE, JR.
Major, USAF
NOTE FOR DR. NAKA

SUBJECT: SALT Debriefing

As you are aware, you, Dr. Seaman and Dr. McLucas are scheduled to be briefed by General Allison on Febru.

Attached for your information is record memorandum reflecting the thoughts passed to Colonel Sweeney the staff on January 19, by Col Pau VonIns and Capt Bill McLean of Gen staff.

Col Sweeney raised an interesting during the January 19 debriefing at USIB involvement. I share the noti that USIB should begin generating interest in the requirements as opp to the capability for verification. systems are capable but no real as has been made on the required int
of verification and the effect of this on our total mix of resources during a year-by-year verification process. This may be a point worthy of mention in your future discussions on SALT.

HAROLD S. COYLE, JR.
Major, USAF
January 19, 1971

NOTE FOR COLONEL SWEENEY

SUBJECT: SALT

As a follow on to our SALT debriefing this morning, I wanted to let you know what we are doing in this area. You will recall that in 1969 Jim Marshall and Bob Meceda spent a considerable amount of time supporting the original staff actions and participating in the Verification Panel studies. Recently Bud Coyle has spent no small effort in working on the four papers that Col Von Ins mentioned this morning as ongoing efforts—mobile ICBMs, fixed ICBMs, SAMS in an interceptor role, and verification aspects of strategic forces survivability. Bud's efforts have been largely through the JCS, specifically General Allison's people, and his efforts have been to temper the optimism which all parties seem to evidence when it comes to the capabilities of NRO systems. Through his efforts with the JCS, he has assisted in gaining agreement from all agencies on a realistic assessment of NRO system capabilities. Although Col Kiefer has not been able to participate fully in these sessions Bud has kept him up to speed to Dick's satisfaction.
We envision that in due time Admiral Moorer may insist upon an update of the Verification Panel Study. At this time we will need to get SS-7 into the driver's seat on that effort. In the meantime Bud is doing a really outstanding job of looking out for our interests and the feedback that we are getting from ACSAN reflects this.

FREDERICK L. Hofmann
Major, USAF